



**Global
Partnership**
for Effective Development
Co-operation

Discussion paper on the GPEDC mandate and working arrangements

Global Partnership Steering Committee meeting
29 February – 1 March 2015, Lilongwe, Malawi

This document is designed to help guide the discussion on the mandate and working arrangements of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. It identifies strategic issues and explores how the GPEDC can help realize the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the SDGs, and commitments encapsulated in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda related to international development cooperation, and will be updated as the work and agenda of the Global Partnership move forward.

This document is shared with Steering Committee members [for information and discussion.](#)

Contacts

Mr Thomas Boehler, tel: +1 33 45 24 87 75, email: thomas.boehler@oecd.org

Mr Derek Kilner, tel. +1 212 906 5742, email: derek.kilner@undp.org

Background

This paper aims to inform a structured and inclusive discussion around the future mandate and working arrangements of the GPEDC. The time horizon for this paper is fifteen years, through 2030, to coincide with the timeline of the global development agenda. The process suggested is to revise the mandate and working arrangements roughly every four years, following the High Level Political Forum at the level of Heads of State and Government under the auspices of the United Nations General Assembly. This approach will help shape a mandate that is immediately relevant, yet embracing the vision of the new agenda and flexible enough take into account changes in the policy environment and initial experiences with implementation, monitoring and review of the 2030 Agenda and its implications on international development co-operation.

Structure of the paper

Part I recalls the original mandate and working arrangements of the GPEDC. Part II sets the context by highlighting changes in the new global development landscape and lessons learned from existing working arrangements. Part III presents specific options on how the mandate of the GPEDC could be further developed and its future scope defined. Part IV anticipates how revisions in the mandate could have an impact on future GPEDC working arrangements. Part V will suggest how to further pursue a discussion led by SC members and consulting broader membership on possible changes to the mandate and working arrangements and how to carry the discussion forward to agree on a revised mandate at HLM-2.

Part I: Existing GPEDC mandate and working arrangements

The Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation called for the establishment of a “new, inclusive and representative Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation to support and ensure accountability for the implementation of commitments at political level” (para 36). It foresaw that the GPEDC offers “an open platform that embraces diversity, providing a forum for the exchange of knowledge and the regular review of progress” leading to the implementation of the Busan commitments and strengthened political momentum for more effective development co-operation.

The GPEDC took effect in June 2012 when the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF) endorsed its mandate, which kept with the Busan spirit to ensure openness and inclusiveness. The mandate identified four core objectives for the GPEDC:

- Maintain and strengthen political momentum for more effective development co-operation
- Ensure accountability for implementing Busan commitments
- Facilitate knowledge exchange and sharing of lessons learned
- Support implementation of Busan commitments at the country level

The Busan agreement expected that different stakeholders play a proactive role in defining their respective commitments and actions, recognizing their diversity and evolving nature. Regional organizations were seen as critical to co-ordinate efforts within each region.

The GPEDC mandate set in place the following working arrangements:

- Regular High-level Meetings, focusing on delivery on Busan commitments and topical and emerging issues relevant for effective development co-operation;
- The Steering Committee and its composition, supporting HLM preparations; providing strategic leadership and oversight to the GPEDC work programme; reflecting key messages in relevant discussions; and guiding the work of the Secretariat;
- Three Co-chairs, representing the GPEDC externally, guiding its work, and responsible for delivering its overall objectives.

Part II: **Current context and lessons learned**

Governments have agreed on a new global development agenda, its financing framework and a new climate change deal. The 2030 Agenda instills a sense of urgency to mobilize all relevant resources and partners for development and recognizes the importance of development co-operation to help mobilize and catalyze financing, capacity, technology and knowledge to achieve the SDGs (see paper on GPEDC contribution to 2030 Agenda for more on new opportunities).

An even broader group of development actors will need to play an active role. The ministries, agencies, development finance institutions, civil society organizations, parliamentarians, foundations and international organizations that have been tasked to provide, use and monitor development co-operation in the past will remain vital, but may change their focus, approach and engagement. They will work more closely together with other line ministries and their partners, the private sector and local and regional governments who will have a much greater role to play in helping to achieve the SDGs, including through development co-operation.

The new environment also implies a need for greater coordination and coherence among these actors and better tracking of the full range of development co-operation resources and their use. The demand for more systematic sharing of information and best practice about what works, particularly given the engagement of different partners and the use of different resources, can be anticipated.

Within this policy context, the GPEDC has a clear role and value in its focus on the behaviours and policies that, based on shared principles, produce more effective international development co-operation and, therefore, more sustainable development results:

- The GPEDC's inclusive and open character is an essential asset, allowing a stronger contribution from multiple actors than can be found in other fora, and providing the Partnership with significant convening power. The GPEDC can further strengthen its convening power by better demonstrating its relevance to a broader set of key development actors.

- The GPEDC's voluntary and flexible nature is also an important asset. In combination with its inclusive character, it allows for candid discussion on sensitive issues; this acts as an important complement and brings value to discussions at the UN.
- The GPEDC's focus on country-level action provides the opportunity to be a “do-shop” rather than a “talk-shop”. The Partnership can further strengthen its role in this area by more effectively showcasing existing country-level efforts.
- The GPEDC monitoring framework is well placed to add unique value to the 2030 Agenda, contributing evidence on the quality of development partnerships and promoting behavioural change. To ensure it is fit for purpose for the 2030 agenda, the monitoring framework is currently being reviewed by an independent “Monitoring Advisory Group” with the aim of strengthening it and making it more inclusive and relevant to the range of development actors and resources.

The references to the effectiveness of development co-operation in the 2030 Agenda and the AAAA and the draft report of the United Nations Secretary-General on follow-up and review of the implementation of the SDGs are also a key asset. They recognise the GPEDC as an important part of the global arrangements for follow-up and review of development co-operation, engaging the full range of development cooperation actors. This provides an opportunity to use the GPEDC as a vehicle to engage the full range of development co-operation actors on a voluntary basis to support implementation of the sustainable development agenda.

Together with their analytical reports, the High Level Political Forum and the Financing for Development Forum are at the centre of follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda and its financing framework. GPEDC activities should be aligned in a way that they make the most useful, practical contributions to those forums. This will have implications on GPEDC activity modalities, focus and timing (See *Contribution to the 2030 Agenda*).

At the same time, working arrangements for the GPEDC could function more effectively:

- There is a sense that the constituency model for the Steering Committee is not working as intended, with many stakeholders that are not on the Steering Committee feeling that they are not adequately involved in global discussions.
- While Co-Chairing arrangements were greatly valued in securing political momentum and engagement, non-governmental stakeholders are not directly represented; regular coordination between three Co-Chairs, an HLM host, and a joint secretariat poses practical challenges and transaction costs; and lack of more formal guidance on rotation of Co-Chairs can complicate transition, leading to some loss of institutional memory.
- Despite improvements, there remains a sense that evidence of progress, challenges, and activity at country level – intended to be the focus of the Global Partnership – have not been adequately captured or reflected in global discussions.

- There is also a sense that reconciling constituency aspects (recipient, provider, countries receiving and providing development cooperation etc.) with regional considerations adds further challenge to effectively engaging the full breadth of countries in the GPEDC’s work.

**Part III:
Rethinking the mandate**

The Busan outcome document and Final Communiqué of the first High-level Meeting anticipated many of the features of the 2030 Agenda, including the growing importance of a range of development actors and sources of development finance and the importance of country and political leadership over all development efforts. This suggests that ensuring the GPEDC fit for purpose for supporting this agenda may depend more on *how* the GPEDC’s mandate is translated into action rather than the mandate itself.

In going forward, the GPEDC should have a strong focus on strengthening the effectiveness and quality of all types of co-operation to achieve the SDGs, with an emphasis on actions with country-level impact.

While focus is important, the development effectiveness agenda is broad and the GPEDC must respond to that breadth and to varied interests. This can also include a more dedicated reflection on how a broader set of policy actions – including in provider countries – have implications for development impact.

The Partnership should work to clarify and concretize the engagement of an even broader group of actors by better capturing and developing different approaches to shared effectiveness principles. It should align working arrangements accordingly.

The core functions of the mandate remain relevant with explicit links to the 2030 Agenda. They could be streamlined into three reinforcing functions:¹ – supporting political momentum, supporting country-level implementation, and monitoring and review, all supported by dialogue and knowledge-exchange.

| Current Mandate | Future Mandate |
|--|--|
| Maintain and strengthen political momentum for more effective development co-operation | <u>Maintain and strengthen political momentum</u> for more effective development co-operation to achieve the SDGs |
| Ensure accountability for implementing Busan commitments | <u>Monitor and review progress</u> on implementing effective development co-operation principles to support accountability |
| Facilitate knowledge exchange and sharing of lessons learned | Support <u>country-level implementation</u> of effective development co-operation, including through sharing of knowledge, |

¹ The same proposal is made in the paper on GPEDC contribution to the 2030 Agenda.

| | |
|--|--|
| | learning and action for strengthened development results |
| Support implementation of Busan commitments at the country level | |

This mandate would reflect the ambition of the current GPEDC leadership, Steering Committee and JST to deliver on the intention of Busan to strengthen the effectiveness of all types of development co-operation. It would build on the AAAA reference and be directly relevant to a broad range of aspects of the 15-year global agenda and its financing framework, relating more clearly to the fuller set of means of implementation than the term “development effectiveness” did (see *paper on GPEDC contribution to 2030 Agenda for more on new opportunities*).

The GPEDC is expected to contribute more explicitly to policy dialogue, review and implementation efforts for effective development co-operation that supports the 2030 Agenda. With this, it would complement the work of the Development Cooperation Forum (DCF) in specific ways. With a strong focus on country-level action, the GPEDC would be expected to look at ways to operationalise in practice policy discussions taking place at the DCF; and provide evidence and lessons to inform discussions at the DCF. The GPEDC would also feed into other follow-up and review efforts at the United Nations (see *paper on GPEDC contribution to 2030 Agenda for more on new opportunities*).

All three dimensions of the mandate, in particular country implementation efforts, would largely depend on capacity building efforts and effective knowledge exchange, learning and innovative action among and between development actors on concrete approaches to making cooperation more effective. The GPEDC would continue to strengthen its role as a knowledge hub that engages High-level officials, builds on evidence from monitoring and policy dialogue, and exists with the main purpose to support country level implementation.

To pursue a focus on effectiveness of all types and modalities of development co-operation, GPEDC leadership would need to further emphasize the voluntary nature and openness of the Partnership as well as the flexibility of the type of issues and aspects of effectiveness different stakeholders would like to emphasize, taking into account themes addressed in other fora, like the FfD forum and the HLPF. It should be avoided to straight-jacket stakeholders into a pre-determined model of effectiveness. To signal independence and openness to different principles of effectiveness, GPEDC leadership should also engage stakeholders to further articulate their priorities within the scope of the GPEDC mandate. Especially actors less involved would have to be encouraged, at an early stage, to engage substantively in an exchange on how they want to contribute to the discussion on the effectiveness of their development co-operation. Thinking about how to structure dialogue with all actors will be important.

Part IV:
Seeing through change: adapting working arrangements

This broader mandate would have the following implications, to be further discussed. It is important to note that changes in one area may have implications for consideration of changes in another area. At the same time, it must be recognized that the GPEDC's flexibility is also an asset, supporting inclusivity and a complementarity to formal UN processes. Some measures may also come with expanded resource requirements. Any steps to add greater formality should be reviewed through this lens.

The following presents some options for consideration by the Steering Committee:

Co-chairing arrangements

Given the need to reflect the diversity of the Partnership, the addition of a fourth "non-government" Co-Chair could be considered. At the same time, given operational challenges in coordinating among three Co-Chairs (effectively four in the lead-up to the HLM), there may also be a need to revisit the number of co-chairs and the support by a slim, fully-funded Joint Support Team. The chair(s) could be guided by instructions in the form of Terms of References and hand-over notes from outgoing chairs. Decisions on successor and handover arrangements should be taken very early on to ensure smooth transition. This should also include considerations for the next HLM host.

Consider streamlining Co-Chairing arrangements, which might include:

- Review the number of (Co-)Chairs
- The cycle for (co-)Chair(s) would need to be adjusted to the meeting calendar, ranging from one GPEDC HLM to the next, thus e.g. from Dec 2016 to mid/end 2019, and beyond.

Steering Committee arrangements

For the Steering Committee model to function more effectively in future, it would require:

- Reconsidering the composition of the membership and definition of constituencies based on an assessment of SC member contributions, while maintaining a manageable size (e.g. 25);
- Instilling a stronger sense of ownership and accountability among Steering Committee members;
- A greater role for regional coordinating mechanisms.
- Expanding opportunities for the broader GPEDC stakeholders; and
- Expanding mechanisms for regularly capturing and sharing information from the wider community;

Strengthen the ownership and leadership of Steering Committee members, as well as other stakeholders, over the GPEDC's agenda, might include to:

- Introduce TORs with clear tasks and specific requirements for all SC members, particularly for the "ambassador" function;
- Clarify membership of constituencies;
- Clarify timeline and procedure for nominations for each two-year cycle, possibly to be agreed in the margins of High-level Meetings;

- Ensure major GPIs are “represented” by an SC member;
- Develop a two-year work plan for the Steering Committee;
- Consider financial commitments for some members; and
- Consider SC member-led work / dialogues to advance particular priorities related to different constituencies/country contexts.

Expand opportunities for consultation with stakeholders and regularly capturing evidence

- Have each Steering Committee member establish agreed procedure to consult constituency;
- Introduce more regularly reporting by Steering Committee members on outreach within constituency;
- Hold annual meeting of GPIs to share progress
- Establish regular calendar of regional / constituency workshops; and
- Introduce mechanism for regular reporting of progress beyond monitoring report

Expand role for regional coordination

- Strengthen the regional aspect in re-organising governmental SC membership
- “Formalize” regional support mechanisms for SC members
- Strengthen regional platforms for development effectiveness, particularly in LAC, Middle East, and Eastern Europe/Central Asia.

Events and activities

The GPEDC may consider adjustments to its schedule of activities to facilitate contribution to the global review mechanisms for the 2030 Agenda – particularly the HLPF and FFD Forum, which will review means of implementation every year, and meet every four years at level of Heads of State and Government beginning in 2019. Thematic reviews of SDG 17 under HLPF in and FFD Forums are foreseen for every year.

It may be considered to adjust the GPEDC meeting schedule to allow discussions in greater depth on particular areas of focus and holding the HLM at strategically important moments.

Strengthen alignment of events and activities to inform UN processes:

- Consider holding the HLM on a regular basis every four years, e.g. six months before the HLPF, beginning in 2019.²
- Hold a smaller annual global meeting in Q4 or Q1 of each year to support inputs to the annual FFD Follow-up Forum and thematic and global HLPF reviews; possibly building on the annual Global Partnership Forum hosted by the Republic of Korea.
- Facilitate in-depth dialogue between selected GPEDC stakeholders at targeted meetings (e.g. providers and recipients discussing action; SSC and their recipients

- taking forward the issue of areas of focus for improvements; business and developing country governments; foundations and developing country governments; etc.).
- Prepare substantive inputs to the HLPF and FFD review processes (for further information see *Contribution to the 2030 Agenda*)

Part V:

Next steps to agree on an updated mandate and working arrangements

Steering Committee members are invited to consult with their constituencies ahead of the Steering Committee Meeting in Malawi on 29 February (session 4) and provide initial guidance in the run up to, and during the Meeting.

Drawing on this guidance, a proposal for a draft revised mandate and suggestions for improved working arrangements would be developed by April 2016 for consultation as part of the broader consultations organized for the HLM2 Outcome Document.

Such a proposed mandate section of the HLM-2 outcome document (2-3 paragraphs) would be considered for endorsement at the July 2016 Steering Committee meeting in New York. To produce this proposal, the Steering Committee might wish to task the Co-Chairs, Kenya as the host of HLM-2 and the JST and seek inputs from the Steering Committee on a first draft in writing in March 2016.