



SOUTHERN VOICE

Southern perspectives. Global debates.

OCCASIONAL
PAPER
SERIES
Nº

53



Rethinking Development Effectiveness: Insights from Literature Review

Mustafizur Rahman
Sherajum Monira Farin

OCCASIONAL
PAPER
SERIES
N°

53

**Rethinking Development
Effectiveness:
Insights from Literature Review**

Mustafizur Rahman
Sherajum Monira Farin

Publisher

Southern Voice

Website: www.southernvoice.org

E-mail: info@southernvoice.org

First Published April 2019

© Southern Voice

Disclaimer: The views expressed in this study are those of the authors alone and do not necessarily reflect the views of Southern Voice or any other organisation(s) with which the authors are affiliated.

ISSN 2307-9827 (Online)

ISSN 2307-681X (Print)

Preface

With the advent of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), discussions on development finance have been revitalised. Mobilising sufficient financial support to meet the resource gap in SDG implementation is a critical challenge for developing countries.

Traditional aid flows to these countries have been restrained by both supply-side limits and demand-side pulls. However, new actors and innovative financing instruments create opportunities for additional funding. In this context, improving the quality of development cooperation (including financial flows) and assessing its effectiveness have become more pertinent than ever.

Economic and political factors aggravate the challenge of effective development cooperation. The current global development finance architecture lacks necessary political ownership and momentum. Further, the discourse suffers from an obvious lack of credible knowledge that reflects realities on the ground. Demand is thus high for Southern perspectives so as to embed them in future reforms.

That is what Southern Voice, a network of over 50 think tanks from Africa, Asia, and Latin America, is facilitating. It provides structured inputs from the Global South for debates on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. With capacity gained through the successful execution of various research programmes, Southern Voice aims to contribute to the global discussion on the effectiveness of development cooperation in the era of SDGs.

The new initiative, "Rethinking Development Effectiveness: Perspectives from the Global South," is being carried out in partnership with the Centre for Policy Dialogue (CPD) in Dhaka, Bangladesh and with support from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The present study is the third in a series of nine occasional papers on rethinking development effectiveness. It analyses the literature on development effectiveness of development cooperation against a changing scenario and through this provides guiding elements to assess the same at country level.

Debapriya Bhattacharya, PhD

*Chair, Southern Voice and Distinguished Fellow, CPD
Dhaka, Bangladesh*



Acknowledgement

We are particularly grateful to Debapriya Bhattacharya, Chair of Southern Voice and Distinguished Fellow at the Centre for Policy Dialogue (CPD) for his encouragement, guidance, and helpful advice. We thankfully acknowledge the important insights gleaned and valuable knowledge drawn from two background studies authored by Maryam Almasifard and Neissan A. Besharati, respectively. We extend our sincere thanks to Andrea Ordóñez, Director of Southern Voice, for sharing detailed comments on an earlier draft. We would like to recognise the valuable feedback received from the participants of the expert group meetings and key informants' interviews held at various points in time in connection with this project. Finally, we want to thank the Southern Voice and CPD colleagues who were involved in this project. They deserve special thanks for their excellent cooperation and unwavering support during this research.

Abstract

Literature review testifies to a distinct shift in recent years in the discourse concerning development effectiveness. Factors contributing to the shift include the change in focus from aid to development cooperation, the involvement of new development actors and the new roles performed by traditional development actors, the diversity of financing instruments and modalities, and—most importantly—the new demands originating from the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Historical and analytical appraisal of these changing dynamics reveals a compelling case favouring the need for a rethinking of how development effectiveness should be defined under the emerging scenario. This rethinking should be underpinned by recipient countries' perspectives, cognisance of changing country profiles and the country-specific contexts that inform the development effectiveness architecture, and the consequent need to develop new assessment frameworks. This study captures the state of knowledge in this connection and identifies knowledge gaps in assessing development effectiveness. Proper measurement of development effectiveness hinges on the quality of implementation (i.e., processes) and ensuring the delivery of expected developmental results (i.e., outputs, outcomes, and impacts), this is also key to ensuring accountability between and within recipient and partner countries. By drawing insights from the survey of relevant literature, the study develops a framework to help assess development effectiveness at the country level.

Authors

Mustafizur Rahman is a distinguished fellow at the Centre for Policy Dialogue (CPD). He is an economist by training. His current research areas concern issues of development effectiveness, regional cooperation in Southern Asia, and multilateral trading system and global integration of low income countries. He can be reached at mustafiz@cpd.org.bd.

Sherajum Monira Farin is a research associate at the Centre for Policy Dialogue (CPD). Her primary areas of interest are international economics and public policy analysis. Monira has completed her bachelor's and master's degrees in economics from University of Dhaka, Bangladesh. She can be reached at sherajum.m.farin@gmail.com.



Content

Preface	iv
Acknowledgement	v
Abstract.....	vi
Acronyms and abbreviations	viii
Introduction	9
Evolution of the concept of development effectiveness and the key debates	12
Measurements of development effectiveness of development cooperation.....	28
Mapping the knowledge gaps and implications for assessing development effectiveness at the country level	37
Conclusion	46
References	47



Acronyms and abbreviations

DAC	Development Assistance Committee
GPEDC	Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SSC	South-South Cooperation
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

Rethinking Development Effectiveness: Insights from Literature Review

Mustafizur Rahman
Sherajum Monira Farin

Introduction

The concept of development effectiveness has evolved in tandem with a number of important changes in the development cooperation landscape: the shift in focus from aid to development cooperation, the diversity of financial flows, the multiplicity of actors, the wide range of deployed financing instruments and modalities, changing patterns of allocations of resources, and—most importantly—because of how development is being viewed in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which introduced the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Indeed, in

view of the SDGs, the need for a deeper understanding of development effectiveness has gained even more urgency. The focus of the development effectiveness discourse now covers a broader ambit and has a deeper meaning. Thus, development effectiveness of development cooperation has emerged as a distinct concept that embraces the new realities of how development effectiveness should be defined in the SDG era, keeping in view the newly emerging diversity of the nature and forms of development cooperation. Development effectiveness is traditionally assessed from a limited perspective. The effectiveness of development cooperation has been primarily measured through its contribution to poverty reduction and economic growth. There is now a need for a more comprehensive assessment of effectiveness that considers triangulation of economic growth, social inclusiveness, and environmental sustainability (as opposed to a narrow project-based approach).

Given the growing gap between the demand for resources in developing countries and the flow of resources from provider countries, raising development effectiveness has gained heightened policy significance. Resource availability must rise if the SDGs are to



**The focus
of the
development
effectiveness
discourse now
covers a broader
ambit and has a
deeper meaning.**

be attained both at the country level and globally. Resources need to be mobilised from both the public and private sectors and domestic and external sources—from traditional aid providers as well as emerging development partners. While conventional practice has been to treat development cooperation narrowly as official development assistance (ODA) provided by the member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC), the instruments and modalities for development finance are undergoing significant changes¹. A number of emerging economies are assuming the role of providers through South-South cooperation (SSC). At the same time, the private sector is getting involved in development initiatives through deals involving blended finance. Traditional providers, i.e. mostly Northern providers are now trying to leverage private capital not only to generate additional funds for the development of developing countries, but also to increase development effectiveness of development cooperation.

The development effectiveness discourse has evolved over time and with the evolution of ideas about and understandings of development on the parts of various relevant stakeholders. Thus, issues concerning assessment frameworks and measurement of development effectiveness have practical significance. In the face of shifting priorities originating from emergencies such as migration and conflicts, traditional providers are diverting resources to countries in conflict and post-conflict situations for humanitarian and security assistance.

Klingebiel (2014) highlights that development cooperation needs to be sustainable at four different levels (at the budget, programme, operational, and ecological levels); this somewhat resonates with the triangulation requirement of the SDGs (the three pillars of the 2030 Agenda—economic, social, and environmentally sustainable development). Development effectiveness has been defined and perceived in different ways—in terms of efficiency of the development outcome of an aid intervention; organisational effectiveness; policy coherence; and overall development outcome (Kindornay, 2011). The upshot of this is that there is an emerging need to ensure that development cooperation is deployed for the right purposes (targeting and earmarking), in the proper manner (forms of intervention), in the right sequence (blending and leveraging), and at the right time (critical timing). There is a need to revisit the development effectiveness discourse from these vantage points and newly emerging perspectives.

1 In this study, financing instruments refer to generic means of providing or facilitating financing (e.g., debt [mostly loans], equity, guarantees, or grants); modalities are practical arrangements to implement the instruments within defined legal, policy, and operational structures (e.g., public-private partnerships, blended finance deals, advance market commitments, etc.) (Asian Development Bank, 2005; Green Climate Fund, 2013).

One factor to reckon with is that the development effectiveness discourse has traditionally been dominated by Northern providers' and development practitioners' perspectives. Indeed, the evolution of the idea of development effectiveness is rooted in the discussion on, and subsequent expansion of, the concept of aid effectiveness. With the resurgence of the Global South, there is a need to develop a narrative from recipient countries' perspectives as well. Hence, the need to examine the development effectiveness concept using a bottom-up approach. Identifying what is essential in terms of defining development effectiveness at the country level, with a recipient country lens, will be helpful in this context. Consequently, the articulation of a common but differentiated framework for a deeper understanding of development effectiveness has high relevance both from the angles of development theory and practice at the recipient country level.

Objective of the research

The objective of this study is historical and analytical appraisal of the evolution of the concept and assessment of development effectiveness of development cooperation through literature survey. The literature review seeks answers to the following questions:

- How has the concept of development effectiveness evolved, including in view of the SDGs? What are the major debates against the backdrop of this unfolding scenario?
- How have the providers' and recipients' perspectives on development effectiveness changed over this period?
- How has the accountability framework evolved?
- Which new elements have informed thinking on development effectiveness in the SDG era?
- What are the emerging trends (new developments) in methods of assessing (measuring) development effectiveness?
- Which elements in assessing development effectiveness call for a rethinking from the perspective of developing an appropriate methodological framework for development effectiveness at the recipient (developing) country level?

Methodology

This study is primarily based on a review and analysis of the literature on development effectiveness. Relevant international agreements and reports by multilateral organisations were consulted towards this end. Reports by important forums and meetings on different aspects of development cooperation were reviewed to track the evolution of critical debates and discussions on development effectiveness. Given the objectives of the study and the questions posed, the focus was placed on more recent publications, particularly those

published since 2000². The study has gained from several expert group meetings and key informants' interview where earlier drafts and findings of the study were discussed. The study has drawn insights from two background studies that have looked at development effectiveness through the lens of two specific types of development cooperation, namely ODA (Almasifard, 2019) and SSC (Besharati, 2019).

Evolution of the concept of development effectiveness and the key debates

Brief historical appraisal of the development effectiveness discourse

A review of relevant literature on development cooperation reveals that geostrategic issues tend to occupy a central place in aid (development assistance) relations; this became more pronounced during the Cold War era (Degnbol-Martinussen & Engberg-Pedersen, 2005³; Hjertholm & White, 2003; Kentikelenis, Stubbs & King, 2016). A large part of aid targeted military and security issues and was in general political aid (Bigsten, Platteau & Tengsten, 2011; Elayah, 2016; Easterly, 2018; Lancaster, 2008). Developmental aspects started to gain importance when a large number of developing countries began to emerge in the post-colonial period; aid to post-colonial countries, in many instances, had both economics and politics embedded in cooperation (Alesina & Dollar, 2000; Apodaca, 2017). Gradually, the motivation of aid started to shift and aid was targeted primarily to enhance economic

 **The motivation of aid started to shift and aid was targeted primarily to enhance economic growth.**

² Documents published prior to this time frame have been consulted to a limited extent to glean historical insights.

³ Degnbol-Martinussen and Engberg-Pedersen (2005) summarise four decades of aid (1960 to 2000) and observe that aid expanded from involving central administration (core ministries) and project-based target groups (individuals, households, and organisations) only to almost all levels of a society (viz. state/political level, the national legislature, ministries, the private sector, local administration, the informal sector, civil society, non-government organisations, agricultural sector etc.).

growth, generally in the form of financial donations, concessional loans, economic aid, aid for trade, and charitable aid. Development aid was primarily focused on implementing various projects with clearly defined goals (mainly to reduce poverty) and definite project cycles (in the 1960s and 1970s), the scope of which gradually expanded to multi-layered strategies with goals and started being referred to as programmes (Mosley & Eeckhout, 2002). The scope of development interventions expanded further to be termed policy-oriented aid (in the 1980s) to address broader challenges in the form of support for the balance of payments, structural adjustment programmes, or sector programme aid to different sectors such as agriculture, health, and education (Babb & Kentikelenis, 2017; Pfeiffer & Chapman, 2010; Stuckler & Basu, 2013; Summers & Pritchett, 1993). As Kentikelenis (2017) suggests, by the early 2000s and following extensive criticisms, structural adjustment programmes became clad in new rhetoric (Schrecker, 2016): they demonstrated flexible policy design, streamlined conditionality, borrowing-country ownership, and pro-poor orientation (International Monetary Fund, 2009; World Bank, 2009). Subsequently, developing the required human resources to raise the capacity of government institutions and various civil society organisations in recipient countries started to increasingly gain importance in development cooperation (Akramov, 2006).

As the review of literature demonstrates, discussion on value for money⁴ gradually started to dominate the development discourse, being underpinned by several concerns in provider countries as regards whether development cooperation was generating expected results (Collier & Dollar, 2004; Dalgaard, Hanson & Tarp, 2004; Drehel, 2015; Easterly, 2003; Hanlon, 2004; Niyonkuru, 2016; Nowak-Lehmann, Dreher, Herzer, Klasen, & Martínez-Zarzoso, 2012; Rajan and Subramanien, 2005; Rajan and Subramanien, 2008; Riddell, 2007). This strand of literature also shed light on overarching concerns that clouded the traditional North-South development aid paradigm—concerns about allegations of corruption and leakages of aid funds, whether providers' support addressed the policy priority demands of recipient countries, and the true effectiveness of aid in poverty reduction and economic growth in recipient countries. Given insights drawn from the aforementioned literature, these concerns can be broadly put into two main strands: one coming mainly from traditional Northern providers, with emphasis on good value for money; the other coming primarily from analysts of development cooperation who emphasised the need for ensuring the primacy of alignment with national policies and priorities and the reduction of transaction costs on recipient countries' ends. Indeed, the importance of recipient countries' perspectives in determining the goals, strategies, and forms of development intervention started to be highlighted only in the early 1990s,

4 Jackson (2012) conceptualises value for money as an optimum balance of economic and efficiency considerations. Economic considerations refer to minimising costs, while efficiency considerations relate to getting more and better results for the minimised costs.


when development partners started to consider national ownership of development endeavours as an essential element (Degnbol-Martinussen & Engberg-Pedersen, 2005).

Discussions about improving the quality of aid (as well as quantity, particularly in view of additional resource needs in the context of the Millennium Development Goals [MDGs]) gained new momentum at the International Conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey, Mexico in 2002. The need to expand the scope of aid effectiveness was underpinned by several factors, as the survey of relevant literature suggests. First, aid effectiveness tended to be limited to project outcomes while what countries were looking for went beyond projects and embraced the impacts of development cooperation on their economies. Second, recipient countries' perceptions needed to be given priority over provider countries' perceptions. Third, not only outcomes but also processes concerning development cooperation needed to be given due consideration. Discussion on increasing the effectiveness of aid continued and evolved into discussion on development effectiveness of development cooperation, particularly at the High Level Forums on Aid Effectiveness held in Rome (2003), Paris (2005), Accra (2008), and Busan (2011) and High-Level Meetings of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (GPEDC) in Mexico City (2014) and Nairobi (2016). The discourse on aid effectiveness gradually developed into discussion on principles of good development practices and sound development partnerships involving both provider countries and recipient countries. Figure 1 shows the timeline of events with the titles of outcome documents and associated key points.



Discussion on increasing the effectiveness of aid continued and evolved into discussion on development effectiveness of development cooperation.

Figure 1. Historical milestones that shaped the development effectiveness discourse



Source: Based on data from OECD (2016); elaborated by the authors.

It is seen from a review of the relevant materials, the primary focus of the High Level Forums was to coordinate the development finance procedures of provider countries (OECD, 2003). This coordination then took shape as principles for assessing aid effectiveness as espoused in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (OECD, 2005). The Paris Declaration set out the five fundamental principles of aid effectiveness for the first time: ownership, alignment, harmonisation, managing of results, and mutual accountability. The distinctive feature of the subsequent Accra and Busan High Level Forums (OECD, 2008; OECD, 2011) was the major shift in the discourse from aid effectiveness to development effectiveness (Martini, Mongo, Kalambay, Fromont, Ribesse, & Dujardin, 2012). According to Besharati (2019), development effectiveness became the new buzzword in the international development community and has been widely used by all types of organisations, albeit with somewhat different interpretations and understandings. The Accra Agenda for Action (OECD, 2008) highlighted aid transparency, predictability, and national ownership at the recipient country end and emphasised the need for more accountability in international development assistance. This was also when the need to factor in the voice of civil society in the assessment framework of development cooperation started to gain traction. Civil society was given representation in the assessment of development cooperation in the GPEDC, which was established at the High Level Forum in Busan (OECD, 2011). The GPEDC was set up as a forum that includes governments, bilateral and multilateral organisations, civil society organisations, and the private sector. Its primary purpose is to systemise knowledge on development cooperation worldwide and devise methods to make development cooperation more effective⁵.

Interestingly, the rise of SSC has coincided with the particular phase of global development cooperation that has focused on shifting the discourse from aid effectiveness to development effectiveness. Although SSC has been part of international development since the mid-1950s, it began to be increasingly prominent during the decade of the 2010s (Gray & Gills, 2016). SSC has its roots in the Non-Aligned Movement and the historic SSC conferences held in Bandung (1955), Buenos Aires (1978), and Nairobi (2009), which incrementally set out the principles for economic and technical cooperation among developing countries. Besharati, Raowhani, and Riios (2017) succinctly summarise the principles that have emerged from various SSC conferences in Bandung, 1955; Buenos Aires, 1978; Nairobi, 2009; Bogotá, 2010; and New Delhi 2013. Indeed, the United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation evolved from a special unit on SSC that was set up in 1978 by the United Nations Development Programme. Some significant Southern

5 The GPEDC tracks progress on the Busan commitments with the help of its monitoring framework, which has 10 targets and associated indicators for systemising the process of delivering development finance. The framework is based on the Busan Principles, while the indicators are grouped under several principles—focus on results, country ownership, inclusive partnership, and transparency and mutual accountability.

providers contributed between USD 1 billion and USD 7 billion per year in development cooperation (Besharati, 2013; Gray & Gills, 2016; UNDESA, 2010), surpassing in some cases the assistance provided by some of the smaller OECD providers.

In comparing the principles of SSC (Besharati et al., 2017) with the principles of traditional North-South aid as set out in the High Level Forums, a certain level of commonality and convergence can be observed. For instance, emphasis in both cases has been put on the following aspects: national ownership and that development assistance should be aligned with the priorities of recipient countries; inclusiveness and multi-stakeholder participation; the importance of capacity development; and compliance with the principles of transparency and mutual accountability (Chaturvedi, Fues, & Sidiropoulos, 2012; Ling, 2010; Tortora, 2011).

Gray and Gills (2016), Mawdsley (2011), Mawdsley, Savage, and Kim (2013), and Quadir (2013) have discussed issues concerning SSC in impressive detail and provided several reasons for the emergence of SSC as a significant phenomenon in the development cooperation architecture. First, the rising (financial and otherwise) capacity of some Southern developing countries to emerge as providers (e.g., BRICS countries [Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa], but not limited to this group). Second, the need to harness opportunities in regional and sub-regional cooperation by extending support to neighbouring countries in the form of SSC. Third, the resource-constrained Southern developing countries, many of which have embarked on middle-income journey, are looking for additional resources in view of addressing infrastructure and other deficits. Fourth, SSC has supported investment in a number of areas that many of the traditional providers have tended to avoid (e.g., cross-border projects).



**South-South
cooperation
has supported
investment in a
number of areas
that many of the
traditional providers
have tended to avoid.**

Shift in the discourse from aid effectiveness to development effectiveness of development cooperation

In line with the various milestones depicted in Figure 1, there was a concomitant shift in the way that the international development community understood the meaning and essence of cooperation between providers and receivers of development support.

The term development cooperation began to replace development aid to emphasise the importance of looking at the traditional donor-beneficiary type of relationship from the perspective of an equal partnership between providers and recipients⁶. The following narrative captures the evolution of the concept of development effectiveness based on Kindornay and Morton (2009), Kindornay (2011), and Almasifard (2019)⁷.

Development effectiveness as aid effectiveness was the traditional way of conceptualising the effectiveness of development cooperation. Development effectiveness of aid referred to the outcomes that aid sought to achieve and against which aid's efficacy was to be measured, whereas aid effectiveness put primary emphasis on how aid was delivered.

Development effectiveness as organisational effectiveness was a way of thinking that measured development effectiveness in terms of how well an organisation achieved its stated objectives and goals. These organisations included the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 2001), World Bank (2005; 2008), Inter-American Development Bank (IDB, 2010), and the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID, 2008). As can be seen, this is primarily a supply-side driven concept. A useful distinction was made between development effectiveness and organisational effectiveness by the United Nations Development Programme, which elaborated that organisational effectiveness is linked to the achievement of more immediate results (completion of activities and outputs), while development effectiveness measures the changes in conditions in recipients (outcomes and impacts) consequent to development interventions (Almasifard, 2019).

Development effectiveness in terms of policy coherence for development emphasised the systematic promotion of reinforcing actions across government institutions to achieve improved development results for developing countries. This policy alignment concept was widely advocated by civil society and later adopted by multilateral organisations as well. There was also an increasing emphasis on this by the Global South, which called for more policy coherence for development in an attempt to redefine the concept of development and ensure greater effectiveness of development cooperation (Besharati, 2019; OECD, 2012).

6 In the SDG era where the global commitment to achieving inclusive societies is emphasised, there is a drive to change the connotation of superiority in the use of terms like donors, beneficiaries, and aid. Hence, this study consciously uses the terms "development partner" and "provider" in lieu of the term donor as well as "recipients" instead of beneficiaries.

7 As Kindornay (2011) states, it should be noted that these categories are neither mutually exclusive nor exhaustive. The categories should not be understood as classifications of development effectiveness by aid actors, but rather by conceptualisations.

Development effectiveness as defined in terms of overall development outcome tended to look at development effectiveness from a holistic perspective. According to this view, development effectiveness hinged on the collective and coordinated actions of a range of national and international actors, rather than specific outcomes attributed to specific development interventions. In this line of thinking, it was not financial flows that were the central focus; instead, what was emphasised was the ability of financial flows to catalyse and complement alternative development resources. According to this line of thinking, the effectiveness of development cooperation incorporates external and internal factors and has implications for all sectors, thus the impacts and accountability of development interventions need to be shared among the various stakeholders (International Fund for Agricultural Development, 2007).

Given the progression of events and discussions from Monterrey in 2002 to the establishment of the GPEDC in Busan 2011 to the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (United Nations, 2015a), the development effectiveness discourse experienced a visible shift from aid to development cooperation. This shift was informed by the realisation that development is a complex process that can only succeed if grounded in contextualised, comprehensive, mutual, and accountable partnerships.

The SDG era necessitates a more comprehensive view of development

Literature survey testifies to a significant broadening of the discourse on development effectiveness in view of the SDGs. As is known, the SDGs combine economic, social, and environmental dimensions that the global community has set for itself to achieve, at the country level and globally (United Nations, 2018). Indeed, the SDGs are much more comprehensive and ambitious than their predecessors, the MDGs (Bhattacharya & Kharas, 2015; Kumar, Kumar & Vivekadhish, 2016; Sawadogo, 2016). In the context of the SDGs, the need to have a deeper understanding of development effectiveness has become even more urgent as more clarity is needed to define and measure development effectiveness from the perspective of the 2030 Agenda, with emphasis on leaving no one behind.

The concept of development effectiveness in the SDG era crosses country boundaries and is associated with attaining the aspirations of protecting the planet, attaining zero poverty and zero hunger, and in general advancing together as a unified global civilisation. The post-2015 development agenda focuses on reframing issues such as trade and security as global public priorities and urges to work towards the delivery of global

public goods⁸ (Furness & Klingebiel, 2012; Klingebiel & Xiaoyun, 2015; Kaul, 2013). During the MDG period, a few large countries including India and China played crucial roles. During the SDG period, development effectiveness is to be measured against attaining social, economic, and environmental targets at both the country level and globally and reducing both intra-country and inter-country inequalities in development (Glennie, 2011; Hackenesch & Janus, 2013; Sumner, 2012). Hence, development effectiveness needs to be measured from a broader and deeper perspective.

SDG 17 (partnerships for the goals) articulates the concept of development effectiveness and policy coherence for development in the SDG era. It unpacks what is often referred to as development enablers or means of implementation. As Besharati (2019) observes, means of implementation include a coherent set of efforts by countries to enhance development assistance, foreign direct investment, lending by development banks, debt relief, improving developing countries' access to capital markets and providing them with more favourable terms in the global trading system, relaxing intellectual property rights, promoting knowledge exchange, technology transfer, flow of migrants and remittances, strengthening capacities, domestic resource mobilisation, and other policies that contribute to sustainable development. The outcomes are to be assessed at the disaggregated level so that no one and no sector is left behind.



**The 2030
Agenda
incorporates non-
technical and non-
financial aspects
as objectives
of development
cooperation.**

SDG 16 (peace, justice, and strong institutions) rightly acknowledges that more significant development gains can occur when economic and technical assistance are coupled with the promotion of peace and stability, promotion of good governance, strengthening of institutions, and the rule of law. Additionally, development cooperation in the SDG era is not only about money but also about the exchange of goods and sharing of expertise, knowledge, ideas, and technology. Along with traditional ODA flows, SSC and triangular cooperation are now significant modalities for non-financial exchanges between providers and recipients. In this connection, the 2030 Agenda incorporates

⁸ Examples of global public goods are global climate stability, international financial stability, communicable disease control, peace and security, the institutional architecture of international trade and finance, global communication and transportation systems, and global norms such as basic human rights (Kaul, 2013).

non-technical and non-financial aspects as objectives of development cooperation. Some of them relate to rights, dialogue and participation, good governance, social justice, and capacity development (International Labour Organization, 2018).

The upshot of the above discussion is that the SDGs have added new perspectives in the debate on development effectiveness and have broadened the discourse on assessment of development cooperation in several ways. One perspective draws the conclusion that the transition from the concept of aid effectiveness to development effectiveness in the SDG era requires that development effectiveness be measured against a more comprehensive set of ambitions—the ability of development cooperation to ensure economic growth, social inclusiveness, and environmental sustainability (triangulation), the ability to implement development cooperation through a whole-of-society approach (disaggregation and localisation of the development process), and the capacity to attain these goals by leaving no one behind (participation and inclusiveness). This approach to assessing development cooperation, on the one hand, underpins the importance of the process and, on the other hand, makes the task of capturing outcomes and impacts highly complex.

Increasing financing requirements, new players, and implications for development effectiveness

Literature survey suggests that there is a need for significant additional resources to implement the SDGs in the backdrop of limited resources. This need has added a new dimension to the development effectiveness discourse. Indeed, the issue of additional resources was also a concern in the context of the MDGs. Experts had at the time called for replenishment of ODA with the allocation of more funds through multilateral financial institutions (Sachs, 2005).

It was estimated that no less than USD 100 billion per year would be required to meet the MDGs (UNDP, 2003). Social sectors highlighted in the MDGs received increasing amount of funds from traditional providers (mostly OECD countries) through bilateral aid or vertical funds such as the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (Besharati, 2013). In view of the SDGs and the significantly higher amount of funds needed, now the development partners has to move "from billions to trillions" (World Bank, 2015), not only to implement the SDGs in countries but also to underwrite global public goods. The finance required for the implementation of the 17 SDGs points to an infrastructure financing gap of some USD 1 trillion to USD 1.5 trillion annually in developing countries, while estimates of the global gap generally range from USD 3 trillion to USD 5 trillion annually (Rao, 2017; UN, 2015b).

The 2030 Agenda calls for the mobilisation of resources from both domestic and external public and private sources as well as from traditional and emerging development partners. While ODA from OECD countries may not have the same prominence, it had during the MDG period, it remains a crucial source of finance for social sectors, particularly in the case of low-income and least developed countries. However, the role of ODA is set to decline in view of both the amount of finance available and the players involved in SDG-era financing⁹. A large part of development-related financial flows was getting diverted in the face of both supply-side limitations (consequent to financial and economic crises) and demand-side pulls (like the cross-border migration crisis, particularly in Europe). There is consensus in the literature favouring the need for additional funds beyond ODA if the 2030 Agenda is to be achieved by 2030 (OECD, 2018a; 2018b). The 2030 Agenda also calls for more investment in areas such as climate financing and combating environmental challenges, which often leave the poorest countries vulnerable to shocks.

Against this backdrop, many experts have drawn attention to making greater use of SSC-type of funds and assistance flows. This will not only ensure greater availability of finance, but also enhance opportunities of increased development effectiveness. They emphasise that SSC is already playing a prominent role in developing countries, particularly in agriculture and industry, trade and investment, and infrastructure development (Besharati & Loga, 2018). The emergence of new players also underpins the need for revisiting development effectiveness.

As mentioned, emerging economies—traditionally recipients of aid—have now become providers themselves, some of these countries are still receiving development assistance from traditional and non-traditional providers (Chaturvedi et al., 2012; Gray & Gills, 2016; Sato, Shiga, Kobayashi, & Kondoh, 2012). Multinational corporations, international non-governmental organisations, private philanthropists, and civil society organisations have emerged as essential parts of the global aid architecture. The complexities in global aid architecture have grown manifold with the rise in the number of actors and diversity of development interventions (Kharas & Rogerson, 2017). The literature survey indicates that these new partners are coming up with a variety of new and innovative financing tools, instruments, and modalities (Desai & Kharas, 2008; Kharas, 2007). SSC involving developing countries is taking place in the form of a diverse range

⁹ Harcourt (2018) highlights that, on average, provider countries are moving further away—not closer—to the target of 0.7% of gross national income of developed countries to be allocated for ODA. As shown in a 2018 OECD report, only five countries met that target in 2017—Denmark, Luxembourg, Norway, Sweden, and the United Kingdom (the only G7 provider). Germany, having met the target in 2016, could no longer meet the ODA target in the following year due to additional refugee costs. As per the OECD's data release in April 2018, rising costs spent on refugees living in provider countries have accounted for more than one-third of overall aid increases in the past eight years.

of modalities: capacity building support, lines of credit, trade and investment, technology transfer, and classical grants that involve both government as well as non-state actors (Chaturvedi, 2016). Emerging economies are sensitive about their newly found importance and non-traditional nature of their role; they do not feel obligated to follow the norms of traditional providers.

The North-South binary development cooperation structure is now competing with newly emerging South-South development cooperation structure. In certain sectors and activities SSC is perceived to be more cost-effective and ranks higher in terms of development effectiveness compared to traditional North-South aid (Besharati, 2019). In cases of certain types of development initiatives, SSC forms of support are perceived to be more appropriate by recipient countries. The speed of disbursement (time efficiency), the notion of mutual benefits through regional and sub-regional undertakings, peer learning, and the ability to draw greater synergies inform this preference (Gary & Gills, 2016; Mawdsley, 2011). However, while experience has induced traditional Northern providers to choose coordination to raise aid effectiveness, such coordination has yet to develop in the context of SSC.

McEwan and Mawdsley (2012) opine that development effectiveness of various modalities of SSC can be raised if and when there is greater coordination between cooperation provided by non-traditional Southern providers and traditional Northern providers. Significant synergies can be drawn if interventions between traditional bilateral development partners, SSC and multilateral providers are better coordinated. There is hardly any literature that has looked into this aspect of development cooperation, possibly because these are not yet practiced widely. Triangular cooperation would be able to contribute to higher levels of development effectiveness by encouraging knowledge sharing and co-creation among actors with different backgrounds. This could contribute to long-term capacity development to realise the goal of sustainable development in recipient countries. This would also help develop mutual trust and partnership among relevant actors through various coordinated activities. Involvement of traditional providers will encourage good practices in policy and legal areas, which should ensure better quality outcomes from SSC.

Recent literature (for instance, Fishman, 2018; United Nations Capital Development Fund, 2018) is bestowing increasing importance on blended finance as a potential source of financing for the SDGs. Blended finance allows Northern official financial flows to leverage private sector financial resources in recipient countries. Indeed, this has remained largely untapped as of now. Efficacy of development cooperation is being raised by making good use of concessional ODA to mobilise additional finance for development from private and non-traditional sources. Blended finance thus has an in-built mechanism to reduce attendant risks and enhance the expected returns of an investment.

However, against the backdrop of the rising number of players in the development cooperation landscape, issues of overall development effectiveness have become more complex. For example, ensuring food security entails technologies that produce the best yields. This, however, may not be best practice from the environmental sustainability angle. On the other hand, a particular type of development finance cooperation could help crowd-in different kinds of resources. Development effectiveness would thus need to factor in both the trade-offs and synergies of development cooperation. The interplay of various forms of cooperation—to generate economy-wide impacts—is also emerging as an important concern. This, in turn, has important implications for measuring the development effectiveness of development cooperation¹⁰. Catalysing and leveraging, trade-offs and synergies are some of the key words and concepts that have come to dominate the discourse on development effectiveness in recent years. Development cooperation is being increasingly evaluated and assessed from the perspective of these metrics.

Recipient country experiences and perspectives ought to inform the global development architecture

As the literature survey indicates, the recognition of a recipient country's role as an important factor in ensuring development effectiveness has emerged against the backdrop of not only the demand for greater voice of recipient countries but also as a driver for raising development effectiveness (Ramalingam, 2013; Martini et al., 2012). At the same time, the need for robust capacities in developing recipient countries, strong institutions, accountable systems, and local expertise have also emerged as important concerns in ensuring that recipient countries can fully own and manage their development processes (Tortora, 2011). Both recipient and provider countries have come to recognise that developing institutionalised partnerships at the country level promotes the cause of development effectiveness (Martini et al., 2012). This also received endorsement in the Deauville G8 Declaration (G8 Summit, 2011), which asserted that responsibility for aid effectiveness should be shared by both, the provider and recipient countries. However, literature survey does not provide enough evidence that the perspectives of recipient countries are being considered in practice beyond the remit of aid. The diversity of forms and players in the arena of development cooperation has yet to be given due credence in the development effectiveness discourse.

10 The need to capture the upstream and downstream impacts of development interventions has been particularly emphasised by experts in Focus Group Discussions and Expert Group Meetings held during the course of this study.

After the global financial crisis of 2007-2008, aid outflows and whether provider country interests are appropriately served were carefully examined. There has been a growing inclination among development partners to increasingly listen to the voices of their core funding constituencies (taxpayers and donor agencies), as opposed to the voice of recipient countries (Jackson, 2012). The general aid allocation mechanism has been tainted by the practice of provider countries supporting politically aligned recipient countries through higher ODA flows (Ramalingam, 2013). As mentioned, a number of studies found that many provider countries' aid allocations have been primarily driven by strategic interests that do not consider development outcomes as a factor in decision making (Alesina & Dollar, 2000; Faye & Niehus, 2012)¹¹. Literature review shows that the global aid architecture started questioning the effectiveness of aid in the 2010s; during the 2000–2010 period, the tone was dominated by optimistic notions about the effectiveness of development cooperation as voiced by the likes of Browne (2006), Ridell (2007), and Sachs (2005). The notion that developing countries' perspectives and their actual experiences were not given enough attention when deciding on aid disbursement and allocation is supported by the literature (Burall, Maxwell & Menocal, 2006; Easterly, 2007; Moyo, 2009; Ramalingam, 2013). The need for recipient countries to exercise greater strength in development cooperation power relationships should be recognised (Prizzon, Greenhill & Mustapha, 2016).

The profiles of recipient countries have been undergoing substantial changes; a significant number of them are in the process of leaving the least developed country group and a large number belonging to the low-income country group is moving up to the lower-middle-income country group (Committee for Development Policy, 2018). As Bhattacharya and Khan (2017) posit, this will leave the least developed country group largely "Africanised"¹². Concurrently, the number of fragile and conflict-affected countries is on the rise—currently, about 1.8 billion people live in fragile contexts.

Accountability frameworks to promote development effectiveness

There is consensus in the literature that accountability in development practice promotes the cause of development effectiveness. Accountability frameworks have to

11 Faye and Niehaus (2012) established a causal relationship between politics and aid for recipient countries. They found that the greater the alignment between the recipient party and the donor government, the more aid the country received on average during an election year. Alesina and Dollar (2000) studied the three biggest donor countries—Japan, France, and the United States—and found that each had its own strategy for allocating aid. Japan prioritised countries that exhibited similar voting patterns at the United Nations, France mostly supported former colonies, and the United States provided disproportionate aid to Israel and Egypt, which are its strategic allies.

12 Africa also hosts almost half of the people who live in extreme poverty (World Bank, 2018).

embrace the entire spectrum of development cooperation—the way cooperation is designed, how it is implemented, and whether the expected results are being generated (Jackson, 2012)¹³. Indeed, successful implementation of the SDGs hinges on high levels of development effectiveness, which in turn depend on a high level of accountability. Accountability may be viewed from several vantage points.

Mutual accountability between development partners and recipients is essential to ensure high levels of development effectiveness. The concept has evolved with the evolution of the development effectiveness architecture and at present increasingly focuses on mutual learning and knowledge sharing between providers and recipients. In view of the SDGs, mutual accountability requires the participation of a broader range of stakeholders including local governments in the recipient country and civil society stakeholders.

Vertical accountability in recipient countries is a crucial aspect of ensuring development effectiveness. This can be viewed as a principal-agent issue such as elections, where the principals (voters) bring the agents (governments) to account (Ocampo & Arteaga, 2014). An important aspect of this is to ensure tripartite domestic accountability concerning the roles to be played by the government, civil society and the private sector (Kharas, 2012). Klingebiel (2012) argues that in some cases, vertical accountability is costly and entails numerous compromises. This is true, for example, if national development strategies are to be coordinated and implementation is to be done through joint monitoring initiatives.

Coordination among development partners is widely promoted for encouraging harmonisation of programmes and systems, avoiding duplication and aid fragmentation, and thus reducing the burden and transaction costs for beneficiaries engaged in multiple development interventions with many partners.

Accountability of development partners to funding providers becomes an issue when a certain amount of a national budget is annually earmarked for development finance provided by a development partner, which is usually a developed country. This amount is sometimes allocated through direct bilateral mechanisms or multilateral agencies, which tend to be accountable to provider countries and the taxpayers of provider countries through parliamentary oversight. In the case of multilateral development partners, this type of accountability lies with funding providers.

13 Jackson (2012) posits that incorporating value for money in development cooperation discussions is important to raise the accountability of development partners to taxpayers as well as beneficiaries (recipient countries and individuals).

Accountability systems in recipient countries are geared to ensuring that they reap the expected benefits from external assistance through the monitoring of outcomes (Wolfensohn, 2005). When it comes to oversight mechanisms, national accountability systems can be potent. Development partners often have legal obligations to follow recipient country procedures and policies and if proper domestic accountability systems reinforce this, it has a positive effect on development outcomes. However, this in turn depends on whether necessary capacities are in place in recipient countries.

Accountability as regards the management of development funds remains a crucial aspect of ensuring development effectiveness. A major concern in the management of development funds is the issue of inefficiency, corruption, and leakages involving the public system of provider and recipient countries. Some stakeholders and analysts tend to be sceptical about the amount of resources reaching the final beneficiaries. Okun (1975) initially explored this concept by estimating that up to 15% of leakages are to be expected in a public system. He described how a part of the money being transferred from the rich to the poor would inevitably dissipate in inefficiencies related to administrative costs, tax collection, transfer systems, reduced work effort, and changes in socio-economic attitudes. This concern remains widespread today.

The aforementioned levels and types of accountability do not automatically or necessarily complement each other; on the other hand, they are not mutually exclusive. It can be gleaned from the literature that where the accountability framework in view of development cooperation is strong and sound, development effectiveness tends to be higher. In the past, the (implicit) focus was on accountability as regards outcomes of development support (e.g., aid) on the part of recipients to providers. This provider-oriented view tends to divert the focus from recipient countries' perspectives on development cooperation (bypassing partners' national systems, functioning project islands, providers' implementation interests, etc.). Conceptually, this particular way of looking at development effectiveness shifted in tandem with the shift of focus from aid effectiveness (in terms of the Paris Declaration). The new focus on development effectiveness gave primacy to recipient countries' perspectives in the accountability framework, both as regards processes and outcomes of development cooperation.

There is broad agreement in the literature that for accountability frameworks to be effective, they need to engage and get support from the highest levels of political power (Carothers & Brechenmacher, 2014). This works better when clear roles, rights, and responsibilities are assigned to the various parties involved. For an accountability framework to be useful and able to deliver and propel change, clear and realistic targets need to be agreed upon. Regular review of progress has to be in place and reporting on this in a transparent manner is a precondition.

Accountability frameworks also need to be backed up by technically sound monitoring systems that use empirical and credible methods of measurement. This is where indicators of effectiveness become critically important since what is accomplished is usually what is being measured (Kusek & Rist, 2004). Monitoring of progress in turn hinges on the availability of relevant and reliable data. Capacities need to be in place, involving all partners to be able to conduct appropriate monitoring, evaluate results, and report transparently to peers and the public. In the context of the SDGs, voluntary national reviews are both a monitoring exercise as well as a global accountability exercise involving SDG-implementing countries and the global community, with accountability running both ways. However, the principles, standards, criteria, and norms of such accountability needed under the SDGs have not yet been clearly articulated.

The need to take the discourse on development effectiveness forward, in view of the SDGs, has assumed both importance and urgency. It is important to ensure that the SDGs get delivered through development cooperation; this is urgent because the lead time for attaining the SDGs is becoming shorter as we move towards 2030. Well-defined metrics of measurement could play an important role in instituting an appropriate system for monitoring progress on SDG delivery and thereby helping to raise the development effectiveness.

Measurements of development effectiveness of development cooperation

The evolution of the concept of development effectiveness has important implications for a framework of assessment and associated principles, processes, and outcomes. There is a general agreement that proper measurement of effectiveness is key to monitoring the quality of implementation and ensuring that expected developmental outcomes are attained. This is also important to ensure accountability. In view of this, existing methodologies used to assess the effectiveness of different aspects of a development intervention are first examined.

The literature review indicates that measurement of development effectiveness may be broadly classified into two types of assessment: process assessment and results assessment. The review underscores the need to capture development effectiveness by taking cognisance of the entire range of results—in terms of inputs, outputs, outcomes, and impacts. If the results chain as suggested by Kusek and Rist (2004) is considered, an outcome is at the micro level and may be observed in the short term; outputs, outcomes, and impacts are viewed as different forms of results, with the forms evolving over time

(over the short and long term) and across levels of analysis (micro, meso, and macro). However, this entails increasing involvement and contribution of other factors, beyond the particular development intervention. What emerges from the literature review is that the higher the results are up the chain, the more difficult it is to assess development effectiveness; attribution remains a major challenge in this connection. Impact evaluation as well as monitoring and evaluation techniques have tended to remain very much project-specific and also specific to respective provider organisations and countries.

As far as new modalities of development cooperation such as SSC and blended finance deals are concerned, conceptual and institutional aspects are still in the process of development. This constraints assessment of development effectiveness in view of new developments. Additionally, the lack of adequate data is emerging as a critical concern and challenge in this connection.

Aid effectiveness agreements such as the Paris Declaration, Accra Agenda for Action, and Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation emphasise the importance of managing for results (OECD, 2005; OECD, 2008; and OECD, 2011). The United Nations General Assembly's review of results-based management in 2008 underlined that, notwithstanding some conceptual and practical problems, it remains the dominating operational framework of the development industry¹⁴. Results-based management is conceptualised on the theory of change, and development interventions are built on a particular theory of change or programme theory (Funnell & Rogers, 2011; Levison-Johnson, Dewey & Wandersman, 2009; Weiss, 1997). This constitutes the base for assessing the development effectiveness of any development intervention. As White and Phillips (2012) suggest, practitioners and academics have interpreted the theory of change in different ways, like impact theory, logic model, results framework, and outcome mapping. In essence, however, they all refer to the same concept.

Results-based management is a management approach that emphasises development results in planning, implementation, monitoring, learning, and reporting. As Kusek and Rist (2004) posit, a results framework is conceptually intuitive and presents a logical hierarchical chain of results, each feeding into the next level, and thus helps provide controls and clarity when troubleshooting.

A theory of change is often divided into two major parts: one refers to a theory of how interventions are implemented (i.e., theory of action), while the other refers to the changes that occur in a society or among beneficiaries as a result of an intervention

¹⁴ The purpose of results-based management is to assist organisational learning, improve performance, and enhance accountability and transparency (UNDG, 2011).

(i.e., theory of change). Weiss (1997) distinguishes between implementation theory, the chronological steps of project activity, and programme theory, and the psychosocial transformations that occur in a community receiving an intervention. Donaldson (2007) refers to these two elements as process theory and impact theory. This distinction is more recent as there has been a shift in the focus of assessing development effectiveness from the effectiveness of the process to that of the result.

A theory of change affects all aspects of the project cycle and is relevant for conducting all development management functions from design to implementation, monitoring, and evaluation (Funnell & Rogers, 2011). Often interventions fail merely because they have been designed with a poor logical model, or the theory of change was not based on real evidence (Davies, 2012; White, 2013). Assessment from the perspective of the theory of change may also reveal risks, assumptions, and other socio-economic, institutional, and environmental forces as well as endogenous and exogenous

factors, which affect development outcomes, and therefore can be used as confounding variables during impact evaluation processes. The argument here is that to conduct a proper evaluation of any policy or programme, the intervention logic needs to be spelled out and defined and should be framed by managers, evaluators, and stakeholders.

Monitoring and evaluation exercises are diverse since the modalities of development interventions tend to vary, as do objectives and principles pursued by different organisations (Donaldson, 2005). Even within one organisation, assessments of interventions tend to be different depending on analysts and evaluators who operate with different frameworks and models. This makes the aggregation of results difficult, making the task of capturing and observing the overall contribution of even a single intervention (or for that matter, organisation) a complex exercise (White, 2005)¹⁵. Literature review indicates that evaluations can vary significantly depending on their purpose, the questions being asked,



Assessments of interventions tend to be different depending on analysts and evaluators who operate with different frameworks and models.

¹⁵ As White (2005) elucidates, interventions can be evaluated using a multitude of lenses. For instance, client satisfaction, coverage, achieved results, unintended results, implementation process, quality of intervention, coherence and coordination, contribution to national priorities, and cross-cutting issues (e.g., gender, participation, and capacity development). The OECD Evaluation Network, for example, uses five criteria for evaluating development assistance, namely relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability.

the intended audience, conceptual frameworks, the context of an intervention, and the type of analysis being undertaken, as well as the particular methods and approaches employed by the evaluator.

Literature survey also shows that evaluations and assessments of development cooperation have evolved. For instance, Scriven (1976) defined evaluations as either formative or summative in their purpose¹⁶. Other formative exercises are diagnostics and situational analysis, which precede actual interventions on the ground and are carried out with the intention of informing the design of an intervention. Owen and Rogers (1999) suggest several evaluation forms including proactive, clarificative, interactive, monitoring, and impact. Kusek and Rist (2004) illustrate other evaluation approaches such as performance-logic chain, pre-implementation, case study, rapid appraisal, process implementation, impact, and meta-evaluation. Patton (2011) makes a case for a new "developmental evaluation" to be used for innovation, change, and learning in complex and evolving interventions that are common in development settings in developing countries. Viewing results at a disaggregated level is also common in monitoring and evaluation exercises. Monitoring, process, and implementation evaluations usually look at factors that are controlled by involved organisations such as inputs, activities, and outputs.

All development programmes have in-built financial management systems. Typical annual reports of organisations that handle development finance indicate how much money has been given, for what, to whom, and where. However, efficient management of development finance could also serve as a tool for ensuring development effectiveness. Financial auditing is essential for improving development effectiveness for several reasons. Reporting of this kind promotes accountability and the data made available can be used to assess the quantity and quality of disbursed development cooperation funds. Wastage and leakage related to the use of development resources are common complaints, as is evident from the literature survey. Many authors have focused on financial and consequently developmental losses originating from costly services and products, expensive delivery mechanisms, high transaction costs, organisational overheads, and corruption (Calderisi, 2006; Dichter, 2003; Easterly 2007; Moyo, 2009). Some prominent studies on these issues include Jepma's (1991) analysis of tied aid and ActionAid's (2005) report on phantom aid. Although there is no clear consensus about exactly how much of development aid trickles down to the final beneficiaries, commentators at the International Conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey thought that only

16 Formative evaluation is usually done internally while the programme is still in progress, with the purpose of improvement, learning, and refining a specific development product or service. Monitoring and process evaluation are thus often associated with formative evaluation. Summative evaluation, on the other hand, is typically done at the end of an intervention to evaluate its final value, worth, and effectiveness.

about 30% of provided funds gets utilised for intended purposes. According to Easterly (2007), 40-60% of medicine sent to West Africa is stolen before it reaches clinics and sold on the black market.

Analytical tools such as public expenditure tracking surveys and quantitative service delivery surveys are deployed to capture the use of funds involved in development cooperation. These are typically conducted in sectors such as education and health (Dehn, Reinikka, & Svensson, as cited in Bourguignon & Pereira da Silva, 2003; Lindelöw & Wagstaff, 2003)¹⁷. Both public expenditure tracking surveys and quantitative service delivery surveys have been useful in tracking different forms of corruption, absenteeism, funding delays, inequitable allocations, misuse of services, and institutional inefficiencies (Reinikka & Svensson, 2006). All these have a bearing on the development effectiveness of development cooperation. These types of analytical exercises can be expensive and time-consuming. To be effective, they also need a high degree of political support. On the other hand, the findings can also lead to drastic institutional changes (Reinikka & Svensson, 2006).

Quality of Official Development Assistance, an evaluation pioneered by the Center for Global Development (Birdshall, Kharas, & Perakis, 2011), assesses the quality of the aid provided by different countries and multilateral organisations by benchmarking these countries and organisations against each other, on an annual basis, based on four dimensions: maximising efficiency, fostering institutions, reducing the burden on partner countries, and transparency and learning. This exercise is carried out with the help of 31 indicators¹⁸.

The methods discussed so far pay attention primarily to processes, good practices, and quality of assistance as well as agree on a set of principles for engagement. On the contrary, impact evaluation exercises are focused mainly on results.

17 Through careful review of documents, official records, targeted interviews, and targeted questionnaires, public expenditure tracking surveys examine the flow of resources through layers of public administration (i.e., the inputs and the outputs), while quantitative service delivery surveys are more concerned with local-level institutions (e.g., schools and clinics), which transform received funds into services for expected beneficiaries. In quantitative service delivery surveys, the issues of accountability, staff management, incentives, and quality of services are monitored and evaluated. Because of the propensity by corrupt officials to misreport, data are often triangulated and validated from multiple angles, which include users, staff, and administrators at different levels.

18 Four editions of Quality of Official Development Assistance have been released so far—2010, 2011, 2014, and 2018. The 2018 edition differs from the previous three editions in terms of indicators and data sources and has 24 indicators under four dimensions.

Impact evaluations are devoted to examining whether a programme, treatment, or intervention caused any particular change in the intended outcome. Assessing the impact of the programme is done by measuring the difference between the treatment group and the control group (Gertler, Martinez, Premand, Rawlings & Vermeersch, 2011)¹⁹. The underlying assumption in this is that all endogenous and exogenous factors remain the same throughout the process and then the difference between the treatment and control groups is the impact (or net effect) of a particular development intervention. Cook & Campbell (1979) explain that to conduct an impact evaluation, three conditions—covariation, temporal precedence, and no plausible alternative—must be met before a cause-effect relation in a development intervention can be inferred. As Besharati (2019), Davies (2012), and Todd (2012) suggest, conventional methods used for impact evaluations are interrupted time-series analysis, difference-in-difference analysis, regression discontinuity analysis, and cross-section analysis.

Macro-level impact evaluations use cross-country econometric models using mostly cross-section and panel data (Neumayer, 2003) and various types of multivariate regression analysis. Here, the effectiveness of development interventions is primarily assessed with respect to the economic growth of recipient countries (e.g., Guillaumont & Chauvet, 2001). Such aid-growth models are often expanded to capture the impact of how other variables affect the impact of development interventions. Alesina and Dollar (2000), Brumm (2003), Easterly and Levine (2003), and Roodman (2008) have attempted to assess whether aid—in general—makes a difference in terms of the development of developing countries. Some studies have found a positive relationship between ODA and growth (e.g., Levy, 1988; Marris, 1970; Riddell, 2007). However, a large segment of research concludes that aid has little or no developmental impact on recipient countries (e.g., Boone, 1996; Doucouliagos & Paldam, 2009; Mosley, 1980) and sometimes even a negative effect (e.g., Knack, 2001; Moss, Pettersson & Van de Walle, 2006).

Micro-level impact evaluations tend to be more precise as they contain fewer factors to control for compared to macro-level ones. This makes the task of assessing development effectiveness at the macro level more complex; attribution remains a significant problem. Micro-level evaluations capture the impact of organisations' programmes on intended recipients (individuals) who have been directly affected by an intervention.

The micro-macro paradox in capturing development impacts was first mentioned by Mosley (1986) and later confirmed by Boone (1996). As can be derived from the above discussion, when evaluating micro-level development interventions of different organisations, the vast majority of assessment reports alluded to resounding success

19 A control group is selected in a manner so that it is identical (or at least very similar) to the treatment group.

of concerned interventions. However, when macro-level econometric studies on the combined effects of all interventions were conducted at the country level, the results tended to be somewhat disappointing. In other words, the aggregate impact of a development programme is less than the sum of its parts.

Some academics have recently devoted their attention to micro-level analyses, arguing that small, punctual measures lead to significant results in economic development. They claim that small-scale policies such as providing de-worming treatments or offering nutritional supplements to students are very effective in reducing poverty and thus should be treated as a priority by those willing to promote economic growth around the world. Yet, Banerjee and Duflo (2012) argue that however interesting the micro-level studies may be, small policy reforms can only be implemented within a relatively stable social structure. Otherwise, it is improbable that they will be carried out appropriately, if at all. Therefore, macro factors still matter. The following observations confirm the importance of macro-level studies: there are negative factors in the provision of aid (e.g., the so-called aid curse), which cause negative consequences for recipient countries that only become evident at the macro level (e.g., inflation, the Dutch disease, brain drain from government to international organisations, indirect fuelling of corruption, support for non-democratic forces, and conflicts); and there are detrimental effects on aid-receiving governments, which have to bear high transaction costs of dealing with multiple development organisations (Howes, Otor & Rogers, 2011).

In recent years, econometric models have been met with growing scepticism from the vantage points of availability of timely and accurate data, the lagged responses of developmental interventions, sample selection bias, and the inability to adequately capture positive and negative externalities (Arndt, Jones & Tarp, 2006; Andrabi, Das, Khwaja, & Zajonc, 2011; Clemens, Radelet, & Bhavnani, 2004; Deaton, 2009; Dehejia, 2013; Evans, Kremmer, & Ngatia, 2014; Howes et al., 2011;).

Cost-benefit analysis and cost-effectiveness analysis (e.g., Levin & McEwan, 2001; Jackson, 2012) examine whether and to what extent the costs (inputs) of an intervention outweigh benefits (i.e., the progression or positive changes evident as results [outputs or outcomes]) and what is the net economic impact. Jackson (2012) proposes cost-effectiveness analysis as a tool to measure the value for money of aid interventions as well as a method to evaluate net development (economic) impact of an aid intervention where monetising the outcomes is not possible or appropriate. For example, a measure such as quality-adjusted life years is used in assessing a development intervention in the health sector. On the other hand, for cost-benefit analysis, expected benefits (outcomes) are estimated and monetised while accounting for inflation. Notably, in anticipation of the huge resource requirement for implementing the SDGs, the issue of ensuring good

value for money has been gaining prominence in relevant literature (e.g., Jackson, 2012; Giordano, 2017; Jayasuriya, 2018). Value for money is described as striking the best balance between the “three E’s”—economy, efficiency and effectiveness, with the addition of a fourth E, namely equity in view of inclusive development and distributive justice.

Assessing the effectiveness of SSC

As mentioned, the emergence of SSC in the development cooperation landscape has not only added to the diverse nature of aid delivery but also the complexity of development assessment. The various measurement issues and tools discussed above in this section typically focus on traditional development assistance and mostly reflect Western or North-led ideologies. The arguments favouring a distinct framework for assessing SSC have been informed by the distinct features departure of SSC vis-à-vis traditional North-South type partnerships concerning the following issues: actors (Southern providers and Southern recipients as against Northern providers and Southern recipients), types of participants (both providers and recipients being developing countries in SSC), areas concerned (significant shares of SSC involve cross-border, regional, and sub-regional cooperation projects), sectors receiving development finance (a large part involves infrastructure projects), and the dual nature of some providers (some are also recipient countries).

Lack of a clear, common assessment framework makes monitoring and evaluation of SSC challenging (De Mello e Souza, Esteves, Assunção, Adams, Pomeroy & Paz, 2016). As Fues (2016) and Besharati (2013; 2019) posit, SSC providers have not yet agreed to a shared narrative on norms, standards, and principles that could be considered as a reference point for measuring the development effectiveness of SSC. Concepts and definitions as regards SSC are still vague and contested. There is no consensus among involved Southern countries about an institutionalised mechanism in this connection.

An agreed system to assess the development effectiveness of SSC-related collaboration is an ongoing endeavour. The Network of Southern Think-tanks has attempted to construct a framework for assessment in this regard²⁰. As explained in Besharati et al. (2017), the Network of Southern Think-tanks’ monitoring and evaluation framework for SSC flows has a set of 20 indicators, with five dimensions (inclusive national ownership; horizontality; self-reliance and sustainability; accountability and transparency;

20 Established in 2015 and then refined and finalised in 2017 after a number of expert group meetings and field-based SSC case studies, the framework operationalises various conceptual issues related to the quality and development effectiveness of SSC.

development efficiency)²¹. Each indicator is accompanied by guiding questions and suggestions for data collection methods and potential sources of information. The idea is to guide monitoring and evaluation processes around the quality of South-South partnerships for development. The framework relies on data collected from secondary documents and also from interviews with a diversity of stakeholders from both provider and recipient countries. It also uses experiential observations from field-based research.

An analytical appraisal of the Network of Southern Think-tanks framework reveals the followings. First, the five key dimensions used to assess the effectiveness of SSC are not significantly different from the principles of aid effectiveness (Ali, 2018; Besharati, Moilwa, Khunou, & Garelli, 2015; Besharati, 2019). Second, the five broad dimensions in the framework are more or less the same as those that China officially endorsed in its policy documents on foreign aid, with the exception of accountability and transparency (Ali, 2018). Moreover, the Network of Southern Think-tanks' set of indicators is driven predominantly by qualitative approaches. There have been suggestions to complement the qualitative assessments of SSC deals with more systematic quantitative evaluations. However, due to lack of concrete statistical data differentiating aid, concessional loans, and investment, quantitatively examining SSC is a challenging task (Ali, 2018; Besharati et al. 2015; Besharati, 2019).

Assessing the effectiveness of blended finance deals

The discourse on development effectiveness of blended finance deals has added new considerations in assessing the effectiveness of development cooperation. This discourse is relatively novel since blended finance deals are a new phenomenon for the majority of developing countries. Whether blended finance is crowding in or crowding out private sector investment, whether it is contributing to increasing competitiveness in markets or undermining it, and whether the developmental impacts are appropriately reflected in user fees, charges, and prices concerning deliverables—these have emerged as questions that need to be answered in assessing the development effectiveness of projects supported by blended finance. The fact that in most cases blended finance projects have yet to provide results (the majority of projects are ongoing) makes the

21 The five dimensions, with respective indicators, are: Inclusive national ownership (multi-stakeholder partnerships, people-centred inclusivity, demand-driven, and non-conditionality); horizontality (mutual benefit, shared decisions and resources, trust and solidarity, and global political coalitions); self-reliance and sustainability (capacity building, knowledge and technology transfer, use country systems and human resources, and domestic revenue generation); accountability and transparency (data management and reporting, monitoring and evaluation systems, transparency and access to information, and mutual accountability and joint reviews) and development efficiency (flexibility and adaptation, time and cost-efficiency, internal and external coordination, and policy coherence for development).

exercise even more challenging. Ex-ante assessments (ahead of subsequent ex-post analysis) have emerged as a necessity in view of this.

United Nations Capital Development Fund (2018) suggests that for blended finance deals where ODA is involved, the aid effectiveness principles should hold. The principles of blended finance developed by the United Nations and the group of Development Finance Institutions may be used to guide assessment of blended finance deals.

The literature review in the first instance reveals that capturing the developmental effects of development cooperation is not easy. Positive and negative externalities, the availability of adequate and timely data, lagged responses and the micro-macro paradox—these are essential considerations in the context of such an exercise, but they are not easy to capture. The diversity of actors in the development cooperation landscape and the multi-dimensional development objectives that the SDGs aspire to attain, make this task even more difficult.

On the other hand, the literature review gives pointers for several observations to be made. The best ways to capture development effectiveness remain an ongoing endeavour. No one approach is ideal. The tools to assess development effectiveness need to take cognisance of a varied range of elements such as. project type, forms of support, actors involved, etc. While project (micro-level) effects can be reliably captured with varying degrees of accuracy, adequately capturing the impacts at aggregated levels is difficult. The current metrics do not aptly capture upstream and downstream effects and externalities; The current parameters are not tuned to capturing the triangulation of the three pillars of sustainability as per the 2030 Agenda (i.e. social, economic, and environmental), synergies and trade-offs, and the inclusiveness aspects as embedded in the SDGs. The appropriate assessment of the development effectiveness of SSC and blended finance deals is an area that should be further explored for the various reasons mentioned above. Consequently, as the literature review bears out, there is a need for developing a common but differentiated framework and metrics to assess development effectiveness.

Mapping the knowledge gaps and implications for assessing development effectiveness at the country level

This study has captured the state of knowledge in the context of the development effectiveness discourse. In undertaking this exercise, the study has also identified some of the knowledge gaps that are emerging with respect to assessing development effectiveness

in view of the new developments in the development cooperation architecture, particularly in the context of the SDGs.

Knowledge gaps

Existing methodologies for the assessment of development effectiveness do not adequately capture recipient countries' experiences.

The five principles of the Paris Declaration (OECD, 2005) have served as the foundation for developing methodologies to assess the development effectiveness. However, these principles have focused primarily on aid. A major criticism of this relates to the relatively less importance accorded to country contexts as highlighted by Glennie (2011) and Quibria (2014), which underscores that recipient countries are often ill-equipped to deal with the issues of allocation, design, and delivery of foreign assistance including aid. Coherence within recipient countries' policies requires parallel and reinforcing actions across government institutions, which recipient countries often lack. Given the diversity of recipient countries, ranging from well-run ones to fragile and conflict-affected states, more flexible, adaptive, context-specific, and locally driven approaches to ensure higher levels of development effectiveness are required. At the same time, recipient countries themselves need to be adequately prepared to do the needful on their part. Moreover, discussions on development effectiveness ought to consider the shifting profile of recipient countries. The financial assistance needs of recipient countries have their unique features, as mentioned earlier, and these features ought to inform development cooperation allocations and disbursements as well as provider countries' expectations about outcomes of development interventions. Thus, there is increasing urgency for development effectiveness to be assessed by taking cognisance of country-specific contexts.

Emerging diversity has yet to be anchored in a commonly accepted development effectiveness framework

At the international level, there is no clear institutional platform for global reporting on SSC or blended finance in the same way that the OECD-DAC is the authoritative reference point for information on North-South cooperation. There is a pressing need for a global forum where involved stakeholders could define, measure, regularly analyse, monitor, and account for emerging forms of development cooperation. A common understanding needs to be developed towards this. An information hub dedicated to the collection, coordination, compilation, processing, and dissemination of development cooperation data from middle-income countries is also needed. This is particularly relevant for SSC.

While doing away with "tied aid" was seen as an important factor in increasing the development effectiveness of North-South cooperation, the presence of conditionalities in the context of SSC is the new normal. Bhattacharya and Rashmin (2016) present evidence-based concerns about the nature of the concessionality of SSC. Concerns as regards debt burden, debt servicing, and debt sustainability have added new dimensions to this discourse, underscoring the need to look at development effectiveness from the medium to the long-term lens as well.

As Ramalingam (2013) observes, for aid (development cooperation) to be more effective in the future, it needs to be "fluid, dynamic, emergent." One or more platforms need to be established where Southern partners can jointly define, monitor, and evaluate development cooperation, thereby encouraging learning and further development of South-South development partnerships (Besharati, 2019). Even OECD-DAC platforms, including the GPEDC, have been criticised for being heavily driven by Northern countries and not adequately representative of significant SSC players (Besharati, 2019). Accordingly, if properly defined, the new frameworks could not only contribute to strengthening the voice of the South but also increase the effectiveness of SSC.

The development effectiveness architecture has yet to be appropriately informed by the aspirations of the 2030 Agenda

Since the SDGs are integrated and interdependent, the effectiveness of a specific development cooperation intervention needs to be assessed from a more comprehensive and sophisticated perspective. Achievement of the SDGs hinges on clearly defined roles and responsibilities for various involved actors, which should be held accountable through transparent mechanisms to assess performance, interventions and results. Social and environmental aspects of development should be assessed by giving them importance equal to economic growth objectives.

Achievement of the SDGs also hinges on a revitalised global partnership for sustainable development (United Nations, 2018). Such a partnership would ideally bring together governments, civil society, the private sector, international organisations, and other actors towards a common global development vision. Ensuring greater effectiveness in the SDG era requires coordinated and effective participation of these stakeholders in implementation and monitoring of development cooperation. Thus, while development effectiveness primarily hinges on country-specific measures, much also depends on collaborative regional and global initiatives as required. As was discussed in the preceding section, development effectiveness in view of the SDGs also calls for factoring in synergies, trade-offs, and upstream and downstream externalities in assessment metrics.

Existing frameworks to assess development effectiveness are dominated by process assessment frameworks

The literature survey indicates that development assessment frameworks tend to be dominated by the assessment of process elements as inputs, and activities as a measure of execution of the cooperation. Outputs, outcomes, and impacts as results of development cooperation tend to get less rigorous attention because of the limitations of the tools to capture the effects caused often by the so-called attribution factor. Current frameworks (e.g., the DAC-driven GPEDC) have been criticised for putting relatively more emphasis on process elements related to alignment, harmonisation, transparency, and accountability. As mentioned earlier, effective processes translating into impactful outcomes can deliver increased development effectiveness, which is where the focus has to be.

Lack of data has emerged as a major bottleneck in measuring the effectiveness of new and innovative development finance

Reporting on SSC is weak and inconsistent, in significant part due to the lack of a common definition and conceptual framework. This also results from the data limitations and weak information management systems of most emerging development partners, as they struggle to produce accurate aggregate data regarding their total development cooperation. A number of factors make it difficult for the emerging Southern development partners to comply with the strict standards and complex systems of accounting by the OECD-DAC. These include poor information management, lack of accountability, weak results management capacities, and lack of political will (Besharati, 2013; 2019; Steering Committee of the Bogota High Level Event, 2010; United Nations Economic and Social Council, 2008). Transparency and rigour are extremely weak in aid reporting by emerging development partners (Besharati 2013; De Mello e Souza, 2013; United Nations Economic and Social Council, 2008).



Reporting on South-South cooperation is weak and inconsistent, due to the lack of a common definition and conceptual framework.

Implications for country studies

From the perspective of designing an appropriate framework for assessing the development effectiveness at the country level, a number of conclusions emerge from the literature review undertaken in this study. Literature review reveals that from the perspective of development effectiveness, it is important to capture both the efficacy of process elements and the quality of outcomes. A number of observations can be made following the literature survey.

The assessment framework has to be sensitive to specific forms of financial support. As the literature review reveals, the architecture of development cooperation has moved beyond aid to embrace an increasingly large number of actors—SSC partners, largely untapped private sector resources such as private philanthropic foundations, the entwining of private capital and aid through blended finance, and others. The traditional North-South binary development cooperation is being complemented by, and in some instances competing with, these new sources. While traditional aid is assessed primarily from the vantage point of the Paris Declaration, the distinctive features of emerging forms of development cooperation call for a renewed look at how development effectiveness is to be assessed. For example, the issue of untied aid has to be considered in view of the conditionalities that are embedded in the North-South and South-South types of development cooperation.

Given recent experiences, as seen in the case of several SSC projects, assessment of development effectiveness ought to also consider downstream issues such as debt liability and debt sustainability. In the case of blended finance deals, recipient countries need to assess the crowding-in effect of ODA and concessional flows (additionality) and critically examine whether these deals are causing market distortions, creating monopolies, resulting in private gains at the cost of public gains, or crowding out other actors in national financial markets. The effectiveness of ODA is now also being assessed from the vantage point of the new role of enabling recipient countries to mobilise additional funds, for example, for implementing large-scale infrastructure projects.

Transparency and accountability have emerged as essential concerns to ensure maximum effectiveness of development cooperation. Development practitioners increasingly recognise that development impacts and effectiveness of development cooperation are closely associated with levels of transparency in the negotiation process as well as accountability in implementation. Aid conditionalities in SSC and terms of a negotiated settlement in blended finance deals have added urgency to these initiatives. Similarly, putting in place an appropriate accountability framework has assumed heightened importance to ensure development effectiveness. To a large extent,

development effectiveness hinges on whether accountability frameworks have been adequately put into place in projects.

The SDGs have added new dimensions in assessing development effectiveness. As the literature survey indicates, the SDGs have given prominence and importance to the need for embedding the triangulation of economic growth, social inclusiveness, and environmental sustainability in assessing development effectiveness. The trade-offs and synergies associated with attaining the 2030 Agenda need to be factored into the assessment of development effectiveness to ensure attainment of specific SDGs. The shift from provider-centric evaluative metrics to recipient-centric ones would be strengthened by the emphasis on attaining the SDGs in the assessment framework.

An essential aspect of assessing development effectiveness also relates to attaining the 2030 Agenda's pledge to leave no one behind, which puts the interests of the farthest first in recipient countries. Equity and distribution aspects have emerged as important concerns in the delivery of outcomes and impacts. Democratisation in decision-making processes and inclusion in the distribution of development outcomes have emerged as key criteria to measure the development effectiveness from the perspective of recipient countries in the SDG era.

In view of the SDGs, and taking a cue from the principal elements of development effectiveness framework as presented by Almasifard (2019), the following elements can be identified as important in terms of assessing development effectiveness at the recipient country level: empowerment (a development intervention should help empower citizens of recipient countries to claim their rights); justice (with development support, recipient countries should strive to transform their societies that are based on equity and social justice); sustainability (development interventions should support sustainable development in recipient countries); equality and solidarity (the principles of equality and solidarity should inform interactions among the community of countries, both providers and recipients); sovereignty (development cooperation should encourage independent democratic development); and self-reliance (recipient countries ought to reduce aid dependency and strive towards self-reliance).

What emerges from the literature survey is that there is a need to develop common but differentiated framework for assessing development effectiveness at the country level. Rather than having different frameworks for different types of development finance, there is a justification for identifying common elements of assessment as well as specific ones. Literature review shows that the principles against which development effectiveness needs to be measured include common criteria such as national ownership of the recipient country, alignment with national development priorities, and presence of transparency

and accountability in the conduct of development implementation. Assessing these process elements is critical for achieving expected development outcomes and impacts. For example, in the case of blended finance deals where private sector stakeholders are on the recipient side and international financial organisations tend to be in the driver's seat, there is a need to assess development cooperation against country alignment and priorities. Ensuring coherence of SSC with domestic priorities in recipient countries is equally important.


At the same time, there is a need to capture elements specific to a particular type of development cooperation. For instance, in the cases of SSC (e.g., debt sustainability) and blended finance (e.g., market distortion), there may be specific aspects that need to be captured through assessment metrics. Because of the SDGs, trade-offs, synergies, and distributional impacts need to be captured in impact assessments. It was also revealed in the literature survey that synergies and trade-offs are contextual to countries, as are upstream and downstream externalities. Hence the need for a differentiated approach.

At the results end, as mentioned, the higher vantage point from which the results are assessed, the more difficult it gets to capture the attribution of a particular development intervention to development effectiveness. However, since essential synergies and trade-offs are involved, capturing macro-level impacts is important to have a comprehensive assessment of development cooperation. The challenge in assessing development effectiveness at the project level is that while immediate impacts can be evaluated at the micro level (short-term), many of the meso-level (intermediate) and particularly macro-level (overall and medium-term) impacts are not easy to capture. Techniques to assess the micro-level impacts of development cooperation are generally found to be well-developed at the level of projects. At the macro level, medium-term impacts are difficult to assess because of the multiplicity of factors involved in generating outcomes and because of the well-known attribution problem. On the other hand, the importance of capturing the synergies, trade-offs, and positive and negative externalities, particularly in view of the SDGs, remains a significant concern—they can be captured only at the meso and macro levels. Hence, a case can be made in favour of assessing development effectiveness at the meso level, complemented by micro-level assessment.

Figure 2 develops guiding elements for a framework for assessing development effectiveness for country studies by drawing on insights gleaned from the literature survey. The importance of both process assessment and outcome evaluation is highlighted in the framework. The need for both of these aspects of development effectiveness must be emphasised, as revealed by the literature survey.

Figure 2. Guiding elements for an assessment framework at the country level

Assessment of development effectiveness of development cooperation		
Guiding elements	Process	Results
Factors to be considered	Decentralisation of the process of development intervention; Inclusivity in the decision-making process; Use of national process; Alignment of the development intervention objectives with the local needs and priorities; Accountability (of development partners, recipient countries, mutual accountability); Operational efficiency; Additionality; Transparency; Ownership (democratic and local)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Macro level: Economic growth; trade-offs and synergies; Additionality at the macro level (Catalysing effect); Reduced dependency on aid; Sustainable development (developmental changes which are economically, environmentally and socially sustainable). • Meso level: sector-wide lower dependency on aid. • Micro level: Higher inclusivity in the planning and implementation of the development intervention; Higher inclusion in target group (from LNOB perspective); attainment of development goals
Indicators	Programme design; Procurement (value for money and controls in procurement, open competition for awarding of contracts); Involvement of local sub-national level entities; Reliable, functional and updated national statistical system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific to type of development intervention. • Macro level:(e.g. employment generation, economic growth, poverty alleviation). • Meso level:(e.g. increased literacy). • Micro level: (number of household benefitting from the project).
Methods of assessment	Technique specific to the modality of development cooperation (ODA, SSC, or blended finance); Qualitative methods like perception survey of recipient and provider agencies, case studies; Monitoring and evaluation, Logic chain analysis; Diagnostic and situational Analysis; Development resource management; Network of Southern Think-Tanks' monitoring and evaluation framework for SSC flows	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact evaluation, Project-based monitoring and evaluation, and Cost-benefit analysis; Cross-country analysis; Randomised controlled trial; Auditing (external as well as internal); Perception survey; Case studies



Elaborated by the authors.

In view of the above discussion, and taking cognisance of the diversity of forms of development cooperation, insights from the literature survey indicate that assessment of development effectiveness at the country level should be defined primarily by the objectives set out to be attained through a particular development intervention. If the aim is to assess the development effectiveness of specific projects, assessment of process elements along with micro-level (project) results of development cooperation is required. However, this may leave out essential aspects of outcomes and impacts (leveraging, synergies, trade-offs, positive and negative externalities, etc.). From the SDG perspective, measurement of development effectiveness needs to capture these to the extent possible. From this perspective, it appears that capturing development effectiveness at the sectoral level (e.g., education, health, and infrastructure) could prove to be the preferred way to go. This exercise can be reinforced, since this is also important as indicated by the literature survey, through relevant project-level case studies. This way process elements of development effectiveness that have implications for outcomes and impacts, as well as the broader developmental outcomes at the meso level, could be captured.



Conclusion

As the literature review testifies, the literature on assessment of development effectiveness of development cooperation has evolved in significant ways over the years. First, with the profound changes in the development cooperation landscape (actors, forms, focus, SDGs, etc.), there was a need to think afresh and delve deeper into conceptual issues concerning what is meant by development effectiveness. Second, conceptual issues in connection with the assessment of development effectiveness have also undergone important changes, with the consequent need to develop new metrics to capture the effectiveness of development cooperation against the backdrop of the changing development cooperation landscape. Third, there have been significant shifts in the development effectiveness discourse—traditionally dominated by provider countries' perspectives—that have given primacy to the process elements. Perspectives of recipient countries has traditionally been dominated by those of the providers. Fourth, the literature has been enriched by new tools and techniques that have been developed to capture development effectiveness. Fifth, with the 2030 Agenda and specifically its triangulation of social, economic, and environmental dimensions and pledge to leave no one behind, a new and important dimension has been added to the literature that attempts to capture how development effectiveness should be understood and assessed during the SDG era.

Developing countries are having to grapple with, and grasp, the meaning of development effectiveness by taking into cognisance all of the new developments in the development cooperation architecture. Through wide-ranging literature landscaping, this study has drawn insights as regards some of the critical elements that should inform the concept of development effectiveness and assessment of development effectiveness of development cooperation in the developing country context. What emerges quite clearly is that there is not one single way of defining development effectiveness and assessing development effectiveness. The literature survey indicates that both should be informed by the country context, specific type of development cooperation, form of finance, and the requirements of the SDGs. What comes out, however is that process elements have important implications for results, while assessment of development effectiveness and techniques of assessment vary depending on the level at which effectiveness is to be measured and evaluated as well as the specific country context. What can also be gleaned from the literature survey is that a common but differentiated framework needs to be developed to measure and assess development effectiveness at the country level.

References

- ActionAid. (2005). *Real aid: An agenda for making aid work*. London: ActionAid. Retrieved from: <https://actionaid.org/publications/2005/real-aid-agenda-making-aid-work#downloads>
- Akramov, Kamiljon T. (2006). *Governance and Foreign Aid Allocation* (Dissertation). Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. Retrieved from: http://www.rand.org/pubs/rgs_dissertations/RGSD202.
- Alesina, A., & Dollar, D. (2000). Who Gives Foreign Aid to Whom and Why? *Journal of Economic Growth*, 5(1), 33-63. Retrieved from: doi:10.3386/w6612
- Ali, M. (2018). *Monitoring and Evaluation in South-South Cooperation: The Case of CPEC in Pakistan* (Discussion Paper). Bonn: German Development Institute.
- Almasifard, M. (2019). Evolving Debates on the Effectiveness of Official Development Assistance (Occasional Paper Series No. 51). Southern Voice.
- Andrabi, T., Das, J., Khwaja, A. I., & Zajonc, T. (2011). Do value-added estimates add value? Accounting for learning dynamics. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 3(3), 29-54.
- Apodaca, C. (2017). *Foreign Aid as Foreign Policy Tool*. Oxford Research Encyclopedia. Retrieved from: <http://oxfordre.com/politics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-332>
- Arndt, C., Jones, S., & Tarp, F. (2006). *Aid and development: the Mozambican case*. Copenhagen: Department of Economics, University of Copenhagen.
- Asian Development Bank. (2005). *Innovation and Efficiency Initiative Pilot Financing Instruments and Modalities*. Retrieved from: <https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/institutional-document/32103/financing-instruments-modalities.pdf>
- Australian Agency for International Development. (2008). *Annual review of development effectiveness 2007*. Retrieved from: www.ode.usaid.gov.au/publications/pdf/arde_report2007.pdf
- Babb, S. L., & Kentikelenis, A. E. (2017). International financial institutions as agents of neoliberalism. *The SAGE Handbook of Neoliberalism*, 16-27. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Banerjee, A., & Duflo, E. (2011). *Poor Economics: A Radical Rethinking of the Way to Fight Global Poverty*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Besharati, N. (2013). *Common Goals and Differential Commitments: The Role of Emerging Economies in Global Development*. German Development Institute. Retrieved from: <https://www.die-gdi.de/en/discussion-paper/article/common-goals-and-differential-commitments-the-role-of-emerging-economies-in-global-development/>
- Besharati, N. (2019). *Measuring Effectiveness of South-South Cooperation* (Occasional Paper No. 52). Southern Voice.

- Besharati, N., & Loga, D. (2018). *Towards an Integrated Financing Strategy for the MGDS-3: Development Finance Assessment for Malawi*. Lillongwe: United Nations Development Programme/ Ministry of Finance.
- Besharati, N. A., Moilwa, M., Khunou, K., & Garelli, T. O. (2015). *Developing a conceptual framework for South-South cooperation* (Working Document). SAIIA. Retrieved from: <http://www.saiia.org.za/generalpublications/891-developing-a-conceptual-framework-for-south-south-co-operation/file>
- Besharati, N., Raowhani, C., & Riios, O. G. (2017, March). *A Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for South-South Cooperation*. SAIIA. Retrieved from: <https://saiia.org.za/research/a-monitoring-and-evaluation-framework-for-south-south-cooperation/>
- Bhattacharya, A., & Kharas, H. (2015, April 8). Worthy of support. *The Economist*. Retrieved from: <https://www.economist.com/free-exchange/2015/04/08/worthy-of-support>
- Bhattacharya, D., & Khan, S. S. (2018). *Is Blended Finance Trending in the LDCs? Perspective from the ground* (Occasional Paper No. 49). Southern Voice.
- Bhattacharya, D., & Rashmin, R. (2016). *Concessional Financial Flows among Southern Countries: Conceptualising Design Principles, Operational Modalities and an Assessment Framework*. New York: United Nations Development Programme.
- Bigsten, A., Platteau, J.P., & Tengstan, S. (2011). *The aid effectiveness agenda: The benefits of going ahead*. Retrieved from: http://www.delog.org/cms/upload/pdf-ae/benefits_of_going_ahead-aid_effectiveness_agenda_en.pdf
- Birdshall, N., Kharas, H., & Perakis, R. (2011). *Measuring the quality of aid: QuODA Second Edition*. Center for Global Development-Global Economy and Development at Brookings. Retrieved from: <https://www.cgdev.org/page/quality-oda-quoda>
- Boone, P. (1996). Politics and the effectiveness of foreign aid. *European Economic Review*, 40(2), 289–329.
- Bourguignon, F., & Pereira da Silva, L. (2003). *Evaluating the poverty and distributional impact of economic policies (techniques and tools)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Browne, S. (2006) *Aid and Influence. Do Donors Help or Hinder?* London: Earthscan
- Brumm, H.J. (2003). Aid, policies, and growth: Bauer was right. *Cato Journal*, 23(2), 167-174.
- Burall, S., Maxwell, S., & Menocal, A. R. (2006). *Reforming the international aid architecture: Options and ways forward* (278). Overseas Development Institute (ODI).
- Calderisi, R. (2006). *The trouble with Africa: why foreign aid isn't working?* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Carothers, T., & Brechenmacher, S. (2014). *Accountability, Transparency, Participation and Inclusion A new development consensus?* Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Retrieved from: https://carnegieendowment.org/files/new_development_consensus.pdf
- Chaturvedi, S. (2016). *The Development Compact: A Theoretical Construct for South-South Cooperation*. Retrieved from: <http://ris.org.in/newasiaforum/development-compact-theoretical-construct-south-south-cooperation-sachin-chaturvedi-2016>

- Chaturvedi, S., Fues, T., & Sidiropoulos, E. (2012). *Development Cooperation and Emerging Powers: New Partners or Old Patterns?* London: Zed Books.
- Clemens, M. A., Radelet, S., & Bhavnani, R. R. (2004). *Counting chickens when they hatch: the short-term effect of aid on growth* (Working Paper No. 44). Washington, D.C.: Center for Global Development.
- Collier, P., & Dollar, D. (2004). Development Effectiveness: What have We Learnt? *The Economic Journal*, 114(496), F244-F271. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0297.2004.00221.x
- Committee for Development Policy. (2018). *Report on the twentieth session* (12–16 March 2018). New York: United Nations.
- Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: design & analysis issues for field settings* (Vol. 351). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Dalgaard, C., Hansen, H., & Tarp, F. (2004). On the Empirics of Foreign Aid and Growth. *The Economic Journal*, 114(496), F191-F216. Retrieved from: doi:10.1111/j.1468-0297.2004.00219.x
- Davies, P. (2012). The state of evidence-based policy evaluation and its role in policy formation. *National Institute Economic Review*, 219(1), R41-R52.
- De Mello e Souza, A. (2013). Development Agency in Emerging Powers: the case of Brazil. Draft paper prepared for the DIE/Mora Institute/AMEXCID Conference held in Mexico City, Mexico.
- De Mello e Souza, A., Esteves, P., Assunção, M., Adams, K., Pomeroy, M., & Paz, L. (2016). Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanisms for South-South and Triangular Cooperation: Lessons from Brazil for the 2030 Agenda. New York: UNDP. Retrieved from: [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/development-impact/SS%20Research%20Publications/11875%20-%20Monitoring%20and%20evaluation%20mechanisms%20for%20South%20-%202006_Web%20Version\(2\).pdf](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/development-impact/SS%20Research%20Publications/11875%20-%20Monitoring%20and%20evaluation%20mechanisms%20for%20South%20-%202006_Web%20Version(2).pdf)
- Deaton, A. (2009). *Instruments of development: randomization in the tropics, and the search for the elusive keys to economic development* (Working Paper No. 14690). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER).
- Degnbol-Martinussen, J., & Engberg-Pedersen, P. (2005). *AID Understanding International Development Cooperation*. Zed Books.
- Dehejia, R. (2013). *The porous dialectic: experimental and non-experimental methods in development economics* (WIDER Working Paper No. 2013/011). Helsinki: The United Nations University World Institute of Development Economics Research.
- Desai, R. M., & Kharas, H. (2008). The California Consensus: Can Private Aid End Global Poverty? *Survival*, 50(4), 155-168. doi:10.1080/00396330802328982
- Dichter, T. W. (2003). *Despite good intentions: why development assistance to the Third World has failed*. Cambridge: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Donaldson, S.I. (2005). Using program theory-driven evaluation science to crack the Da Vinci Code. *New Directions for Evaluation* 106, 65-84.

- Donaldson, S. I. (2007). *Program Theory – Driven Evaluation Science. Strategies and Applications*. New York: Routledge
- Doucouliaagos, H., & Paldam, M. (2009). The aid effectiveness literature: The sad results of 40 years of research. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 23(3), 433-461.
- Drehel, A. (2015, October 22). *Does foreign aid boost growth?* [Blog post]. World Economic Forum. Retrieved from: <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2015/10/does-foreign-aid-boost-growth/>
- Easterly, W. (2003). Can Foreign Aid Buy Growth? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 17(3), 23-48. Retrieved from: doi:10.1257/089533003769204344
- Easterly, W. (2007). *The white man's burden: why the West's efforts to aid the rest have done so much ill and so little good*. New York: Penguin Press
- Easterly, W. (2018, November 26). *Foreign Aid Goes Military!* [Blog post]. Retrieved from: <https://www.brookings.edu/opinions/foreign-aid-goes-military/>
- Easterly, W., & Levine, R. (2003). Tropics, germs, and crops: How endowments influence economic development. *Journal of monetary economics*, 50(1), 3-39.
- Elayah, M. (2016). Lack of foreign aid effectiveness in developing countries between a hammer and an anvil. *Contemporary Arab Affairs*, 9(1), 82-99. doi:10.1080/17550912.2015.1124519
- Evans, D., Kremmer, M., & Ngatia, M. (2014). *Schooling costs, school participation, and long-run outcomes: evidence from Kenya* (Unpublished Working Paper).
- Faye, M., & Niehaus, P. (2012). Political Aid Cycles. *American Economic Review*, 102(7), 3516-3530. doi:10.1257/aer.102.7.3516
- Fishman, A. (2018, December 20). *SDG Knowledge Weekly: Private Sector Action, Blended Finance for LDCs* [Blog post]. IISD. Retrieved from: <https://sdg.iisd.org/commentary/policy-briefs/sdg-knowledge-weekly-private-sector-action-blended-finance-for-ldcs/>
- Fues, T. (2016). *South-South Cooperation: Global force, uncertain identity*. German Development Institute. Retrieved from: <https://www.die-gdi.de/en/the-current-column/article/south-south-cooperation-global-force-uncertain-identity-1/>
- Funnell, S.C., & Rogers, P. J. (2011). *Purposeful program theory: Effective use of theories of change and logic models*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/Wiley.
- Furness, M., & S. Klingebiel (2012): *The Post-2015 Development Agenda: the European Union must contribute more than just aid*. Bonn: DIE (The Current Column of 24 September 2012)
- G8 Summit. (2011). *Deauville G8 Declaration: Renewed Commitment for Freedom and Democracy*. Retrieved from: http://ec.europa.eu/archives/commission_2010-2014/president/news/speeches-statements/pdf/deauville-g8-declaration_en.pdf
- Green Climate Fund. (2013). *Business Model Framework: Financial Instruments*. Retrieved from: https://www.greenclimate.fund/documents/20182/24934/GCF_B.04_06_-_Business_Model_Framework__Financial_Instruments.pdf/7b8e96dd-4e06-46fd-b986-1b8743efa15b

- Gertler, P. J., Martinez, S., Premand, P., Rawlings, L.B., & Vermeersch, C.M. J. (2011). *Impact evaluation in practice*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Giordano, N. (2017, April 20). *How to measure Value for Money in delivering aid*. [Blog post]. Retrieved from: <https://insights.careinternational.org.uk/development-blog/how-to-measure-value-for-money-in-delivering-aid>
- Glennie, J. (2011). *The role of aid to middle-income countries*. Retrieved from: <http://www.odi.org.uk/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/7189.pdf>
- Gray, K., & Gills, B. K. (2016). South–South cooperation and the rise of the Global South. *Third World Quarterly*, 37(4), 557-574. doi:10.1080/01436597.2015.1128817
- Guillaumont, P. & Chauvet, L. (2001). Aid and performance: A reassessment. *Journal of Development Studies*, 37(6), 66-92.
- Hackenesch, C., & Janus, H. (2013). *Post 2015: how emerging economies shape the relevance of a new agenda* (Briefing Paper 14/2013). Bonn: German Development Institute.
- Hanlon, J. (2004). Do donors promote corruption? the case of Mozambique. *Third World Quarterly*, 25(4), 747-763. doi:10.1080/01436590410001678960
- Harcourt, S. (2018, April 19). Opinion: As aid levels stall, quality of spending is critical. Devex. Retrieved from: <https://www.devex.com/news/opinion-as-aid-levels-stall-quality-of-spending-is-critical-92564>
- Hjertholm, P., & White, H. (2003). Foreign aid in historical perspective: backgrounds and trends. In F. Tarp (Ed.), *Foreign Aid and Development: Lessons Learnt and Directions for The Future* (pp. 80-102).
- Howes, S., Otor, S., & Rogers, C. (2011). *Is there a micro-macro paradox in international aid, or do the data deceive?* Canberra: Center for Development Policy, Australian National University.
- Inter-American Development Bank. (2010). *Development effectiveness framework 2008-2009*. Retrieved from: <http://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getdocument.aspx?docnum=1775544>
- International Fund for Agricultural Development. (2007). *Report on IFAD's development effectiveness*. Retrieved from: <https://www.ifad.org/documents/10180/8fc31218-2e30-40fd-8371-6f76e4137ba5>
- International Finance Corporation, European Development Finance Institution, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, African Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, European Investment Bank, Asian Development Bank, & Islamic Corporation for the Development of the Private Sector. (2017). *DFI Working Group on Blended Concessional Finance for Private Sector Projects: Summary Report*. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18235/0000876>
- International Labour Organisation. (2018). *Towards 2030: Effective development cooperation in support of the Sustainable Development Goals (4)*. Geneva: International Labour Office. Retrieved from: https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_624037.pdf

- International Monetary Fund. (2009). *Creating Policy Space - Responsive Design and Streamlined Conditionality in Recent Low-income Country Programs*. Washington, D.C.: IMF. Retrieved from: <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/Policy-Papers/Issues/2016/12/31/Creating-Policy-Space-Responsive-Design-and-Streamlined-Conditionality-in-Recent-Low-Income-PP4372>
- Jackson, P. (2012). *Value for money and international development: Deconstructing myths to promote a more constructive discussion*. OECD Publishing. Retrieved from: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/49652541.pdf>
- Jayasuriya, D. (2018, October 11). *What is Value for Money in aid programs?* [Blog post]. DEVPOLICYBLOG. Retrieved from <http://www.devpolicy.org/what-is-value-for-money-in-aid-programs-20130819-1/>
- Jepma, C. J. (1991). *The tying of aid*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Kaul, I. (2013). *Global Public Goods A concept for framing the Post-2015 Agenda?* German Development Institute. Retrieved from: <https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/161015/DP%202.2013.pdf>
- Kentikelenis, A. E. (2017). Structural adjustment and health: A conceptual framework and evidence on pathways. *Social Science & Medicine*, 187, 296-305. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.02.021
- Kentikelenis, A. E., Stubbs, T. H., & King, L. P. (2016). IMF conditionality and development policy space, 1985–2014. *Review of International Political Economy*, 23(4), 543-582. doi:10.1080/09692290.2016.1174953
- Kharas, H. (2007). *The New Reality of Aid*. Wolfensohn Center for Development at Brookings Institution. Retrieved from: <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/2007kharas.pdf>
- Kharas, H. (2007). *Trends and Issues in Development Aid* (Research Paper 1). Wolfensohn Center for Development at Brookings Institution. Retrieved from: https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/11_development_aid_kharas.pdf
- Kharas, H. (2012). *The global partnership for effective development cooperation*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Kharas, H., & Rogerson, A. (2017). *Global development trends and challenges: horizon 2025 revisited*. Overseas Development Institute. Retrieved from: <https://www.odl.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/11873.pdf>
- Kindornay, S. (2011). *From Aid to Development Effectiveness: A Working Paper*. The North-South Institute. Retrieved from: <http://www.nsi-ins.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/2011-From-aid-to-development-effectiveness.pdf>
- Kindornay, S., & Morton, B. (2009). *Development effectiveness: towards new understandings*. The North-South Institute. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237425551_Development_effectiveness_towards_new_understandings
- Klingebiel, S. (2012). *Results-Based Aid (RBA): New Aid Approaches, Limitations and the Application to Promote Good Governance* (Discussion paper 14/2012).

- German Development Institute. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255698156_Results-Based_Aid_RBA_New_Aid_Approaches_Limitations_and_the_Application_to_Promote_Good_Governance/download
- Klingebiel, S. (2014). What is Development Cooperation. In *Development Cooperation: Challenges of the New Aid Architecture*. London: Palgrave Pivot.
- Klingebiel, S., & Xiaoyun, L. (2015, December 3). *Rising powers and public goods*. Le Monde diplomatique. Retrieved from: <https://mondediplo.com/outsidein/rising-powers-and-public-goods>
- Knack, S. (2001). Aid dependence and the quality of governance: cross-country empirical tests. *Southern Economic Journal*, 310-329.
- Kumar, S., Kumar, N., & Vivekadhish, S. (2016). Millennium development goals (MDGS) to sustainable development goals (SDGS): Addressing unfinished agenda and strengthening sustainable development and partnership. *Indian Journal of Community Medicine*, 41(1), 1. doi:10.4103/0970-0218.170955
- Kusek, J. Z., & Rist, R. C. (2004). *Ten Steps to a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System: A Handbook for Development Practitioners*. Washington D.C.: World Bank. Retrieved from: <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/14926/296720PAPER0100steps.pdf?sequence=1>
- Lancaster, C. (2008). *Foreign Aid: Diplomacy, Development, Domestic Politics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Levin, H. M., & McEwan, P. J. (2001). *Cost-Effectiveness Analysis: Methods and Applications* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Levison-Johnson, J., Dewey, J., & Wandersman, A. (2009). *Getting to outcomes in systems of care: 10 steps for achieving results-based accountability*. Ananta, GA: ICF Macro.
- Levy, V. (1988). Aid and growth in Sub-Saharan Africa: the recent experience. *European Economic Review*, 32(9), 1777-1795.
- Lindelöw, M., & Wagstaff, A. (2003). *Health facility surveys: an introduction* (Vol. 2953). Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- Ling, J. (2010). *Aid to Africa: what can the EU and China learn from each other?* (Occasional Paper 56). Johannesburg: SAIIA.
- Marris, R. (1970). Can we measure the need for development assistance? *The Economic Journal*, 650-668.
- Martini, J., Mongo, R., Kalambay, H., Fromont, A., Ribesse, N., & Dujardin, B. (2012). Aid effectiveness from Rome to Busan: some progress but lacking bottom-up approaches or behaviour changes. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*, 17(7), 931-933. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3156.2012.02995.x
- Mawdsley, E. (2011). The changing geographies of foreign aid and development cooperation: contributions from gift theory. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 37(2), 256-272. doi:10.1111/j.1475-5661.2011.00467.x

- Mawdsley, E., Savage, L., & Kim, S. (2013). A 'post-aid world'? Paradigm shift in foreign aid and development cooperation at the 2011 Busan High Level Forum. *The Geographical Journal*, 180(1), 27-38. doi:10.1111/j.1475-4959.2012.00490.x
- McEwan, C., & Mawdsley, E. (2012). Trilateral Development Cooperation: Power and Politics in Emerging Aid Relationships. *Development and Change*, 43(6), 1185-1209. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7660.2012.01805.x
- Mosley, P. (1980). Aid, savings and growth revisited. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 42(2), 79-95.
- Mosley, P. (1986). *Aid-effectiveness: The Micro-Macro Paradox* (IDS Bulletin 17:22-27). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-5436.1986.mp17002004.x>
- Mosley, P., & Eeckhout, M. J. (2002). From project aid to programme assistance. In F. Tarp (Ed.), *Foreign Aid and Development: Lessons Learnt and Directions for the Future* (2nd ed., pp. 131-153). London and New York: Routledge.
- Moss, T., Pettersson, G., & Van de Walle, N. (2006). *An aid-institutions paradox? A review essay on aid dependency and state building in sub-Saharan Africa* (Working Paper No.74). Washington D.C.: Center for Global Development.
- Moyo, D. (2009). *Dead aid: why aid is not working and how there is a better way for Africa*. London: Allen Lane
- Neumayer, E. (2003). *The pattern of giving aid: the impact of good governance on development assistance*. London: Routledge.
- Niyonkuru, F. (2016). Failure of Foreign Aid in Developing Countries: A Quest for Alternatives. *Business and Economics Journal*, 7(3). doi:10.4172/2151-6219.1000231
- Nowak-Lehmann, F., Dreher, A., Herzer, D., Klasen, S., & Martínez-Zarzoso, I. (2012). Does foreign aid really raise per capita income? A time series perspective. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économie*, 45(1), 288-313. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5982.2011.01696.x
- Ocampo, J. A., & Arteaga, N. G. (2014). *Accountable and effective development cooperation in a post-2015 era*. UNDESA. Retrieved from: http://policydialogue.org/files/publications/papers/Ocampo_and_Arteaga_Accountable_and_effective_development_cooperation.pdf
- Okun, A. M. (1975). *Equality and Efficiency: The Big Tradeoff*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2003). *Rome Declaration on Harmonisation*. Rome: OECD Publishing. Retrieved from: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/hlf-1thefirsthighlevelforumonaideeffectivenessrome.htm>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2005). *The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness: Five Principles for Smart aid*. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/45827300.pdf>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2008). *The Accra Agenda for Action*. Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/45827311.pdf>

- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2011). *Busan High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness: Proceedings*. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/HLF4%20proceedings%20entire%20doc%20for%20web.pdf>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2012). *Policy framework for policy coherence for development* (Working Paper No. 1). Paris: OECD Office of the Secretary-General Unit for Policy Coherence for Development. Retrieved from: <http://www.oecd.org/development/pcd/50461952.pdf>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2018a). *Development Co-operation Report 2018: Joining Forces to Leave No one Behind*. Retrieved from: https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/development-co-operation-report-2018_dcr-2018-en#page4
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2018b). *Multilateral Development Finance Towards a new pact of multilateralism to achieve the 2030 Agenda together*. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264308831-en>
- Owen, J. M., & Rogers, P. (1999). *Program evaluation: Forms and approaches*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (2011). *Developmental evaluation: applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use*. New York: Guilford.
- Pfeiffer, J., & Chapman, R. (2010). Anthropological Perspectives on Structural Adjustment and Public Health. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 39(1), 149-165. doi:10.1146/annurev.anthro.012809.105101
- Prizzon, A., Greenhill, R., & Mustapha, S. (2016). *An age of choice for development finance: evidence from country case studies*. Overseas Development Institute. Retrieved from: <https://www.odi.org/publications/10390-age-choice-development-finance-evidence-country-case-studies>
- Quadir, F. (2013). Rising Donors and the New Narrative of 'South–South' Cooperation: what prospects for changing the landscape of development assistance programmes? *Third World Quarterly*, 34(2), 321-338. doi:10.1080/01436597.2013.775788
- Quibria, M. (2014). Aid effectiveness: research, policy and unresolved issues. *Development Studies Research*, 1(1), 75-87. doi:10.1080/21665095.2014.922890
- Rajan, R. G., & Subramanian, A. (2008). Aid and Growth: What Does the Cross-Country Evidence Really Show? *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 90(4), 643-665. doi:10.1162/rest.90.4.643
- Rajan, R., & Subramanian, A. (2005). *What Undermines Aid's Impact on Growth?* (Working Paper 11657). Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research. doi:10.3386/w11657
- Ramalingam, B. (2013). *Aid on the Edge of Chaos: Rethinking International Cooperation in a Complex World*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rao, S. (2017, May 29). *Funding Needs for UN's 2030 Development Agenda – Global Policy Watch*. [Blog post]. Global Policy Watch. Retrieved from: <https://www.globalpolicywatch.org/blog/2017/05/29/funding-needs-for-uns-2030-development-agenda/>

- Reinikka, R., & Svensson, J. (2006). Using micro-surveys to measure and explain corruption. *World Development*, 34(2), 359-370.
- Riddell, R. C. (2007) *Does Foreign Aid Really Work?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roodman, D. (2008). *Through the looking-glass, and what OLS found there: on growth, foreign aid, and reverse causality* (Working Papers 137). Washington, D.C.: Center for Global Development.
- Sachs, J. (2005) *The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for our Time*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Sato, J., Shiga, H., Kobayashi, T., & Kondoh, H. (2011). "Emerging Donors" from a Recipient Perspective: An Institutional Analysis of Foreign Aid in Cambodia. *World Development*, 39(12), 2091-2104. doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2011.04.014
- Sawadogo, S. (2016, March 31). *Experts consider SDGs more ambitious than MDGs but often too vague* [Blog post]. Retrieved from: <https://www.dandc.eu/en/article/experts-consider-sdgs-more-ambitious-mdgs-often-too-vague>
- Schrecker, T. (2016). Neoliberalism and Health: The Linkages and the Dangers. *Sociology Compass*, 10(10), 952-971. doi:10.1111/soc4.12408
- Scriven, M. (1976) Maximizing the power of causal investigations: the modus operandi method. In G. V. Glass (Ed.), *Evaluation studies review annual* (Vol. 1, pp. 108-118). Beverly Hills: SAGE.
- Steering Committee of the Bogota High Level Event. (2010, March 25). *Bogota Statement: Towards effective and inclusive development partnerships*. Bogotá. Retrieved from: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/1/23/45497536.pdf>
- Stuckler, D., & Basu, S. (2013). *The Body Economic: Why Austerity Kills - Recessions, Budget Battles, and The Politics of Life and Death*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Summers, L. H., & Pritchett, L. H. (1993). The structural-adjustment debate. *American Economic Review*, (83), 383-389.
- Sumner, A. (2012). *Global poverty and the "New Bottom Billion" revisited: exploring the paradox that most of the world's extreme poor no longer live in the world's poorest countries*. Retrieved from: <https://www.ids.ac.uk/files/dmfile/AndySumnerGlobalPoverty14May2012.pdf>
- Todd, P. (2012). *Non-experimental and quasi-experimental methods for impact evaluation*. Lecture at the CLEAR/3ie Impact evaluation technical course in Johannesburg, September 2012. Johannesburg: University of Witwatersrand.
- Tortora, P. (2011). *Common ground between South-South and North-South Cooperation Principles* (Issue Brief). Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved from: website: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/49245423.pdf>
- United Nations Capital Development Fund. (2018). *Blended Finance in the Least Developed Countries*. Retrieved from: <http://www.uncdf.org/bfldcs/home>
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2010). *Development cooperation for the MDGs – Maximizing Results*. International Development Cooperation Report. New York: UNDESA.

- United Nations Development Group. (2011). *Results-based management guidance and policy*. New York: UNDG.
- United Nations Development Group. (2011). *Results-based management guidance and policy*. New York: UNDG.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2001). *Development Effectiveness Review of Evaluative Evidence*. Retrieved from: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/der2001.pdf>
- United Nations Development Programme. (2003). *Human development report 2003: a compact among nations to end human poverty*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- United Nations Economic and Social Council. (2008, April). Background Study for the Development Cooperation Forum: Trends in South-South and Triangular Development Cooperation. Retrieved from: http://www.un.org/en/ecosoc/docs/pdfs/south-south_cooperation.pdf
- United Nations. (2015a). *Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development*. Retrieved from: https://www.un.org/esa/ffd/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/AAAA_Outcome.pdf
- United Nations. (2015b). *Closing the infrastructure gap*. Inter-agency Task Force on Financing for Development. Retrieved from: <https://developmentfinance.un.org/closing-the-infrastructure-gap>
- United Nations. (2018, October 23). *Global Partnerships Crucial for Progress but Must Be Tempered by United Nations Values, Delegates Say in Second Committee*. Meetings Coverage and Press Releases. Retrieved from: <https://www.un.org/press/en/2018/gaef3505.doc.htm>
- Weiss, C. H. (1997). Theory-based evaluation: past, present, and future. *New directions for evaluation*, 1997(76), 41-55.
- White, H. (2005). *Challenges in evaluating development effectiveness* (Working Paper No. 242). Brighton: IDS.
- White, H. (2013). The use of mixed methods in randomised control trials. In D.M. Mertens, & S. Hesse-Biber (Eds.), *Mixed methods and credibility of evidence in evaluation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- White, H., & Phillips, D. (2012). *Addressing attribution of cause and effect in small impact evaluations: towards an integrated framework*. New Delhi: International Initiative for Impact Evaluation.
- Wolfensohn, J.D. (2005). *Voice for the world's poor: selected speeches and writings of World Bank President James D. Wolfensohn, 1995-2005*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- World Bank (2018, August 09). *Where do the world's poorest people live today?* Retrieved from: <http://datatopics.worldbank.org/world-development-indicators/stories/where-do-the-worlds-poorest-people-live-today.html>

- World Bank. (2005). *Improving the World Bank's Development Effectiveness: What Does Evaluation Show?* Retrieved from: <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/7225/563670PUB0deve10Box349502B01PUBLIC1.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- World Bank. (2008). *Annual Review of Development Effectiveness 2008: Shared Global Challenges*. Retrieved from: <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/6553/461300PUB0Box318082137714701PUBLIC1.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- World Bank. (2009). *Development Policy Lending Retrospective: Flexibility, Customization, and Results*. Retrieved from: <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2009/11/11516130/2009-development-policy-lendingretrospective-flexibility-customization-results>
- World Bank. (2015). *From Billions to Trillions: Transforming Development Finance Post-2015 Financing for Development: Multilateral Development Finance*. Retrieved from: [http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DEVCOMMINT/Documentation/23659446/DC2015-0002\(E\)FinancingforDevelopment.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DEVCOMMINT/Documentation/23659446/DC2015-0002(E)FinancingforDevelopment.pdf)



southernvoice.org



[SVoice2030](https://www.facebook.com/SVoice2030)



[@SVoice2030](https://twitter.com/SVoice2030)