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Introduction

Donors roads from Paris to Accra

The Paris Declaration on the effectiveness of aid, signed on April 2005, is an important step of the International Community towards a development aimed to the MDGs. It offers a response to the risk of probable chaos and congestion of the aid system in the light of the proposed aid financial increases. It is an ambitious plan to reform aid management to be achieved at the same time as the aid is increased. Its basic principle is the recognition of leadership to partner countries, from the strategic planning phase to the actual implementation and evaluations of the interventions planned.

Should the objectives of the Paris Declaration be achieved by 2010, their positive effects would include: the improvement of the purchasing and financial management systems in more than half of the developing countries; 85% of aid will figure in the budgets of the partner countries, with significant administrative simplification; donors will have reduced uncoordinated missions to recipient countries by 75% and 84% of aid will be effectively paid out in the year in which it is promised and will be, for the most part, untied.

In 2005 the EU approved more ambitious targets on aid effectiveness than the Paris Declaration, mainly regarding the use of country systems, coordination of technical assistance and the avoidance of new parallel units.

However the extent of the challenge is indicated by the 10,453 missions to 34 countries carried out by aid donors and the 75,000 new aid contracts approved in 2005. Therefore, many consider aid effectiveness objectives to be more difficult to achieve than the increase in aid levels given that they require the reorganisation of ongoing activities and changes in the traditional methods of managing aid by the various donors. This has led many donors to quickly reform their methods of managing aid, so as to achieve the effectiveness objectives by 2010. The results have been assessed two years later. The first progress report on aid targets and the new commitments on aid effectiveness compelled donors to further rethink their work.

If one considers the Paris Declaration born within the OECD donors’ club, within a limited group of developing countries gathered for the occasion, in 2008, three years later, the third high level meeting on aid effectiveness in Accra demonstrated that the process has generated momentum, with a broader participation by developing countries. After one year long consultation, donors, Partners countries and many civil society (CSO) finally met to review the 2005 progress and attempted to address some shortcomings of the Paris Declaration. After relentless negotiations the conference endorsed the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA).

Overall, the AAA achieved more than expected. There has been significant progress in terms of greater commitment to be inclusive of CSOs, parliamentarians and other actors. There has also been some limited but important improvement on the issues of mutual accountability, transparency, predictability and conditionality. Although falling short of delivering time-bound reforms the AAA is a good middle point.

This was the product of late negotiations with the Europeans facing down US and Japanese efforts to prevent any new commitments at all. However, overall, when judged against civil society demands, there is little of real substance, though the language throughout is often positive. One advisor to developing countries summed it up the Accra Agenda for Action as 8/10 for language, 4/10 for commitments.
### Table 1: topic related comparison between Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action Commitments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paris Targets</th>
<th>Accra Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Halve the proportion of aid flows to the governmental sector not reported on Partner countries’ budgets - with at least 85% reported on budget</td>
<td>Support efforts to increase the capacity of all development actors - parliaments, central and local governments, CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66% of aid flows are provided in the context of programme-oriented approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% of technical cooperation flows implemented through co-ordinated programmes consistent with national development strategies</td>
<td>Promote the provision of technical co-operation by local and regional resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A reduction (minimum 1/3 maximum 2/3) in the % of aid to the public sector not using countries’ public financial management systems</td>
<td>Use country systems as the first option for aid programmes in support of activities managed by the public sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tied aid percentage below the 2005 level</td>
<td>Channel 50% or more to government-to-government assistance through country financial systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A reduction (minimum 1/3 maximum 2/3) in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries’ procurement systems</td>
<td>Jointly assess the quality of country systems in a country-led process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% of donors mission are joint</td>
<td>Provide staff guidance on how country systems can be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66% of country analytical work is joint</td>
<td>Extend coverage of the 2001 DAC Recommendation on Untying Aid to non-LDC HIPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halve the proportion of aid not disbursed within the fiscal year for which it was scheduled</td>
<td>Elaborate individual plans to further untie their aid to the maximum extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce by 2/3 the stock of parallel project implementation units (PIUs)</td>
<td>Promote the use of local and regional procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Align their monitoring with country information systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publicly disclose regular, detailed and timely information on volume, allocation and, when available, results of development expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regularly make public all conditions linked to aid disbursements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide full and timely information on annual commitments and actual disbursements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide developing countries with regular and timely information on their rolling three-to five-year forward expenditure and/or implementation plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delegate sufficient authority to country offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change organisational and staff incentives to promote behaviour in line with aid effectiveness principles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: elaboration on Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action
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Despite the not too ambitious Paris commitments, and, after a three-year long effort to reform aid management according to the new aid paradigm, the 2008 Evaluation of the Paris Declaration and the 2008 Survey highlighted insufficient results. Progresses have been achieved in aligning aid strategies with national priorities, but much less so when it comes to aligning aid allocations, using and building country systems, reducing parallel implementing units (PIU) and improving coordinated support for capacity building. In particular the 2008 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration shows that very little progress has been achieved in the use of country systems and in improving the predictability of aid flows.

According to the DAC\(^1\), the implementation of the Paris Declaration is a political agenda and not merely a technical one. Political commitments and engagements are crucial to ensuring that improved partnerships and mutual accountability for results will occur. Accelerated progress on the Paris Declaration requires political leadership, but the Declaration does not yet have enough political soundness. Aid agencies face pressure to deliver and disbursement targets provide negative incentives for aid effectiveness implementation. Donors agencies management tends to be risk averse, whereas adherence to the Paris Declaration principles implies taking risks - for instance fiduciary risks when using countries systems.

Internal policies and procedures have a strong impact on aid effectiveness. Regulation can generate risk-avoiding behaviour. Many donors had to review the legal framework under which they operate, in order to allow for channelling funds through another donor or through pooled funds without unnecessary burdens or authorisations.

Data shows that the higher the degree of decentralisation of resources and responsibilities, the better is the agency’s performance in aid effectiveness. This also includes a reshaping of back offices functions. Yet for many donors, although decentralisation is taking place, decision making authority still resides at headquarter level.

This study aims to track and highlight how six donors planned to change their aid management in a comparable way. It sets 23 criteria against which assessing commonalities. Some policy guidance can indirectly be drawn for all donors, but the study policy recommendations are aimed to influence the aid effectiveness plan of the Italian development cooperation.

Unlike many EU donors Italy did not issue any comprehensive management reform plan until now, on the eve of the DAC peer review. Action plans on implementing the Paris Declaration were high on the international development agenda in 2006 with many Donors implementing or preparing those plans. Their implementation varies across donors with some Action plans not yet implemented. Some donors even realized that mainstreaming aid effectiveness into corporate planning is more effective than implementing separate action plans on Aid Effectiveness.

---

\(^1\) OECD-DAC Incentives for aid effectiveness in donors agencies, September 2008.
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Le vie dei donatori da Parigi ad Accra

La Dichiarazione di Parigi sull’efficacia degli aiuti, firmata nell’Aprile 2005, è un passo importante della Comunità Internazionale verso gli Obiettivi di Sviluppo del Millennio (MDGs). Essa offre una risposta al rischio della probabile confusione e congestione del sistema degli aiuti alla luce anche degli incrementi finanziari previsti. E’ un ambizioso progetto di riforma della gestione degli aiuti da realizzarsi nel momento stesso del loro aumento. Suo principio di fondo è il riconoscimento della leadership ai paesi beneficiari, dalla fase di pianificazione strategica all’effettiva realizzazione e valutazione degli interventi programmati.

Se gli obiettivi della Dichiarazione di Parigi dovessero essere raggiunti entro il 2010, i loro effetti positivi includerebbero: il miglioramento dei sistemi di gestione finanziaria e bando di gare per più della metà dei paesi in via di sviluppo; l’85% degli aiuti comparî nei bilanci dei paesi partner, accompagnandosi ad una significativa semplificazione amministrativa; i donatori ridurranno del 75% le missioni non coordinate verso i paesi partner; e l’84% degli aiuti verrà effettivamente sborsato nell’anno in cui è stato promesso, senza ritardi, e sarà in larga parte, slegato dall’obbligo di garantirne l’implementazione attraverso le imprese del donatore.

Nel 2005 l’Unione Europea ha approvato obiettivi sull’efficacia dell’aiuto più ambiziosi di quelli della Dichiarazione di Parigi, soprattutto riguardo l’uso dei sistema finanziari del Paese (di seguito indicato come country system), il coronamento dell’assistenza tecnica e la riduzione delle strutture amministrative parallele.

Tuttavia, la portata della sfida resta consistente, come dimostrato dalle 10.453 missioni dei paesi donatori in 34 paesi e dai 75.000 nuovi interventi nel 2005. Perciò, molti considerano più difficile raggiungere questi obiettivi rispetto all’avanzamento dei livelli dell’aiuto, poiché essi richiedono una riorganizzazione delle attività in corso e cambiamenti dei metodi consolidati di gestione degli aiuti da parte dei vari donatori. Per far fronte alla sfida, molti donatori hanno avviato una veloce riforma delle loro modalità di gestione dell’aiuto, in modo da centrare entro il 2010 gli obiettivi sull’efficacia. I risultati di queste riforme sono stati valutati due anni dopo e i modesti progressi registrati impongono ai donatori di riconsiderare ulteriormente il loro operato.

Se si considera che la Dichiarazione di Parigi è nata nel club dei donatori OECD, all’interno di un gruppo limitato di paesi in via di sviluppo riunitosi per l’occasione, nel 2008, tre anni più tardi, il terzo meeting di alto livello di Accra ha dimostrato che il processo ha guadagnato interesse e slancio, con una più larga partecipazione dei paesi in via di sviluppo. Dopo una consultazione durata un anno, donatori, paesi Partner e gran parte della società civile (CSO) sono alla fine giunti a riesaminare il progresso dal 2005 e hanno tentato di individuare alcuni limiti della Dichiarazione di Parigi. Dopo lunghi e aspri negoziati la conferenza ha sottoscritto l’Agenda per l’Azione di Accra (AAA).


L’AAA è il frutto di lunghe trattative che hanno visto gli Europei vincere gli sforzi di USA e Giappone di evitare qualsiasi tipo di nuovo impegno. Tuttavia, nell’insieme, se giudicati alla luce delle richieste della società civile, il giudizio rimane modesto, nonostante il linguaggio spesso ottimistico. Un negoziatore dei paesi in via di sviluppo ha valutato l’Agenda per l’Azione di Accra in 8/10 per il linguaggio e 4/10 per gli impegni.
Tabella 1: Confronto per argomenti tra la Dichiarazione di Parigi e l’Agenda per gli impegni all’azione di Accra.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obiettivi di Parigi</th>
<th>Obiettivi di Accra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimezzare la proporzione di flussi di aiuti verso il settore governativo non riportati nei bilanci dei Paesi Partner – con almeno l’85% riportato nel bilancio</td>
<td>Sostenere lo sviluppo delle capacità di tutti gli attori dello sviluppo – parlamenti, governi centrali e locali, CSO (società civile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il 66% dei flussi di aiuti sono forniti nel contesto di approcci a programma</td>
<td>Promuovere la fornitura della cooperazione tecnica attraverso risorse locali e regionali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il 50% dei flussi di cooperazione tecnica implementati attraverso programmi coordinati compatibili con le strategie di sviluppo nazionale</td>
<td>Utilizzare i country systems come prima opzione per i programmi di aiuti a sostegno delle attività gestite dal settore pubblico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Una riduzione (minimo 1/3 massimo 2/3) della percentuale di aiuti al settore pubblico che non utilizzano sistemi di gestione di finanza pubblica dei paesi</td>
<td>Veicolare il 50% e oltre all’assistenza governo-a governo attraverso sistemi finanziari dei paesi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentuale di aiuti legati sotto il livello del 2005</td>
<td>Verificare congiuntamente la qualità dei country systems attraverso un processo guidato dai paesi partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Una riduzione (minimo 1/3 massimo 2/3) della percentuale di aiuti al settore pubblico non utilizzando procedure di gara dei paesi partner</td>
<td>Fornire sostegno allo staff delle agenzie di sviluppo sul modo di usare i country systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il 40% delle missioni dei donatori sono congiunte</td>
<td>Estendere la copertura delle Raccomandazioni DAC sugli Aiuti slegati verso gli HIPC non-LDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il 66% del lavoro analitico dei paesi è congiunto</td>
<td>Elaborare piani nazionali individuali per slegare ulteriormente il più possibile gli aiuti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimezzare la proporzione di aiuti non erogati nell’anno fiscale in cui sono stati programmati</td>
<td>Promuovere l’uso di forniture locali e regionali di beni e servizi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridurre di 2/3 le strutture amministrative parallele di implementazione del (PIU)</td>
<td>Allineare il monitoraggio ai sistemi di informazione dei paesi partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendere pubbliche regolarmente tutte le condizioni legate alle erogazioni degli aiuti</td>
<td>Rendere pubbliche informazioni puntuali, dettagliate e regolari sul volume, l’assegnazione, e, ove disponibili, i risultati degli stanziamenti di spesa per lo sviluppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fornire informazioni puntuali ed esaustivi sugli impegni annuali e sulle erogazioni effettive</td>
<td>Fornire ai paesi in via di sviluppo informazioni puntuali e regolari sulla loro spesa futura operativa dai tre ai cinque anni e/o sui progetti di implementazione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegare sufficiente autorità agli uffici della agenzia nei paesi</td>
<td>Modificare gli incentivi organizzativi e del personale per promuovere comportamenti in linea con i principi dell’ efficacia degli aiuti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fonte: Elaborazione sulla Dichiarazione di Parigi e l’Agenda per l’Azione di Accra.
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Nonostante gli impegni non eccessivamente ambiziosi di Parigi, e, dopo uno sforzo lungo tre anni di riformare la gestione dell’aiuto secondo il nuovo paradigma, la Valutazione della messa in opera della Dichiarazione di Parigi del 2008 e la Ricognizione dei progressi del 2008 hanno evidenziato risultati ancora insufficienti. Aree di maggior miglioramento hanno riguardato l’allineamento alle strategie dell’aiuto con le priorità nazionali, ma molto meno è stato raggiunto in termini di allineamento degli stanziamenti degli aiuti, nella costruzione e nell’uso dei country systems, nella riduzione delle strutture amministrative di implementazione parallele (PIU) e nel miglioramento del coordinamento dell’assistenza tecnica. In particolare, la Ricognizione del 2008 sul Monitoraggio della Dichiarazione di Parigi mostra che pochi progressi si sono fatti nell’uso dei country systems e nel miglioramento della prevedibilità dei flussi degli aiuti.

Secondo il DAC², la messa in opera della Dichiarazione di Parigi riguarda l’agenda politica e non semplicemente tecnica. L’impegno e il coinvolgimento politico sono cruciali per assicurare che le partnership si rafforzino e che una comune responsabilità per i risultati si concretizzi. Progressi accelerati verso una maggiore efficacia richiedono leadership politica, ma la Dichiarazione ancora non possiede il peso in questo senso. Le agenzie dell’aiuto fronteggiano pressioni di esborso e spesa, con gli obiettivi di esborso che forniscono incentivi negativi alla realizzazione dell’agenda dell’efficacia dell’aiuto. Il modello di gestione delle agenzie dei donatori tende a ridurre al minimo i rischi, dove invece l’aderenza ai principi della Dichiarazione di Parigi implica dei rischi almeno per garantire l’innovazione – per esempio di natura fiduciaria quando si usano country systems.

Le procedure e le politiche interne hanno un forte impatto sulla realizzazione dell’efficacia dell’aiuto. Le procedure possono generare comportamenti orientati ad evitare rischi. Molti donatori hanno dovuto riconsiderare la struttura legale sotto cui operano, per poter canalizzare fondi attraverso un altro donatore o partecipare a fondi comuni multi-donatore.

I dati evidenziano che più alto è il livello di decentramento di risorse e responsabilità a livello Paese delle agenzie di donatori, migliore è la performance dell’agenzia rispetto all’efficacia dell’aiuto. Ciò comprende anche il rimodellamento delle funzioni e ruoli delle strutture amministrative in sede. Tuttavia per molti donatori, nonostante l’attuale decentramento, il potere decisionale risiede ancora al livello dei quartier generali.

Questo studio si prefisge di tracciare ed evidenziare in chiave comparativa le riforme avviate dai donatori per modificare la gestione dell’aiuto. Stabilisce 23 criteri in base ai quali mappare eventuali percorsi comuni. Alcune tendenze comuni possono essere individuate per tutti i donatori, ma le raccomandazioni dello studio mirano a influenzare il piano sull’efficacia dell’aiuto della cooperazione italiana allo sviluppo in corso di preparazione.


² OECD-DAC Incentivi per l’efficacia dell’aiuto nelle agenzie dei donatori, Settembre 2008.
The European Commission

Graph 1: Paris Declaration Targets, trends in 2005-2007 and distance from the 2010 target

* Tied aid percentage not applicable
Source: elaboration on the 2008 Survey on monitoring the Paris declaration.

Performance on aid effectiveness
EC commitment towards Paris Declaration Targets and additional EU targets on aid effectiveness shows a positive trend in all sectors, except for the use of common arrangements, declining from 50% to 46% (against a EU target of 60%). Relevant results have been achieved in the domain of Joint analytical work, where the target of 66% has already been overcome. Much remain to be done in the field of coordinated technical assistance, where EC is lagging at 50% against the EU target of 100%. In the 2008 OECD Survey, no data are available for untied aid.

Overview
In 2006, the EU adopted an “Aid Effectiveness package” to translate into action the commitments undertaken by the European Union in terms of Aid Effectiveness and MDGs. The Package, endorsed by the Council, gives recommendations on how aid can be made more predictable and more effective for recipients and how the substantial commitments on aid volumes by the European Union can be delivered effectively. The Package is composed by an action plan containing nine time-bound deliverables which fall under the three broad headings: i) monitoring the Monterrey Consensus, the Paris Declaration, and updating the EU Donor Atlas; ii) developing a Joint Programming Framework to be implemented in 2008 and iii) improving complementary and enhancing the division of labour between the EC and the member states to be fully implemented by 2010.

Furthermore in 2006 the EC has developed a specific Action Plan to mainstream aid effectiveness across its global program and to prepare and monitor progress on the strategies for the EU four additional aid effectiveness commitments3.

According to the EC self-assessment undertaken in preparation of the 3rd High Level Forum (HLF) of Accra, “implementation of the strategies for four additional EU commitments” is well underway. The strategies for increased use of country systems and for increased proportion of joint missions are being implemented, while the strategy on Technical Cooperation and PIUs is being developed in coordination with other donors. The four commitments are being monitored through an addition of an annex to the Commission's bi-annual reporting by Delegations, to collect specific data for a baseline and then to measure progress regularly on each target.

The main challenge to the implementation of the EC Aid Effectiveness Agenda originates from its peculiar status within the international donors community, since it provides direct donor support to developing countries, while playing also a crucial “federating” role with the other institutions and Member States of the

3 The four additional EU commitments on aid effectiveness are: to provide all capacity building assistance through coordinated programs with an increasing use of multi-donor arrangements; to channel 50% of government-to-government assistance through country systems, including by increasing the percentage of assistance provided through budget support or sector support (SWAP) arrangements; to avoid the establishment of any new project implementation units (PIUs); to reduce the number of un-coordinated missions by 50%.
European Union. Therefore, EC efforts on aid effectiveness are directed towards and should be monitored against both the improvement of its internal system and the enhancement of the process of coordination, complementarity and division of labor among all European donors. The second task, in particular, requires the development of a strong and legitimized leadership at country level, in order to overcome or harmonize EU member states’ national interests, priorities and procedures.

**Strategy and Policy Positioning**

The EC Action Plan proposes neither a specific definition of ownership nor an explicit strategy towards civil society organisations engagement. Nevertheless, the EC self-assessment states that “EC actively supports the dialogue on the aid effectiveness agenda with CSOs”, which until recently has been considered the “missing link” in the Paris Agenda. It organises meetings with representatives of CSOs, takes part in the NGOs events, such as International Forum on CSOs and Aid Effectiveness in Ottawa in February 2008 (OECD, 2008a, § 29, p. 116).

The European commitment to untying of aid is reaffirmed in the communication “Financing for Development and Aid Effectiveness”, that stress the fact that “all EU MS have agreed to further extend the scope of the OECD/DAC recommendation on aid untying to the LDCs and called for full untying of food aid and food aid transport” (COM, 2006, 85, §8, p. 13). According to the EC self-assessment, “the Community adopted two regulations concerning tied aid in 2004/2005” that have been incorporated in the new aid instruments. They untied EC external assistance far beyond the scope of the DAC recommendations. They go far beyond the sole trade off between DAC donors, and put the partner countries centre-stage by largely untied aid to them as well as maintaining existing price preference systems. The EC offer of full access on the basis of reciprocity for non-EU donors is currently being applied to several DAC members. The Commission supports the ongoing extension of the DAC recommendation to all HIPC countries. It is supporting further untying of technical assistance, food aid and food aid transport. It also calls for a more pro-poor approach centred on developing countries by opening access to developing countries themselves. However, the DAC Peer review recommends that “while recognising the actions already taken, the Commission and the Member States should work with ACP partners to bring the untying policy under EDF in line with the DAC Recommendations of 2001 and the Community should look for ways to further untie its aid in general” (OCSE, 2007, p. 21).

The “EU Code of Conduct (CoC) on Complementarity and Division of Labour in Development Policy” adopted in May 2007 by the General Affairs and External Relations Council and the representatives of the governments of the Member States. It proposes a voluntary code of conduct to enhance complementarity and the division of labour amongst EU donors (Community and Member States) in developing countries, building on the principles of the EU consensus and the Paris Declaration.

Greater use of budget support is viewed by the EC as a key instrument for advancing the aid effectiveness agenda and improving aid delivery. Conditions for budget support disbursements are largely outcome-based and drawn from commonly agreed performance assessment frameworks. In the interest of predictability, the EC budget support mechanism typically envisages three-years commitments and a graduated response to performance to minimize the risk of stop-and-go cycles.

The Community has committed to reducing the number of parallel implementation units. According to the OECD survey on monitoring the Paris Declaration, PIUs have been reduced from 205 in 2005 to 104 in 2007. However, the DAC Peer Review recalls that “one special aspect of its co-operation with ACP countries is to put in place a National Authorising Officer to ensure that programmes are consistent with Community rules and regulations. The task of the National Authorising Officer is often assisted by an “EDF Cell” composed of both local government staff and special contractors, which in some cases resembles a parallel implementation unit. National Authorising Officers do not exist in RELEX countries. It would seem appropriate to compare the value of this approach in these two different sets of countries so as to improve overall Community aid effectiveness” (OCSE, 2007, p. 20).

In terms of aid effectiveness mainstreaming, according to the EC self-assessment, “follow up to the Paris Declaration has been inserted in all policy framework, strategies, operational guidelines, and internal mechanisms”. For example, the concept of aid effectiveness has even been included in the new EU Treaty. Several EU Directors General meetings for development policy have been dedicated fully or in part to aid effectiveness. Both the 10th European Development Fund (EDF) agreement covering 2007-2013 makes a clear statement in support of aid effectiveness and the Paris Declaration and the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) refers to aid effectiveness under the general principles of the EC action (OECD, 2008a, p.112).

The Communication “Joint Programming Framework” proposes an updating of the 2000 Country strategy Paper framework with a view to introducing joint multiannual programming aimed at facilitating the gradual
alignment of lenders on the multiannual programming cycles of the partner country and increasing the possibility of synchronising the programming processes of the Member States and the Commission. The JPF is described as a “flexible, gradual and open process, with the partner country playing a leading role, and emanating from the bottom up”. Its spirit “is to create a mechanism, compatible with existing national documents and cycles, open to other donors, and which offers a framework for regrouping the duplicating building blocks of Member States systems and thereby reduce the transaction costs of our programming”. The Framework would contain elements such as the factual description of country profile, a common analysis of the situation, donor matrixes, and the analysis of EU policy mix. It should offer, over the medium term, the possibility for donors to establish a collective strategic response to the challenges raised in the joint country analysis, and in the long term pave the way for a potential joint programming.

**Budget and management**

According to the self-assessment, the EC has a dedicated budget of 2 million Euros to support aid effectiveness processes.

The Commission has given *decentralised authority* to its Delegations, so that program and project development, contracting, monitoring and evaluation now takes place at the country level, with only quality support functions being extended from HQ. For example, in 2007 84% of geographic programmes and 70% of thematic programmes were managed by Delegations.

A *new legal framework* including new Instruments and reviewed Financial Regulations covering the EC General Budget, and Financial Regulations implementing the 10th EDF. Financial regulations have been revised and made more flexible to facilitate aid effectiveness, allowing the EC to delegate tasks to national bodies (indirect centralised management) and new possibilities for the Commission to manage funds from other donors.

The Code of Conduct is being put into practice through the implementation of the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) and the 10th EDF. In this framework, “the EC is launching a *delegated cooperation initiative* whereby the EC will delegate sectors to member states in a number of partner countries. With a view to fostering ownership, the programming exercise is done jointly with the partner country or region concerned, which is to the extent possible the leading force in the coordination of Community assistance with other donors” (OECD, 2008a, §9, p. 113).

The EC Action Plan includes the development of *Joint Local Arrangements* (Deliverable n. 8), to promote a single dialogue, disbursement and reporting mechanism at country level between the donor community and the partner country, quoting already existing experiences built around budget support and SWAPs operation in Zambia or Mozambique. By 2008, such arrangements should be proposed for all the 14 countries that have signed the Rome Declaration on Harmonization. However, the EC self-assessment does not describe the current status of implementation of this commitment.

In terms of institutional framework, the DAC Peer review of the EC notes underlines that “a 2006 reform consolidated the previously confusing array of 35 financial instruments (both ODA and non-ODA funds) into a more manageable set of 10 instruments”. Now, the largest flows are found in the European Development Fund (EDF) and the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI). Together they represent the majority of total ODA; however, they are managed differently. Thematic funds largely fall outside country strategy planning. Better coherence between thematic programmes and country strategies would increase effectiveness and overall impact.

The EC has taken steps to improve long term *predictability* in its aid management system. There are multiyear allocations to non-ACP partners through the budget Financial Perspective, and to ACP partners through the 10th EDF (Cotonou agreement). The national envelopes translate into programme cycles in the Country Strategy Papers (CSP) of seven years for non-ACP (2007-2013) and six years for ACP (2008-2013) (OECD, 2008a, §37, p. 117). According to the EC self-assessment, the use of Budget Support has increased from 30% under the 9th EDF to 45% under the 10th EDF (OECD, 2008a, §11, p. 114). Nevertheless, according to the OECD 2008 survey on monitoring the Paris Declaration, the percentage of programme based aid (SWAP and budget support) has decreased from 50% in 2005 to 44% in 2007 (to 46% when the same baseline of 2005 survey is considered) (OECD, 2008b).

As a longer-term, more predictable form of budget support, the EC has been developing the “MDG Contract” in consultation with the EU Member States. The MDG Contract targets well performing countries that have successfully implemented budget support and show a commitment to achieving and monitoring the MDGs. This form of budget support would last for six years; provide a minimum, virtually guaranteed level of support; entail annual monitoring with a focus on results; assess performance in a medium-term framework
and be targeted at strong performers.

In terms of **countries concentration**, as noted by the DAC Peer Review, EC “distributes its ODA across 145 recipient countries, the largest spread of any DAC member. Its presence in some developing countries may be justified by its federating role among EU members, although not necessarily as a direct donor” (OECD, 2007, p. 17). EC has been under pressure from some Member States to increasingly concentrate on the low income countries, and to play a leadership role in fragile states, acting as EU representative, especially those receiving relatively little attention.

**Staff**

Among **institutional arrangements** introduced to foster aid effectiveness, the EC self-assessment quotes (but without specifying relationship and overlapping between these structures):

- **two Aid Effectiveness Networks** - one in Head Quarters across the services, and one involving 46 priority delegations, through which the Action Plan is implemented;
- **an EC internal Task Force** on aid effectiveness has been established within the various services (DEV, RELEX and AIDCO), to coordinate and facilitate our joint work on aid effectiveness;
- the various services of the EC have either **entire units** dedicated to aid effectiveness (DEV and AIDCO), or **dedicated staff** (DG RELEX). In total, approximately 70 staff members are involved in aid effectiveness activities - with some 10 full time persons in DG DEV, AIDCO and RELEX, and another 60 persons involved various aid effectiveness networks.

As recognized in the EC self assessment, “there are no specific **incentives** for staff to work on Aid effectiveness and it is not part of staff performance assessment system” (OECD, 2008a, §36, p. 117).

In order to strengthen the EU vision (Deliverable 7) the EC aims at promoting joint **training tools** and opportunities at European level. In particular, the EC is member of the Joint Donor’s Competence Development Network (“Train4Dev”), whose goal is to promote the implementation of the Paris Declaration through development of joint learning events addressed to donors’ staff. Moreover, instruments for training on aid effectiveness listed in the EC self assessment are:

- The Commission's annual Regional Seminars, where the top management from all Delegations in the region are briefed, prioritized aid effectiveness in 2006 and co-financing in 2007;
- Regular training programmes are given by Commission staff and NGOs on a monthly basis since 2006 and once every 2 months in 2008. The training programs are designed so that participating staff can cascade the course on to staff in Delegations when they go on missions;
- Country level problem solving workshops on aid effectiveness, involving EU Member States as well other donors;

Among initiatives to support capacity development **between European actors**, the EC self-assessment lists:

- The EC regularly also organises **Technical Seminars on aid effectiveness** with the EU Member States to advance on implementation of agreed actions and/or to advance on outstanding issues on an informal basis at technical level;
- **An EU Practitioners Network** has also been set up by the EC and Member States development agencies, with four working groups to encourage coordination among EU implementation agencies;
- Coordination meetings between the EC and Member States also take place on a regular basis both in partner countries and at HQ-level, to share information on country level objectives and project pipelines as a concrete basis for harmonising activities.

**Communication**

The main forum to promote public awareness on development cooperation and in particular on aid effectiveness is the “European Development Days”, organized annually in the form of a summer school.

At internal level, the Commission has sent out various Guidance and Strategy notes to all Directors and Heads of Delegations, such as: i) Guidance on co-financing, general budget support, sector wide approaches (SWAPs), and delegated cooperation; ii) a strategy for increasing use of country systems and the proportion of joint missions; iii) an instruction letters to the delegations on the implementation of the Code of Conduct.
Furthermore, updated information on aid effectiveness is made accessible to staff through a dedicated internal website which is also a forum for exchange of information on best practice among the country offices (OECD; 2008a, § 19 and 23, p. 115).

Evaluation

Instruments included in the Action Plan in order to improve transparency and dissemination of information are: The revised EU Donor Atlas; The Compendia on EU Development Rules and Procedures: on programming, procurement, rules governing the relations with NGOs and rules on subsidies (Deliverable 9). The aid effectiveness commitments are being monitored through an addition of an annex to the Commission's bi-annual reporting by Delegations, to collect specific data for a baseline and then to measure progress regularly on each target.

A specific deliverable of the Action Plan relates to the monitoring of the international objectives and targets agreed in the Paris Declaration and the more ambitious additional objectives that the EU has committed itself to (Deliverable 2). The first set of commitments will be monitored through the OECD-DAC Joint venture on Monitoring, while the second will be monitored through the Annual Report on the Follow up of Monterrey, which takes stock of the fulfilment of EU promises both in terms of volume and effectiveness of a
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Source: elaboration on the 2008 Survey on monitoring the Paris declaration.

Performance on aid effectiveness
According to the 2008 OECD Aid effectiveness monitoring survey (see graphs above), in two years France has improved in almost all Paris Declaration targets. The most important improvements were in Coordinated Technical assistance which increased from 20% up to more than 45% and joint missions (from 10% in 2005 up to 31% in 2007), and joint analytical work (from 41% to 55%). Those were the major areas of improvement, but there were additional improvements in aid predictability, parallel units reductions, alignment and use of country systems. Use of common arrangements showed no significant improvement neither for the untying of aid in the two year period, although negative variations in the indicator are observed during the period, most of French Aid is untied (see below). The most problematic areas in French aid in terms of meeting the 2010 targets of the Paris Declaration are parallel units decrease, use of common arrangements, alignment and, lastly, aid predictability.

Overview
In May 2005, the Comité Interministériel de la Coopération Internationale et du Développement (from now on CICID) asked for an Action Plan (AP) to implement the Paris Declaration (PD). The AP summarises the commitments made by France with respect to the PD with a view to achieving the targets set for 2010. Taking the indicators selected by OECD-DAC as a framework, the Plan sets forth France’s objectives in terms of improving the division of labour and aid predictability.
In June 2006 CICID approved the AP followed by Conference on Strategic Planning in December 2006. The AP is the result of a joint effort by all the actors which are part of the French system of aid: Direction Générale de la Coopération Internationale et du Développement (DGCD), Direction Générale du Trésor et de la Politique Economique (DGTEPE) and the Agence Française du Développement (AFD) together with NGOs. The CICID is in charge of monitoring the implementation of the AP.

Strategy and Policy Positioning
The AP is based on 12 measures that refer to three overarching aims: a focus on capacity building; the expanded role of Partnership Framework Papers (PFPs) and improving the procedures and practices of French development cooperation. PFPs are a multiyear framing instrument (they are signed for a 5 year period) for French ODA to countries in the French Solidarity Priority Zone (which will be explained below). Approved by all the ministries PFPs are signed by the Minister for Cooperation and development and by the partner country authorities and then published.

The AP does not only include the Paris Declaration (PD) indicators but also takes into account three additional essential issues for aid effectiveness. Those are: capacity building, reinforced role of the Partnership frameworks and the strengthening of human resources at a local level.
Ownership is a central issue for the French ODA system and is stated in the first proposition of the AP: to enable partner countries to fully own their national development strategies and give them control over funding. The actions connected to this proposition are the following: to propose a coordinated and targeted multi-year support program to define and implement national development strategies; to favour program based approaches for the financing of partner’s countries development. When the conditions are in place, to increase general budget support and sector aid related to programme-based approach.

Among the actions necessary to improve ownership there is the support of the opening of operational dialogue between the partner countries and donors at a local level and to ensure that bilateral aid flows from France to the public sector, including technical expertise, are reported in partner countries budgets. This should be done according to partner countries budget cycles.

The commitment to ensure greater flexibility is not stated as such in the Action Plan. But procedural flexibility is a precondition for most of the challenges stated in the AP. Procedure flexibility can be approached through variety of initiatives or processes: regarding the use of national systems, France has also actively involved in the Public Expenditure And Financial Accountability (PEFA) partnership which aims to support integrated and harmonized approaches to assessment and reform in the field of public expenditure, procurement and financial accountability in coordination with partners countries. The concern for greater flexibility can be also reflected in the promotion of the European “Code of Conduct on Complementarity and Division of Labour in Development Policy” in pilot countries.

The AP encourages aid allocated to the public sector transit via partners’ public financial management systems to certain conditions, i.e in countries where fiduciary risk is under control. One of the actions included in Proposition 1 of the AP (ownership issue) is to use programme approaches to finance partner countries development strategies. Capacity building (proposition 2 of the AP) is central and the following actions were stated:

- to increase the percentage of ODA allocated to capacity building, with a view of fostering partners countries’ ownership of their policies;
- to promote multi-donor, multi-year frameworks aligned on partners’ priorities;
- to provide support for institutional reform, particularly reform of public financial management systems, budget implementations of programmes and procurement;
- to promote training and use of existing local capacities, in both local administrations and aid agencies;
- to reopen and advance the international debate on capacity building.

Moreover, in the 2007 Governance Strategy, France gives a central role to institutional and human capacity building, particularly in terms of targeting agents of change, as well as structures of change.

In this perspective, France has launched a process to set up a framework strategy on capacity building by end 2009. In a first step, the French Ministry for European and Foreign Affairs and the AFD (Agence française de développement) has launched 2 studies on French cooperation action on capacity building. France is also actively involved in the promotion of local governance in particular through co-operation between French and African local authorities and support to national decentralization programs. It has been instrumental in the adoption by EU countries of a “Charter of the aid to local governance”.

Finally, the 2007 French Position Document on Fragile States and Situations of Fragility recognizes the need to tailor assistance packages to the distinctive characteristics of the operating environment, to focus on state-building and to coordinate better with other international actors. The document also highlights the need to improve the French strategy in fragile states in terms of capacity development of civil society and to develop joint approaches to local capacity building with other partners. In this spirit, French co-operation is actively involved in the follow-up of DAC Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations of fragility, as well as the launching of an international dialogue on peace building and State capacity.

Beyond the AP recommendations regarding the evaluation performance of the aid system, France is actively involved in the assessment of multilateral effectiveness through the “MOPAN” process. Multilateral Organisations Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) is a group of eleven donors with a common interest in monitoring multilateral effectiveness, that French co-operation has joined in 2007.

France is committed to reducing Parallel Implementing Units according to indicator 6 of the PD. Following the DAC Review of 2006 there were 63 in the 26 countries concerned by the survey. This number is probably an overestimate because the PD definition centred on public administration does not correspond to
the aim of French aid. French aid when structured in aid to specific projects is aimed to support diversified actors.

French aid is to be mostly untied, the percentage of untied aid being well beyond the DAC’s 2001 recommendation. All the activity of AFD is untied since 2002 whatever the country or the sector concerned. Nonetheless the untiring of aid is not an aim by itself, the essential being the quality and the effectiveness of aid. France has kept two tied aid instruments representing the 0,14% of ODA. The first one is a grant for studies (Fond d’Etudes et d’Aide au Secteur Privé – FASEP Etudes), the other one is a loan for Emerging Countries (Réserves Pays Emergents – RPE) which includes a technological transfer.

**Budget and management**

Proposition 5 of the AP is about the development or improvement of instruments to enhance the medium-term predictability of all ODA flows. This means to make progress towards improved anticipation of ODA flows to enable better oversight of France’s disbursements. A multi-year financial framework of estimated ODA flows has been elaborated within the framework of the 2009 Financial Law project to include year-to-year data, covering a period of three years for predicted expenditures (2009-2011), including debt relief.

Proposition 10 of the AP states that in the core target countries it is necessary to increase field staff numbers. The French services must have at least one economist or development generalist and specialists in the priority sectors. Economists and development generalists will be assigned to the Cooperation and Cultural Action Services of the AFD branches. Whenever appropriate, the teams will involve experts form the economic missions of the Ministry of the Economy, Industry and Labour (MINEIE). The use of local staff is anyway to be preferred. Also devolution of decision making is stated in proposition 10 of the AP. Some managers of sector programs can be assigned at a local level. MINEFI, the Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs and AFD are going through measures aiming at implementing devolution and reviewing existing rules on delegation.

In 1998, the international cooperation system in France has undergone a reform which has set the so-called Priority Solidarity Zone – ZSP (Zone de Solidarité Prioritaire). ZSP was defined as the zone in which bilateral development aid has to be selective and concentrated to have a significant effect. The ZSP is defined by the CICID. The last definition has been given in 2002. Since 2004, SPZ has 55 countries most of them in Sub Saharan Africa. In 2007, 70% of French ODA was accorded to Africa. The AP establishes the importance of making progress on enhancing complementarity between donor interventions, coordinated at international level. This has to be done by promoting a better geographical distribution of aid and a more rational division of labour between donors, based on an appraisal of each donor’s value added and comparative advantages.

With a view to concentrating aid the AP proposes the identification of core target countries, i.e. those where France is willing to take the role of reference donor. In countries located outside the core target, sector interventions consistent with overall sector priorities should be promoted. In those countries, France’s presence may take the form of: i) participation in co-financing; ii) delegated management operations; iii) pilot experiments. A process has been launched in 2008 so as to enhance the French ODA concentration, in the framework of the public administration review.

An important part of French ODA has historically been given trough the instrument called “Technical Assistance”. This instrument has undergone a reform. The latter has brought about a strong decrease in terms of human resources (direct technical assistance) coming from the Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs (DGCID). In the 80’s there were 23000 technical assistants now there are 1200. France new approach to technical assistance aims at building up and supporting local expertise. France intends to improve the integration of its technical assistance into joint approaches to capacity building that will encourage ownership and reduce the risks of substitution, to align its activities with national systems, and to make use of local capacities to carry out the country’s programme. Since 2002 a dedicated structure has been created by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Public Ministry for Civil Servants. It is the GIP (Groupeement d’intérêt public) called France Coopération Internationale (FCI) whose aim is to promote French technical expertise abroad. The updating of “Technical Assistance” is progressing towards the opening up of recruitment procedures and of fields of intervention (technical assistance to NGOs, to professional structures, to multilateral organisations).

Staf
The Co-Secretariat of the CICID is in charge of monitoring and implementing the AP, which will include annual monitoring of the performance of French aid. As the aid effectiveness agenda is perceived as a cross-disciplinary theme, specific co-ordinators are identified within each French institutional entity (Ministry
of Foreign and European Affairs, Ministry of the Economy and Industry, Agency for Development). Taking into account the aid system as a whole, an approximate number of 20 staff is dedicated to aid effectiveness.

France co-operation system is undertaking a new phase of reform within the framework of the public administration review. The current reform following the waves of institutional restructuring in 1998 and 2004 aims to rationalize the aid system through (i) further distribution of roles between the different components of French MOFA and the operator, (ii) further co-ordination between the capital and the network on the field.

Proposition 11 of the AP stresses the need to integrate aid effectiveness thinking into human resource policies. This means to make the most of development skills in human resources management. From the recruitment phase, France is committed to organise careers in French and International institutions both at the central office and in the field.

The Plan states that it is necessary to draft a training policy that emphasises aid effectiveness and to develop continuous training for the staff of the cooperation system in development areas. Also the initiative will be taken on permanent training with the European Commission and European partners. The AFD has different training programs which include the issues of aid effectiveness. DGCID and AFD have been working together to initiate a training program on "public finances management" for French Staff in charge of ODA but also for local administrators and donors working in French speaking territories.

Communication
Communication on ODA is very important for France. Starting from 2007, France is taking part in "The informal Network for Communication and Development of DAC members". Some special brochures to raise awareness were prepared for the general public.

Some specific documents were prepared for political institutions, for interested public offices and administrations. Those are: "Framework Partnership Document: for a better piloting of ODA"; "French Action Plan on Aid Effectiveness"; “Increasing and showing the Effectiveness of ODA” which underlines specifically how aid should be centred on effective results. Internet websites of AFD and DGCID have a dedicated section on the subject.

Evaluation
Proposition 12 of the AP states that it is necessary to evaluate the performances of the ODA device and to mobilize public opinion on the effectiveness issue. The actions that have been designed for this purpose are: to participate in common evaluations with other donors considering different sectors and different countries; to clarify to politicians, to the media and to the general public current approaches on ODA and the relevance of the effectiveness issue.

The Co-Secretariat of the Interministerial Committee for International Cooperation and Development (CICID) is in charge of implementing and monitoring the AP.

The evaluation of the performance of aid system in the theme of aid effectiveness has to be done by supporting the launch of joint evaluations with other donors and with the partner country by sector and by country. It is also advisable to apply external evaluations to financing across the board and to develop cross-cutting evaluations (by instrument, country and sector) and PFP evaluations.

Monitoring will be based on the annual performance indicators for the budget and the PD. Civil society will also be involved. An annual report is to be submitted to the conference on strategic directions and programming.

The AP underlines the need to integrate results as a basis for dialogue with recipients. For this it is necessary to strengthen the support for partner countries to implement result-based management tools and improve statistical systems; by encouraging performance monitoring systems based on a few simple indicators and to propose that one person in each country be put in charge of results based management for all donors.
Germany
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**German performance on aid effectiveness**

According to the 2008 Aid Effectiveness monitoring Survey, in two years German improved the most in terms of untied aid and joint analytic work. Coordinated technical assistance, improved too, becoming one of the main strength for German aid effectiveness. The use of country system and in the aid predictability registered a positive trend, while the development assistance’s alignment, although the good improvement, needs to accelerate the trend. Despite their improvement the most problematic areas for the German development cooperation, anyway, remain the use of common arrangements and the joint donors missions. The first especially is improving too slowly to meet the 2010 targets. The only area in which German scores worsened is the parallel unit reduction, that seems really left behind from the efficient German cooperation system.

**Overview**

Soon after having signed the PD, BMZ, Bundesministerium Für Wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit (German Federal Ministry for Economic Development Cooperation) elaborated a detailed implementation plan and a manual on the PD for the German aid system. Implementing agencies have individually incorporated PD requirements into their programming (via the corporate annuals goals) and are making explicit references to the PD. Particular work was done under the German EU Presidency to establish a Code of Conduct from the Division of Labour in Development Cooperation.

The German aid effectiveness plan was approved in 2005, updated in April 2008. The Plan of Operation 2005-2006, clearly assigned responsibilities to different Departments within the German development cooperation system. There is no reference to any Strategy approval by the Parliament. The Plan of Operation contains a detailed framework of directives and implementation activities, with deadlines and tasked responsibilities to reach the five main goals indicated in the PD. According to the Plan an update the Strategic operations should be annually carried out. The main challenge for development aid-effectiveness is to achieve better coordination within the system.

**Strategy and Policy Positioning**

Ownership is defined the same way as in the Paris declaration. The German comment contained in the update of April 2005acknowledges that there is a concern that the “PD’s concept of ownership may be too narrowly focused on recipient governments’ ownership.”

Aid effectiveness has not been planned to be mainstreamed in different and other sectoral policy document neither there is a reference to further untying beyond taking part in the international debate.

Germany is a strong actor in technical cooperation and capacity building which can be and advantage when partner countries need a long-term support in areas such as sector programme management, public financial management or procurement but and obstacle in the context of achieving the aid effectiveness targets.
The Plan states that technical cooperation must be embedded in partner countries’ program-based approach and hints to the possibility of avoiding the establishment of new Parallel Implementing Units, only if needed. Monitoring and containing the widespread of parallel units will be enact following the involved partner country procedures.

Predictability is planned to be tackled by expanding multi-year commitments to three years while assessing weather it would be appropriate to draw up disbursement schedules.

According to the Plan no further action on aid untying should be needed, beyond participating into the international debate.

In drafting Country Strategy papers, the plan envisages the possibility of not drawing up national country strategy paper if there is a broad donors consensus.

There is a clear political mandate to increase financial allocations to joint programs/based-approaches including program-orientated joint financing and for joint analyses and missions with other donors.

**Budget and management**

There was a shift to strengthen field offices, by seconding personals and moving officers from the headquarters. The KfW is planning to increase its country representation by transferring one fourth to one-third of its headquarters staff to the country offices in the next few years. Decentralization is piloted in 4 countries, field officers are given responsibility in country planning, project management and, above all, evaluation.

Concerning managing for results, BMZ has established a system to better direct aid management towards objectives. An important step in this regard are the common programme proposals being elaborated by the implementing agencies on the basis of the priority area strategy papers and indicating the results to be achieved.

German implementing agencies have become attractive partners for delegated cooperation and silent partnership with other donors who have dismantled part of their implementation capacity in recent years.

At field level, there are coordination and harmonization problems within the German aid system, both at political level with tensions raising between the embassy depending on the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the local office of the Ministry of Development Cooperation. Difficult coordination is reported at implementation level as well due to the multiplication of German official development actors.

The Guidelines for Bilateral Financial and Technical Cooperation have been updated in March 2007 and allow for enhanced flexibility in joint funding mechanisms as well as for delegated cooperation and silent partnerships, which are seen as transitional tool, particularly useful in fragile contexts. The EU German presidency invested in the establishment of a Code of Conduct from the Division of Labour in Development Cooperation.

In principle, reasons must be given if any activities is launched outside the scope of program-based approaches. Germany plans to continue the process of concentrating activities on fewer countries and priority areas. In 2008 BMZ decided to reduce the list of partner countries from 70 to 57: implementing this reduction, however, will need some time. Silent partnerships/delegated cooperation is planned to be early implemented.

**Staff**

BMZ, DED, Deutscher Entwicklungsdienst (German Development Service), GTZ, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit GmbH (German society for technical cooperation) and KfW, Kreditanstalt Für Wiederaufbau (German Development Bank) created special units of different configurations or strengthened existing ones to deal with specific PD related topics. The task of these units essentially consists of studying the topics, mainstreaming them in the own organization and providing support to the staff at headquarters and country level.

The Plan acknowledges the need for dialogue and coordination within the German aid system, with other donors and with partner countries has risen considerably, requiring additional staff capacity at headquarters and particularly at field level. The German aid system has reacted to this challenge in a number of ways achieving a great degree of awareness among its staff, yet the efforts taken so far appear to be still insufficient. Moreover, the initial implementation of the PD has meant increased transaction cost with adding
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up of new staff and job re-shuffling. Eventually, new staff was recruited, but developed capacities are weakened by high staff rotation.

There is no reference to staff recruitment policy including a section on aid effectiveness, but the aid effectiveness related qualifications in job description have been included in evaluation staff procedures. And is not possible to define the exact number of the aid effectiveness staff, since there is not a centralized aid effectiveness unit, and each one of the previous mentioned offices has its own people dealing with the theme, among their other tasks.

The Plan also acknowledges that the PD agenda involves a shift to new modes of delivery and to consequent result orientation, both of which entail a demand for new substantive and management skills that are not always available and therefore to some extent have to be created by dedicated trainings and experience sharing.

Communication
The PD and related topics and documents have been disseminated widely and intensively in the German system: widely because of the involvement of the main actors at the levels of government, parliament and civil society, beyond the mere provision of information by taking the form of discussions of specific subjects of the PD. The continuous dissemination and discussion have contributed to increasing the knowledge and understanding needed to implement the PD agenda.

There is no mention to any aid effectiveness special internal communication tools, but internal communication exchanges has happened.

Evaluation
The Plan only refers to the fact that the implementing agencies have monitoring and evaluations system in place. No more detailed description of the evaluating mechanism is mentioned. The Plan aimed at supporting international efforts “to make MDG indicators more precise”, water and environment as for 2005, gender as for December 2006.
Development of performance assessment frameworks: the German development system has recruited a professional to specifically work on evaluation of management for development results.
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Performance on aid effectiveness
The distance from the Paris Declaration Targets in 2010 is considerable. This distance will be largely reduced with the approval of the new Master Plan 2009-2012 and the recent reform of the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation (AECI). The deepening and enrichment of the Paris Declaration principles and of the international agenda of the aid effectiveness, together with the analysis of the system which the Spanish Cooperation counts on nowadays, suggested an integral approach and a substantial development in order to be able to start up a development result oriented management in the Spanish aid system. Thus, it could not or must not be approached in a partial or fragmented way, but it required a long term approach which could provide consistency to the whole, from the political level to the operational one. Although all this have been progressively evolving since 2005 in the Spanish cooperation system, it will be carried out – as a result of this evolution – from the development result oriented management approach included in the Master Plan 2009-2012, as the Spanish Annual Plan for International Cooperation 2008 (PACI) announces.

Overview
The Plan Director for Spanish Cooperation (2005-2008) defines in chapter 7 the principle implementation mechanisms for improving the quality of aid. This planning document has given impulse, amongst other things, to the principles of ownership, alignment, harmonisation, and result-oriented approach, and to the mutual responsibility developed by the Annual Cooperation Planning since 2005 - 2008, and which taken together constitute the strategic framework for effectiveness of aid by Spanish Cooperation.

At national level, the broad process of consultation generated on Spanish Cooperation for development fostered a high degree of awareness of the Paris Declaration and the agenda of aid effectiveness amongst politicians and other interested groups in civil society. In December 2007, all political parties with Parliamentary representation signed, at the initiative of the Spanish NGO Coordination for development, the State Agreement against Poverty, which renews and updates the obligations adopted by the Solidarity Agreement of 2006 and marks the involvement of political powers in Aid effectiveness.

The Implementation of the principles of aid effectiveness in the Spanish Cooperation system requires short, medium and long-term commitments on the part of all bodies concerned, and in a coordinated manner-shrily, a national plan has been established to delay the Effectiveness Action Plan work out so that other processes could go on and lay foundations during 2007 and 2008. The enrichment of positions in the Aid Effectiveness International Agenda within the Development Assistance Committee and the EU.

Reference is made to the experiences and best practice of agencies and cooperation in the various member nations of the OECD who are preparing similar plans, including geographical or sector case studies resulting from collaboration with research bodies. There is also reference to the experience and knowledge acquired through active participation in the working group on aid effectiveness of the DAC and other subgroups.
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Spain still finds difficulties when its objective is to align its cooperation policy with the whole range of development cooperation actors. This is due to some general Spanish APS characteristics: the high percentage of funds channelled into development NGOs, the crucial role of decentralized cooperation and the emphasis laid on sub national work in partner countries. These characteristics imply a high risk of lack of consistency and waste of efforts, which will erode basic conditions for an effective alignment if these characteristics are not properly corrected.

**Strategy and policy positioning**
The Plan does not provide any definition of ownership but commits Spain to support the participation of the civil society of partner countries in the preparation of operating strategies for development and the fight against poverty. We find reference to the support for civil society in the first draft of the Master Plan 2009-2012.

It is important to highlight that the principle of leadership-ownership and alignment prevail throughout the documents.

The Plan 2009-2012 includes clear criteria to understand what general frame of action is adopted in the corresponding sector; priority given to targets and strategic lines of the sector; unified criteria used to make decisions among all the actors of Spanish Cooperation in a specific sector, detailing possible fields of action in a sector (what the Spanish Cooperation will “never” support; what “is likely” to be supported; what support is “a priority”).

Untied Aid is considered an important dimension. Overall, the percentage of tied aid has been progressively reduced. Furthermore, in the context of wide approval for the development of Spanish APS, the examining committee noticed the interested groups (ministries, political parties, civil society and private companies included) support the untying of Spanish APS. Spain could benefit from this support and continue to advance in untied aid. The Donors Compendium reports the Spanish commitment to increase the percentage of aid not linked to the supply of Spanish goods and services.

The **Country Strategy Papers**, used by Spanish Cooperation and which serve as a guide for their realisation in each country, involve on average 10 priority strategic sectors (Schulz, 2007). It indicates a lack of qualification of the Spanish aid that restricts the coordination opportunities with other donors. This makes it essential that the new **Plan Director** for Spanish Cooperation reverses this tendency, concentrating on sector and geographical priorities and building a model which starts from the added value of Spanish Cooperation.

**Budget and management**
The first draft of the Master Plan 2009-2012 specifically refers to the principles of harmonisation, alignment, ownership, result oriented management and mutual responsibility.

On the 26th of November 2007 the Royal Decree 1403/2007 established that the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation - attached to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation through the State Secretariat of International Cooperation - is the institutional body for the implementation of the whole Spanish policy for International Development Cooperation.

The AECID follows under the State Agencies Law for the improvement of public. Furthermore, enabling it to acquire a new management system, on the base of a target oriented development of the administration, results evaluation and of the staff participation, in a context of greater flexibility.

In order to increase aid predictability, one of the main characteristics of the new regulatory framework is the establishment of a management agreement between the Agency and the State Public Administration for 4 years (exceptionally will be only one in the first agreement). During this period, the Agency is given a multi-annual budget subject to financial and fiscal results.

AECI plans to define an optimal distribution of powers between the headquarters offices and the Agency's Units overseas and to progress in the flexibility and simplification of management procedures and financial reviews to render the practices of harmonisation and alignment feasible.

Spain recognises its limited experience in managing practices like GBS (**General Budget Support**) or SWApS (**Sector Wide Approaches**) and recognises the need to improve its capacity and experience in this area. Spain aims to significantly increase the use of these modes and to improve the capacity of human resources.
Joint missions are not frequent, and it is planning to increase them. In addition, Spain will have to make constant efforts for the harmonisation of procedures within its own system, especially among the bodies involved in decentralised cooperation.

The active incorporation in the Development Result Oriented Management group (GpRD) of the Development Assistance Committee, allowed to develop a better view of the GpRD at an international level but also within the Spanish Cooperation to lay the foundations of the review of the planning, follow-up and evaluation integrated system.

Spain has not yet developed a results-based management approach that ties these to different levels in the system and has to strengthen its result-based management capability and set up a steadier evaluation approach in the entire system. This would imply, amongst other things, enhancing staff training and strengthening specialised staff both in the headquarters and on the ground. The DAC recommended Spain to give urgent priority to introducing a result-oriented management, strengthening the system and culture of evaluation.

The Spanish Cooperation with its 23 priority countries enjoys a comparative advantage and a clear leadership in Latin America. Other donors would perhaps like to benefit from this situation and Spain should prepare itself for this eventuality. Progressively increasing share of APS in Sub-Saharan Africa, Spain is entering a relatively unknown field often characterized by high levels of dependence on external aid, a high amount of represented donors and old networking mechanisms. Thus, Spain should take into account the option of using existing mechanisms via delegated cooperation.

Staff
To support the implementation of the reform to comply with aid effectiveness targets, a specific unit with 5 people staff has been established. However, the AECID acknowledges the need to define and implement systems of incentives to promote the implementation of the principles of the Paris Declaration.

Communication
The Plan includes a specific component for spreading and communicating the Paris Declaration within the Spanish Cooperation system and that of the partner countries. Wider civil society consultation on aid effectiveness took place in Spain, while specific briefings at headquarters for Heads of Missions and Ambassadors through concept notes and specific presentations.

Evaluation
According to the Donor Compendium, the number and quality of interventions evaluated is growing at a good rate. With a view to carrying out monitoring and evaluating this Plan, it includes an indicator system for result-orientation to measure the changes realized in the different action sectors proposed and linked to the indicators in the Paris Declaration. The aims to strengthen the evaluation cycle is considered by the Master Plan 2005-2008 one of the key elements to enhance the quality of the aid management.

In particular this effort resulted into new Paris-Declaration-fit principles for evaluation, such as:

- involving partner countries in the evaluation processes and evaluation results;
- using joint evaluations not only with donors but also with partners;
- scaling up of follow-up and evaluation skills within partner countries institutions;
- maximizing the use of partner's human and technical resources in the evaluation process as best option;
- strengthening planning, implementation and evaluation of policies by improving follow-up and evaluation systems of partner countries;
- aligning indicators and methodology with donors and partners in order to reduce costs and standardizing point of views before mutual accountability;
- delegating evaluation of development interventions.

Spain set itself some goals not to lose sight of the targets of the Paris Declaration and it included progress indicators in the International Cooperation Annual Plan. Nevertheless, these are difficult to evaluate, since in most cases they adopt standard which cannot be measured. To set clear quantitative goals for at least some of the indicators, taking into account feasibility studies of the units which works on the ground, would permit it to carry out better organised and goal consistent efforts.
Spain

A system for monitoring the strategic level of geographic and sector-wide planning, integrating quantitative and qualitative indicators based on primary and secondary information, linked to the commitments derived from the Paris Declaration has been finalized.
Sweden

Graph 5: Paris Declaration Targets, trends in 2005-2007 and distance from the 2010 targets

Source: elaboration on the 2008 Survey on monitoring the Paris declaration.

Swedish performance on aid effectiveness
According to the 2008 Aid effectiveness monitoring Survey, Sweden has in two years improved most with the indicator on aligning its development assistance to partner country priorities (by 45%) and the indicator on parallel units where Sweden has reduced the number of units by a third. Beyond those major positive developments, additional improvements include: the use of country systems and the increase in aid predictability. Yet, with joint donors missions Sweden reports no changes since 2005. Swedish scores worsened for coordinated technical assistance and use of common arrangements. Despite the positive trends in alignment and parallel units reduction, these are still the most problematic areas for the Swedish development cooperation to meet the 2010 targets, whereby the current path of reforming have to be implemented more quickly. SIDA is planning an thorough analysis of the results and what lies behind the figures. Some explanations to the figures on use of common arrangements and use of country systems could be that reporting instructions were more strict in 2007 than in the 2005 years survey. Some indicators (use of country systems, % aid aligned) are heavily dependent on the part of the partner country on improvement of its systems etc. As for the improvement in indicator on use of country systems, an explanation could be competence in development activities and the clear policy formulations on this area. An explanation for the improvement on the indicator on predictable aid could be that in 2007 no new country strategies passed government approval and several programs were only prolonged. As for the worsened indicator on coordinated technical assistance an explanation could be that the people have viewed the necessity for coordination only in joint programmes and not with individual TA-contracts.

Overview
At the signature of the Paris Declaration, the Swedish State Secretary and the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) Director General issued a joint letter to all embassies to confirm their commitment to the aid effectiveness agenda. In 2006, SIDA presented a paper on the implications of the Paris commitments for its way of working, with a list of 11 principles to be followed - for instance that SIDA funds should always be integrated with, and reflected in, the planning and budgeting process of the partner country. These 11 principles were integrated in SIDA’s manual for programme management “SIDA at Work”, however the principles were not binding for SIDA’s programmes. However it was not clear whether these 11 propositions were immediately binding for SIDA way of working.

In the 2006 Letter of Appropriation, the Swedish Government requested SIDA to report on measures taken at headquarters and at the field level in order to implement the Paris Declaration. As a response SIDA developed an operational multi-year (2006-2008) Action Plan for increased Aid Effectiveness. The Action Plan was not subject to a Parliamentary or Cabinet approval.

The Action Plan was only a SIDA (not joint with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) document. The proposed actions in the 2006 years Action Plan were to be completed before the end 2008. However, since the suggested activities in Action Plan were never included in the normal planning and budgeting procedures of SIDA the Action Plan failed to become successful. According to the 2007 DAC Donors Compendium on aid effectiveness, the Aid Effectiveness agenda has been well integrated into SIDA’s actions at field level, but,
due to organisational changes that took place during these years, they remain to be fully integrated it into all parts of its Head Quarter.

At present, the MFA and SIDA are in the process of jointly preparing a renewed Action Plan for implementing the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA), as well as improving the results related to previous Paris Declaration commitments. The Action Plan 2009-2011 sets seven priorities: 1) increased use of country systems, 2) increased number of Programme Based Approaches, 3) Predictability and increased results focus, 4) increased sector focus and decreased number of contributions per sector, 5) increase in joint analytical work and decrease in missions per country, 6) improved global cooperation with other donors incl. EU, 7) improved focus on support to multilaterals to fulfil their commitments on aid effectiveness. The priorities are set on the areas that are viewed as most central for increased efficiencies in Swedish development cooperation and where Sweden needs to improve most.

The plan will be implemented through regular planning & follow-up process. Moreover, the intention is to address the underlying causes for the current results, moving beyond the indicators and also seeing the qualitative side. The plan includes all development cooperation, including support to civil society organisations and multilaterals. A baseline and individual targets are set for each country and category of countries.

One of the main activities for 2009 is to undertake a thorough aid effectiveness portfolio analysis of country programmes. The analysis will a) be carried out from a PD and AAA perspective, b) identify main obstacles for moving the PD and AAA commitments forward, and c) make a concrete plan for increased use of PBAs, broadly defined as including improvements related to the PD and AAA targets over time, not least the use of country systems.

**During the Swedish EU-presidency in the second half of 2009, aid effectiveness will be one of the development issues that will be highly prioritised.**

**Strategy and Policy positioning**

Under the Paris Declaration, Sweden has made a commitment to increase the share of aid delivered through programme-based approaches (PBAs), which includes budget support. SIDA has produced a Guidance Paper. SIDA has had a ‘support group’ for PBAs since 2006, which has worked with promoting the Paris Declaration and PBAs mainly in relation to sector programmes, but also in other contexts. Based on actual field experience, a Guidance paper for PBAs has been developed.

The Guidance Paper Guiding sets 6 guiding principles for SIDA: 1) SIDA should apply a programme-based approach to all of its development cooperation. 2) The partner’s results analysis and planning cycle should be the point of departure for SIDA’s analytical work and dialogue. 3) SIDA should promote its priority issues primarily through engagement in dialogue rather than through earmarking of funds 4) SIDA should link its financial commitments to the partner’s results framework and budget cycle. 5) Full alignment should be considered the first option for financial support to a Government or an organisation’s programme.

In 2007 SIDA produced a PFM Position Paper and an handbook. The Position paper states that the basic principle for channelling funds to projects and programmes is to use country systems as far as possible, as this in itself contributes to the strengthening of the system. Moreover, SIDA commits at minimum to integrated its funds with, and be reflected in the planning and budgeting process of the partner country. PFM capacity development has been a priority for Sweden. A number of training courses have been held for SIDA staff and a handbook is available. Consultancy services have been used in various field offices and regions related to PFM and public sector reform. The increased understanding of PFM issues, including public sector reform, is expected to improve the understanding of SIDA staff on how to design and negotiate support that is aligned with country systems.

The 2006 Plan provides a definition for Ownership, underlining that civil society organizations play a relevant role. SIDA is to base its strategy on an analysis on the role of the State, the civil society, the private sector and other actors in each country. The basic concept of “ownership” must be interpreted as including the whole society, leading to strengthened democratic and participatory processes and increased government accountability towards its citizens. In the 2009 Action Plan the ownership definition is broadened including the concepts on democratic ownership from Accra Agenda for Action.

Swedish NGOs argue that the Swedish government is unwilling to push the refusal of economic policy conditions and to fully respect the principle of country ownership. According to the government, Sweden
cannot exclude certain policy conditions such as privatization and trade liberalization on a general level as this could pre-empt developing countries’ own policy formulation.

The Donor compendium lists the results of one year long policy reflection within SIDA, including the Guidance Paper on PBAs, the handbook for analysing countries’ public financial systems, capacity development, and on choices of financing form.

In April 2007 SIDA issued its Strategy for Multilateral Development Cooperation, which is a first step towards clearer and more results-oriented Swedish work and involvement in multilateral development cooperation. The strategy proposes that assessments of relevance and effectiveness will be made for Sweden’s multilateral partners. These will serve as a guidance tool for financing decisions in annual budget rounds and replenishments and provide a basis for development of organisation-specific strategies and undertaking dialogue with the organisations concerned. The new Action Plan sets clear priorities and targets for how Sweden will support multilaterals to become more effective.

The Action Plan 2009-2011 measures PIU reduction as part of the priority number 1 on increased use of country systems. One activity in the Plan is also to clarify Swedish position on technical assistance including PIUs in a practical methods paper on Capacity Development.

**Budget and management**

In the 2006 Plan, “Concentration” is singled out as the key issue to achieve aid effectiveness. Concentration was to be led at country with SIDA regional departments having a responsibility for managing and the sectoral departments only participating in this process. According to the setting principles, sectors and countries had to be chosen following SIDA complementary and added value.

In the 2006 Plan, “Concentration” is singled out as the key issue to achieve aid effectiveness. Concentration was to be led at country with SIDA regional departments having a responsibility for managing and the sectoral departments only participating in this process. According to the setting principles, sectors and countries had to be chosen following SIDA complementary and added value.

Swedish Government is currently carrying out extensive reforms to make Sweden’s development cooperation more effective. The overall aim is to create a new development policy which is characterised by **quality, efficiency and results** with the ultimate goal of increasing Sweden’s contribution to poverty reduction and thereby the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). An important part of the reform process has been to **focus bilateral development cooperation to fewer countries and fewer sectors**. By reducing the number of partner countries from 67 to 33 over the next three years and the number of sectors to a maximum of three in each country, Swedish development cooperation is expected to become more effective and strategically oriented.

The Government has adopted a new system for **enhanced results-based management**. The MFA has been given a more strategic and strengthened role in policy leadership. All policies and strategies are to be decided by government decisions, and a clear line has been established between the MFA as responsible for policymaking and SIDA as the policy implementing agency.

The plan acknowledges the challenges posed by the Paris Declaration and concentration to the current SIDA management method. Swedish companies, consultants and institutions providing technical assistance, were deemed to be among the main factors behind what could be identified as Swedish comparative advantage and value added in development cooperation, though SIDA acknowledges these elements must be balanced against the new Paris Declaration environment.

In the Countries Strategy Papers – all interventions should justify the following: priorities of the partner country, coordination with other donors in the strategy process, concentrating in a limited number of sectors and areas, highlight Sweden’s comparative advantages, and clarifying synergies and/or conflicts of different policies objectives effective delivery at the country level. It is worth noting that policy coherence is considered to be one dimension to assess aid effectiveness potential in any future partner country.

The 2006 years Plan requested all staff to report any procedural obstacles identified that prevent SIDA from living up to the international commitments to aid effectiveness. Yet the DAC compendium does not mention the result or procedural reforms undertaken after that scoping work. In 2008 SIDA completed the review of internal regulations for audit, anti-corruption and contribution management in order to ensure greater flexibility.

SIDA has a new organisation since 1 October 2008 and has introduced some important changes in its working methods. The objective of the re-organisation is to make SIDA a more efficient and result-oriented
organisation. The organisation is divided into three main pillars: Policy, Operations and Management. Country based teams in all its major partner countries leading the aid effectiveness process.

Although the 2006 Plan stated that PD indicators were to be integrated with SIDA regular monitoring processes a qualitative analysis has not yet been done on the indicators. In 2007 no internal monitoring activities was carried out. In 2008 SIDA was for the first time requested to report results on aid effectiveness to the government. In 2008 years Letter of Appropriation from Government to SIDA Aid Effectiveness targets are clearly included.

In the previous organisation Paris Declaration commitments were mainstreamed into various forms of quality assurance committee. The previous Quality Assurance Team visits to embassies and Development Corporation Offices with an aid effectiveness check-list. With the relaunching of the new organisation new committees and structures for quality assurance were launched. It is part of the 2009-2011 Action Plan to mainstream Aid Effectiveness into the work of the committees.

In the new organisation, enhanced results orientation is a key. Each country cooperation strategy has a results matrix covering the whole strategy period, in line with international practice. The results matrix is annexed to SIDA’s annual country plan and followed up in the annual country report and revised annually, as necessary. Consultations take place with the MFA before the adoption of the annual country plan. The country report forms part of SIDA’s reporting to the MFA on the implementation of cooperation strategies and includes results and costs in relation to strategy objectives and the objectives included in the results matrix. Country reports provide an input to the annual performance report that SIDA annexes to its annual report (called the results annex in the remainder of this memorandum). All development cooperation will be reported in a results report to the Parliament, with the first report to be presented during the spring of 2009.

Staff
The Department for Management and Methods in Development Cooperation within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is responsible for coordinating the development assistance budget and for dealing with matters relating to SIDA and the Swedish Agency for Development Evaluation (SADEV). It has an overall responsibility for the implementation of the Paris Declaration, follow-up of the Accra Agenda for Action. Within SIDA the Department for Methodology and Effectiveness - 14 people staff, 3 specifically tasked for aid effectiveness- was recently established, with a mandate to manage and coordinate the work around SIDA’s policies and methods.

In 2006, SIDA was already aware of its staff weakness to implement the Paris Declaration and the Plan lists the need to develop competence in various positions and review principles for staffing recruitment and carrier incentives. Also the Ministry for Foreign Affairs plans for a comprehensive series of internal seminars to train concerned staff on development policies and international commitments of the Paris Declaration.

There is no mention to any staff turn-over and redeployment policy specific policy to support internal knowledge sharing on aid effectiveness.

Communication
The 2006 Plan acknowledges the very importance to develop a strategy for internal and external communication, to reach southern partners, private sector, decision-makers, the media and the public in Sweden. A new Communication Policy is to be taken in 2009. Communication efforts have concentrated on targeting civil society organisations. Support has also been provided to international civil society engagement in the Working Party process.

Moreover, thanks to the priority to internal and ongoing monitoring of the aid effectiveness implementation, the Swedish Government is going to issue the first new annual report on results in Development Cooperation to be presented to the Swedish Parliament.

On the negative side, the Compendium highlights the very need to quickly target a wider public, including members of Parliament, to make it familiar with Paris declaration principles in order and to solve the emerging tension between more resources control and increase use of country systems.

Evaluation
It is the responsibility of the MFA to ensure that development cooperation as a whole is monitored and evaluated systematically.
According to SIDA approach development cooperation should as far as possible be evaluated in close cooperation with the developing partner country. Support should be given to improve partner country capacity for monitoring, learning from and evaluating the results of development activities.

Evaluation of development cooperation is carried out by The Swedish National Audit Office, SADEV and SIDAs evaluation unit (UTV). The Swedish National Audit Office (SNAO) is responsible for auditing the activities of the entire Swedish state and, in this way, promoting the optimum use of resources and efficient administration. In order to increase the credibility of evaluation activities, an independent agency for evaluation of international development cooperation was established on 1 January 2006: the Swedish Agency for Development Evaluation (SADEV), with the highlighted risk of being a new and disconnected administrative structure. SIDA evaluations are commissioned either by SIDA’s Department for Evaluation (UTV), by the office for internal audit or by operational departments.

Sweden will actively participate in the second phase of the evaluation on Paris Declaration that will be carried out by DAC Evaluation-net.

About 0.2% of SIDA operational expenditures are used for evaluations. In 2007, the average operational evaluation took 11 staff-weeks to complete, with 6 weeks spent in the field.
**United Kingdom**
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Performance on aid effectiveness

DFID has already achieved the majority of the Paris Targets for 2010: 7 targets out of 10 have been already achieved. Some areas have seen particularly strong progress: DFID has phased out more than half of the parallel ‘Project Implementation Units’ (PIUs) and have sharply increased the share of aid provided through ‘programme based approaches’, in which donors work together to support locally owned and led development programmes: 71% of aid across the 33 countries is now provided in this way, up from 61% in 2005 and ahead of the Paris target of 66%.

DFID has increased the share of technical assistance provided through co-ordinated, country led capacity building programmes – up to 66% from 56% in 2005, and well clear of the Paris target of 50%. DFID has seen good progress in the share of missions conducted jointly with other donors, an increase from 46% to 61%.

Currently the main challenges are the reduction of Parallel Implementation Units and Alignment. DFID is committed to making faster progress in both areas, and is working with partner countries to undertake analysis into the key bottlenecks. The use of country public financial management and procurement systems remains very high and above the EU target level of 50%. DFID ability to use country systems is determined on a case by case basis depending on country circumstances, which may explain the fall in the use of country procurement systems between 2005 and 2007.

Overview

Improving aid effectiveness is a priority in two of DFID new 2008/11 Departmental Strategic Objectives (DSOs): “Make all bilateral and multilateral donors more effective” and “Deliver high quality and effective bilateral development assistance”.

The year of approval of the DFID Medium Term Action Plan on Aid Effectiveness is 2006 (July), but recently DFID has decided to mainstream aid effectiveness instead of having a separate plan. In 2008 DFID has published the “UK Progress Report on Aid Effectiveness”.

The aid effectiveness strategy approved by the Parliament: the UK Parliament has approved in 2002 the International Development Act that has freed aid from commercial or geopolitical constraints. In 2006 the Parliament approved the International Development (Reporting and Transparency) Act that made commitments about bilateral aid and required DFID to report annually on the effectiveness of both bilateral and multilateral aid in meeting the MDGs.

In 2007 DFID has mainstreamed aid effectiveness into its business planning rounds and does not have anymore an operational Action Plan. Two of DFID’s seven Departmental Strategic Objectives (DSO) are on aid effectiveness. Targets are agreed with individual divisions to ensure that the DSOs are met. In this way
divisional directors and country office heads are held accountable for meeting also the Paris Declaration Targets. In the Medium Term Action Plan on Aid Effectiveness there is only one deadline different from and more ambitious than the ones of the Paris Declaration.

**Strategy and Policy Positioning**
The meaning of the concept of ownership, and the engagement of CSO – the engagement of civil society is not mentioned into DFID documents and no specific meaning is given to the concept of ownership.

In February 2008 DFID has published an up-dated Poverty Reduction Budget Support (PRBS) Policy, replacing the 2004 policy. In the 2008 Policy is specified that in order to decide whether PRBS can achieve similar benefits to other forms of aid in a specific country, DFID will assess the following things: the government’s strategy, budget and capacity; fiduciary risk; political risk; the expected benefits of PRBS. DFID provides Poverty Reduction Budget Support to 14 countries, and this constituted 18% of the total bilateral programme budget of 2006/2007.

Aid effectiveness principles are incorporated into DFID’s procedures and processes. For example, all Country Assistance Plans (CAPs) are expected to include an aid effectiveness’ assessment.

Procurement Systems ranking Standards B$^4$ or above in the procurement scale of performance, which means that DFID will use partner procurement management when they have sufficient confidence in the system and a reform programme in place to address weaknesses.

DFID aims at improving coordination (harmonize) of technical assistance in support of long term reforms. In the plan DFID specifies that improving technical assistance is an area where DFID still have to make a lot progresses and a long way to go but no specific priorities are specified.

Procedures and a road map to reduce parallel “Project Implementation Unit” (PIUs) are not mentioned or specified in the Medium Term Action Plan on Aid Effectiveness, however at present DFID have phased out more than half of PIU across the 33 countries that have been surveyed in the 2008 “UK Progress Report on Aid Effectiveness”.

There is no reference to further supporting in utning of aid, as DFID aid is 100% untied since 2001.

**Budget and management**
No Procedural review to support flexibility is specifically mentioned, however DFID has a highly decentralized structure that give the flexibility to respond to specific country’s needs.

DFID committed to increase financial predictability and provide information to recipients on disbursement plans at the time and in the form needed for finalisation of their budgets$^5$. Where aid partnerships are working well DFID will develop long term agreements; as above mentioned, UK Government had signed Long Term Development Partnership Arrangements$^6$ (DPAs) with better performing countries.

DFID specifies that want to improve aid allocation across countries and across sectors in-countries by working with international aid donors and agencies. In the Plan, it is not specified the parameters used to decide in which country concentrate aid and there is no road-map for deepening concentration. However, DFID has identified 14 priority countries for 2008-2011: DRC, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Sierra Leone, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

In the plan it is also specifically stated the intention to build on close relationships with other donors$^7$ and to work across DFID with other donors in order to reach a better division of labour between donors. DFID analyzes how many donors are working in partner countries and together with the Nordic + have agreed a set of guiding principles on division of labour between donors in Zambia, Uganda and Tanzania. In order to

---

$^4$ The Procurement Scale of Performance’s Standards are the following: A) Fully achieve good practice; B) Substantially achieve good practice; C) Partially achieve good practice; D) Do not achieve good practice.

$^5$ “DFID will disburse all PRBS (Poverty Reduction Budget Support) in the first six months of the partners’ financial year. In year of disbursement of PRBS will be fixed and subjected only to commitment to poverty reduction, adherence to human rights and fiduciaries issues”.

$^6$ DPAs are long terms commitments (usually 10 years) intended to support transparency and predictability.

$^7$ Joint offices and shared staff are good promoters of closer working relations.
reduce the bureaucratic burden on recipient countries, DFID had developed “silent partnerships” in order to channel funds through other donors. Moreover, DFID has created joint donor offices in Sudan and Cambodia.

DFID committed to work to improve the way the multilateral agencies (UN and Global Funds) support partner countries.

In the Plan, there is no mention to further decentralization of decision making, possibly, due to the fact that DFID has already an high degree of flexibility.

**Staff**

At HQ level an Aid Effectiveness and Accountability Department (AEAD) has been created. This department has 27 full time staff, 7 of whom are advisory staff specializing on aid effectiveness. Moreover, DFID has created a virtual policy network on aid effectiveness, which is the largest thematic network within the organization.

Moreover staff training models on aid effectiveness have been developed and are delivered several times a year in the form of one day training. Topics include: the Paris Declaration, Multilateral effectiveness, corruption and financial management, aid instruments, results, conditionality, predictability. DFID “Best Practice Guide”, which provides staff with good practice example has a section on Aid Effectiveness and Country Led Approaches. Moreover, AEAD develops and disseminates policies and technical guidance for DFID’s own aid programme.

However, in the pan there is no mention to any staff recruitment policy, including locals and from other donors, and carrier development based on Aid Effectiveness.

**Communication**

There are regular meetings between DFID staff and the UK Aid Network (UKAN), a network of UK NGOs working on aid effectiveness and on aid quantity. Furthermore, DFID has a part of its website dedicated particularly to aid effectiveness and publishes on its website monthly newsletters on this issue. Moreover, DFID has published in 2008 the “UK Progress Report on Aid Effectiveness” that is available to the general public through internet.

Moreover, DFID Annual Report 2008 on development cooperation has a chapter on “making bilateral aid more effective”, another chapter on “making multi-lateral aid more effective” and a chapter on “building an effective organization”. Moreover, progress against Paris Declaration targets is included in DFID Institutional Strategy Papers for key multilateral organisations.

DFID produces a monthly internal newsletters on aid effectiveness. In addition to the newsletters DFID’s Communications Department has the responsibility to keep all DFID’s staff aware of the organization work including aid effectiveness, in fact all DFID policy papers and technical guidance notes are circulated to all DFID’s staff and made available through internet.

**Evaluation**

DFID, apart from using independent evaluations, had an Evaluation Department (EvD) that assesses the effectiveness of development programmes. Moreover it has established an Independent Advisory Committee on Development Impact (IACDI) to help evaluate the impact of UK aid.

DFID’s major policies and programmes have been subjected to independent evaluations. These are made available externally and published on the DFID’s Website.

In the plan is specified that DFID will use partner countries monitoring framework and will work with governments to strengthen statistical and poverty monitoring systems where are weak. DFID is working with partner governments (for example Uganda) to implement national systems of performance assessment.

in 2007 DFID has elaborated a “Results Action Plan” with the aim of creating a change in the way information are used and in DFID’s focus on poverty outcomes. In the Results Action Plan is stated that “A

---

5 In Yemen, DFID contributed 3,5 millions pounds to the Netherlands Government over five years to contribute to fund health programmes.

6 UKAN has engaged with DFID ministers and government officials to push for stronger commitments on aid effectiveness and real changes in practice on the ground.
core set of standardised indicators will be developed to collect consistent information from country programmes on key development outcomes”.

DFID has played a leading role in the establishment of two important networks. The Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation (NONIE) is a network of international donors who have a strong interest in the topic of aid effectiveness and who aim to build a collaborative research effort for more high quality and useful impact evaluations as a means of improving development effectiveness. DFID chairs this network and is also a founder member of 3IE, the International Initiative on Impact Evaluation with the Gates and Hewlett Foundations. Moreover, EvD works with OECD/DAC and Nordic Plus to develop and manage a strategic programme of joint donor evaluations.
**Italy: working towards effectiveness**
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*In the 2008 Monitoring survey of the Paris Declaration, the tied aid percentage for 2008 is not showed. Source: elaboration on the 2008 Survey on monitoring the Paris declaration.*

**Italian performance on aid effectiveness**

According to the Italian Development cooperation communication to the DAC in preparation to the 2008 Survey on aid effectiveness, aid effectiveness is the priority of Italian aid. If assessed under the Paris Declaration indicators, in 2007 Italian aid effectiveness improved in seven areas and even met the target for coordinated technical assistance. It is noteworthy the Italian score for aligned technical assistance was the second best in the EU, highlighting a good feature of the Italian development management to be shared with other donors. Conversely, the Italian score worsened for the use of country systems, country arrangements with on aid management and the increase in parallel implementation units. The low score on the use of country systems is surprising as in its reporting to the DAC the Italian development cooperation had stated that it relied on Partner Countries’ procurement management systems (including tender) for the purchase of goods and services, under a specific provision foreseen by the Italian law on Cooperation (art.15). As for the Parallel implementation units, their number increased for Italy while 216 were dismantled. In 2007 Italy had on average 16 implementation unit to manage 100 million euro in aid, against an EU average of 5 PIU per 100 million euro. As for tied aid, unfortunately the DAC Survey does not report the aid effectiveness value, despite the fact the Italian development cooperation states to have provided it. This lack is unfortunate as tying of aid is one of the most problematic issues for Italian aid quality. However, the share of Italian tied aid as percentage of its bilateral aid, excluding net debt relief, increased from 36% in 2005 to 68% in 2007. Concessional loans are particularly problematic, as they represent 76% of tied aid. In terms of meeting the 2010 targets, Italy will have to mainly focus on the same areas that recorded no-improvement between 2005 and 2007.

**Working towards aid effectiveness**

Last December the Italian development cooperation approved the 2009-20011 strategic plan that was meant to also provide some political direction to the work of the newly established task-force on aid effectiveness. The strategic plan states that aid effectiveness is deemed as a key priority as a response to Italian ODA quantitative limits. The dearth of financial resources could threaten any major reform as the management structure has no incentives and future perspectives.

The Task-force is supposed to steer the internal debate and produce the national plan on aid effectiveness in close collaboration with the national civil society.

The 2009-2011 strategic guidelines for the Italian development cooperation officially endorses the principle of democratic ownership and commits to align future Italian country strategy paper to Partners countries national development strategies. In terms of processes the Italian commitment to ownership aims at engaging local civil society in strategic talks and a more-structured consultation with Italian-based civil
society. Moreover, the development of a wide public communication strategies informed by aid effectiveness perspective is considered to be crucial. However, there is no mention to increase transparency and accessibility of aid information to allow a better quality and timely reporting of aid. Italian reporting to the DAC is poor with non systematic reporting of DAC sectoral markers, such as gender, governance or environment. Moreover, with a view to enhance mutual accountability, the language barrier – all aid documents mainly available in Italian- should be tackled to allow citizens in Partners countries to be aware of the Italian interventions.

In order to ease harmonization and comply with the EU commitments on division of labour, the guidelines attempt to set a geographical and sector priorities. The results for this concentration efforts are in line with those of other EU donors. Italy lists 58 future partners country divided into high priority, medium priority and low priority. Despite country different engagements have to be detailed yet, the geographical concentration effort resulted in a 60% reduction in the number of current partner countries. Geographical areas are earmarked with fixed percentage of the total available financial resource, and Partners countries are divided into priority 1 and priority 2. Despite this important effort to set clear and accountable policy criteria, the strategic guidelines does not help the effort to increase Italian aid predictability nor establish the operational and financial distinction between a Country priority 1 and Priority 2. The taskforce on aid effectiveness should explore some change to ensure a stable amount of financial resources, at least in Country Priority 1, and at least establish a commitment to promptly communicate to partners countries financial changes. Eventually, so far the multi annual country planning is not transparent and its final documents are not publicly available to the Italian and partner country citizen. The country planning is supposed to follow the DAC recommendation performance-based budgeting, by initially setting which are the country-wide expected results.

Less successful were the Strategic Plan’s results for sectoral specialization with a list of 10 sectors mentioned throughout the document. No link is attempted between geographical and sectoral priorities. Yet the sectoral guidelines update provides the opportunity to mainstream the aid effectiveness perspective, with a specific section throughout the sectors.

The strategic plan shortly refers to the issue of common donors arrangements by mentioning the possible use of general budget support but no reference neither to any plan for increase nor to preliminary conditions to use the modality is made. Moreover, last September an amendment to the current legislation on development cooperation was approved to allow the Italian cooperation offices on the field to receive financial transfers from the European Commission and EU member States in order to be able to fully take part in the future EU work on division of labour. Italy is taking part into the EU exercise into 4 countries (Albania, Lebanon, Mozambique and Ethiopia).

However any improvement on the Paris Declaration indicators is linked to the possibility for Italy to participate into pooled funds or multi-donors funds, obliging to review internal administrative procedures. The strategic guidelines do not refer to any work on procedural reform to ensure greater flexibility, being specifically targeted to the aid effectiveness commitment. Yet, over the last two years, the Directorate General for Development Cooperation has being working on procedural reforms, that should be accomplished and also steered to comply with Paris Declaration targets.

The strategy also sketches 3 criteria informing the future strategy on financial allocation to multilateral organizations. These include: 1) organizational coordination and management; 2) sectoral mandate in line with Italian sectoral priorities; 3) Italian-based organizations. As for sectoral specialization, Italy is to focus on organizations specialized in food security, health, education and water. Yet, it is not clear whether this criteria just refers to the organization core mandates or includes special programs, as well. Eventually and more surprisingly the document states that being an Italian based organization is set as sufficient condition to be strategic and eligible to receive Italian money. It does no reference to the organization implementing effectiveness. In this context, the document does not plan any joint evaluation of multilateral organization effectiveness to possibly inform future financial allocations.

Eventually the multi-year strategy is apparently silent on the problematic areas for the Italian development cooperation to meet the 2010 targets on aid effectiveness. As for the use of country systems, the guidelines still refer to article 15 as the sufficient condition to meet the Paris declaration objective, not referring to the poor results score in 2008. The Italian development cooperation used art.15 as legal basis to take part into the General Budget Support in Mozambique, but there is scope to reduce the administrative burden. The internal on-going work on procedural reform could provide an opportunity to move forward towards the use of country systems. It has to be borne in mind that by using country systems, donors countries accept Partner countries, budget, reporting and auditing procedures. As for local procurement target, a recent DAC study assumes that Italy’s procurement for the development programme by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Directorate General for Development Co-operation and other public organisations follows competitive procedures in line with the EU Procurement Directive, but was unable to establish to what extent bids from local or regional firms are allowed. In both cases, if the on-going procedural reform is on opportunity, policy guidelines need to be developed to clearly state the level of fiduciary risk.

The three-year plan acknowledges the recent efforts on decentralisation of decision making, increasing the number of Local Technical Units in the field, with both a national or local staff. However they do not announce for any further delegation for decision making at local level, including in financial management. A general finding from the Paris Declaration Survey is that those donors whose operations are more decentralised to their country offices or embassies tend to be more supportive of partner ownership and the use of country systems. In the Italian context the increase in delegate authority at field level is also linked to the increase in number of the implementation units. The positive effort to move decentralization forwards should be coupled with a time table plan of parallel implementation unit reduction or restructuring. Italian PIU increased by 33% between 2005 and 2007, mainly thanks to those in Morocco, Ethiopia and Egypt. According to the Paris Declaration criteria a Project Unit is labelled as “Parallel” if its reporting lines are headed to the donor agencies, even if it just deals with monitoring the progress.

As for joint missions and analytic work, despite the most improvement Italy recorded in 2008 survey, Italian performances are still respectively last and third last within the EU. In the first aid effectiveness survey Italy was the second last EU donors concerning its joint work, two years later, it is still the second furthest donors from joint missions and analytic work targets. Joint work in Albania and Mozambique was particularly critical, while in Ethiopia had already met the Paris Declaration Target. Improvements on the two targets do not require any complex administrative reform to take place, it only needs a clear directives to encourage and monitor joint work. In the Italian context, it is important to note that missions by the Italian local authorities contribute to the overall result on joint work, hinting to the need of better coordination of the whole Italian cooperation system.

Lack of staff is described as one of the main weakness of the Italian development cooperation field presence, and it plans a major staff increase to bring the staff number to its initial level. Despite this positive planned quantitative boost there is no reference to staff qualities. The plan is silent on possible financial investment resources to improve and update staff competencies to meet the challenges of the new aid context.

As for evaluation, the guidelines call for increased efforts in evaluation according to DAC criteria. Last December the Evaluation Unit was appointed. According to the current legislation, the Evaluation Unit is tasked with: 1) ex-ante initiatives approval before they are submitted to the Steering Committee and 2) commissioning ex-post independent impact evaluations. Due to zero financial resources allocated to the last evaluation unit activities, the Italian development cooperation did not actually carry out any independent widely disseminated evaluations over the last 7 years. The evaluation unit is no a guarantee to have independent evaluation produced, until its budget is going to be approved. Moreover, no matter how positive starting to evaluated again is, the new evaluation activities have to take into account the Paris Declaration principles. The updated version of the evaluation policy should encourage, for instance, joint evaluations not only with donors but also with partners or maximizing the use of partner’s human and technical resources in the evaluation process as best option and aligning indicators and methodology with donors and partners in order to reduce costs and standardizing point of views before mutual accountability.

In the Plan, despite the specific section on concessional loans – representing the greater share of the Italian tied aid - there is no reference to further untying or support to local procurements of good and services throughout the document. As for local procurement, last December the Italian development cooperation increased the percentage of locally purchased services for some sectors for concessional loans. This move is in line with Accra commitments and further progress could be built on this. More importantly, despite the fact that article 6 of the current development cooperation legislation ties all loans, a non-legal reform was approved in 2002 to comply with the DAC recommendation on aid untying for Least Developed Countries. More specifically the Inter-ministerial Committee for Economic Planning approved the reform to allow the LDC untying. The same process is envisaged to extend the untying to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries, proving that further untying can be quickly achieved.

Eventually, the 2009-2011 plan points out to the need of developing a coherent nation-wide approach to development cooperation, including all institutional and private stakeholders whose action can be beneficial to Partner country development beyond aid. The document stresses the Italian effort to foster “development

\[\text{OECD-DAC, Promoting Local And Regional Procurement in Developing Countries, May 2008.}\]
effectiveness", but fails to make any reference to Policy Coherence for development and taking into account that trade or agricultural or migration can have negative impact on developing countries. Despite the 2004 DAC recommendations Italy has not issued any specific public statement on coherence for development, nor identified policy areas incoherent with its development co-operation objectives. The current aid effectiveness work is an opportunity to implement the stated commitment to foster development effectiveness, by planning a work on policy coherence.
Italia: al lavoro per l’efficacia

Grafico 7: Obiettivi della Dichiarazione di Parigi; trend nel periodo 2005-2007 e distanza dagli obiettivi del 2010

* Nello Studio di Monitoraggio sulla Dichiarazione di Parigi del 2008, la percentuale degli aiuti legati per il 2008 non è stata riportata.
Fonte: elaborazione sullo Studio del 2008 sul Monitoraggio della Dichiarazione di Parigi.

Performance italiana sull’efficacia dell’aiuto

Al lavoro per l’efficacia dell’aiuto
Lo scorso dicembre la cooperazione italiana allo sviluppo ha approvato il piano strategico per il 2009-2011 teso a fornire un indirizzo politico alla task-force recentemente istituita sull’efficacia dell’aiuto. Il piano strategico ritiene l’efficacia dell’aiuto sia una priorità che una risposta ai limiti quantitativi italiani dell’aiuto pubblico allo sviluppo (APS). La scarsità di risorse finanziarie potrebbe minacciare ogni riforma più importante poiché la struttura di gestione (soprattutto la Direzione Generale per la Cooperazione allo Sviluppo) non ha incentivi e poche prospettive future.
Dalla Task-force ci si aspetta che guidi il dibattito interno e che produca il piano nazionale sull’efficacia dell’aiuto in stretta collaborazione con la società civile italiana.
Le linee guida strategiche della cooperazione italiana allo sviluppo per il 2009-2011 sostengono ufficialmente il principio di “ownership” democratica e si impegnano ad allineare le future strategie nazionali Paese alle strategie di sviluppo nazionale dei Paesi Partner. In termini di processo, l’impegno italiano nell’ownership mira a coinvolgere la società civile nei Paesi in discussioni strategiche attraverso anche una più strutturata consultazione con la società civile in Italia. Inoltre, lo sviluppo di strategie di comunicazione al grande pubblico per sensibilizzarlo sul tema dell’efficacia dell’aiuto è considerato cruciale. Comunque, non c’è riferimento all’aumento della trasparenza e dell’accessibilità dell’informazione per permettere di rendicontare puntualmente gli aiuti e migliorarne la qualità. La rapportistica italiana al DAC è ancora carente nel riportare gli indicatori di genere, governance e ambiente. Inoltre, per migliorare la responsabilità reciproca tra donatori e partner, le barriere linguistiche – tutti i documenti sugli aiuti disponibili principalmente in italiano – dovrebbero essere ridotte con traduzioni su più lingue così da permettere ai cittadini dei Paesi Partner di essere consapevoli degli interventi italiani.

Per facilitare l’armonizzazione e rispettare gli impegni dell’Unione Europea sulla divisione del lavoro, le linee guida cercano di stabilire priorità settoriali e geografiche. I risultati di questo sforzo verso la concentrazione sono in linea con quelli di altri donatori dell’Unione europea. L’Italia elenca 58 futuri Paesi Partner suddivisi in alta, media e bassa priorità. Sebbene le varie modalità di coinvolgimento nei paesi devono ancora essere dettagliate, lo sforzo di concentrazione geografica è risultato in una riduzione del 60% nel numero degli attuali paesi partner. Le aree geografiche sono contrassegnate da ripartizioni percentuali fisse sul totale delle risorse finanziarie disponibili come aiuto, e i paesi partner divisi in priorità 1 e 2. Nonostante questo notevole sforzo per fissare criteri chiari e giustificabili, le linee guida strategiche non contribuiscono allo sforzo per migliorare la prevedibilità dell’aiuto italiano nè stabiliscono una distinzione finanziaria e operativa tra la priorità 1 e la priorità 2 di un paese. La Task-force sull’efficacia dell’aiuto dovrebbe esplorare possibilità di cambiamento in modo da assicurare ammontare più stabili di risorse finanziarie, almeno nei paesi con priorità 1, oltre a stabilire l’impegno a comunicare prontamente modifiche finanziarie ai paesi partner. Finora, la pianificazione pluriennale del paese non è stata trasparente con i suoi documenti finali non disponibili pubblicamente ai contribuenti italiani e ai cittadini dei paesi partner. La pianificazione del paese dovrebbe basarsi sulle raccomandazioni del DAC relative alle allocazioni finanziarie basate sulle performance, stabilendo inizialmente quali sono i risultati previsti dall’intervento italiano nel paese.

Meno riusciti sono stati i risultati del piano strategico relativamente alla specializzazione settoriale, con una lista di dieci settori menzionati all’interno del documento, su un totale di 12 possibili. Nessuna relazione è stabilita tra priorità geografiche e settoriali. Tuttavia, l’aggiornamento delle linee guida settoriali fornisce l’opportunità di ampliare la prospettiva dell’efficacia dell’aiuto con una sezione specifica all’interno dei singoli settori.

Il piano strategico fa un breve riferimento alla questione degli accordi sui fondi d’aiuto comuni, con il riferimento al possibile uso del sostegno generale del bilancio, ma nessuna specificazione ulteriore viene fornita relativamente all’aumento o alle condizioni preliminari per l’impiego di questa modalità. Lo scorso settembre è stata approvata una modifica all’attuale legislazione sulla cooperazione allo sviluppo per permettere agli uffici della cooperazione italiana sul campo di ricevere i trasferimenti finanziari dalla Commissione europea e gli Stati membri EU al fine di poter partecipare pienamente all’esercizio dell’Unione sulla divisione del lavoro, attraverso anche la cooperazione delegata. L’Italia sta prendendo alla sforzo dell’Unione Europea in 4 paesi (Albania, Libano, Mozambico ed Etiopia).

Comunque, qualsiasi miglioramento sugli indicatori della dichiarazione di Parigi è legato alla possibilità per l’Italia di partecipare a fondi comuni o multi-donatore, obbligando la cooperazione italiana alla revisione delle procedure amministrative interne. Le linee guida strategiche non indicano alcun lavoro sulla riforme procedurali volto ad assicurare una maggiore flessibilità, pur essendo orientate specificamente verso un miglioramento dell’efficacia dell’aiuto. Tuttavia, nell’arco degli ultimi due anni, la Direzione Generale per la Cooperazione allo Sviluppo ha lavorato alle riforme procedurali che dovrebbero essere complete e indirizzate in modo tale da rimuovere gli ostacoli per il raggiungimento degli obiettivi della Dichiarazione di Parigi.

La strategia abbozza inoltre 3 criteri alla base della futura strategia per le attribuzioni finanziarie a organizzazioni multilaterali. Questi includono: 1) coordinamento e gestione organizzativa, 2) mandato settoriale in linea con le priorità settoriali italiane, 3) organizzazioni con sede in Italia. Per quanto riguarda la specializzazione settoriale, l’Italia si concentrerà sulle organizzazioni specializzate nella sicurezza alimentare, la salute, l’istruzione e l’acqua. Tuttavia, non è chiaro se questi criteri si riferiscano esclusivamente ai mandati chiave dell’organizzazione o includano anche programmi speciali ad hoc. Infine, e sorprendentemente, il documento sostiene che l’essere un’organizzazione con sede in Italia sia condizione sufficiente per essere strategica ed eleggibile a ricevere denaro italiano. Non fa alcun riferimento all’efficacia dell’operato dell’organizzazione stessa. In questo contesto, il documento non pianifica nessuna valutazione.
oggettiva congiunta dell’efficacia dell’organizzazione multilaterale al fine di informare future attribuzioni finanziarie.

Infine, la strategia pluriennale tace evidentemente sulle aree problematiche della cooperazione italiana per raggiungere gli obiettivi del 2010 sull’efficacia dell’aiuto. Per quanto riguarda l’uso di country system, le linee guida si riferiscono tuttora all’articolo 15 come alla condizione sufficiente a raggiungere l’obiettivo della Dichiarazione di Parigi, non facendo cenno agli scarsi risultati del 2008. La cooperazione italiana allo sviluppo ha usato l’articolo 15 come base legale per partecipare, ad esempio, al Sostegno generale al Bilancio in Mozambico, ma c’è spazio per ridurne il peso amministrativo. La presente attività di riforma delle procedure fornisce un’opportunità per avanzare verso l’uso dei country system. Bisogna tenere a mente che, usando country system, i paesi donatori accettano le procedure di bilancio, resoconto e revisione dei paesi partner. Per l’obiettivo relativo all’uso delle procedure di gara locale, un recente studio del DAC riconosce che nella realizzazione di bandi di fornitura la cooperazione italiana segue procedure competitive in linea con le procedure europee. Tuttavia lo studio non è stato in grado di stabilire in che misura le offerte di aziende locali o regionali siano state accettate per la cooperazione italiana.

Il piano triennale riconosce i recenti sforzi verso il decentramento del processo decisionale, incrementando il numero di Unità Tecniche Locali sul campo, attraverso personale nazionale e locale. Tuttavia non programmato alcuna delega ulteriore del processo decisionale a livello locale, gestione finanziaria inclusa. Tra le conclusioni dello Studio della Dichiarazione di Parigi vi è il riconoscimento che quei donatori le cui decisioni sono maggiormente decentralizzate agli uffici o alle ambasciate del loro paese, tendono a sostenere maggiormente l’ownership locale e utilizzare maggiormente i country system. Nel contesto italiano, l’aumento dell’autorità delegata al livello palese è anche legata all’aumento del numero delle strutture parallele di implementazione. Lo sforzo positivo verso l’avanzamento del decentramento dovrebbe essere affiancato da una tabella di marcia di riduzione o ristrutturazione delle strutture di implementazione parallele (PIU). Le PIU italiane sono aumentate del 33% tra il 2005 e il 2007, principalmente a causa di quelle di Marocco, Etiopia ed Egitto. Secondo i criteri della Dichiarazione di Parigi una Struttura di implementazione è considerata “parallela” se le linee di management sono verso le agenzie del donatore, anche se tratta esclusivamente del monitoraggio dei progressi.

Per quanto riguarda le missioni congiunte e il lavoro analitico, nonostante si registri un rilevante miglioramento italiano registrato nello Studio del 2008, le performance italiane sono ancora rispettivamente scarse: penultima e terzultima nell’Unione Europea. Nel primo studio sull’efficacia dell’aiuto, l’Italia era il penultimo donatore europeo per il suo operato congiunto; due anni dopo, occupa la seconda posizione più distante dal raggiungimento degli obiettivi per le missioni congiunte e lavoro analitico. Il lavoro congiunto in Albania e Mozambico è stato particolarmente problematico, mentre in Etiopia la cooperazione italiana aveva già raggiunto gli obiettivi della Dichiarazione di Parigi. I miglioramenti nei due obiettivi non richiedono nessuna riforma amministrativa complessa, ma solo chiari ordini di servizio per incoraggiare e monitorare il lavoro congiunto. Nel contesto italiano, è importante rilevare che le missioni della cooperazione decentrata contribuiscono al risultato complessivo italiano sul lavoro congiunto, rendendo esplicito il bisogno di un migliore coordinamento dell’intero sistema di cooperazione italiano sull’agenda dell’efficacia.

La mancanza di personale è descritta nella relazione dell’Italia al DAC come una delle maggiori debolezze per la presenza sul campo della cooperazione italiana, e si pianifica un decisivo aumento del personale per portarlo al suo livello iniziale. Nonostante questo positivo aumento quantitativo pianificato, non c’è riferimento alla qualità del personale. Il piano tace su possibili investimenti in termini di formazione volti a migliorare e ad aggiornare le competenze dello staff per essere all’altezza delle sfide del nuovo contesto dell’aiuto.

Per quanto riguarda le valutazioni, le linee guida puntano ad uno sforzo maggiore verso la valutazione, da realizzarsi secondo i criteri del DAC. Lo scorso dicembre l’Unità di Valutazione è stata re-istituita. Secondo la legislazione attuale, l’Unità di Valutazione ha il compito di: 1) approvare iniziative ex-ante prima che vengano sottoposte al Comitato Direzionale e 2) commissionare valutazioni d’impatto indipendenti ex-post. A causa delle risorse finanziarie nulle, la cooperazione italiana non ha effettivamente eseguito nessuna valutazione negli ultimi 7 anni. La sola presenza di un’unità di valutazione non è garanzia per avere valutazioni indipendenti, finché il suo bilancio non sarà approvato. Comunque, al di là di quanto positivo sia far ripartire

---

la valutazione, le nuove attività di valutazione devono considerare i principi della dichiarazione di Parigi. La versione aggiornata delle linee guida politiche di valutazione dovrebbe incoraggiare, per esempio, valutazioni congiunte non solo coi donatori ma anche coi partner o il massimo uso in prima istanza delle risorse umane e tecniche del partner nel processo di valutazione e l’allineamento di indicatori e metodologie con donatori e partner al fine di ridurre i costi di transazione.

Nelle Linee guida triennale, nonostante una sezione specifica sui prestiti concessionali – che rappresentano la porzione maggiore degli aiuti legati italiani - non c’è riferimento ad un ulteriore slegamento o sostegno agli approvvigionamenti locali di beni e servizi. Per quanto riguarda l’approvvigionamento locale, lo scorso dicembre, la cooperazione italiana allo sviluppo ha aumentato la percentuale di servizi acquistati localmente per alcuni settori da prestiti concessionali. Nonostante il fatto che l’articolo 6 dell’attuale legislazione della cooperazione allo sviluppo leggi tutti i prestiti, una riforma non legale è stata comunque realizzata nel 2002 per rispettare le raccomandazioni del DAC sullo slegamento dell’aiuto per i paesi meno sviluppati. Più specificamente, il Comitato Interministeriale per la Pianificazione Economica ha approvato la riforma che ha permesso lo slegamento di prestiti verso i Paesi meno avanzati. Il Comitato Direzionale prevede di seguire lo stesso percorso per estendere lo slegamento ai Paesi Poveri più indebitati a riprova che un ulteriore slegamento può essere raggiunto velocemente.

Infine, il piano 2009-2011 sottolinea il bisogno di sviluppare un approccio nazionale coerente alla cooperazione allo sviluppo, che includa tutti gli stakeholder le cui azioni possono avere un impatto sullo sviluppo dei paesi partner, anche oltre l’aiuto. Il documento pone l’accento sugli sforzi italiani a promuovere “efficacia dello sviluppo”, ma non fa nessun riferimento alla Coerenza delle Politiche per lo sviluppo, riferendosi alle conseguenze delle politiche commerciali, agricole e migratorie sui paesi in via di sviluppo. Nonostante le raccomandazioni DAC del 2004, l’Italia non ha fatto nessuna dichiarazione pubblica specifica sulla coerenza delle politiche per lo sviluppo, né ha identificato aree di incoerenza rispetto agli obiettivi della cooperazione allo sviluppo. L’attuale lavoro sull’efficacia dell’aiuto è un’opportunità per mettere in piedi un percorso verso la promozione dell’efficacia dello sviluppo, pianificando un lavoro sulla coerenza delle politiche.
Conclusion and recommendations for Italy

The work of the aid effectiveness Task force is still at preliminary stage and no consolidated index Plan has been externally circulated for consultation. The contents analysis of the 6 EU country plans aims to provide food for thought for the Italian plan by highlighting issues that are commonly tackled. However it is important to point out that each plan has to be donor-tailored to meet its specific aid-effectiveness challenges.
Table 2: comparison of 6 aid effectiveness national plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paris Declaration National Plan, process and topics</th>
<th>Spain*</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>EC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of approval of the aid effectiveness plan and updates</td>
<td>Drafting on-going, first reference in 2005</td>
<td>Approved in 2006, in 2007 it was mainstreamed</td>
<td>Approved in 2006</td>
<td>Approved in 2006</td>
<td>Approved in 2006</td>
<td>Approved in 2006, with a specific update in 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level political approval</td>
<td>Ministerial Level</td>
<td>Ministerial Level</td>
<td>Ministerial Level</td>
<td>Cabinet level</td>
<td>Ministerial Level</td>
<td>Council approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of the Parliament</td>
<td>Polical parties subscribed bi-partisan commitment for more effectiveness</td>
<td>Yes, in 2006 the Parliament made commitments about bilateral aid and required DFID to report annually on the effectiveness of both bilateral and multilateral aid</td>
<td>No, drafted by the administration in consultation with NGOs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional responsibilities and deadlines included</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comité Interministériel de la Coopération Internationale et du Développement is in charge of the implementation of the Action Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris Declaration National Plan, process and topics</td>
<td>Spain*</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional reorganization</td>
<td>Setting up one dedicated unit</td>
<td>Aid effectiveness and accountability department established</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4 special units established, aimed at mainstreaming aid effectiveness and staff support</td>
<td>Department for Policy and effectiveness tasked to monitor aid-effectiveness</td>
<td>Yes, with dedicated units and inter Directions Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid effectiveness staff in the Agency</td>
<td>5 people staff</td>
<td>7 people staff</td>
<td>20 people staff in the whole aid system</td>
<td>Scattered among different Ministries</td>
<td>3 people</td>
<td>10 people between Relex, AIDCO, and DG Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreaming aid effectiveness in other policy documents</td>
<td>Yes, from third master plan 2006-2008</td>
<td>Yes, the whole aid effectiveness is mainstreamed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid effectiveness section in country strategy papers and sectoral guidelines</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, when updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of ownership, mentioning civil society</td>
<td>Yes, in the 2009 - 2012 strategy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No, but supporting its engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy guidance for using country systems</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, to be used when ranking standard B</td>
<td>Yes, to be used when ranking standard B</td>
<td>No, limited to ad-hoc &quot;appropriateness evaluation&quot;</td>
<td>Not detailed, at minimum aid to be reflected in partner country budget</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy guidance to use General Budget Support</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification needed for non-programme-based work</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural reforms to ensure flexibility</td>
<td>Yes, reform enacted in 2007</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, for Technical cooperation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects approval evaluation including an aid effectiveness dimension</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for further decentralization</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No, Dfid is already decentralized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, via staff redeployment at field level</td>
<td>Yes, Field offices to lead the aid-effectiveness process</td>
<td>No, the EC management is deemed to be decentralized enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris Declaration National Plan, process and topics</td>
<td>Spain*</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans to reform Technical assistance</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, but challenging</td>
<td>on-going, but great focus on promoting capacity building</td>
<td>Yes, but challenging</td>
<td>Yes, challenging</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for further untying</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, but no reference to EDF untying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans to reduce parell units</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, need to coordinate ACP and No-ACP arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing multilateral effectiveness</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans to ensure greater predictability</td>
<td>Yes, Agency is given a multi year budget</td>
<td>Yes, 10 partnership agreements 10 year long with better performing countries</td>
<td>Yes, with 5 year commitments</td>
<td>Possible, extending to 3 years commitments, and disbursement plans</td>
<td>Yes, a priority in 2009-2011</td>
<td>Yes, mainly via the MDG contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for country and sectoral concentration</td>
<td>23 priority countries, 50 in total - not enough sectoral concentration-delegated cooperation in the new regional priority: Africa</td>
<td>14 priority countries - delegated cooperation with Nordic</td>
<td>54 priority countries, further concentration planned</td>
<td>From 70 to 57 countries</td>
<td>Yes, in 33 countries, with 3 sectors per country</td>
<td>No, but increasing pressures to focus on &quot;Donors orphans&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public awareness communication strategy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, not addressed, yet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal communication strategy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid effectiveness as specific section in the development cooperation report</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and staff incentives based on aid effectiveness</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris Declaration National Plan, process and topics</td>
<td>Spain*</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal trainings on aid effectiveness</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, mainly on internal redeployment and Knowledge sharing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation policy reviewed and scaling up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, using Countries framework</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, establishing a new unit</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider dissemination of evaluations, even among other donors</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of internal performance indicators</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to increase aid transparency info</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* the Spanish aid effectiveness national plan is currently under development

Source: Elaboration on Spain, France, Germany, Sweden, EC and UK national plans
Conclusion and recommendations for Italy

By using the matrix (see table below), it is possible to list how frequently different topics are dealt within the national plans, in order to establish whether there are commonalities and un-avoidable issues to be included in any national plan. All had an high political endorsement both at Ministerial or Cabinet level, with commitments to ensure procedural flexibility and greater, to increase communication efforts on aid effectiveness and a strong investments at building internal staff capacity. Four out of six agencies have specifically tasked headquarter-based staff to follow and support the aid effectiveness implementation. It is important to note that, all plans were approved in the aftermath of Paris Declaration approval. The 2008 aid effectiveness survey and the new Accra Commitments compel to their update, by broadening the topics to Accra related issues while focussing on Donors specific critical areas.

Table 3: Topic prevalence in the 6 analyzed plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan process or topic</th>
<th>Prevalence in 6 analyzed plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level political approval</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of the Parliament</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional responsibilities and deadlines included</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional reorganization</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid effectiveness staff in the Agency</td>
<td>7 people on average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreaming aid effectiveness in other policy documents</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid effectiveness section in country strategy papers and sectoral guidelines</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of ownership, mentioning civil society</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy guidance for using country systems</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy guidance to use General Budget Support</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification needed for non-programme-based work</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural reforms to ensure flexibility</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects approval evaluation including an aid effectiveness dimension</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for further decentralization</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans to reform Technical assistance</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for further untying</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans to reduce parallel units</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing multilateral effectiveness</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans to ensure greater predictability</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Conclusion and recommendations for Italy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan process or topic</th>
<th>Prevalence in 6 analyzed plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plans for country and sectoral concentration</td>
<td>83%, 41 priority countries on average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public awareness communication strategy</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal communication strategy</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid effectiveness as specific section in the development cooperation report</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and staff incentives based on aid effectiveness</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal trainings on aid effectiveness</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation policy reviewed and scaling up</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider dissemination of evaluations, even among other donors</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of internal performance indicators</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to increase aid transparency info</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Elaboration on Spain, France, Germany, Sweden, EC and UK national plans.

As a matter of fact having a plan is not a sufficient guarantee to meet the Paris declaration targets. As the matrix shows, all countries but Germany, displayed some areas of worsening in the Paris Declaration Targets. On average, the targets where all donors critically performed were those related to the use of procurement systems and progress on aid untying. Some aid agencies are still uncertain regarding what lies behind these figures. In many case the development of a national plan just managed to deal with the PD as a technical matter – without enough political drive, proper incentives and knowledge old habits die hard. In order to address the underlying causes for the current results, donors have to move beyond the indicators – also looking at the qualitative side, by reaching others constituencies - i.e Parliaments – different from the “usual suspects”. Political leadership is the most important driver of change and is a necessary condition to generate the commitment of the senior management of donor agencies to the Paris Declaration principles. Political incentives include: passing new legislation and regulations; promoting public and parliamentary awareness of Paris Declaration principles; external scrutiny of the delivery of development results. Without clear and sustained signals from Policy and all levels of high level management, changes in policies, procedural norms, staffing rules or reporting systems will have limited impact.
Table 4: Donors performance in meeting Paris Declaration targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paris Declaration targets</th>
<th>Spain*</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>6 Donors aver.</th>
<th>Italy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Aid aligned</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Coordinated Tech. Assist.</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Use of Country Systems</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Use of country_procurements systems</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Aid Predictability</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Untied aid*</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>Already 100%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Already 100%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Use of common arrangements</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Joint Missions</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Joint Analytic work</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% reduction in Parallel Units</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worsening</th>
<th>Slight improvement</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Source: elaboration on the 2008 Survey on monitoring the Paris declaration.
In order to produce a comprehensive plan to tackle the Italian aid shortcomings in aid effectiveness and to further detail the contents of the 2009-2011 guidelines, the Italian national plan on aid effectiveness should:

in order to comply with the Paris Declaration commitments:
- have a high level endorsement of aid effectiveness, including a Parliamentarian involvement;
- clearly establish internal responsibilities within the structure and deadlines for outputs delivery;
- provide an institutional reorganization, with aid effectiveness specifically dedicated staff to support the aid effectiveness plan rolling-out;
- systematically consult with local civil society in planning, implementing and monitoring the Italian country strategy;
- plan further untying and increase the percentage for local purchase of good and services;
- achieve necessary procedural reforms to ensure flexibility, i.e. carry out a procedural reform to increase the use of Partner country systems and common donors arrangements, and provide specific policy guidance to make explicit the level of fiduciary risk;
- plan to ensure greater predictability, by anticipating and adjusting country flows allocations and making the information immediately available to the Partner country;
- make aid interventions transparent, by translating the documents into English, making them automatically available on the web-site, and complying with all DAC reporting rules;
- further delegate decision making authority at field level, while reducing and reforming the mandate of parallel implementing units;
- plan evaluation work to encourage aligned, mutual and joint evaluation and justify no-joint missions and analytic work.

in order to be aligned to DAC donors best practices in aid effectiveness:
- take part in joint assessment of multilateral organizations effectiveness, in order to further concentrate the Italian allocations;
- detail country plans, including Italian added values, multi-year planned financial allocations, expected results and make them publicly available;
- mainstream aid effectiveness perspectives into all policy documents, projects approval and country strategies, by including an aid effectiveness specific section;
- develop internal and external communication strategy and report on aid effectiveness in the existing publications or communication tools;
- task local offices to monitor and report on progress and obstacles on achieving aid effectiveness targets.
Conclusioni e raccomandazioni per l'Italia

Il lavoro della Task-force per l'efficacia dell'aiuto è ancora ad uno stadio preliminare e nessun indice consolidato è stato messo in circolazione per la consultazione. Le analisi dei contenuti dei Piani nazionali per l'efficacia dei 6 paesi europei mirano a fornire spunti di riflessione per il piano italiano, evidenziando i temi affrontati da tutti. Comunque, è importante sottolineare che ogni piano deve essere adattato al contesto del donatore per metterlo in grado di far fronte alle sfide specifiche dell'efficacia dell'aiuto.
### Conclusioni e raccomandazioni per l'Italia

Tabella 2: paragone tra i 6 piani nazionali sull'efficacia dell'aiuto

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piano Nazionale per la Dichiarazione di Parigi, procedure e argomenti</th>
<th>Spagna*</th>
<th>Regno Unito</th>
<th>Francia</th>
<th>Germania</th>
<th>Svezia</th>
<th>CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approvazione politica ad alto livello</td>
<td>Livello Ministeriale</td>
<td>Livello Ministeriale</td>
<td>Livello Ministeriale</td>
<td>Livello di Consiglio dei Ministri</td>
<td>Livello Ministeriale</td>
<td>Approvazione del Consiglio dei Ministri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coinvolgimento del Parlamento</td>
<td>Partiti politici hanno sottoscritto impegni bi-partisan per una maggiore efficacia</td>
<td>Si, nel 2006 il Parlamento si è impegnato sugli aiuti bilaterali e ha richiesto che il DFID relazioni annualmente sull'efficacia degli aiuti bilaterali e multilaterali</td>
<td>No, redatta dall'amministrazione in consultazione con le ONG</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsabilità istituzionali e scadenze incluse</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conclusioni e raccomandazioni per l'Italia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piano Nazionale per la Dichiarazione di Parigi, procedure e argomenti</th>
<th>Spagna*</th>
<th>Regno Unito</th>
<th>Francia</th>
<th>Germania</th>
<th>Svezia</th>
<th>CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riorganizzazione istituzionale</td>
<td>Istituzione di un'unità ad hoc</td>
<td>Formato il dipartimento per la responsabilità e l'efficacia dell'aiuto</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Stabilite 4 unità speciali con lo scopo di estendere l'efficacia dell'aiuto e il sostegno dello staff</td>
<td>Assegnato al Dipartimento per la Politica e l'efficacia il compito di monitorare l'efficacia dell'aiuto</td>
<td>Si, con unità dedicate e Task Force interdireziva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personale per l'efficacia dell'aiuto nell'Agenzia</td>
<td>Personale di 5 persone</td>
<td>Personale di 7 persone</td>
<td>Personale di 20 persone nell'intero sistema di aiuti</td>
<td>Sparsi fra diversi Ministeri</td>
<td>3 persone</td>
<td>10 persone tra Relex, AIDCO e DG Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacia dell'integrazione dell'aiuto nei documenti di altre politiche</td>
<td>Si, dal terzo piano principale 2006-2008</td>
<td>Si, tutta l'efficacia dell'aiuto è integrata</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sezione sull'efficacia dell'aiuto nei documenti strategici del Paese e linee guida settoriali</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Si, quando vengono aggiomate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definizione di proprietà, con riferimento alla società civile</td>
<td>Si, nella strategia 2009-2011</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>No, ma sostiene il suo impegno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direttive politiche per l'uso del sistema-paese</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Si, da usare nel caso il sistema Paese abbia standard B</td>
<td>Si, da usare nel caso il sistema Paese abbia standard B</td>
<td>No, limitato a valutazioni sull'appropriatezza ad hoc</td>
<td>Non dettagliato, almeno l'aiuto deve essere riportato nel bilancio del paese partner</td>
<td>Si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direttive politiche per usare il Sostegno al Bilancio Generale (GSS)</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Possibile</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giustificazione richiesta per lavori non basati su programmi</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conclusioni e raccomandazioni per l'Italia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piano Nazionale per la Dichiarazione di Parigi, procedure e argomenti</th>
<th>Spagna</th>
<th>Regno Unito</th>
<th>Francia</th>
<th>Germania</th>
<th>Svezia</th>
<th>CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Riforme procedurali per assicurare flessibilità</strong></td>
<td>Sì, riforma avviata nel 2007</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì, per cooperazione tecnica</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valutazione di approvazione dei progetti che includono la dimensione dell'efficacia dell'aiuto</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piani per un ulteriore decentramento</strong></td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>No, DFID è già decentralizzato</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì, attraverso la redistribuzione dello staff sul campo</td>
<td>Sì, gli uffici sul campo conducono i processi di efficacia dell'aiuto</td>
<td>No, la gestione della CE è ritenuta abbastanza decentralizzata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piani per riformare l'assistenza tecnica</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sì, ma impegnativi</td>
<td>In corso ma attenzione alla promozione dello sviluppo di capacità locali</td>
<td>Sì, ma impegnativi</td>
<td>Sì, impegnativi</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piani per ulteriore slegamento</strong></td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sì, ma non c'è riferimento allo slegamento del FED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piano per ridurre unità parallele</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, ma riduzione del 50% dal 2006</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Possibile</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sì, bisogna coordinare accordi ACP e non ACP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verifica dell'efficacia multilaterale</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piani per assicurare maggiore prevedibilità</strong></td>
<td>Sì, l'agenzia è fornita di un bilancio pluriennale</td>
<td>Sì, 10 accordi di partnership di 10 anni con i paesi con prestazione migliore</td>
<td>Sì, con impegni di 5 anni</td>
<td>Possibile, estendendo a impegni di 3 anni, e piani di erogazione</td>
<td>Sì, una priorità nel 2009-2011</td>
<td>Sì, principalmente attraverso il Contratto MDG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piani per la concentrazione settoriale e di paese</strong></td>
<td>23 paesi prioritari, 50 in totale -non abbastanza concentrazione settoriale - hanno delegato la cooperazione nella nuova priorità regionale: l'Africa</td>
<td>14 paesi prioritari - cooperazione delegata con Nordic</td>
<td>54 paesi prioritari, pianificata ulteriore concentrazione</td>
<td>Da 70 a 57 paesi</td>
<td>Sì, 33 paesi con tre settori per paese</td>
<td>No, ma aumento delle pressioni per concentrarsi su quelli “Orfani di Donatori”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategia di comunicazione per la consapevolezza pubblica</strong></td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Non ancora implement.</td>
<td>Sì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategia di comunicazione interna</strong></td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sì</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conclusions and Recommendations for Italy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piano Nazionale per la Dichiarazione di Parigi, procedure e argomenti</th>
<th>Spagna*</th>
<th>Regno Unito</th>
<th>Francia</th>
<th>Germania</th>
<th>Svezia</th>
<th>CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficacia dell’aiuto come sezione specifica nel rapporto della cooperazione allo sviluppo</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclutamento e incentivi al personale basati sull’efficacia dell’aiuto</td>
<td>Possibile</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formazione interna sull’efficacia dell’aiuto</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Si, principalmente sulla redistribuzione interna e condivisione del sapere</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politiche di valutazione revisionate e aumento progressivo</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì, allineandosi alla cornice quadro di valutazione dei paesi</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Si, formando una nuova unità</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribuzione più vasta di valutazioni, anche tra altri donatori</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sviluppo di indicatori interni di prestazione</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impegno ad aumentare le informazioni sulla trasparenza dell’aiuto</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>Sì</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sì</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Il piano nazionale spagnolo sull’efficacia dell’aiuto è attualmente in via di perfezionamento.
Fonte: Elaborazione sui piani nazionali di Spagna, Francia, Germania, Svezia, CE e Regno Unito
Usando la matrice (vedi tabella in basso), è possibile elencare la frequenza con cui diversi argomenti sono trattati all’interno dei piani nazionali, al fine di stabilire se ci sono tratti in comune e questioni ineludibili da includere in ogni piano nazionale. Tutti hanno avuto l’approvazione politica di livello ministeriale e di Consiglio dei Ministri, includono impegni volti ad assicurare flessibilità procedurale e ad aumentare gli sforzi di comunicazione sull’efficacia dell’aiuto e forti investimenti nella costruzione di capacità di personale interno. Quattro agenzie su sei hanno specificamente dato mandato ad una sezione del personale in sede di seguire e sostenere l’implementazione dell’efficacia dell’aiuto. E’ importante notare che tutti i piani sono stati approvati in seguito alla sottoscrizione della Dichiarazione di Parigi. Lo Studio DAC 2008 sull’efficacia dell’aiuto e i nuovi impegni di Accra esigono aggiornamenti, attraverso l’inclusione nei piani dei temi di Accra, concentrandosi sulle specifiche aree critiche dei singoli donatori.

Tabella 3: Prevalenza di argomenti nei 6 piani analizzati

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure e argomenti del Piano</th>
<th>Prevalenza nei 6 paesi analizzati</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approvazione politica ad alto livello</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coinvolgimento del Parlamento</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsabilità istituzionali e scadenze incluse</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riorganizzazione istituzionale</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personale per monitorare l’efficacia dell’aiuto nell’Agenzia</td>
<td>7 persone in media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrazione dell’aiuto nei documenti di altre politiche</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sezione sull’efficacia dell’aiuto nei documenti strategici del paese e linee guida settoriali</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definizione di ownership, con riferimento alla società civile</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direttive politiche per l’uso del country system</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direttive politiche per usare il Sostegno generale al Bilancio (GBS)</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giustificazione richiesta per interventi non basati su programmi</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riforme procedurali per assicurare flessibilità</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valutazioni di approvazione dei progetti che includono la dimensione dell’efficacia dell’aiuto</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piani per un ulteriore decentramento</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piani per riformare l’assistenza tecnica</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piani per ulteriore slegamento</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Conclusioni e raccomandazioni per l’Italia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure e argomenti del Piano</th>
<th>Prevalenza nei 6 paesi analizzati</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verifica dell’efficacia multilaterale</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piani per assicurare maggiore prevedibilità</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piani per la concentrazione settoriale e geografica</td>
<td>83%, 41 paesi prioritari in media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategie di comunicazione per la sensibilizzazione pubblica</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategia di comunicazione interna</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacia dell’aiuto come sezione specifica nel rapporto sulla cooperazione allo sviluppo</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assunzione ed incentivi al personale basati sull’efficacia dell’aiuto</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formazione interna sull’efficacia dell’aiuto</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politiche di valutazione riviste ed aumento progressivo</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribuzione ampia delle valutazioni, anche da altri donatori</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sviluppo di indicatori interni di performance</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impegno ad aumentare le informazioni sulla trasparenza dell’aiuto</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fonte: Elaborazione sui piani nazionali di Spagna, Francia, Germania, Svezia, CE e Regno Unito
Conclusioni e raccomandazioni per l'Italia

Di fatto, avere un piano non è garanzia sufficiente per soddisfare gli obiettivi della Dichiarazione di Parigi. Come mostra la matrice, tutti i paesi tranne la Germania, presentano alcune aree di peggioramento negli indicatori della Dichiarazione di Parigi. In media, gli obiettivi dove tutti i donatori hanno avuto prestazioni critiche, sono stati quelli legati all’applicazione delle procedure di appalto locali e allo slegamento dell’aiuto. Alcune agenzie di sviluppo stanno ancora analizzando i motivi di progressi così modesti. In molti casi, lo sviluppo di un piano nazionale ha portato a ritenere la realizzazione dell’Agenda di Parigi come una mera questione tecnica – senza il sufficiente impegno politico, incentivi concreti e conoscenze, le vecchie abitudini sono dure a morire. Per comprendere le cause profonde dei risultati ottenuti, i donatori devono guardare oltre gli indicatori – considerando anche l’aspetto qualitativo, raggiungendo altri stakeholders – per esempio i Parlamenti – diversi dai “soliti sospetti”. La leadership politica è il motore più importante per generare cambiamento, ed è condizione necessaria per avviare l’impegno dei quadri più alti dell’amministrazione delle agenzie di sviluppo ai principi della Dichiarazione di Parigi. Gli incentivi includono: l’approvazione di una nuova legislazione; la promozione della consapevolezza pubblica e parlamentare dei principi della Dichiarazione di Parigi; la valutazione esterna dei risultati. Senza segnali chiari e sostenuti dalla politica e dalla dirigenza, ogni cambiamento di norme procedurali, di gestione delle risorse umane o dei sistemi di rendicontozazione avrà sempre un impatto limitato.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obiettivi della Dichiarazione di Parigi</th>
<th>Spagna*</th>
<th>Regno Unito</th>
<th>Francia</th>
<th>Germania</th>
<th>Svezia</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>Media dei 6 donatori</th>
<th>Italia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Aiuto allineato</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Assistenza Tecnica Coordinata</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Uso di country system</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Uso di sistemi di appalto del paese</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Prevedibilità dell’aiuto</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Aiuto slegato*</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>Già 100%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Già 100%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Uso di fondi comuni multi-donatore</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Missioni congiunte</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Lavoro Analitico Congiunto</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% riduzione di Strutture parallele</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fonte: elaborazione sulla Ricognizione del 2008 sul monitoraggio della Dichiarazione di Parigi.
Al fine di produrre un piano completo che affronti i limiti dell’aiuto italiano rispetto all’agenda dell’efficacia dell’aiuto e in continuità con quanto espresso nelle linee guida del periodo 2009-2011, il piano nazionale italiano sull’efficacia dell’aiuto dovrebbe:

al fine di attuare gli impegni assunti con la Dichiarazione di Parigi:
- avere un’approvazione politica di alto livello, incluso il coinvolgimento del Parlamento;
- stabilire chiare responsabilità interne nella struttura con scadenze;
- prevedere una riorganizzazione, che includa personale specificatamente dedicato all’efficacia dell’aiuto che supporti la messa in opera del piano sull’efficacia degli aiuti;
- confrontarsi sistematicamente con la società civile nelle fasi di pianificazione, implementazione e monitoraggio della strategia italiana;
- pianificare un ulteriore slegamento dell’aiuto e aumentare la percentuale di approvvigionamento locale di beni e servizi;
- completare riforme procedurali che assicurino flessibilità, come quelle volte all’aumento dell’uso dei country system e degli accordi tra donatori comuni, nonché fornire politiche guida che rendano esplicito il livello di rischio fiduciario;
- pianificare a livello Paese in modo da assicurare maggiore prevedibilità all’aiuto, anticipando le disposizioni finanziarie per i paesi e informando immediatamente i Paesi partner;
- rendere più trasparenti le attività di cooperazione, traducendo tutti i documenti in inglese, mettendoli immediatamente a disposizione sul sito e rispettando tutti i requisiti della rapportistica DAC;
- delegare ulteriormente il processo decisionale alle UTL, riducendo e riformando il mandato delle strutture di implementazione;
- pianificare il lavoro di valutazione in modo da favorire valutazioni allineate e congiunte, e giustificare studi e missioni non-congiunte.

al fine di allinearsi alle migliori pratiche dei donatori DAC sull’efficacia dell’aiuto:
- partecipare alle valutazioni congiunte sull’efficacia delle organizzazioni multilaterali, per concentrare ulteriormente i contributi italiani;
- dettagliare i piani paese, descrivendo il valore aggiunto dell’azione italiana, le attribuzioni finanziarie programmate pluriennalmente, i risultati previsti, rendendoli pubblicamente disponibili;
- incorporare la prospettiva dell’efficacia dell’aiuto in tutti i documenti di posizionamento nelle linee guida, nell’approvazione dei progetti e nelle strategie dei paesi, prevedendo una sezione specifica sull’efficacia dell’aiuto;
- sviluppare strategie di comunicazione interna ed esterna e riportare dati sull’avanzamento nazionale sull’efficacia dell’aiuto nelle pubblicazioni esistenti;
- assegnare agli uffici locali il compito di monitorare e registrare ostacoli e progressi verso gli obiettivi dell’efficacia dell’aiuto.
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