Presentation by Ms. Brenda Killen
Deputy Director, Development Co-operation Directorate

UNDCF 2014: Session 6 "Key steps towards a global post-2015 monitoring and accountability framework for development co-operation"

Friday 11 July 2014

Excellencies, Ministers, and Distinguished Representatives: It is a great honour for me to speak at this eminent panel – and I thank you for this opportunity.

Allow me to start with a few reflections from discussions this week: **we all speak of accountability – but what does it actually mean?** Despite the sound of it, it doesn't mean giving account – it's not an expense claim. It's more than that. To me, it means setting targets and being responsible for making development happen. As we heard this morning; this isn't about making commitments, it's about delivering them. And, crucially, it's also about being responsible to learn and improve.

This requires a variety of mechanisms: **data and processes** so that we can see whether we are on track – and to enable the watchdog element of accountability. But we also need **spaces where we can openly and honestly discuss** successes, failures and lessons – so that we can learn.

Prerequisites for this kind of learning were put eloquently yesterday by Prof Robert Chambers in a set of three T's: **Trust, Transparency, and Truth**. When we trust each other, we can have a frank and open discussion, and we can get to the bottom of things.

Additionally, **we need to know what we're all responsible for**. Many speakers throughout the week have stressed that we all have the responsibility to make development happen: whether we're donor governments, developing country governments, civil society, private sector, parliamentarians – we play a unique role in our relationships and with that come unique responsibilities. Many of us would agree that MDG8 was too fuzzy to track properly. Perhaps one of the problems was that it wasn't clear who was responsible for what. But we can and must do better for post-2015. We have the ingredients to design a robust post-2015 global accountability framework for development co-operation. We can make it work – it all pends on political will.

Now to my question: How could a post-2015 global monitoring and accountability framework for development co-operation be designed to build on existing accountability mechanisms at all levels?

As set out by Jose Antonio Ocampo and Natalie Gomez Arteaga in their recent – and excellent – paper, accountability mechanisms should address three imperatives: answerability, enforcement and a clear delineation of responsibility. I will briefly focus on **how these three elements can be brought together at different levels**.

1. **Developing country leadership provides the foundation for accountability efforts at all levels**. Efforts to monitor partnerships need to be grounded in developing countries' own accountability mechanisms and information systems. And this is already happening. The first monitoring round of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation saw a wide range of countries drawing on existing data and processes to feed into a global accountability mechanism. Several countries, such as Rwanda and Cambodia, have had systems in place for some time, and they relied on these to gather the relevant monitoring information.

Ideally we should rely on country-led processes to generate simple 'snapshots' of progress at the global level - and to ensure global processes are answerable to local citizens. But this needs strong local systems and high quality data. We need to invest in a data revolution to build effective and accountable states – which is *the* foundation for **answerability** at all levels.

2. **Regional structures can and should play a key role in consolidating accountability and generating peer pressure and learning needed to drive change**. An excellent example of this is the *Pacific Islands Forum Compact*, which monitors partnership behaviour according to globally agreed effectiveness principles and includes a peer review across all partners. Peer reviews are also at the core of the OECD business model – and we've seen that they work: accountability among peers sparks peer-learning and collective progress. Regional mechanisms can provide appropriate pressure and incentives for the '**enforcement**' aspect for monitoring, in ways that fit the region's context. Looking ahead, these structures could play an important role in enabling cross-regional sharing of best practice, and fostering mutual learning on what works in different contexts.

3. **The global level is where this all comes together to spur action for more and better results**. We know that having a global framework and targets gives the reference point needed to negotiate more detailed and relevant in-country frameworks to support accountability. Alongside individual countries, there are several successful examples of the global principles for effective development co-operation being adapted to different contexts and priorities, including:

   • The **International Health Partnership,** which has used the Busan principles to monitor and enhance the effectiveness of partnerships in the health sector; and

   • Within the Global Partnership for effective development co-operation, different groups are setting their own commitments against which they will be monitored – from initiatives such as the **New Deal** for Engagement in Fragile States, to the recently developed **Guidelines for Effective Philanthropic Engagement**, to the **Istanbul Principles** for CSO Development Effectiveness.

   These frameworks help to define everyone's **roles and responsibilities** – the third element identified by Ocampo and Arteaga. And a key lesson from MDG-8.

Finally, at OECD we have found that while monitoring needs accurate numbers and data, it is not just the numbers that count – it is the dialogue and learning that changes behaviour and mind-sets; that has a transformative impact and sets in motion a "race to the top". Alongside robust monitoring mechanisms, this calls for **inclusive spaces to review progress and have frank dialogue** on what works, what doesn't, and how to make things work better.

This is why Partnerships, why *relationships,* matter for accountability. We can't have a discussion about development without having everyone at the table, working together. And, as Prof Chambers reminded us yesterday, trust is the starting point for genuine partnership, and it is the **political will to be held to account by each other that builds this trust.**

* * *