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I will make a short introduction on the state of play and the challenges faced by our Global Partnership. But I will be happy later on to enter into details of governance issues of the Partnership, the agenda in Mexico, the logistics of the venue, etc.

To understand where we are we need a bit of background:

1) A bit of History.

MDGs

After a decade of donor fatigue and of bad results from the 1990s, the MDGs marked a new era on development cooperation. The adoption of concrete goals in important social issues, turned out to be powerful drivers to push the aid agenda forward.

Monterrey

The adoption of the goals brought the issue of the means to realize them and thus the question of development finance; thus the Monterrey Consensus: on volumes of aid and other finance sources. In particular the old target of 0.7% was ratified.

Paris.

The other side of quantity was of course quality: effectiveness of aid. This was the issue tackled in Rome and Paris and which gave birth to our agenda. A novelty was that following the MDGs example, those that adopted the Paris declaration committed themselves to achieve certain targets of aid effectiveness in 5 years time, in 2010. To monitor progress, a complex system of benchmarks and indicators was created. (To understand there were commitments to increase coordination among donors, untie aid, respect ownership, etc)

But if the PD was a novelty it appeared in the midst of rapid changes in the international aid architecture quite soon the framework of the Paris Declaration and its agenda somehow became outdated. To understand how it has adapted to these changes and which are the challenges we face today we will codify Paris.

First: To start with the PD was basically an agenda of two actors: DAC donors and recipient countries. Even if signed by other actors, it was clearly a bipolar agenda.

Second Paris had a very clear and well defined aid effectiveness agenda with clear commitments for both for donor and recipients.

Third, the PD was born in the DAC and was administered by a DAC subsidiary body: the Working party on Aid Effectiveness.

Fourth. The PD was an agenda on how to increase the effectiveness of ODA, not of other flows or modalities of cooperation, such as SS cooperation.

Now in all these four dimensions matters changed rapidly. In this perspective the route from Paris through Accra and Busan and now to Mexico can be seen on three dimensions:

1. one of passing from a limited partnership of two actors to a truly global partnership of many state and non-state actors. How to generate a dialogue and synergies among all these actors, not an easy task
2. one of passing from a limited and technical agenda of aid effectiveness to a more holistic and political agenda of *development effectiveness*; where not only ODA but other development cooperation flows and actions are considered; Which other factors besides aid we have to consider? I we consider that all development flows are relevant are we not running the risk of undermining ODA?
3. one of passing from an agenda driven by and anchored in the WPEFF OECD/DAC, which was soon perceived to have become a bureaucratic body with limited legitimacy, to one administered by a SC where all constituencies are represented, not based in Paris anymore, supported not only by the DAC secretariat but also by the UNDP. How can such structure run if constituencies are not clearly specified?

How successful has this transformation been so far? What are the challenges that we are facing in Mexico and beyond?

We should start by recognizing that by leaving behind a cosy well-defined aid effectiveness agenda with two well-defined actors, and heading instead into a broader and less focused agenda of development cooperation effectiveness with new state and non-state actors, we entered into muddy waters; we ran a risk, a necessary risk but a risk nonetheless.

Moreover these changes came at a difficult times when due to the financial crisis ODA volumes are going down; and also at a time when the traditional donors, in large measure as a response to competition from SS providers, seem to be losing faith in some aspects of their traditional aid models.

So as you see, we are doing our best to adapt our Partnership and our Agenda to the challenges of the times, but we are in a quite critical moment; so it is important to make all we can to assure that the Mexican meeting will be a success.

Challenges:

--To keep the interest and commitments of traditional donors and to bring in the new donors: the SS providers and the private sector, the foundations. All in all the total amount of resources should be mounting as well as their effectiveness.

--To pass from aid effectiveness to development effectiveness. First without forgetting the old unfinished business of the aid effectiveness agenda which the recipient countries are interested in, and to an agenda which broader is still delimited and not everything can go in.

--To incorporate all these new actors in a meaningful way and for meaningful dialogues, encouraging them all to take commitments on the benefit of development and poverty eradication. To make the Partnership a place where each constituency brings its comparative advantages to bear for a common endeavour: to generate synergies rather than falling into chaos.

In the SC committee we have taken a number of decisions to tackle these challenges:

--improve the governance by increasing the legitimacy of the SC by increasing its numbers and bringing; and by bringing in regional organizations to help constituencies organize as such (the DAC is a rarity)

--have an annual technical meeting to deal with monitoring of commitments that will be hosted by Korea similar to the WP-EFF. The country heavy global light formula was not properly working: we need global and country heavy agenda

--bring the partnership into the post MDGS global framework. Putting the Partnership to contribute to the how while the UN will do the what: the goals. Looking for synergies and even foreseeing an eventual merger in the future between the DCF and the Global partnership

Now to end my introduction, what in my view can the CSOs and within this spectrum the Trade Unions do to support the agenda and our Partnership in these challenging moments? (This is of course a theme in which you are more versed than me, and about which I am eager to hear your views, but I will incur nonetheless).

To answer this question we might start by recognizing their particular role in this agenda. In contrast with other new non State stakeholders in this agenda, such as the Private Sector and the Foundations, the Trade Unions and most other CSOs, are not in this agenda or not mainly so, as donors. So what could be their role:

a) On the one hand, help to put pressure on donors (Traditional and emerging donors, but also the Private Sector and Foundations) to scale up their assistance and the effectiveness of this assistance; it is crucial for the bottom billion.

b) But on the other, you find out what you can do by yourselves to help the poor people and specially the poor workers in developing countries; your fellow workers.

It is common for non-state actors to approach this agenda with a mentality of getting something for themselves; for example a better environment to perform their work (CSOs) or to invest (Private sector). This is fine and valid. But we should not stop there. Paraphrasing Kennedy do not focus on what can this agenda do for you, but what you can do for this agenda.