

OECD DAC 중견관리급 회의 결과

〈 2007.12.12 〉

OECD 개발원조위원회(DAC)에서는 매년 상반기에 HLM(High-level Meeting), 하반기에 SLM(Senior-level Meeting)을 개최하여, 개발협력관련 주요 이슈를 논의하고 있다. 이번 SLM에서는 2008년 9월 가나에서 개최예정인 Accra 고위급 포럼의 의제와 일정 협의, 원조 재원과 성과의 연계, 2009-2010년 DAC의 작업계획, 원조중역에 대해 논의했다. 특히 Accra 고위급 포럼의 경우, 원조의 효과성 제고를 위한 파리선언 이행의 중간점검이라는 차원에서 귀추가 주목되기 때문에 동 의제를 다룬 금번 SLM의 회의 결과를 소개하는 것이 의미가 있다고 할 수 있다. [정리 : 정책연구실]

I. 핵심요지

- 회원국들은 Accra 고위급 포럼('08.9.2~4 가나)에서 원조의 예측가능성, 공여국간 원조 분업(division of labor), 수원국의 주인의식과 원조에 부여되는 조건(conditionality), 역량강화 등의 분야에서 구체적인 산출물(key deliverables)을 기대한다는 데 공감대를 형성함
- EC 및 대부분의 유럽국가들은 공여국간 원조 분업관련 "EU code of Conduct"가 중점적으로 논의되기를 희망한 반면, 일부 국가들(일본, 한국 등)은 이에 유보적인 입장을 표명함
- 원조의 언타이드화 관련, 대부분 국가는 언타이드화 대상국 및 적용 분야(기술 협력 등 포함)에 대한 확대, 동 이슈의 아크라 포럼 의제의 포함에 대해 적극 찬성하는 입장이나, 벨기에, 일본, 프랑스의 유보적 입장으로 내년도 5월 DAC 고위급 회의(HLM) 등을 거쳐 재협의기로 함
- 벨기에는 2001년 DAC 권고사항의 이행 현황 파악 및 회원국들의 철저한 이행이 선행된 이후, 적용범위의 확대가 논의되어야 한다는 입장
- OECD 사무국은 2006년도 DAC 회원국의

ODA가 총 1,044억불로서 전년대비 4.5% 감소되었고, 이는 GNI 대비 평균 0.31%를 차지, 1997년 이후 최초의 감소이나, 이라크 및 나이지리아 부채탕감이 있었던 2005년이 기록적으로 ODA가 높았던 해임을 감안하면, 2006년도 ODA는 여전히 매우 높은 수치라고 발표함
- 그럼에도 불구하고 2005년 G-8 정상회의 공약 등을 감안할 때 2010년까지 500억불의 추가적인 ODA 지원이 필요한 상황임

II. 상세 내용

1. 아크라 고위급 포럼 의제 및 일정 협의

가. 주요 산출물

- 원조효과작업반 의장인 Jan Cedergrén은 지난 11.28-29 원조효과작업반회의에서 논의된 아크라 고위급회의의 구체일정, 회의의 구성(장관급회의, 9개의 라운드 테이블, 홍보섹션 설치 등)및 주요이슈에 대해 보고함
- 회원국들은 원조의 예측가능성, 공여국간 원조 분업(division of labor), 수원국의 주인의식과 원조에 부여되는 조건(conditionality), 역량강화 등을 주요산출물로서 기대한다는 데 공감대를 형성함

나. 회의의 성격

- 아울러 파리선언 이행의 중간점검이라는 차원에서 그간의 성과를 측정하는 기술적인 협의 외에 참석자들의 관심을 제고하는 차원에서 정치적인 메시지 전달이 매우 중요함을 지적함
- 아크라 고위급회의의 주요 결과물인 아크라 행동계획(AAA)은 2010년 파리선언 중간평가에 대비, 한정된 분야에서 구체적인 조치가 이루어 질 수 있도록(action-oriented) 수립될 필요가 있다는 것이 강조됨
- EU는 근본적으로 정치적인 결단이 필요한 야심찬 것이어야 함을 강조한데 반해, 미국은 공여국과 수원국간의 기여에 있어 균형이 이루어져야 함을 강조

- 또한 동 행사의 성공을 위해서는 여타 국제기구 행사와 연계가 필요하다는 점에 공감대가 형성되었고, 라운드테이블회의에 수원국과 공여국간 참여의 조화가 필요하다는 점이 지적됨
- 아울러 시민사회 및 민간 분야의 참석도 활성화 필요

다. 원조의 언타이드

- DAC의 「2001년 최빈국(LDC) ODA 지원에 대한 언타이드화 권고방침」이 대상국가를 최

빈국으로 제한하고, 기술협력(TC) 및 식량지원에 대해서는 적용하지 않는 데 대해, 대다수 유럽국가가 대상국가(Non-LDC HIPC) 및 분야(기술협력 및 식량원조 포함)의 확대에 적극 찬성하고 아크라회의에서 동 사항에 대한 실질적인 진전이 있어야 함을 주장함

- 벨기에는 현재 자신의 언타이드 비율이 99%이라는 점을 전제한 후, 2001년 DAC 권고사항의 이행 현황파악 및 회원국들의 철저한 이행(회원국간 동등한 비율의 언타이드)이 선행된 이후, 적용범위의 확대가 논의되어야 한다는 입장임
- 일본은 언타이드화가 실제로 수원국의 필요를 만족시키는지 주의깊은 분석이 필요하며 동 사항은 수원국의 주인의식이 존중되도록 수원국이 결정할 사항이므로 언타이드 확대문제를 신중히 접근해야 한다고 함. 아울러, 언타이드 적용대상국가 확대 논의 관련, Non-LDC HIPC 국가들의 경우, HIPC “졸업” 후 3년이 지난 경우에는 언타이드의 적용이 될 수 없다는 조항이 삽입되어야 한다고 주장함

라. EU Code of Conduct

- 대다수 유럽지역 공여국들은 원조관련 공여국들간 특정 수원국 및 원조분야의 중복을 방지하기 위해 금년 5월 EU에서 채택한 “EU 개발관련 code of conduct”(공여국들이 1개 수원국

내 참여섹터를 최대 3개로 제한)를 아크라 회의의 주요논의 이슈로 채택할 것을 제안함

- 우리나라는 공여국간 원조분업에 탄력적이고 자율적인 원칙이 적용되어야 함을 강조하고, 특히 신흥공여국의 특수성을 감안할 필요가 있음을 지적함
- 일본은 수원국의 ownership을 해칠 가능성이 있다는 점을 지적하며, 이행할 때 유의해야 하는 점을 1차적 견해(preliminary observation)로서 표명하며 유보적인 입장을 밝힘

2. 재원과 성과의 연계

- 원조를 지속적으로 수원국에 지원하기 위해서는 원조의 실질적인 성과를 의회와 국민에게 제시하여 지지를 받을 필요가 있다는 데 대부분이 공감함
- 캐나다는 지속적인 개발원조를 위해서 평가체제를 갖추는 것이 중요하고 동 결과가 의회 및 여론 지지 제고를 위하여 필요함을 강조함. 일본 또한 원조의 결과 및 영향(impact)에 대하여 일반국민에게 계속 알리는 것이 중요하며, 아울러 그 결과를 수원국 및 신흥공여국의 관점에서 바라보는 것도 중요하다고 함
- 상기관련, EC는 제약조건(conditionality)은 “결과중심의 원조”와 상충되는 면이 있으며, 제약조건보다는 결과중심으로 원조를 지원하

는 것이 바람직하다고 함

것으로 기대됨

3. 2009-2010년 DAC 작업 계획

- DAC 활동중 동료검토(peer review), 통계작성, DAC 권고이행은 핵심적인 활동으로 인정받고 있는 바, 그 외 2009~2010년 DAC의 주요활동이 될 핵심이슈 등에 대해서 논의됨
- 기후변화에 대한 논의가 개발협력과 어떻게 조화될 것인지에 대한 논의(아일랜드, 노르웨이, 프랑스, 호주 등), 범지구적 개발공공재(global development commons), 역량강화, 신흥공여국의 역할, 무역을 위한 원조(aid for trade) 등이 새로운 활동영역(new priority)으로 제안됨

4. 원조 증액

- OECD 사무국은 2006년 파리선언 이행에 관한 최초 설문조사 이후, 2005~2010년까지 수원국별 원조 금액 및 원조계획을 취합하고 다양한 방법으로 분석함으로써 원조예측가능성 및 공여국간 원조중복 등에 관한 정보를 제공함
 - 동 조사는 프로그램 국별원조(CPA; Country Programmable Aid)라는 개념을 제시하고, 이 개념에 의해 2005-2010년까지 수원국별 추정 원조금액을 제시하여 공여국간 분업, 수원국의 거래비용 감소, 원조배분결정(aid allocation decision)에 좋은 정보를 제공할

※ CPA는 전체 ODA에서 예측불가능(인도적 지원 등)하거나 국경간 이동없는 ODA 금액 등을 제외한 수원국 수준(at country level)에서 프로그램이 가능한 ODA 금액

- 아울러 OECD 사무국은 2006년도 DAC 회원국 ODA가 총 1,044억불로서 전년대비 4.5% 감소되었고, 이는 GNI 대비 평균 0.31%를 차지, 1997년이후 최초의 감소이나, 이라크 및 나이지리아 부채탕감이 있었던 2005년이 기록적으로 ODA가 높았던 해임을 감안하면, 2006년도 ODA가 여전히 매우 높은 수치라고 발표함
- 우리측은 2010년 DAC 가입을 앞두고 ODA 규모의 확대추진, 중장기계획 수립, 특별동료검토수검, 개발협력을 제고하기 위한 선진공여국과 정책대화 노력 등을 설명하면서 우리나라의 DAC가입에 대한 회원국들의 지지를 당부하고 OECD 사무국 및 회원국들로부터 호응을 받음

Ⅲ. 참고사항

- Richard Manning DAC 의장은 올해 임기만으로 퇴임할 예정이며, OECD DAC 회원국 및 중국, 한국 등 신흥공여국 등 약 150여명이 금번 회의에 참석함

EU Code of Conduct on Complementarity and Division of Labour in Development Policy

This Code of Conduct presents operational principles for EU donors regarding complementarity in development cooperation. Their aim is to enhance effectiveness by improving overall development results and impact for poverty reduction and reducing the transaction costs, through a division of labour between donors.

The Code proposes an inclusive approach that is open to all donors.

The Code is embedded in the principles of ownership, alignment, harmonisation and management for results and mutual accountability of the Paris Declaration as well as the additional objectives and values highlighted by the European Consensus.

The Code is voluntary, flexible and self-policing. It is a dynamic document that establishes principles and targets towards which EU donors will strive to work progressively and accordingly.

The partner country should be responsible for coordinating donors. EU Donors will encourage and support the partner country to assume that responsibility while structuring themselves, in an appropriate manner, using – where appropriate – good existing practices as inspiration.

EU donors will base their engagement on the below outlined principles. These principles have to be approached in a pragmatic and flexible manner. It is hoped that other donors will want to commit themselves to abiding by it and are invited to participate and base their activities on similar principles as those outlined in this Code of Conduct.

General principles

EU donors (the Member States and the Commission) commit themselves to further progress on complementarity and division of labour, including closer cooperation among them, in line with the following general principles:

1. The primary leadership and ownership in in-country division of labour should first and foremost lie in the partner country government. If such leadership and

ownership do not exist, the EU should promote such a process. In any case, the EU should always play an active role in promoting complementarity and division of labour. All initiatives need to be open for other donors, build on existing processes whenever possible, and be readily transferred to the government whenever appropriate. The EU should provide capacity building support to the partner countries to enable them to take on this responsibility.

2. It is crucial that the division of labour is not implemented at the expense of global aid volumes or predictability of aid flows and is carried out in collaboration with the partner countries.
3. Implementation needs to be based on
 - (i) country-level priorities and needs,
 - (ii) a long-term perspective, as well as
 - (iii) a pragmatic and well-sequenced approach.
4. It is recognised that the EU donors share common development objectives, vision, values and principles. When limiting the involvement of Member States or the

Commission in a partner country or sector, situations where all EU donors are absent from a strategic sector for poverty reduction should be avoided.

5. While implementation needs to be based at field-level, political commitment and adequate support and impetus need to be made both in headquarters and in the field. It is also important to improve coordination between the field-level and the headquarters to ensure a coherent approach. This should not, however, undermine the partner country leadership and ownership.
6. Comparative advantage is not primarily based on financial resources available, but also on a wide range of issues such as geographic or thematic expertise. Therefore, each Member State has a role to play.

Guiding Principle 1

- Concentrate on a limited number of sectors in-country

EU donors will aim at focussing their active involvement in a partner country on a

maximum of three sectors¹, based on the following criteria:

- Each donor will act ambitiously to reduce transaction costs on partner governments and streamline their sector presence according to their comparative advantage as recognised by the partner country government and other donors.
- The appreciation of what constitutes a sector, being intuitive or informed, should be done in a flexible manner, at partner country level and match the definition of the partner country, that should have identified the sector as a priority in its poverty reduction strategy or equivalent. In agreement with the partner country, the partitioning of sectors should be avoided as much as possible.

In addition to the three sectors, donors can provide general budget support, where conditions permit to do so, support to civil society, and research and education schemes including scholarships. In their selected sectors donors should mainstream crosscutting issues.

A donor's comparative advantage can be determined by, inter alia, any of the following criteria:

- presence in the field,
- experience in the country, sector or context,
- trust and confidence of partner governments and other donors,
- technical expertise and specialization of the donor,
- volume of aid, at country or sector level,
- capacity to enter into new or forward looking policies or sectors,
- capacity to react quickly and/or long term predictability,
- efficiency of working methodologies, procedures, and quality of human resources,
- relatively better performance – without necessarily absolute advantage,
- lower cost compared to other donors with adequate standards of quality,
- building new experience and capacities as an emerging donor.

The comparative advantage of a given donor should be self assessed, endorsed by the

1) In limited cases, where donors face a significant reduction in sector coverage, this target may be increased to engage in more than three sectors, taking full account of partner country views, neglected issues of particular importance and a realistic timeframe to support any change in their country programmes.

partner government, and recognized by other donors. The EU encourages partner countries to provide clear views on donors' comparative advantage.

The partner countries will be encouraged to identify the areas for increased or reduced support and to indicate their preferences as to which donors should remain actively involved in each sector.

EU donors will work together with the partner country to identify sectors in which to remain, and propose exits from sectors from which they shall withdraw. The creation of orphan sectors should be avoided in this process.

EU donors will aim at a long term engagement in a given sector (i.e. minimum of 5–7 years, or a minimum of one period of a national poverty reduction strategy).

Guiding Principle 2

- Redeployment for other in-country activities

A redeployment process should be based on local negotiations and will very much depend on the situation in the country. It is

recommended that headquarters offers field offices/delegations a flexible enough mandate with room for negotiation and capacity to adapt.

EU donors that are active in sectors other than the three concentration sectors should pursue one of the following options:

- stay financially engaged in the sector through the use of delegated cooperation/partnership arrangement,
- redeploy the freed-up resources into general budget support – where conditions permit to do so – while still being engaged in developments in the additional sector through the structures, dialogue and capacity building processes surrounding general budget support,
- exit from the sector in a responsible manner while using the freed-up resources in scaling-up support for the sectors in which they will remain.

Responsible exit from a sector entails a well planned and managed process with the full participation of the partner country and with the change/redeployment process being well communicated to all stakeholders.

Guiding Principle 3

- Lead donor arrangement

In each priority sector, EU donors will work towards and support the establishment of a lead donor arrangement in charge of all donor coordination in the sector thereby reducing the transaction costs for both partner countries and donors. The lead donor model might differ from one case to another. Burden sharing arrangements, for instance through a team of supporting donors, could be envisaged where relevant. The important objective is to ensure that the partner country is faced with a structured donor set-up.

The lead donor(s) should be given a substantial mandate for specific aspects of sector policy dialogue and have an obligation to regularly consult with other donors in the sector. In order to allow for efficient specialisation and continuity, rotation of lead donor responsibility should be limited (for example sequenced on national planning cycles if applicable).

Guiding Principle 4

- Delegated cooperation/partnership

If a given sector is considered strategic for the partner country or the donor, EU donors may enter into a delegated cooperation/partnership arrangement with another donor, and thereby delegate authority to the other donor to act on its behalf in terms of administration of funds and/or sector policy dialogue with the partner government. Partner governments should be consulted on the donors' delegating agreements. Delegating donors should be enabled to review policies and procedures of the lead donor relevant to their delegating agreements. A delegated cooperation /partnership role in a sector will be considered additional to the maximum of three sectors in which a given donor is engaged.

The delegation of cooperation from the Commission to other donors will follow the provisions of financial and implementation regulations of Community Budget and the EDF.

Guiding Principle 5

- Ensure an adequate donor support

When implementing sector concentration, the EU should ensure that at least one donor with appropriate comparative advantage and

sharing similar values and principles, is actively involved in each sector considered relevant for poverty reduction.

EU donors, with full participation and ownership of the partner country, will seek to limit the number of active donors to a maximum of 3–5 per sector, based on their comparative advantage. Other donors can still take part in sector activities by means of delegated cooperation modalities.

Guiding Principle 6

- Replicate practices at regional level

While adhering to the general principles of aid effectiveness also at regional level, EU donors will apply the above principles of in-country division of labour also in their work with partner regional institutions.

Guiding Principle 7

- Establish priority countries

EU donors agree to reinforce the geographical focus of their assistance to avoid spreading their resources too thinly. They will strive to establish a limited number of priority countries.

This process will be informed by a dialogue within the EU, taking into account the broader donor engagement, and be carried out in dialogue with partner countries and with other donors. Discussions should be based on:

- transparent information on EU donors' activities and plans and, as much as possible, on the activities and plans of other donors;
- self-assessments conducted by each donor;
- regular EU-wide exchange of information when Member States modify their list of priority countries, as well as exchange of information with partner countries and other donors in order to prevent at an early stage the creation of orphan countries.

In non-priority countries, EU donors may provide their support *inter alia* through delegated cooperation arrangements or by redeploying on the basis of responsible exit strategies prepared with the partner country. EU donors will share information on good practices.

The European Consensus recognises its global presence as an added value for the EC.

Guiding Principle 8

- Address the “orphans” gap

Committed to avoiding imbalances, EU donors will address the problem of “orphaned” or neglected countries, based on needs and performances, taking into account all financing flows from ODA and other aid flows. The specificity of those neglected countries calls for a redeployment of resources in their favour.

“Orphaned” or neglected countries are often ‘fragile states’ whose stabilisation would have a positive spill-over effect on the wider region. Addressing this issue should be done amongst other things as an input for the ongoing OECD/DAC initiative and initiatives of other international fora.

Adequate attention and financing need to be given to linking relief and rehabilitation to long term development.

Guiding Principle 9

- Analyse and expand areas of strength

EU donors, taking into account the views of partner countries, will deepen the self-

assessment of their comparative advantages as regards sectors and modalities with the aim to identify those in which they would like to expand, as well as those where they might be willing to reduce their own activities.

The Commission will further develop its expertise and capacities in the areas where it has comparative advantages, paying particular attention to building the necessary capacity and expertise at the country level, in line with the deconcentration process and ownership of partner countries.

Guiding Principle 10

- Pursue progress on other dimensions of complementarity

EU donors commit themselves to advancing on the other dimensions of complementarity. On vertical complementarity, primarily in the context of relevant international fora and ongoing discussion on the rationalisation of the international aid architecture, and to further discuss cross-modalities and instruments, in the context of specific partnership and the implementation of joint/coordinated programmes.

Guiding Principle 11

- Deepen the reforms

EU donors recognize that in order to achieve a coherent division of labour between individual donors, strong political commitment and adequate support is needed both in headquarters and in the field, implementation needs to be based at field-level and a close coordination between the

headquarter and field level is necessary. Member States may consider in this regard decentralised structures to facilitate complementarity and coordination on the ground, institutional incentives to staff and redeployment of financial and human resources.

[자료: 주오이시디대표부]