

## GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION

**First Meeting of the Steering Committee  
London, 5-6 December 2012**

### Summary

Contacts:

Mr. Derek Kilner ([derek.kilner@undp.org](mailto:derek.kilner@undp.org))

Ms. Hanna-Mari Kilpeläinen ([hanna-mari.kilpelainen@oecd.org](mailto:hanna-mari.kilpelainen@oecd.org))

## **GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION**

### **FIRST MEETING OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE LONDON, 5-6 DECEMBER 2012**

#### **SUMMARY**

**5 December**

#### **Introductory remarks**

1. Ministers Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala (Nigeria), Armida Alisjahbana (Indonesia) and Justine Greening (United Kingdom) welcomed participants to the first meeting of the Global Partnership Steering Committee. In doing so, they expressed their gratitude to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) for providing a venue for the meeting.

2. In her introductory remarks, Ms. Okonjo-Iweala pointed to the global backdrop of economic uncertainty and fragile recovery against which the Global Partnership came into being, noting that as assistance to developing countries remains uncertain, there is a need to work together and look at how resource mobilisation efforts can be shaped to enable developing countries to do better for themselves. She went on to set out her vision for a Global Partnership that delivers something different for both developed and developing countries, signaling her ambition that the work of the Global Partnership might contribute to international efforts on a post-2015 development agenda, and within it, a potential successor to MDG8. Ms. Okonjo-Iweala expressed her interest in exploring linkages with, for example, work on asset recovery and tax evasion, as well as knowledge-sharing on aspects of domestic resource mobilisation and statistics.

3. Ms. Alisjahbana introduced the complex and dynamic global development landscape, pointing to shifting roles among stakeholders and the increased participation of actors such as the private sector in discussions on development. She suggested that the Global Partnership offers a platform within which to set out a vision for effective co-operation, expressing her hope that it could inform the post-2015 development agenda through the work of the UN High Level Panel. Ms. Alisjahbana emphasised the importance of linkages with other forums and processes, including the UN Development Co-operation Forum (DCF), indicating her desire to see the Global Partnership facilitate the involvement of a wider group of stakeholders in co-operation processes and in turn leverage a broader set of resources for development. Ms. Alisjahbana emphasised the importance of inclusive approaches in the work of the Global Partnership, identifying knowledge sharing as one set of functions that could support this.

4. In welcoming participants to London, Ms. Greening noted that the Global Partnership offers an opportunity to change development co-operation. She pointed to the need for both ambition and prioritisation in the work of the Steering Committee. From a “donor” perspective, Ms. Greening reminded participants that development co-operation involves the use of taxpayers’ resources, and that governments have a duty to ensure that “spending” on development is in fact an “investment” in development. Ms. Greening invited participants to consider how a few key

development themes might be grouped together so as to provide a focus for the early phases of the Global Partnership's work. Examples cited included collaboration to address tax evasion; situations of conflict and fragility; and middle income countries. Better statistics and improved transparency were cited as critical elements going forward, with Ms. Greening also placing an emphasis on the need to avoid duplication of international efforts.

**Agenda Item 1: Vision and substantive priorities for the Global Partnership: an initial discussion** (*chaired by Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, Nigeria*)

5. The Chair invited the reactions and ideas of Steering Committee members in response to the introductory remarks made, and the framing paper for this session (Document 1). The summary that follows clusters the main points by theme.

6. Several participants offered views on the purpose and functioning of the Global Partnership, highlighting its potential as a "partnership of partnerships" (US); the need for evidence-based, country-based and innovative approaches (BetterAid, UNDP); and the desire to create a "comfortable" space for dialogue among all actors, including emerging economies (Korea, OECD/DAC).

7. The discussion emphasised the need to move beyond an "aid"/ODA-centric discussion and a North-South dichotomy to explore development financing, policy and co-operation issues in a more holistic manner (EU, Peru, BetterAid), finding ways of both building on the new agenda set out in Busan and promoting the implementation of aid effectiveness commitments made in Paris and Accra. Participants took note of relevant efforts to generate evidence at the country level (Timor-Leste) and the desire that such evidence should be brought to a global stage in a systematic way to inform regular dialogue (OECD/DAC).

8. The role of civil society in development and development co-operation was highlighted, as were the particular challenges presented by limitations to the space within which CSOs operate (OECD/DAC, US). Respect for human rights was highlighted as a priority (BetterAid), as were efforts to address the challenges faced by marginalised groups and populations (US).

9. Several members emphasised the importance of the private sector dimension which is new to the work of the Global Partnership, with the private sector representative drawing attention to progress made to date in the context of the Joint Statement on Expanding and Enhancing Public and Private Co-operation endorsed in Busan (CIPE). Others expressed an interest in looking specifically at how private resources might be better leveraged to support development (OECD/DAC, US).

10. Commitments focused on "aid effectiveness" were identified as an important element of the Global Partnership's work (US), as was the potential for the Global Partnership to offer a platform for addressing "aid architecture" issues and the challenges presented by the fragmentation and proliferation of international development co-operation efforts (OECD/DAC).

11. The status and role of middle income countries in international development co-operation efforts was flagged, as were the specific challenges faced by these countries and their potential to contribute to development and poverty reduction both at home and in all countries (Peru). The importance of common goals and differential commitments was also reaffirmed (Korea).

12. Support was expressed for the knowledge-sharing aspects of the partnership (Korea), while the need for greater clarity on the substantive focus of such knowledge-sharing efforts was also highlighted (World Bank).

13. Participants flagged both opportunities and potential challenges relating to the positioning of the Global Partnership relative to other international efforts. Some stakeholders emphasised the need to capitalise on the comparative advantage of the Global Partnership in terms of, for example, its global reach and multi-stakeholder nature (US, World Bank). At the same time, a degree of prioritisation will be important, if duplication with the work of other international fora is to be avoided and synergies are to be promoted (UNDP). Several participants concurred with the desire expressed by the Co-Chairs to ensure linkages with – and a meaningful contribution to – a global partnership for the post-2015 development agenda.

14. In summing up the discussion, the Chair took note of the range of themes and interest identified by participants, as well as the need for continued reflection on issues of international process and collaboration. The Chair suggested that some of the key issues identified over the course of this discussion be clustered together into a limited number of work strands that would feed the first ministerial meeting. (*Note: this discussion was continued under Session 4 – see paragraphs 43-50 below*).

**Agenda Item 2: Towards a first ministerial-level meeting: roadmap, partnerships and synergies** (*chaired by Justine Greening, UK*)

15. The Chair introduced the key upcoming events for which a date and venue would need to be decided: i) a second meeting of the Steering Committee; ii) a third meeting of the Steering Committee; and iii) the first ministerial-level meeting. The Chair also raised the need to clarify how the work of the Global Partnership can best feed into the chronology of related processes and requested a concept note mapping the relationship of the Global Partnership to other forums and processes.

16. The Chair proposed holding the second meeting of the Steering Committee in March in Bali, Indonesia, back-to-back with the meeting of the High Level Panel on the Post-2015 Development Agenda. Ms. Alisjahbana, Ms. Okonjo-Iweala, and several members (EU, Korea, US) also expressed support for this option. Ms. Okonjo-Iweala noted that the priority strands of work for the Global Partnership would need to be articulated in advance of the second Steering Committee, as it will be a last chance to feed these into the work of the High Level Panel, which will complete its report in May 2013.

17. The Chair proposed holding the third meeting of the Steering Committee during the second half of June or the first half of July. Several members expressed interest in holding it in a developing country – and particularly in Africa (Ms. Okonjo-Iweala, EU, Korea, US). While the African Union annual meeting in May was viewed as too early in the year, there was interest in holding the meeting in Addis Ababa – in connection with the African Union, or back-to-back with the June symposium of the UN DCF - or in Abuja, Nigeria. UNDP also raised the possibility of having a smaller event during the meeting of the UN Economic and Social Council in Geneva in July.

18. In presenting the options for the ministerial-level meeting, the Chair noted that it could be organised back-to-back with the UN General Assembly High Level Meeting on the MDGs in New York in September, or back-to-back with the annual meetings of the World Bank and IMF in Washington in October. The chair noted that holding the meeting in September would better

maintain momentum; while a meeting in October would allow more time to reflect the conclusions of the High Level Meeting in the Global Partnership's discussions.

19. Ms. Okonjo-Iweala expressed a preference for an October meeting, noting that the ministerial-level meeting could lose visibility if held alongside the UNGA, which already features a number of high-profile events, and which could also present logistical challenges for ministers to attend. She further noted that the World Bank / IMF could potentially be invited to support an October meeting. The World Bank confirmed that it would be willing to help if this option was chosen. The US pointed to the need for a balance between the Global Partnership's desire to engage with the High Level Panel, and the need to explore a wider array of opportunities for engagement. Members also took note of the range of views of UN Member States vis-à-vis the Global Partnership. Ms. Okonjo-Iweala also raised the possibility of holding the ministerial-level meeting in October, in a location relatively close to Washington (to facilitate travel) but in another country, possibly in Latin America.

20. Some members also expressed support for holding the ministerial-level meeting in September, during the UNGA (Korea); or back-to-back with the DCF Symposium in Switzerland in October (BetterAid). While several members raised the logistical benefits of scheduling a meeting alongside an event where several ministers will already attend, there was some interest in holding the meeting in a developing country (UNDP), or an emerging economy (EU), to emphasise broad participation in the Global Partnership; and in holding the meeting in a standalone location to avoid having the meeting compete for visibility with another major event.

21. Members expressed interest in aligning the substantive discussions of the ministerial-level meeting with the priority strands of work identified in Agenda Item 1; and of showcasing progress on building blocks (Korea). Korea suggested that in terms of format, there could be a combination of plenary and breakout sessions; that the meeting could last one and a half days; and that the outcome could be a brief communiqué.

22. Several members underscored that the timeline to the ministerial-level meeting will be very tight, and highlighted the importance of working quickly to ensure adequate inputs for the meeting, and to ensure that stakeholders are adequately informed. Some members also raised the importance of prioritising refining the substantive focus of the ministerial-level meeting over discussions of timing (CIPE, EU, US).

23. The Chair summarised by proposing that the second meeting of the Steering Committee be held in March in Bali; that the second Steering Committee meeting be held in the second half of June or the first half of July in an African country; and that it would be desirable to hold a ministerial-level meeting in October, either back-to-back with the World Bank/IMF meetings or in a non-OECD/DAC country, possibly in Latin America.

24. By the end of the year, Steering Committee members will share their plans to engage with different constituencies. Concept notes should be circulated on the priority work streams (see Sessions 1 and 4), with individual volunteers preparing initial drafts for discussion.

25. An overview of inputs for the ministerial-level meeting, with an extended timeline; and a concept note mapping the relationship of the Global Partnership to other relevant international and multi-stakeholder fora and processes will also be prepared and circulated.

**Agenda Item 3: Progress and challenges in the implementation of Busan commitments, including Knowledge Sharing Platform (chaired by Armida Alisjahbana, Indonesia)**

**a) Members' reporting on relevant efforts and initiatives**

26. The Chair opened the session by highlighting the varying nature of commitments between different stakeholders party to the Busan agreement and drawing members' attention to two essential questions: i) how far have we progressed since Busan; and ii) how do we move forward, including by promoting knowledge sharing and multi-stakeholder initiatives?

27. Members showcased several examples of country level progress in implementing the commitments made in Busan one year ago. Representing the g7+ group of fragile and conflict affected states, Timor Leste provided an update on ongoing implementation of the New Deal in pilot countries, emphasising that several countries (including Timor Leste, South-Sudan, Liberia, Central African Republic and Haiti) have secured support from the highest political leadership for driving implementation forward. The work on peacebuilding and statebuilding goals (PSGs) is ongoing, with a view to informing the post-2015 agenda. The International Dialogue will meet in Juba mid-December to discuss New Deal implementation and Timor Leste will organise a regional consultation in Asia-Pacific in February 2013.

28. Korea informed participants on its government-wide taskforce for Busan implementation and ongoing process for elaborating a national plan on Busan implementation, and showcased initiatives by Vietnam in integrating Busan implementation into national strategies. Korea drew attention to the urgent commitments made in Busan with deadlines ranging from 2012 to 2015, and called for progress reports on these issues.

29. Samoa updated participants on the Pacific Islands Forum Compact. Building on peer reviews, regional monitoring and aid effectiveness workshops, the Compact has supported 18 countries in the region in their move from aid-centred approaches to effectively managing all resources available for development. The Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat together with UNDP country offices are planning targeted initiatives to strengthen capacities and country systems. To support monitoring progress, regional data sets are being established, drawing on the global Busan indicators. Samoa highlighted the importance of finalising the global indicators to support this regional work.

30. Bangladesh showcased its joint co-operation strategy as a key co-ordination mechanism including concrete actions and timelines. The revised action plan for 2013-14 aims at providing a common platform for all development actors, including civil society. Consultative dialogue on how to best implement Busan commitments is taking place at sectoral level. Bangladesh is in the process of establishing an aid information management system as well as a national aid policy to strengthen the effectiveness of aid management, and is envisioning a regional meeting on implementing Busan commitments.

31. Guatemala informed the meeting of its consultations with Latin American countries, and highlighted El Salvador's recent aid effectiveness strategy, which was agreed with all development partners, as an example of translating Busan commitments into country level action.

32. In addition to progress at the level of individual countries, the meeting showcased examples of collective efforts to implement Busan commitments. The OECD/DAC informed

members that the DAC has developed – in consultation with other stakeholders – a set of guidelines to limit the proliferation of multilateral channels, and stands ready to work with the Global Partnership to assess whether these could be utilised more broadly to ensure collective progress on this important commitment. The framework for a common transparency standard was adopted in June 2012, joining together the creditor reporting system and forward spending surveys of the OECD/DAC as well as the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI). The OECD/DAC informed participants that the OECD is exploring possibilities for hosting IATI, and emphasised that efforts around transparency now require translating the common standard into something practically useful to partner countries. While progress has been made on some urgent time-bound commitments, the OECD/DAC noted that others such as predictability and untying involve challenges of a political nature. The OECD/DAC highlighted the potential of the Global Partnership to drive progress at the political level around these challenging commitments and called for continued peer pressure from stakeholders in the Global Partnership to drive reform efforts of providers of development co-operation.

33. BetterAid updated participants on the transition process of civil society actors to organise around a new platform, stating that the CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness would be launched in Nairobi the following week. In supporting implementation of Busan commitments, BetterAid emphasised the need for clear lines of accountability, both globally and at country level, stressing the importance of human rights, democratic ownership and accountability, and encouraging the development of an ambitious transparency indicator. Related to arranging the next Steering Committee meeting in Bali, BetterAid flagged that the CSO task force on enabling environment would meet in Bali in March, and that this could provide for further back-to-back synergies.

34. The European Union echoed the remarks by the OECD/DAC in stating that providers of co-operation were making progress despite the budgetary pressures and political challenges related to some of the Busan commitments, including for example progress in aid transparency. The EU announced substantial progress on EU joint programming, which aims to reduce fragmentation and transaction costs and is now taking place in eight countries, with a second wave of pilot countries envisioned shortly. Key elements of the joint programming exercise include synchronisation with national development strategies and aligning the response to these strategies. The EU is opening up the initiative to other actors, and discussions have already taken place with the US on joining the process.

35. There was broad agreement on the importance of continued country level efforts to drive implementation and of identifying and sharing successful initiatives to support further progress. Several participants highlighted the need for further feedback on concrete implementation initiatives to inform the preparations of the ministerial-level meeting, and invited updates on progress from the Busan building blocks (Korea, Timor Leste, US). The US emphasised that different stakeholders are active around different themes and building blocks, and that all actors should strive to feed inputs on progress from those areas into the work of the Global Partnership. The US also called for focus on areas where the global monitoring indicators remain to be finalised.

36. In order to drive progress for implementing Busan commitments, there was consensus on the importance of outreach to stakeholders both within and beyond the Global Partnership. It was recognised that some stakeholders may perceive the Global Partnership as a process driven by provider countries, and that special efforts are needed to reach out to these partners to share information on and find common interests and synergies around the Global Partnership. It was noted that in addition to the Co-Chairs' outreach efforts and to ensuring consultations and

outreach as a committee, all members are well placed as individuals to seize outreach opportunities in bilateral or regional meetings.

37. Before closing the discussion, the Chair invited remarks from the other two Co-Chairs. Ms. Greening emphasised transparency and results as focus areas for the UK's implementation efforts and highlighted the importance of learning from peer reviews to accelerate progress. Ms. Okonjo-Iweala welcomed the richness of initiatives and efforts taking place, and called for Steering Committee members' support in reaching out to broader stakeholders to mobilise partnerships around the Busan agenda. In concluding the session, the Chair echoed the appeal for members to advise the Co-Chairs on how best to engage with and deliver key messages on progress and lessons to broader partners, including private sector actors, emerging economies and non-executive stakeholders.

## 6 December

**Agenda Item 3: Progress and challenges in the implementation of Busan commitments, including Knowledge Sharing Platform** [continued from Day 1] *(chaired by Wismana Adi Suryabrata, Indonesia)*

38. To facilitate discussions around knowledge-sharing, Indonesia presented a background paper on knowledge sharing platforms, highlighting the potential of such platforms for enhancing peer learning, engaging stakeholders beyond traditional providers of co-operation and serving as a vehicle to implement the global development agenda. Drawing links to the meeting document on the communications strategy, Indonesia proposed to establish a Global Partnership web platform for knowledge sharing, and invited Committee members to identify common interests for South-South and triangular co-operation.

39. Indonesia's proposal on a knowledge-sharing platform received support (Peru, Korea). Members also posed several questions for clarification, including how to link knowledge-sharing objectives more realistically with the mandate of the Global Partnership and avoid duplication with existing platforms (World Bank); which specific areas of work would knowledge-sharing focus on, bearing in mind the need to focus on under-delivered areas (UNDP); who would produce and disseminate knowledge so as to ensure ownership and inclusiveness (BetterAid); and how the Indonesian experience would relate to knowledge sharing more broadly in the context of the Global Partnership (EU).

40. Indonesia clarified that knowledge sharing, as a complementary mechanism for stronger development cooperation, provides a vehicle for implementing Busan commitments. The Global Partnership should disseminate best practices on different ways of sharing knowledge as a means of engaging with a wider set of stakeholders around development cooperation issues. It was agreed that Indonesia would provide more detailed elaborations on the way forward in a concept note. Overall, there was broad support for building on existing knowledge sharing platforms, coupled with the suggestion to link different country level platforms to the Global Partnership knowledge sharing website (Korea, World Bank). UNDP drew attention to the fact that reaching out to stakeholders and networks and providing consolidated knowledge on Busan implementation will require adequate resources and funding.

### ***b) Update on the development of a global monitoring framework***

41. The UNDP/OECD support team (Brenda Killen) offered a brief presentation on the state of advancement in the operationalisation of the global indicators and targets for monitoring the



implementation of Busan commitments. She explained that work is ongoing to develop and refine measurement methodologies in consultation with developing countries, particularly for those indicators that are new, and that do not build on pre-existing approaches to measuring progress. Operational guidance for developing country stakeholders engaging in the global monitoring process is being drafted by the joint support team, and will be discussed with developing country stakeholders as part of the consultation process prior to finalisation in the first quarter of 2013. This would potentially allow for some data – albeit partial in coverage – to be made available and compiled in time to inform the first ministerial-level meeting of the Global Partnership.

42. Participants welcomed the presentation by the joint support team, noting that distributed as a template for use by Steering Committee members in their own outreach efforts. In the discussion that followed, members noted the willingness of private sector stakeholders to contribute to the development of the indicator on the private sector (CIPE); the need for further consultation among constituencies to offer guidance on the more political and strategic issues relating to the transparency indicator (UK, EU); the need for continued broad consultation on the operationalisation of the indicators (BetterAid), and the particular importance attached by the parliamentary community to the need for indicator 6 to focus on resources that are “subject to parliamentary scrutiny” (IPU). Participants expressed their support for work planned by the joint support team to establish a light helpdesk facility to support stakeholders involved in monitoring efforts at the country level.

**Agenda Item 4: Planning for a ministerial-level meeting** (*chaired by Richard Calvert, UK*)

43. The Chair (UK) introduced the session by recapping emerging areas of consensus from Agenda Items 1 and 2 (see summaries above), identifying the following priority strands of work for the Global Partnership leading to the ministerial-level meeting, and noting a need to focus on deliverables:

- i. What has changed on the ground since Busan, and what more needs to be done?
- ii. Domestic resource mobilisation
- iii. Leveraging private sector resources for development and strengthening the regulatory and investment environment
- iv. Knowledge-sharing

44. Additionally the Chair noted agreement to map out linkages and synergies with other relevant international and multi-stakeholder forums and processes.

45. *What has changed on the ground since Busan.* This work strand would involve identifying and sharing successful initiatives for driving progress in implementing Busan commitments, including supporting democratic ownership and accountability. It would also include bottom-up feedback on key challenges and areas requiring political focus and accelerated efforts, including in the context of the Busan building blocks.

46. Members suggested that this area could serve as an umbrella, including all Busan commitments and allowing for specific concerns emerging from global monitoring, building blocks, and other sources (EU, World Bank). Some members raised that, based on discussions from Day 1, there should be a separate strand of work built around inclusive development, including issues of civil society, gender, accountability, right to development, results focus, and

policy coherence (BetterAid, UNDP, US). The Chair noted that these aspects could be included as part of the work strand on what has changed on the ground since Busan.

47. *Domestic resource mobilisation.* This work stream would involve supporting countries in domestic resource mobilisation, including addressing tax evasion and the recovery of illegal assets. Members raised that it would be important to further clarify how the Global Partnership should contribute in this area, noting that sharing best practices alone is not sufficient (Korea), and that there is a need to focus on aspects that requires global-level political engagement, such as the link with aid flows (World Bank). Others suggested that this work strand should encompass all forms of financing for development, and that this could contribute to financing for development discussions in the post-2015 development agenda (EU).

48. *Private sector.* This work stream would focus on leveraging private sector resources for development and strengthening the regulatory and investment environment. Some members suggested that there is a need to focus on areas where the Global Partnership can add value, for example by finding innovative solutions to help leverage ODA to increase investment for development (World Bank). Other members stressed that a key message at Busan was the importance of supporting an institutional framework at country-level, including to address issues of informality (CIPE) and that the focus should go beyond the role of ODA (EU).

49. *Knowledge-sharing.* This work strand would involve identifying mechanisms for sharing knowledge as a way to engage new partners, drawing on existing partnerships and platforms, promoting inclusiveness, and recognising the differential roles and commitments of different stakeholders. Members raised the need to coordinate this work with that of the G20 Development Working Group (Korea), and that knowledge-sharing could be a tool for other work areas rather (World Bank). The Chair noted that there was a clear indication from the Co-Chairs that knowledge-sharing should be a substantive priority in its own right.

50. As overall comments, members raised that there is a need to clarify what the Global Partnership's value added will be (UNDP), and to ensure that the focus areas chosen require political action at the global level (World Bank). There was also a suggestion that "policy coherence" – in terms of coordinating the policies of all the different actors involved in the discussion in order to make development cooperation work effectively – could be a theme to tie the work strands together (EU, BetterAid).

51. Members also expressed an interest in providing a concrete plan for how the Global Partnership can relate to discussions on the post-2015 development agenda (BetterAid), and that the Global Partnership should be guided by the substantive vision that emerges from the post-2015 process (UNDP). Some members also emphasised the need to include the work of the building blocks in the ministerial-level discussion, including suggestions for an action plan (BetterAid), and for reviewing progress on the various building blocks over the course of the next two Steering Committee meetings (Korea).

52. In terms of outputs for the ministerial-level meeting, members expressed an interest in producing a communiqué that is as light as possible, so as to avoid spending too much time on the specifics of a text (EU). Members also requested a structured proposed agenda for what will be discussed at the ministerial-level meeting (UNDP).

53. In terms of next steps, the Chair proposed that drafts of concept papers be prepared by the end of 2012 on each of the substantive priorities, with a lead author on each: umbrella on Busan commitments (joint support team); domestic resource mobilisation (Nigeria); private sector

(CIPE); knowledge-sharing (Indonesia); and inclusive development (BetterAid and US). The joint support team will work with lead authors in each instance.

**Session 5. Working arrangements and steering committee membership** (*chaired by Chii Akporji, Nigeria*)

**a) Global Partnership communications and stakeholder engagement strategy**

54. The Chair framed the discussion by inviting the joint support team to present the background document on communications and outreach strategy. The support team highlighted the three objectives of the strategy, namely i) communicating to the public at large; ii) reaching out to all members of the Global Partnership; and iii) reaching out to new partners. The Chair invited members to focus discussions particularly on elaborating the independent web-presence and visual identity for the Partnership, agreeing how Steering Committee work should be communicated and on identifying how Steering Committee members will reach out to the broad membership of the Global Partnership.

55. The objectives of the communications strategy received broad support (US, Korea, EU, Bangladesh, UNDP, WB), as did the notion of developing both internal and external websites building on existing tools and platforms, including the UNDP 'Teamworks' tool. Members raised the importance of using regional platforms (Bangladesh) and proposed to add links to the building blocks (World Bank). As to the target audience of the strategy, Korea proposed to add G20 to the list, and shared its own experience of organising outreach events in the margins of G20 Development Working Group meetings as a potentially helpful example for the Co-Chairs to draw on in planning their outreach efforts.

56. Regarding the working arrangements of the Steering Committee, inclusiveness was emphasised as a key element of the Global Partnership. Recognising the multi-stakeholder nature of effective development cooperation as well as ensuring inclusive consultations and effective communications in the work of the Global Partnership arose as priorities for the Steering Committee. There was broad agreement on the need for transparent processes, with clear indications to all stakeholders on the timing and mechanisms for consultations, inputs, consolidated positions, decisions and feedback. There was no consensus on the proposal to webcast meetings of the Steering Committee or make full recordings available online, though this had been usual practice for PBIG. It was also noted that political engagement to reach out to new partners will necessitate separate efforts, including through high-level diplomacy. On the question of document translation, there was agreement that careful consideration should be given to cost constraints, with support for translation by Global Partnership members appreciated. A pragmatic approach would be adopted with English, French and Spanish translations of detailed documents, also ensuring that a wider set of languages are catered for in key ministerial documents so as to offer a reasonable degree of accessibility to all audiences, as per pre-Busan practice.

**b) Steering Committee participation and representation**

57. The Chair drew members' attention to requests received for seats on the Steering Committee and invited feedback from members.

58. The OECD/DAC reminded participants that in addition to a manageable committee size, representativeness had also featured as a key element in the deliberations of the Post-Busan Interim Group and that the Co-Chairs of the Global Partnership were not expected to represent

their constituencies alone, but the broad membership of the partnership. The OECD/DAC voiced support for the request of the African Union and of Trade Unions, also adding that observer status could provide a way to initially engage emerging economies and Arab donors in the work of the Committee. The OECD/DAC also raised the importance of ensuring continuity in the work of the Committee, and of looking at sustainable modes of rotation in this regard. Peru expressed support for the membership request of United Cities and Local Governments as well as for the idea of engaging emerging economies on observer status.

59. The EU acknowledged the legitimacy of all the requests, and was supportive of enabling engagement of emerging economies in Committee work, for example by considering the proposed observer status, and encouraged the Committee to consider ways of ensuring inputs and contributions from all members, including those beyond the Committee membership.

60. Several members emphasised that given the urgency of preparing the ministerial-level meeting, there may be advantages to focusing on substantive work using the existing committee composition (US, Korea, UNDP, UK, Guatemala, IPU). Additional arguments in favor of maintaining the status quo included that the PBIG had already done its best to strike a balance between effectiveness and representativeness (US), that Committee membership should most appropriately be addressed at the ministerial level in connection to succession and rotation arrangements (Korea, UNDP), and that with only two Committee meetings left before the ministerial meeting, practical contributions and engagement of stakeholders in between Steering Committee meetings would be crucial for substantive work and may not require formal participation in the Committee meetings (UK).

61. The African Union Commission (on behalf of Chad) provided some background information related to the AU membership request, informing participants that the AU request was agreed at the 19<sup>th</sup> AU Summit and that the AU Commission and NEPAD are working jointly to support post-Busan implementation and to consolidate and co-ordinate African views.

62. Overall, members underlined that inclusiveness was about much more than Committee membership. The World Bank called on all Steering Committee members to work in a way that fosters frank, open and inclusive discussions, two-way communication with constituencies as well as effective consultations and communications from the Committee as a whole. Members also proposed that Steering Committee members consider dedicating particular efforts to engaging with certain stakeholder groups (UNDP, Guatemala). BetterAid called for concrete mechanisms for enabling inputs and contributions to the work and decisions of the Committee.

63. In drawing agenda item 5 to a close, the Chair concluded that the communications strategy – including the three objectives - had been endorsed and that the joint support team would take forward the visual branding, bearing in mind the need for the website to reflect the inclusive and consultative nature of the Global Partnership. Information will be provided on the costing of the communication-related activities and the interest of the US to provide funding was welcomed. Existing tools, including UNDP Teamworks and regional platforms, will be maximised. All Steering Committee members will be expected to exercise active outreach to key constituencies. Regarding Steering Committee membership, the Chair acknowledged the requests received and concluded that inclusiveness will be a key element in the work of the Steering Committee. The question of Steering Committee membership should be revisited at the ministerial level, in conjunction with any discussion on succession/rotation arrangements and also as part of any review of the Global Partnership mandate in the future.

## Annex A. List of participants

Co-Chairs	
	<p>Armida Salsiah ALISJAHBANA Minister of National Development Planning, Indonesia</p> <p>Justine GREENING Secretary of State for International Development, DFID, United Kingdom</p> <p>Ngozi OKONJO-IWEALA Minister of Finance, Federal Ministry of Finance, Nigeria</p>
Delegates representing Co-Chairs on Day 2 (plus support staff)	
<p>Co-chair representing Ms Alisjahbana (Day 2)</p>	<p>Mr. Wismana Adi SURYABRATA Deputy Minister for Development Funding Affairs</p> <p>Ms. Teni WIDURIYANTI Deputy Director, National Development Planning Agency of the Republic of Indonesia</p> <p>Mr. Kurniawan (Iwan) ARIADI Deputy Director/Administrative Assistance to the Minister</p> <p>Ms. Masriati PRATAMA Minister Counsellor for Economic Affairs, Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia</p> <p>Mr. Teuku Mohammad Hamzah THAYEB Ambassador to UK, Indonesian Embassy</p> <p>Ms. Silvia MALAU Third Secretary for Economic Affairs, Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia</p>
<p>Co-chair representing Ms Greening (Day 2)</p>	<p>Mr. Richard CALVERT Director General, Finance and Corporate Performance Division Department for International Development</p> <p>Mr. Roger HEATH Assistant Private Secretary to the Secretary of State of International Development Department for International Development</p> <p>Ms. Hannah RYDER Team Leader, Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation Department for International Development</p>
<p>Co-Chair representing Ms Okonjo-Iweala (Day 2)</p>	<p>Ms. Chii AKPORJI Special Adviser to the CME (Co-ordinating Minister for the Economy) and Hon Minister of Finance</p>
Participants	
<p>Bangladesh</p>	<p>Mrs. Nurjahan BEGUM Joint Secretary, Coordination and Nordic Wing, Economic Relations Division Ministry of Finance</p> <p>Mohammed EQTIDAR ALAM Assistant Secretary, ERD, Ministry of Finance</p>
<p>Chad</p>	<p>Mr. Amadou Cissé Senior Economist, Department of Economic Affairs, African Union Commission</p>

CSO partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE)	<p>Ms. Mayra MORO-COCO Development Policy and Advocacy Manager, Policy and Advocacy Manager Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID)</p> <p>Mr. Antonio TUJAN JR. International Director IBON</p>
EU	<p>Mr. Gustavo MARTIN PRADA Director, EU Development Policy Directorate-General for Development and Cooperation, European Commission</p> <p>Mr. Timo WILKKI Administrator, Aid and development effectiveness and financing Directorate-General for Development and Cooperation, European Commission</p>
Guatemala	<p>Ana MENDEZ CHICAS Under Secretary of International of Cooperation Guatemala</p> <p>Mr. Raul BOLAÑOS Executive Director, Subsecretaria de Cooperación Internacional Secretaria de Planificación y Programación de la Presidencia de Guatemala</p>
IPU	<p>Dr. Jeff BALCH Director, Association of European Parliamentarians with Africa (AWEPA) Amsterdam, Netherlands</p>
Republic of Korea	<p>Ms. Enna PARK Director-General, Development Cooperation Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade</p> <p>Ms. Soonhee CHOI First Secretary, Development Policy Division, Development Cooperation Bureau Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Korea</p>
OECD/DAC	<p>Mr. Brian ATWOOD DAC Chair, DCD</p> <p>Mr. Erik SOLHEIM DAC Chair-elect</p>
Peru	<p>Mr. Luis OLIVERA Executive Director, Peruvian International Cooperation Agency (APCI).</p> <p>Ms. Ana Marina ALVARADO DIAZ Advisor to the Executive Direction of the APCI, Peru</p>
Center for International Private Enterprise	<p>M. John SULLIVAN Executive Director, Center for International Private Enterprise</p> <p>Mr. Jonathan GREENHILL Policy Manager, BIAC</p>
Samoa	<p>Ms. Noumea SIMI Assistant CEO, Aid Coordination Unit, Ministry of Finance</p>
Timor Leste	<p>Mr. Helder DA COSTA National Co-ordinator, g7+ Secretariat Aid Effectiveness Directorate, Ministry of Finance</p> <p>Miss Claire LEIGH Overseas Development Institute (ODI)</p>

UN Development Programme (UNDP)	Ms. Sigrid KAAG Assistant Secretary General and Assistant Administrator Bureau for External Relations and Advocacy
	Ms. Dasa SILOVIC Senior Policy Advisor, Bureau for External Relations and Advocacy
United States	Mr. Donald STEINBERG Deputy Administrator, Office of The Administrator US Agency for International Development
	Dr. Steven PIERCE US Representative to the DAC
World Bank	Ms. Sophie SIRTAINÉ Director, Corporate Reform and Strategy Operations Policy and Country Services
	Mr. Yoichiro ISHIHARA Senior Economist, Aid Effectiveness Unit

#### Secretariat

OECD	Mr. Jon Lomoy Director, Development Cooperation Directorate
	Ms. Brenda KILLEN Head of Division, Global Partnerships and Policies, Development Cooperation Directorate
	Mr. Robin OGILVY Policy Analyst, Global Partnerships and Policies, Development Cooperation Directorate
	Ms. Hanna-Mari KILPELAINEN Policy Analyst, Global Partnerships and Policies, Development Cooperation Directorate
	Miss Claire CONDON Assistant to the Division, Global Partnerships and Policies, Development Cooperation Directorate
UNDP	Ms. Bettina WOLL Aid Modalities Specialist - Capacity Development Group Bureau for Development Policy
	Mr. Derek KILNER Intergovernmental Affairs Officer, BERA Bureau of External Relations and Advocacy