

**Monitoring Advisory Group Work Plan:  
Presentation to the GPEDC Steering Committee,  
September 3, 2015**

**Brian Tomlinson & Gonzalo Hernandez Licona,  
On Behalf of the Monitoring Advisory Group**

# Overview

1. Initiating the Monitoring Advisory Group: Orientation and areas of focus for our first meeting
2. Some issues arising from our first meeting ...
3. Overview of MAG Work Plan
4. Track Two: Political buy-in for the second round monitoring exercise
5. Monitoring Advisory Group working arrangements.

# 1. Initiating the MAG: Orientation and areas of focus from the first meeting

- ❖ 12 MAG members with strong balanced sectoral and country-based expertise.
- ❖ **Areas of focus for our first meeting in New York, hosted by UNDP, May 20-21<sup>st</sup>:**
  - ❑ Getting to know each other, our complementary expertise, and establishing some common ground for initial initial analysis of monitoring.
  - ❑ Understanding the SC purposes for establishing the Group (strengthen the credibility and methodological soundness of the indicators and their relevance to the monitoring framework for the SDGs).
  - ❑ Orientation and discussion of the political context for the GPEDC indicators -- evolving discussions at the UN on indicators for the SDGs.
  - ❑ Presentation of four pilot indicators and preliminary advice for the JST.
  - ❑ MAG Work Plan: Agreement on our main areas of focus, division of labour and our working methodologies to maximize our contributions.

## 2. Some issues arising from our first meeting ...

1. Strong support for the monitoring initiative, but an increased appreciation for the complexity and practical challenges in the ambition (behaviour change) that we all share for this monitoring framework.
2. We need more clarity about the theories of change implied in the monitoring framework and the 10 indicators.
3. The practical time constraints affecting the scope of how far the MAC can “push the envelope.”
4. The need to address the implications of the “country-heavy” orientation of the monitoring process.
5. An iterative approach to implementing our mandate and Work Plan.

# 3. MAG Work Plan Overview (1)

## Three Track Framework:

- 1. Track One: Review and advice to refine the methodologies for the four pilot indicators (May 15 to July 15):**
  - Advice on: Indicator One: Use of country results frameworks; Indicator Two: CSO enabling environment; Indicator Three: Private sector engagement; Indicator Four: Transparency.
  
- 2. Track Two: Advice on quality of Progress Report – Translating key findings into actionable and policy relevant recommendations (July 15 to Aug 16):**
  - Advice on building incentives for developing countries, aid providers and other stakeholders to participate in Round Two;
  - Advise on incentivizing behaviour changes and follow-up to the monitoring process and the Progress Report;
  - Advice on the 2016 Progress Report: structure, peer review, strengthening Report recommendations, improve the value added case for the monitoring exercise, and stock taking on the limitations of data collected.

## 3. MAG Work Plan Overview (2)

### 3. Track Three: Review the GPEDC monitoring framework to ensure conceptual relevance to the post-2015 SDG accountability efforts (Sept 15 to June 16).

- ❑ Elaborate a work plan for track three (September MAG meeting).
- ❑ Stress test current ten indicators through Round Two monitoring process, developing stress test questions for each indicator, undertake an assessment to provide advise on how to strengthen the indicators, taking into account the conceptual relevance to SDG accountability framework.
- ❑ Monitor the Inter-agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators in order to inform AG advice on a relevant monitoring framework.
- ❑ Review and provide advice on the relevance of the monitoring framework – its conceptual basis in a theory of change affecting behavioral and policy changes; strengthen an accountability framework; and nature and possible questions for an evaluation of the Monitoring Framework (if relevant stakeholders agree to pursue an evaluation).

## 4. Track Two: Political buy-in for the second round monitoring exercise

1. **Importance of incentivizing all stakeholders**, not only partner country governments, to maximize full participation in the Monitoring Round.
2. **Develop a value proposition for the monitoring process** that appeals to all stakeholders.
3. **Importance of dialogue promoting / explaining the new monitoring round with country champions** by the JST, GPEDC Co-Chairs and/or SC members.
4. **Draw lessons from similar national government and global monitoring processes.**
  1. **Importance of credible indicators** where stakeholders can see clearly the benefits
  2. **Create local incentives** through public recognition of strong performers
  3. **Invest in strong capacities in producing good quality data**
  4. **Be clear about expectations for follow-up.**
5. **Ultimately participation by governments and other stakeholders will be a political judgment** about whether sufficient and relevant change can be envisioned to warrant investment (particularly human resources) in the monitoring exercise.

# 5. Monitoring Advisory Group working arrangements

**Our role** is to provide technical expertise, advice and recommendations to the Co-Chairs and the SC, to complement the work of the JST.

## **Some directions for working arrangements ...**

1. Advice reflects the mix of expertise in the Group
2. MAG consensus not always necessary: provide a range of options when appropriate
3. MAG advice documents accessible to all Steering Committee members
4. Division of labour and potential for cluster groups among MAG members
5. A lead coordinator among our members?
6. Developing a communications strategy with the SC, the Co-Chairs, the JST.

**Some items for the second meeting of the MAC, Paris, September 28 & 29th**