



Helpdesk Research Report

The multilateral system's contribution to international development goals on governance

Becky Carter

01.05.2015

Question

What is the multilateral system's contribution to international development goals on governance? The report will identify the international development goals on governance, and the roles of different multilateral players at national, regional and international level.

Contents

1. Overview
2. State of the evidence
3. Structure of the multilateral system
4. Roles of multilateral organisations
5. Effectiveness of the multilateral system's contribution to governance goals
6. References

1. Overview

Recent decades have seen an emerging consensus among donors that “good governance” is essential to achieve poverty and development objectives, as well as a valued end in itself. This agenda has two broad themes, around public sector management and effective institutions for service delivery, and around concepts of democracy and the rule of law (UNDESA, UNDP & UNESCO, 2012).

This report looks at how the multilateral system contributes to achieving governance goals. It is challenging to synthesise the evidence base on the multilateral system's contribution international development goals on governance because of the wide-ranging and contested nature of the concepts involved. Various large bodies of literature provide different entry-points and perspectives for this topic.

Looking at the structure of the multilateral system as a whole, the literature describes a sprawling, fragmented system, with multiple autonomous specialised organisations that coordinate on specific issues. Traditionally this system has run on hierarchical lines; today more dynamic instances of coordinated governance are emerging, with multilateral organisations partnering regionally with public and private actors.

This research has mapped the governance approach, focus and activities of individual multilateral organisations. Detailed findings are presented in a separate annex. Drawing on this mapping and other literature on the overall multilateral system and international development goals on governance, this review finds that key roles for multilateral organisations on governance include:

- **Leadership:** The United Nations System has a leadership role on the international conventions on human rights, anti-corruption, development objectives and financing for development, and development goals. These provide specific governance goals, and affirm the importance of governance for achieving human rights and sustainable development. Other large multilaterals – such as the World Bank and the European Union – also play a leading role in shaping international development policy-making, including on governance.
- **International partnership:** There are numerous examples of bilateral donors, other multilateral organisations and other bodies partnering with a multilateral organisation on governance work, at the levels of financial investment, policy, advocacy, knowledge sharing and programmes. Many of the perceived comparative advantages of multilateral organisations are of particular relevance for working on governance issues.
- **Regional roles:** Regional multilateral organisations are well placed to respond to specific regional needs and demands especially for smaller countries, which may have little say in global rules. Multilateral led governance reforms sometimes take a regional approach, particularly in tackling governance issues that have trans-border impacts.
- **Support to country governance reforms:** Each multilateral organisation focuses on certain areas of governance reform – from electoral processes to access to justice to public sector management and anti-corruption – providing fiduciary, knowledge, advisory, technical assistance and capacity-building to a range of government and other stakeholders within a developing country. Some organisations have been set up to address specific governance concerns (such as UN-Women’s mandate to accelerate change in gender equality across all areas of governance). Many of the major multilateral organisations support fragile and conflict-affected states, recognising the need to support governance reforms in these difficult contexts.
- **Knowledge and capacity-building:** Several multilateral organisations invest in knowledge production and dissemination at country, regional and international levels. Some organisations also support national stakeholders’ capacity for generating and using evidence and data.
- **Monitoring:** Some multilateral organisations play a major role in the technical work of designing measurable governance indicators and monitoring progress.

The literature highlights two key challenges to the effectiveness of the overall multilateral system, which impact on its contribution to governance goals: 1) how to ensure effective, representative and coherent global governance for international development goals, and 2) how to end the proliferation of organisations and funds, and earmarked funds. Finally, this review identifies literature on the effectiveness of individual multilateral organisations and governance interventions as a starting point for further synthesis work.

2. State of the evidence

It is challenging to search, map and synthesise the evidence base on the multilateral system's contribution to international development goals on governance because of the wide-ranging and contested nature of the concepts involved. The multilateral system is fragmented and consists of multiple networks and autonomous organisations. The concept of governance is wide-ranging, involving numerous diverse activities by a large number of actors across multiple sectors. There is no discrete set of "international goals on governance". Instead there are pertinent international agreements on human rights, development goals, aid effectiveness, anti-corruption and other issues, which specify what constitutes effective governance and how to achieve it.

As a result, this report has found relevant analysis in a number of related but separate policymaker and academic literatures on:

- 1) The global governance for international development, and in particular recent analysis of the effectiveness of global development governance for achieving the Millennium Development Goals and post-2015 sustainable development goals.
- 2) The development and trends of the global governance order – encompassing geo-political interests and spheres beyond the traditional 'aid' arena.
- 3) The emergence of democracy and good governance as an objective of and condition for development cooperation, and how effective donors (multilateral and bilateral) are in achieving these objectives.
- 4) Effectiveness of individual multilateral institutions, organisationally and within individual sectors.
- 5) Effectiveness of governance interventions in country and sector evaluations of donor-supported governance activities.

Each of these is a large body of literature in its own right, and this rapid review has not been able to cover each in detail. Instead this report provides a summary mapping of the structure, activities and goals of the multilateral system on governance. It also gives some initial findings on the effectiveness of the multilateral system's contribution to governance goals, and identifies evaluations and other analyses that may contain further findings.

3. Structure of the multilateral system

The multilateral system for international development is a fragmented and "eclectic set of arrangements", made up of specialised organisations (Killen and Rogersen 2010: 1; OHCHR et al 2013). There more than 200¹ autonomous multilateral organisations² and funds that each have their own governance structure, with a specific mandate, often set up to respond to a particular challenge, and their own decision-making processes and rules, accountable to a particular set of members (OHCHR et al 2013). These organisations coordinate with each other on specific issues, including international goals on governance, through a variety of different bodies and initiatives. Moreover these organisations are part of the increasingly inter-


¹ <http://www.oecd.org/dac/aid-architecture/multilateralaid.htm#latestdocuments>

² The OECD DAC defines multilateral organisations as "international institutions with governmental membership. They include organisations to which donors' contributions may be reported, either in whole or in part, as multilateral ODA as well as organisations that serve only as channels for bilateral ODA" (OECD 2013).

connected vast “network of networks” of semi-autonomous institutional channels: embassies, government departments, local communities, international organisations, non-governmental organisations, investors, contractors, foundations, media, and think-tanks (DAC 2010).


A traditional view of this system is a hierarchical state-driven model (see Figure 1). However, this is challenged by increasing interdependence of the global economy and integrated decision-making, and factors undermining state-led authority (such as increasing globalisation and integration of markets, and the democratization of the means to produce and disseminate information instantly to a global audience) (OHCHR et al 2013; World Economic Forum 2013). The World Economic Forum identifies (and promotes) an emerging trend for public and private actors to come together through dynamic “coordinated governance” in order to deal with collective problems that have trans-border dimensions (see Figure 2).

Figure 1. Traditional paradigm



Source: World Economic Forum 2013.

Figure 2. Coordinated governance



Source: World Economic Forum 2013.

4. Roles of multilateral organisations³

Leadership for international development goals on governance

The **United Nations (UN) system** is the home of the human rights treaty system and other important conventions setting out international governance objectives. These conventions define governance goals in two ways: 1) setting objectives on human rights, anti-corruption, development goals and development financing, and 2) affirming the understanding that good governance is essential to the achievement of human rights and sustainable development. International development goals on governance are found in the multi-layered international human rights architecture, from the widely accepted Universal Declaration on Human Rights (1948) and its Covenants on economic, social, cultural, civil and political rights (1977), to hundreds of other legal instruments and political declarations on a wide range of development issues – which have a varied take-up by states (Crichton et al 2015). Other important international conventions for governance goals include the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) (2003) which provides for anti-corruption instruments and actions.

International structures and organisations have been set up to promote and protect international conventions on human rights and other conventions. These include the Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights (OHCHR), the International Labour Organisation's systems for enforcing labour rights, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime's mandate to promote the United Nations Convention against Corruption, and treaty-based human rights committees monitoring state implementation of specific areas of a particular treaty (Crichton et al 2015).

The UN has also played a lead role in other international agreements on development objectives and financing for development which commonly commit endorsing states to upholding human rights, democracy and participatory governance, as well as ensuring the protection of vulnerable groups. These include the Millennium Declaration (2000)⁴, the 2002 Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development, World Summit on Sustainable Development⁵, the 2002 Monterrey Consensus on Financing for Development⁶, and the 2009 Rio+20 Outcome Declaration⁷.

The UN system is also the key convener of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) process and its successor, the intergovernmental High Level Political Forum. The MDGs have been criticised for a lack of attention to governance, which some think has led to a lack of focus on issues of inequality and power (Foresti et al 2014). Work is ongoing to define the post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to be agreed at a United Nations Summit in September 2015. The UN Open Working Group's proposal includes SDG16: "Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels" (Open Working Group 2014). There are also recommendations to underpin the other socio-economic goals with existing rights standards and governance objectives (for example by aiming for universal access, targeting the most excluded and investing in disaggregated data) (UNDESA et al 2013: 4). There is substantial literature from academics, think-tanks and civil society organisations discussing the pros and cons of how governance has been

³ See the Annex for profiles of individual multilateral organisations' contribution to governance goals.

⁴ <http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm>

⁵ <http://www.un-documents.net/jburgdec.htm>

⁶ <http://www.un.org/esa/ffd/monterrey/MonterreyConsensus.pdf>

⁷ http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/66/288&Lang=E

included in the draft targets and indicator framework (prominent examples include Hilderbrand 2015 and ICSU and ISSC 2015).

Within these processes, the **international financial institutions** and other **multilateral development banks** play important roles in shaping policy direction. The governing bodies and financing processes of the international financial institutions are important sites for international development policy making. The intergovernmental bi-annual Development Committee of the World Bank (WB) Group and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) is “a leading forum for agreeing objectives, roles and responsibilities” in the global development architecture (Killen and Rogerson 2010: 2).

The **European Union** (EU) is also a prominent actor in shaping the international development agenda, playing a key role at international conferences (UN 2006). A report on the EU and UN partnership finds that the EU also demonstrated international leadership in promoting the achievement of the MDGs through its collective commitment to reach the UN target for official development assistance (UN 2006).

Multilateral organisations are important contributors, through the **OECD Development Assistance Committee** (DAC), to the aid effectiveness reform agenda. This has resulted in a number of important agreements on reforming donors’ approach to and support on governance goals such as building effective national institutions and using country systems, and effective engagement in fragile states. Key agreements include the “New Consensus on Effective Institutions” which stresses the importance of solutions specifically tailored to the country context and local processes, and using national systems in the delivery of assistance (Busan 4th HLF 2011b) and the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States⁸ which sets out peace-building and state-building goals for work in fragile and conflict-affected states.

International partnerships

Multilateral organisations engage in partnerships with other multilateral organisations, bilateral donors and groups of states on governance work. These partnerships can be at the level of financial investment, policy, advocacy, knowledge sharing and programmes.

There are numerous examples of these partnerships that have contributed to achieving international development goals on governance. For example, the WB leads a number of global programmes on governance in partnership with bilateral donors (e.g. the Governance Partnership Facility, the Global Partnership for Social Accountability and the Nordic Trust Fund for Human Rights). Another example is the EU’s involvement in a “governance initiative” with the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States to launch policy dialogue on governance reforms. Another key partnership on governance exists between the EU and the UN, who view each other as natural partners, united by the core values of the international human rights system (UN 2006). Further collaboration amongst multilateral and bilateral donors, and with other stakeholders (such as think tanks, NGOs, research centres and experts) takes place in knowledge sharing networks (a prominent example is the DAC Network on Governance⁹).

There are a number of partnerships between multilateral organisations for their governance work in Fragile and Conflict Affected States (FCAS), with increased understanding of the need to strengthen the impact of collective engagement in FCAS. For example, the EU tends to partner with the UN in fragile country

⁸ <http://www.newdeal4peace.org/new-deal-snapshot/>

⁹ <http://www.oecd.org/dac/governance-peace/governance/#d.en.253928>

situations where consistent field presence and combined UN mandates facilitate transition out of crises (UN 2006). The UN and WB have also set up a joint trust fund for their fragility and conflict partnership¹⁰.

There is discussion in the literature on the anticipated comparative advantages of multilateral organisations, which may be part of the motivations of bilateral (and other multilaterals) to partner with multilateral organisations on supporting governance reforms. OECD DAC analysis finds that the main reasons to engage with multilateral organisations are: economies of scale; governance based on global development principles and standards; political neutrality and legitimacy; abundant capital and knowledge resources; advisory services and technical assistance; low transaction costs; contribution to global public goods; global presence; and effectiveness and efficiency (OECD DAC 2012).

In his analytical paper on the WB, Ravallion (2015) also highlights that multilaterals – and in particular the WB – appear to take a longer-term perspective on investing in institutional development. He cites the good performance of the WB on the “fostering institutions” indicator in the 2014 Quality of Official Development Assistance assessment (Birdsall and Kharas 2014). An additional analysis that finds that multilaterals are significantly more likely to use the recipient country's performance management system than unilateral agencies, who rely more on their own parallel systems (Knack 2013).

Regional roles

Another key component of global development governance are regional institutions and arrangements (such as the regional development banks and other regional initiatives). OHCHR et al (2013) finds that the regional multilateral organisations are well placed to capture and respond to specific regional needs and demands especially for smaller countries, which may have little say in global rules. Moreover, a perceived comparative advantage of regional multilaterals is their expert knowledge of their region and a concentration of personnel with local knowledge and regional expertise (AfDB 2013).

Multilateral led governance reforms sometimes take a regional approach, in particular to tackle governance issues that have trans-border impacts. One example is the WB led initiative to assist countries and regional economic communities in strengthening their regulatory systems and enforcement capacity against counterfeit medicines. Through the East African Community Medicines Regulatory Harmonization Initiative, five countries recently agreed on a draft set of common standards for drug registration and aim to share information on fake and sub-standard drugs (World Economic Forum, 2013: 4)

Support to developing countries' governance reforms

All major multilateral organisations working on governance reforms have endorsed the MDGs, development and financing for development conventions, and aid effectiveness agreements. They make explicit reference to these in their strategies on governance interventions, designing support to countries in order to achieve the governance goals set out in these agreements.

Focus of support

Some multilateral organisations focus their contribution to governance goals on one or more sectors of governance reform. For example, a central focus of the United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP) and the EU's contribution to governance reforms is support for **democratic governance**, with a rights-based

¹⁰ <http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/fragilityconflictviolence/brief/un-world-bank-fragility-and-conflict-partnership-trust-fund>

approach. For the EU their financial and technical assistance programmes are implemented at the country-level focusing on four key areas: fair and transparent electoral processes; strengthening the institutional capacity of parliaments; promoting an independent media; and encouraging pluralistic political systems. The UNDP also prioritises supporting credible and inclusive elections, providing strategic assistance throughout a country's electoral cycle, alongside other programmes promoting rule of law, access to justice and legal empowerment, seen as the enabling environment for achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

In contrast, the cornerstone of the WB's governance support has been in **public sector management**, through providing fiduciary support with public sector capacity building, as well as expertise in procurement, financial management and public sector operations. Their governance work today also includes promoting the rule of law, tackling anti-corruption, strengthening justice institutions and improving justice services for the poor and marginalised. There is much critical discussion in the literature of the WB's lack of explicit recognition of the centrality of human rights to development. In a recent publication – 'The World Bank Group A to Z' – the WB states that it supports the realisation of human rights, and is developing a more informed view on how human rights relate to the institution's core work and mission (World Bank 2015: 79).

The regional multilateral development banks also tend to focus on governance issues of public sector management. They may also have additional areas of interest: for example the Inter-American Development Bank also provides support to strengthening governance and transparency in the extractive industries.

Some multilateral organisations have been set up to concentrate on a **specific area of reform**, either for a particular sector or a cross-cutting issue. This is the case for a number of UN agencies – such as the UN's Children Fund's (UNICEF) focus on upholding children's human rights and, more recently, the establishment of UN-Women to works across all areas of governance to accelerate change in gender equality. The International Finance Corporation (IFC) (a member of the WB Group) is another example: it has a particular mandate to support governance reforms of the private sector.

Other multilateral organisations and funds have been set up to tackle a particular issue – such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF). These may not engage with governance issues more broadly, but, due to their financial, political and technical resources, can be key actors in contributing to governance reforms in their sectors.

Type of support

Multilateral organisations support governance reform in a wide variety of countries, from fragile and conflict affected countries, from low to middle income countries. The WB alone has over 750 staff in more than 100 countries providing lending, fiduciary, knowledge, advisory, and technical assistance services across all its sectors of focus, including governance activities.

Multilateral organisations undertake a variety of different approaches to supporting country governance reform, commonly using a mix of **financial, political and technical interventions**. Depending on the multilateral organisation, this support can take the form of loans or grants (or a combination) for the partner country. Examples of political interventions include the EU's engagement in political dialogue to encourage partner governments to integrate democracy and human rights in their development plans and identify opportunities for EU assistance.

Multilateral organisations' governance interventions can support a range of actors within a country, including government, civil society, private sector and community stakeholders. For example, the EU has a particular focus on supporting the empowerment of **civil society and non-state actors**, including promoting the participation of civil society organisations in domestic policies; and increasing local CSOs capacity to perform such a role.

Many of the multilateral organisations working on governance reforms provide support to fragile and conflict affected states. A number of the UN agencies (e.g. UNICEF, UNCDF) highlight their roles in FCAS, as does the WB and the EU among others. These organisations identify the importance of supporting good governance in these difficult contexts. For example, the African Development Bank's (AfDB) Strategy for Enhanced Engagement in **Fragile States** identifies the importance of good governance in sound financial management practices in post-crisis and post-conflict transition. Particular attention is paid to the challenges of resource rich fragile states and to the role a lack of transparency and corruption have as contributors to state fragility.

Investment in knowledge and capacity-building

In addition to providing financial support, several multilateral organisations play a key role in investing in knowledge production and dissemination at country, regional and international levels. Some organisations also prioritise supporting national stakeholders' capacity for generating and using evidence and data.

For example, the WB has positioned itself as the "Knowledge Bank". From being a knowledge broker, tapping into existing knowledge and redirecting it to needy clients, Ravallion (2015: 8) finds that more recently it has taken on the role of a "knowledge generator" that identifies pressing knowledge gaps and fills them, making the knowledge public (ibid.). The WB's contribution to the global public good of governance knowledge includes developing platforms for open access of its own and other data. Recent examples include two new platforms providing information about progress toward gender equality¹¹, and a new Open Budgets portal showcasing government public spending datasets to advance fiscal transparency and open data¹².

Another example is support by UNICEF to various knowledge management and communication tools within countries to strengthen the capacity of Education Management Information Systems to disaggregate data by gender and other disparities. Other UNICEF partnerships, including the Global Partnership for Education and the UN's Girls' Education Initiative, aim to generate evidence and knowledge, and provide technical support for the design, financing and implementation of national education plans.

Monitoring governance

Some multilateral organisations also play a major role in the technical work of designing measurable indicators and monitoring progress. In recent years there has been "an explosion" of **indicators** to measure a wide range of governance dimensions (Hilderbrand 2015: 8). The main indicators are widely used by a variety of international actors (including academics, government policy makers, donors and civil society organisations) for different purposes, including influencing policy and donors' funding decisions. They do not define international goals on governance, but they play an important role in turning them into

¹¹ The enGender Impact database (a repository of impact evaluations) (<http://tinyurl.com/p8j5f7v>) and the ADePT Gender software application <http://tinyurl.com/opja3ys> (a growing volume of gender data, and the facility to produce quick, standardized reports, including cross-country labour statistics).

¹² <http://wbi.worldbank.org/boost/>

measurable targets, and informing the international community's understanding of governance dimensions and trends, and how these can be supported. Developing methods and tools for tracking dimensions of governance within and across countries may also improve the broader governance environment, especially around legitimacy and trust¹³.

Examples include:

- The WB provides a data portal on disaggregated governance indicators, and easily generated country governance reports¹⁴. The WB also runs the Worldwide Governance Indicators, providing data for six dimensions of governance¹⁵.
- The EU, WB and the IMF are part of a multi-donor group that set up the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability program to assess the condition of country public expenditure, procurement and financial accountability systems and develop a practical sequence for reform and capacity-building actions. As a result of the international recognition of the PEFA Framework as a robust and comprehensive technical tool, its wide geographical coverage, and the generally high quality of reports, the PEFA-based assessments are becoming a standard input to many public sector management reform processes (PEFA 2010).
- Multilateral organisations, along with other donors and civil society stakeholders, are feeding into the process of defining the indicators to track progress on the post-2015 SDG on governance. The UN Statistical Commission is leading the ongoing process of collating feedback on the draft targets and measurable indicators.

5. Effectiveness of the multilateral system's contribution to governance goals

Effectiveness of the overall multilateral system

There is an extensive literature discussing the effectiveness of the multilateral system for development goals in general. Two key challenges were identified in the surveyed literature.

Effective, representative and coherent global governance

The literature highlights numerous issues with the current multilateral system, many of which may impact negatively on its contribution to achieving international governance goals. High level international political forums have repeatedly called for an improved institutional framework for more effective, representative and coherent global governance to achieve sustainable development.

Coordination of the multilateral development system is fragmented, challenging and contested. It is difficult to coordinate autonomous multilateral organisations that each have their own governance structure, with a specific mandate, often set up to respond to a particular challenge, and their own decision-making processes and rules, accountable to a particular set of members (OHCHR 2013). David Cameron's report on global governance to the G20 finds that complex and interconnected development problems have led to many different institutions being involved, leading to a lack of clarity of exactly who

¹³ <http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/governance/overview#2>

¹⁴ <https://agidata.org/site/>

¹⁵ <http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx#home>

is doing what, and exacerbating the tendency of individual organisations to work in silos and sometimes duplicating each other's work (Cameron 2011: 36).

In the literature the issues of representativeness, legitimacy and effectiveness of the system are repeated concerns. The governance of the WB and the IMF is much debated, with key concerns being the representation of developing countries and the selection of the President/Managing Director. On the other hand, the inclusive UN faces critiques that point out how consensus-building among broad memberships can impede effective action (OHCHR 2013). Meanwhile informal groups – such as the G20 – have emerged in recent years to address global issues, with the underlying logic that they may be able to take swifter collective action than the established machinery of the existing international bodies (OHCHR 2013). The G20 aims to address global challenges and takes actions on sustainable development, but, according to some analysts, it has yet to prove its ability to tackle global challenges, and raises legitimacy and accountability concerns in some quarters (OHCHR 2013).

Proliferation of channels and earmarked funds

It is widely accepted that untied and un-earmarked funds combined with universal procurement gives multilaterals the most flexibility to seek the greatest value for money and maximum efficiency in the use of the resources (AfDB 2013). However, the latest OECD DAC review of multilateral aid finds that contributions to the multilateral system are increasingly fragmented and earmarked funds are common. Previous OECD DAC analysis warned that the sprawling and fragmented multilateral system results in three key problems for all development goals, including those on governance: unpredictable support; some chronically under-aided countries; and fragmentation of sources and earmarks adding to transaction costs and distorting national allocation decisions (Killen and Rogersen 2010). The 2013 report offers a set of guiding principles to help limit the proliferation of channels. These include using the existing channels as the default and providing core or un-earmarked contributions to multilateral organisations, where possible (OECD 2013: 12).

References on the effectiveness of individual multilateral organisations

Organisational evaluations and performance surveys of multilateral organisations may contain useful findings on the effectiveness of individual multilateral organisations' contribution to international governance goals. There is also empirical analysis of how successful governance interventions – including by multilaterals – have been in achieving their objectives. Synthesising the findings from such literature was not within the scope of this paper. However, the following references may be a useful starting point for further work in the area:

Evaluations and assessments of multilateral organisations

- Multilateral Organisation Performance Network (MOPAN) Assessment Reports¹⁶
- Common Performance Assessment System (COMPAS) assessments of multilateral development banks¹⁷.

¹⁶ <http://www.mopanonline.org/>

¹⁷ <http://www.mfdr.org/Compas/index.html>

- Reviews of multilateral organisations by bilateral donors: Australia’s Multilateral Assessment 2012¹⁸; Danish Multilateral Development Cooperation Analysis (2013)¹⁹; Sweden’s assessments of multilateral organisations (2011)²⁰; the Netherlands’ scorecards of multilateral organisations (2011)²¹; the United Kingdom’s Multilateral Aid Review (2011)²² and Multilateral Aid Review Update (2013)²³; ICAI’s review of The Effectiveness of DFID’s Engagement with the WB (2012)²⁴.
- OECD/DAC annual reports on multilateral aid²⁵.
- Quality of Official Development Assistance (QuODA) assessment (Birdsall and Kharas 2014).
- Publish What You Fund’s Aid Transparency Assessment²⁶.

Evaluations of governance interventions – by organisation, country, sector

- Listed in the Annex.

6. References

AfDB (2013). *DFID Engagement with multilaterals: response for international development committee of the UK parliament.*

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201314/cmselect/cmintdev/349/349vw09.htm>

Birdsall, N. & Kharas, H. (2014). *The quality of official development assistance.* Third Edition, Center for Global Development and Brookings Institution.

<http://www.brookings.edu/research/reports/2014/07/quality-official-development-assistance-birdsall-kharas>

Busan 4th HLF (2011a). Busan Partnership For Effective Development Co-Operation.

<http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/49650173.pdf>

Busan 4th HLF (2011b). New Consensus on More “Effective Institutions” for Development.

<http://www.effectiveinstitutions.org/documentupload/New%20Consensus.pdf>

Cameron, D. (2011). *Governance for growth: Building consensus for the future.* Prime Minister’s Office: London.

http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130109092234/http://www.number10.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/GovernanceForGrowth_acc.pdf

Chrichton, J., Haider, H., Chowns, E. & Browne, E. (2015). *Human rights: Topic guide.* Birmingham, UK: GSDRC, University of Birmingham. <http://www.gsdr.org/go/topic-guides/human-rights>

¹⁸ URL not found.

¹⁹<http://um.dk/en/~media/UM/Danish-site/Documents/Danida/Samarbejde/Int-org/Danish%20Multilateral%20Development%20Cooperation%20Analysis.pdf>

²⁰ <http://www.government.se/sb/d/11747/a/122004>

²¹ URL not found.

²² <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/multilateral-aid-review>

²³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/multilateral-aid-review-update-2013>

²⁴ <http://www.oecd.org/derec/49962632.pdf>

²⁵ <http://www.oecd.org/dac/aid-architecture/multilateralaid.htm#latestdocuments>

²⁶ <http://www.publishwhatyoufund.org/index/>

- Foresti, M. and Wild, L. with Rodriguez Takeuchi, L. and Norton, A. (2014). *Governance targets and indicators for post 2015. An Initial Assessment*. Overseas Development Institute: London. <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8789.pdf>
- Grindle, M.S. (2010). *Good governance: the inflation of an idea*. HKS Faculty Research Working Paper Series, RWP10-023, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. <http://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/4448993>
- Hilderbrand, M. (2015). Benefits and Costs of the Governance & Institutions Targets for the Post-2015 Development Agenda. Copenhagen Consensus Center. http://www.copenhagenconsensus.com/sites/default/files/governance_assessment_-_hilderbrand.pdf
- ICSU & ISSC (2015): *Review of the Sustainable Development Goals: The science perspective*. Paris: International Council for Science (ICSU). <http://www.icsu.org/publications/reports-and-reviews/review-of-targets-for-the-sustainable-development-goals-the-science-perspective-2015/SDG-Report.pdf>
- Killen, B. & Rogerson, A. (2010). *Global governance for international development: who's in charge?* OECD Development Co-operation Directorate. <http://www.oecd.org/dac/45569897.pdf>
- Knack, S. (2013). Aid and donor trust in recipient country systems. *Journal of Development Economics* 101: 316-329. <https://ideas.repec.org/a/eee/deveco/v101y2013icp316-329.html>
- OECD DAC (2012). *What do we know about multilateral aid? The 54 billion dollar question*. http://www.oecd.org/dac/aid-architecture/13_03_18%20Policy%20Briefing%20on%20Multilateral%20Aid.pdf
- OECD (2013). *Multilateral aid report*. OECD: Paris. <http://www.oecd.org/dac/aid-architecture/2013%20Multilateral%20Aid%20Report.pdf>
- OHCHR, UNICEF, UN Women, UNDP & UNEP (2013). *Issues Brief: Human rights including the right to development*. Technical Support Team, Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals. https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/2391TST%20Human%20Rights%20Issues%20Brief_FINAL.pdf
- Open Working Group (2014). *Open Working Group Proposal for sustainable development goals*. Open Working Group of the General Assembly on Sustainable Development Goals. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/1579SDGs%20Proposal.pdf>
- PEFA (2010). *The PEFA framework – five years of successful implementation*. <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/PEFA/Resources/PEFA-Signature-Proof.pdf>
- Ravallion, M. (2015). *The World Bank: Why it is still needed and why it still disappoints*. Washington D.C.: Center for Global Development. <http://www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/CGD-Working-Paper-400-Ravallion-World-Bank-Needed-Disappointing.pdf>
- UNDESA, UNDP & UNESCO (2012). *Governance and development Thematic Think Piece*. UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda. http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/Think%20Pieces/7_governance.pdf

UNDP & DESA (2013). *Issues brief: global governance*. Technical Support Team, Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals.
https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/2429TST%20Issues%20Brief_Global%20Governance_FINAL.pdf

United Nations (2006). *The partnership between the UN and the EU. The United Nations and the European Commission working together in Development and Humanitarian Cooperation*. United Nations: Brussels. <http://www.unric.org/html/english/pdf/UN-EC%20Report.pdf>

World Bank Group (2015). *The World Bank Group A to Z*. Washington, DC.: World Bank.
<https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/20192>

World Economic Forum (2013). *More effective design of international initiatives – coordinated governance*. Cologny/Geneva: World Economic Forum.
http://www3.weforum.org/docs/GAC/2013/WEF_GAC_InternationalInitiatives_CoordinatedGovernance_Report_2013.pdf

Suggested citation

Carter, B., Hinds, R. & Avis, W. (2015). *The multilateral system's contribution to international development goals on governance* (GSDRC Helpdesk Research Report 1221). Birmingham, UK: GSDRC, University of Birmingham.

About this report

This report is based on 10 days of desk-based research. It was prepared for the UK Government's Department for International Development, © DFID Crown Copyright 2015. This report is licensed under the Open Government Licence (www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence). The views expressed in this report are those of the author, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of GSDRC, its partner agencies or DFID.

The GSDRC Research Helpdesk provides rapid syntheses of key literature and of expert thinking in response to specific questions on governance, social development, humanitarian and conflict issues. Its concise reports draw on a selection of the best recent literature available and on input from international experts. Each GSDRC Helpdesk Research Report is peer-reviewed by a member of the GSDRC team. Search over 400 reports at www.gsdr.org/go/research-helpdesk. Contact: helpdesk@gsdrc.org.