

## Official development assistance and the war against poverty

Michele Ruiters

Dr Michele Ruiters is a senior researcher for the IGD's Multilateral Analysis programme.

**T**HIS POLICY brief focuses on two multilateral initiatives scheduled for review in late 2008, the Monterrey Consensus for Development (hereafter 'Monterrey Consensus') and the Paris Declaration for Aid Effectiveness (hereafter 'Paris Declaration'). It argues that instead of decreasing poverty and increasing sustainable development, especially in the countries of the global South, official development assistance (ODA) has not effectively reduced poverty or significantly increased the quality of aid. On the contrary, ODA commitments have proportionally decreased over the past decade in relation to donor countries' gross national income (GNI) with the effect that available ODA will not be able to assist developing countries to meet the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015. Also, without broad-based participation in decision making and implementation processes, ODA will fail to address the real needs of people in developing countries.

Because of the review meetings scheduled for later in 2008, the Monterrey Consensus and the Paris Declaration are topical and depict transparent and broad-based consultative processes that will ultimately strengthen these two initiatives to the benefit of developing countries. There have been a number of other initiatives that have fed into poverty reduction debates that are worth mentioning; for example, the Copenhagen Declaration on Social Development (1995), the Doha Development Round (2001), and the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg (2005). Partnerships for development is only one current debate taking place with regard to ODA, with others looking at mobilising domestic resources for development, Aid for Trade, or seeking alternative sources of funding for development. Aid provided for development programmes is controversial as it places recipient governments in dependent relationships with donors and perpetuates a global economy constituted of those who have and those who receive. However, without the assistance of the donor countries and agencies, the developing world would not be able to address the many demands that are placed on it and its significant backlog in meeting social needs. Therefore, international attempts to collaboratively improve ODA, both in terms of its volume and quality, should be critically analysed and, despite their shortcomings, be applauded.

*Global Insight* aims to provide members of the policy community with concise but trenchant analyses of topical issues. Comments and suggestions are invited.

### International aid co-ordination

In recent years, poverty reduction has become an important policy consideration for many countries across the globe, but more especially for developing countries. In Africa, more than 70 per cent of the population lives on less than \$2 a day, a phenomenon that places significant social welfare demands on governments that unfortunately cannot meet them because of weak state institutions and budgetary constraints. As a result, many African governments

rely on foreign aid to provide services to their citizens. Poverty reduction has been recognised as a critical policy area and a number of international and national initiatives have been crafted in this regard over the years, including the MDGs of 2000, the Global Fund to assist development programmes in developing countries, the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative (MDRI) that provides debt relief packages to Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPCs), and national Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) that enable countries to define, with the assistance of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank, their own development agendas. While ODA from developed countries has played a significant role in alleviating poverty in developing countries, the proliferation of aid has also resulted in complex and unequal relations between donor and recipient countries. This, for example, was the case in the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) of the 1970s and 1980s.

The two high level review meetings will mark the end of year-long consultations on how best to improve the effectiveness of aid and to increase assistance to developing countries. The Third High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Ghana will be held from 2 to 4 September<sup>1</sup> and the follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development to Review the Implementation of the Monterrey Consensus is scheduled to take place from 29 November to 2 December in Doha.<sup>2</sup> In addition, preparations for the Paris Declaration review meeting in Ghana have given rise to the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) which sets out goals to be met by 2010. For the effectiveness of ODA, the two meetings place great importance on policy coherence between donor and recipient countries. The concept of policy coherence, as used in the Monterrey Consensus and the Paris Declaration, argues that it is only attainable if all stakeholders in development programmes are effectively involved in decision-making processes, and if relevant institutions are adequately equipped to interact at international and national levels. Policy coherence, for the purposes of this discussion, is an initiative that advocates that all policies, national and international, be streamlined to address poverty issues in a comprehensive and complementary way. In this regard, Chapter IV of the Monterrey Consensus advocates an increase in international financial and technical co-operation for development, and the Paris Declaration reinforces those recommendations.

A major weakness of aid initiatives in many developing countries and communities has been the duplication of assistance to some areas and the neglect of others. Moreover, unco-ordinated aid has partly resulted in haphazard development that fails to serve people living in poverty around

the world. Due to the plethora of institutions involved in poverty reduction programmes, a need arose for institutions to complement each other in their efforts to address poverty effectively. To this end, the Monterrey Consensus encourages policy and programme co-ordination of international donor institutions and coherence at the operational levels to meet the MDGs of sustained economic growth, poverty eradication and sustainable development. In 2005, the Paris Declaration further contributed to the policy debate on how best to reduce poverty and increase the positive impact of aid through five key principles, namely, ownership, alignment, harmonisation, managing for results, and mutual accountability.<sup>3</sup>

### Policy coherence

Policy coherence was first introduced by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) in 1991, to ensure that OECD member countries individually and collectively pursue policies that support sustainable development processes. The OECD defines policy coherence as the 'systematic promotion of mutually reinforcing policy actions across government departments and agencies creating synergies towards achieving the agreed objectives'.<sup>4</sup> As the provision of and need for development assistance increase, international institutions have become more aware of the relationship between the limited size of their budgets and the need to make their decision-making processes more effective. In 2000, the term 'policy coherence' was given a further boost when the UN's Millennium Declaration revived the concept of 'development partnerships' and committed members to develop 'a global partnership for development' (MDG8). This partnership should ensure that policies complement, not contradict, each other in their effort to achieve poverty reduction and development. Policy coherence therefore should facilitate the efforts of all donors and their partners to create synergies between and also streamline their approaches to poverty eradication. As the concept was first introduced by the OECD, it initially addressed the need for synergy within and between donor organisations rather than between the donor and the recipient. New conceptions of policy coherence refer to the responsibility of both donors and recipients. Developing countries, as recipients, are equally responsible for ensuring good governance, effective policies and conflict resolution, while the developed countries, as donors, are entreated to increase aid to the developing world and also to develop more effective aid and policy coherence.

## Official development assistance and the war against poverty

Policy coherence for development covers a number of issues, beyond the narrow purview of ODA, which include the sectors of trade, migration, investment, climate change, arms exports, organised crime, and so forth. These are not normally issues related to donor aid but hold significance for a large number of countries and for a range of national departments within a single country. An underlying assumption about the linearity of the relationship between trade and economic development has resulted in the Aid for Trade initiative that argues for the opening of developing markets to developed partners for economic growth and development. Recent studies have disputed this relationship, arguing that the growth that results from economic development does not often augur well for poverty reduction in developing countries because the development occurs either at a highly skilled level or is in non-labour intensive industries, such as the service industry.<sup>5</sup>

### Developed nations' commitments

Criticism from within the development sector has been levelled against donor countries for not meeting their aid commitments to developing countries. The traditional donors, like the United States, the Scandinavian countries, the United Kingdom and members of the European Union, have had to work more carefully with the funds earmarked for development as they also face internal crises that demand more inward-looking policy orientations. For example, the sub-prime interest rate crisis in the United States, mounting commodity and fuel prices, and the increasing attention to climate change have directed spending to domestic concerns. Shrinking ODA has had a direct impact on the potential to achieve the MDGs, which presently are underfunded by \$50 billion. If present rates of funding continue, the shortfall will amount to \$75 billion by 2015. In fact, despite the percentage increase of aid to sub-Saharan Africa from 25 per cent in 2000 to 33 per cent in 2004, the latter levels are equivalent to those of 1990,<sup>6</sup> representing an overall decrease in aid.

In 1969, the OECD members set a target for aid of 0,7 per cent of their GNI. The UN adopted this target in 1970 in its efforts to combat poverty and underdevelopment, but most donor countries have been unable to meet that target for domestic-related reasons such as an underperforming economy or natural disasters, or due to other aid commitments, for example, the Tsunami fund for affected countries. This is despite the commitment of the G8 at Gleneagles to increase aid to Africa by \$25 billion annually. However, this additional pledge still will not meet the needs of poor communities at

present spending rates. At the 2008 G8 meeting, heads of state recommitted their governments to assist developing nations with ODA, but all G8 members' commitments remain below 0,7 per cent and some G8 countries are backtracking on their promise. For example, the Italian government recently announced its decision to cut its development aid by 170 million euros, prior to its presidency of the G8 in 2009, and the French government, the incumbent EU chair, is also reconsidering its aid commitments.

Therefore, to maximise ODA, donor countries would need to improve policy coherence and consistency of donations, and improve ODA efficiency through increased co-ordination and efficient public partnerships. The OECD defines ODA as aid flows from government sources to developing countries and flows to multilateral institutions, for example the World Bank or IMF, for developing country recipients. These funds are administered for the promotion of economic development and welfare of developing countries, have concessional financing terms, and convey a grant element of at least 25 per cent.<sup>7</sup> In the 1990s, a large proportion of concessional ODA was directed into poverty reduction programmes and long-term economic assistance; however, the amount earmarked for refugee and emergency relief grew, effectively reducing the amount of aid for poverty reduction initiatives.<sup>8</sup>

The Monterrey Consensus underscored the importance of the PRSPs as a means to facilitate this long-term planning framework. Notwithstanding the critiques against the PRSPs, they are meant to provide a collaboratively determined long-term framework through which the donor and recipient nations negotiate the level and nature of ODA. In addition to the PRSPs, the Paris Declaration has also introduced measures to streamline aid for development in order to: foster local ownership of country policies, align donors behind national strategies, harmonise donor efforts, promote result-oriented efforts to raise the productivity of aid, and to ensure mutual accountability of donors and recipients.

### Monterrey Consensus

The Monterrey Consensus was arrived at in Mexico in 2002. The agreement aimed at eradicating poverty, achieving sustained economic growth and promoting sustainable development. It also called for a fully inclusive and equitable global economic system through collective and coherent partnerships.<sup>9</sup> In general, the Monterrey Consensus suggests ways to mobilise domestic and international resources for development, harness international trade for development,

increase international financial and technical co-operation for development, track and reduce external debt, and to address systemic issues and enhance the coherence and consistency of the international monetary, financial and trading systems in support of development. In relation to policy coherence, the Monterrey Consensus recognises the importance of consistent international and national financial, monetary and trading systems. This requires reforming and strengthening the international financial and trade architecture in ways that include countries and representatives from the global South, civil society structures, and national governments as equal partners in the construction of poverty reduction policies.

Chapter IV of the Monterrey Consensus recognises that international financial and technical co-operation in the development sector needs to be managed to ensure maximum impact. In that regard, it outlines various ways through which development co-operation could complement, maximise and increase other sources of financing for development. Many developing nations do not have sufficient domestic resources to fund development programmes. Therefore, the majority of them rely on ODA to supplement their national budgets and to address development shortfalls. Chapter IV also examines different configurations of partnerships within the development sector, for example:

- Public-public partnerships between donor governments have been perceived as having protectionist practices that ‘reduce opportunities for faster economic growth through increased trade’, a lack of market access by developing countries to developed markets, and a strong regional focus that advocates regional integration for development.
- Public-private partnerships between recipient governments and donors that highlight the important roles that infrastructure development has in poverty reduction programmes, the judiciary in transparent and accountable government, and foreign equity investment in small and medium enterprises.<sup>10</sup>

These partnerships were deemed vital for achieving greater policy coherence and accelerating development. In this regard, policy coherence was identified as one of the key methods for improving the provision of ODA to developing countries.

Overall, the Monterrey Consensus calls for a holistic approach that prioritises sustainable, gender-sensitive, people-centred development. Ideally, policy coherence should occur at different levels. International co-operation between UN bodies, Bretton Woods Institutions (BWIs), the World Trade Organisation, and donor agencies would minimise contradictory or excessive aid conditionalities and duplicated

development programmes. Regional initiatives such as the New Economic Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) should be encouraged and institutionally supported, especially in the area of infrastructure development. Key national government departments such as finance, trade and industry, and foreign affairs should be encouraged to work together and streamline their policies to ensure that development programmes effectively contribute to poverty reduction. Finally, civil society organisations and private sector partners should be invited to contribute to development processes.

Critiques of the Monterrey Consensus argue that the commitment might have been made in principle, but reality shows that aid is not forthcoming from the signatories of the document. For example, in 2008 only \$3 billion aid has been disbursed despite the promise to double the initial commitment of \$25 billion aid to Africa. These commitments by donor countries are good public relations initiatives that are often made at the end of G8 meetings, but do not impact significantly on development levels.

The framework of the Monterrey Consensus relies on macroeconomic policies within an open market system, which disadvantages the poor in general and women in particular through, for example, inflation controls and open market access to external competitors in areas where women make up the majority of the workforce, such as the informal sector. The reduction of tariffs and trade barriers to attract external investors and businesses significantly reduces the national budget thereby forcing governments to identify important sectors in which they are willing to invest for development. In this regard, if governments do not consciously prioritise social welfare spending, macroeconomic policies have the effect of countering policy coherence initiatives aimed at producing sustainable development, gender equality, and poverty reduction.

### Paris Declaration for Aid Effectiveness

In 2005, at the start of the High Level Forum meeting on aid, the ministers made the following statement: ‘As in Monterrey, we recognise that while the volumes of aid and other development resources must increase to achieve these goals, aid effectiveness must increase significantly as well to support partner country efforts to strengthen governance and improve development performance.’<sup>11</sup> The Paris Declaration builds on the High-Level Forum on Harmonisation in Rome (February 2003) and the Marrakech Roundtable on Managing for Development Results (February 2004). Signatories of the

## Official development assistance and the war against poverty

Paris Declaration agreed to meet targets by 2010.

They aimed to:

- Increase aid and to make it more effective by collaboratively strengthening partner countries' national development strategies.
- Increase aid alignment with partners' priorities, systems and procedures.
- Enhance donor and recipient country accountability to their citizens and parliaments for their development policies, strategies and performance.
- Eliminate duplication and rationalise donor activities to make them cost effective.
- Reform and simplify donor policies and procedures to encourage collaborative behaviour and progressive alignment with the recipient country.
- Define measures and standards of performance and accountability in public financial management, procurement, fiduciary safeguards and environmental assessment in line with broadly accepted good practices and their quick and widespread application.

The signatories also acknowledge that aid effectiveness still faces challenges, including, among others, lack of institutional capacity in recipient countries, the failure to produce predictable and multi-year commitments on aid flows, insufficient delegation of authority to donors' field staff, insufficient integration of global programmes and initiatives into partner countries' broader development agendas, and corruption and lack of transparency in recipient countries.<sup>12</sup>

One of the most important tenets of the Paris Declaration is *ownership* of the aid programme by the recipient country. This implies that the aid agenda is collaboratively developed by the donor and recipient countries, but owned by the recipient because the latter has identified the areas requiring aid, the modalities of aid disbursement, and has been an equal partner in the aid relationship. In this regard, General Budget Support (GBS) programmes best foster recipient country's ownership as they determine when, where and how budgets are disbursed. However, not many donor countries support GBS programmes; rather, they favour other modalities of aid, such as projects, sector approaches, specialist assistance, to name a few. This is perceived as recipient governments being insufficiently equipped to deal with additional budgetary flows.

*Mutual accountability* is vital for the success of aid programmes as each development partner has to take responsibility for their role in administering poverty alleviation programmes. In the case of donors, a recent report of the Advisory Board for Irish Aid (2008) argues that donors sometimes avoid GBS programmes because they perceive recipient

countries' institutions as weak; however, the Paris Declaration requires that country systems are sufficiently equipped to deal with the extra funds.<sup>13</sup> Recipient governments in this case would need to ensure that institutions are developed to deal with extra funds or with additional implementation responsibilities. By insisting that recipient countries bear most of the responsibility in relation to governance issues, donors deny their own responsibility to ensure that institutions are suitably developed and enabled to deal with the particular modality of aid associated with the project. They also place the responsibility for programmatic success exclusively on the shoulders of the developing partner.

Alignment, harmonisation, and managing for results are the other three principles of the Paris Declaration. *Alignment* addresses two levels of interaction: firstly donors should align their policies to address issues of duplication or contradiction and to ensure that their policies are in line with recipient countries' needs. Secondly, recipient countries should align their policies to ensure that key departments work together to effect meaningful poverty reduction and ensure that donor expectations do not contradict national expectations. Horizontal alignment between donor agencies and within governments, and vertical alignment between donors and recipients should facilitate the management and disbursement of aid and affiliated programmes. In order to achieve coherence, all departments and agencies should work together to ensure alignment of policies and initiatives at all levels of engagement.

*Harmonisation* requires that donor agencies align their policies individually and in collaboration with each other. The IMF and World Bank have been accused of implementing policies that, at times, contradict rather than complement each other. These two institutions make up the core of funding agencies for development in the international arena, and should therefore ensure that their policies are harmonised to facilitate their partners' access to external aid that is effective and contributes to sustainable development. National agencies such as the Department for Financing International Development (DfID) or Norwegian Agency for Development (NORAD) should also ensure that they are internally coherent, but also internationally synchronised with the IMF, World Bank and other development institutions.

The commitment to *manage for results* is integral to the success of development projects. Through the Paris Declaration, donors have committed their national institutions to produce more effective and results-driven aid. Monitoring and evaluation will play a key role in achieving a results-driven agenda for aid, which ties in with policy transparency

and partner accountability. Both the donor and the recipient countries have to ensure that systems are instituted that track the volume, quality and effectiveness of aid and report on their programmes regularly and widely.

### Civil society engagement

The Ghana High Level Forum review of the Paris Declaration provided opportunities for civil society organisations (CSOs) to comment on aid effectiveness and feed into the debates on how to make the Paris Declaration more responsive to developing countries' needs. In 2007, a multi-stakeholder Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness (AG-CS) was established under the auspices of the OECD-DAC. The AG-CS was tasked to examine civil society's role as development agents and as monitors and evaluators of aid effectiveness in their own countries. It determined that even though CSOs had a 'limited' role in the formulation of the Paris Declaration, they should become equal development partners with governments since they work directly with communities and therefore know what the needs of citizens are.<sup>14</sup> As a result, the AG-CS recommended that CSOs have greater voice and representation in the aid effectiveness dialogue. It also recognised that CSOs could play a significant role in strengthening the aid effectiveness principles of alignment, harmonisation, mutual accountability, ownership and co-ordination. Finally, CSOs as development partners also have to be measured for delivery effectiveness.

Independently, CSOs around the world held workshops to discuss how best to improve the Paris Declaration and closely critiqued two drafts of the AAA during the past year and will present their findings and recommendations to the Accra meeting. The CSO International Steering Group, established in preparation for the Ghana High Level Forum, has critiqued the AAA on the basis that the final draft does not offer enough 'concrete and time-bound commitments' that would lead up to 2010.<sup>15</sup> They call for the following areas to be strengthened: democratic ownership of programmes and policies; transparency and accountability of both donor and recipient countries; a reduction in conditionality of aid packages; the provision of measurable technical assistance; increasing the value of aid especially with regard to reducing tied aid and conditions of procurement; enhancing the predictability of aid provision, for example, medium-term aid; supporting fragile states more effectively; broadening the debate to include previously excluded non-governmental partners; and providing a better vision through medium to long-term aid commitments.

### Conclusion: benefits of policy coherence

The Monterrey Consensus and the Paris Declaration were formulated to address global economic inequalities in the realm of development assistance. Policy coherence is meant to address those inequalities and render aid more effective, particularly with regard to reducing poverty levels around the world. These two agreements attempt to ensure that the benefits of globalisation, both economic and political, are more equitably distributed and shared among all development partners, but more especially with developing nations. In the light of declining ODA resources, policy coherence directs aid to areas of need that have been jointly identified by the international donor community and recipient countries; for example, the MDGs. To this end, policy synergies across a range of issues support the achievement of development objectives.

Policy coherence also assumes responsible, transparent and accountable governance at international, regional and national levels that allows for policy impact assessments at all times during the programme cycle. In this regard, reform would have to occur in international organisations, for example, the BWIs, UN bodies and trade organisations, to ensure the active and equal participation of developing countries in decision-making processes. Regional Economic Communities (RECs) would need to ensure that regional policies address cross-cutting poverty-related issues across the region; for example, infrastructure development, trans-border health threats (bovine, avian influenza, etc), skills transfer, and so forth. RECs should also include civil society at a more fundamental decision-making level where the latter group feeds into policies early enough in the policy chain. As per the recommendations of the AG-CS, CSOs should also be included in these processes at a more fundamental level that renders them partners rather than simply watchdogs of governments. Civil society interfaces with regional and continental organisations (for example, the African Union's ECOSOC) should be strengthened to ensure the development of people-centred policies. At a national level, key departments need to enforce coherence at all levels, but more especially for social welfare programmes that address the needs of poor communities and individuals.

Policy coherence should expand to include civil society in its broadest definition, which means that the policy process should be opened to include voices that have not been traditionally included in policy making. CSOs have a significant role to play in the five tenets of the Paris Declaration and within the Monterrey Consensus because their presence in the

## Official development assistance and the war against poverty

debates would connect policy makers to people whose lives are influenced by policy decisions. In a nutshell, policy coherence could save time, money and human resources, and direct assistance to the areas in dire need of development. A broader understanding of coherence could introduce new voices to the policy debate and strengthen emerging policies, create more bottom-up ownership of policies and programmes, deepen the accountability and transparency of donor and recipient countries to their citizens and clients, and forge a new policy space for development through dialogue.

### Recommendations

All partners in the development sector should adhere to the basic principles of the Monterrey Consensus, the Paris Declaration and other international financial agreements that govern collaborative relationships for poverty reduction. These relationships should be guided by the tenets of the Paris Declaration, namely, ownership, alignment, harmonisation, managing for results, and mutual accountability.

#### For international organisations

- Donors should ensure that their internal policies are coherent and complementary within and across all international financial and donor institutions.
- Reform agendas at the World Bank, IMF and donor agencies should ensure broad-based consultation and input into international policies; in other words, voices of the global South need to be included in international financial and aid institutions.
- Aid should ideally be untied and should not be limited by procurement conditions.
- Technical aid should be quantifiable and be provided in budgetary terms in order for recipient governments to determine what the true size of their aid packages are.

#### For regional economic communities

- Regional development banks should ensure policy coherence across all their programmes.
- Policy coherence across regional borders would produce more effective and streamlined policies that could begin to address socioeconomic development issues, such as infrastructure development, health, education, skills transfer,

and trans-border diseases (for example, avian influenza).

- Regional community organisations should be invited to debate policies before they are passed and even be encouraged to provide input on policy issues before they are drafted into policy papers.
- Regional consensus should be reached about which policies could be streamlined without placing national political sovereignty at risk.

#### For national governments

- Key national departments, such as foreign affairs, national treasury, trade and industry should ensure that their policies complement rather than contradict each other.
- National development priorities should be clearly defined and protected from external threat (international macroeconomic policies that possibly contradict national priorities).
- Governments should reduce their dependence on aid and opt for more equal economic relations with donor countries.
- Alternative funds for development other than ODA should be sought: for example, through taxation at a domestic level, support for an export-oriented market for beneficiated goods to be sold for foreign exchange, defining profitable rents for the leasing of land for extractive industries, and so forth.

#### For CSOs

- Civil society has an important role to play as a watchdog over governmental policy processes (decision making and implementation), ensuring proper monitoring and evaluation of existing programmes, and providing input into new programmes.
- A second role would be for them also to monitor and evaluate their own development programmes to ensure that they comply with the national development agenda.
- Opportunities do exist for CSOs to be actively involved in international debates on aid and development. Therefore, every effort should be made to participate in broad-based participatory initiatives, to comment on draft documents such as the AAA and contribute to the review process of the implementation of the Monterrey Consensus.

## Endnotes

- 1 See <http://www.accrahlif.net> for more information on the Accra meeting in September 2008.
- 2 For more information about the November 2008 meeting, visit <http://www.un.org/esa/ffd/doha/index.htm>
- 3 OECD Development Co-operation Directorate, 'The Paris Declaration' [http://www.oecd.org/document/18/0,2340,en\\_2649\\_3236398\\_35401554\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/18/0,2340,en_2649_3236398_35401554_1_1_1_1,00.html)
- 4 OECD Policy Brief, July 2003, 'Policy Coherence, Vital for Global Development', p 2.
- 5 Razzaque Mohammad A & Selim Raihan (eds.) 2007. *Trade-Development-Poverty Linkages: Reflections from Selected Asian and Sub-Saharan African Countries, Volume 1 - Country Case Studies*. CUTS International, Jaipur.
- 6 'The Reality of Aid 2006 Report: Facts and Figures.' [http://www.realityofaid.org/downloads/roa\\_facts\\_and\\_figures\\_final\\_eng.pdf](http://www.realityofaid.org/downloads/roa_facts_and_figures_final_eng.pdf)
- 7 <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/26/14/26415658.PDF>
- 8 <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/1997/06/pdf/worldbnk.pdf>
- 9 UN. 2002. 'Report of the International Conference on Financing for Development', Monterrey, Mexico, 18-22 March, paragraph 8, p 3. This document provides a full report of the meeting. [http://www.unctad.org/en/docs/aconf198d11\\_en.pdf](http://www.unctad.org/en/docs/aconf198d11_en.pdf)
- 10 Ibid. pp 30-32.
- 11 <http://www1.worldbank.org/harmonization/Paris/FINALPARISDECLARATION.pdf>, p 1.
- 12 Ibid.
- 13 Advisory Board for Irish Aid. 2008. 'Final Synthesis Report: Good governance, aid modalities and poverty reduction - From better theory to better practice', February, p 21.
- 14 Advisory Group of Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness. 2008. 'Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness - Synthesis of Findings and Recommendations.' <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/ACCRAEXT/Resources/4700790-1208545462880/AG-CS-Synthesis-of-Findings-and-Recommendations.pdf>
- 15 Response from the CSO International Steering Group to the Accra Agenda for Action, p1. [http://www.eurodad.org/uploadedFiles/Whats\\_New/News/CSO\\_response\\_AAA\\_seconddraft.pdf](http://www.eurodad.org/uploadedFiles/Whats_New/News/CSO_response_AAA_seconddraft.pdf)

---

### Institute for



**Global Dialogue**

Block 12, Thornhill Office Park, Bekker Street,  
Vorna Valley, Midrand, South Africa  
PO Box 32571, Braamfontein 2017, South Africa  
Tel +2711 315 1299  
Fax +2711 315 2149  
Email [info@igd.org.za](mailto:info@igd.org.za) · Web [www.igd.org.za](http://www.igd.org.za)

All rights reserved. The material in this publication may not be reproduced, stored or transmitted without the prior permission of the copyright holder. Short extracts may be quoted, provided the source is acknowledged.

ISSN 1607 2375

Produced by Acumen Publishing Solutions, Johannesburg.

---