

DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE

Making development co-operation reform happen

Lessons and tools

Global Meeting of Development Co-operation Providers, Paris.

This paper draws from existing literature and interviews with stakeholders from countries that underwent a reform process during the last decade. It considers what a reform mindset entails for development co-operation providers, explores drivers for change and suggests questions decision makers might ask themselves as they work through the particular challenges at each stage of reform in their own context.

This paper is part of the Development Co-operation Directorate Perspective Series. Please cite this paper OECD (2023), "Making development co-operation happen: Lessons and tools", *OECD Development Co-operation Directorate*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

Ana Fernandes, ana.fernandes@oecd.org

Valentina Lisi, valentina.lisi@oecd.org

JT03513282

Making development co-operation reform happen: Lessons and tools

A rapidly changing world requires development co-operation providers to continuously adjust their institutional arrangements, policies, systems and processes. Yet, until today, existing tools for public policy reform had not been adapted for the sector. To fulfil this ambition, this paper draws from existing literature and interviews with stakeholders from countries that underwent a reform process during the last decade. It considers what a reform mindset entails for development co-operation providers, explores drivers for change and suggests questions decision makers might ask themselves as they work through the particular challenges at each stage of reform in their own context.

Key messages

- The rapidly changing development co-operation landscape requires development co-operation providers to continuously improve and reform their institutional arrangements, policies, systems and processes.
- There is no one-size-fits-all for development co-operation reform; politics, context and availability of resources determine the scope, process, pace and success of reforms.
- Reform is not just about changing institutional arrangements, policies, systems and processes; it is a mindset that demands constant attention and iteration.
- Lessons learned from recent development co-operation reforms can help policy makers address particular challenges posed in their specific context at each step of a reform.
- Applying strategic foresight, taking a systems approach, stress testing and engaging with stakeholders will help providers to anticipate and prepare for change.

Box 1. Ten lessons to make policy reform happen

1. Agree a **clear vision and narrative** with expected outcomes and results.
2. Define **roles and responsibilities**.
3. Provide **sound leadership** based on need.
4. Dedicate the **necessary resources**.
5. Understand and address **legislative and administrative requirements**.
6. Prioritise to **balance ambition and realism**.
7. Build and maintain **ownership and support**.
8. Recognise that **change takes time**.
9. Establish **oversight, consultation and evaluation mechanisms** to ensure innovation is captured and reform is part of a mindset.
10. **Communicate** on the reform to other parts of the government, to parliament and to stakeholders.

The context for development co-operation reform¹

A rapidly changing development co-operation landscape requires providers to continuously improve and reform

An evolving world is changing the context for development co-operation. Improving lives and pursuing sustainable development is neither a static nor a linear process. There are multiple challenges to address – from reducing poverty through addressing inequalities and supporting fair and inclusive economic growth, to combatting the effects of climate change and the impact of crises and fragility – and the fact that these are all interconnected creates considerable complexity for development co-operation providers. The impact of geopolitics adds further complexity. For example, the food and energy crises

triggered by Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine are creating major challenges for developing countries and their development co-operation partners.

The increasingly complex operating environment brings additional challenges. Development co-operation providers are engaging with an expanding variety of actors and need to adapt to new channels, modalities and partnerships. Providers are called on to better leverage the strengths of domestic, international and partner country-based civil society, and private sector actors. They are increasingly working with decentralised and local governments in partner countries and encouraged to partner with new and emerging actors, including through south-south and triangular co-operation.

COVID-19 reinforced the impetus for providers to adapt quickly. The pandemic has had a systemic impact on the development co-operation ecosystem. It triggered a multifaceted crisis at global, national and partner country levels, and has challenged providers' working practices, partnerships and business models (OECD, 2020^[1]). It simultaneously accelerated, disrupted and added to pre-existing domestic and international transformational trends. Calls to build back better towards more resilient, effective, inclusive, sustainable and impactful development co-operation systems are likely to feed reform agendas in many provider countries, both within and outside the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC).

This context requires continuous improvement. Providers cannot stand still. To be fit for the future, they will need to adjust and improve their institutional arrangements, policies, systems and processes. In this document, based on the experience of several OECD countries that have undergone recent reforms, we offer questions, lessons and tools to help development co-operation providers seeking to do this.

To be fit for purpose, development co-operation providers need to continuously adjust and improve their institutional arrangements, policies, systems and processes

Multiple drivers for development co-operation reform

Development co-operation providers face a range of external and internal incentives to reform. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is a universal call to action with an integrated set of goals and targets. The global partnerships and co-operation that it envisaged require new approaches from providers. Similarly, providers wishing to join and maintain membership of inter-governmental bodies will seek to apply norms and standards – for example, implementing international agreements and policy recommendations provided by multilateral organisations like the OECD and the DAC.²

Changes in the landscape require updated development co-operation policies. As part of this process, there is often a need to translate international agreements, policies and regulations into the national context (Stone, 2012). New schools of thought can bring change. For example, the localising and decolonising aid movements challenge providers to think of development co-operation as partnerships in which actors exchange different knowledge and resources rather than a one way flow of these from north to south. Nevertheless, changes in approach are shaped by what is possible in a particular domestic context.

Reform is often motivated and driven by changes other providers make. Transformation of a provider's approach to development co-operation is often driven by other countries' practices and experiences. This international policy diffusion process, through which "policy choices in one country affect the policy choices in other countries" (Meseguer and Gilardi, 2009^[2]), involves four main mechanisms – mutual learning, competition, coercion and emulation (Gilardi and Wasserfallen, 2019^[3]). Identifying and synthesising international policy trends of like-minded providers in development co-operation enables policy makers to situate their own model and practices and can incentivise them to consider reforming their system to align with contemporary and emerging policies more strongly. In adopting practices from other

providers, it is important to draw on their reform experience and lessons learned to avoid repeating mistakes.

Provider interests are becoming more explicit in development co-operation strategies and frameworks. Where altruism and solidarity were offered as the rationale for development co-operation, there is increasing recognition and promotion of the benefits that can accrue to providers. This is leading countries to articulate the benefits of development co-operation and how linking it to aspects of foreign and trade policy can deliver on their national interests – e.g. contributing to peace and security, enhancing soft power and influence, promoting universal values and a rules-based international order, responding to irregular migration and creating opportunities for trade.

Domestic drivers often play a critical role. A change of government can lead to new directions for development co-operation. An incoming government or Minister may demand greater administrative efficiencies in delivering development co-operation or evidence that it is effective. The desire to be more actively engaged in or deliver better development co-operation can surface challenges in the operating environment, for example where Ministries of Foreign Affairs lack the specialist skills to manage development co-operation activities. In some cases, improvements may be needed to meet the standards required to deliver European Union (EU) delegated co-operation.

There is no one-size-fits-all approach to reforming development co-operation

Reforming development co-operation requires a reform mindset. We define reform as a “structured and conscious process of producing change” (Huerta Melchor, 2008^[4]) involving a multifaceted and integrated response to major challenges and opportunities in a given sector (OECD, 2011^[5]; Lindquist, Vincent and Wanna, 2011^[6]). Although reform and change are often used interchangeably, “reform is only one way of producing change...and some reforms produce little or no change at all” (Huerta Melchor, 2008^[4]). For development co-operation, this may include shifts in institutional arrangements, policies, systems and processes amounting to a “complicated, long-term, and uncertain process of change in incentives, behaviours, institutions, relationships, and power alignments” (Abonyi, 2005^[7]). Getting it right matters.

There is no one-size-fits-all for development co-operation reform;
politics, context and availability of resources determine the scope,
process, pace and success of reforms

Two main trends emerged in reform of institutional arrangements during the last decade. In order to achieve greater coherence between development, foreign and trade policy, for instance, a number of DAC members have chosen to merge, integrate or amalgamate institutions responsible for development co-operation into their foreign ministries – e.g. Australia, Canada, Iceland, New Zealand and the United Kingdom. Currently 42% of DAC members have an integrated institutional arrangement.³ At the same time, a number of countries have chosen to establish new agencies – Estonia, Italy and Romania – or entrust development co-operation to existing entities – Latvia and Lithuania. Motivations vary and include separating development co-operation policy and implementation functions; building, professionalising and retaining development expertise – which can be constrained by rotation within foreign ministries; and passing pillar assessments to be able to engage in EU delegated co-operation. In doing so they join 58% of DAC members with a separation between policy and decision-making and implementation roles and responsibilities.

Shifts in development co-operation policy require different capabilities and approaches to implementation. No provider can stand still in the ever-changing development co-operation landscape.

All providers – new, emerging or experienced – need to adapt and change. Reforms can respond to a broad range of policy challenges – working more effectively in fragile contexts and with development actors in partner countries; bringing greater energy to efforts to combat climate change; supporting global public goods and addressing global, regional and transboundary challenges; engaging more effectively with the private sector and making greater use of financial instruments and modalities such as blended finance and equity investment. Providers are increasingly challenged to do development differently by entering into innovative partnerships and new modalities of development cooperation.

Systems and processes require continuous improvement. DAC peer reviews regularly encourage providers to become more fit for purpose – to improve their approaches to managing for development results, evaluation, knowledge management and learning. A number of providers are striving to localise their development co-operation⁴ and/or to make greater use of adaptive management and innovation. Existing compliance and control systems reduce risk-taking and the use of a broader range of financial instruments. There is also need for better alignment between bilateral, multilateral, south-south and triangular co-operation. Reform is needed in and across each of these areas.

Applying OECD analysis of public sector reforms

Political economy factors can facilitate or hinder reform. The OECD analysed 20 structural reform efforts by 10 OECD member countries in three policy areas – pensions, labour markets and product-market regulation – for its Making Reforms Happen project (Tompson, 2009_[8]). This analysis surfaced political economy lessons for policy makers aiming to design, adopt and implement structural reforms (Box 2).

Reform processes share common traits. A follow-up study analysed reform experiences in 30 OECD countries covering nine policy domains and identified additional points to take into account when undertaking future policy reform (Box 2). While policy design and strategies for adopting reforms need to reflect the institutional and cultural context of the country in which they are implemented, common challenges and potential solutions across countries and issues indicate significant scope for cross-country policy learning (OECD, 2010_[9]).

Box 2. OECD lessons for policy makers aiming to design, adopt and implement structural reforms.

Analysis of structural reform in pensions, labour markets and product-market regulation surfaced the following lessons:

- An **electoral mandate** is important
- **Effective communication** is essential
- Policy design should be underpinned by **solid research and analysis**
- Structural reforms take **time**
- **Cohesion of the government** is also critical
- Concertation¹ is no substitute for **government leadership**
- The **condition of the policy regime to be reformed** matters; some are more “ripe” for reform
- Successful reform requires **persistence**.

Further analysis in a broader range of policy areas surfaced additional lessons:

- Challenges are more likely to be met where **appropriate institutions** support reform from decision to implementation
- Successful reforms often take **several attempts**

- It pays to **engage opponents of reform** rather than trying to override their opposition.
- **Whether, when and how to compensate** those who lose out.

Note: 1. Concertation is an example “of “social pacts “, or formalised agreements between governments, trade unions and employers over one or many measures of social and economic reform,” (Afonso, 2013^[10]).

Source: Afonso (2013^[10]). European Integration, Domestic Politics and Social Concertation, In *Social Concertation in Times of Austerity: European Integration and the Politics of Labour Market Reforms in Austria and Switzerland* (pp. 53–74), Amsterdam University Press; OECD (2010^[9]), *Making Reform Happen: Lessons from OECD Countries (Summary)*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264086296-sum-en>; Tompson (2009^[8]), *The Political Economy of Reform: Lessons from Pensions, Product Markets and Labour Markets in Ten OECD Countries*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264073111-en>;

Strategy development and implementation is a continuous learning process rather than a one-off exercise. There are inherent interconnections between the stages of strategy development and implementation. Support for Improvement in Governance and Management (SIGMA), a joint initiative of the OECD and the EU, notes that the strategy process generally follows a universally designed and applied policy-planning cycle (Vági and Rimkute, 2018^[11]):

- Problem analysis
- Prioritising reform ambitions
- Setting objectives
- Defining indicators (with baselines and targets)
- Action planning and costing
- Public administration reform management and learning.

Steps in development co-operation reform

Taking a mindful approach to the reform process

Reform is a mindset that demands constant attention. There are many ways to achieve change in development co-operation and the change being pursued may impact institutional arrangements, policies, systems and/or processes. Whether complex or not, the process of producing change – the reform – should be one of continuous improvement, drawing from review and reflection.

Reform is not just about changing institutional arrangements, policies, systems and processes. It is a mindset that demands constant attention.

Policy makers and decision makers have a lot to consider as they design, plan, implement and oversee reforms. This section offers a range of questions to ask as they work through particular challenges posed in their specific context at each step of a reform. As noted above, there is no one-size-fits-all for development co-operation reform. Some reforms will follow a step-wise process. Others, however, may be truncated – e.g. where no legislative mandate is required and government institutions are instructed by the government or a minister to proceed with a specific reform such as a merger, amalgamation or integration of a development co-operation agency with or into a ministry, or to create independent institutions. The context for each reform dictates what is possible.

Step 1. Definition and framing

Setting the agenda and framing the reform. Reform involves an intentional intervention by policy makers. This first step involves focusing attention on the policy issues being considered for reform. It entails recognising, selecting, framing and defining the issues to be dealt with in the reform process, the outcomes to be achieved and the eventual impact of the reform. Agenda setting plays a pivotal role in the dynamics of the whole policy reform. It is the most contentious stage of policy reform as it both reflects the interplay between politics and the instruments employed to achieve reform (Lascoumes and Le Gales, 2007^[12]) and involves a range of stakeholders prioritising diverse reform options and proposing competing ideas in a particular policy domain. This stage requires strategic reflection about which issue gets put on the policy agenda and clarifies the boundaries of a policy reform. Agenda setting results in selecting and framing the issues for reform and what it is expected to achieve.

Table 1. Step 1: Define and frame the reform

Element	Questions to ask
Diagnosing the need for the reform	What are the underlying causes/problems making reform necessary? What specifically necessitates a reform?
Actively considering policy reform options	What policy solutions would address the underlying causes/problem? What weighting can be given to each option?
Deciding on a (set of) policy option(s) to underpin the reform	Which is the preferred (set of) option(s)? What is included and excluded from the reform?
Clarifying the expected outcomes and impact of the reform	What outcomes are expected to be achieved by the reform? What impact will the reform have on development co-operation?
Framing the reform	How will the reform be explained to all relevant stakeholders and to the public? How is the reform expected to be implemented?

Note: As development co-operation is impacted by and has implications for several domestic policies it is important to carefully consider how the chosen (set of) policy reform option(s) will affect other domains.

Step 2. Formulation and design

Turning policy ideas into implementable actions. Having decided on the reform and its boundaries, this second step involves clearly spelling out the vision of the reform, defining broad objectives and targets, planning resource allocations and assessing the feasibility of the reform – e.g. identifying key barriers that will prevent the policy from being developed. A critical element of this phase is ensuring a staged process for the reform. Rather than comprising sudden sweeping changes, reform is a dynamic and iterative process which involves continuous assessment of progress, making adjustments and refining approaches to implementation. The reform’s formulation and design phase is a key step as many ideas for reform may look good on paper but will not be feasible to implement.

Ensuring buy-in and mitigating risks. Policy makers or decision makers may initiate the reform, but its success will depend on support from a broad-based constituency within and outside government, and positive engagement by stakeholders, especially those who will be impacted most. As the reform takes shape, their willingness to participate will be critical to its success, enabling a broad range of evidence to be considered and options to be aired and their viability to be tested. Stakeholder concerns and objections will provide valuable input to the design, and the choice of instruments, and institutional and organisational arrangements for the reform. Addressing these will help with consideration of risks to the reform’s successful implementation and the choice of mitigation mechanisms.

Table 2. Step 2: Formulate and design the reform

Element	Questions to ask
Defining a strategic vision for the reform	Am I clear about the strategic vision and reform objectives? Will these make sense to stakeholders?
Designing a roadmap for the reform	Am I clear about the route to be taken and the destination of the reform?
Authenticating the reform plan with evidence	Am I drawing on the best available evidence to substantiate the reform?
Choosing instruments for the reform	Which instruments will be put in place to achieve the reform objectives? Which actors will be responsible for implementing these instruments?
Defining institutional and organisational arrangements for the reform.	What are the costs and benefits associated with the reform, from a budgetary perspective? What are the resources, capacities and technical elements required to implement the reform? How much time is needed for the reform to be enacted?
Nurturing a broad-based constituency and engaging stakeholders	How do I ensure that key stakeholders are willing and able to participate in the policy design process (government, civil society organisations, the private sector, and other institutions)? How do I ensure that their inputs are incorporated in the design of the reform?
Recognising and accounting for barriers to the reform	What are the challenges that may hamper the reform? What incentives can be created to ensure that the reform can be implemented? How do I make room for innovative ideas to be included in the reform? How to anticipate, assess and mitigate risks in the reform process?

Step 3. Reform decision process

Mandating the reform. Once the reform is formulated and designed, a decision is made to proceed with implementation. In this step the reform is placed on the political agenda. Policy reform, as an integral part of policy making, is never a purely technical process. In making decisions about reform, policy makers need to weigh up political considerations (e.g. public reaction if the costs and impact of institutional change are high despite the reform being expected to achieve efficiencies) and normative considerations (e.g. value judgments about the likelihood of maintaining standards or the legitimacy of a change in policy as compared with other countries' practice) (European Commission, 2017^[13]). Especially in major institutional reforms, the political motivation is a key determinant for success (Moreira Da Silva and Gaynor, 2020^[14]).

Engaging stakeholders and obtaining buy-in. Reforms are much more likely to be successful and their success to be sustained when they have broad-based support. This step provides a further opportunity to convince a range of stakeholders across and beyond government of the value of the reform and to garner the support needed to implement it in a timely fashion.

Table 3. Step 3: Decide on the reform process

Element	Questions to ask
Preparing legislative and other documents that underpin the reform	<p>Is legislation needed to mandate the reform or is a government decision sufficient?</p> <p>Which documents are crucial to enable the reform to be implemented?</p> <p>Is it necessary to link the reform to existing laws or other international obligations, institutions and stakeholders that provide the context for the reform, or might be affected by it?</p> <p>If yes, do the documents do this properly?</p> <p>Do documents clearly specify the rationale, objectives, implementation modalities, timing and resources of the reform, as well as set the boundaries of the reform (what is in and out of scope)?</p>
Identifying the leader(s) of the reform	<p>Which institution will lead the reform?</p> <p>Within the institution is there a person or persons with the skills required to lead the reform?</p>
Obtaining buy-in for the reform across government	<p>What level of support or opposition exists across government?</p> <p>Who are my allies in the reform and how can I make best use of their support?</p> <p>Who is opposed to the reform and how can I engage them to good effect?</p> <p>How will I deal with too much opposition or too little support?</p>
Engaging stakeholders outside of government	<p>Are stakeholders sufficiently invested in the reform?</p> <p>To what extent do stakeholders support or oppose the reform and how will this positively or negatively impact it?</p> <p>What incentives can be offered to build or strengthen support for the reform?</p>
Introducing and passing legislation	<p>Has sufficient time been factored in to enable legislation to be introduced and passed?</p>

Note: In some instances, legislation directly mandates and informs the reform. In other instances, legislation or a decision of the government or a minister dictates broad structural parameters, and it is up to a governmental institution (or group of institutions) to design the details and implement the reform in a way that is applicable to the policy field.

Step 4. Managing implementation

Maintaining momentum and adapting to challenges. Implementing policy reform is an ongoing, often non-linear process that must be carefully managed. Implementation is not only a technical process. It requires consensus building, participation of key stakeholders, conflict resolution, compromise, contingency planning, resource mobilisation and adaptation (Sutton, 1999_[15]). The business management literature sheds light on the complexity of the implementation of change (Sutton, 1999_[15]), such as the skills required to deal with the unpredictability, resistance, practical difficulties and disruption to personnel arrangements that change can bring about.

Monitoring progress and delivering on milestones. It can be useful to break more complex reforms into manageable components or to pilot separate elements in order to assess and respond to implementation barriers. Milestones used to monitor progress provide an opportunity to decide whether course correction is required and how new ideas can be incorporated. They also provide an opportunity to check the commitment of internal and external stakeholders, and to consider what to do should levels of support change mid-stream. They are an important opportunity to determine whether the expected outcomes and results are being achieved and implemented.

Table 4. Step 4: Manage reform implementation

Element	Questions to ask
Implementing the reform using a step-by-step process	Can the policy reform be broken into manageable components, or piloted in limited forms to assess implementation barriers?
Involving key stakeholders during the implementation process	Am I properly engaging key stakeholders in implementation activities and encouraging their participation? Has their support or opposition changed over time?
Monitoring progress of a reform process and meeting milestones of a reform	Am I assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of implementation phases? Are there options that I can consider to resolve barriers to implementation? Am I documenting progress – whether positive or not – and decisions in a way that will facilitate evaluation of the reform?
Adapting to hiccups during implementation and changes in context	Am I charging straight ahead without considering the possibility of doing things differently? If the context has changed, what can I do to achieve the ultimate goal of the reform? What innovative ideas can I introduce to ensure that the reform achieves its expected outcomes and impact? How can a reform mindset be maintained throughout the process?

Step 5. Ensuring sustainability and adaptability

Ensuring reforms are sustained over time. A successful reform is rarely a one-off event but is a result of continuous improvement of policies and instruments over time. Reforms can take several attempts and resistance can occur during and after implementation. Time and persistence are required. Subjecting the process to review and reflection enables lessons to be learned and adaptations to be made to evolving policy realities and external circumstances. In this spirit of continuous improvement, this step is an opportunity to consolidate the gains of the change process and mainstream the new way of working so that it is embedded.

Determining whether the reform has been successful. Evaluation provides an opportunity to reflect on the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of a reform (OECD, 2021^[16]). There are many forms of evaluative activity that take place during implementation of the reform – e.g. gathering and reflecting on data and feedback, assessing progress, identifying lessons. An evaluation will draw on these and help to determine whether the reform has been successful in addressing the original problems and challenges. It will also offer recommendations to help embed the reform and to guide future reform initiatives – whether by the development co-operation provider or by other institutions in the country or external to it.

Table 5. Step 5: Ensure sustainability and adaptability of the reform

Element	Questions to ask
Establishing effective mechanisms for feedback	Have I provided opportunities for all stakeholders to reflect on progress with the reform and to suggest areas for improvement? Are lessons being drawn about whether the reform is addressing the original problems and challenges?
Continuous improvement and knowledge management	Am I accumulating evidence throughout the reform process and adjusting accordingly? Is the resulting knowledge being stored in an accessible manner?
Preparing evaluation terms of reference	What is already known about the reform and what more do I need to know? What are the objectives of the evaluation (what will it find out) and how will I translate them into relevant and specific questions? What evidence is needed to answer the evaluation questions and how is this best collected? Which stakeholders will participate in the evaluation and contribute to its design? How can the governance structure safeguard the credibility, inclusiveness and transparency of the evaluation? Who will receive the findings of the evaluation?
Following up the evaluation	Are all recommendations systematically responded to and follow-up actions assigned? Is there a tracking system to ensure accountability for implementation of actions? Are the evaluation results presented in an accessible format and systematically distributed internally and externally for learning?
Making course corrections	Is there a process in place to further refine the reform based on lessons learned through the evaluation?

Ten lessons to make development co-operation reform happen

Recent experiences offer lessons for reforming development co-operation

Lessons can be drawn from differing reform experiences. Ten recent examples of reforms to the way OECD countries manage development co-operation implemented in the last decade provide valuable lessons for the wider development community. None of the reforms were the same because there is no one-size-fits-all. Politics, context and availability of resources are strong influences on reform ambition.

Each reform was undertaken in its particular context – in diverse legal and administrative systems, for a range of reasons, with access to differing human and financial resources. Despite this the lessons that emerge can help providers as they embark on their own development co-operation reforms.

Politics, context and availability of resources are strong influences on reform ambition.

Lesson 1. Agree a clear vision and narrative with expected outcomes and results

Be clear about the change that will happen and the reasons for it. A clear vision enables policy makers to communicate the reform to stakeholders and to the general public. A simple narrative that includes expected outcomes and results enables policy makers to build internal and external support for the reform.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) of **Estonia** separated development co-operation and humanitarian assistance from policy making, founding the Estonian Centre for International Development (ESTDEV) on 23 April 2021. The existing Estonian Centre for Eastern Partnership merged with ESTDEV as the Eastern Partnership Department. *The reform aimed to increase the impact of Estonian development co-operation and humanitarian assistance projects, and create the preconditions necessary for policy formulation and implementation* (OECD, 2022^[17]).⁵

Iceland merged the Icelandic International Development Agency (ICEIDA) into the Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MFA) on 1 January 2016. *The reform aimed to achieve internal harmonisation and effectiveness, and to better align development co-operation and other foreign affairs policies* (Ministry for Foreign Affairs, 2016^[18]).

Romania established the Romanian Agency for International Development (RoAid), under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and an Advisory Committee, comprised of several ministries and central institutions and coordinated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in 2016 with RoAid becoming operational in 2017.⁶ This was part of a long process seeking to better regulate development co-operation after Romania joined the European Union in 2007. *It aimed to have efficient institutions for development co-operation, enable rapid responses to emergencies and increase policy coherence* so Romania could achieve its commitment to meeting the Sustainable Development Goals and eradicating poverty.

The Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MFA) of **Finland** began updating its development policy and operating practices in January 2017. The reform focused on three areas: *clarifying priorities and making better use of monitoring and results data in thematic management; simplifying the channels, instruments and implementation process for development co-operation and improving information technology systems; better allocating and focusing human resources, and strengthening development co-operation competence* (Ministry for Foreign Affairs, 2018^[19]).

Lesson 2. Define roles and responsibilities

Plan steps of the reform process. Good leadership (Lesson 3. Provide sound leadership based on need) and careful planning enhance the success of a reform. A roadmap can help to set priorities (Lesson 6. Prioritise to balance ambition and realism), lists tasks to be undertaken – e.g. outreach (Lesson 7. Build and maintain ownership and support), oversight and review (Lesson 9. Establish oversight, consultation and evaluation mechanisms to ensure innovation is captured and reform is part of a mindset) as well as communication (Lesson 10. Communicate on the reform to other parts of the government, to parliament and to stakeholders) – and assigns responsibilities for each.

Avoid institutional overlap and duplication. Defining the role and responsibilities of each development co-operation entity, and the relationships between entities, provides clarity to stakeholders and the public. It is important to outline the key functions of an agency, its accountabilities and reporting requirements and the mandate of an advisory committee or council. Similarly, with a merger outline the role and responsibilities of MFA directorates or divisions and establish internal governance arrangements to achieve coherence and avoid internal silos and competition.

Reforms in Estonia, Italy, and Romania included outlining the division of labour between the MFA and the agency and roles for advisory and consultative entities. **Romania** established an Advisory Committee to work alongside the MFA, RoAid and other central and local administration entities (Box 3). Through Law 125/2014, **Italy** established an Inter-ministerial Development Co-operation Committee to co-ordinate

public development activities and align them with the three-year programming plan, a National Development Co-operation Council and a Joint Development Co-operation Committee to approve all bilateral and multilateral initiatives above EUR 2 million and concessional loans. In addition to the MFA and ESTDEV, **Estonia** has an Inter-ministerial Development Cooperation Committee to ensure the necessity, impact technical feasibility of projects (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2021^[20]).

In **Belgium**, updates were made to laws regarding development co-operation, the agency (Enabel) and the development finance institution (BIO). These strengthened the role of the MFA's Directorate-General for Development Co-operation and Humanitarian Aid over development policy and as co-ordinator of development co-operation, and provided greater operational autonomy to the implementing entities (OECD, 2020^[21]).

Amendments to the Framework Act on International Development Cooperation⁷ in **Korea** strengthened the authority and role of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Economy and Finance, and embassies in partner countries. The Committee for International Development Cooperation in the Prime Minister's Office was given a stronger role in policy formulation and strategic evaluations.

Rather than change institutional arrangements, the reform in **Finland** updated the MFA's operating practices, leading to strengthened results-based management tools and systems and improved risk management (OECD, 2021^[22]).

Box 3. The legal basis for development co-operation in Romania.

Law No. 213/2016 lists the roles and responsibilities of the main development co-operation actors.

- The Ministry of Foreign Affairs co-ordinates Romania's development and humanitarian aid policy; prepares, in consultation with the Advisory Committee, the multi-annual programme and annual plan which are both approved by the government; monitors progress with Romania's commitments to international development goals, effective development and coherent development policies; reports annually to the government and maintains oversight of financial agreements and the government's budget for development co-operation – including that allocated by central and local administration entities.
- The Agency for International Development Cooperation (RoAid) is responsible to the MFA for implementing development and humanitarian assistance projects and programmes.
- Central and local public administration entities use their budgets to support development and humanitarian activities in support of Romania's multi-annual strategic programme and annual plan.
- The Advisory Committee ensures the unity of strategic planning and establishes geographic and thematic priorities by consensus. It is co-ordinated by the MFA with representatives from civil society, academia and the business community invited to participate in meetings.

Source: Law 213/2016 On international cooperation for development and humanitarian aid (unofficial translation): http://roaid.ro/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Law-213_-2016-on-Development-Cooperation.pdf.

Lesson 3. Provide sound leadership based on need

Have the right leadership in place. Leadership is critical to reform and can change over the course of the reform process. While politicians may articulate the need for reform and set the agenda (e.g. Parliament or Minister of Foreign Affairs), it is likely that a range of actors will be responsible for leading the reform as it proceeds through each step. For instance, a Ministerial Advisor, a Director-General or a senior manager

within the development co-operation directorate of the MFA or the newly created agency can lead the design and implementation phases. These steps may also be led by a specially appointed project manager or delegated to working groups reporting to an oversight body.

Several examples can be drawn from the recent institutional reforms scrutinised. In one case, the Minister mandated the reform and a Task Force led by the Secretary of State provided oversight. The Director-General led a working group for the corporate pillar while Directors led working groups for the development co-operation modalities and human resources pillars.

Another case showed that change in the political leadership during the process of adoption of the reform can pose a challenge, and in such instances, efforts might be needed to retain support for reform within the new leadership.

In some cases, multilateral organisations (e.g. the UNDP) can help the country to prepare legislation, design the institutional changes and related strategic priorities. In a recent reform process, UNDP facilitated implementation in the initial stages of the reform. With the continuation of the process implementation then passed to the newly formed agency.

Maintain leadership as the reform beds in. While structural change or the launch of new processes may happen quickly, there are significant risks in assuming that change will be accepted without resistance. Leadership is required to embed and sustain the reform over time (Lesson 8. Recognise that change takes time). In **Canada**, the amalgamation of the Canadian International Development Agency with the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade in 2013 was a structural success. However, silos hindered the exchange of information and collaboration, and insufficient attention was paid to creating a unified culture, greater harmonisation of systems and streamlining of procedures across the department (OECD, 2018^[23]). To embed and sustain amalgamation, a Chief Development Officer was appointed at senior level to champion the international development profession resulting in a dedicated rotational international assistance stream within the foreign service. International assistance modules were added to the Canadian Foreign Service Institute's professional learning programme. Nevertheless, challenges remain, such as creating coherence across diplomacy, trade and international assistance, and establishing unified reporting and information management systems (OECD, 2021^[24]). When **Korea** amended the Framework Act on International Development Cooperation in November 2020, it strengthened oversight and co-ordination. The Office for International Development Cooperation in the Prime Minister's office increased its capacity to support the Committee for International Development Cooperation (OECD, 2021^[25]).

Lesson 4. Dedicate the necessary resources

Ensure sufficient resources to achieve and sustain the reform. Careful consideration is required of the budget needed to effect reform and sustain it into the future. For instance, start-up and ongoing costs must be allocated when creating a new institution or developing and implementing a new information technology (IT) system. As recent reforms show, guaranteeing the resources needed to create a new agency will require whole of government support, including from the Ministry of Finance.

Consider and anticipate the human resource implications of reform. In addition to good leadership, skilled people are needed to prepare, implement and sustain reform. If they are not available internally, they need to be recruited. New staff and different skill sets may be required. Achieving this requires adequate budget. Examples from recent reforms include hiring specialised staff to manage the reform, lawyers to advise on the legal process and experts in administration and accounting to help a new agency to build project management systems. Sometimes international experts from multilateral organizations are also requested to provide technical advice and expertise (e.g. OECD and UNDP).

Mobilise political, legal and administrative resources. Development co-operation never involves a single ministry. Ministries of Finance influence ODA levels and the financial resources allocated to

managing ODA. Line ministries often lead sector-specific relationships with multilateral, international, regional and partner country institutions and may be involved in project implementation and capacity building. They will feel the impact of a change in arrangements. Recent reforms show that whole-of-government support is needed as well as acknowledgement among the different ministries, government institutions and stakeholders that the reformed development cooperation system will bring positive benefits to all.

Pay attention to internal regulations. Reform may require a change in legislation and administrative procedures (Lesson 5. Understand and address legislative and administrative requirements). Mobilising support from relevant government experts will help to understand and address legal and administrative dimensions of the reform. For example, merging an agency into a Foreign Affairs Ministry may make it difficult to recruit and retain staff with development co-operation expertise. Human resources rules and regulations may need to be amended to facilitate hiring mid-career professionals with development expertise and experience, enabling the merged institution to attract and retain staff or to enable development experts to move to foreign policy positions and vice versa. Further streamlining may be needed with the MFA's structure – or even the Minister's title – as seen in **Iceland** (OECD, 2020^[26]).

Lesson 5. Understand and address legislative and administrative requirements

Scope legislative and administrative constraints to reform. While a government decision mandates reform in some jurisdictions, others face a much more complicated process. Understanding the legislative and administrative procedures required to make reform happen will assist with planning and avoid unnecessary delays. Moreover, recent reforms show that it can be challenging for a Ministry of Foreign Affairs to address some of the legal, human resource and financial requirements of creating an agency.

Examples show that even when a legal basis for development co-operation exists, the envisaged changes can require a new law covering the development co-operation system and the establishment of the agency.

Lesson 6. Prioritise to balance ambition and realism

Decide what is needed most and how to achieve it. It is natural to be ambitious. However, politics, context and availability of resources are strong influences on reform ambition. A strong dose of realism helps to determine what is possible, and what will work in a given context. Being realistic also helps when making the case for resources.

For example, **Romania** was engaged in development co-operation prior to joining the EU in 2007 and recognised that it needed to scale-up its role as a development co-operation actor. In order to do so, Romania initially relied on support from UNDP – e.g. to help reinforce the capacity within MFA to manage ODA, to implement projects such as the Mobility Fund and to co-ordinate with line ministries involved in ODA. The mobility fund enabled Romanian experts to provide advice to priority countries, thereby gaining experience (UNDP, 2013^[27]).

Lesson 7. Build and maintain ownership and support

Nurture a broad-based constituency and engage stakeholders. Widespread political and public support is good to have but by no means is it a given. Effective communication is a critical element of building openness to and support for the reform. Engaging with internal and external stakeholders throughout the reform serves many purposes – generating ideas, introducing realism, determining the pros and cons of each option, identifying constraints, countering opposition, building support, learning what is and is not working, generating and applying lessons, adapting. It also helps to sustain reform.

Recent reforms show the value of engaging senior leadership as well as encouraging the participation of staff who bring innovative ideas to reform implementation. Stakeholders also bring valuable ideas. A broad

range of stakeholders were involved in consultations leading to the formulation and adoption of **Italy's** 2014 law on development co-operation – including civil society organizations (CSOs), the private sector, local authorities, foundations and co-operative finance institutes. In particular, the law explicitly recognises the role of diaspora as part of civil society. Organisational changes included establishment of the National Development Co-operation Council – with broad multi-stakeholder involvement – and an Inter-ministerial Development Co-operation Committee. As the reform beds in, stakeholders have been fully involved in co-ordinating and drafting new guidance – on areas as diverse as energy and development, disability and citizenship education. The amount of time taken to approve policies and guidance reflects constant collaboration and ownership by stakeholders. CSOs in particular are satisfied at more frequent and productive dialogues with the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and International Co-operation and the newly established Italian Agency for Development Cooperation (OECD, 2019^[28]; OECD, 2022^[29]).

Lesson 8. Recognise that change takes time

While reform may happen overnight, positive change takes time. Once the groundwork is laid – a law is passed, a decision is made to proceed – the visible element of the reform may occur quickly. Institutions can be merged, a policy can be published or a new process can be introduced. However, this seemingly rapid action hides the significant length of time taken to prepare the reform or to roll it out. Preparing for, implementing, embedding and sustaining change can take many years. Reform is not just about changing institutional arrangements, policies, systems and processes. It is a mindset that demands constant attention, flexibility and ability to adjust to unforeseen scenarios.

For example, in the case of **Iceland**, the process to prepare, implement and embed reform of its development co-operation system has taken several years. A DAC Special Review in 2013 recommended Iceland revisit its institutional framework to ensure it was fit for purpose. An external review, conducted and published in 2014,⁸ recommended merging ICEIDA with the MFA. The Minister of Foreign Affairs presented a bill for discussion in the parliament in February 2015 with a final decision of the parliament on 18 December 2015 to integrate ICEIDA's work into the MFA on 1 January 2016 along with several accompanying changes. This included the creation of a Committee on International Development Cooperation which replaced two former advisory bodies and brought aboard members of the parliament instead of representatives of parliamentary parties.

Development of a foreign policy in **Estonia** laid the groundwork for institutional reform. The first step required a number of parliamentary discussions. Once the policy was in place it needed to be implemented. A new institution was created, and the existing Centre for Eastern Partnerships merged into ESTDEV.

Since 2007, **Romania** has focused on transforming its development co-operation system. Rather than tackling everything at the start, Romania followed a step by step approach starting by addressing the legal aspects of the reform and then setting up the operational guidance, systems and processes needed to enable the functioning of the implementing agency, as well as to ensure an efficient and predictable working relationship with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as national coordinator of policy, and with other institutions.

The **Republic of Korea** provides a good example of a system that is incrementally improving its performance over time. Joining the DAC in 2010 provided an incentive to further strengthen Korea's development co-operation system and the country remains receptive to continuous improvement, spurred on by DAC reviews and its commitment to development effectiveness (Egan and Persaud, 2021^[30]).

Lesson 9. Establish oversight, consultation and evaluation mechanisms to ensure innovation is captured and reform is part of a mindset

Monitor and report on progress. Reform is not just about changing institutional arrangements, policies, systems and processes. It is a mindset that demands constant attention. A formal oversight mechanism

provides the opportunity to take stock of progress with the reform; consider whether the roadmap remains fit-for-purpose (Lesson 2. Define roles and responsibilities), the right leadership is in place (Lesson 3. Provide sound leadership based on need) and adequate resources are available (Lesson 4. Dedicate the necessary resources); obtain feedback from stakeholders (Lesson 7. Build and maintain ownership and support and Lesson 10. Communicate on the reform to other parts of the government, to parliament and to stakeholders). Regularly reflecting on evidence and lessons from evaluative activity offers the opportunity to innovate and adapt and to develop a reform mindset.

Recent development co-operation reforms were managed in a variety of ways – for example, setting targets and sharing achievements in working groups with an overarching task force to ensure that the reform remains on track. Such an approach enables staff to see tangible progress. In addition, complementing objectives set by management with space for co-creation – staff developing innovations from the bottom up – strengthens ownership of the reform process. **Iceland** has launched an evaluation of the merger of ICEIDA and the MFA focused on the efficiency and effectiveness of development co-operation; organisation and strategy, and; human resources and management.⁹

Lesson 10. Communicate on the reform to other parts of the government, to parliament and to stakeholders

Keep key stakeholders informed of progress. Regular communication about the reform contributes to building support, maintaining ownership (Lesson 7. Build and maintain ownership and support) and ensuring accountability for outcomes. This includes the initial decision-maker – e.g. the parliament, the government, the minister, leadership of the Ministry – and staff, as well as other development co-operation actors and stakeholders, and the public. Entities established to scope, prepare, implement and sustain reform – such as advisory committees or councils, inter-ministerial bodies and consultative forums – have a keen interest in following progress. Reporting can be formal and informal, including use of social media.

The 2018 Development Policy Results Report (Ministry for Foreign Affairs, 2018_[19]) reported to the parliament of **Finland** on progress with the MFA's reform of operating practices. The report appended theories of change that support thematic management in four priority areas: women and girls, economy and employment, well-functioning society; natural resources. Improved results-based management makes it easier to obtain and analyse results data. Learning in turn facilitates comprehensive steering of development policy.

An important dimension of building support for and sustaining reform in **Romania** was engagement with a range of stakeholders during their regular development camps. In partnership with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Romanian platform of non-governmental development organisations (FOND) organises annual Development Camps for Romanian stakeholders to raise awareness about development co-operation. Participants come from national, European and international civil society, Romanian and European public institutions, international organisations, the media, academia and the private sector. The first camp, organised in 2008, was aimed at increasing knowledge of official development assistance amongst Romanian stakeholders, since then it has been organised regularly, focusing on a wide range of issues in development co-operation.

Lessons from peer reviews of DAC members

Eight elements to consider when reforming institutions. DAC members encounter a number of strengths, opportunities, risks and challenges when implementing changes to their institutional arrangements. Lessons from recent integration, amalgamation and merger experiences in development co-operation appear in Box 4.

Box 4. Lessons from integration and merger experiences in development co-operation.

A review of the process of integration, amalgamation or merger by Development Assistance Committee member countries surfaced eight main observations:

- The **political motivation** for major institutional reform is a key determinant for success
- Bringing two institutions together is not enough; it is important to **create a new institution with its own culture and ways of working**
- Having a **dedicated development voice** at the most senior levels of political leadership can protect the quality and integrity of development co-operation
- Dedicated **mechanisms for oversight, accountability and external scrutiny** are needed to protect development objectives
- **Shedding expertise** can have an immediate negative impact on quality and take years to rebuild
- Investing in **staff engagement and a phased change-management process** with regular status checks can mitigate tension and sustain staff morale.
- It takes time and investment to build **harmonised and appropriate systems and procedures**
- **Strong external communication** can protect the quality of development co-operation programmes and partnerships.

Source: Moreira Da Silva and Gaynor (2020^[14]), "Integrations, amalgamations and mergers: Lessons from institutional reforms in development co-operation", Development matters blog, OECD, <https://oecd-development-matters.org/2020/07/30/integrations-amalgamations-and-mergers-lessons-from-institutional-reforms-in-development-co-operation/>.

Tools to enhance the quality of reform

Complexity demands ongoing improvement and innovation. While the future cannot be known, applying a range of tools will help providers to anticipate and prepare for global change and to adjust and continuously improve development co-operation.

Applying strategic foresight, taking a systems approach, stress testing and engaging with stakeholders will help providers to anticipate and prepare for change.

Strategic foresight

Transforming development co-operation to be fit for the future. Foresight supports policy-making through better anticipation, policy innovation and future-proofing. Surfacing ideas about the future to anticipate opportunities and challenges that could occur, foresight spurs new thinking about how to address these, and stress-tests current or proposed strategies and policies. Foresight methods can support development co-operation providers and actors as they engage with uncertainty and search for solutions to existing and future needs (OECD, 2018^[31]).

An iterative process. Strategic foresight involves examining the strategic context, openly engaging with a broad set of views about the future, using scenarios to identify possible alternative futures and trends,

and considering the policy implications of genuine strategic alternatives. As an adaptive and innovative approach, foresight embraces and facilitates flexibility. Use of strategic foresight enables governments “to constantly explore and prepare for the future in order to navigate, adapt and shape the future through better policies” (OECD, 2018_[31])¹⁰.

A range of methodologies can be used – e.g. horizon scanning, megatrends analysis and scenario development. Commonly used strategic foresight tools are available from the OECD’s Observatory of Public Sector Innovation [Playbook for Strategic Foresight and Innovation](#).

Anticipating and preparing for the future. Being fit for development co-operation in a rapidly changing world involves being able to go beyond managing the current, complex operating environment. Scenario development, exploring possible future changes and what they imply can help providers to adjust and improve their institutional arrangements, policies, systems and processes to be fit for the future.” (OECD, 2020_[32]). It is possible to develop scenarios planning to be quick in adjusting programs and projects when unforeseen situations arise like war or climate disasters.

Systems approaches

Working holistically to tackle uncertain and complex challenges. Governments have traditionally addressed challenges in a particular policy area through discrete interventions. However, taking a siloed approach – only looking at impact in that particular area – can have unintended consequences for other policy areas. Complex operating environments call for holistic policy approaches involving the whole system rather its individual parts. Such approaches can transform policy-making by valuing outcomes rather than processes, engaging a variety of voices and inputs rather than self-interest and focusing on change that has the greatest impact. The term systems approaches describes “a set of processes, methods and practices that aim to affect systemic change” (OECD, 2017_[33]).

Systems thinking helps to understand the impact policies have on a complex world. Policies tackling multiple, interconnected challenges require cross-sectoral, multidisciplinary collaboration. A systems approach enables actors “to achieve a better understanding of the non-linear behaviour of complex systems and improve the assessment of the consequences of policy interventions” (Hynes, Lees and Müller, 2020_[34]).

Systems mapping helps to visualise the complexity of a development co-operation system. Mapping can help development co-operation providers to understand the complex relationships, links and interactions between actors – within their own system and their partnerships with other development co-operation actors. There are many systems mapping methods and tools including actor mapping, appreciative inquiry, causal loop diagrams, issue mapping and social network analysis.¹¹ Simplified diagrams that capture the complexity of a system – system models – come in many forms (Senge, P., et al., 1994_[35]).

Stress testing

Predicting, adapting and aligning business models with anticipated global change. Stress tests were introduced after the 2008 financial crisis to determine a bank’s financial strength and its ability to survive a future crisis in the financial system. They use scenarios to assess resilience. While used extensively in the financial sector, stress testing is also being used in other sectors to assess resilience. Sustainability Stress Tests look at an organisation’s compatibility with tomorrow’s business environment and whether it is ready for the future. They “measure the capacity of an organisation to make predictions, adapt activities to a longer cycle, and align its business model with anticipated global changes” (Houot, 2012_[36]). In response to the significant strains that COVID-19 placed on supply chains, the OECD proposes stress tests as one of four public-private policy actions to build trust in global supply chains.¹²

Consulting and engaging with stakeholders

Stakeholder engagement can broaden perspectives underpinning reform and enhance buy-in. OECD members recognise that open government – promoting transparency, integrity, accountability and stakeholder participation – is an important dimension of building public trust and contributes to achieving positive policy outcomes. It increases the accountability of government, enables citizens to influence decisions, enhances the evidence base for policy making and offers the opportunity for innovation in policy making and in service delivery. Stakeholder participation takes a number of forms. At a minimum it involves the one-way flow of information from government to interested parties. Consultation is a two-way relationship where stakeholders offer feedback to government and vice-versa. Engagement occurs when stakeholders have the opportunity and the ability to collaborate throughout the policy cycle and in designing, delivering and reviewing services (OECD, 2017^[37]).

Public engagement builds support for development co-operation. Strong public support for development co-operation emboldens politicians and can result in cross-party political support and highly engaged legislative assemblies. Communicating with the public about results – good and bad – encourages citizens to understand the challenges providers face – what works, what does not work and why – and how providers learn from success and failure (OECD, 2014^[38]). While effort is always needed to build and maintain public understanding of development co-operation, this is particularly the case when development co-operation is in its infancy. In such instances, intensive efforts to build awareness and deepen understanding across stakeholders – politicians, government, civil society, the private sector, academia and the media – can have positive and long-lasting results.

References

- Abonyi, G. (2005), *Policy Reform in Indonesia and the Asian Development Bank's Financial Sector Governance Reforms Program Loan*, ERD Working Paper No. 76. [7]
- Afonso, A. (2013), *European Integration, Domestic Politics and Social Concertation*, Amsterdam University Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt46mwmc>. [10]
- Crosby, B. (1996), "Policy implementation: The organizational challenge", *World Development*, Vol. 24/9, pp. 1403-1415, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750x\(96\)00050-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750x(96)00050-2). [40]
- Egan, J. and S. Persaud (2021), *"From Emerging Donor to Global Development Partner", Korea and the OECD: 25 years and beyond*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/view/?ref=1113_1113250-qswshuy2u8&title=Korea-and-the-OECD-25-Years-and-Bey. [30]
- European Commission (2017), *Quality of Public Administration: A Toolbox for Practitioners*. [13]
- Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada (2014), *Departmental Performance Report 2013-14*, https://www.international.gc.ca/gac-amc/publications/plans/dpr-rmr/dpr-rmr_1314.aspx?lang=eng. [42]
- Gilardi, F. and F. Wasserfallen (2019), "The politics of policy diffusion", *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 58/4, pp. 1245-1256, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12326>. [3]
- Houot, X. (2012), "Will your company pass the Sustainability Stress Tests?", *BearingPoint Institute Report Issue 002*, <https://www.bearingpoint.com/en/insights-events/insights/will-your-company-pass-the-sustainability-stress-tests/>. [36]

- Huerta Melchor, O. (2008), "Managing Change in OECD Governments: An Introductory Framework", *OECD Working Papers on Public Governance*, No. 12, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/227141782188>. [4]
- Hynes, W., M. Lees and J. Müller (eds.) (2020), *Systemic Thinking for Policy Making: The Potential of Systems Analysis for Addressing Global Policy Challenges in the 21st Century*, New Approaches to Economic Challenges, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/879c4f7a-en>. [34]
- Lascoumes, P. and P. Le Gales (2007), "Introduction: Understanding Public Policy through Its Instruments? From the Nature of Instruments to the Sociology of Public Policy Instrumentation", *Governance*, Vol. 20/1, pp. 1-21, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2007.00342.x>. [12]
- Lindquist, E., S. Vincent and J. Wanna (2011), *Delivering Policy Reform. Anchoring Significant Reforms in Turbulent Times*, ANU Press, <https://doi.org/10.22459/dpr.04.2011>. [6]
- Meseguer, C. and F. Gilardi (2009), "What is new in the study of policy diffusion?", *Review of International Political Economy*, Vol. 16/3, pp. 527-543, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290802409236>. [2]
- Ministry for Foreign Affairs (2018), *Finland's Development Policy Results Report 2018*, <https://um.fi/documents/35732/0/UM+KPR+2018+ENG+WEB.pdf/944cf817-9d4a-43ca-07a7-2aebd6053801>. [19]
- Ministry for Foreign Affairs (2016), *OECD DAC Peer Review of Iceland Memorandum*, <https://www.oecd.org/dac/peer-reviews/Memorandum-of-Iceland-2016.pdf>. [18]
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2021), *Arengukoostöö Ja Humanitaarabi Programm 2021–2024 (Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid Programme 2021-2024)*, <https://www.vm.ee/media/4373/download>. [20]
- Moreira Da Silva, J. and M. Gaynor (2020), *Integrations, amalgamations and mergers: Lessons from institutional reforms in development co-operation*, Development Matters Blog, <https://oecd-development-matters.org/2020/07/30/integrations-amalgamations-and-mergers-lessons-from-institutional-reforms-in-development-co-operation/>. [14]
- OECD (2022), *Development Co-operation Profiles*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/2dcf1367-en>. [17]
- OECD (2022), *Italy Mid-term Review, 13-14 June 2022, Rome*, <https://www.oecd.org/dac/peer-reviews/DAC-mid-term-Italy-2022.pdf>. [29]
- OECD (2021), *Applying Evaluation Criteria Thoughtfully*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/543e84ed-en>. [16]
- OECD (2021), *Canada Mid-term Review, 12-15 July 2021, Ottawa – Paris*, <https://www.oecd.org/dac/peer-reviews/DAC-mid-term-Canada-2021.pdf>. [24]
- OECD (2021), *Finland Mid-term Review, 25 March 2021, Helsinki – Paris*, <https://www.oecd.org/dac/peer-reviews/DAC-mid-term-Finland-2021.pdf>. [22]
- OECD (2021), *Korea Mid-term Review, 7-10 June 2021, Seoul – Paris*, <https://www.oecd.org/dac/peer-reviews/DAC-mid-term-Korea-2021.pdf>. [25]

- OECD (2020), *Development Co-operation Report 2020: Learning from Crises, Building Resilience*, OECD Publishing, <https://doi.org/10.1787/f6d42aa5-en>. [1]
- OECD (2020), *Earmarked funding to multilateral organisations: how is it used and what constitutes good practice?*, <https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-topics/Multilateral-development-finance-brief-2020.pdf>. [39]
- OECD (2020), *Iceland Mid-term Review, 11 September 2020, Reykjavik – Paris*, <https://www.oecd.org/dac/peer-reviews/DAC-mid-term-Iceland-2020.pdf>. [26]
- OECD (2020), *Multilateral Development Finance 2020*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/e61fdf00-en>. [43]
- OECD (2020), *OECD Development Co-operation Peer Reviews: Belgium 2020*, OECD Development Co-operation Peer Reviews, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/026f1aad-en>. [21]
- OECD (2020), “Scenarios: A user guide”, in *Back to the Future of Education: Four OECD Scenarios for Schooling*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/d08897ba-en>. [32]
- OECD (2019), *Strategic Foresight for Better Policies: Building effective governance in the face of uncertain futures*, <https://www.oecd.org/strategic-foresight/ourwork/Strategic%20Foresight%20for%20Better%20Policies.pdf>. [41]
- OECD (2019), *OECD Development Co-operation Peer Reviews: Italy 2019*, OECD Development Co-operation Peer Reviews, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/b1874a7a-en>. [28]
- OECD (2018), *OECD Development Co-operation Peer Reviews: Canada 2018*, OECD Development Co-operation Peer Reviews, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264303560-en>. [23]
- OECD (2018), “Using foresight methods to adapt development co-operation for the future”, in *Development Co-operation Report 2018: Joining Forces to Leave No One Behind*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/dcr-2018-17-en>. [31]
- OECD (2017), *Recommendation of the Council on Open Government, OECD/LEGAL/0438*, <https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0438>. [37]
- OECD (2017), *Systems Approaches to Public Sector Challenges: Working with Change*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264279865-en>. [33]
- OECD (2014), *Engaging with the Public: 12 Lessons from DAC Peer Reviews and the Network of DAC Development Communicators*, <https://www.oecd.org/dac/peer-reviews/12%20Lessons%20Engaging%20with%20the%20public.pdf>. [38]
- OECD (2011), *Fisheries Policy Reform: National Experiences*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264096813-en>. [5]
- OECD (2010), *Making Reform Happen (Summary)*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264086296-sum-en>. [9]
- Senge, P., et al. (1994), *The Fifth Discipline Field Book Strategies and Tools for Building a Learning Organization*, Currency Doubleday, New York. [35]
- Sutton, R. (1999), *The Policy Process: An Overview*, Overseas Development Institute. [15]

- Tompson, W. (2009), *The Political Economy of Reform: Lessons from Pensions, Product Markets and Labour Markets in Ten OECD Countries*, OECD Publishing, Paris, [8]
<https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264073111-en>.
- UNDP (2013), *The New ODA Cooperation Partnership with Romania (2013-2015)*, United Nations Development Programme Regional Project Document, [27]
<https://info.undp.org/docs/pdc/Documents/SVK/ProDoc%20ODA%20Romania%20-%20signed.pdf>.
- Vági, P. and E. Rimkute (2018), "Toolkit for the preparation, implementation, monitoring, reporting and evaluation of public administration reform and sector strategies: Guidance for SIGMA partners", *SIGMA Papers*, No. 57, OECD Publishing, Paris, [11]
<https://doi.org/10.1787/37e212e6-en>.

Notes

¹ The OECD would like to thank the member and partner countries and stakeholders that shared their policy reform experiences during dedicated consultations and interviews, as well as external experts and contributors from within the OECD and the OECD-IIASA Strategic Partnership on Systems Approaches, who provided inputs at various stages of the process.

² A full list of OECD legal instruments including Recommendations can be found at <https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/>.

³ Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Lithuania, the Netherlands and Switzerland also use an integrated model.

⁴ Fifteen donors endorsed a *Donor Statement on Supporting Locally Led Development* at the 2022 Effective Development Co-operation Summit in Geneva, Switzerland. See <https://www.usaid.gov/localization/donor-statement-on-supporting-locally-led-development>.

⁵ Details about ESTDEV can be found at <https://estdev.ee/organization/?lang=en>. For profiles of official and philanthropic providers of development co-operation, including Estonia and others referenced in this report see <https://www.oecd.org/development/development-co-operation-profiles-2dcf1367-en.htm>.

⁶ Details about RoAid can be found at <http://roaid.ro>

⁷ The Framework Act on International Development Cooperation was amended on 26 May 2020. An English version is available at https://elaw.klri.re.kr/eng_mobile/viewer.do?hseq=54777&type=part&key=44.

⁸ A copy of the report is available at <https://www.stjornarradid.is/library/03-Verkefni/Utanrikismal/Throunarsamvinna/uttekta--og-ryniskyrslur/Throunarsamvinna-Islands---lokaskyrsla.pdf>.

⁹ At the time of writing, the report had not been published. Details about the evaluation can be found at <https://www.government.is/topics/foreign-affairs/international-development-cooperation/evaluations/>.

¹⁰ For information about the OECD's work to deepen strategic foresight capacity and mainstreaming it into all workstreams see <https://www.oecd.org/strategic-foresight/>. A dedicated foresight unit within the Development Co-operation Directorate aims to ensure that development co-operation policies stay relevant and fit for the future.

¹¹ For the pros and cons of these tools and a list of online tools, many of which combine multiple mapping methods, see <https://www.wri.org/insights/insider-systems-mapping-vital-ingredient-successful-partnerships>.

¹² To create resilient supply chains the OECD online tools propose using risk management tools to anticipate risks; domestic policy tools to minimise exposure to shocks; public-private tools to build trust; and international tools to keep markets open. The OECD online tool is available at <https://www.oecd.org/trade/resilient-supply-chains/stress-tests/>.