

2006年6月19日
JPO 村田あす香

国際開発援助動向研究会 第53回 議事録

1. 日時：平成18年5月26日（金）12：00～13：30
2. 場所：千代田会館4階 セミナールーム
3. 発表者：Richard Manning氏（DAC Chair）
4. 議題：New Challenges in ODA
5. 出席者：52名
6. 議事：

6.1 開発援助情報システム「DAKIS」(<http://dakis.fasid.or.jp>)

- 開発援助の新しい潮流：文献紹介
 - No.59 坂本寿太郎（FASID ジュニア・プログラム・オフィサー）
David Bloom, David Canning, and Kevin Chan (2006) *Higher Education and Economic Development in Africa*, World Bank(AFTHD)
- Discussion Paper
 - No.9 林薫氏（文教大学国際学部）
「公共財政管理と日本の開発援助」
 - No.10 近藤正規氏（国際基督教大学）
「長期的な対印経済協力のあり方—インド・モデルの構築—」
- Journal Express
 - Journal Express 創刊号
- 開発援助動向シリーズ
(<http://www.fasid.or.jp/shuppan/hokokusho/enjo/view.html>)
 - 国際援助動向シリーズ4 秋山孝允・笹岡雄一編著(2006)『日本の開発援助の新しい展望を求めて』

6.2 本日のプレゼンテーション

I would like to talk about 4 major issues, and the linking theme is about how real the things donors have been saying are likely to turn out to be. The four questions are the following;

Issue1: Are donors serious about scaling up ODA?

In 2005, many commitments were made. The most significant one is probably by the EU

countries which require members to reach the aid target of 0.7 % of the GNI by 2015, but there are doubts and questions about the credibility of some of the European figures.

On the Japanese side, last year the Prime Minister announced the \$10 billion extra over a 5 year period, which we have taken as 2006-10. The simulation takes the view that this \$10 billion will be slightly back loaded. We know that Japan, as many European countries, the budgets are tight and the public debt is very high, and it will be very interesting to see whether Japan is able to deliver this \$ 10 billion. In the U.S., the situation is different from other DAC members. The U.S. has been the largest single source of increase over last few years. Of course, this is significantly driven by the major commitment in Iraq and Afghanistan, but the aid in Sub-Saharan Africa also increased very rapidly. The US has made no formal commitments for its aid volume beyond 2006. All in all, I think we will see a significant increase in aid even if it does not achieve this particular rate.

Finally, the very important question is, “Are the donors planning to spend this large amount?” We engaged with the World Bank to ask donors what plans they have over the next 3-4 years. We do not have the result of this exercise yet, but it is very interesting to see how far the plans have actually been made.

Issue2: Are donors serious about making aid effective?

DAC played a major role in the so-called “Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness” which was built around the main pillars of taking the issue of country ownerships seriously, aligning aid behind these priorities, harmonizing aid procedures, strengthening the focus on results, and mutual accountability where both sides of the donor-recipient relationship understand responsibilities. But the question is whose ownership, and what to do if it appears that the recipient government is out of touch with its own public? This has been tested in very interesting way in Ethiopia which has a history of quite a cooperative donor-recipient relationship. However, the election last year resulted in disorder. Some of the key donors who were providing general budget support, such as the World Bank and the U.K., have pulled back from what had been their plans of delivering of general budget support in the last Ethiopian fiscal year. Instead, the donors are trying to remain engaged through different channels, not the central government but the devolved government down to the district level. However, it is already gone against one of the Paris Declaration principles; that of predictability, therefore, it is interesting to watch cases like Ethiopia to see how the issue of ownership can in fact work when the difficulty arises in the donor-recipient relationship.

On harmonization, my question is how willing are the donors to change procedures to do this, and I have been working on this agenda for about five years. At the top level, they are much in favor of harmonization to reduce transaction costs, some field staffs are keen to see change, but at middle levels in headquarters some are extremely reluctant to change procedures. In my opinion, we have a long way to go in sharing analysis and to trust each other to deliver things on behalf of others at the sector and project level.

Issue 3: Are donors really “managing for results”?

Here in Japan, very important strategic aid reform has been announced. As aid becomes more important to most of developed countries, many donors have looked at more carefully how they manage aid and what kind of policy rationale they put to the public. That raises the question how good are donors to manage their own systems to achieve results, how effective are developing countries to manage the results. I think at the project level evaluation is relatively straightforward, but at the programme level, it is much harder. One area that interests me is better evaluation of impact of these programmes, and the Center for Global Development in Washington started an initiative, rather controversial one, to see if we can build an international coalition for better quality impact evaluation particularly for social programmes. I think we need to strengthen capacity of developing countries to carry out impact evaluations and to see what is the value of the programmes they and you are financing. The emphasis of next February’s international roundtable on results is particularly on capacity development on this aspect of developing countries as well as developed countries, so it is regarded as a major unfinished important agenda.

Issue 4: Will “Emerging Donors” change the face of development cooperation?

We are now going to see a big expansion of aid from Korea, Turkey and Eastern and Central European countries, and a big increase in DAC membership. Therefore, DAC are required to reshape itself accordingly.

China announced a 10 billion programme at the UN general assembly last year, but we do not know how much that programme is concessional. China also announced a new policy for Africa. At the same time, China has been very cautious about engaging with DAC and with other donors. I think that one useful way of building engagement with countries like India and China is to make use of the new process that was agreed at the UN General Assembly to have a development cooperation forum every two years. In my view, it could provide more consistent reporting of contributions which have been made outside of DAC, and all donors should regard MDGs as a core objective to achieve.

Q & A and Comments:

1. Issue of scaling up aid

Question:

There are some econometrical studies that show diminishing returns to aid, and also we need to avoid aid dependency. Do we not need some special strategies which should be accompanied with scaling up of aid?

Answer:

I am very interested in the issue of aid dependency, and academic research shows fairly clearly that there are diminishing returns to aid. What the academic research usually fails to show is exactly at what level that sets in with different circumstances. We need to bear in mind that it is not a static situation. The expansion of ODA from \$80 billion in 2004 to \$130 billion in 2010 is certainly a big increase, but the developing world is itself growing. My position would be that scaling up of aid, if properly planned, should

be compatible with more progress while avoiding aid dependency, but we need to monitor very carefully. We now have a common objective in the development community, and it is time to have a common strategy. Development is not something that is going to be achieved by one donor but achieved collectively with the developing countries playing the major role. So we need to play that supporting role in much more intelligent way than before in order to achieve the results.

2. Emerging donors

Question:

There is a potential that those emerging donors can provide their recent experiences of development. So in this regard, does DAC have some opportunities to share their perspectives and experiences?

Answer:

Koreans think that one of the things that they have to offer to the rest of the world is to say how they achieved what they have achieved. It was interesting when I was in Nigeria, the president of Nigeria himself drew the comparison between Nigeria and Korea whose per capital income had been very similar when Nigeria became independent in 1960s, and there is a lot of interest in how a country like Korea and China had made progress. I think what Japan has done in the TICAD process to try to encourage interaction between Asia and Africa is a very constructive.

3. Aid and National Interests

Comments from the floor:

The reform of the JICA is a major event in ODA policy for the future. I would like to point out that a major political motive for this reorganization is coming from the feeling that Japanese ODA is lacking a strategic objective, in the sense of clear correlation between foreign policies and development strategies. This became very clear, especially with the failure of UN reform in the Security Council. It is very important to recognize especially in Japan that the public support for scaling up ODA is still quite fragile, and this also is affected by the media report primarily on the role of China as a donor. The report goes as far as to say that Chinese assistance programme is being utilized for the political motives and has been done more effectively compared to Japanese programmes. Right or wrong, certainly this comes from a lack of accountability and transparency of Chinese assistance programmes; therefore, I hope DAC will be able to play a constructive role in making their programmes more transparent.

Comments by Mr. Manning:

It is a very good point, but my experience would be that if you define your national interest rather narrowly, you end up doing bad development, and if you do bad development, you lose the public support. There is much evidence where countries allow their aid programmes to be driven by the short term political objectives; on the whole, money used in this way is not very effective in contributing to long term sustainable development. Every country supports national interest for aid programmes, but you have to start with a very professional approach to make it sure that all your aid

interventions are consistent with promoting the long term sustainable development. After all, Japan's biggest interest and China's biggest interest is the long term sustainability. One of my major concerns about Chinese policies would be; "Is Chinese policy weakening the long term prosperity of sustainable development in certain countries because of over-aggressive emphasis on natural resources?" There are concerns that they are effectively encouraging some countries to pursue poor governance, so we need to have a conversation with China about that.