

Workshop

Unfinished Business: Moving forward to meet the Busan commitments

Preliminary conclusions

Dialogue at the country level has strengthened as a result of global effectiveness efforts. **Now the dialogue needs to be institutionalised.**

- This is important for **inclusive partnerships**: dialogue and engagement cannot be *ad hoc*, but needs structured mechanisms so that being at the table has real impact. There exist good examples of institutionalised, inclusive dialogue mechanisms already across different countries and regions – so this is possible.
- Institutionalised dialogue is important also to move forward on the **use of country systems**. Continued and structured dialogue is necessary to facilitate the trust that is needed to deal with risks jointly among development partners, and to adopt and maintain a longer-term approach where systems are used while strengthening them.

The notion of domestication of Busan commitments by developing countries has been on the table for long. **Now is the time for localisation of Busan commitments by co-operation providers.**

- Country examples highlight a persistent disconnect between providers' effectiveness rhetoric at the global level and their operations at the country level. This signals the need for provider headquarters to **delegate authority to** country decision-making processes to enable country offices to be transparent, provide the necessary planning information and manage risk. In addition to authority, this requires the **right incentives**.
- So long as country offices lack the necessary authority, building **trust and long-term relationships required to make progress** on challenging commitments will remain difficult.

Strengthening country led implementation of Busan commitments requires information and data. They are needed for budgeting, for accountability and for tracking progress. Information and data also enable documenting good practice and sharing lessons.

Getting the right information and data in place at country level requires transparency and predictability from co-operation providers. Transparency is essential not only for governments, but also a key ingredient for meaningful engagement of civil society and creating an enabling environment for civil society organisations to contribute to development efforts. There are already good examples of transparency which confirm that it is possible.

Translating Busan commitments into reality is everyone's responsibility. No commitment can be implemented by one constituency or stakeholder alone. Encouraging examples of different stakeholders translating shared principles into practice include the Guidelines for effective co-operation adopted by philanthropic actors, the strategy of Arab providers to implement Busan commitments, and the Istanbul Principles adopted by CSOs to strengthen effectiveness of their own development efforts.

* * *

[A summary of the workshop will be issued after the Mexico High-Level Meeting]