

Strengthening the Global Partnership Monitoring Framework Next Steps, Process and Timeframe

The Global Partnership's (GP) first monitoring round culminated in the first *Progress Report* released in April 2014. There is broad agreement among the Co-Chairs, Joint Support Team (JST) and Steering Committee on the importance of building on and further strengthening the Global Partnership monitoring framework to offer a credible and appealing model of mutual accountability, both for the upcoming second GP monitoring round, as well as in the context of post-2015 implementation and accountability efforts.

Recap of the Global Partnership monitoring framework

The monitoring framework of the Global Partnership was agreed to by consensus through the Working Party of Aid Effectiveness in 2012, in conjunction with agreeing to the mandate of, and establishing, the Partnership. It is composed of ten indicators and targets set for 2015, which are a result of political negotiations led by the Post-Busan Interim Group. The Global Partnership mandated the Joint Support Team to develop, refine and implement a global methodology for monitoring.

To ensure continued improvement of this monitoring framework, the 2012 agreement foresaw two review efforts of different scope and timing:

- 1) Following the first monitoring round (2013-14), a **light stock-take** to identify lessons from the monitoring effort and from piloting and finalising the four new global indicators. This stock-take would lay the groundwork for a strengthened second round of monitoring of the implementation of Busan commitments.

- 2) Towards the end of 2015/early 2016, a **review of the global arrangements for monitoring** to ensure the relevance of Global Partnership monitoring framework (indicators and multi-stakeholder process) to the post-2015 development agenda. This timing was re-confirmed in the Mexico High-Level Meeting Communiqué.

Action to strengthen the Global Partnership monitoring framework

In line with the above sequencing, and under the leadership of the Global Partnership co-chairs, the JST is focusing monitoring efforts on two distinct work-streams over the coming months:

A. Compliance to the 2012 agreement – finalising the monitoring framework as agreed post-Busan

- **Finalising the methodology for the remaining four global pilot indicators.** The JST is resourcing the technical work necessary to strengthen and finalise the four global pilot indicators' methodology and processes (Indicator 1, 2, 3, and 4). This work will engage GP constituencies through collaboration with relevant stakeholder bodies, Building Blocks and Voluntary Initiatives as well as piloting revised methodologies in developing countries;

- **Reviewing feedback, challenges and lessons around the monitoring exercise to strengthen the overall process for the second monitoring round.** The JST issued an online questionnaire for monitoring focal points in April 2014 to learn from the process at country-level.

The GP Annual Workshop in Seoul (6-7 November 2014) will provide an opportunity for broader consultation on the methodology and processes of the four global pilot indicators, as well as on lessons learned from the overall monitoring process.

Refined methodologies and monitoring process will set the foundation for the second round of Global Partnership monitoring, which will produce the Progress Report for the second High-Level Meeting of the Global Partnership.

B. Relevance to post-2015 efforts – reviewing the monitoring framework to ensure its relevance to future accountability efforts

While the process to review the relevance of the monitoring framework was initially scheduled for the end of 2015/early 2016, given the fast approaching post-2015 UN-led negotiations and Financing for Development Conference, it will now need to start in parallel to implementing the second round of Global Partnership monitoring.

The Co-Chairs and the JST will prepare a proposal for the process to review the relevance of the monitoring framework and arrangements in the lead-up to the next High-Level Meeting of the Global Partnership. Building on the existing monitoring framework as a model for mutual accountability on quality of co-operation and partnerships, this review will include:

- **A review of strengths and weaknesses of the current indicators.** As one form of ‘stress testing’ the indicators, this work would aim to identify what works in the current indicators, and aspects that may need to be further improved in view of future monitoring efforts. Any desk reviews of strengths and weaknesses would then be complemented during the second monitoring round, which would offer the opportunity to ‘**stress test**’ these indicators in action;
- **The identification of relevant existing indicators (with possible elements of refinement) and/or additional indicators;**
- **The preparation of a refined monitoring framework (indicators and associated multi-stakeholder process)** through a consultative process engaging GP constituencies. If feasible, undertaking of baseline monitoring may be embedded in the second round of the monitoring.

To support this review, and strengthen the overall monitoring process of the Global Partnership, the Co-Chairs and JST propose the establishment of an **Independent Advisory Group** which will provide technical advice and a sounding board for monitoring efforts. The Group will play a particular role in defining the stress-test process.

Guiding principles for this review:

- Future Global Partnership monitoring efforts should build on previously agreed principles (Busan) and parameters (selectivity, global-light and country focused framework, building on existing developing country data, systems and accountability processes).
- The review and associated refinements to the monitoring framework will seek to inform the preparation process for Financing for Development and inter-governmental dialogue on the SDGs, their Means of Implementation and accountability in the Post-2015 context, so as to position the GPEDC monitoring framework effectively in subsequent global accountability efforts.
- The next High-Level Meeting of the Global Partnership would endorse the refined monitoring framework, its process, indicators and associated targets.

MORE DETAILED TIMELINE OF UPCOMING MONITORING EFFORTS

Stakeholder consultation: to ensure inputs and support from all GPEDC constituencies, the JST will use a range of channels of consultation, such as online questionnaires, e-discussions, Steering Committee meetings, meetings of the Independent Advisory Group and up-coming events (e.g. the Seoul workshop on 6-7 November 2014). The JST will make sure outreach efforts are timely and well-targeted.

Two parallel work streams		
DATE	(1) Compliance to the 2012 agreement – finalising the monitoring framework as agreed post-Busan	(2) Relevance to post-2015 efforts – reviewing the monitoring framework to ensure its relevance to future accountability efforts
July 2014- Jan 2015	<p>JST: Finalisation of four global pilot indicators</p> <p>Consultation and technical work to refine and finalise the pilot indicators: transparency, results, private sector engagement, enabling environment for civil society.</p> <p>JST: Light stock-take of the first monitoring round process</p>	<p>JST: Preparation of proposal for the review process, and practical work to prepare the establishment of an Independent Advisory Group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation of ToRs, • Proposed memberships • Preliminary workplan
January 2015	<p>Steering Committee</p> <p><i>Update from Co-chairs and JST on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Progress on the finalisation of the four global pilot indicator methodologies and assessment processes; recommendations for strengthening the GP monitoring process. ▪ Proposed process and activities for reviewing the relevance of the monitoring framework for Post-2015 (including the establishment of the Independent Advisory Group). <p><i>SC endorsement on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The role and membership of the Independent Advisory Group for the second monitoring round process as well as for the review of the relevance. ▪ The proposal for the process to conduct the second monitoring round and to finalise the methodologies for the four global pilot indicators. 	

February-March 2015	<p>Ongoing work of the Independent Advisory Group</p> <p>The Group will play a key role in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. advising on the finalisation of four global pilot indicators; ii. advising on the implementation of the second GP monitoring round, to ensure an inclusive; and technically feasible monitoring process and presentation of results and key findings; and iii. reviewing the GP monitoring framework to ensure its relevance to post-2015 accountability efforts. <p>The Group will also particularly be involved in setting-up and conducting the 'stress testing' of existing indicators.</p>	
Jan 15-June 15	<p>On the basis of the January SC meeting:</p> <p>JST: Finalisation of methodologies and assessment process for the four global pilot indicators.</p> <p>JST: Strengthened overall monitoring process for the second monitoring round (linking country and global levels).</p>	<p>JST: Proposed activities and roadmap to review the relevance of the GPEDC monitoring framework for the Post-2015/FfD</p> <p>Analytical work on monitoring the quality of cooperation in the context of post-2015.</p> <p>Identification of relevant existing indicators and elements of refinement and/or additional indicators.</p>
[Steering Committee [Month to be confirmed]	<p>Steering Committee</p> <p><i>Update from Co-chairs and JST on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed finalised methodology and assessment process for the four global pilot indicators. <p><i>SC endorsement on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The strengthened framework and the process for the second monitoring round. ▪ The process for strengthening the relevance of the GPEDC monitoring framework. 	
June 2015 –	<p>JST: Second monitoring round and report</p> <p>(the timeline will ultimately be guided by the timing of the second HLM)</p> <p>The round will consist of guidance, stakeholder outreach and technical support to roll-out the monitoring process at country level, country-level data collection and validation, data review and analysis, Progress Report production.</p> <p>This round will be the opportunity to 'stress-test' all 10 indicators.</p>	<p>JST: A review of the relevance of the GPEDC monitoring framework for the Post 2015/FfD</p> <p>Consideration of best working arrangements to support a consultative process and country-led accountability and monitoring.</p> <p>Proposed areas of refinement in the context of post-2015 and setting out necessary technical work on methodology, indicators, etc.</p> <p>Undertake baseline analysis, if feasible.</p> <p>Preparation of SC proposal for the refined monitoring framework for the HLM 2016.</p> <p><i>SC endorsement on:</i></p> <p>The refined GP monitoring framework.</p>
2016 HLM	<p><i>Presentation by Co-chairs and JST on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The <i>Progress Report</i> from the Second Monitoring Round to inform the HLM discussions. ▪ The proposal for a refined GP monitoring framework. 	<p><i>High-Level Meeting endorses:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The refined GP monitoring framework.

Annex A: Updates and Planned Activities for the Four Global Pilot Indicators

Indicator 1: Use of Country Results Framework

- **Main objectives:** simplify the measurement and find an alternative to original proxy approach used in first monitoring round (where co-operation modality was used to indicate the use of country results by co-operation providers). Anchor the indicator development more firmly at country level.
- **Proposed approach:** conduct a more qualitative assessment, whereby stakeholder perceptions at country level provide the basis for assessing the use of country results frameworks.
- **Process:** the JST has commissioned a discussion paper to undertake deeper analysis in two to three countries to help identify the key factors that should be considered in a perception-based index/survey approach. Based on this analysis, the JST will further commission work to:
 1. Construct a perception-based methodology with a simplified country-level process;
 2. Pilot this approach in a few countries; and
 3. Based on the piloting findings, refine the methodology and process.
- **Consultation:** collect feedback on the preliminary discussion paper and the planned approach in Seoul (6-7 November 2014); present an update and the next steps to Steering Committee (19-20 January 2015). Country-level piloting activities will be planned in close collaboration with the Busan Building Block on Results, which is also undertaking a piloting programme in a number of developing countries, to seek maximal substantive synergies as well as broad stakeholder feedback on the indicator methodology.

Indicator 2: CSO Enabling Environment

- **Main objectives:** root the assessment at country level and overcome the bottleneck of not having existing country level data.
- **Approach:** conduct a preliminary assessment through a country-level questionnaire on CSO enabling environment. Convene dialogue between developing country governments, CSOs and donors to fill in the questionnaire. The questionnaire would be structured around key elements of enabling environment, and could a) help forge an agreement on a common understanding of the concept of enabling environment; b) be refined based on feedback and provide a basis for a more quantitative indicator approach in the future.
- **Process:** work with the Task Team on Enabling Environment which includes CSOs, developing countries and co-operation providers to:
 1. Structure the questionnaire and identify key elements to include;
 2. Consult and engage with different stakeholders; and
 3. Identify countries and a process to test the questionnaire in a few pilot countries.
- **Consultation:** collect stakeholder feedback in Seoul (6-7 November 2014), present the planned questionnaire approach to the Steering Committee (19-20 January 2015), build on collaboration with the Task Team on Enabling Environment to facilitate stakeholder consultations and to engage partners at country level.

Indicator 3: Public Private Dialogue as a proxy for enabling environment

- **Main objectives:** Use public-private dialogue (PPD) as a proxy to measure private sector engagement in development. Produce “PPD country profiles” to describe conditions in which PPD takes place and the quality of the dialogue process.
- **Proposed approach:** A tool has been developed to produce “PPD country profiles”. Country reviews will focus on a specific agreed upon dialogue platform and look at the country-level context for PPD by assessing three dimensions:
 1. Country’s readiness to host, create or sustain a dialogue process;
 2. Organizational effectiveness of a given platform;
 3. Legal and regulatory context for PPD.
- **Process:** The World Bank has been closely involved in developing the tool and is testing it to produce country profiles in four countries in October-November 2014. The Overseas Development Institute is contributing to review the methodology and comment on the country profiles. Based on WB and ODI inputs, the JST will refine and finalise the indicator for the second monitoring round.
- **Consultation:** discuss preliminary piloting results in Seoul (6-7 November 2014), present an update on the indicator finalisation to the Steering Committee (19-20 January 2014). Provide regular updates to P4P as a key Busan building block on private sector collaboration.

Indicator 4: Transparency Indicator

- **Main objectives:** Forge agreement on how OECD Working Party on Statistics (STAT) and IATI members address the different nature of its three systems (OECD Creditor Reporting System and Forward Spending Survey; and IATI); use this to guide a revised measurement approach to reporting in these three systems. Reach clarity on how members want to assess quality of reporting vs. its timeliness.
- **Proposed approach:** Explore ways to further differentiate assessment of timeliness, comprehensiveness and forward-looking nature between OECD and IAT reporting systems. To review the construction of the overall indicator, seek guidance from members on whether reporting to these three systems should be complementary or mandatory.
- **Process:** discussion by STAT in September 2014 and by IATI in October 2014. Follow-up these meetings by exploring the establishment of a temporary, joint STAT-IATI working group to provide recommendations to the Co-Chairs and JST. In addition to recommending refinements to measuring reporting to the common standard, the group could be invited to provide recommendations on what assessments of transparency would be most relevant for accountability efforts post-2015.
- **Consultation:** collect country-level feedback in Seoul (6-7 November 2014) to help guide the Group’s work, provide an update to the Steering Committee (19-20 January 2015) on the Group’s work and on the next steps for finalising the review.