



Third International Roundtable

**Managing for Development Results**

*Hanoi, Vietnam – February 5 - 8, 2007*

# **Leadership and Accountability: Creating a Culture of Results**

## **A Background Paper**

**Third International Roundtable on  
Managing for Development Results**

**Hanoi, Vietnam**

**5-8 February 2007**



## **The Third Round Table on Managing for Development Results:**

### **Leadership and Accountability Theme**

#### **Introduction**

This paper aims to provide an overview of Leadership and Accountability, within the context of Managing for Development Results (MfDR). Underpinning this is a view that an effective MfDR approach can support good governance as a fundamental cornerstone to achieve development goals.

The paper looks at how MfDR can assist government leaders in conceptualizing and communicating both what they are going to do and how they are going to do it. Further, the paper examines the kind of support needed by government leaders in their efforts to manage for development results effectively. It will focus on the interrelation between leadership, accountability and MfDR.

Planned break out sessions at the Roundtable will provide a forum for discussion amongst leaders on issues related to this approach. Issues include identifying the need for leaders to demand a focus on results, what they need to do to improve their capacity and skill in applying the approach, and how stakeholders, such as civil society, can be mobilized to participate in this process aimed at improving accountability and overall development effectiveness.

#### **MfDR - A Common Understanding of the Way Forward**

The Millennium Development Goals (MDG's), the last Roundtable at Monterrey, the various MfDR events and the Rome and Paris declarations have created a global consensus as to what results and responsibilities might look like: what is to be achieved, when, how, and by whom. The process that started with the First Roundtable on Managing for Development Results in Washington in 2002 has put results squarely at the centre of all development efforts and promoted new instruments and tools to enhance the results focus in all areas of managing the development process. MfDR is also generally recognized as a key aspect of, and pre-requisite for, improved aid effectiveness.

This development consensus is the backbone of present day development efforts. It facilitates planning of activities towards joint outcomes, it encourages the alignment of development assistance to country-owned strategies and frameworks, and through harmonised approaches, procedures and joint work it helps reduce transaction costs. MfDR is also a common platform for knowledge sharing, for mutual accountability, and for jointly examining lessons learned, in particular transferable lessons where common experiences can be shared and differences in context and setting easily identified.

It may be argued that these and other mechanisms such as Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRS), Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEF) and decentralisation strategies are somewhat supply driven and have a 'donor handprint' on them. Nevertheless, these types of mechanisms can - as catalysts - provide opportunities for national governments to: define their priorities, manage effective relationships with development partners and civil society organisations, and agree on expected results within the context of overall global goals and agreements. MfDR provides both a common set of 'rules for the game', accountability frameworks, and a mechanism for accelerating development results.

Common understanding among the various development stakeholders and commitment are central to effective pursuit of an MfDR agenda. All stakeholders and 'actors' need to be 'on the same page', through signing up to the results that have been agreed upon and by supporting and keeping accountable those who are charged with leading the implementation process.

### **Implementing MfDR**

Implementing MfDR rests on the idea that governments, institutions and organisations should be accountable for delivering results. It involves not just the use of a new set of tools and techniques, but a huge shift in mindset and focus. It is an incremental and non-linear approach, where shared agreed results by stakeholders are the outcome. These results are underpinned by an iterative implementation process, including all partners, emphasising the importance of reviewing progress, learning from what works and what does not work, and altering the overall plan if necessary. It requires monitoring and self-assessment of progress towards results and the ability to make timely changes to improve performance if things are off course. Effective reporting holds leaders to account for what they achieve, supports good government and provides a process through which they can ensure they are still on track and alter things if necessary. The approach can also underpin donor interventions where aid is provided to support a government-led plan and where contribution to outcomes can be monitored and assessed to ensure greater effectiveness.

### **The Leadership Challenge**

National Leaders face some key challenges in taking an MfDR agenda forward. To be fully owned and successfully integrated within national policy initiatives, examples such as Uganda and Ghana suggest that MfDR needs to tackle similar issues to those faced by other Public Service Reform initiatives. Successful application is based on an ability to create a leadership and management culture that is focused on results and not just on compliance, or on implementing new administrative and operational systems. This involves not just organisational, but also institutional change. Viewed simplistically, the 'Public Sector' is an administrative bureaucratic culture that emphasises the management and measurement of inputs, activities and outputs. A results-oriented culture, however, focuses on the achievement, monitoring and reporting of outcomes. The former requires public managers and leaders to be familiar with and apply appropriate laws, hierarchies, regulations and procedures; the latter requires managers and leaders to diagnose problems, design solutions, take risks and develop adaptive implementation approaches. Successful leadership involves an appropriate combination of new and old ways of operating; ensuring effective administrative accountability is combined with results-focused innovation and mobilization of stakeholders and resources.

The adoption and application of MfDR methods may also necessitate leadership development. The changes that MfDR implies at leadership and management level in terms of adapted roles and responsibilities does not grow out of MfDR itself, but need to be nurtured and developed. The leadership development effort should promote the pluralistic and broad-based inclusion of individuals representing all segments of society. The focus can not be just on improving the effectiveness of existing leaders, but also support leaders who are emerging, and leaders of the future – youth, representatives of disadvantaged groups in society, and social activists.

**Recommendations on the role and importance of the institutional and political setting**

as identified at the  
Mutual Learning Initiative -  
OECD/DAC Joint Venture on Managing for Development Results  
Workshop organized by  
the Government of Uganda and OECD-DAC,  
15-16 June, 2006, Jinja, Uganda

- Political will is vital for the success of MfDR processes; therefore, there is a need to understand and involve political decision makers in time.
- It is recommended to map political processes in the country so that we are aware of what drives politicians.
- Ensure effective integration of short-term concerns of politicians and long-term objectives of MfDR.
- Use political processes (e.g. elections, parliamentary debates) to ensure that MfDR is on top of the political agenda.
- Feed politicians with PRSP results at critical moments in the political process.
- Politicians should be held accountable on MfDR through participatory process involving civil society organizations. The Poverty Observatory approach in Mozambique is recommended as a model.
- It is important to transform data into information for policy makers; the delivery of statistical data should be timely, user friendly and accessible for policy makers and align to the policy-making and budget cycle

There is a need for a generic leadership paradigm that connects leaders across the political, private and civil society sectors respecting the different emphases of different cultures and regions but identifying and building on commonalities.

Over the last two to three decades, it has become clear that while people may have different leadership proclivities, there are certain dimensions of leadership which are key to development in a wide array of cultures and contexts, and that they can be cultivated. These can be summarized as follows:

1. Vision: the Change Dimension. This is the capacity to engage various constituencies to produce a shared vision of the future, identify realities to be addressed to reach the vision, and to inspire, motivate, and mobilize others to achieve the vision/change. It includes the ability and willingness to address difficult or controversial issues, such as gender equality, requiring debates and longer-term investments that are fundamentals to development;
2. Competence: the Effectiveness Dimension. This is the capacity to: (i) diagnose underlying problems/issues; (ii) prioritize among multiple and competing challenges; (iii) find solutions (technical capacity); (iv) mobilize stakeholders; and (v) implement (management capacity) (vi) learn and adjust;
3. Integrity: the Values Dimension. This is the commitment to serve the public good, to personify individual and professional ethics, and to champion accountability relationships that inspire mutual trust in institutions, communities, and society as a whole.

Underlying these key leadership competencies is a commitment to manage for results.

**Creating Effective Accountability Structures to affect Good Governance**

Commitment to MfDR must come also from wider society through effective challenge processes which question the actions of government and hold them accountable for what they have said they will achieve and how they will achieve it.

### **Recommendations on engaging key stakeholders in MfDR**

as identified at the  
Mutual Learning Initiative -  
OECD/DAC Joint Venture on Managing for Development Results  
Workshop organized by  
the Government of Burkina Faso and OECD-DAC,  
6-8 June, 2006, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso

- Make sure that programs are properly appropriated by the various partners (government, civil society, TFPs) before applying MfDR
- Build the capacities of civil society to guarantee their full participation in the SRP Monitoring/Evaluation
- Make sure of the effective involvement of civil society agencies and other non-governmental stakeholders in the full cycle of poverty reduction strategies and national development plans. A dedicated fund to support capacity building of the civil society in the national budget could insure effective involvement of the civil society (e.g. Sénégal)
- Performance-based capacity building for successful MfDR implementation requires donor support
- Ensure a consensus among the various partners (government, civil society, TFPs) on the choice of a limited number of relevant and objectively verifiable indicators when developing monitoring frameworks for poverty reduction strategies and national development plans
- Accountability, transparency and communications must be assured at all levels in the chain (from local to national level).

Ghana established an Office of Accountability in 2003, which acts as a watchdog agency based on a code of conduct and a mandate from the President and passed three Acts of Parliament to reinforce accountability processes. As the Auditor General of Ghana points out 'Politicians should be challenged to produce evidence rather than a gut feeling as this will encourage them to make decisions based on that evidence'. He puts forward the need for 'an obligation to answer for a responsibility conferred'. Governments themselves must encourage a strong and transparent challenge function to ensure the commitment and sense of legitimacy for an MfDR approach and for 'good governance'. Leadership must involve the desire for a stronger state and development interventions must include supporting the constituents, civil society groups, and other organisations that represent the demand-side of the results agenda. One of the basic conditions for this is statistical capacity.

The Ghana example reflects a view of accountability that extends beyond an exclusively 'audit mentality'. Accountability means institutions taking responsibility for initiating action and the results of that action. Accountability requires clear definitions of responsibility, an appropriate legal and institutional framework to ensure that communication of results and feedback on performance are easily facilitated, and a capacity to produce the statistical evidence needed to ensure that decisions are indeed made based on facts and not on anecdotes, politics or inertia.

### **Developing Effective Leaders**

Leadership is a much-discussed concept in the context of development effectiveness. It is clear that an understanding of context and history are as important to understanding the role, potential and emergence of leadership as are the identification of skills, competencies, styles and approaches. At a country level, leaders have an enormous potential to provide the passion and desire to

communicate a future vision and to energise and mobilize the actors and momentum required for sustainable change. MfDR provides a means by which that vision can be meaningful both in terms of outcomes, in the processes required to achieve them and in the tracking and reporting over accomplishments and risks encountered. The adoption of results-focused leadership and management mechanisms and procedures do, however, normally expose capacity development needs at leadership and management level. Therefore there is a critical need to identify, nurture, unleash and develop leadership in partner countries, and for creating links and relationship among those leaders, potential leaders, and ex-leaders.

Over the last three years, the World Bank Institute (WBI) has been engaged in the design and delivery of leadership support programmes which take a holistic approach to leadership development. One specific example is a leadership development initiative undertaken in Madagascar aimed at providing a wider focus to leadership development than traditional capacity building initiatives have done. Activities focused on individual, organisational and institutional levels of leadership and were not mere 'knowledge transfer' programmes but of a more reflective, 'client driven' and process based approach. They have also engaged leaders at different administrative levels, and in different stages of personal development and career, and, not least, they have done so with the clear intention to develop the leadership capital needed to achieve the country's vision – a vision developed by an existing, strong leadership and which provides the much needed common framework for everybody to "work on the same page".

Underpinning this approach to leadership development are a number of key principles:

- Interventions must be demand driven;
- Intervention must have clearly identified objectives;
- Interventions are customised and designed through a participative approach which is based on local needs, context, and culture;
- Interventions address personal attribute development and not just technocratic skills. As such, interventions may use learning methodologies which are unfamiliar to some used to educational expert 'teaching' or 'solution providing' models. They require an awareness of cultural expectations in the learning processes used and an ability to utilise and contextualise development in the stories and experience of participants;
- The targeted audience for interventions include non-government actors, including individuals and groups from Civil Society and the Private Sector.

## **Conclusion**

This paper supports the concept that MfDR assists leaders in both driving forward reforms and remaining accountable for the results they achieve. It also recognized the fact that the implementation of a MfDR approach is a political choice dependent on political decision-makers and leaders. In short MfDR:

- Supports the clarification of accountability relationships in the public sector to improve service delivery;
- Reinforces governance and transparency and facilitates the achievement of development results;
- Provides the basis for a common discourse that translates realistic expectations into results shared by multiple stakeholders, based on key

agreements, supports a consistency in purpose and assists in tracking the achievement of results through monitoring and evaluation supported by statistical systems.

- It provides a way of simplifying the complex task faced by national leaders by providing an operational roadmap of 'what', 'how' and 'why', based on a clear model of change. Evidences improve learning, analysis, understanding and support priority settings for them.
- Can assist in defining their leadership role and form the basis of an 'accountability contract' between the state and citizens and can act as the mechanism by which country governments maintain ownership and manage their relationships with donors based on the donors contribution to their objectives.

Successful implementation of MfDR, as a political choice, implies that capacities must be developed for leaders in government, parliament and civil society. Within this context, strategies that engage civil society more effectively and emphasize the positive relationship required between civil society and government must also be developed.

### **Issues for Discussion during the Third Roundtable on Managing for Development Results**

- What are the incentives and risks to make the political setting receptive to the use of MfDR? Are there examples where MfDR helps support the importance of being realistic in creating expectations and the consistency of purpose?
- What are the conditions for leaders to use MfDR for decision-making and improving accountability? Which skills and attitude do they need to develop?
- How can leaders use MfDR to explain cause and effect relationship?
- MfDR as a methodology is an approach that relies on learning from experience and acknowledging results. What approaches can be used to develop this reflective culture given that leaders are also accountable for scarce resources?
- Institutional change is a long road, are there MfDR examples which can assist National Leaders in getting 'quick wins' and so gain commitment to the longer process? What is the importance of laws, policies and regulations related to MfDR to insure the implementation of MfDR?
- What are the best approaches and under which conditions government and civil society, recognizing their different roles and responsibilities, can engage in the MfDR process to identify results, assess their achievements, make decisions for resource allocation and actions taking into account these achievements and publicly communicate this process and its outcomes?