

Chapter 5

Country actions to implement the Busan commitments

The Busan Partnership agreement is centred around a country-focused approach to effective development co-operation: partnerships for development can only succeed if they are led by developing countries and tailored to countries' specific situations and needs. It calls on developing countries to lead in the development of their own frameworks for monitoring progress and promoting mutual accountability so that these are grounded in their own development priorities and policies. The Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation provides a light structure to support country-level implementation of commitments, exchange knowledge and review progress. This chapter asks what initiatives are countries taking to translate Busan principles to their own contexts and to establish and strengthen frameworks to support learning and accountability? The chapter draws together country examples¹ and confirms that progress is being made in many areas, from creating comprehensive national strategies, reducing fragmentation of efforts to greater transparency and more inclusive partnerships. Important initiatives are also occurring in fragile states and through South-South co-operation.

How are countries monitoring progress and upholding accountability?

Countries are increasingly using data from their existing aid or development co-operation information management systems to report on Global Partnership monitoring indicators.

There is no blueprint for how countries should monitor the commitments and actions agreed in Busan. The monitoring process is flexible, but should be led by country authorities so that it suits the national context and existing frameworks. In order to document good practice in managing accountability efforts with multi-stakeholder engagement, countries reporting on the Global Partnership indicators in 2013 were invited to provide a short description of how they carried out the data gathering and checking, and consultations and dialogue. A significant number of countries have used existing government partnership and monitoring mechanisms, while many other countries have set up an *ad hoc* process for the Global Partnership monitoring:

- Several countries, such as Cambodia and Rwanda, are well advanced in adapting their national systems to regularly gather relevant information on Global Partnership monitoring indicators. These countries note that collecting the required data involved less effort than expected. This enabled them to focus on verifying, validating and analysing the data, as well as discussing progress and challenges in implementing Busan commitments.
- Most countries launched the monitoring process through meetings and workshops with their development partners and other relevant stakeholders. These provided a chance to obtain guidance, share materials and agree on methodology, division of labour and timelines.
- Most countries also concluded the process through data verification meetings and consultations with development co-operation providers, civil society organisations and/or government institutions. This was also an opportunity to discuss some of the challenges faced while collecting data, to explore ways to bring more stakeholders on board or to initiate a wider discussion on the monitoring exercise/mutual accountability framework and the Global Partnership itself.
- Most Global Partnership monitoring submissions from countries combine existing data with new data collected for this exercise (e.g. through a questionnaire). Many participating countries indicated that they had extracted some of the data from an existing aid information management system to which the government and/or providers of development co-operation report their data on development co-operation flows. Some countries have only extracted data for those indicators requiring government reporting, such as development co-operation funds recorded on national budgets, while others have also relied on existing databases for data pertaining to providers' reporting.
- Even where systems to manage information and collect data on development co-operation already exist, several countries noted information gaps due to late or irregular reporting, or discrepancies between information extracted and providers' understanding of accurate data. This has meant extra effort to collect and validate data. While many countries have made progress in either establishing new or strengthening existing systems, these systems need to be regularly maintained and managed. They also depend on continuous timely and quality reporting by providers of development

co-operation. To enhance country-led accountability further, there is a need to strengthen country databases and systems as well as providers' engagement and reporting. This will improve not only the accuracy of monitoring efforts, but importantly also the predictability of co-operation. Greater predictability allows the government to plan and budget more effectively, as well as to record development co-operation funds on national budgets (more information in Chapters 2 and 4).

Several countries, including Lao People's Democratic Republic, South Africa and Zambia, have expressed their interest in using the Global Partnership monitoring framework as a basis to establish a long-term monitoring system or to reinforce an existing system for collecting regular data from providers, including indicators on effective development co-operation and the Busan principles.

What are the country initiatives to drive progress?

Since the Busan High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in 2011 and endorsement of the Busan Partnership agreement, many countries have made notable efforts to implement the Busan commitments. To complement the global monitoring exercise, the UNDP-OECD joint support team has also collected country implementation examples (see endnote 1).

Implementing Busan commitments will require stronger and more coherent national institutional frameworks.

The increasingly complex development co-operation landscape has had implications for countries' institutional frameworks for implementing and monitoring the Busan commitments. Accelerating the shift from aid effectiveness to effective development co-operation in practice – i.e. putting inclusive partnerships and mutual accountability at the heart of efforts – means policy coherence; more effective integrated planning, budgeting, resource mobilisation; and partnership processes and mechanisms for national development planning. While there is a great deal of diversity and complexity in country experiences, a recurring theme is that implementing the Busan commitments seems to require stronger and more coherent national institutional frameworks, and more profound involvement by central government institutions.

Progress on strategic frameworks for effective development co-operation

To advance implementation of Busan commitments, countries are strengthening their national institutional frameworks to increase the transparency, co-ordination, harmonisation, alignment and results focus of development co-operation.

Many countries have made progress in establishing or strengthening national institutional frameworks and processes to increase the transparency, co-ordination, harmonisation, alignment and results focus of development co-operation. These efforts range from launching a national plan or action plan for implementing the Busan commitments, creating an institutionalised discussion forum, and reviewing and revising

development co-operation partnership strategies to setting up an institutional framework or mechanism for mobilising external resources effectively. For example:

- Cambodia has devised a Development Co-operation and Partnership Strategy² which incorporates the principles of effective development co-operation, emphasising results-focused, inclusive and effective partnerships. The strategy ensures that development co-operation resources are used for maximum effectiveness and impact in achieving Cambodia's development goals. This includes implementing the unfinished aid effectiveness agenda, fostering inclusive partnerships and exploring ways to enhance the catalytic role of aid for a broad-based growth agenda. The strategy emphasises programme-based approaches as an important framework to foster development effectiveness. It is accompanied by tools such as a results framework and joint monitoring indicators. It also establishes an institutional framework and dialogue mechanisms – at both technical and political levels – with all national and external partners.
- Mozambique has developed a Post-Busan National Action Plan:³ a medium-term strategy that defines the actions for implementing Busan commitments backed up by a monitoring and evaluation framework.
- Myanmar launched the *Nay Pyi Taw Accord for Effective Development Co-operation*⁴ in January 2013. The adoption of this comprehensive, country-led co-ordination arrangement has involved establishing sector working groups and regular formal discussions with the Foreign Economic Relations Department and the Development Partners Working Committee. The first Myanmar Development Cooperation Forum was held in mid-2013.
- The Forum Compact sets out the collective actions of the Pacific region to strengthen co-ordination and use of all development resources. The effectiveness of development efforts is tracked annually, and peer reviews facilitate exchange of lessons and sharing best practice. Progress under the Compact is reviewed at the Pacific Islands Forum Leaders' meeting and through other Forum processes. Their 2013 report highlights that Forum Island countries are also individually continuing to improve their national planning and monitoring frameworks. The Marshall Islands is developing its first medium-term national development plan; the Federated States of Micronesia is developing state strategic plans and a National Medium Term Action Plan. Countries are also focusing on tracking and accounting for national development outcomes: Kiribati has identified key outcomes and targets and is building its capacities and institutions to co-ordinate implementation and monitor outcomes.⁵
- Other countries, such as the United Republic of Tanzania, Malawi, Benin and Bangladesh, have taken steps to review, revise or establish an institutional framework to enhance national efforts for managing development co-operation effectively.

Progress in fragile states

Improving the quality of development co-operation in fragile and conflict-affected states is more important now than ever. Yet, the development co-operation funding they receive is diminishing, and they have limited access to alternatives for financing development (OECD, 2014). Therefore, ensuring effective co-operation and optimising the mix of resources available are crucial for sustainable development results in fragile and conflict-affected countries and economies (Box 5.1).

Box 5.1. More is needed to help fragile states find a sustainable development path

Aid declined by 2.4% in 2011 and will continue its downward trend, with the least developed countries being hit hardest. Of the seven countries that are unlikely to meet a single Millennium Development Goal, six are fragile. Without greater support, these countries are expected to host more than half of the world's poor beyond 2018. International development efforts need to focus on delivering results quickly in these countries.

More is needed to help these countries find a sustainable path out of fragility. One important element in lasting results is to reinforce the domestic resource base. Fragile states still only collect 14% of their GDP in taxes on average, well below the 20% UN benchmark viewed as the minimum needed to meet development goals. Yet a mere 0.07% of ODA to fragile states is directed towards building accountable tax systems. The OECD report therefore calls on providers to make smarter use of development co-operation to help fragile states mobilise more domestic revenue. It provides many recent country examples of where efforts have been made and there are lessons to be shared, including from Nigeria, Guinea, Timor-Leste and Rwanda.

Source: OECD (2014), *2014 Fragile States: Domestic Revenue Mobilisation*, OECD Publishing, Paris, www.oecd.org/dac/incaf/FSR_2014.pdf.

Compacts in fragile states are an important stepping stone towards greater mutual trust and stronger partnerships.

The *New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States* (International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, 2011) aims to create change by addressing what matters most for people affected by conflict and fragility: putting countries in the lead of their pathway out of fragility; and building mutual trust and strong partnerships. Through the New Deal, development stakeholders agreed to use the Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals as an important foundation to enable progress towards achieving development results and to guide co-operation in fragile and conflict-affected states. They also committed to focus on new ways of engaging with conflict-affected and fragile states, centred around one national vision and one plan to guide an inclusive and country-led transition out of fragility. Stakeholders committed to build mutual trust by providing aid and managing resources more effectively, enhancing transparency and risk management to use country systems, strengthening national capacities and improving timeliness and predictability of funding to achieve better results.

Guided by the New Deal, fragile and conflict-affected states have made important advances. For example:

- Afghanistan's Aid Management Policy,⁶ endorsed in February 2013, sets out an operational plan for New Deal implementation. Built on three pillars, it is an important step forward in translating the global New Deal principles into the Afghan country context. As a starting point, the government, in consultation with development partners and local stakeholders, formulated the Afghanistan National Development Strategy, which provides “one vision, one plan” for all development co-operation. The Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework⁷ adopted by Afghanistan and its partners brings the government and providers together to match funding with priorities and deliver on the strategy. The Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund ensures a harmonised financing approach while pooling fiduciary risks and supports national programmes to facilitate service delivery by the government.

- The Somali Compact,⁸ endorsed in September 2013 at the New Deal Conference in Brussels, represents a new beginning in the joint partnership between Somalia and the international community. In setting out clear priorities for the government and international community and providing a framework for more inclusive dialogue between the government, international partners and local stakeholders, the Compact aims to improve the effectiveness of development co-operation and to demonstrate that it contributes to peacebuilding and statebuilding. The Compact is expected to lead to better co-ordination between political, security and development spheres as well as to progressively strengthen the core state capacities of the Somali government (see also Box 2.1, Chapter 2). Similar to the Afghan example, the Somalia Development and Reconstruction Fund will help to fund national government priorities in a more harmonised way, allowing for strengthened transparency and ownership over the development agenda and its expected results.

While it is too early to assess the impacts of these compacts on enhancing country ownership and results, they are an important stepping stone towards greater mutual trust and stronger partnerships in jointly agreeing on development priorities and exploring ways in which to strengthen country systems while progressively using them to deliver development co-operation. Investing more in country institutions, including those that drive domestic revenue mobilisation, is a crucial part of these efforts as it enables countries to take full ownership of their development and recovery.

Progress in managing diversity

Managing diversity of development co-operation partnerships works best with strong country leadership and a flexible and pragmatic approach.

Developing countries are also making progress in managing the diversity of development co-operation partnerships and reducing the fragmentation created by a proliferation of actors, each with their own priorities, approaches and procedures. The Busan Partnership agreement calls on developing countries to “lead consultation and co-ordination efforts to manage the diversity at the country level”, while “providers of development assistance have a responsibility to reduce fragmentation and curb the proliferation of aid channels” (BPa, 2011: para 25). A comparative analysis of country efforts in managing diversity and reducing fragmentation by the Building Block on Managing Diversity and Reducing Fragmentation (2014a) finds that developing countries are improving at managing the diversity of development co-operation. Countries are taking a flexible and pragmatic approach to this challenge, including formalising the division of labour among development co-operation providers and implementing joint co-operation strategies (such as joint programming, programme-based approaches, etc.). For example:

- Rwanda manages diversity and reduces fragmentation through an agreed division of labour based on a portfolio analysis of development partners using the *Development Assistance Database*. This has decreased the share of development co-operation relations that are relatively small in size and therefore contribute to fragmentation (from 40% in recent years to 31% in 2012). It has been found that failure by development partners to provide forward-looking and transparent information on their development co-operation portfolios and inability of the government to use the information fully can

result in inefficient national and sectoral development frameworks (Building Block on Managing Diversity and Reducing Fragmentation, 2014b).

- Managing provider diversity effectively requires that the country takes a strong lead in a co-ordination process which includes all relevant domestic stakeholders and active international development partners. Both Bangladesh and Rwanda have national and sector working groups that include relevant domestic stakeholders who play an important role in building synergies between policy formulation, implementation and review of development co-operation (Building Block on Managing Diversity and Reducing Fragmentation, 2014b; 2014c).
- Co-ordination and harmonisation work best when linked to clearly defined results developed and owned by the country. Clear country priorities make it easier for development partners to target their aid allocations for greatest impact. In both Rwanda and Bangladesh, sectors with clear development plans have been able to focus their development co-operation dialogue and co-ordination on results rather than processes.

Progress in making the most of development finance

Some countries are mapping their development finance for a better use of all resources available in support of development and poverty reduction.

A holistic and inclusive management approach can ensure that development co-operation catalyses and complements other development finance. However, countries need more robust information on development finance – including climate change finance and innovative development financing – in order to establish more comprehensive financing strategies and frameworks to support development and poverty reduction. Several countries have mapped their development finance comprehensively; others are exploring the range of innovative financing mechanisms. For example, Papua New Guinea’s Development Finance and Aid Assessment (DFAA) analyses potential development finance sources to inform its multi-year budgeting. The DFAA helps to reveal funding gaps, identifies ways in which to diversify the development partnership base, and contributes to the new Development Finance and Aid Policy. Viet Nam is also undertaking a DFAA to inform its 8th Five Year Plan (2016-2020) and to help strengthen its institutional framework so as to maximise the use of all sources of development finance.

Progress in transparent reporting and information management systems

Countries are establishing or strengthening their aid/development co-operation information management systems to improve multi-year planning, budgeting and monitoring.

A number of countries have either established or strengthened their aid/development co-operation information management systems to improve their multi-year planning, budgeting and monitoring processes. For example, the State Committee on Investments and State Property Management of Tajikistan is charged with aid co-ordination. It adopted an aid information management system in 2012, which has streamlined the

process of data collection on projects and funding agreements, upgraded the quality and timeliness of data, and provided access to information for all stakeholders. The system has helped the State Committee to manage their national development planning and budgeting processes more effectively by making it easier to analyse funding trends and projections.

Some countries have piloted initiatives to geocode the location of development co-operation activities in their aid information management system. This involves plotting projects on an interactive map. For example, Honduras launched its Aid Management Platform in 2013, which is helping the government, its partners and civil society organisations to discuss aid fragmentation and the allocation of resources across the country. Nepal has also geocoded its aid information as part of its Aid Management Platform, which has been rolled out to more than 35 local-level development partners and 19 line ministries involved in implementing development projects.

Other countries have started to move towards a more integrated system of public financial management, enhancing the integration and synergies between the aid information management system and the public financial management system. For example, Rwanda's *Development Assistance Database* has been upgraded to synchronise the recording of external resources with the government's public financial management system (known as SmartFMS). Efforts like these inform decision makers and improve the overall alignment of assistance with the country's priorities and programmes.

Some countries have integrated indicators on effective development co-operation into their aid information management system to allow for regular monitoring. For example, Cambodia's ODA database now includes the Global Partnership monitoring indicators, as does Rwanda's, which produces the data needed to monitor development effectiveness every year. Bangladesh also intends to do the same.

Many other countries have also started work to establish or strengthen their aid information management systems, which they see as an integral part of their overall efforts to improve the effectiveness of development co-operation. For example, Morocco is at an advanced stage in establishing an automated information management system, known as the SIG-CDM, designed to improve the efficiency and co-ordination of provider activities. Egypt has also started work on an online interactive aid management system and Guinea Bissau is piloting its aid management platform.

Progress in establishing inclusive development partnerships

Despite efforts towards more inclusive partnerships, the involvement of non-state actors remains limited.

Inclusive development partnerships are being built in a variety of ways in developing countries. While Chapter 3 provides a more systematic analysis of this agenda (e.g. creating an enabling environment for civil society, private sector engagement), this section highlights what individual countries are doing.

Countries are making efforts to extend the coverage of reporting obligations to all providers of co-operation. Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) are now reporting their co-operation through national aid information management systems in a number of countries. For example, Haiti gathers information from more than 250 bilateral and multilateral development partners and non-state actors – notably NGOs – in its external

assistance management module (*Module de gestion de l'aide externe*). The module keeps all stakeholders informed on funding, in-kind contributions and projects/programmes by the international community, enabling better planning, alignment and harmonisation of development activities.

Many countries report benefits from strengthening inclusive dialogue. For example, in Burundi the Partners Coordination Group (*Groupe de Coordination des Partenaires*, GCP) serves as a framework for dialogue and brings together representatives of government, providers, civil society, private sector actors and parliamentary institutions. The Global Partnership monitoring exercise was launched during a strategic forum of the GCP. In Malawi, a workshop on “Open Development Data for Effective Policy” held in October 2013 to launch the Aid Management Platform brought together government ministries, development partners, civil society organisations (CSOs) and media groups to collectively identify ways to harness development data to support evidence-based decision making.

Involving a broader range of stakeholders can introduce innovative ideas, provide information on a much wider range of development activities, and bring on-the-ground perspectives to development co-operation. However, as mentioned in Chapter 4, although some countries are actively strengthening inclusive partnerships, the involvement of non-state actors remains *ad hoc* overall and the depth of their involvement varies greatly from country to country. Accountability frameworks and policy dialogue still primarily involve government and development partners, while the involvement of domestic civil society and the private sector remains limited.

South-South initiatives for effective development co-operation

Countries providing South-South co-operation are strengthening their institutional frameworks for international development co-operation for more effective management and greater focus on results.

The Busan Partnership agreement recognises the increasingly important contribution made by *all* development stakeholders. Over recent decades, South-South co-operation⁹ has been gaining importance in the development co-operation architecture, having risen steadily in both its breadth and scale. Many countries providing South-South co-operation, especially middle-income countries, play a dual role as both recipients and providers of development co-operation. Drawing on this dual role, they have stepped up their contributions of experience, knowledge and development solutions, taking forward the principle of solidarity to become important actors in the global development agenda.

Many such countries, individually or as a group, have been actively involved in developing policy options and shaping the post-2015 development framework, as well as the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. For example, major providers of South-South development co-operation came together in New Delhi in April 2013 at the conference on *South-South Co-operation: Issues and Emerging Challenges*.¹⁰ The conference was convened jointly by the UN Secretariat’s Department of Economic and Social Affairs and the Government of India to discuss the need for greater transparency and effectiveness among providers of South-South co-operation. At the same time, participants reaffirmed that the principles of transparency and effectiveness

apply differently to South-South co-operation, which should not follow the same norms and standards as those guiding North-South co-operation.

Box 5.2. Evolution of Turkish international development co-operation

Established in 1992 as a partner for South-South co-operation, today the Turkish International Co-operation and Development Agency (TIKA) is working in 30 countries. TIKA is now looking to further consolidate and expand its strengths and scale up development co-operation. To this end, Turkey is reviewing and developing its ODA law as well as formulating its development co-operation. Initiatives such as institutional context analysis as well as capacity assessment have supported Turkey's efforts in this regard. Furthermore, Turkey is actively exploring collaborative opportunities with the private sector and civil society.

While the developing countries who are themselves providers of development co-operation are diverse in terms of economic power, demography, political background and culture, several common themes have emerged from the New Delhi Conference, as well as a series of Global Dialogues of Agencies and Ministries for International Cooperation and Development:¹¹

- **Setting up new institutions for managing international development co-operation effectively:** South-South co-operation is generally based on solidarity, equality and mutual benefit. It tends to be driven by experience, knowledge and demand-driven development solutions. However, in recent years, a number of countries have set up or strengthened existing institutional frameworks for co-ordinating and managing their development co-operation with a view to becoming important development actors in the international development co-operation architecture (Box 5.2). Several countries have taken steps to consolidate their institutional frameworks for managing international development co-operation more effectively, both for the development co-operation they receive and provide. For example, countries such as Colombia, Mexico and South Africa have set up development co-operation agencies.
- **Enhancing systems for reporting, communication and visibility:** Strengthening institutions for co-operation is often coupled with efforts to enhance information management systems for reporting, strategy and visibility of activities. The aim is to sustain and strengthen public support for increasing development co-operation provision. Brazil, for instance, published its development co-operation flows from 2005 to 2010 in two reports (Ipea, 2011; 2013).
- **Focusing on results:** Countries such as Indonesia are reviewing their development co-operation framework so as to progressively link the provision of co-operation and knowledge to their foreign policy, economic and sustainable development goals. Commonly such reviews include some element of consultations with domestic development stakeholders on what kind of results should be sought from development co-operation activities.
- **Strengthening the role of knowledge sharing:** Knowledge sharing has long been recognised as a key foundation of South-South co-operation, with many partners sharing similar challenges during their development transition. A number of countries, such as Indonesia and Thailand, are exploring ways to scale up this practice by consolidating and co-ordinating how they share knowledge and develop solutions. One approach is the increasingly popular “triangular co-operation”,¹² which can broaden the

pool of knowledge and experience for developing countries and scale up innovations and solutions to development challenges (Box 5.3).

Box 5.3. Indonesia’s “Grand Design and Blueprint for South-South and Triangular Co-operation”

Indonesia has supported more than 700 activities through South-South co-operation, engaging approximately 3 800 participants from various countries and regions. Drawing on the experience gained, the country is exploring ways in which to strengthen and consolidate its profile as a partner for international development co-operation. As part of this endeavour, Indonesia is undertaking a stock-take of its international development co-operation, with a specific focus on the role of knowledge sharing. The exercise also aims to embed knowledge sharing into policies and institutional arrangements for international development co-operation.

How to move forward?

Country efforts are the foundation for implementing the Busan principles. This chapter highlights some of the many and varied ways in which countries are rising to the implementation and monitoring challenges of the Busan Partnership agreement. What do these examples imply for necessary next steps?

- Lessons from monitoring efforts indicate that the transformation towards country-owned monitoring is both desirable and feasible. Country-led monitoring and accountability paves the way for transparent and evidence-based decision making, and the ambition is to rely fully on country-led processes for simple “snapshots” of progress for global accountability purposes. This will require further investments by countries and their development partners to strengthen national accountability frameworks, particularly to improve the quality of country systems and data.
- Country leadership needs to be matched by stronger engagement by providers at the country level. To ensure the legitimacy of global monitoring efforts, which will increasingly be embedded in national monitoring processes, co-operation providers need to do more to re-align their systems and procedures to those of their partner countries. This calls for better internal communication and co-ordination within provider organisations to address apparent disconnects between headquarters and country office operations. This will be key to accurately monitor progress and reinforce mutual accountability both at the country and global levels.
- Greater sharing of experiences and mutual learning among countries will help to accelerate efforts and inform global accountability dialogue with more country experiences and examples. The Republic of Korea has announced an annual meeting to take stock of Busan implementation. This could also be an opportunity for countries to share experiences and lessons from different regions and stages of development. Various meetings at the regional level¹³ also offer opportunities for sharing experiences, mutual learning and peer review.

Notes

1. This chapter draws on: *i*) presentations by representatives from Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Egypt, Morocco and Tajikistan at the International Workshop on Busan Implementation at Country Level, hosted by Korea's Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the UNDP in November 2013 (UNDP, 2013), see www.undp.org/content/seoul_policy_center/en/home/presscenter/articles/2013/10/25/seoul-conference-to-review-country-progress-in-effective-development-co-operation; *ii*) country examples emerging from discussions on the Global Partnership online community space www.unteamworks.org/gpedc; and *iii*) qualitative feedback provided by countries as part of their monitoring data submissions.
2. More information can be found at www.cdc-crdb.gov.kh/strategy.
3. More information can be found at www.africa-platform.org/sites/default/files/resources/post-busan_action_plan_-_mozambique.pdf and www.mpd.gov.mz.
4. More information can be found at www.president-office.gov.mm/en/?q=briefing-room/announcements/2013/01/29/id-1493.
5. More information can be found at: 2013 Tracking the Effectiveness of Development Efforts in the Pacific Report and the 2013 Forum Compact Peer Review Countries Progress Report (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, 2013a and 2013b).
6. Available at www.undp.org.af/publications/KeyDocuments/ANDS_Full_Eng.pdf.
7. Available at <http://aid.dfat.gov.au/publications/pages/tokyo-mutual-accountability-framework.aspx>.
8. Available at www.pbsbdialogue.org/The%20Somali%20Compact.pdf.
9. While there is no internationally agreed definition of South-South co-operation, United Nations General Assembly Resolution 64/222 (2010) describes it as "... a manifestation of solidarity among peoples and countries of the South that contributes to their national well-being, their national and collective self-reliance and the attainment of internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals." This resolution also clarifies that "... South-South co-operation takes different and evolving forms, including the sharing of knowledge and experience, training, technology transfer, financial and monetary co-operation and in-kind contributions".
10. More information about this conference is available at www.un.org/en/ecosoc/newfunct/dcfdelhi.shtml.
11. This series of dialogues took place in Mexico, October 2012; Peru April 2013; and Indonesia, December 2013.
12. There is no agreed UN definition of triangular co-operation; however, the Nairobi Outcome Document on South-South Co-operation (UN, 2009) provides the following

description: “Triangular co-operation is support provided by developed countries, international organisations and civil society to developing countries, upon their request, in improving their expertise and national capacities through triangular co-operation mechanisms, including direct support or cost-sharing arrangements, joint research and development projects, third-country training programmes and support for South-South centres, as well as by providing the necessary knowledge, experience and resources, so as to assist other developing countries, in accordance with their national development priorities and strategies.”

13. Examples of regional events are available at www.aideffectiveness.org/CDDE-Capacity-Development-for-Development-Effectiveness-Facility.html; www.africa-platform.org.

References

- Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation* (BPo) (2011), endorsed at the Fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, Busan, Republic of Korea, 29 November-1 December 2011, <http://effectivecooperation.org/about>.
- Building Block on Managing Diversity and Reducing Fragmentation (2014a), *The Busan Commitments on Managing Diversity and Reducing Fragmentation: Stocktake and emerging issues*, BMZ, Bonn, Germany.
- Building Block on Managing Diversity and Reducing Fragmentation (2014b), *Managing Diversity and Reducing Fragmentation: The case of Rwanda*, BMZ, Bonn, Germany.
- Building Block on Managing Diversity and Reducing Fragmentation (2014c), *Managing Diversity and Reducing Fragmentation: The case of Bangladesh*, BMZ, Bonn, Germany.
- International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (2011), *A New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States*, International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, www.pbsdialogue.org/documentupload/49151944.pdf.
- Ipea (Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada, or Institute of Applied Economic Research) (2013), *Cooperação Brasileira para o Desenvolvimento Internacional (2010) (Brazilian Cooperation for International Development 2010)*, in Portuguese, Ipea, Brasília, www.ipea.gov.br/portal/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=19070.
- Ipea (2011), *Cooperação Brasileira para o Desenvolvimento Internacional: 2005-2009 (Brazilian Co-operation for International Development: 2005-2009)*, in Portuguese, Ipea, Brasília, www.ipea.gov.br/portal/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=6874.
- OECD (2014), *Fragile States 2014: Domestic Revenue Mobilisation*, OECD Publishing, Paris, www.oecd.org/dac/incaf/resourceflowstofragilestates.htm.

- PIFS (2013a), *Sustaining Progress and Moving Forward: Tracking the Effectiveness of Development Efforts in the Pacific Report*, Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, Suva, Fiji, www.forumsec.org/resources/uploads/attachments/documents/2013_Tracking_Effectiveness_Dev_Efforts_Report_FINAL_09.10.13.pdf.
- PIFS (2013b), *Forum Compact Peer Review: Countries take action!*, Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, Suva, Fiji, www.forumsec.org/resources/uploads/attachments/documents/2013_PIFS_Progress_Report_Final.pdf.
- UN (United Nations) (2009), *Nairobi Outcome Document of the High-Level United Nations Conference on South-South Co-operation*, United Nations General Assembly, 21 December, <http://ssc.undp.org/content/dam/ssc/documents/Key%20Policy%20Documents/Nairobi%20Outcome%20Document.pdf>.
- UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) (2013), “Challenges in the implementation of the Busan Commitments”, discussion paper for the International Workshop on Busan Implementation at Country Level in Seoul, Republic of Korea.



From:
Making Development Co-operation More Effective
2014 Progress Report

Access the complete publication at:
<https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264209305-en>

Please cite this chapter as:

OECD/United Nations Development Programme (2014), "Country actions to implement the Busan commitments", in *Making Development Co-operation More Effective: 2014 Progress Report*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264209305-9-en>

This work is published under the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of OECD member countries.

This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

You can copy, download or print OECD content for your own use, and you can include excerpts from OECD publications, databases and multimedia products in your own documents, presentations, blogs, websites and teaching materials, provided that suitable acknowledgment of OECD as source and copyright owner is given. All requests for public or commercial use and translation rights should be submitted to rights@oecd.org. Requests for permission to photocopy portions of this material for public or commercial use shall be addressed directly to the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) at info@copyright.com or the Centre français d'exploitation du droit de copie (CFC) at contact@cfcopies.com.