Democratic accountability in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: lessons from ASEAN states

Background
Since the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in September 2015, development experts, statisticians and various organizations have discussed the implementation, follow-up and review mechanisms for monitoring progress on the implementation of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

In order for the SDG monitoring process to be accountable, it is essential that the SDG indicators include peoples’ own assessments of the availability, accessibility and quality of services provided. In particular, the intention expressed by the UN’s MY World survey (UN 2016), and by SDG 16—namely, to foster peaceful and just societies and inclusive and accountable institutions—makes it crucial to include people’s voices in monitoring progress towards the goal. To this end, SDG 16 should, where feasible, include survey-based evidence, which tends to be the best way to represent people’s lived experiences and assessments.

This Policy Brief argues that accountability to citizens, and in particular accountability through democratic political processes, is a crucial enabler of the SDGs. Further, democratic accountability can help make the SDG monitoring framework truly people-centred; this is particularly evident with, but not limited to, SDG 16.

Accountability and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
Accountability can be defined as an obligation to account for one’s activities, accept responsibility for them and disclose and justify results. Accountability is a fundamental cross-cutting dimension of the SDG framework. The most explicit reference to accountability at the goal level is grounded in the language on the quality of institutions in SDG 16, which commits UN member states to ‘promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels’ (UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs 2015). Thus, government accountability in their responsibilities as service providers (or regulators of service provision) is a crucial element of the SDGs.

Accountability features at the target level, as in target 16.6: ‘Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels.’ Accountability also features in paragraph 45 on national parliaments, in paragraph 47 on the primary...
Box 1. Responding to the needs of disadvantaged groups in Laos

The Laotian Government identified several remote ethnic villages in need of family planning services. Trained agents, sharing the same ethnic language and social norms, visit each household every month to provide counselling and related services. This participatory approach has increased family planning uptake by 30 per cent over four years (UNFPA 2012).

Box 2. Right-to-information legislation in Indonesia

Under Indonesia’s Freedom of Public Information Act, the Institute for Discourse Research and Application (LPAW) sought information about contracts from a district-owned company in the resource-rich Blora district in Central Java. When the company denied LPAW’s request, the Central Information Commission ruled in favour of LPAW to make the documents public (Soerjoatmodjo 2013).

responsibility of governments, and in paragraph 73 on accountability to citizens. Accountability is also present in the cluster on ‘Data for monitoring and accountability’ in SDG 17, in SDG 5 on gender equality, and in SDG 10 on reducing inequality within and among countries.

What is democratic accountability?

Democratic accountability refers to the many ways in which people, political parties, parliaments, media, civil society and other actors provide feedback to, reward or sanction officials in charge of setting and enacting public policy (International IDEA 2014). It is therefore a crucial enabler of human rights and provides the necessary monitoring framework for their meaningful implementation. There can be no sustainable development without respect for democracy and human rights.

How can democratic accountability make a difference?

It is people-centred and participatory

In The Road to Dignity by 2030, the UN Secretary-General noted that ‘effective governance for sustainable development demands that public institutions in all countries and at all levels are inclusive, participatory and accountable to the people’ (UN General Assembly 2014, emphasis added). In International IDEA’s view, free and fair electoral processes; democratic political parties; popularly elected parliaments with legislative, oversight, budgetary, representative and conflict management functions; ombudsman offices; and supreme audit institutions all contribute to comprehensive representation and human rights.

Social movements and interest groups provide further opportunities for people to participate in and influence the democratic process. The media also provides information and an arena for public debate, and acts as a watchdog. The Putrajaya Joint Declaration by member states of the Association of Southeast Asian Nation (ASEAN) aims to strengthen ‘evidence-based decision making, [and] stakeholder engagement’ (ASEAN 2015: iv).

In Vietnam, four provinces undertook user feedback surveys on various sectors, ranging from health services to construction permits, which confirmed successful areas and also specific recommendations for the provinces and agencies to improve service delivery (World Bank 2015).

It can protect minorities and disadvantaged groups

Democratic accountability can facilitate the human right of all to public service on equal terms. Its mechanisms translate human rights commitments and equality goals into action through governance reform that provides public institutions with the incentives and skills to respond to the needs of disadvantaged groups. Article 2.2(l) of the binding ASEAN Charter commits Member States to have ‘respect for the different cultures, languages and religions of the peoples of ASEAN’ (2007). One particular example, from Laos, is discussed in Box 1.

It builds openness and transparency

Democratic accountability entails the public’s right to obtain information on the organization, functioning and decision-making processes of public administration. Greater transparency in government budgets, procurement and spending improves oversight, policy choices and service delivery. Yet it is meaningless without the right to information and an independent and active media. Democratic accountability bolsters the right to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds. The Putrajaya Joint Declaration asserts the need for ‘the highest standards of . . . transparency and accountability in the civil service’ (ASEAN 2015: v). Furthermore, right-to-information legislation can help to foster transparency and promote accountability in public service delivery. Box 2 provides an example from Indonesia.

It includes answerability

Answerability measures the extent to which a government carries out its duty
to explain and justify its decisions, and is linked to how claims holders articulate their demands, but also to officials’ capacity and willingness to take responsibility for their actions. In this context, democratic accountability can contribute to the promotion of people’s right to participate in public affairs while providing the free flow of information necessary for governments to be held accountable by their citizens. In 2001 the Anti-Corruption Initiative for Asia-Pacific, under the joint leadership of the Asian Development Bank and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, adopted an Anti-Corruption Action Plan for Asia and the Pacific. The plan notes that safeguarding the accountability of public services requires systems for ensuring the availability of information. Box 3 details an example from Indonesia.

### Box 3. Answerability in Indonesia

In Indonesia, LAPOR! (‘Report!’) is an online service that allows citizens to submit reports on national development work and public services. Using a variety of media, citizens can report anything from corrupt officials to damaged bridges or teacher absenteeism. Such initiatives can improve the way government and citizens interact and the way public institutions listen and respond to public demands (Hasan 2013).

**It includes responsiveness**

This principle is about whether public officials consult with and listen to citizens or their representatives before a policy or law is approved, so that decision-making reflects their views and demands for human rights. The ASEAN Declaration on Strengthening Social Protection demands ‘transparency and responsiveness to the needs of those concerned’ (ASEAN 2014: 8).

Democratic accountability mechanisms can help ensure people’s right to participate in public affairs and exert influence over the policymaking process while fostering the implementation of principles such as the rule of law, equal access to justice, the proper management of public affairs and property, judicial integrity and transparency.

For example, the Malaysian Government created Pemandu (‘The Driver’), a new agency that monitors and improves ministry performance. Pemandu’s evaluations helped to bring more public services to rural areas and develop more clearly defined goals regarding service delivery (Iyer 2011).

**It guarantees enforceability**

This principle refers to the formal or informal consequences that duty bearers—government officials being held accountable—might face, as well as their impact. Research by International IDEA suggests that almost all countries with low scores on service delivery have either limited or no provision for effective sanctions, and no credible incentives for politicians to be responsive. Mechanisms for democratic accountability can provide sufficient incentives and sanctions to encourage governments, elected representatives, and public officials and employees to work in the best interests of the people. Box 4 outlines an example of enforceability in the Philippines.

The non-binding ASEAN Human Rights Declaration (2012) describes ‘the right to an effective and enforceable remedy … for acts violating the rights granted to that person by the constitution or by law’ (General Principles: 5).

### Box 4. Enforceability in the Philippines

4Ps, a conditional crash transfer programme in the Philippines, includes a grievance redress mechanism. Complaints are aggregated in a database which is accessible to the public. Since the programme is targeted for expansion, the database also serves as a key source of information to address problems (Ringold et al. 2012).
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**It guarantees enforceability**

This principle refers to the formal or informal consequences that duty bearers—government officials being held accountable—might face, as well as their impact. Research by International IDEA suggests that almost all countries with low scores on service delivery have either limited or no provision for effective sanctions, and no credible incentives for politicians to be responsive. Mechanisms for democratic accountability can provide sufficient incentives and sanctions to encourage governments, elected representatives, and public officials and employees to work in the best interests of the people. Box 4 outlines an example of enforceability in the Philippines.

The non-binding ASEAN Human Rights Declaration (2012) describes ‘the right to an effective and enforceable remedy … for acts violating the rights granted to that person by the constitution or by law’ (General Principles: 5).

### Conclusion

In order for the SDG monitoring process to safeguard people-centred accountability, it is essential that the SDG indicators build on peoples’ own assessments of the availability, accessibility and quality of services provided. Survey-based indicators have the advantage of incorporating people’s lived experiences into the monitoring of the SDG targets over time to complement administratively-based indicators. Indeed, the follow-up process on the SDGs should be as inclusive and people-centred as possible to mirror popular understanding of the SDGs, including the critical importance of ‘honest and responsive governments’.

Hence, democratic accountability can provide the necessary framework for inclusive realization, follow-up and review of the SDGs by protecting minorities and disadvantaged groups, and building openness and transparency, answerability, responsiveness and enforceability.
International IDEA's work on democracy and development

International IDEA recognizes that democracy, while of intrinsic value in its own right, also draws its legitimacy from its capacity to meet people’s expectations that it will deliver sustainable and inclusive development. However, political institutions cannot deliver on their own; rather they can ideally provide political actors with the enabling environment for them to act in the interest of all people. Political actors and their practices and actions are ultimately what matters for democracy and development.

The Democracy and Development Programme advocates for a place for democracy on the development agenda. The programme supports political actors and institutions, and aims to strengthen the capacity of women and men for democratic political participation and representation; effective oversight; and democratic accountability. The work primarily includes knowledge production and advocacy at the global level, and dialogues and support to reform efforts at regional and country levels.
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