SCHOOL OF MISSION AND THEOLOGY (MHS)

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR LOCAL DEVELOPMENT

- A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF UN'S ROLE IN PARTNERSHIPS AND COOPERATION

PROCESSES, WITH A SPECIAL FOCUS ON MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOAL 8

THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE COURSE:

MASTER THESIS IN GLOBAL STUDIES

30-MATH

BY

LORI-ANN AGCAOILI WOLLUM

STAVANGER

MAY 2012

Abbreviations

GNP   Gross National Product

HDI   Human Development Index

LDC   Less Developed Country

MDG   Millennium Development Goal

NGO   Non-governmental organization

ODA   Official Development Assistance

UN   United Nations

UNDP   United Nations Development Programme

UNDG   United Nations Development Group

UNTC   United Nations Country Team

Content

1 INTRODUCTION – GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR LOCAL DEVELOPMENT

1.1 Aim of thesis

The world as we know it today has become highly interrelated, webs are constantly formed and new partnerships are created. People and instances are cooperating across borders and subjects, coming up with new solutions to challenging issues.

The purpose of this thesis is to look at some of the challenges that are brought up in the discussion of global partnership and development. In order to do so, a critical analysis of the United Nations (UN) role in partnerships and cooperation processes, with a special focus on Millennium Development Goal 8; develop a global partnership for development will be given a great deal of attention. It will be the overall theme to the three topics that will form the analysis.

The following research questions; how is it possible to facilitate cooperation strategies between global and local development agencies? and; what does such a partnership entail?- will be attempted to be answered through the challenges that can be found within cooperation on a global level. Partnerships based on mutual benefits, and the issue of trust and coordination within the UN system as well as the global sphere makes up for the first topic of the thesis.

A second topic that is to be discussed relates to the role that power, politics and bureaucracy plays in the global development field. There are many players in the development field, many who strive for better conditions, who fight for the rights of others and advocate for empowerment. Then there are those who claim to do the same, instances that insist that they are there for the weaker ones. However sometimes it boils down to a bureaucratic circle and a power agenda, and the real issue evaporates. The following research question; who defines the agenda? will try to be answered by looking at UN's role as the world's largest bureaucracy, and the political motivation for achieving sustainable development, as well as the issue of how to mobilize donors and make partnerships more equal.

A third topic will revolve around the following question; how can global development contribute to the fulfillment of MDG 8? A look at globalization and some of the current challenges of development aid will try to answer this question. Also a look at what the obstacles and challenges that can be found in reaching MDG 8 will be discussed within the topic. As more and more agencies and countries become involved in the development aid process and as economic globalization evolve, new challenges arise. The new direction of development aid and the challenges that follow will therefore be the last part within this topic and will hopefully shine some new light in regards to the related research question.

The thesis will be based on interviews conducted from my fieldwork in the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) office as well as UN documents and reports. Theories and strategies that I find relevant to the findings will be used to underline special points that are important for the analysis.

1.2 Context: United Nations and the Millennium Development Goals

To be able to combat the growing poverty that the world is facing the UN has created the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). They are to create a framework in which the World's countries together with leading organizations such as the UN, the World Bank and other important partners such as Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) can keep track of the progress and keep each other in check. In this framework, the UN is a very valuable component. It is important when it comes to handling international crises, and not to mention development work.

1.2.1 UN history

The UN is one of the most important agencies, if not the most important in global development aid today. Its foundation is a highly bureaucratic structure that is based upon the need for collective security and cooperation. UN constitutes the backbone in international society. The member states accept and adjust to the guidelines from a higher global level, which regulates everything from conflict-resolutions to issues regarding fundamental human rights. In the General Assembly all the member states have one vote each. In the Security Council where there are five permanent members- USA, Russia, China, France and Great Britain (Jørgensen 2010: 16). Established after the Second World War, it was believed that the UN would have a great deal more power than it actually has today. It lacked both the

authority and the power to be able to become a 'world government'. With the exception of the Security Council, that is entitled to sanction states that do not follow the directed guidelines, the UN resolutions are more of a recommendation than it is a 'law' (Jørgensen 2010: 18). The fact that the UN has limited possibilities in deciding how the development work evolves, creates a deficiency of power that is often used to participate in the global arena. Also the fact that the organization faces difficulties in the decision making process, such as paying attention to the opinion of all the member states makes the relevance of the UN even more limited. Many international initiatives are now being made outside of the UN-umbrella, because many of the member states does not understand how they can relate it to the organization in a constructive way (Jørgensen 2010: 18). As the UN was one of the first big players on the development field, a gap was filled by their creation. Though its power may not have a significant relevance today, the organization still plays a central role in the development field through many projects, and lately specifically through the MDGs.

1.2.2   The intentions of the MDGs

As world poverty has become a global issue today, a partnership between local and global agencies has thus become even more important for taking action. "The Millennium Development Goals represent the world's commitment to deal with global poverty in its many dimensions." (What will it take to achieve the Millennium Development Goals?: 1). The MDGs consists of eight goals, each with their own sub-targets. These are the following goals; 1- eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, 2- achieve universal primary education, 3- promote gender equality and empower women, 4- reduce child mortality, 5- improve maternal health, 6- combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases, 7- ensure environmental sustainability, 8- develop a global partnership for development (see attachment 3 for the corresponding targets). As the MDGs are interlinked, progress in one goal supports progress in others. It is important to invest in all the goals, this is why multisectoral approaches and coordination among various implementing agencies become critical (What will it take to achieve the Millennium Development Goals?: 1).

MDG 8 takes on the issue of developing a global partnership for development. Though it is the last goal, it is still a very important goal, as it wants to foster a global commitment, making all agencies involved and responsible for reaching the goals. This also gives the receiving parties a more active part in the process. Though the MDGs are initially big

promises created for a global purpose, the real drive for achieving this goal lies on a local level.

> Because local governments are directly accountable to their communities, they tend to have greater incentives to improve delivery. Where a central agency might be able to 'afford' being unresponsive to the demands of localities that have limited national political leverage, local governments have more at stake if local constituents perceive them as deficient. (Scaling up support for the MDGs at the local level: 9)

MDG 8 wants to create better opportunities for development both internationally and in the independent countries. One can argue that though a top-down approach to dealing with development is contributing to the poverty challenges, a bottom-up approach serves in many ways as a continuous project that foster capable local societies. The information found for monitoring the MDG achievements at the global, regional and country level is collected from various MDG reports as well as a sample of country case studies (What will it take to achieve the Millennium Development Goals?: 3) which will be some of the sources used for this thesis. The writers of this assessment admit that even though these reports contain extensive data, there are still challenges in terms of reliability and timelines (What will it take to achieve the Millennium Development Goals?: 3).

1.3   Limitations

As this thesis is going to discuss global institutions, I would like to start off with discussing the concept of a global institution. The institutions that I will focus on are organizations that have a long history in world economics and politics; such as the UN created after the Second World War, and the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) created after the Bretton Woods conference. As my fieldwork were in one of the many UNDP offices, the focus of the thesis will be on specifically the headquarter office and the interviews that I got during my fieldwork. I have also found some literature that I find relevant to some of the interviews. Though I understand that the main topic is wide and indefinable, I will try to relate all the secondary findings to the relevant interviews and other primary sources.

The theme of the thesis is somewhat wide and open for discussion from any angle; I have chosen to look at it from a top-down perspective. The basis for this comes from my fieldwork which was in the UNDP headquarters. I experienced development work from the "top", the place where the initial policy planning starts and is later implemented by local UNDP country

offices. This will allow me to narrow the thesis and focus on the main theme from a specific angle. This means that I will look at development from a "top" perspective that includes politics and bureaucracy. I will not discuss development as it is seen from a local view. I will discuss cooperation and partnership from a global institutional position and how it is viewed in regards to interaction with local organizations. Thus the discussion will not include the local position and interaction. Though it would have been interesting to study the bottom-up approach and the local side of development aid through local NGOs, time restrictions in regards to the fieldwork study set limitations as to how wide the thesis could be.

1.4 Structure

As global development is the basis for the thesis, globalization theory will be a central tool as the thesis unfolds. I will therefore start off by discussing different theories on globalization. A second theoretical tool that will be important in the analysis of the thesis is development aid; therefore different views on this subject will also be discussed. After giving the theoretical basis for the thesis, it will follow with the method chosen for conducting the research. It will include some information on how the fieldwork was conducted and my role as an interviewer. It will also discuss access and limitations to the interviews.

The main part; 'Partnership and Development' is organized into three themes with three corresponding research questions. The first part 'Cooperation and Partnerships' will discuss the challenges of cooperation on a global level, such as ownership of the aid projects and who are involved in the decision making process. It will also discuss partnerships based on mutual commercial benefits which will mention a new way of addressing development cooperation. Further on, the topic of trust and coordination will in the thesis address skepticism and failing coordination between local governments and international aid workers.

In the second part 'Power, Politics and Bureaucracy' the question; 'Who defines the agenda?' will be a central topic and a large part of the discussion will be given to UN's role as the world's largest bureaucracy. Political motivation for achieving sustainable development will address the issue of how it is possible to engage cooperation without there being a hidden agenda. Which will bring forth the question; How to mobilize donors and make partnerships more equal? As some donors are considered corporate bodies, their structure and agenda might make cooperation a challenging task. A challenge since the creation of the MDGs has

been the lack of ownership towards the goals from some of the countries and local governments. This might make it hard to implement MDG policies and this topic will be discussed more here.

The last and third part will revolve around 'Global Development Aid'. One issue here will be about globalization and the current challenges of development aid. It is believed that corporate social responsibility might be a solution to the new problems that the development process is facing today. This will lead to a specific issue regarding MDG 8 and what it will take to reach this goal. A specific problem related to this goal is the issue of the world's largest economies failing on their promise to put in place a trading environment. So how can global development contribute to the fulfillment of MDG 8? The last topic will discuss the new direction of development aid and the challenges that follow. If the new direction is headed for the private sector, the changes need to follow the evolution.

2   THEORY AND METHOD

2.1   Theory – a tool for further analysis

In order to analyze and discuss what one has found during a research period a theoretical foundation is a critical tool. Not only will it create some sort of basis for the project, it will also provide different angles for understanding. And being able to understand the project from not only one side, but being able to see the critical aspects as well will be key in understanding and gaining knowledge from the project. In this thesis I have chosen Globalization theory and Development theory as the theoretical tool of the project.

Globalization theory is relevant because it deals with the effects that are facing the world as people and agencies become more connected and thus creating an interdependency link. Through technology, economy, culture and media we are more connected than ever before. This means that we are aware of what is happening around the globe, through the information flow such as numerous newspapers, television news channels and internet-sites we are able to follow other people and experience their joys and sorrows. What this means for global organizations such as the UN, the IMF and the World Bank is the need for transparency. People can now pay attention and take action when injustice is being made. Amnesty International knows about human rights violations in tiny towns in forgotten parts of the world because of global technology and media outlets. In some cases globalization has contributed to a more "open" world, where opinions can be shared and acted upon. A global partnership is able to create a forum where this can happen.

As for Development theory, there are two known concepts for how to disperse of financial development aid; there is macro-credit, where the theoretical idea is based on a top-down,-trickle-down philosophy. This means that large loans are given by global organizations to for example nation states. It is believed that the profit from these loans will eventually trickle down to the local communities and serve the poor population as well. In practice this may translate into Conditionality agreements which aim to restructure the national economies in order to achieve faster and sustainable growth. Conditionality agreement loans are development aid given by the leaders in the world economy; the World Bank and IMF, while an organization such as the UN can be viewed as the custodians of these funds. Then there is

micro-credit, based on a bottom-up approach to development aid. The idea here is that small individual loans given by NGOs will create a binding and personal ownership that will result in the ability to pay back the loans on time and start local profitable activities such as farming and shops. From looking at these different aid programmes it is clear that they both do have their strengths and weaknesses. Unfortunately, the topic of local based development will be too wide to be discussed further in this thesis. It has only been included in order to show the difference between two main theories and practices, as a way of looking at development aid.

2.1.1   Globalization theory

The connection between the aim of the thesis and globalization theory starts with the MDGs and economic globalization. Globalization can be characterized as a development process containing all sorts of aspects; such as cultural and political, as well as technological. In trying to reach the aim of the thesis, the globalization theory chapter will mostly entail the definition of economic- and political globalization, and criticism and positive remarks related to it. As MDG 8 is based upon having "an open, rule based, predictable, nondiscriminatory trading and financial system" (MDG 8, target 12, see attachment 3) it is appropriate to limit the thesis to economic- and political globalization.

Transnational organizations and interdependency

The MDGs are a global project. The UN, World Bank, IMF etc. are all global agencies situated above the nation states. They are able to sanction countries that breach ratified agreements such as The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and they are able to regulate world economies through conditionality agreements. An open sanction may cause a public 'naming and shaming' giving the sanctioned country a less than good reputation in the global media and politics, as well as trade difficulties. The issue of national economies being regulated through global agencies may for instance experience a devaluing of national currencies or having interest rates raised. The point to be made here is that globalization is making everything more intertwined, more connected and interdependent. This can be understood as interdependency, where for instance states, global organizations as well as local organizations become more mutually dependent on each other and work within a partnership that allows them to share ideas and resources. The outcome is both positive and negative. Globalization reduces the control of nation states. Diminishing borders and connectivity are also words used to understand the process of globalization. However this process is much

more complicated than just claiming that the world is getting smaller and we are getting more connected.

The process of globalization can be divided into different themes, such as; cultural-, technological-, political- and economic globalization. Though they each have their own aspects and ways of development, they tend to be highly interrelated. Andrew Heywood in his book *Political theory* talks about globalization as "a slippery and elusive concept." (Heywood 2004: 107). He thinks of globalization as a collection of processes resulting in a web of interconnectedness that are in many ways shaping events that occur in our lives. People are less separated by time and space. Social space is a term Heywood uses in defining the sense that territory matters less now that an increasing range of connections have a 'transworld' or 'transborder' character. This means that connections such as global partnerships are not restricted by geographical, political or organizational borders. His definition of economic globalization is based upon the idea that no economy is an island; they all have to an extent been absorbed into an interlocking global economy. This he claims can be seen by the "growing power of multinational companies, and the free and instantaneous flow of financial capital between countries." (Heywood 2004:107). Political globalization can be seen by the growing importance of international organizations such as the UN (Heywood 2004: 108). Jan Aart Scholte writes that some say that global governance institutions like the World Bank, and global nongovernmental organizations address problems of rural development more effectively than state programmes have ever done. He also writes that many commentators have seen globalization as a way for democratization to grow (Scholte 2005: 35).

Governance

It can be argued that globalization has brought democracy and good governance. Without it one may say that the foundations of the UN would not have been laid. In *Power Politics* Martin Wright talks about how:

> The existence of the United Nations has exaggerated the international importance of the have-not powers, enabling them to organize themselves into a pressure group with much greater diplomatic and propaganda weight than they would otherwise have had. (Wight 1995: 238)

So one might argue that globalization has led to developed institutions like the UN, making it possible for the less resourceful to be able to promote themselves and act upon their needs.

One might also argue that through globalization democracy has been able to develop around the world. This means the spread of notions of human rights, rule of law and good governance, the very foundation of the Western world which have been very successful in utilizing the process that globalization can offer.

Heywood writes that supporters of globalization argue that the "emergence of global capitalism has extended prosperity, widened opportunities and spread individual rights and freedoms." (Heywood 2004: 108). It is argued that economic globalization is able to benefit not only rich countries but also poor ones because each country is able to specialize in a production of goods that is best suited for them. He further writes that "the spread of market-orientated economic reform fuels pressure for political reform in that a wider range of groups and interests seek a political voice." (Heywood 2004: 108). Globalization he writes, in this view promotes democratization and its character is has a pronounced neoliberal or free-market ideology (Heywood 2004: 108). Though this can be viewed as positive and empowering, globalization also has its critics and in *Understanding Globalization*, Tony Schirato and Jen Webb draws a link between capitalism and the globalizing practice. Just like the globalization process, capitalism seeks out to "join others, and craft alliances, which means capitalism easily becomes a globalizing practice." (Schirato and Webb 2008: 81). They further write that Karl Marx already foreshadowed the globalization process through the idea that capitalism was driven by the need for bigger markets and cheaper raw materials which would eventually spread across the world. His thoughts about what would later have the term 'globalization' were not a positive one. He already saw the outcome of "informationalism, production and communication technologies, neoliberalism and neocolonialism." (Schirato and Webb 2008: 81-82).

Conditionality and imperialism

Writer of *The new rulers of the world* John Pilger claims in his book that imperialism has returned as globalization. And much like Marx, Pilger's idea of this process is a negative one. His thoughts on global economy are linked to the globalization of poverty where he states that a 'sophisticated system of plunder' has been forcing countries into structural adjustment programmes, also known as nation building or good governance. Pilger argues that this has widened the gap between the rich and poor, resulting in an elite of fewer than a billion people controlling 80 per cent of humanity's wealth (Pilger 2008: 2-3). A power elite controlling all

the major aspects of global society. As Ashraf Ghani and Clare Lockhart state in *Fixing failed states* economic choices are not determined by businesses or states alone. Now in addition to states and corporations, a constellation of major players from the news media, financial markets, universities, international organizations and foundations drives the global decision-making process (Ghani and Lockhart 2008: 62). Though structural adjustment programmes and the agenda it entails, such as conditionality agreements are often viewed as negative by opponents of globalization, it does also have some redeeming qualities. John Braithwaite and Peter Drahos write in *Global business regulation* that:

> The expansion of conditionality clearly comes at the expense of national sovereignty over financial regulation. This need not necessarily be a bad thing. Some states which lack a financial plan or which have political masters with a partiality for personal financial extravaganzas may benefit from conditionality. (Braithwaite and Drahos 2000: 126)

However what cannot be overlooked is the fact that states that borrow money through structural adjustment programmes have to comply with rules and regulations that are not necessarily their own and might make them politically poor in the larger scheme of global politics. Braithwaite and Drahos also write that:

> States borrowing money under high conditionality arrangements are subject to performance criteria which involve them agreeing to eliminate budget deficits, raise interest rates, eliminate government subsidies and devalue their currencies. (David 1985: 22 in Braithwaite and Drahos 2000: 125)

Thus some claim that globalization is imperialism in disguise and could fit the title as suggested by Schirato and Webb; neocolonialism. In *Understanding globalization* they suggest that World Trade Organization (WTO), World Bank and the IMF are perceived to be carrying out a rather strong pro-capitalist agenda. They especially highlight the fact that these organizations are acting on behalf of, or under the influence of the United States (Schirato and Webb 2008: 123). This opens the discussion for also mentioning other definitions of globalization such as Americanization or Westernization, which highlight the extent of power the Western world and especially the United States holds on global- economy and politics. These definitions follow the idea that globalization is dynamic and its social structures, typical of the western world such as; capitalism, industrialism, bureaucracy and so forth are spread to other parts of the world, in the meantime destroying other cultures and local self-determination in the process (Scholte 2005: 16). Ethnocentrism cannot be said to hold any real

value in the globalization process. Wight state that: "It is quite particularly necessary to guard against the notion that morality in politics is a flower that blooms especially or exclusively in Anglo-Saxon gardens." (Wight 1995: 292). Structural Adjustment Programmes are an example of knowledge transfer, where it is believed that a specific plan can be beneficial for all. However as economic globalization evolves and more and more agencies and countries become involved in development aid, new challenges arise.

2.1.2 Development theory

After WWII the Marshall Plan was established in order to help rebuild the war torn countries around Europe. This was the beginning of the numerous development aid projects that we know of today. The main difference between the Marshall Plan and development aid as we know it today was the fact that the recipient countries were given full control over the financial resources and how they would manage it. In *Fixing failed states* Ashraf Ghani and Clare Lockhart write that; "the Marshall Plan's institutional framework made the recipient country the driver of strategy and policy as well as project manager." (Ghani and Lockhart 2008: 88). When learning about the history of aid projects one may wonder how it evolved from the countries themselves having full control over their own agenda to the modern day aid agencies having been accused of being fundamentally exploitative. And a well-known previously mentioned issue is the case of structural adjustment programmes which has led to the "imposition of the weak, impoverished, and now deeply indebted governments, especially in sub-Saharan Africa." (Chambers 2003: 16). It was hoped that these policies would enable economies to recover and debts be repaid. Markets would also be freed. However to expect these weak states to be able to put the strategies into action through central planning and government action caused them into further debt, and without being in any position to negotiate, policies of structural adjustment were expected to be met by the creditors, making the poor even poorer (Chambers 2003: 16).

However the difference between the period of the Marshall Plan and now is that there are so many new agencies involved in the development process. The growing webs and partnerships call for greater transparency and the need for international staff to control the webs and flows of resources. Accountability is more important now than it was in 1945 because so many are involved in the process.

Measuring development

Globalization has made development aid a common concept, and many are familiar with the agencies that are in the forefront of these aid projects; such as the UN, Red Cross, Doctors without Borders and so on. However as Smukkestad states in *Utvikling eller avvikling*, the concept of development does not have any clear definition, it can have many meanings and it can be controversial (Smukkestad 2008: 11). Many relate the concept to economic development, this relates to a process where resources are used in a better and more efficient way in a country, region or an area such as farming or industry. A lot of development aid theory originated from the North and reflects global power relations and our worldview. The aftermath of WWII did not only create the foundation of development agencies it also brought forth a new concept. The North-South concept developed after WWII, in order to categorize the geographical location. With time this dichotomy became a concept that got an economic dimension by characterizing north as the rich North, while the South became the poor South (Smukkestad 2008: 11-13). The "rich" North is often also known as the West, First World or the developed world, while the "poor" South is referred to as the developing world or Third World. All the definitions will be used here, but they do refer to the same concept.

Smukkestad also states that power relations and Western ethnocentrism plays a part when we use this kind of economic development measurement in order to classify countries. Further on he claims that development countries are always evaluated on the basis of the developed countries. Our world, he says is used as a scale for others and the Southern countries are in this view considered as undeveloped and submissive in comparison. Western development is therefore often viewed as a goal that every country must want to aspire to (Smukkestad 2008: 13).

If development is something that can be graded from high to low, what are the measurements used in order to do so? First of all there is Gross National Product (GNP) per capita- "total domestic and foreign value added divided by total population." (Potter et al. 1999: 6). The method of measuring development through GNP has received a lot of criticism, especially since it gives no interpretation of distribution of national wealth. Another more popular indicator is the United Nations Human Development Index (HDI) which collects data on life expectancy, literacy, income, environmental quality and political freedom (Potter et al. 1999: 6-7). Though measuring development can be helpful in recognizing the difficulties that

countries are facing, many have criticized the way development have been defined especially 'antidevelopmentalists' "who see both the 'problems' and of the Third World and their 'solutions' as the creations of Western development discourse and practice." (Potter et al. 1999: 11).

Development in the form of conditionality

One of the most criticized practices in development aid is the use of conditionality which developed at the end of the Cold War. The focus was then on democracy and human rights violations. The condition was that developing countries would receive no more aid unless they did not organize multi-party elections (Uvin 2004: 57). The aim was to create a democratic environment much like the one we have in the West. However many difficulties have risen from this solution. Peter Uvin has identified and organized the difficulties with conditionality into four categories. The first category being that conditionality is unethical, simply summarized it deals with aid conditionality hurting the poor, while the rich are able to escape the ill effects of aid sanctions. The second difficulty deals with conditionality as never being fully implemented, Uvin states that conditionality will only be applied to some countries, or only by some countries. The result is that both legitimacy and its effectiveness will suffer. Also the fact that on the donor side, economic or political interest intervenes makes conditionality highly inconsistent (Uvin 2004: 59-64). The third category claims that conditionality does not produce the intended result "(…) because (a) it deals with the symptoms and not the causes, and (b) the recipients possess too many tools for evasion." (Uvin 2004: 65). The last difficulty deals with conditionality as being counterproductive. Uvin claims that external pressure can lead to a backlash that undermines the goal. He also says that the aim of conditionality and this is especially relevant to structural adjustment programmes, is to place limitations on economic and political power of the existing holders. However the difficulty is that the existing holders are in charge of the implementation of the conditionality policies, thus conditionality destroys the very domestic accountability and social transformation it seeks to achieve (Uvin 2004: 67-68). It has been claimed that conditionality strategies has been made to function in Western societies with a liberal framework. It is therefore not made to withstand the challenges that can be found in countries with different frameworks. This is one of the outcomes; "incumbent power elites are typically strengthened rather than weakened, even by economic and political liberalization programs that seek to place limits on their actions." (Hibou 2002 in Uvin, 2004: 68).

Bureaucracy

As mentioned in relation to the globalization theory section, globalization is often viewed as a new coming of imperialism. It is associated with bureaucracy and capitalistic agendas. Imperialism contributed to establishing these values into all corners of the world. And it could be claimed that not much have changed in regards to the practice of the fundamental ideas of bureaucracy and capitalism. For example between WWI and WWII:

> (…) colonial government was dominated by bureaucrats, both in metropolitan capitals and overseas, striving on behalf of the colonies with little appreciation either of indigenous aspirations or of the changing world economy in which they were situated. (Potter et al. 1999: 36-37)

Today, the same issues are found relevant as there have been claims that bilateral agencies such as governments and multilateral agencies are not held accountable for the development process as well as the lack of transparency and coordination. Uvin quote Nicolas van de Walle in *Human Rights and Development* when van de Walle talks about sub-Saharan African and the issue of bilateral- and multilateral aid and the lack of accountability. This is what van de Walle says about the donors:

> (…) they are only in charge of following bureaucratic procedure but not of producing results, and thus they have a strong built-in disincentive against the sort of critical and confrontational analysis required for effective conditionality. (van de Walle 2001; Easterly 2002, in Unvin 2004: 65)

Lack of accountability and an impersonal way of viewing bureaucracy is not a new phenomenon. Max Weber acknowledged that the prize of great efficiency that came with a bureaucratic structure "was a more depersonalized and inhuman social environment, typified by the relentless spread of bureaucratic forms of organization." (Heywood 2004: 135). However he also saw a positive outcome of using a bureaucratic structure to exercise power:

> (…) in clearly defining the realm of authority and attaching it to an office rather than a person, bureaucratic authority is less likely to be abused or give rise to injustice. In addition, bureaucratic order is shaped, Weber believed, by the need for efficiency and a rational division of labour. In his view, the bureaucratic order that dominates modern society is supremely efficient. (Heywood 2004: 135-136)

Thus it can be argued that the bureaucratic structure that shape our society today is built on a democratic form with a special focus on avoiding power being abused. However it might set some restrictions to the way that modern development aid is conducted. Ghani and Lockhart

state that bureaucracy is a hinder for successful development aid. They write that the international organizations that emerged after 1945 have become isolated from each other. They often end up reproducing the same bureaucratic practices of the past. The also write that their lack of coordination is usually the largest obstacle to achieving coherence of purpose or efficient resource use. What is claimed to be the largest problem is not the existence of development aid, but rather its structure and its lack of change. Ghani and Lockhart believe that the design of the aid system has to change in order for it to function as intended. And a basis for this would be a well-functioning state, so that business and civil society could work in a proper manner (Ghani and Lockhart 2008: 3-12). They are after all a necessary component of the state "that balances global and local networks of rights and obligations." (Ghani and Lockhart 2008: 12). Cooperation between these actors, they say, is therefore key elements of positive change (Ghani and Lockhart 2008: 13).

Top-down and bottom-up approaches to development
The main idea that is often criticized when arguments about the aid system are made is the fact that it can be highly hierarchical and based on a top-down approach. This approach is built on the notion that such an approach will lead to a trickle-down effect where it is believed "that making the North, the cities and elites in the South, and the rich generally, richer will ultimately produce trickle down benefits for the world's less advantaged." (Potter et al. 1999: 58). What is being largely advocated in the development field is the bottom-up approach, which has its origin from the idea 'another development' that was born at the Seventh Special Session of the United nations General Assembly and the allied publication by the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation 'What Now?' (Potter et al. 1999: 67). In a historic perspective the top-down approach to development is associated with the 1950s, through to the early 1970s mainly because the idea of modernism became hegemonic after 1945 (Potter et al. 1999: 52). In the 1970s however, a growing critique of these kinds of policies started to evolve. The critics argued that development did not equate economic growth, and that it did not have to follow a single linear path. Thus 'another development' or development from below became with its varied strategies and alternative paths conceived. The bottom-up approach focuses on indigenous natural and human resources. The main idea is that development should not be formed at a higher level rather it should focus on the needs of the people that are actually in need of development, and how they can contribute to forming the solutions to their needs (Potter et al. 1999: 69).

In *Whose reality counts*, Robert Chambers talks about empowerment, this is especially relevant since it is believed that bottom-up approaches to development can be a source of empowerment. In order to achieve empowerment Chambers puts forth the idea of putting the last first. When putting the last first, the outcome is imbalance. However Chambers claims that imbalance is needed to establish balance. A sort of reorientation where participatory training sets the mode for participation in the field, empowerment he says is trough identifying the weak and enabling them to gain the skills, confidence and knowledge. His further ideas on empowerment are that it does not necessarily need to be good. This depends greatly on who the empowered are. For instance if those who gain power are outsiders who exploit their new found situation or they consist of an elite that dominates, the poor and disadvantaged may be put in a worse situation. Also empowerment can be weak and short-lived unless it is embodied in institutions. It is therefore in need of a framework in order to be applicable. An institution such as the UN and especially local NGOs are able to provide this kind of setting (Chambers 2003: 210-219).

Human development

A central actor in the development field is the UN with UNDP particularly centered on development issues, not only has it created the HDI as a way of measuring development. Some would also argue that it has contributed immensely in the development field by describing human development as a process that is to increase human opportunity. Human development has become not only a process but also a goal. Through the ability to act and address one's own situation human development has come a long way from the traditional view of development and the idea that economic growth equals sustainable development (Smukkestad 2008: 29). Though the development field still has its drawbacks such as power agendas and bureaucratic processes, it seems clear that the field has evolved. A claim that has been set forth is the idea that the traditional division between donor and recipient has become less highlighted because both parts have development as a goal. This makes them more likely to be called collaborators or development partners than donor-recipient. However, critics claim that this is only a subtle use of definition power that creates a fictitious equilibrium (Smukkestad 2008: 26).

2.2 Method

In addition to the theory that was chosen, the choice of method proved to be valuable in the further analysis of the thesis. During the fieldwork I was able to gather useful data through UNDP respondents and public UN documents.

2.2.1 Background and choice of method

The reason for my choice of method; fieldwork and qualitative interviews was based on the interest in the MDGs, and finding out especially related to MDG 8; how it is possible to get a global and local partnership to interact. There is much information to be found in public UN documents and I chose to supplement this information with the data that I gathered from the fieldwork. I was able to have my fieldwork in the UNDP office because of a close relative that worked there. As I wanted to investigate the role of UN/UNDP in relation to global partnerships, the relation that I had to my relative became important for accessing the office.

In this time of increased globalization and financial difficulties, development is greatly affected. So what I have been looking at through the theory is the process of how development has evolved and become what it is today as well as the influence of globalization. Since a huge focus has been shifted from the donor-recipient relationship over to a partnership and cooperative relationship, the background for the interviews that was conducted is the relationship between a global institution such as the UN and partnering countries, or as they are sometimes still referred to; donor recipient-countries. The idea behind the fieldwork was to specifically focus on how it is possible for an organization such as the UNDP to cooperate with donors and local NGOs.

To be able to find out more about this subject I was able to interview ten UNDP employees from the UN headquarter in New York from different office levels. I interviewed four employees on an executive level, five employees on a professional level, and one employee on a general staff level. UNDP is a major player in the development field. They are often the facilitators between local governments and groups and larger institutions such as IMF and the World Bank. A weakness of the study is that though it is to be a study of global and local partnerships, I was only able to look at the global side of such a relationship. From interviewing UNDP employees I found that many had been stationed abroad working with local governments, however they were still related to the UN and therefore associated with the

23

global side of the partnership. Though I will be discussing bottom-up approaches to the development cooperation later, the study will be seen through a top-down perspective as the people interviewed are situated in a top-down organization.

2.2.2 *Qualitative interview as a research method*

A qualitative interview method was chosen on the base that the interviews would be semi-structured. I chose to follow two separate interview-guides; one directed at the executives, and one at the employees on the professional and general staff level to allow all the employees to have the structure of an interview but also be able to elaborate on their answers. The interview- guides can be found as attachments at the end of the thesis (attachment 1 and 2). Interview as a research method provides flexibility as questions can be repeated, or reformulated to suit the person being interviewed. An interview study also makes it easier to control the question order, as well as dealing with spontaneous answers. There is no way for the respondent to cheat, as the respondent is the only one to answer the questions (Bailey 1987: 174). However there are also disadvantages of this kind of study as one might be biased to the interview or the respondent. The interviewer might misunderstand the answer, or may understand it but make an error when recording the answer. Another problem might be recording an answer even when the respondent did not reply (Bailey 1987: 175). Sometimes one might end up interpreting the answer according to the research. However Martyn Hammersley and Paul Atkinson stress in *Ethnography* the fact that all accounts must be interpreted in terms of the context in which they were produced. The aim they write:

> (…) is not to gather 'pure' data that are free from potential bias. There is no such thing. Rather, the goal must be to discover the best manner of interpreting whatever data we have, and collect further data that enable us to develop and check our interferences. (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007: 102)

Also when working in close relation to existing theory and data:

> Any decision about whether to use interviews, alone or in combination with other sources of data, must be made in the context of the purpose of one's research and the circumstances in which it is to be carried out. (…) What is important to remember, though, is that different research strategies may produce different data, and thereby, perhaps, different conclusions. (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007: 103)

2.2.3 Selection criteria

The interviews started with a very open outlook on the research process. I was not sure what I would find and therefore had no specific persons in mind for the interviews. The only starting point I had was that I wanted a diverse respondent group. Before I started the interviews I developed two separate interview guides, one that was directed at the employees on the executive level, and another directed at employees on a professional and general staff level. I knew about these different levels in the UNDP system and based on the decision to use two separate interview guides it became my criteria to have a few from each level to ensure a diverse data collection and represent different standpoints. I also wanted the respondents to come from different fields within the UNDP office, such as the MDG support team, the Gender and Poverty team, as well as other fields within UNDP. I was also looking for experiences from country office teams as I thought this would be valuable experiences.

2.2.4 Access to the informants

My gatekeeper and contact into the UNDP office was a close relative. She made it possible for me to access the office and also to make the necessary arrangements for the interview process. This meant that none of the people interviewed were chosen by me. This had both its advantages and disadvantages. As for the first, my relative working in the UNDP office meant that she had easy access to the people she considered most influential and relevant to my study. She was my gatekeeper into the fieldwork process, and given the time restrictions that I had to complete the research, my contact allowed me to get a quicker response and an actual date for the interviews. I was lucky to have this contact in the system, if not I would have had to go through the bureaucratic procedures of the UN system and talked to the various assistants before settling on a sit-down date. I also think that I became less of an outsider, as many knew my gatekeeper and I was able to refer to her. The disadvantages relates to the fact that I had to rely on her for the interviews. For instance I did not have control over who would be more or less relevant to the study. The risk here was that the data that was gathered could not be relevant to the study. However the position that I was fortunate enough to be in gave me an advantage in research process. Though it is argued that:

> (…) the ethnographer must try to retain the leeway to choose people for interview. Otherwise there is a grave danger that the data collected will be misleading in important respects, and the researcher will be unable to engage in the strategic search for data that is essential to a reflexive approach. However, gaing access to informants can be quite complex, sometimes as difficult as negotiating access to a setting. Indeed,

as we have seen, it may even be necessary to negotiate with gatekeepers before one can contact the people one wants to interview. (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007: 104)

It is also important to stress that without my gatekeeper I might not have had access to the respondents and there would have been no study. The advantages therefore outnumber the disadvantages. When starting the research process the criteria that I had to the respondents were somewhat limited. I wanted the interviews to represent different standpoints and experiences and thought that not having a strict selection process would be most beneficial for the study. Also in regards to my gatekeeper the way that I chose to organize the research proved to be a good idea.

2.2.5   Collection of data

I chose to keep the study anonymous in case some might be offended by my interpretation of the interviews, and also for the respondents to be able to speak more freely. The interviews were categorized into the different levels of employment in the UNDP system; the executive level and, professional and general staff level. All interviews were recorded except for the third one with an executive employee. He had had some bad experience with a previous scholarly interview and did not want to be recorded. This was a little bit of a challenge and I tried to write down his answers as accurately as possible. Each interview was then transcribed and categorized into the different levels of employment. A summary of each interview were then composed and the most central topics of each was drawn out and again organized according to topic.

As the interview process was based on the respondents being anonymous I coded each of the respondents interview. It is based on their employment level in the UNDP system; Executive – E, Professional – P or General staff – G. The respondents were further categorized by the order of the interviews. The following is the respondents coding; P1, E2, E3, P4, P5, P6, P7, G8, E9 and E10. The interviews will be used in the analysis, and the further topics as indicated in 1.1 that will be discussed are 'Cooperation and Partnerships', 'Power, Politics and Bureaucracy', and 'Global Development Aid'.

2.2.6 The relevance of the research study

Is the collection of data relevant? From the interviews I conducted I would say that some interviews were more relevant than others. Some went more in-depth and was able to lead the study in the direction I was hoping for. As for some of the other interviews, I got data that was harder to categorize, and might not even be relevant for the study at all. However, even in the interviews that seemed to give a little less, there was still information that could be used that indicated that the study was still on the right track. As the respondents were all employees in the UN system, they all had the basic knowledge of their workplace; this made them all relevant to the study. Even though some were more knowledgeable than others they were all able to talk about their tasks and experiences, which was relevant to the study.

2.2.7 Ethical reflections – reflexivity

In reflecting over the fieldwork and the method used one must take into account one's own background and knowledge. As the researchers social background and societal experiences may influence the perception and understanding of the study (Grønmo 2004: 9). What I found was that my field of interest was related to the people interviewed, though my knowledge base was much more limited than the respondents. Some of the respondents had worked in the development field for many years and had a high degree of education. Though some had problems answering the questions there was no doubt that these where highly competent people. This made me as a researcher and interviewer less knowledgeable than the respondents. They were able to refer to terms used in the UNDP system, abbreviations that I had not heard of before. This sometimes resulted in me having to stop the interview and ask about these terms which made some of the interviews go less smoothly. As a researcher I sometimes felt that my knowledge was situated below the respondents. The benefit of this was that the respondents could feel that they were in an authoritative position where they could provide more elaborate explanations compared to being interviewed by an insider. It can be argued that this gave more information as the respondents were in a position where they were more knowledgeable. However it also posed some difficulties. Respondent E3 had some negative experience with academic interviews in the past and preferred not to be recorded. He did not want to go into detail about his previous experiences. I therefore had to write down all the answers which made this particular interview a challenging task. Despite some challenges in the interview process, which should be expected, I felt that the interviews gave me some further insight into the field of development aid from a top-down approach. Had the research

only been based on the public UN documents that are available, I doubt that the critical light that will be highlighted on the structure of the UN in the analysis would have taken place.

3   PARTNERSHIP AND DEVELOPMENT

The purpose of this chapter is to do a critical analysis of UN's role in partnerships and cooperation processes, with a special focus on MDG 8. The analysis will incorporate the UN's own understanding of its role in global partnerships through the interviews conducted during my fieldwork, and through public UN documents. It will also focus on theories that criticize the current development aid field, including the UN, the World Bank and IMF. The three themes that will draw this topic together, with corresponding research questions will be; 3.1 Cooperation and Partnerships, asking; 3.1.0 How it is possible to facilitate cooperation strategies between global and local development agencies? And, what does such a partnership entail? The second theme will be; 3.2 Power, Politics and Bureaucracy, asking; 3.2.0 Who defines the agenda? The third and last theme will be 3.3 Global Development Aid, asking; 3.3.0 How can global development contribute to the fulfillment of MDG 8?

3.1 Cooperation and Partnerships

This part will be making use of the theory found in 2.1 of globalization- making the world more related and interdependent, as well as looking at what UNDP documents and the interviews conducted from the fieldwork has to say about the topic. There are many challenges related to cooperation and partnerships on a global level, one of them being ownership of the aid projects. The issue of who are involved in the decision making process is also relevant for the cooperation process. Global partnerships have lately been addressing the mutual commercial benefits that can prove to be a satisfactory outcome for further development work. However there is still the issue of trust and failing coordination between local governments and international aid-workers in the vast area of development.

3.1.0   Research question

Many international development agencies are situated in a top-down position, such as the UN, while local development agencies often have a bottom-up approach to dealing with development. Being on opposite ends of the process a central question of the thesis is; How is it possible to facilitate cooperation strategies between global and local development agencies? What does such a partnership entail?

3.1.1   Challenges of cooperation on a global level

How does a partnership on a global level with international and local agencies work? MDG 8
is based on the idea of having "an open, rule based, predictable, nondiscriminatory trading
and financial system." (Millennium Development Goals, What will it take to achieve the
Millennium Development Goals 2010: 41). This is UNDPs understanding of what MDG 8 is
set out to accomplish:

> The final Millennium Goal takes a broader view of development that supports national
> efforts to achieve the other MDGs. (…) one of the clear priorities encouraged by the
> Millennium Goal is integration with the global economy with equal opportunities
> through market access, international cooperation, debt policies and fiscal acumen.
> (The path to achieving the Millennium Development Goals 2010: 45)

In regards to the MDGs, one of the challenges on both a global level as well as a local level
has been a lack of donor coordination and cooperation especially in the least developed
countries. Also inadequate governance has been a huge challenge that often leads to
ineffective use of available resources, through for example corruption and other leakages (The
path to achieving the Millennium Development Goals 2010: 46-48).

Donor coordination

As for donor coordination, the first interview from the fieldwork was with an employee on the
professional level P1 (see attachment 2), who had worked in the UNDP country office in the
Philippines and was now stationed in the UNDP headquarters in New York. In regards to
donor coordination she replied to the second question from the interview guide that:

> One of the biggest challenges was creating a common understanding. Some
> constituents in the field were only after the money. However the task of the UNDP is
> to achieve a sustainable development and the money cannot simply be handed out to
> everyone. Real development is sustainable development. Challenges related
> specifically to MDG 8 are multilateral and bilateral donors such as World Bank and
> Asian Development Bank that are there for political reasons. The number one
> challenge from that part is political motivation – they might state that they are there
> because of the people, but the fact that they are corporate bodies who make decisions
> based on political reason, representing various governments with different motive
> makes them sometimes difficult to cooperate with. Another challenge is that some
> countries will just comply with the policies in order to get the money, but where is the
> collaboration, sustainability and capacity here? Then you are just making them comply
> with you instead of their own rules. (P1)

Corruption is also an aspect that may hinder donor coordination, however it is not limited to the local and national governments. As for corruption P1 went on to say that corruption could also be found within the donor agencies. It is often assumed that corruption takes place within the local governments that receive financial development aid, however:

> When it comes to corruption, many donors are also corrupt. Some donor banks are also corrupt. It is not only within the governments that one can find corruption. It is easy to judge governments for being corrupt but in reality they are getting paid less for doing the same work that we- development agencies are doing. They are more selfless than any of us. (P1)

Global imbalance and interdependency

The second employee E2 that was interviewed was on an executive level (see attachment 1), who had been working with the MDGs from the beginning. He found financial difficulties and natural calamities the most challenging issues facing a global partnership.

> Global imbalances such as the economic crisis mean an increased vulnerability towards developing countries. As the developed countries are also experiencing financial difficulties they have had fewer resources to give to the developing countries. Natural calamities such as climate change are also huge challenges that are especially difficult for the developing countries. (E2)

Respondent E2 did not emphasize the issue of corruption in the donor agencies and focused on corruption being a challenge in the developing countries.

> There have been created anti-corruption agencies to combat corruption. This matter is an even greater challenge in the developing countries. There is a need for more transparency to ensure that this issue can be handled correctly. (E2)

When it comes to "(…) integration with the global economy with equal opportunities through market access (…)." (The path to achieving the Millennium Development Goals 2010: 45) corporate social responsibility comes into play and the third interview with an employee on the executive level, E3 had the idea that this was a challenge that was facing the development process. He said that:

> If people are less skilled it affects the whole community and corporations loose out. If corporations make investments in the citizens then the developing countries can be seen as a market that can be invested in. An investment in the growing market would again mean an investment in development. (E3)

The notion of interdependency and that no economy is an island (Heywood 2004: 107) makes a point here as the global economy is thought to affect the global community. For the trickle-down effect to have a positive outcome there needs to be cooperation that benefits the whole community. An employee on the professional level who specifically worked with economic analysis and creating budgets, P7, responded that one of the biggest challenges facing the development process are "(…) funds, ensuring that assistance is directed and being in touch with the projects. A challenge related to the latter part is how to be able to mobilize donors and partnerships." (P7). Another employee on the executive level who had worked in the country office in Papa New Guinea, E10, also found that a "challenge in the development process is bringing the agencies together, and creating a common agreement." (E10).

3.1.2   *Partnerships based on mutual (commercial) benefits*

For the private sector to become involved in development aid there needs to be an incentive, an outcome that will not only benefit developing countries but also the private corporate sector. Due to the financial crisis many countries have had to cut their development aid budgets. "(…) the global financial and economic crisis is beginning to take its toll on the country finances and consequently the share allocated to development assistance." (What will it take to achieve the Millennium Development Goals? 2010: 33). Because of this turn, development agencies such as the UN has turned towards the corporate sector, to see what they are capable of doing in regards to development aid. The UN believes that in order to have a broad global partnership that will support the implementation of the MDGs, a private sector partnership plays an important part. They can provide new technological aspects to the development process as well as providing financial resources. This is how the UN views a partnership with the private sector:

> Private-sector partners as a key source of financial support, technological innovation, efficiency in business processes, and technical expertise. Economic growth, job creation and sustainability of local development processes require active engagement of the local and international private sectors. (Scaling up support for the MDGs at the local level 2010: 29)

A partnership with the private sector is beneficial as it is able to provide jobs thus making local development long term and sustainable. As respondent E3 pointed out; "If corporations make investments in the citizens then the developing countries can be seen as a market that

can be invested in." (E3). Such a partnership will be mutual because both parts will have an equal investment in the cooperation process.

Partnerships can also have mutual benefits for cooperation among similar global agencies. For instance the executive employee in the second interview, E2, highlighted that institutions such as the World Bank and IMF are better equipped to further deal with an action plan because of their financial resources. UN which has no financial resources is good at preparing action plans (E2).

Mutual benefits and interdependency

The benefits are mutual in the sense that UN gets to implement their agendas such as the MDGs through the action plans while other multilateral institutions such as the World Bank and IMF gets to decide how finances are distributed. The latter, one could argue do hold some power over such a partnership as they are able to regulate world economies through conditionality agreements. However one can also argue that interdependency comes into action here, making these global institutions mutually dependent on each other. Each of the institutions is able to share ideas and resources that make them trust each other. Respondent E3 stated that there was no competition between the UN and other agencies such as the World Bank. "These two institutions simply complement each other, as World Bank has the means to distribute loans and the UN lacks this resource." (E3). He specifically added; "Development is not all about money, it is also about human development." (E3). And concluded that; "The World Bank and the UN is in the same family – their goals and issues are the same." (E3).

Also partnerships with local NGOs can prove to give mutual benefits. Respondent P1 who as mentioned had worked in the UNDP country office in the Philippines had experience with implementing UNDP programmes, working with donors and other country offices. She said that partnership with local NGOs could be found.

> There is also a partnership with NGOs where there is a need for contractors to come and do commercial and semi-commercial work. Sometimes the UNDP country offices give micro-grants to NGOs so that they can become bigger players in the development area. (P1)

With micro-grants or any other form of incentive, local NGOs are able to partake in global development through local forms of action. As previously mentioned in 2.1.1 Wight made a key claim when he stated that:

> The existence of the United Nations has exaggerated the international importance of the have-not powers, enabling them to organize themselves into a pressure group with much greater diplomatic and propaganda weight than they would otherwise have had. (Wight 1995: 238)

The 'exaggerated' importance of the weaker actors allows them to join the cooperation process, and not be left behind when it comes to issues that are specifically related to them. From a democratic perspective this form of partnership is beneficial for both parts because one may argue it creates good governance. Seen from a Western aspect good governance is needed in order to promote democracy and set the foundations for cooperation. This is especially relevant in regards to the UN. The very background of the organization is built on a shared understanding and being able to cooperate in a respective manner with local governments as well as bilateral, multilateral and corporate agencies. Having a common understanding to set the foundation through for instance the idea of good governance, can be seen as a legitimate and efficiently way to cooperate. In regards to local governments this common understanding makes it easier for organizations such as the UN to set targets that may be achieved.

However, what is supposed to be a common understanding could end up being one-sided. Policies can be agreed on and implemented with the basis of getting funding. The challenge is making the policies local and private. Financial incentives given to local- governments and NGOs, much like the structural adjustment loans promote a guideline for following the desired way in achieving the set targets. Though it is in everyone's interest, it again comes back to the challenge and issue of creating sustainable development. As P1 stated; "(…) some countries will just comply with the policies in order to get the money, but where is the collaboration, sustainability and capacity here?" (P1). One may argue if this is a case of development acting as Westernization, destroying other cultures and local self-determination in the process (Scholte 2005: 16). Or one could see it as a way for local governments- and NGOs to become key players in their own development agenda.

3.1.3   Trust and coordination

Many of the respondents agreed on the catalytic role that the UN had in the development process. There was one who specifically mentioned the UN as a catalyst for local governments and how it functioned as a tool for further political implementation (P5).

Lack of coherence in the UN system

The UN however, has not always been as unified as it sets out to appear, and for this catalytic role to function there needs to be coherence and coordination. In 1997 the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) was established in order to improve the UN's development work on a country level. UNDP is a member of UNDG along with other UN agencies, as well as other global agencies such as the World Bank. It was set up to respond to a changing world and the evolving international aid structure. The purpose was to make the development process more effective, efficient and coherent in reducing poverty. The challenge of various UN organizations that were unaccustomed to working closely together prompted the issue of this new agency. UNDG was set up in order to coordinate the UN's development operations. In the first years of its operation, cooperation was not automatic, and there was a degree of conflict over mandates and resources. Each of the UN agencies has their own history, governance structure procedures, and institutional culture. Sharing information and developing common policies were therefore no easy task. Before the establishment of the UNDG it was common for representatives of UN agencies working in a programme country to not have any contact with each other (UN Country Coordination: Working together for development 2007: 9-11). In regards to the core idea of MDG 8, it is hard to find the sort of partnership and cooperation that is wanted in this way of addressing the main ideals of the agency. The UN will also have problems functioning as a catalyst when there are conflicting ideas as how to go about it. An issue when working in an organization of this magnitude is that it incorporates so many different rules and regulations that coherence is difficult to achieve. Respondent P4 said that a condition that could be limiting when working with the MDGs where the bureaucratic structure of the UN:

> The UN system is the world's largest bureaucracy. This is both a strength and a weakness. It is not bureaucratic because it wants to be bureaucratic. The UN is custodians of donor funds and with it comes lots of rules and regulations. They are accountable to the donors, and at some point it can be difficult to do it. However smaller agencies such as some NGOs are not able to impact structural changes such as legislations and policies within governments. UNDP is able to bring this kind of change. (P4)

35

Bureaucracy as a hinder for successful development

Bureaucracy is able to bring order and structure to the UN development process in what would otherwise seem vast and disorganized. However Ashraf Ghani and Clare Lockhart both with backgrounds from the World Bank, Lockhart also having worked in the UN argue that bureaucracy is a hinder for successful development aid. In a lengthy discussion they argue that the issue of reproducing the same practices of the past makes coordination the largest obstacle to achieving coherence of purpose or efficient resource use (Ghani and Lockhart 2008: 3-11). The very issue of the development work that the UN was facing previous to the establishment of UNDG.

Surveys conducted by the UN themselves have found that UN staff is increasingly aware of the development expertise that is available across different UN agencies. They have also become more open to new ways of working together. However the UNDG have themselves identified major obstacles that hinder UN agencies from working together more coherently and effectively. Despite developing policies that can address these issues, new and agreed procedures have not translated into real progress on the ground. The reason for this is that there have not been proper incentives for staff and management. The UN system is largely based on career incentives on what employees achieve for their individual agencies, and not the UN as a whole (UN Country Coordination: Working together for development 2007: 13).

Also a factor to take into account, the UNDG was established in 1997, still 10 years later Ghani and Lockhart argue that bureaucracy and lack of coordination is the problem in reaching a successful development process (Ghani and Lockhart 2008). And the UNDG even admits that though there has been a creation of new and agreed procedures for UN agencies to cooperate with one another, the translation of these procedures into practice have been lacking. There is not only the issue of mobilizing outside partnerships, the agencies within the UN system themselves has problems coordinating with one another. Developing a global partnership is therefore not an easy task. The UN system needs a structure that unifies all the agencies. As the UNDG points out:

> All trends are pointing toward greater coherence and coordination in the UN system. The challenge going forward for the UN Development Group is to ensure that the pilots deliver on their potential. To do this the agencies involved must harmonize their planning approaches more closely, along with business practice and reach deeper

agreements on the division of labour, roles and responsibilities between them. (UN Country Coordination: Working together for development, 2007: 15)

Longstanding bureaucratic structures can be rigid and needs a considerable amount of time to change. For the MDGs and especially MDG 8 to be successful the agencies within the UN needs to develop a partnership for their own structural development. "The ultimate target, as always, is to help the peoples of the United Nations to realize their internationally agreed development goals." (UN Country Coordination: Working together for development 2007: 15).

The MDGs creating a new framework for development
UNDG argue that the MDGs have helped transform the framework for global development. The MDGs, they say have provided an unprecedented basis for partnership between developed and developing countries and made it possible for the UN to build its work around this common framework in order to improve coherence and effectiveness in country level operations. In the 2007 Resident Coordinator Annual Reports one could find that there had been greater coherence and effectiveness of United Nations Country teams (UNCT) around the MDGs. This suggested that the UNCT was working more efficiently and was effective in showing support to countries to help them realize their national strategies (UN Country Coordination: Working together for development 2007: 25).

Part of the job in the country offices is supporting local governments through translating policies into practice. Also consulting with NGOs and the local governments are part of the work that employees in country offices do. One of the questions in the interview guide was how the employees felt that they were able to participate in the MDGs (see attachment 2).
P1 said that she felt that she was able to participate in the MDGs, especially referring to when she was working in the country office. While working in the country office she had been able to save money for the local government, as well as managing corruption (P1). "Every day there are contributions to be made to the MDGs." (P1). This can be viewed as a positive aspect of the development process on a local level, however UNCT still has challenges ahead as overlapping mandates and goals reflect earlier priorities that stand in the way of the effectiveness. It is argued that not only do they need to ensure greater coherence at a country level, it must also exist within the wider UN system (UN Country Coordination: Working together for development 2007: 25).

Distrust towards the development field

Distrust and disorganization can be felt by the inhabitants in the aided countries. One example is the people of Haiti, who despite all of the existing developing- programmes and aid workers that came after the 2010 earthquake, prefer to deal with their problems within their own tradition and culture. They do not trust Western development aid organizations or the UN (Bistandsaktuelt, nr.7, 2011). This is one of the conclusions from a research project conducted by social-anthropologist Rachelle Doucet and sociologist Alain Giles funded by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Utenriksdepartementet) in cooperation with PRIO and Quisqueya University in Port-au-Prince (Bistandsaktuelt, nr.7, 2011). According to the researchers many of the aid organizations that have come to Haiti, have a limited knowledge of the language and the local culture. There is also an issue of the coordination between the government and the international aid organizations. Building trust within the local community takes time, Doucet says, but it is well worth it (Bistandsaktuelt, nr.7, 2011). This brings the topic back to the issue of the development process acting as a form of Westernization, not integrating the local culture and self-determination process that makes the less developed countries key contributors to their own development process. Respondent G8 stated that one of the challenges in relation to the development process were "countries not feeling an ownership towards the MDGs, thus making it hard to implement MDG policies." (G8).

Coordination is a crucial factor that needs to come from within before it can be released into a global arena. A large scale organization such as the UN depends on the trust of the people they help and the donors, without it nothing can be done and the bureaucratic circle will be never ending without any real development purpose. The UN is well aware of this challenge within its own system and has set up measures to ensure that the organization is still one of the most important actors in the development sphere. This is what UNDG says about the organizations part in development:

> To remain valued, relevant providers of development assistance, UN organizations must increasingly plan together and coordinate their programming. By harnessing the resources and diversity of the full system, the UN can truly demonstrate its unique value and deliver more for the people who need it most. (UN Country Coordination: Working together for development 2007: 66)

3.1.4 Conclusion

Develop a global partnership for development is a huge goal that is meant for the entire global community, MDG 8 has 7 targets (see attachment 3) that include addressing the needs of the least developed countries to cooperate with governments and the private sector. Mention of a partnership and cooperation within the UN system is not to be found within these targets. A crucial factor when one imagines the many agencies and sub-agencies that make up the UN system.

In facilitating cooperation strategies between global and local agencies many challenges can be found. Lack of donor coordination and cooperation in the least developed countries proves to be a difficult task and this often stems from a lack of common understanding. As seen with the case in Haiti, disorganization amongst the aid organizations, and also the partnership with the government has made the people of Haiti distrustful of the Western aid organizations. Respondent P7 found that it was a challenge to be able to mobilize donors and partnerships. For the partnerships to be fruitful there usually needs to be some form of mutual benefits that can ensure that all parts are interested in remaining within the partnership.

When it comes to the partnership that exists between the World Bank, IMF and the UN there is usually a sense of interdependency. The World Bank and the IMF has the resources to finance huge development projects, however they lack the development competence that can be found in the numerous agencies within the UN system.

Coherence, coordination and trust seem to be concepts that are very important for a successful development partnership. The UN has experienced problems with these concepts within their own system, and a special agency was even set up in order to deal with them. Global cooperation cannot be expected to take form when the core of the organization has not been able to coordinate properly. As respondent P4 pointed out; the UN is the world's largest bureaucracy. In order for them to operate within the global arena a common understanding needs to be in place. As for what a partnership between global and local development agencies entail? The answer seems to be clear, especially in Haiti's case; trust based on a common understanding between the global and local community is essential.

3.2 Power, Politics and Bureaucracy

This part will continue discussing the globalization theory as well as the development theory focusing on UN's role in the world order. Since the foundation of the UN is so vast it is dependent on a bureaucratic structure, however there are many limitations with this structure. The role that the UN plays in regards to other development agencies are built on rules and regulations that put restrictions on some cooperation processes. When addressing sustainable development, political motivation is a key component. Many agencies in the development system have their own agendas often built on political or economic motivation. This create barriers for cooperation and coordination processes, thus the globalization process has often been criticized for being in favor of the "West". The development aid concept developed in the "West", seen as an equal partnership between the developed and developing countries therefore face challenges when it comes to an equal relationship, since the "Western" agencies often holds the financial and an often political resources. As there are many players in the development system, an interdependent relationship, link these agencies together.

3.2.0 Research question

In today's highly globalized and political society many actors can be found in global institutions that are powerful enough to set agendas on behalf of the rest of the world. Through networks, powerful relationships are created, and bring forth the following question of; Who defines the agenda?

3.2.1 UN's role as the world's largest bureaucracy

The idea behind a bureaucratic structure is to divide tasks to different parts of an organization. Each part will then be responsible for the directed tasks. This structure is supposed to make the organization more efficient and organized, as well as avoiding the abuse of power. When dealing with a large amount of information and clients, this type of structure seems best equipped to deal with the demands that accompany the large flow of information. The bureaucratic structure is often criticized because of its sometimes impersonal attitude towards its clients. It is also criticized because of its lack of coordination with the other parts in the organization. Bureaucracy is often associated with a Western society, the idea of rationality and efficiency is therefore the main foundation of bureaucracy. Later on during the imperial period, colonial government was dominated by bureaucrats (Potter et al. 1999: 36). So the idea of the West and its relation to a bureaucratic structure may have been enforced.

The organizational system that the UN consists of is built on the Western bureaucratic structure. The idea of collective security and cooperation is organized into key elements that make UN the backbone of international society, as well as the development field. Even the structure behind the UN created MDGs has a bureaucratic aspect to it. Here are some statements that highlight some structural procedures that can be found within the UN and working with the MDGs:

> The operational structure of the UN has proved to be successful in a great deal of areas that are related to the MDGs; the MDGs are interlinked, thus progress in one goal will support progress in others (What will it take to achieve the Millennium Development Goals? 2010: 1).

A global partnership implies both global and local strategies. The delegation of tasks from the policy level down to the local level calls for a strong network of involved partners, as well as a well-defined bureaucratic system. The following statement is what the UN thinks is important in order to deal with global poverty and foster a global commitment:

> The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) represent the world's commitment to deal with global poverty in its many dimensions. This commitment is supported by a global partnership, which calls for country-led strategies and support from developed countries in areas of trade, Official Development Assistance (ODA), debt sustainability and access to medicine and technologies. (What will it take to achieve the Millennium Development Goals? 2010: 1)

It is also acknowledged that there are challenges when it comes to cooperation of such a magnitude. A bureaucratic issue is the lack of policy coherence. This might be problematic as a partnership should have a shared understanding of its foundation.

> However, while partnerships have been strengthened in some areas, many gaps can be found both within and outside of the issues covered by MDG 8. One of the gaps is the lack of policy coherence. (What will it take to achieve the Millennium Development Goals? 2010: 32)

As custodians of donor funds, the UN has to adapt to rules and regulations, thus enforcing its bureaucratic structure. Thus the lack of policy coherence might be one of the most challenging tasks in sustaining a global partnership.

Differing rules and regulations
Earlier in the thesis, under the subheading 3.1.3 *Trust and coordination*, the issue of the people of Haiti showing mistrust towards the Western aid agencies, especially after the 2010

earthquake that impacted the whole country, was mentioned. Coming back to the case in Haiti, bureaucracy seems to have hindered development aid work in Haiti since 2004, or this is at least the year that the aid system was forced to acknowledge that the aid agenda had had an adverse impact on the state and that there was a need for an explicit agenda for state-building. The donors found that there was a lack of coordination. There was also a lack of consistency and strategic vision in their interventions (Ghani and Lockhart 2008: 109). The problem with a lack of coordination can be found in the thousands of aid projects that exist around the globe. Each project has its own rules, its own procedures and requirements. In addition, in order to prevent corruption, the projects also have its own agreements on specific rules for procurement, accounting and auditing. Procurement is to determine the purchase of goods and services and is a key link to the private sector. It is to build rule of law by making transactions more transparent. The problem with this task is that it is difficult to achieve when there are a great amount of rules and regulations set by aid donors that need to be followed (Ghani and Lockhart 2008: 100). The wide spreading of rules and regulations not only brings forth the issue of private ownership. The issue of bureaucracy hindering cooperation and partnerships because of a lack of coherence is also an important issue. Transparency and accountability, important building blocks to a successful aid foundation, can best be achieved when local processes become the main focus of attention and when all efforts center on adhering to a harmonized set of rules and regulations (Ghani and Lockhart 2008: 100).

In the case of the UN, the system with multiple rules and regulations is a result of the many agencies within the UN system as was previously mentioned. All the different rules and regulations are necessary for the UN's role as custodians of donor funds. They are not free to set up guidelines without consulting with the donors. In many ways it puts a limitation on what the UN can do, and it also reinforces a bureaucratic structure that limits the projects capacities as well. Instead of allocating more money to the projects, funds are used to ensure that the rules and regulations set up are in order and that they follow the conditions. This puts them in some sort of conditionality agreement with the donors.

As it was stated by respondent P4, and previously pointed out in 3.1; the UN system is the world's largest bureaucracy. He said that since the UN is accountable to donors, they do experience difficulties related to it. However smaller agencies such as some NGO's he said

are not able to impact structural changes such as legislation and policies within governments like the UN are able to. (P4)

The strength of the bureaucratic structure of the UN is that they have been able to successfully implement programmes that allow for greater operational coherence and coordination in country offices. As the UN themselves state;

> The introduction of the common country programming process at country level is one of the most significant UN coherence achievements. By establishing a framework for joint programming between UN agencies, it allowed the UN system to strengthen the link between its normative agenda and its operational activities in alignment with national priorities, to simplify and harmonize agency programming cycles, and more importantly to offer partner countries a range of expertise and resources from across the UN development system. (UN Country Coordination: working together for development, 2007: 39)

Despite this successful development, it is argued that the aid system is facing a crisis. A large amount of reports are being produced every year, each UN agency are able to produce many of these successful development reports that indicate that the system is on the right track. However it has not been proven that the development agencies are able to do a better job than the state when it comes to cost-effectiveness, corruption, efficiency, and competent service delivery. The aid system has in many ways undermined the state (Ghani and Lockhart 2008: 107). Going back to the issue of mistrust in Haiti, the problem of coordination might especially spring from the lack of communication, not only with the other aid agencies and the local government but also with the local community who have their own set of traditions that impact their view on certain rules and regulations.

3.2.2 *Political motivation for achieving sustainable development*

Not all agencies found in the development field hold a true motivation for achieving sustainable development. In an ideal interdependent world a trustful relationship would be enough for people and agencies to cooperate and form successful partnerships that foster sustainable development. In reality the economic incentives and a power agenda often rules out a partnership explicitly founded on a wish to create a healthy relationship without any hidden agendas.

Agencies that are in the development field with their own hidden agendas makes it difficult for other agencies that wishes to create real sustainable development. As stated by respondent P1; "Challenges that is related to the MDG 8 is the issue of multilateral and bilateral donors such as World Bank and Asian Development Bank who are there for political reasons." (P1). She continued with;

> The number one challenge from that part is political motivation – they might state that they are there for the people, but the fact that they are corporate bodies who make decisions based on political reason, representing various governments with different motive makes them sometimes difficult to cooperate with. (P1)

Accountability

Again this challenge seems to imply a common understanding, a cooperation strategy based on the same values. Having agencies with different agendas work together will not create a fruitful partnership, and instead of breaking out of this mold, it will contribute to the never ending bureaucratic circle. As van de Walle was quoted earlier in regards to bilateral and multilateral aid and the lack of accountability, he stated that these donors were only in charge of following bureaucratic structure, but not of producing results. He therefore felt that they had a strong built-in disincentive against the sort of critical and confrontational analysis that he meant was required for effective conditionality (van de Walle, 2001: Easterly 2002, in Uvin 2004: 65). This might mean that some of the donor agencies in the development system are only doing their job by following the rules and procedures directed to them, nothing more, and nothing less.

A development aid project often implies a legal agreement between the donor and the recipient government. The donor agency of the World Bank has its own rules that take an acknowledged precedence over national law. What it entails is that it allows the World Bank to cancel the project if the country does not meet established conditions. Completed projects by the World Bank are rated by the World Bank as 72 percent satisfactory; however, fewer than half of them are sustainable (Ghani and Lockhart 2008: 97). So even though they are doing their job one might argue whether or not the agenda behind these projects are just to establish them, allocate some funds and create more jobs in the "West".

> As a result, the aid system has created a web of relationships between multilateral and bilateral donors, UN agencies, private contractors, and NGOs. Funds go directly from the donors to NGOs and private contractors, sometimes channeled through UN

agencies that then subcontract NGOs and private contractors. (Ghani and Lockhart 2008: 97)

Globalization has made these webs interdependent. An order consisted of financial and informational flow, together these agencies make up a development mechanism. However, though the bonds between these global agencies may have increased during the globalization process, and in the meantime built successful institutions, a debate regarding globalization, and how it creates a greater economical division has become a significant issue. This trend is referred to as global polarization as one can find the developed countries in one end of the spectrum and the developing countries in the opposite. Thus critics of the globalization process have argued that the multilateral organizations that is IMF, World Bank and World Trade Organization (WTO) are mechanisms for promoting globalization and new-liberalistic economical politics in the "third world" (Smukkestad 2008: 176-177). This is the reason why globalization is often viewed as the new coming of imperialism.

3.2.3 How to mobilize donors and make partnerships more equal?

Many theories claim that since the development aid concept originated in the "West" it therefore reflects a global power relation and a "Western" worldview. Even when referring to geographical parts as the "West" and "South" connotations to these divisions are immediately brought up. It is argued that this creates a somewhat unfair categorization as it creates an unequal balance in what one would originally hope to be a balanced relationship. Antidevelopmentalists have been criticizing the development field for years, especially since they view the problems and the solutions of the "Third world" as the creations of Western development and practice (Potter et al. 1999: 11). Sometimes in aid-dependent countries, where interests are not channeled in a coherent way, the presence of donors becomes an inescapable part of the landscape. Signs that feature the logos of donor countries and organizations, reminds the inhabitants of their perpetual dependency (Ghani and Lockhart 2008: 99).

Conditionality through the "Western" development framework

As previously mentioned, one development strategy that have been criticized the most in the past 20 years is the use of conditionality. The aim of conditionality, especially through Structural Adjustment Programmes was to bring the same democratic environment that can be found in the "West" to the "South". However there are many issues related to the use of

conditionality, for instance the conditionality strategies are often created with a basis in a "Western" framework. This can make it difficult for developing countries to implement policies made up by foreign institutions. It makes any kind of cooperation process less equal, as it is based on one part supposedly having the right set of framework, while the other has the wrong one. It does not take into consideration that despite many of the developing countries financial needs it sometimes has the competence to function with the existing framework. Sometimes the government structures in the developing countries are weak, and this is acknowledged by the development system. The issue becomes a problem when the development agencies fall short in its efforts to strengthen the institutional structures (Ghani and Lockhart 2008: 107). Another issue that becomes a great problem is when the countries only comply with the policies set by the UN in order to get the funding. There is no question that this way of dealing with the intended development process does not create sustainability. Real development is supposed to be sustainable development.

Top-down approach to development

One could argue that conditionality is a way of addressing development aid challenges through a top-down approach. Through this lens, top-down approaches are often viewed as defining a problem on an organizational level, and further continuing with an agreement of principles for how the problem is to be solved. It ends with an agreement on the proposed rules and the application of the rules. The idea behind it with regards to development aid is the trickle-down philosophy where it is believed that the financial resourceful groups in the North will be able to produce trickle-down benefits for the less advantaged (Potter et al. 1999: 58). The hope is that it will generate financial wheels through creation of jobs.

Financial resources

The institutional powerhouses and global partners of the UN; the World Bank and IMF are good examples in the use of top-down approaches to development. They were both established as a response to the financial situation that many states were left in after WWII. Several actors saw the need for an international organization that would be able to coordinate the world economy and create peace between the states. In 1944 delegates from 44 countries met in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, USA. The Bretton Woods meeting included John Maynard Keynes, one of the main architects in the establishment of the World Bank and IMFs intended way of function (Braithwaite and Drahos 2000: 97-98). The starting point for the

World Banks establishment was according to Keynes description to give financial aid to war torn countries in order to support their re-establishment (Braithwaite and Drahos 2000: 114). The idea of the World Bank was also to increase the living standards in less developed countries.

The role of the IMF was to ensure that the agreement of international regulations was in order. Keynes was sure about the fact that the IMF should not intervene in the financial regulations (Braithwaite and Drahos 2000: 114). Through the conditionality agreements that have been highly criticized in the later years, the limited power that the World Bank and the IMF was supposed to maintain has not been held. They have become global leaders in the development aid arena being able to intervene in the financial regulations based on what some might say own corporate agendas. As respondent P1 stated and previously mentioned in relation to 3.1 and 3.2.2;

> Challenges related specifically to MDG 8 are multilateral and bilateral donors such as World Bank and Asian Development Bank that are there for political reasons. The number one challenge from that part is political motivation – they might state that they are there because of the people, but the fact that they are corporate bodies who make decisions based on political reason, representing various governments with different motive makes them sometimes difficult to cooperate with. (P1)

Bottom-up or development from below

As opposed to the top-down approach to development aid, that focuses on a trickle-down effect, the bottom-up approach or also referred to as development from below seeks to empower those that are in most need of the development aid. The idea behind it is that solutions come from the bottom, from local communities that know their challenges better than multinational corporations and global agencies. As mentioned in the theory section 2.1, under the subheading; *Top-down and bottom-up approaches to development*, it focuses on "indigenous natural and human resources." (Potter et al. 1999: 69). Also in this section the idea of putting the last ones first is highlighted. The outcome of this should be imbalance, as this is what is needed to create balance. This includes the need for reorientation where participatory training promotes empowerment. However it is also argued that empowerment can be weak and short-lived unless it is embodied in institutions. It is therefore in need of a framework in order to be applicable (Chambers 2003: 219). As one of the respondents stated; "(…) smaller agencies such as some NGOs are not able to impact structural changes such as

legislations and policies within governments, UNDP is able to bring this kind of change." (P4). The competence to be able to bring such a change stems from UN's involvement in modern development aid from the beginning. No other global institution can claim to have the magnitude of development experience that the UN system is able to provide. Thus they are in a position that makes them suited for this kind of task, if one is to argue that this particular theory of empowerment seeks an embodiment in institutions.

Based on this theory is it therefore possible that UN's, MDGs are able to create a global partnership for local development? Despite all the criticisms that the UN endure, based on their highly bureaucratic structure, their lack of coherence within their own system and their position in regards to other global agencies they have been able to create a framework through the MDGs, or as one respondent called it; "a benchmark for further developing work in the countries." (E1). This will be further discussed in 3.3.2; What will it take to reach MDG 8? – Obstacles and challenges.

In a more socialist theory about empowerment it is argued that "Third World countries should try to reduce their involvement in processes of unequal exchange." (Potter et al. 1999: 69). The idea behind this particular theory on empowerment is that basic needs such as food, clothes and housing should be a first priority within particular territories. It is argued that this is something that can only be achieved through countries that are more reliant on local resources and communalization of productive wealth. Also it is argued that there needs to be a closing up to outside forces of change. The purpose is to increase self-sufficiency and self-reliance. Bottom-up approaches focus on the idea that development should not be concentrated in higher levels of settlements and social systems, but rather in the lower parts of society. The fact is that strategies and policies are more often than not found in political centers (Potter et al. 1999: 69). Thus one could argue if the UN system really is capable of promoting local development through their global development initiative?

UN's Joint Programmes

In order to achieve greater coherence and coordination between the agencies in the UN system and increasing accountability for results, the joint programming was created.

> Joint programming is how the UN works at the country level and is driven by the
> needs of each country. When agencies plan and design their programmes together they

increase their effectiveness. (UN Country Coordination: working together for development 2007: 40)

It can be argued that the joint programming process is a way to combine the use of a top-down approach with a bottom-up approach to development. The UN, a top-down organization has the purpose through this programme to ensure that decisions are made at a lower level. They are trying to make United Nations Country Teams (UNCT) more coherent in dealing with one another and in dealing with other UN agencies. But the programme also seeks to:

> (…) ensure coherent focus on national priorities, streamline the contributions of different agencies to governments and other national partners, and to reduce transaction costs to government. At the same time, depending on specific country situations, UNCTs need to evaluate what outcomes they can achieve best through using joint programmes. Joint programmes add value when there are clear gains in effectiveness and efficiency from the combined efforts and resources of UN agencies and national partners rather than adopting a stand-alone project approach. (UN Country Coordination: working together for development 2007: 42, cont.44)

This could be seen as a way to combine a top-down approach with a bottom-up approach as it takes into consideration specific country situations but also deals with different agencies and national partners. Government partners have increased their support to the joint programmes project as it reduces their administrative burdens and the transaction costs of having to deal with UN agencies separately (UN Country Coordination: working together for development 2007: 44).

3.2.4 Conclusion

In this section of chapter three, I have discussed the role of power, politics and bureaucracy in the development aid field. I have argued that because of its bureaucratic structure the UN has problems with cooperation and coherence within its own organization. Different rules and regulations that can be found within the different UN agencies make coordination a challenging task. It is therefore argued that if the UN has problems within their own organization, how are they able to deal with cooperation and partnerships with other outside agencies and governments. This section has also discussed the idea of development aid and how it is initially built on a "Western" worldview. This creates a challenge as seen in the case of the people of Haiti showing distrust towards the foreign development aid organizations.

The top-down and bottom-up approach deals with two different ways in addressing development issues, however there might be a middle way in combining these two approaches in using UN country teams as facilitators.

So who defines the agenda? The donors, the UN with their ability to impact structural changes such as legislation and policies within governments, or is it the local governments themselves who define their own agenda? The latter can be seen as unlikely. Given the knowledge about conditionality programmes, the local governments in developing countries under development aid have had little to say in regards to their own rules. Many have to comply to a set of rules and regulations in order to get funding. However in the later years, especially the UN has realized that this is an issue that must be addressed. Through for instance joint programming governments have been able to partner up with UN country teams and address their special needs.

3.3 Global Development Aid

The process of globalization and development aid are both relatively new concepts. I would argue that it is not possible to think of the development aid process that we know of today without also mentioning globalization and what it implies for modern development aid. Some may argue that globalization has brought nothing but a new form for imperialism when creating the development aid sphere. Others may argue that through transnational organizations and networks it has been possible to connect with others across borders and set up successful development programmes. The MDGs are one of the development programmes that have gained a lot of attention since it was launched in 2000. It was seen as the ultimate fight against poverty and addressing, health issues such as maternal health, child mortality and combating diseases, including HIV/AIDS. Also on the agenda was promoting education and gender equality, as well as ensuring environmental sustainability and developing a partnership for development. With three more years to go until its deadline in 2015, there is still a lot ahead. It is a grand scale development project with all the agencies within the UN system involved. With the UN trying to ensure that all the MDGs are reached through MDG 8- a global partnership for development, many instances outside the UN umbrella such as bilateral and multilateral agencies, NGOs and private corporate organizations have become involved in the process as well. In order to achieve successful development within a transnational system

the need to look beyond the existing structures of the development field has become a new challenge.

3.3.0   Research question

Development aid has played a significant role in the financial development of many countries. Sometimes other aspects of the development process have not been equally as significant or successful. MDG 8 was created to be a framework for the other MDGs, a process where cooperation could be established and further address the other goals. This is why I was interested in finding out; How can global development contribute to the fulfillment of MDG 8?

3.3.1   Globalization and some challenges related to the development process

The globalization process has come to mean a great deal in relation to development aid. As previously discussed it brings up the challenges related to the "North-South" debate, where opponents of globalization view the role of the "North"/ "West" as an imperialistic one. Because of this new form for imperialism one might argue that globalization is on the one hand able to make individuals politically poor on a global scale. And on the other hand global actors rich with influence are able to set up agendas that deal with their issues and interests.

Globalization has influenced the role of the citizens as well as states and international institutions. Globalization has since the fall of the communist wall focused on a larger scale of processes in society; including cultural, political and economic aspects. Cultural globalization is often viewed as information being produced in one end of the world and then becoming part of a global culture. Thus one of the challenges today is related to what some scholars refer to as "Americanization". The United States have been greatly criticized for their power position within the World Bank and the IMF. Not to mention that the UN headquarters is located in New York. The United States' road to power after WWII was gradual. As the dollar became a reference currency it gained a prominent place in the world order. Challenges occur when a dominant currency is also the currency of a hegemonic state. One of them is related to the negative issue of who gets to set the agenda (Braithwaite and Drahos 2000: 100). Because of the conditionality agreements set up by World Bank and IMF many states have through the implementation of policies been forced to devalue their currency (Braithwaite and Drahos 2000: 125). Critics of globalization claim that the process is a game that includes "winners"

and "losers". The "winners" are often associated with "Americanization", it is easily found in the global society through the World Bank and the IMF. As the conditionality programmes was created by the World Bank and the IMF it is also greatly influenced by "Western" values and capitalism, the challenges related to private ownership can therefore easily be understood. A focus on the global market rather than the local makes the citizens in the developing countries the losers in this game (Heywood 2004: 108-109).

Increased globalization has led to changes in the development of international laws. This has placed individuals, states and non-state organizations under new systems of legal regulations. International law is now what defines legitimate use of power, force, rules and regulations. States are no longer in charge of dealing with the citizens as they please. The idea of a political society of self-decision can no longer be found within the borders of a single state (Held 1999: 102). This effect of globalization has both its beneficial and negative side related to it. On the one hand; development aid should in theory be able to reach everyone. There is no restriction as to who gets to be helped. The UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights are to ensure all people despite national borders that we have our own rights despite what the government may enforce.

International institutions

International institutions have for the most part been created in order to protect collective interests and to monitor each other's behavior. These institutions have a responsibility to intervene in different sectors in society that influence the relationships between local groups and their governments. This creates further incentives for transnational activism. These incentives create transnational activist elite together with different actors, including NGO's. Together with powerful states these elites make up the international institutions, local and social movements that are able to form transnational activist networks. These networks are able to address issues in a given society and influence governments, international institutions and multinational financial actors (Tarrow 2001: 14). Globalization has created the opportunity to follow and show concerns for what is happening around the world. Human Rights breaches and poverty challenges have made more people involved in a global discussion.

The power of networks

However, the negative side is that the global power holders are able to shape the global agenda into their own interests. Governance has been mentioned before, then in relation to a "Western" framework. However not everyone are able to participate in the governance structure. Governance is about how one uses their power in order to achieve what they want (Burris, Kempa, Shearing 2004: 2). This creates new ways for people to become citizens. It is possible because states do not have a monopoly on governance, and are themselves under the influence of non-state actors. The World Bank, a part of the global network in the development field, is one who has taken on a powerful governance role, that includes international trade, environment, health and security (Burris, Kempa, Shearing 2004: 29). Acceptance and implementation of World Bank policies gives incentives that are used as a condition for financial aid that in many countries is crucial in the development process. This gives an institution such as the World Bank a lot of power; it is in part able to decide the policy process in many countries. In relation to the network they share with the UN, it may be argued that the World Bank does hold more power than the UN. One executive respondent, E3 argued that there was no competition between other agencies such as the World Bank; these two institutions complemented each other, as the World Bank had the means to distribute loans and the UN lacked this resource (E3). However, the solution for dealing with global challenges as it was initially thought of in the beginning of the UN was to have the World Bank, the Currency fund and GATT under the same UN system. What happened instead was that the dominant member-states in the World Bank and the Currency fund found their common interests in hindering the UN to much access to the finance institutions. The weak role of the UN was clear when UN's General Assembly in the mid-sixties announced that Portugal's colonial submission in Angola and Mosambik, as well as South-Africa's apartheid policies were in breach of the UN agreement. The UN asked that the organizations, especially the World Bank to withhold any financial aid to these two countries. The World Bank argued that it was a financial institution and not a political organ, and despite the request of the UN borrowed money to both Portugal and South-Africa (rorg.no).

Thus it may seem as the World Bank has a larger playing field when it comes to sanctioning. Not only can they assure mistrust in international capital markets, they can also decide who gets financial aid. The consequence is that states with a large need for financial aid might lose control and charge over the local policies (Burris, Kempa, Shearing 2004: 29). This kind of

top-down policy implementation might mean that states lose their private ownership to the policies and that it becomes harder to maintain "others" rules and regulations, that are in many cases based on "Western" values.

Globalization gives a larger playing field for organizations such as the World Bank to show their financial muscles in a global society influenced by information and economy. Information and economy have through increased globalization become important resources that can be transformed into power. Governance is supposed to ensure an open information access, something that implies that one knows where to find the information and further knowledge on how to use it (Burris, Kempa, Shearing 2004: 3). In a globalized society it is the resourceful who are best equipped to use governance as a way of ruling. Fragmentation of state sovereignty and an increasing number of agencies gives life to the resourceful groups where only the most successful are able to partake. These groups get the opportunity to operate within a world of distributed governance. Burris, Kempa and Shearing define the ones that are excluded from the global society as a "forth world". They view this as isolated and marginalized groups excluded from the global trade-network, culture and development, a kind of "global apartheid". Social systems has changed and evolved, many theorists claim that they have become too complex, different and specialized in order to be ruled through top-down policies (Burris, Kempa, Shearing 2004: 32-33).

However using networking as a governance tool in today's highly globalized society, makes it possible to keep ones control, as well as being able to explore (Strand 2007: 299). Though one may argue that networking acts in favor of the resourceful, both in terms of financially and knowledge wise. It may also act in favor of the less resourceful, given the fact that some are able to establish relevant contacts. Because of this one could say that networking can promote empowerment as it may create social mobilization. Empowerment through networking is created through the support to local groups and organizations that together are able to promote rights and resources that would otherwise be hard to achieve by oneself. This is the core in networking. Together one becomes stronger and therefore more capable of directing issues against one's own agenda. Through MDG 8, the UN saw the opportunity to create a global network that could build a strong foundation for the weaker partners.

3.3.2 What will it take to reach MDG 8? – Obstacles and challenges

At the turn of the century the UN launched the MDG guidelines, both for the UN institution as a whole and the world community for the coming years. UNDP has stated that lessons learned in the in the MDG process has been the importance of strengthening national ownership, of facilitating cross-sectoral collaborations, and of ensuring NGO participation (Unlocking progress: MDG acceleration on the road to 2015, 2010: Executive summary). The importance of having a national ownership towards the MDGs often determines the success of the implementation process.

> Locally developed strategies, based on national consultation and participation through representative political structures, accountable and capacitated institutions and adequately incentivized public servants are key to effective implementation of MDG strategies and policies. (What will it take to achieve the Millennium Development Goals 2010, Executive summary)

As previously mentioned the MDGs consist of 8 goals, with the intention of representing the "world's commitment to deal with global poverty in its many dimensions." (What will it take to achieve the Millennium Development Goals? 2010: 1). MDG 8 is to be some kind of facilitator towards the other goals, hopefully achieving them through a global partnership with other worldwide agencies.

Respondent E2 had worked specifically with the MDGs and were therefore able to describe the evolution of the MDGs from its launch in 2000 until its "deadline" in 2015.

> The first five years of the Millennium project, starting in 2000 was about spreading information about the MDGs. The main focus was advocacy, workshops, in general getting the information out through campaigns. The next five years; 2006-2010 was about development strategies. Finding out what the countries were in need of and giving them support based on those needs. A part of this process was also to estimate financial support. From a macro-economic point of view part of the job was to analyze resource availability. As of 2011 and towards 2015 the main focus has been on the Acceleration Framework- identifying the goals and targets that are lacking i
> individual countries. UNDP are not alone in working with the MDGs and have partnered up with other agencies when it comes to assessing the goals. (E2)

The outcome of not achieving the MDGs by 2015

One question that was specifically targeted to the executives during the interview process was; 'How will it affect the credibility of the UN if the MDGs are not fully successful by

2015? Respondent E2 answered that some targets would be missed. However this does not mean that the UN will be seen as failure. He said that:

> The targets will simply be postponed until 2020 or 2025. 2015 is not a do or die kind of deadline. The UN has made a serious effort in establishing the MDGs, though it is not a complete progress it still has a positive outcome. It has created a benchmark for further developing work in the countries. (E2).

Respondent E3 was very clear in his answer; the MDGs would not be achieved by 2015. But as the previous executive had said, it was important to acknowledge that there has been made progress in many, many areas because of the MDGs. He said that it is important not to give up (E3). "Realistically some countries will not attain the MDGs and this must be discussed, and UN is the best place to do so." (E3). It has been argued earlier in this paper whether or not UN actually is the best place to do so. As previously mentioned the organization is so large that each of the agencies within the UN system can be seen as individual entities. They have their own rules and regulations and follow different procedures. The UN partnership that seeks a global standpoint has internal difficulties that needs full acknowledgement. This is one of the obstacles that stand in the way of reaching MDG 8.

Respondent E9 agreed with the others that the MDGs would not be achieved by 2015. He said: "The MDGs does not only belong to the UN, the individual countries are just as responsible. The UN plays a supporting role and it is important that each country has a sense of ownership to the MDGs." (E9). A challenge that has become quite common is the sense of ownership towards the MDGs. For countries to lack a sense of ownership to the goals are one of the biggest obstacles in reaching the MDGs. If the MDGs are not successfully implemented in the country policies one might argue that it takes on the same role as the conditionality programmes. Government officials complying with set policies in order to get financial aid. Thus the countries themselves need to truly believe in the MDGs and implement them in a way that makes them their own, not some kind of rules and regulations imposed by "Western" bureaucrats.

Individual Country Reports from the UN country offices show that national governments are making progress in becoming more self-reliant, however the need for official development assistance (ODA) still remains. Most countries are expecting a decline in ODA in the coming years because of the global financial crisis that has had some kind of impact on all countries.

It is under this kind of challenge that developing countries find it difficult to hold the international community to their MDG commitments. Thus the commitments to the ODA are placed on the developing countries themselves. And an example is the issue of some donors that require that goods and services be procured through a specific list of suppliers. This can distort established distribution channels in the recipient countries (The path to achieving the Millennium Development Goals 2010: 46). The UN themselves acknowledges this problem that can be linked to the issues of conditionality. Another more specific challenge can be found in Ethiopia where;

> (…) a significant proportion of ODA is targeted to finance social services, including projects focused on education, health, water supply and sanitation, population control and reproductive health. Far too little is targeted to the productive sector such as agriculture, industry, and trade, yet, the Ethiopia Country Report notes, improvements in the productive sector often drive social sector development. (The path to achieving the Millennium Development Goals 2010: 46)

Civil society

The last executive interviewed, E10 agreed with the previous one; the governments are the one responsible for reaching the MDGs. However, he added it is also a global responsibility that includes donors, the UN, civil society and governments. This respondent added civil society as an important component to a global partnership (E10). Civil society takes place outside the state and creates an opportunity for individuals to organize themselves as private citizens in autonomous groups and organizations (Heywood 2004: 41). It is possible to take those who are politically weak into action and create pressure groups that are able to interact in an organized network and form partnerships with powerful agencies. The fact that network organization can come together despite territorial boundaries raises it up to another level. Some countries have a government that sometimes does not act on behalf of their citizens, the importance of civil society in these countries are therefore crucial. The fact that it was mentioned in gaining global responsibility makes it an important tool in overcoming the challenges related to strict government regimes.

'Global Civil Society' is a concept that takes the idea of civil society to another level. The fact that networks can come together despite the territorial boundaries makes networking a global tool for dealing with poverty and democracy issues. It is a wide definition and can include so much more. In general 'Global Civil Society' is a step away from state centralized ways of dealing with things to an increased concern towards individual empowerment and personal

autonomy (Kaldor 2003: 6). The concept came from the demand to have a radical expansion of both political and personal rights. In order to address these demands, participants in civil society saw the importance and the opportunity to form alliances across territorial boundaries. It was therefore developed in order to address the state and international institutions (Kaldor 2003: 76-77).

UNDPs MDG Acceleration Framework

In order to be within reach of the MDGs by 2015, UNDP established in 2009 the MDG Acceleration Framework (MAF). Many countries have made progress in reaching the MDGs, a lot of experiences have been gained, experiences which can be scaled up to accelerate progress. In other MDG areas progress has slowed down, indicating that there are still obstacles in the way. MAF is designed to assist countries in developing their own action plans by identifying and addressing bottlenecks that get in the way of reaching the MDGs. MAF was developed in cooperation with various other UN agencies and development partners as part of a broader MDG Breakthrough Strategy. A year later, based on the interest of several other UN Country Teams and national governments, a number of countries began to pilot the MAF. The interested countries then selected one or more MDG targets where they felt progress had been unsatisfactory. With technical support from UN agencies and other partners, the countries have come up with solutions. For each of the solutions a set of activities was developed. The partners that were best placed to carry out these activities were also identified. What this framework helped prove was that when governments take the lead and have effective assistance from partners, progress is possible (Foreword by Helen Clark, Unlocking progress: MDG acceleration on the road to 2015, 2010).

Respondent P6 focused on the fact that the goal of reaching the MDGs was actually a distraction of the real goal, she said; "The main idea of reaching the MDGs by 2015 could somehow be more important than actually achieving them." (P6). The attention that has been given to reaching the MDGs have been costly, the first five years of its creation it evolved around creating awareness of the goals through workshops and campaigns. I would believe that this was not a cheap strategy. It took another five years for "finding out what the countries were in need of and giving them support based on those needs." (E2). Ten years after its launch it is still "identifying the goals and targets that are lacking in individual countries." (E2). Though the magnitudes of the MDGs are huge; involve multiple developing

countries and partners it might be legitimate to say that the focus on reaching the goals has taken on a commercial aspect that may in fact distract from the real development process. Many resources have been put into the promotion of the MDGs, and though it has been stated that the goals will not be reached within 2015, there needs to be some sort of outcome that will prove that the MDGs has had a significant purpose. By 2015 it needs to have achieved something so that it will not be viewed as a development failure or waste of time and resources. Though respondents stated that 2015 would not be the end of the MDGs and that they would continue well into the following years, the fact that there has been so much emphasis on achieving the goals by 2015 makes it kind of a disappointment if a significant research outcome cannot be proven. I would say that though 2015 is not the end of the MDGs, the year of the "deadline" needs to end with something substantial and significant in order for the contributors to continue supporting the goals. The goals have been part of the development field for nearly 15 years, it has had great exposure and the question on whether or not it promotes sustainable development will be proven in 2015.

3.3.3   A new direction for development aid and some challenges that follow

The development aid field has generally been confined within the development aid agencies. For many years the aid partnership on a global level has been limited to the world leaders in development aid; the UN, the World Bank and the IMF. As years have gone by this partnership have come to include important contributors such as NGOs and local governments, the latest contributor has been the private sector. The world is rapidly changing and new networks with new solutions are created every day, thus the direction that development aid has been following also seeks a change, broader networks and new solutions.

Partnerships taking on a democratic form

It can be argued that all these new components in the development field create a democratic process because it allows more and diverse actors to contribute in the development system. Development aid is no longer limited to the power players in this field. As seen with the UN country teams that are stationed in local areas around the world, decisions are more successful if they are developed alongside the local government and sometimes also NGOs. The MDGs have through the MAF been able to establish ownership within local and national areas in collaboration with UN country teams, other UN agencies and other global partners.

Partnerships as an undemocratic process

On the other hand it can be discussed whether a democratic and accountable process really is achieved by having multiple contributors in a partnership that seeks to address development aid issues. Some of the partners may have different backgrounds from the other partners. For instance the institutional structure of the UN and the World Bank would be based on a similar bureaucratic framework. This might be beneficial in the ways that they address each other in formal settings. Also they have been partners since the beginning of their organizational lives and are therefore in a system where they are aware of each other's procedures. States on the other hand does not always have the same framework. They are diverse and based on cultural and traditional framework that may differ significantly from the neighboring state. Also local governments and national governments may have different ways in dealing with state agendas, thus cooperation between these participants may prove to be a challenge. When you add local and global NGOs to the mix, also with their own systems and frameworks the partnership might develop differing views as to how to go about the process. If you add a new partner such as the private sector, the partnership might become so big that it becomes difficult to follow, given that the partners all have diverse interests. This will leave the cooperation process unable to deal with issues on a larger scale.

Partnerships and accountability

However, the case of the different UN agencies having their own rules and procedures, have already proven to create challenges in the cooperation process. Adding other partners with their own rules and regulations does not necessarily make a partnership more complex and difficult to follow. With more agencies and actors involved it could be argued that such a relationship could prove to be successful because there are more participants involved that are able to hold each other accountable. Decisions cannot simply be made on the top-down level, it needs to include the local participants, the ones that receive the development aid; the ones that are in the center of the development process. Adding more partners may prove to be successful because more resources, not only in the financial form, but also in technical assistance form; such as information and communication may benefit the recipient countries. Also new networks are able to pull their resources together and come up with new solutions that target larger areas of the development field. A focus of analysis is the MDGs which includes all development factors that are important in order to achieve successful development processes.

Partnering up with the private sector

As pointed out in the theory section, the traditional division between donor and recipient has become less highlighted because both parts have development as a goal (Smukkestad 2008: 26). As mentioned the development sector is branching out and looking for new actors that can contribute to the development field. Respondent E2 said: "New partners are emerging in the private sector and a new question that has come out of it is how we can bring in the private sector to accelerate the MDGs?" (E2). The development system is turning to the private sector and the resources that the developing countries are able to provide. "In line with international economic and political shifts, development cooperation is undergoing a radical transformation, and there is great potential in facilitating South-South and triangular cooperation." (What will it take to achieve the Millennium Development Goals? 2010: 37). The globalization process has developed a new global order and a major aspect of this is the:

> (…) growing economic and political influence of relatively large emerging economies which make up the G20, including Brazil, China, India, Saudi Arabia, South Africa and Turkey. While North-South development cooperation still dominates, as measured by ODA flows, cooperation within the South offers fresh channels for resource and knowledge transfers. What South-South cooperation provides is the opportunity to go beyond the donor-recipient relationships of aid to a partnership based on mutual commercial benefits. The rise of emerging economies also provides the opportunity to induce changes in global governance, both in terms of institutional architecture and the policies that govern globalization. (What will it take to achieve the Millennium Development Goals? 2010: 37)

This new shift in the development process demonstrates that the developing countries are also able to contribute in their own development process. The claim that the division between donors and recipients has become outdated is a valid claim here, and referring to collaborators or development partners become more acceptable terms in the process. However there are limitations in this collaboration:

> (…) Neither South-South cooperation itself, nor the envisioned changes in global governance fully address the structural constraints faced by the LDCs that hinder their progress on the MDGs. The G20, for example, falls short or representing the majority of the world's poor, whose views are not reflected in the global trade and financial architecture as well as in climate change negotiations. The difference between the old and new world will only be beneficial for the LDCs if they are fully represented. The UN setting can provide such representation. (What will it take to achieve the Millennium Development Goals? 2010: 37)

According to the UN the less developed countries (LDC) are not strong enough to be able to represent their own interests; they are in need of further representation. This is an example of how networking is required to empower weaker participants through approaches that highlight the needs of the specific participants. As stated in 3.2 by respondent P4; "(…) smaller agencies such as some NGOs are not able to impact structural changes such as legislations and policies within governments, UNDP is able to bring this kind of change." (P4.) And with this representation and more partners joining the development process more issues are raised. With all the various new partners in the field such as traditional and emerging bilateral donors, vertical funds, NGOs, private foundations, and the corporate sector the need for transparency in resource flows has become even greater (What will it take to achieve the Millennium Development Goals? 2010: 34).

3.3.4   Conclusion

The process that globalization has taken on in the later years have contributed in shaping the development aid society the way we know it today. It has also caused the "North"/"South" debate that implies that imperialism has made its return. However it can be argued that the globalization process has created a sphere with international rules and regulations that has the goal of hindering states in abusing their citizens. However this also makes powerful international actors capable of defining important rules. Networks and governance are powerful tools for those that know how to use them. The ones that do not become politically poor unless they are able to team up with other agencies that can through cooperation provide empowerment.

It can be argued that the MDGs through the UN umbrella have been able to create such cooperation. With almost fifteen years on the development agenda, the MDGs have been an important factor in the development aid sphere. With only three years until their deadline it is clear that all the goals will not be achieved. It has been stated that the MDGs have been important because it has been able to set a benchmark. However, I argued that it is not enough to have the framework of the MDGs and the action plans to implement them. As a deadline was set in 2000, it is important that something significant in regards to achieving the goals can be found by the deadline in 2015. Otherwise outside support to the UN and the MDGs might become less important. With new partnerships taking form it is important not to create any reasons for them to not show their support to the MDGs. With the financial crisis many

countries have had to cut back on their contribution to development aid programmes. The support from the private sector has thus become a new and important partner.

With new partnerships, new challenges arise. 'Less Developed Countries' are always at risk of being taken advantage of, they are therefore in need of full representation by larger agencies that are able to ensure that the development process is fair and satisfactory. The UN argues that they are an agency that is capable of this.

4   SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this thesis has been to investigate and discuss the challenges that come with a global partnership for development, especially a partnership that is connected to the world's largest bureaucracy, and a world leader in the development aid field; the UN. Being an organization situated at a top level the interesting part of the analysis has been finding out how they are able to create cooperation processes with other agencies that are often situated in a higher or lower level than the UN itself. Using the framework of MDG 8; develop a global partnership for development I have tried to analyze the position that the UN has in global society.

Many agencies can today be found in the development field. When all the agencies come together in creating a global network the most resourceful agencies situated high at the top level can often hold a powerful role in the decision making process. Many powerful actors in the development field often view development as financial development. However it has been pointed out that development is more than economics. Conditionality has often overrun the private ownership that less developed countries is in need of in order to achieve sustainable development. It has been argued in my thesis that bureaucracy and finances often sets the agenda before a cooperation process is even able to be established. The field of development aid is trying to get past this way of approaching development, for instance through the MDGs. However one may argue that the bureaucratic jungle that can be found within the global top-down institutions sets the precedence for the further development structure.

4.1   Synopsis of research

Conditionality, the issue relating to countries complying with rules and regulations set by international institutions as a top-down approach to development has received a lot of criticism over the years. Mainly, the World Bank and the IMF is related to this process. The UN is also related to this approach as they are often the policy makers and the executors of the guidelines funded by the donors. As previously pointed out, the UN is custodians of donor funds and the role they have in the field is a catalytic one. The UN was not created with financial intentions. The focus has from the beginning revolved around human development. However with no financial resources my research has indicated that the role they have had in the field of development might be limited. My research indicates that their position has put

them in a dependent relationship with the donors. Therefore I have found that they themselves are in some sort of way attached to conditionality guidelines, where in order to take on the role as custodians they have to comply with the donor agencies in order to get funding for their projects. The question of; Who sets the agenda? is thus still to be fully answered. On the other hand the UN, I have found, has the ability to bring the notion of legitimacy through a partnership with other international institutions and local organizations. All the member states in the UN support the institution and acknowledge its democratic structure. It is therefore able to unify this common notion on a global level. Other partnering agencies such as the World Bank and IMF do not have the position that the UN has in world society in relation to development aid issues. The UN has been involved in modern development aid since the beginning. No other global institution can claim to have the same magnitude of development experience that the UN is able to provide. Institutions such as the World Bank and IMF lack the same legitimacy that can be provided through the UN system. A partnership with the UN is thus beneficial as it can foster trust when cooperating with less developed countries, NGOs and new actors. My research would therefore indicate that UN's contribution is so large that they are able to facilitate cooperation strategies between the other global development agencies such as donors and local actors such as local NGOs and local governments. Due to their experience in development aid and their position in global society, the UN has a solid foundation when cooperating with less developed countries.

However the bureaucratic structure that can be found in the UN system can sometimes be considered a jungle where one could easily get lost. Rules and regulations differ within the system itself, and coordination and coherence have been issues that the UN has had to deal with over the years. What is problematic is that fostering a global commitment has to have a unifying quality. It is impossible to achieve trust and cooperation if the core does not have the same values as the overall goal. This is a further challenge for MDG 8. The fact that the UN is custodians of donor funds not only creates challenges related to the conditions that they have to meet. It also creates difficulties in regards to the bureaucratic structure they work under. It is the world's largest bureaucracy because it has multiple rules and regulations to follow making the coordination process a goal in itself. The restraint of the structure that the UN is working under might be putting them in a situation where the sustainable development is far from reality. As previously mentioned it has not been proven that development agencies are able to do a better job in regards to development work. Also a problem when cooperating on a

global scale is that not all actors involved hold the same motivation or agenda towards the partnership. Political or economic agendas might steer the partnership, making a shared understanding a difficult task. It might also lead to a never ending bureaucratic circle where nothing is achieved. For local cooperators the idea of following conditions through the "Western" bureaucratic framework have proven to be a challenge, especially in Haiti's case. Not being able to follow the coherence among the multiple aid agencies found in the country has led the people of Haiti to show distrust towards the aid agencies. Other countries comply with conditionality programmes in order to get funding and in the process lose their attachments to the real development process.

The UN system has come to include multiple agencies over the years. I have found that the system can be considered so large that it has difficulties cooperating within their own system. This issue further relates to achieving the MDGs. Though it is unlikely that the MDGs will be achieved by 2015, it still needs to have achieved something substantial and significant in the field of development aid. As it was stated by one of the respondents, the MDGs is a benchmark for further development. However in order to be a benchmark it needs to be able to prove that something has been achieved, prove that a milestone in the development field has been reached. The outcome of this may not be found until 2015, but 2015 will be a crucial phase that will decide whether or not the MDGs have been successful in achieving what it was set out to do. My research indicates that if the UN is unable to prove that they are the leaders in the development field and that they are able to meet the targets that they create they might lose credibility and important partners.

Previously in the analysis a respondent stated that the developing countries were just as responsible for implementing and achieving the MDGs as the UN. However it would not be fair to leave the responsibility of achieving the MDGs solemnly on the developing countries if the MDGs have not created a benchmark by 2015. The MDGs have slowly developed from advocacy and development strategies to identifying goals and targets that are lacking in the developing countries. The process has been costly both in time and resources and I have found that the goals have taken on a more commercial aspect that may distract from the real development process.

The direction that development aid is following has become a more commercial path, looking for new partners in the private corporate sector. Over the years the private sector has become more important in the development field. A large reason for this is the financial challenges that have occurred in the resent years in many of the developing as well as developed countries. Development aid networks and partnerships that were before limited to the field have expanded to include the private sector. It was argued that on the one hand a partnership with the private sector might lead to a more democratic cooperation process as development aid is able to branch out rather than limiting itself to the traditional development agencies. As more actors become involved the issue of holding each other accountable becomes even more crucial to the process. Decisions cannot simply be made without common understanding. However it was also discussed that global scale partnerships can take on an undemocratic process as coherence might be difficult to achieve since all the partners have their own structure, and thus their own rules and regulations to follow.

4.2   Conclusion of research

My findings are that the bureaucratic structure that can be found within the UN system poses a lot of challenges when dealing with a global partnership. The structure causes problems in relation to coherence within the organization as differing rules and regulations dictate how the different agencies within the system operate. When such challenges can be found within the core of the organization it further translates into the outside and thus the partnerships that they form with outside agencies and countries. The UN is able to facilitate cooperation strategies between local and global agencies because of their position in the global development field. They can provide a legitimizing aspect to development processes despite not having any financial resources. However their position in comparison to other global institutions such as the World Bank and the IMF, who do have financial resources, is somewhat less powerful, as the UN in some cases has to comply with the others rules and regulations. Their role as custodians of donor funds further enhances their bureaucratic structure.

Based on these findings I conclude that the UN system is greatly affected by its bureaucratic structure. It shapes the core of the organization as well as the partnerships and development processes that the UN forms outside the organization. The fact that the UN is such a trusted institution makes them a legitimate component in the development field, and the issue that it has become too big to deal with challenges on a local level is not a general theme when

discussing its position in global development. The UN as a forum for a global scale cooperation has become an important factor in the development aid sphere. Without this forum a large scale operation such as the MDGs would not be able to develop.

However, as 2015 is approaching the discussion of whether or not the UN is capable of fostering such a large commitment will be more prominent. My research demonstrates that the actors in the UN system do not expect the MDGs to be fully achieved by 2015. If a credible partnership for development and a significant development change has not been achieved by then, their trusted position might be jeopardized and the discussion of their capability in creating sustainable development will be questioned. 2015 is not a do or die kind of deadline as it was previously stated by one of the respondents, but my evaluation is that the 2015 status of the MDGs will influence the ability of the UN to uphold its leadership position in the development field.

5   BIBLIOGRAPHY

Theory and Method:

Bailey, K.D. 1987, *Methods of social research*, The free Press, New York, USA

Burris, S., Kempa M. and Shearing, C. *Changes in Governance: A cross disciplinary review of current scholarship*, in 41 Akron, Law Review 1, 2008

Braithwaite J. and Drahos, P. 2000 *Global Business Regulation*, Cambridge University Press

Chambers, R. 2003, *Whose reality counts? – Putting the first last*, ITDG Publishing, UK

Ghani, A. and Lockhart, C. 2008*, Fixing failed states – A framework for rebuilding a fractured world*, Oxford University Press, USA

Grønmo, S. 2004, *Samfunnsvitenskapelige metoder*, Fagbokforlaget, Bergen, Norge

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. 2007, *Ethnography – Principles in practice*, third edition, Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, London and New York

Held, D. 1999, *The transformation of political community*, rethinking democracy in the context of globalization, Cambridge University Press

Heywood, A. 2004, *Political theory – An introduction*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, USA

Jørgensen, S.I 2010, *Globale utfordringer*, Høyskoleforlaget, Kristiansand, Norge

Kaldor, M. 2003, *Global Civil Society: An answer to War*, Polity Press

Pilger, J. 2002, *The new rulers of the world*, Verso, London and New York

Potter, R.B., Binnis, T., Elliott, J.A., Smith, D. 1999, *Geographies of development*, Addison Wesley Longman Limited, New York, USA

Sahl, Ingvild. *Bistandsaktuelt*, September 2011, nr.7 - Stoler ikke på vestlige bistandsorganisasjoner

Smukkestad, O. 2008, *Utvikling eller avvikling? – En innføring i økonomisk og politisk utviklingsteori*, Gyldendal Norsk forlag (Gyldendal Akademisk), Oslo, Norge

Strand, T. 2007, *Ledelse, organisasjon og kultur*, Bergen, Fagbokforlaget

Tarrow, S. *Transnational Politics: Contention and Institutions in International Politics*, in Annual Review of Political Science, Vol. 4: 1-20 (volume publication date: June 2001)

Uvin, P. 2004, *Human rights and Development*, Kumarian Press, USA

Wright, M. 1995, *Power politics*, Leicester University Press, Royal Institute of Iternational Affairs, London and New York

Internet sources:

http://www.rorg.no/Artikler/1306.html (last visited: 03.05.2012)

UN documents and reports:

United Nations Development Programme, 2010, *The Path to Achieving the Millennium Development Goals: A synthesis of MDG evidence from around the world*, the Lowe-Martin Group, New York, NY, USA

United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Capital Development Fund, 2010, *Scaling up support for the MDGs at the local level – A global programme partnership proposal*

United Nations Development Group, 2007, *Synthesis of Resident Coordinator Annual Reports 2007, UN Country Coordination: working together for development*, New York, NY, USA

United Nations Development Programme, 2010, *What will it take to achieve the Millennium Development Goals? An international assessment*, New York, NY, USA

United Nations Development Programme, 2010, *Unlocking progress: MDG acceleration on the road to 2015*, New York, NY, USA

Interview guide no.1

The following questions will be directed at executives working in UNDP:

1. How do you work on the organizational level in order to be within reach of the MDGs?

- What is the philosophy and strategy behind reaching the MDGs, and MDG 8 in particular?

2. What are the most challenging issues regarding 'building a global partnership for development'?

- What have been the most challenging so far?

3. How are you able to ensure that corruption does not interfere with the development process?

- What kind of means do you have to ensure that this does not happen?

4. How does power relations dictate what is to be done?

- For instance who has the most saying in the partnership between UN/UNDP and the World Bank in Cities Alliances?

5. How will it affect the credibility of the UN if the MDGs are not fully successful by 2015?

Interview guide no.2

The following questions will be directed at other UNDP employees such as the professional staff and the general support staff:

1. How do you work on a scholarly level in order to be within reach of the MDGs?
   - What is the philosophy and strategy behind reaching the MDGs and MDG 8 in particular?

2. Are there any UN employees working on a local level with MDG 8?
   - If so, what are their daily tasks and challenges?
   - If not, why is there no one working on a local level?

3. What are the biggest challenges facing the development process?

4. How do you feel that you are able to participate in the MDGs?
   - Which limitations/ conditions are limiting your ability to participate?

Millennium Development Goals

(UNDP, What will it take to achieve the Millennium Development Goals? 2010)

Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger

> **Target 1.A:** Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than 1.25 dollar a day
>
> **Target 1.B:** Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people
>
> **Target 1.C:** Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger

Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education

> **Target 2.A:** Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling

Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women

> **Target 3.A:** Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and in all levels of education no later than 2015

Goal 4: Reduce child mortality

> **Target 4.A:** Reduce by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate

Goal 5: Improve maternal health

> **Target 5.A:** Reduce by three-quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio
>
> **Target 5.B:** Achieve by 2015 universal access to reproductive health

Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases

> **Target 6.A:** Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS
>
> **Target 6.B:** Achieve by 2010 universal access to treatment for HIV/AIDS for all those who need it

Target 6.C: Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases

Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability

Target 7.A: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources

Target 7.B: Reduce biodiversity loss, achieving by 2010 a significant reduction in the rate of loss

Target 7.C: Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation

Target 7.D: Have achieved by 2020 a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers

Goal 8: Develop a global partnership for development

Target 8.A: Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, nondiscriminatory trading and financial system (includes a commitment to good governance, development, and poverty reduction – both nationally and internationally)

Target 8.B: Address the special needs of the Least Developed Countries (includes tariff- and quota-free access for Least Developed Countries' exports, enhanced programme of debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC) and cancellation of official bilateral debt, and more generous official development assistance for countries committed to poverty reduction)

Target 8.C: Address the special needs of landlocked developing countries and small island developing states (through the Program of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States and 22nd General Assembly provisions)

Target 8.D: Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long term

Target 8.E: In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries

Target 8.F: In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communication technologies