
MOLDOVA

INTRODUCTION

MOLDOVA is a lower-middle income country with a GNI of USD 1 560 per capita (2009) which has grown at an average rate of 5.2% per annum since 2005 (WDI, 2011). It has a population of 3.6 million (excluding the Transnistrian region), approximately 2% of whom (67 000 people) currently live under the 1.25 dollar-a-day income poverty line (WDI, 2011).

Moldova is slowly recovering from a dramatic fall in real GDP and living standards post-breakup of the USSR. At the same time, Moldova is focussing on implementing reforms in order to align its national systems with the standards required for further integration with the EU. These reforms have been made more difficult by the world economic and financial crises as well as recent floods. Transnistrian secession and substantial emigration remain major issues.

Net official development assistance (ODA) to Moldova in 2010 totalled USD 245 million (OECD, 2011a) and is on an upwards trend. Since 2005, net ODA has averaged 5% of GNI and 17% of central government expense. The top five donors contribute 76% of Moldova's core ODA (OECD, forthcoming). ■

SUMMARY OF PROGRESS

PROGRESS ON THE PARIS DECLARATION INDICATORS depends on improvements by both donors and partner governments. Since Moldova's baseline year in 2005, targets have been met for 6 out of 13 available indicators. Since 2005, progress has been made on a further six indicators and two indicators have seen setbacks. The Government of Moldova has been working to increase the effectiveness of aid since endorsing the Paris Declaration in 2006. Since 2010, the government-donor co-ordination and communication process is based on the Partnership Principles Implementation Plan (PPIP) developed and signed by the government and 21 donors working in Moldova. The PPIP is drawn from the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action tailored to the specific circumstances of the Republic of Moldova.

Of the five Paris principles, targets for managing for results and mutual accountability have already been met and ownership is following an upward trend. Targets have been met or significant progress made for the alignment indicators concerning country systems and practices. The unmet targets are in areas of primarily donor responsibility in alignment and harmonisation, such as PIUs, untying, predictability, common arrangements and joint working. The challenges that concern the government often depend on the actions of the donor agencies working in Moldova.

TABLE 1:
Baselines and targets
for 2010

INDICATORS		2005 REFERENCE	2007	2010 ACTUAL	2010 TARGET
1	Operational development strategies	D	C	C	'B' or 'A'
2a	Reliable public financial management (PFM) systems	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.0
2b	Reliable procurement systems	Not available	Not available	C	No Target
3	Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	70%	57%	92%	85%
4	Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	26%	29%	71%	50%
5a	Use of country PFM systems	25%	41%	70%	50%
5b	Use of country procurement systems	25%	39%	71%	No Target
6	Strengthen capacity by avoiding parallel PIUs	43	59	18	14
7	Aid is more predictable	67%	77%	81%	83%
8	Aid is untied	81%	81%	80%	More than 81%
9	Use of common arrangements or procedures	16%	30%	51%	66%
10a	Joint missions	20%	14%	36%	40%
10b	Joint country analytic work	50%	46%	51%	66%
11	Results-oriented frameworks	D	C	B	'B' or 'A'
12	Mutual accountability	Y	Y	Y	Y

TABLE 2:
Learning from success
and challenges

	ACHIEVEMENT OR CHALLENGE	LESSON OR PRIORITY ACTION
Ownership	Challenge: The national development strategy is not costed and has weak links to both existing policy papers and sectoral strategies.	Priority action: To improve participation in the implementation and monitoring of the national development strategy, Parliament and local authorities need to be involved and the current budgeting and performance monitoring practices need extending to more central level and all level-local budget planning and execution processes.
Alignment	Achievement: Sector councils and the integrated database of external assistance, an aid management platform have improved the alignment of aid to national priorities.	Priority action: Measures to strengthen the national systems and expand their use beyond direct budget support and extend them to the smaller donors.
Harmonisation	Achievement: The Partnership Principles Implementation Plan provides a framework endorsed by the Government of Moldova and donors.	Priority action: Use sector-wide approaches to implement a division of labour and information sharing between donors.
Managing for results	Achievement: Monitoring and evaluation reports of the national development strategy are accessible to the public are used in the strategic planning process by policy makers and line ministries.	Priority action: Ensure the monitoring and evaluation framework is fully operational.
Mutual accountability	Achievement: Consolidation of the aid coordination unit at the level of the State Chancellery.	Priority action: Hold donors accountable for their progress and share lessons from other donors.

ABOUT THE SURVEY

This chapter assesses progress against the quantitative indicators provided by the Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration, drawing on data provided by the government and donors, the OECD and the World Bank. In addition to this, it draws on qualitative evidence submitted to the OECD by the national government which incorporates feedback from donors and other stakeholders. Stakeholders note that it is possible that in places definitions and concepts were interpreted differently by survey respondents in 2011 compared with previous years. A degree of caution should be taken when analysing the trends shown by some of the indicators.

The 2011 survey responses cover 25 donors and 93% of Moldova's core ODA. Moldova participated in both the 2006 and 2008 surveys. The country report was developed by the Moldovan Aid Coordination Unit. Moldova also completed the optional modules on gender equality and inclusive ownership. ■

OWNERSHIP

AID IS MOST EFFECTIVE when it supports a country-owned approach to development. It is less effective when aid policies and approaches are driven by donors. In the context of the Paris Declaration, ownership concerns a country's ability to carry out two, inter-linked activities: exercise effective leadership over its development policies and strategies; and co-ordinate the efforts of various development actors working in the country.

Indicator 1 assesses the operational value of a country's development strategy. In particular, it looks at the existence of an authoritative country-wide development policy (*i.e.* a unified strategic framework), the extent to which priorities are established, and whether these policies are costed and linked with the budget. All of these features are important to harness domestic resources for development, and to provide a basis for the alignment of aid to development priorities. Each country has provided evidence against these criteria, and this has been translated into a score by the World Bank using the same methodology as in the 2006 and 2008 surveys. A five-point scale runs from A (highest score) to E (lowest score). The Paris Declaration targets 75% of partner countries achieving a score of A or B by 2010.

Moldova received a C rating in 2010, the same as in 2007 and an improvement compared to the D rating received in 2005, but is less than the B required to meet the 2010 target. According to the World Bank's assessment, this indicates that progress is being made, although not yet enough, and the basis exists for even more substantive progress. The national development strategy (NDS) is linked to the long-term vision, but the sectoral strategies and policy papers are not prioritised. The NDS action plan links the NDS with the medium-term expenditure framework (MTEF), although without a costing the credibility of the link is somewhat unclear.

Moldova's NDS was formulated in 2007 and covers the period 2008-11. The longer-term framework into which these strategies fit is provided by the MDG agenda which Moldova committed to in 2000. The NDS's targets are prioritised and they are linked to MDGs. They form the basis for annual action plans, the implementation of which is overseen by the State Chancellery. Sectoral strategies are in line with NDS priorities, but the link is weak and sectoral agendas are sometimes at odds with the national agenda. In 2010 to increase the effectiveness of the NDS, Moldova formulated a medium-term financial framework (MTFF) and MTEF for the period 2011-13. The NDS has not been costed, but it is used by the State Chancellery to set strategic priorities for the year and serves as a guide for the development of the medium-term budgetary framework (MTBF). In the MTBF for 2011-13 the sector strategies cover about 85% of total public expenditure. The draft budget and MTBF are consistent, embodying the same spending limits and priorities. Elements of performance budgeting have been applied since 2003 in some sectors and the process now covers about 30% of total state budget expenditure. The main challenge at this stage is to extend the programme budgeting practice and performance to the entire central and local level budgeting/budget execution process.

INDICATOR 1

Do countries have operational development strategies?

Moldova is achieving better ownership. However, according to information provided by Moldova regarding the inclusiveness of ownership, only some stakeholders are involved in the formulation, implementation or monitoring of the NDS. Civil society and donors take part in annual national-level debates that serve as a part of the monitoring and evaluation system for NDS implementation. However, other important stakeholders are still not involved or the level of their participation is limited. During the NDS formulation, Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) were very actively involved while, in the monitoring and evaluation processes the participation of civil society and the business community was weaker. Donors also provided technical support to this process. The formation of the National Participation Council in 2010 improved the quality of dialogue, and civil society and other actors were subsequently involved more actively in the policy making, monitoring and evaluation process. However, there is still room for improvement such as making public all the information concerning progress reports and evaluation assessments of the NDS. The weakest point with respect to participation is the weak involvement at the formulation of the Parliament and local authorities and non-involvement at the evaluation and monitoring stage.

Progress has been made in promoting gender equality issues in the NDS. Gender equality issues were integrated into four out of five NDS priority sectors through an open multi-stakeholder consultative process. Revised MDG targets (MDG 3) were approved and adopted in the NDS. In addition, the Government of Moldova has approved the National Programme on Ensuring Gender Equality (NGEP) for 2010-15 and the National Action Plan 2008-11 for implementation of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). However, The NGEP has not yet been costed in MTBF. Lack of clear link between policy priorities and state budget resource allocation is one of the major deficiencies in many sectors. So far, there is no clearly defined budget allocated to gender equality in the state budget and largely no evidence of using gender responsive budgeting in PFM in a systematic way. ■

ALIGNMENT

AID THAT IS DONOR DRIVEN AND FRAGMENTED is less effective. For aid to be effective, it must make use of national development strategies and use and help strengthen capacity in national systems, such as those for procurement and public financial management. The Paris Declaration envisions donors basing their support fully on partner countries' aims and objectives. Indicators 2 through 8 of the Paris Declaration assess several different dimensions of alignment.

Moldova met targets for four of the seven available alignment indicators, made progress on two indicators and saw a minor setback in the share of untied aid. Moldova's desire to become a member of the European Union is driving the reform of its financial management and procurement systems, bringing them into line with EU standards.

INDICATOR 2 Building reliable country systems

Indicator 2 covers two aspects of country systems: public financial management (PFM) and procurement. Do these systems either adhere to good practices or are there plans for reform? If countries have reliable systems, donors are encouraged to use them for the delivery and management of aid. This helps to align aid more closely with national development strategies and enhances aid effectiveness.

INDICATOR 2a How reliable are country public financial management systems?

Indicator 2a of the Paris Declaration assesses whether PFM systems meet broadly accepted good practices or whether credible reform programmes are in place. The assessment is based on the World Bank's Country Policy and Institutional Analysis (CPIA) score for the quality of PFM systems, which uses a scale running from 1 (very weak) to 6 (very strong).

To score highly, a country needs to perform well against all three of the following criteria: a comprehensive and credible budget linked to policy priorities; an effective financial management system to ensure that the budget is implemented as intended in a controlled and predictable way; and timely and accurate accounting

and fiscal reporting, including timely and audited public accounts with effective arrangements for follow up. Meeting the global 2010 target requires half of partner countries to move up at least one measure (*i.e.* 0.5 points) between 2005 and 2010.

In 2010 Moldova received a rating of 4 against the baseline score of 3.5 in 2005. To meet the target of 4, Moldova launched a PFM reform strategy in 2005. Several actions have been taken to improve the quality of the system to meet international standards and EU requirements. The government has introduced an integrated financial management system for budget preparation and execution, adopted laws on public finance and on public internal financial control and also developed the National Decentralisation Strategy within the framework of the European Charter signed in 1997. Despite the fact that Moldova has already reached its target for improving PFM systems some challenges remain. The priority for the government is to ensure the effectiveness of the laws adopted and to implement a capacity building programme.

Indicator 2b was first measured in 2008 by 17 countries. The process is one of self-assessment, using the Methodology for the Assessment of National Procurement Systems developed by the OECD-DAC Task Force on Procurement. The methodology includes baseline indicators to compare a country's systems to internationally-accepted good practice, as well as a new set of indicators. These indicators assess overall performance of the system, compliance with national legislation and standards and whether there is a reform programme in place to promote improved practices. The results are expressed as grades on a four-point scale running from A (the highest) to D (the lowest). The 2010 target is for a third of partner countries to move up at least one measure (*i.e.* from D to C, C to B or B to A) although not all countries will perform an assessment.

In 2010, Moldova was rated a C on the reliability of its procurement systems, although no target is applicable. Since 2005 Moldova has undertaken several reforms to improve public procurement systems. In 2007, a new public procurement law was adopted. In November 2009, further institutional changes were introduced to more rigorously separate the regulation of public procurement from other activities of the government. This resulted in establishing a new Public Procurement Agency (PPA) under the Ministry of Finance with the aim of ensuring close co-ordination across the entire public financial management system. The standard documentation for public procurement was elaborated but was not implemented due to lack of finances. This issue remains the key challenge for the improvement of the national procurement system.

Comprehensive and transparent reporting on aid, and its use, helps ensure that donors align aid flows with national development priorities. When aid directed to the government sector is fully and accurately reflected in the national budget it indicates that aid programmes are well connected with country policies and processes. This also allows partner country authorities to present accurate and comprehensive budget reports to their parliaments and citizens.

As a proxy for alignment, indicator 3 measures the percentage of aid disbursed by donors for the government sector that is included in the annual budget for the same fiscal year. The indicator reflects two components: the degree to which aid is aligned with government priorities, and the extent to which aid is captured in government's budget preparation process. Budget estimates can be higher or lower than disbursements by donors and are treated similarly for the purpose of measuring indicator 3 despite the different causes.

The 2010 target is to halve the proportion of aid flows that are not currently reported on government budgets, with at least 85% of aid reflected in the budget.

In 2010, 92% of Moldova's aid was reported on budget. This is 7% above the 2010 target; however USD 32 million of aid is still not aligned to national priorities. This represents significant progress since the 2008 survey results which reported a significant decline, with only 57% of total aid disbursed recorded in the national budget in comparison with 70% as a baseline in 2005. In 2010 the annual budget estimates of the government regarding the assistance provided by the major donors were higher than the amounts

INDICATOR 2b
How reliable are country procurement systems?

INDICATOR 3
Aligning aid flows on national priorities

disbursed by donors for the government sector. The main causes of this discrepancy are due to tranches of budget support which the country authorities have recorded in the 2010 budget, of which 12-13% have not been disbursed by donors (IMF, EU Institutions, World Bank) because of the political situation (the electoral period) and the subsequent slowing down of reforms and their implementation and disbursement. The donors disbursing more aid than recorded by the government were all relatively minor contributors. There is effective management of aid by the government through an established aid management platform – the Integrated Database of External Assistance (IDEA), which records the information about the ODA provided for Moldova as well as support planned by the donor for three-five years. This informs the government on the programmes/projects implemented by donors and their alignment to the NDS objectives.

TABLE 3:
Are government budget estimates comprehensive and realistic?

	Government's budget estimates of aid flows in 2010 (USD m) a	Aid disbursed by donors for government sector in 2010 (USD m) b	2005		2007		2010 *		Total aid disbursed through other donors (USD m)
			(for reference)		(for reference)		(%)		
							c = a / b	c = b / a	
Austria	--	1	--	--	0%	--	--	--	1
CEB	1	0	--	--	--	--	--	29%	0
Czech Republic	--	0	--	--	0%	--	--	--	0
Estonia	--	0	--	--	0%	--	--	--	0
EU Institutions	127	113	100%	--	27%	--	--	89%	13
Finland	--	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	0
France	--	0	--	--	0%	--	--	--	0
GAVI Alliance	--	0	--	--	0%	--	--	--	0
Germany	--	3	100%	--	61%	--	--	--	0
Global Fund	8	9	100%	--	23%	--	91%	--	0
Hungary	--	--	--	--	0%	--	--	--	0
IFAD	7	4	100%	--	--	42%	--	54%	0
IMF	150	122	--	--	--	--	--	81%	0
Japan	--	0	--	--	0%	--	--	--	0
Kuwait	4	0	--	--	--	--	--	2%	0
Latvia	--	--	--	--	0%	--	--	--	0
Lithuania	--	--	--	--	0%	--	--	--	0
Netherlands	--	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	5
Poland	--	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	0
Romania	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
Slovak Republic	--	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	0
Sweden	1	5	--	--	0%	--	13%	--	5
Switzerland	--	5	--	--	0%	--	--	--	0
Turkey	--	4	--	--	0%	--	--	--	0
United Kingdom	8	9	10%	--	0%	--	83%	--	0
United Nations	0	27	--	--	0%	--	0%	--	0
United States	--	2	--	--	0%	--	--	--	0
World Bank	116	84	--	100%	--	87%	--	72%	0
Average donor ratio				85%		12%		52%	
Total	421	389		70%		57%		92%	24

*Ratio is $c = a / b$ except where government's budget estimates are greater than disbursements ($c = b / a$).

INDICATOR 7
Providing more predictable aid

For many countries, aid is a vital source of revenue and resources. Being able to predict aid disbursements – both in terms of how much aid will be delivered and when – is important to enable countries to manage public finances and undertake realistic planning for development. The Paris Declaration calls on donors to provide reliable, indicative commitments of aid over a multi-year framework, and to disburse aid in a timely and predictable manner according to agreed schedules.

Indicator 7 examines the in-year predictability of aid for the government sector by measuring the proportion of planned disbursements (as reported by donors) that are recorded by governments in their accounting system as having been disbursed. Indicator 7 therefore assesses two aspects of predictability. The first is the ability of donors to disburse aid according to schedule. The second is the ability of government to record disbursements for the government sector as received in its accounting system. Indicator 7 is designed to encourage progress in relation to both, with the aim of halving the proportion of aid not disbursed (and not captured in the government's accounting system) within the fiscal year for which it was scheduled by 2010. The ultimate goal is to improve not only the predictability of disbursements, but also the accuracy with which they are recorded in government systems – an important element to support ownership, accountability and transparency.

TABLE 4:
Are disbursements on schedule and recorded by government?

	Disbursements recorded by government in 2010	Aid scheduled by donors for disbursement in 2010	2005		2007		2010*		For reference: Aid disbursed by donors for government sector in 2010	For reference: % of scheduled aid disbursements reported as disbursed by donors in 2010**	
	(USD m)	(USD m)	(for reference)	(for reference)	(for reference)	(for reference)	(%)	(%)	(USD m)	e = d / b	e = b / d
	a	b					c = a / b	c = b / a	d		
Austria	--	1	--	0%					1	100%	
CEB	0	1	--	--			29%		0	29%	
Czech Republic	--	0	--	0%					0	100%	
Estonia	--	0	--	0%					0	94%	
EU Institutions	93	73	98%		96%			79%	113		65%
Finland	--	0	--	--					0	--	
France	--	0	--						0	--	
GAVI Alliance	--	0	--	0%					0		94%
Germany	--	3	--		87%				3		97%
Global Fund	9	7	85%	100%				79%	9		79%
Hungary	--	--	--	0%					--	--	
IFAD	6	4	--		13%			65%	4	100%	
IMF	122	150	--	--			81%		122	81%	
Japan	--	0	--	48%					0	100%	
Kuwait	0	4	--	--			2%		0	2%	
Latvia	--	--	--	0%			--		--	--	
Lithuania	--	--	--	0%			--		--	--	
Netherlands	4	0	--	--				0%	0	--	
Poland	--	0	--	--					0	--	
Romania	--	1	--	--					1	100%	
Slovak Republic	--	0	--	--					0	0%	
Sweden	4	2	--	15%				50%	5		39%
Switzerland	--	0	--	0%					5		0%
Turkey	--	0	--	0%					4		0%
United Kingdom	10	9	7%	0%				95%	9	100%	
United Nations	0	30	--	3%			0%		27	90%	
United States	2	2	--				75%		2	100%	
World Bank	83	120	87%		87%		69%		84	70%	
Average donor ratio			69%	25%			52%				69%
Total	332	409	67%	77%			81%		389		95%

* Ratio is c=a/b except where disbursements recorded by government are greater than aid scheduled for disbursement (c=b/a).

** Ratio is e=d/b except where disbursements recorded by donors are greater than aid scheduled for disbursement (e=b/d).

The 2011 Survey indicates that 81% of scheduled aid is recorded in public accounts, narrowly missing the 85% target. This reflects progress since the baseline score of 67% in 2005, which improved to 77% in 2008. Country stakeholders identified that not all external funding is reflected in government budgets and this particularly applies to technical co-operation and flows implemented without using Moldova's country

financial management systems. For some donors this was related to centralised management of data by their headquarters. Other donors were able to provide disbursement schedules for up to three years in advance. Events such as the economic and financial crisis, changing politics in Moldova and the impact of government reform programmes have led to changing disbursement schedules. The Government of Moldova has been unifying reporting systems, standardising accounting practices and building capacity in order to make further progress.

INDICATOR 4
Co-ordinating support
to strengthen capacity

Capacity constraints present significant challenges to development and poverty reduction efforts and their sustainability. These relate both to aid management capacities (the ability of the government to capture, co-ordinate and utilise aid flows more effectively) and also to broader capacities for the design and implementation of policies and service delivery.

Under the Paris Declaration donors committed to providing technical co-operation that is co-ordinated with partner country strategies and programmes. This approach aims to strengthen capacities while also responding to the needs of partner countries. Successful capacity development is led by the partner country.

Indicator 4 focuses on the extent to which donor technical co-operation (an important input into capacity development) is country-led and well co-ordinated. It captures the extent to which technical co-operation is aligned with objectives articulated by country authorities, whether country authorities have control over this assistance, and whether arrangements are in place to co-ordinate support provided by different donors. The Paris Declaration target is for 50% of technical co-operation flows to be implemented through co-ordinated programmes that are consistent with national development strategies by 2010.

TABLE 5:
How much technical
co-operation is
co-ordinated with
country programmes?

	Co-ordinated technical co-operation (USD m)	Total technical co-operation (USD m)	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 (%) c = a / b
	a	b			
Austria	1	1	0%	100%	55%
CEB	--	--	--	--	--
Czech Republic	0	3	--	28%	0%
Estonia	0	0	--	0%	84%
EU Institutions	15	16	--	--	90%
Finland	0	0	--	--	--
France	0	0	--	0%	0%
GAVI Alliance	--	--	--	--	--
Germany	3	4	--	24%	77%
Global Fund	--	--	--	--	--
Hungary	--	--	--	0%	--
IFAD	0	0	--	0%	100%
IMF	0	0	--	--	--
Japan	0	0	0%	100%	100%
Kuwait	0	0	--	--	--
Latvia	--	--	--	64%	--
Lithuania	--	--	--	25%	--
Netherlands	0	0	0%	--	--
Poland	0	1	--	--	0%
Romania	1	1	--	--	100%
Slovak Republic	0	0	--	--	0%
Sweden	4	4	100%	20%	100%
Switzerland	5	6	0%	59%	80%
Turkey	0	2	0%	7%	0%
United Kingdom	5	5	84%	99%	100%
United Nations	17	24	100%	92%	70%
United States	0	9	8%	0%	0%
World Bank	13	13	100%	17%	100%
Total	64	91	26%	29%	71%

The co-ordination of technical co-operation in Moldova improved significantly from 26% in 2005 to 71% in 2010. This is 21% higher than the 2010 target of 50%. USD 64 million out of USD 91 million for technical co-operation was co-ordinated. This achievement is due to the high percentage of co-ordinated technical co-operation reported by the World Bank (100%), United Kingdom (100%), Sweden (100%), European Union Institutions (93%) and United Nations (71%) – the major donors of technical co-operation to Moldova. No national capacity building strategy exists in Moldova, and only some sector strategies have capacity building components. Only broad institutional reform programmes, such as the public financial management and central public administration have co-ordinated technical assistance. In many cases, national authorities do not have control over the technical assistance delivered. Stakeholders report that even for some joint assistance projects, donors do not adopt a unified approach. Since 2005, the government has developed several sector strategies on capacity development as part of the NDS. Sector councils have been established with the participation of donors and government representatives and non-state actors. Moldova has also launched a mapping exercise of donor presence, although the process is not yet complete for some sectors (*e.g.* the leading donor designation). With the new methodology of elaboration of the Plans for Strategic Development, further impetus will be given for donors to follow more closely the specific needs of institutions for capacity building.

Donor use of a partner country's established institutions and systems increases aid effectiveness by strengthening the government's long-term capacity to develop, implement and account for its policies to both its citizens and its parliament. The Paris Declaration commits donors to increase their use of country systems that are of sufficient quality, and to work with partner countries to strengthen systems that are currently weak. Indicator 5 is directly linked to indicator 2 on the quality of public financial management (PFM) and procurement systems.

Indicator 5a measures the extent to which donors use partner country PFM systems when providing funding for the government sector. It measures the volume of aid that uses partner country PFM systems (budget execution, financial reporting and auditing) as a proportion of total aid disbursed for the government sector. The 2010 target is set relative to indicator 2a on the quality of PFM systems. For partner countries with a score of 5 or above on indicator 2a scale the target is for a two-thirds reduction in the proportion of aid to the public sector not using the partner country's PFM systems. For partner countries with a score between 3.5 and 4.5 on indicator 2a, the target is a one-third reduction in the proportion of aid to the public sector not using partner country's PFM systems. There is no target for countries scoring less than 3.5.

In 2010, 70% of aid used Moldova's PFM systems. This is 20% above the target for 2010 and reflects steady progress over the past five years from 25% as the baseline in 2005. This is a result of the increased level of assistance directed by the main donors who traditionally provide finances through direct budget support, rather than an overall change in the donor communities approach towards the use of country systems. According to the data provided, five donors are using Moldova's PFM system for over 60% of their funds in 2010. The use of the country public financial management systems by the majority of donors still remains a challenge. Several donors (IMF, EU Institutions, DFID, World Bank) only use Moldova's PFM systems for direct budget support with the rest of their support still outside the country public financial management systems. Stakeholders report that progress has been made with internal audit, external audit, financial management, informational systems and budget preparation methodologies, and that these are at an advanced level of implementation, contributing to increased trust among donors in the national system.

Indicator 5b follows a similar graduated target to indicator 5a which is set relative to Indicator 2b on the quality of procurement systems. For partner countries with a procurement score of 'A', a two-thirds reduction in the proportion of aid for the public sector not using the country's procurement systems and for partner countries with a procurement score of 'B' to reduce the gap by one-third.

INDICATOR 5

Using country systems

INDICATOR 5a

Use of country public financial management systems

INDICATOR 5b

Use of country procurement systems

TABLE 6:
How much aid for the government sector uses country systems?

	Aid disbursed by donors for government sector (USD m)	Public financial management						Procurement			
		Budget execution	Financial reporting	Auditing	2005	2007	2010	Proc. systems	2005	2007	2010
		(USD m)	(USD m)	(USD m)	(for reference)	(for reference)	(%)	(USD m)	(for reference)	(for reference)	(%)
a	b	c	d			avg(b,c,d)/a	e			e / a	
Austria	1	0	0	0	0%	0%	1%	0	0%	--	4%
CEB	0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Czech Republic	0	0	0	0	--	0%	0%	0	--	--	89%
Estonia	0	0	0	0	--	0%	0%	0	--	--	0%
EU Institutions	113	111	111	111	100%	100%	98%	111	100%	100%	98%
Finland	0	0	0	0	--	--	--	0	--	--	--
France	0	0	0	0	--	0%	--	0	--	--	--
GAVI Alliance	0	--	--	--	--	35%	--	--	40%	60%	--
Germany	3	0	0	0	--	100%	0%	0	--	100%	0%
Global Fund	9	0	9	0	0%	0%	33%	0	0%	--	0%
Hungary	--	--	--	--	--	0%	--	--	--	--	--
IFAD	4	0	0	0	--	0%	0%	0	--	--	0%
IMF	122	122	122	122	--	--	100%	122	--	--	100%
Japan	0	0	0	0	0%	33%	0%	0	0%	33%	0%
Kuwait	0	0	0	0	--	--	0%	0	--	--	0%
Latvia	--	--	--	--	--	8%	--	--	--	1%	--
Lithuania	--	--	--	--	--	0%	--	--	--	100%	--
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	--	--	--	0	--	--	--
Poland	0	0	0	0	--	--	--	0	--	--	--
Romania	1	1	1	1	--	--	91%	1	--	--	91%
Slovak Republic	0	0	0	0	--	--	--	0	--	--	--
Sweden	5	0	2	2	0%	29%	26%	2	0%	11%	39%
Switzerland	5	0	0	0	--	0%	0%	0	--	--	3%
Turkey	4	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	--	0%
United Kingdom	9	9	9	0	7%	0%	67%	2	10%	--	25%
United Nations	27	2	0	0	0%	3%	3%	2	0%	--	6%
United States	2	2	2	2	0%	0%	100%	2	0%	--	100%
World Bank	84	25	25	28	0%	29%	32%	34	0%	29%	41%
Total	389	272	281	266	25%	41%	70%	276	25%	39%	71%

Seventy-one percent of aid now makes use of Moldova's national procurement system, a substantial increase on the 25% recorded in 2005 and 39% in 2008. As with the use of Moldova's PFM systems, the improvement in the use of the national procurement system are mainly based on increased support from several donors providing direct budget support. For projects which are not funded through budget support, the national procurement system is generally not used. The reviews of national procurement systems by some donors (such as the World Bank, SIDA and UN agencies) and the self assessment by the national authorities (rating at a "C" score) have been followed by the increased use of national procurement systems and the decision to support the system's improvement (e.g. through the introduction of an e-procurement system).

INDICATOR 6
Avoiding parallel implementation structures

When providing development assistance, some donors establish dedicated project management units or implementation units (PIUs) – to support development projects or programmes. A PIU is said to be "parallel" when it is created by the donor and operates outside existing country institutional and administrative structures. In the short term, parallel PIUs can play a useful role in establishing good practice and promoting effective project management. However, in the long run, parallel PIUs often tend to undermine national capacity development efforts, distort salaries and weaken accountability for development.

To make aid more effective, the Paris Declaration encourages donors to "avoid, to the maximum extent possible, creating dedicated structures for day-to-day management and implementation of aid-financed projects and programmes." Indicator 6 counts the number of parallel PIUs being used in partner countries. The target is to reduce by two-thirds the number of parallel PIUs in each partner country between 2005 and 2010.

	Parallel PIUs		
	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 (units)
Austria	0	0	1
CEB	--	--	--
Czech Republic	--	8	0
Estonia	--	0	1
EU Institutions	--	10	0
Finland	--	--	0
France	--	0	0
GAVI Alliance	--	0	--
Germany	--	0	0
Global Fund	0	0	0
Hungary	--	0	--
IFAD	--	1	1
IMF	--	--	0
Japan	1	2	0
Kuwait	--	--	0
Latvia	--	0	--
Lithuania	--	0	--
Netherlands	0	--	0
Poland	--	--	0
Romania	--	--	0
Slovak Republic	--	--	0
Sweden	6	4	0
Switzerland	0	0	5
Turkey	0	1	0
United Kingdom	4	3	3
United Nations	11	14	7
United States	13	0	0
World Bank	14	16	0
Total	43	59	18

TABLE 7:
How many PIUs are
parallel to country
structures?

The number of parallel PIUs in 2010 was registered at 18, four more than the 2010 target. Since 2005 the number of parallel PIUs created by donors in Moldova has significantly reduced, compared to 43 in 2005 and 59 in 2008. During the last few years the integration of many activities into the existing frameworks, has been a joint effort between donors and implementing institutions. Many donors are trying to reduce their reliance on parallel PIUs by integrating their functions into the appropriate ministries. However, donors often still maintain the authority to appoint staff members and provide higher salaries than those of civil service personnel. This can undermine national capacity building efforts and create tension within ministries. There are different opinions on the interpretation of parallel PIUs; while the government notes that although the number of parallel PIUs is diminishing, their reclassification from parallel PIUs to integrated does not coincide with a change in their essential function as many of them retain the same procedural characteristics.

Aid is “tied” when restrictions are placed on the countries that goods and services may be purchased from, typically including the donor country and/or another narrowly specified group of countries. Untied aid not only improves value for money and decreases administrative burdens, but also supports the use of local resources, country systems and the harmonisation of donor support provided through pooled or joint aid instruments and approaches.

Data on the extent to which aid is tied are based on voluntary self-reporting by donors that are members of the OECD’s Development Assistance Committee (DAC). The Paris Declaration target is to continue progress towards untying all aid between 2005 and 2010.

INDICATOR 8
Untying aid

TABLE 8:
How much bilateral aid
is untied?

	Total bilateral aid as reported to the DAC in 2009	Untied aid	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	Share of untied aid
Austria	2.2	1.8	7%	92%	83%
Belgium	0.0	0.0	100%	100%	100%
Denmark	0.2	0.2	--	--	100%
Finland	0.2	0.2	100%	--	100%
France	0.2	0.2	100%	17%	100%
Germany	0.0	0.0	0%	99%	--
Greece	0.1	0.1	100%	0%	95%
Ireland	0.0	0.0	100%	100%	--
Italy	0.8	0.1	--	54%	7%
Japan	2.0	2.0	100%	100%	100%
Luxembourg	0.3	0.3	100%	100%	100%
Netherlands	0.3	0.2	100%	98%	81%
Norway	0.2	0.2	100%	100%	100%
Portugal	0.0	0.0	--	100%	--
Spain	0.1	0.0	0%	0%	0%
Sweden	18.9	18.9	100%	100%	100%
Switzerland	1.6	1.6	100%	92%	100%
United Kingdom	1.6	1.6	100%	100%	100%
United States	19.1	10.5	0%	53%	55%
Total	48	38	81%	81%	80%

Source: OECD Creditor Reporting System.

The proportion of untied bilateral aid in 2009 was 80%. Based on the data from previous years (81% in 2005 and 81% in 2007) this represents a minor setback on the 2010 target goal which was reached in 2007. The majority of donors to Moldova untied all their aid, with the notable exceptions of the United States, Spain, the Netherlands, Italy and Austria.

CONDITIONALITY

Regarding other conditionalities, Moldova faces challenges in making public all conditions linked to disbursement at the country level. Different donors are using different conditions in relation to budget support and there is limited discussion of a co-ordinated/single conditionality framework. Donors generally specify an extensive number of conditions and country stakeholders feel that donor's actions and implementation deadlines are somewhat vague. Stakeholders report that conditionalities are imposed without an evaluation of the national capacities and financial possibilities for implementation. However the government has managed to ensure a common list of conditionalities which is in line with NDS objectives. Some first steps are being made by making public the agreements which include conditionalities for disbursements signed between Moldova and donors. ■

HARMONISATION

POOR CO-ORDINATION OF AID increases the cost to both donors and partner countries and significantly reduces the real value of aid. Harmonisation of aid delivery procedures and the adoption of common arrangements help reduce duplication of effort and lower the transaction costs associated with aid management. The Paris Declaration focuses on two dimensions of aid as a proxy for assessing overall harmonisation: the use of common arrangements within programme-based approaches (PBAs) and the extent to which donors and partner countries conduct joint missions and co-ordinate analytic work.

Aid effectiveness is enhanced when donors use common arrangements to manage and deliver aid in support of partner country priorities. A good mechanism for aid co-ordination can be described as one that has shared objectives and integrates the various interests of stakeholders. Indicator 9 assesses the degree to which donors

INDICATOR 9 Using common arrangements

work together – and with partner governments and organisations – by measuring the proportion of total ODA disbursed within programme-based approaches (PBAs). In practice, there are many different approaches and modalities which can use PBAs and harmonisation takes place at various levels.

At one level, the partner country is responsible for defining clear, country-owned programmes (*e.g.* a sector programme or strategy) and establishing a single budgetary framework that captures all resources (both domestic and external). At another level, donors are responsible for taking steps to use local systems for programme design and implementation, financial management, monitoring and evaluation. Finally, partner countries and donors are jointly responsible for donor co-ordination and harmonisation of donor procedures. The 2010 target is that two-thirds of aid flows are provided in the context of PBAs.

TABLE 9:
How much aid is
programme based?

	Programme-based approaches			Total aid disbursed (USD m) d	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 (%) e = c / d
	Budget support (USD m) a	Other PBAs (USD m) b	Total (USD m) c = a + b				
Austria	0	0	0	2	0%	50%	0%
CEB	--	--	--	0	--	--	--
Czech Republic	0	0	0	3	--	0%	0%
Estonia	0	0	0	0	--	0%	0%
EU Institutions	41	1	42	125	59%	64%	34%
Finland	0	0	0	0	--	--	0%
France	0	0	0	0	--	0%	0%
GAVI Alliance	--	0	0	0	40%	60%	100%
Germany	0	0	0	4	--	49%	0%
Global Fund	0	18	18	18	0%	0%	100%
Hungary	--	--	--	--	--	0%	--
IFAD	0	4	4	4	--	0%	100%
IMF	122	0	122	122	--	--	100%
Japan	0	0	0	1	0%	47%	0%
Kuwait	0	0	0	0	--	--	0%
Latvia	--	--	--	--	--	0%	--
Lithuania	--	--	--	--	--	0%	--
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0%	--	--
Poland	0	0	0	1	--	--	0%
Romania	0	0	0	1	--	--	0%
Slovak Republic	0	0	0	0	--	--	0%
Sweden	0	3	3	8	0%	36%	40%
Switzerland	0	0	0	7	0%	0%	0%
Turkey	0	0	0	4	0%	0%	0%
United Kingdom	9	5	15	15	10%	0%	99%
United Nations	0	0	0	27	0%	0%	1%
United States	0	0	0	22	0%	0%	0%
World Bank	25	0	25	84	0%	30%	30%
Total	197	32	230	448	16%	30%	51%

According to 2010 data, 51% of aid to Moldova made use of PBAs. This is not enough to meet the 2010 target of 66%, however, it does reflect substantial progress when compared to the 2005 baseline of 16%. Five donors account for almost 100% of the aid disbursed using PBAs. Excluding the IMF, of the two remaining major donors, EU Institutions and World Bank, only 34% and 30% of their aid respectively used PBAs. The majority of PBA support is direct budget support, with a small proportion of sector support. Stakeholders reported that the main constraint in channelling development assistance through PBAs is achieving sufficient commitment between the partners (both donors and public authorities) for co-ordinated support (based on co-operation in implementing national development programmes, strategies, sector programmes etc.). In practice, even if the assistance received from a donor supports a national programme, use of the budgetary systems, reporting, financial management, and procurement systems remain individualised for each donor.

INDICATOR 10a*
Joint missions

A common complaint of partner countries is that donors make too many demands on their limited resources: country authorities spend too much time meeting with donor officials and responding to their many requests. The Paris Declaration recognises that donors have a responsibility to ensure that, to the greatest extent possible, the missions and analytical work they commission are undertaken jointly – *i.e.* that the burden of such work is shared. The 2010 target is that 40% of donor missions to the field are conducted jointly.

TABLE 10:
How many donor missions are co-ordinated?

	Co-ordinated donor missions (missions)	Total donor missions (missions)	2005 (for reference)	2007* (for reference)	2010 (%)
	a	b			c = a / b
Austria	2	2	100%	0%	100%
CEB	--	--	--	--	--
Czech Republic	13	16	--	0%	81%
Estonia	0	1	--	100%	0%
EU Institutions	13	35	5%	--	37%
Finland	0	1	--	--	0%
France	0	0	58%	0%	--
GAVI Alliance	0	0	--	--	--
Germany	0	3	--	60%	0%
Global Fund	1	2	0%	0%	50%
Hungary	--	--	--	0%	--
IFAD	0	2	--	--	0%
IMF	0	10	--	--	0%
Japan	0	2	0%	0%	0%
Kuwait	0	0	--	--	--
Latvia	--	--	--	100%	--
Lithuania	--	--	--	100%	--
Netherlands	12	12	--	--	100%
Poland	0	0	--	--	--
Romania	0	0	--	--	--
Slovak Republic	0	0	--	--	--
Sweden	17	21	100%	6%	81%
Switzerland	1	4	50%	0%	25%
Turkey	0	5	0%	0%	0%
United Kingdom	8	9	25%	50%	89%
United Nations	19	58	19%	37%	33%
United States	4	22	--	0%	18%
World Bank	44	49	26%	30%	90%
Total	67	187	20%	14%	36%

* The total of coordinated missions has been adjusted to avoid double counting. A discount factor of 35% is applied.

In 2010, 36% of 187 donor missions were co-ordinated and Moldova failed to reach the 2010 target of 40%. In 2005 only 20% of donor missions were conducted jointly, reflecting slow progress in both rationalising the number of donor missions and difficulty in increasing the share of missions which are co-ordinated. The Government of Moldova has established a website for the National Coordinating Unit through which donors can share information on missions; however, use of this web portal remains limited.

* Note: since the publication of Volume 1 of this report (*Aid Effectiveness 2005-10: Progress in implementing the Paris Declaration*), errors in the calculation of indicator 10a for Moldova in 2010 were identified. A discount factor was applied to Moldova's figures for the number of missions in error. The data provided by Moldova were collected so as to avoid double-counting of missions, and as such the aggregates presented in this table replace those previously published.

Country analytic work is the analysis and advice necessary to strengthen policy dialogue, and to develop and implement country strategies. It includes country or sector studies and strategies, country evaluations and discussion papers. The Paris Declaration foresees that donors should conduct analytic work jointly where possible as it helps curb transaction costs for partner authorities, avoids unnecessary duplicative work and helps to foster common understanding. Indicator 10b measures the proportion of country analytic work that is undertaken jointly. The 2010 target is that 66% of country analytic work is carried out jointly.

According to the 2011 Survey, 51% of country analytic works were co-ordinated amongst donor partners. The United Kingdom, Sweden and IFAD are the only donors that co-ordinated 100% of their analytical work. The World Bank co-ordinated 75% of analytic work as required by the 2010 target – with all remaining donors co-ordinating less than this figure.

Stakeholders report a few cases where donors have developed analytical products jointly with government and that in these cases their conclusions and recommendations have been used by the government in preparing the Economic Stabilisation and Recovery Programme and new national development strategy. Still these cases are relatively rare.

INDICATOR 10b*
Joint country
analytic work

TABLE 11:
How much country
analytic work is
co-ordinated?

	Co-ordinated donor analytic work (units) a	Total donor analytic work (units) b	2005 (for reference)	2007* (for reference)	2010 (%) c = a / b
Austria	0	0	--	33%	--
CEB	--	--	--	--	--
Czech Republic	0	2	--	17%	0%
Estonia	0	2	--	--	0%
EU Institutions	1	6	--	100%	17%
Finland	0	0	--	--	--
France	0	0	--	--	--
GAVI Alliance	--	--	--	--	--
Germany	1	2	--	--	50%
Global Fund	0	1	--	0%	0%
Hungary	--	--	--	--	--
IFAD	2	2	--	0%	100%
IMF	0	5	--	--	0%
Japan	0	0	--	--	--
Kuwait	0	0	--	--	--
Latvia	--	--	--	--	--
Lithuania	--	--	--	--	--
Netherlands	0	0	--	--	--
Poland	0	0	--	--	--
Romania	0	0	--	--	--
Slovak Republic	0	0	--	--	--
Sweden	7	7	100%	0%	100%
Switzerland	0	0	0%	0%	--
Turkey	0	0	--	--	--
United Kingdom	1	1	50%	100%	100%
United Nations	32	52	75%	78%	62%
United States	0	2	33%	29%	0%
World Bank	3	4	20%	50%	75%
Total	40	79	50%	46%	51%

* The total of coordinated missions has been adjusted to avoid double counting.
A discount factor of 25% is applied.

* Note: since the publication of Volume 1 of this report (*Aid Effectiveness 2005-10: Progress in implementing the Paris Declaration*), errors in the calculation of indicator 10b for Moldova in 2010 were identified. A discount factor was applied to Moldova's figures for the number of analytic works in error. The data provided by Moldova were collected so as to avoid double-counting of missions, and as such the aggregates presented in this table replace those previously published.

AID FRAGMENTATION

Fragmented aid – aid that comes in many small slices from a large number of donors – creates high transaction costs and makes it difficult for partner countries effectively to manage their own development. Aid fragmentation also increases the risk of duplication and inefficient aid allocation among donors. A pilot analysis on fragmentation of country programmable aid carried out at the country level by the OECD in collaboration with Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) reveals that aid fragmentation increased from 2005-09 alongside an increase in country programmable aid (OECD 2011b).

Moldova recently assessed the degree of alignment between development partner aid flows and the national development strategy. The mapping exercise set the ground work for the further development of sector level co-ordination mechanisms. Some sectors are overcrowded, while others receive limited support. Achieving a better division of labour is seen as a good tool to improve donor co-ordination and reduce fragmentation. A Partnership Principles Implementation Plan has been agreed by EU member states to be the basis for the EU's Fast Track Initiative on Division of Labour. Some actions have been already undertaken with some sectors having identified leading donors and working groups at the level of line ministries. The government will lead in the development of PBAs including SWAps. Such approaches will lead to greater harmonisation amongst donors, not only in terms of financing but also programming, monitoring and reporting. The sector co-ordination boards are a key aspect of this approach. ■

MANAGING FOR RESULTS

BOTH DONORS AND PARTNER COUNTRIES should manage resources according to well-defined, desired results, measuring progress toward them and using information on results to improve decision making and performance. Achieving this implies strengthening capacity to undertake such management and emphasising a focus on results. Countries are expected to develop cost-effective and results-oriented reporting and performance assessment frameworks, while donors commit to use them and refrain from requiring separate reporting.

Indicator 11 assesses the quality of a country's results-oriented frameworks. In particular, it considers the quality of the information generated, stakeholder access to information, and the extent to which the information is utilised within a country level monitoring and evaluation system. The government provides evidence against these criteria through the survey, and this is translated by the World Bank into a score running from A (highest score) to E (lowest score).

The Paris Declaration 2010 global target is to reduce the proportion of countries without transparent and monitorable performance assessment frameworks by one-third.

In 2010, Moldova received an overall score of B for their results-oriented framework (improving from C in 2007). The overall score of B reflects the strong progress made by Moldova in the establishment of monitoring and evaluation system of the National Development Strategy (NDS), ensuring qualitative data collection and performing analysis on a semi-annual basis. Since 2008 the government of Moldova has made good progress in ensuring the effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation system of the NDS and reports are used in the strategic planning process by policy makers and line ministries. Access to information on NDS is regulated by a law on transparency in the decision-making process adopted in 2008. Moldova's high score in managing for results, awarded by the World Bank, is based on the assumption that the monitoring and evaluation framework outlined in the country report is now fully operational.

In Moldova, data collected for the monitoring and evaluation of the NDS is disaggregated by sex for a number of indicators. Notably, in 2008 the National Bureau of Statistics, with the support of UNDP, UN Women and UNFPA, developed a set of harmonised gender-sensitive development indicators (MDG indicators were revised and incorporated in the NDS). Gender statistics are developed and disseminated (213 gender disaggregated indicators). These indicators have been used in developing sector policies regarding,

INDICATOR 11

Do countries have results-oriented frameworks?

amongst others, social assistance and health. The majority of the abovementioned indicators are used in decision making and in developing strategic documents/actions. For instance, maternal health indicators are used in planning the MTEF in the field of health. At the same time, there are still some limitations in the degree to which sex-disaggregated data are used in policy making for various reasons, such as inadequate capacity of the policy units to undertake fully fledged analysis of any trends/directions. ■

MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY

STRONG AND BALANCED MECHANISMS that support accountability are required at all levels for aid to be most effective. Donors and partner country governments should be accountable to their respective publics and to each other for implementing their commitments on aid, its effectiveness, and the results to which it contributes.

Indicator 12 examines whether there is a country-level mechanism for mutual assessment of progress on partnership commitments, including on aid effectiveness. There are three criteria that must all be met: the existence of an aid policy or strategy agreed between the partner country government and donors; specific country-level aid effectiveness targets for both the partner country government and donors; an assessment towards these targets undertaken by both partner and donors in the last two years, and discussed in a forum for broad-based dialogue.

The 2010 target is for all partner countries to have mutual assessment reviews meeting these criteria in place.

Moldova's mutual accountability framework is based on the work of the Donorship Framework which was created specifically to monitor progress towards The Paris Declaration targets. The findings from the previous survey in 2008 indicated modest results, and the Donorship Framework of 2006 was revised. The Partnership Principles Implementation Plan 2010 is expected to improve the efficiency of the use of resources for realisation of government priorities and development targets. The sector councils were established by regulations regarding the institutional framework for co-ordination of the external assistance, representing an advisory body that reflects the partnership between government, civil society, the private sector and donors, and which contribute to the monitoring of development assistance granted in different sectors. Since 2005 a mutual accountability survey conducted by UN structures, in co-operation with the State Chancellery of Moldova, has achieved considerable success in building dialogue on aid effectiveness with donors. This has proved that behavioural change from the government and donors can occur, but there are still priority actions to be carried out. ■

NOTES

The quantitative information presented in the chapter is taken from data provided by national co-ordinators by 31 July 2011, following the data validation process with stakeholders at the country level. It was not possible to modify or correct any data received after this date.

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

REFERENCES

OECD (2011a) DAC Statistics, <http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx>.

OECD (2011b), Country aid fragmentation tables. Pilot analysis of aid fragmentation at the partner country level drawing on evidence sourced from the OECD-DAC Creditor Reporting System. WP-EFF Task Team on Division of Labour and Complementarity, OECD, Paris.

OECD (forthcoming), OECD Report on Division of Labour: Addressing Cross-country Fragmentation of Aid on www.oecd.org/document/46/0,3746,en_2649_33721_46022446_1_1_1_1,00.html.

World Development Indicators, The World Bank Group, 2011. Available at <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator>, accessed 23 May 2011.

INDICATOR 12

Mutual accountability

