

Workshop to facilitate the rolling out of the Global Partnership monitoring framework

**12-14 June 2013, Copenhagen, Denmark
Summary report**

Contacts:

Ms. Alexandra Le Moniet, email: alexandra.lemoniet@oecd.org

Ms. Yuko Suzuki, email: yuko.suzuki@undp.org

Quick reference:

- More information on the Global Partnership available at <http://www.effectivecooperation.org/>
- Community space: <https://one.unteamworks.org/GPEDC>
- Monitoring helpdesk: <https://one.unteamworks.org/node/344262>
- Materials presented at this workshop: <https://one.unteamworks.org/node/344258>

I. Introduction

The joint UNDP-OECD support team organised this workshop on 12-14 June to facilitate the rolling out of the Global Partnership monitoring framework. The workshop targeted developing country government officials, with the objective to ensure that governments have the information and guidance they need to lead the monitoring process in-country. In addition, the workshop offered an opportunity for developing countries to be updated on the Global Partnership agenda and to exchange views on priorities and interest relating to the work of Global Partnership.

The workshop was well attended, with 58 participants representing 32 developing countries, UNDP regional and country offices as well as civil society. A detailed list of participants can be found [here](#).

This report is structured as follows:

- Section II presents the main conclusions of the workshop;
- Section III provides an overview of the workshop sessions and main outcomes;
- Section IV sets out the follow-up action taken and next steps after the workshop; and
- Section V presents a brief overview of feedback received from workshop participants.

II. Main conclusions

Discussions highlighted that countries are implementing Busan. There is a wealth of country-led initiatives and efforts, both to operationalize the broader Busan agenda and to monitor progress.

The **inclusive development agenda is translating into practice** through country led policy frameworks and/or partnerships strategies, which help to structure dialogue also with south-south partners, private sector and CSOs. Many countries indicated that dialogue with CSOs and private sector was moving beyond consultation to true partnerships, with contributions and roles of these actors being better recognized and them playing an important role to spark dialogue for results and accountability at country level.

The **Busan principles are supporting the shift from aid to development effectiveness** by raising awareness and getting different actors involved, strengthening the focus on results and accountability, taking forward key institutional reform (e.g. PFM reforms) and streamlining development efforts and agendas in-country (e.g. integrating climate change finance in the broader development agenda).

While countries have different approaches to implementing Busan, they reiterated the **importance of a clear global framework** to serve as a reference for country efforts – “Scan globally, reinvent locally!” Countries highlighted that while the Global Partnership provides this framework, in practice there is a need for more information sharing and practical support to **bridge the gap between global and country level** efforts and to feed experiences and perspectives from the country level to the global process.

Countries were **unanimous on the need for a political push** to ensure that there is true buy-in for the Busan agenda and engagement in the monitoring from all stakeholders, including emerging providers. UNDP and OECD agreed to look at how to better respond to demands at country level and how to mobilise development partners - also beyond the DAC - to do more. At the same time, at country level strong government leadership is needed to bring partners to the table and enhance accountability.

In addition to mobilising co-operation providers, countries called for help to revitalise their own ministers' interest. At the political level, countries called for **more and clearer feedback and messages from Steering Committee members**, highlighting issues and discussions that are of relevance and interest to political leadership. Discussions concluded that while the "label of Busan" may not say much to politicians, the notion of working together in a more effective way speaks to everyone. There was consensus on the need to find ways to **"translate" the essence of Busan into language and actions that speak to political leaders**.

Overall, countries emphasized the usefulness of the workshop in supporting discussions among peers on shared challenges. The meeting concluded that it would be important to maintain this momentum by finding ways to keep up regular dialogue among countries, within and across regions.

In practical terms, countries highlighted:

- The need for **clear roles and responsibilities** as well as **instructions and timelines** to guide participation in the monitoring effort and the need for equally clear instructions to be delivered to providers of co-operation. Countries from all regions pointed to lack of awareness and commitment to monitoring from many providers.
- The need for tools to facilitate **two-way communication and information sharing**, and the importance of finding ways to keep up dialogue sparked in Copenhagen within and across regions. The joint support team drew attention to the new web-based tools and invited countries to start using them to enable flow of information and peer support.
- The importance of **regional and country support** for some countries was emphasised throughout the discussions. The joint support team emphasised the demand-driven nature of UNDP country and regional support, and encouraged countries to lead in defining their specific support needs and engaging development partners.

III. Sessions and main outcomes

Day 1, Session 2: Introduction on the Global Partnership – purpose and progress to date

Chair: Mr. Chhieng YANARA, Cambodia

The session began with an overview presentation from the joint support team (Brenda Killen) to set the scene for discussions: What is the Global Partnership, what has happened so far at the international level, and how can countries engage?

This was followed by country perspectives on the Global Partnership: What does the Global Partnership mean for us? [Panel format – views from Burkina Faso presented by Amadou DIALLO, Vietnam by Cao Manh CUONG, Armenia by Artak BAGHDASARYAN and Kenya by Monica ASUNA]

The session closed with work in break-out groups to capture how the move from aid effectiveness to effective development co-operation is taking place in practice. The two break-out questions and highlights from group conclusions are set out below.

Question 1: How is this more inclusive agenda translating into practice? What are concrete examples of taking forward the vision of common goals and differentiated commitments, particularly with south-south co-operation partners?

Feedback from discussions pointed to:

- Importance of policy frameworks and partnerships strategies to formalise:
 - south-south cooperation
 - public – private consultation
 - annual consultation with CSOs;
- Importance of inclusive dialogue and involvement of all “new actors” in existing platforms and processes with strong government leadership; and
- Increased role of and need for regional initiatives

Question 2: How are the Busan principles supporting the shift of aid management/development cooperation into broader national development frameworks, planning and dialogue? What are examples of linking development co-operation with broader national reforms?

Feedback from discussions pointed to:

- Raising awareness and getting all actors involved;
- Focusing on results and accountability, including at the level of country monitoring systems;
- Taking forward key institutional reforms (e.g. public financial management reforms);
- Ensuring transparency and accountability of CSOs (reporting on their contribution to national programmes); and
- Streamlining climate change finance in the broader development agenda.

Session 3: The Busan Global Monitoring Framework – purpose and overall approach

Chair: Mr. Dieudonné TAKOUO, Cameroon

The overall objective of this session was to reach a common understanding of the global monitoring approach and how it can be embedded in – and provide support to – country-level accountability efforts.

The session started with a presentation from the joint support team (Yuko Suzuki) on the Global Monitoring Framework: Purpose and scope of monitoring, role of participating countries. Following the introductory presentation, the session consisted of two panel discussions.

1st panel: Making monitoring happen at the country level: [Views from Cambodia by Philip COURTNADE, Moldova by Lucretia CIUREA and Togo by Pierre AWADE]

- How is your country moving forward to participate in the global monitoring?
- What are the most effective ways to ground global monitoring in existing local processes? How can a global framework serve to further strengthen existing systems?
- How to address different country specificities and priorities under one global accountability framework?

2nd panel: Beyond data gathering to an inclusive and comprehensive process for results and accountability [views from Mozambique by Orlando PENICELA, Yemen by Ahmed AL-SHIBAMI and Nepal by Bhuban KARKI]

- How to facilitate broad and inclusive consultations – role of civil society, private sector, parliamentarians and south-south partners?
- Are the Busan principles helping to streamline existing mechanisms or put in place comprehensive mutual accountability frameworks?
- How can different initiatives building on specific sectors (e.g. IHP+) or country contexts (e.g. New Deal) and their accountability structures be more mutually reinforcing?

Discussions highlighted the need for clear guidelines related to practical participation in the 'new' Global Partnership monitoring framework. Many of the questions and issues that arose in this session were revisited in more detail the following day.

Several countries raised questions related to measuring progress at the country-level beyond the Global Partnership indicators. The joint support team confirmed that countries lead in defining national accountability frameworks: these should build primarily on country priorities and may encompass a much wider set of issues and commitments beyond the Busan global indicators. At the same time, countries willing to incorporate some/all of the Global Partnership indicators in national monitoring tools/frameworks will be well placed to feed data into global monitoring efforts without the need for additional data collection efforts.

Given that country specific chapters will no longer be prepared as part of the global reporting process, participants raised the question of how Global Partnership indicators measured from global level sources will be put into country context and linked to country-level dialogue. This was noted as an important point throughout the workshop, and the joint support team has taken note of this and will in due course facilitate country-level access to information on the indicators measured through global processes so that findings can also feed into country-level dialogue.

Day 2 Session 4: Getting organised at country-level for contributing to global monitoring efforts

Chair: Mr. Jaime GARRON, Bolivia

The objective of this session was to provide guidance on rolling out the global monitoring framework at country level, a detailed overview of the indicators and practical tips for managing the process.

The session was opened with an overview presentation from the joint support team (Hanna-Mari Kilpelainen) on process: What, when by whom? How will the evidence be gathered? What support tools and resources are available to facilitate country participation?

General issues that arose in the plenary discussion as well as indicator clinics are summarised below, followed by a brief overview of indicator-specific issues that emerged in the indicator clinics.

General issues:

- A key point was made that data collection is already on-going in many countries, and that there is no need to wait for the global reporting cycle to kick-in to proceed with national level accountability processes and frameworks. Countries are invited to provide data as it is available at the time of global data collection.
- Participants welcomed the broader approach adopted in Global Partnership monitoring to enable reporting on development flows beyond ODA. Some suggested that Global monitoring should also aim to capture flows such as private flows and investments and remittances.
- There is a clear need to build linkages between the analysis of indicators collected through global sources and dialogue at country level. Mechanisms that may support feeding findings and evidence on global-level indicators into country level dialogue will be particularly important to ensure political interest and buy-in for the full global monitoring framework and progress report.
- Questions related to particular definitions in the global monitoring framework included for example the distinction between « development » or « humanitarian » assistance, the potential reporting of CSO/NGO co-operation as part of aid for the government sector and the limitations to definitions of concessionality which may arise due to currently low interest rates.
- Questions were raised as to whether the 2013 monitoring framework will assess progress or be a baseline study. For those indicators where data exists from the Paris Declaration monitoring, baselines can be set using 2010 data. For new indicators with no previous data, this first round of monitoring will provide baselines or pilot the methodology. For all indicators, targets will be set for 2015, in many instances measuring relative progress (similar rational as with Paris Declaration indicators e.g. “halve the gap” etc.)
- In addition to clarifying these concepts in workshop discussions, the joint support team will make concerted efforts to address these, and other, questions in the Frequently

Asked Questions section of the monitoring helpdesk to the benefit of all interested stakeholders.

Indicator-specific feedback from clinics

Indicator 1 – Use of Country Results Frameworks

A number of countries welcomed this indicator, noting that the indicator measures an important aspect of results-based management of development programmes/cooperation. The methodology that calls for assessing the practices through three dimensions of use of country results frameworks (i.e. policy level alignment, use of country's results-based management systems, including M&E systems, and operational and sectoral level alignment) was noted to be useful. Some countries highlighted the national budget preparation and MTEFs as a useful reference point in this context. There remains a question with regard to the practicality of the "scoring" method. Participants also noted the usefulness of providing more narrative to have better understanding of country's efforts and context specificity. Given that this indicator is new, countries welcome the idea of having this as a pilot to provide an entry point to facilitate deeper dialogue on this important agenda at country level. In this case, qualitative narrative will be useful to see what practices are emerging and how, and what key issues to consider in conversation/consultation/dialogue on this agenda at country and global level.

Indicator 2 - Enabling Environment for Civil Society

An update was provided on the CIVICUS work to finalise the methodology and approach for the Enabling Environment Index. Several countries expressed interest to receive further information on how the EEI methodology will feature in the Global Partnership monitoring approach, and whether their country will be included in the final Global Partnership assessment on enabling environment for CSOs. Countries were encouraged to share feedback with CIVICUS on the index and identify opportunities for country-level dialogue.

While government representatives acknowledged the importance of focusing on the enabling environment, they shared a common aspiration to complement the dialogue in this area with an assessment of the development effectiveness of civil society actors themselves. Countries highlighted that any indicator on enabling environment for CSO does not capture the fact that CSOs are receiving a large proportion of development co-operation funding but not reporting on this in terms of development results and effectiveness. Discussions concluded that the international development community may wish to explore in the future how global monitoring efforts could incorporate also an assessment of the implementation of Istanbul Principles.

Indicator 3 - Private Sector Engagement

Several countries expressed interest to pilot this indicator. There was broad support for the proposed initial qualitative approach in order to enable a better understanding of private-public partnerships and dialogue, which would in turn enable further improvements and refinements to the methodology. Given the complexity of assessing public sector engagement and the need for an independent assessment, participants recognised the need for this indicator to be measured through a global process but urged for country-level dialogue opportunities to be built in the process.

Indicator 4 – Transparency

Countries expressed support for a simple indicator, which would be easy to translate into a storyline that resonates with political leadership. Also a broad approach to transparency was

welcomed, which emphasises the importance of access to information for all stakeholders beyond governments. Some countries also expressed the importance of information on flows from a variety of sources; not only official development finance, but also expected flows from non-state actors (which may have macroeconomic implications). While the current methodology will not yet allow for such a broad assessment, this point was noted by the joint support team and may be something the international community can address in the future.

Indicator 5 – Predictability

For measuring annual predictability (5a), participants noted the persistent challenges of reconciling the fiscal years of providers with recipient governments. Both need to agree on how to spread aid allocations across a 12-month period. On medium-term predictability (5b), countries welcomed the approach of assessing the availability of provider forecasts for 1, 2 and 3 years ahead (as opposed to focusing only on information that covers *at least* three years). At this stage, countries expressed support for “Yes/No” reporting on availability of forward spending information, as providing a more detailed, quantitative assessment of information availability would be problematic.

Indicator 6 - Aid on budget

This indicator sparked little discussion as several countries were familiar with the approach. It was clarified that this indicator measures the degree to which financial contributions from providers of development co-operation to the government sector are fully and accurately reflected in the budget, whether they use national PFM systems (or aid “through” budgets, using national budget execution procedures and processed through the country’s treasury). Clarification was also provided on the change in the denominator used for this indicator, which is development co-operation funding scheduled for disbursement at the outset of year n, rather than ex-post disbursements. This separates the measurement of the extent to which government budgets reflect aid estimates from the measurement of predictability, that is the extent to which scheduled funds are actually disbursed (captured by indicator 5a on annual predictability) or the extent to which information on forward spending is available (captured by indicator 5b on multi-year predictability).

Indicator 7 - Inclusive Mutual Accountability Frameworks

Participants emphasized that dialogue around mutual accountability framework at country level is an important aspect in the context of enhancing effectiveness of development cooperation. Thus, this assessment should enrich country-level dialogue on mutual accountability. In light of the Busan principles, inclusive partnership is of critical importance. This means that there will need to be a multi-level accountability in mutual accountability. Further definition on what level of mutual accountability is being discussed may need to be reflected in the assessment of this indicator.

While the inclusive nature of partnership is promoted in the Busan principles, some mutual accountability framework exists for a certain portion of partners. The shift of existing mutual accountability framework to more inclusive framework will be an important element for which qualitative analysis and assessment may be useful.

Participants called for more systematic harmonisation between the Global Partnership’s indicator and the national survey on mutual accountability undertaken by the UN DESA. Both processes are often facilitated/managed by the same institution, which calls for harmonisation in terms of timing as well as content.

Indicator 8 - Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

While taking note that this indicator is assessed through a global process, participants noted that questions being asked needed country inputs. To this end, they asked for more clarity as to how this indicator is being assessed and what kind of country-level process is foreseen. There was a strong call for country involvement in the validation of the assessment. Furthermore, participants noted that tracking gender equality allocations is potentially cumbersome and many countries may not have a system to do this routinely.

Indicator 9 - Use of country systems

Participants noted an increasing scrutiny over development co-operation expenditures in provider countries. As providers get involved in higher risk countries, the need for external audits may remain regardless of progress in the quality of country systems.

Indicator 10 - Untied Aid

Discussions raised the existence of persistent discrepancies between global level figures on untying and country-level realities. Participants concluded that despite a possible 'mismatch' between global and country-level figures, here too it will be important that information from the OECD/DAC reporting, accompanied with necessary information on the approach and methodology, is made available to spark and support country-level dialogue with providers on tying practices.

Day 3, Session 4 continued: Lessons learned in managing the monitoring process to get good data quickly

In order to bring together discussions from the previous day and building on the experience of workshop participants in previous global monitoring efforts, Sudan [Faisal GUMA ABDELRAHMAN] and Mali [Mamadou Amadou DEMBELE] shared their lessons learned in managing the monitoring process to get good data quickly.

Session 5: Getting the most out of the Global Partnership – reflections on priorities and next steps

Chair: Vitalice MEJA, CSOs representative

This session was designed to ascertain how the emerging work of the Steering Committee reflects the priorities of developing countries, and to share views on what is working well and what can be improved in terms of post-Busan structures at the global, regional and country levels.

In opening the session, the Chair emphasized the importance of the forthcoming July Steering Committee as it will provide the framework for the ministerial level meeting. Therefore the timing of Copenhagen discussions was very opportune as key messages arising could be fed into the next Steering Committee meeting.

The session started with a panel on "Getting the most out of the Global Partnership" to set the scene for the final discussion. Panellists included Honduras (Clara SIERRA), Burundi (Pamphile MUDEREGA), Uganda (Fred TWESIIME) and Pacific Islands (Charmina SAILI). The following questions guided panellists' interventions:

NICOD Marjolaine 7/19/13 11:21 AM

Supprimé:

- What is needed to make progress at country level? Where are the bottlenecks?
- Key issues for sustaining/building political momentum ahead of the ministerial stock-take?
- Feedback on efforts to work in “globally light, country focused” ways – what successes, where are there support needs?

The panel discussion was followed by perspectives of country led implementation and progress, focusing on examples of concrete actions taken at country level in implementing the Busan commitments. The commentaries were provided by Zambia (Michael MULWANDA) and Benin (Thierry SOMAKPO) on the topic of results and accountability; Madagascar (Zefania ROMALAHY) on transparency; and Malawi (Betty NGOMA) on effective institutions.

The discussions centered on the following issues:

- The global-light, country-focused approach is welcomed. Global dialogue needs to build on the reality on the ground. In this context, it is important to find a way to strengthen the linkages between country level and global level processes and dialogue through enhanced regional level consultations. The experience with the Pacific Islands Forum Compact can provide further insight in this context.
- Implementing the Busan commitments requires enhanced political momentum both at country and global level. In this context, increased efforts for communication and outreach with all stakeholders (including civil society organisations, parliaments, etc.) were noted to be important. It was also noted that the engagement and commitment from partners seem to have weakened since Busan. The implementation of the Busan agenda indeed requires increased coordination across Ministries and stakeholders and a systematic approach to keep the momentum going. In this context, integrating the Busan agenda into nationally-led initiatives continues to be an important effort.
- Countries are keen to further advance the inclusive partnership agenda. Many initiatives and efforts have been made. The global indicators that focus on inclusive partnerships indicate good stepping forward, while more efforts are needed to see how more new partners can be brought on board on effective development cooperation dialogue.

At country level, there is a clear demand to establish processes and to strengthen structures to fully own the Busan agenda. Some of the challenges include enhancing political leadership and building sustainable momentum at national level. The monitoring framework at country level supports facilitating this process, while also underscores the importance of sustained investment in national systems.

The session closed with some final reflections from the representative of co-chairs (Liz Peri, UK), the Steering Committee (Nancy Magaly SILVA SEBASTIÁN, Peru) and from the joint support team (Brenda KILLEN).

- There is a lot happening at country level. It would be important to find effective ways to bring this together with the global level dialogue in order to reinforce mutual accountability.

- Increased information sharing in all directions is needed, particularly to ensure that good practices and challenges at country level are shared across countries and regions.
- There is a need to revitalize the political momentum. Increased political push on monitoring as well as engagement of all stakeholders at all levels is needed to support political momentum.

IV. Follow-up action taken and next steps

- The joint support team shared the key messages and outcomes of the workshop with the Co-Chairs of the Global Partnership immediately following the Copenhagen meeting. The team particularly emphasised countries' call for strengthened linkages between the global- and country-level process, including regional and country-level support for Busan implementation; the need to translate more clearly the Busan agenda into messages and action that speak to political leaders; and the importance of finding ways to maintain dialogue sparked in Copenhagen between countries and regions.
- To support active participation of co-operation providers in country-level implementation and monitoring efforts the joint support team, together with the UK, organised a workshop for DAC members in Paris on 10 July. DAC members recognised the importance of systematic and consistent communication with their country representatives and agreed to take steps for a more joined-up approach.
- UN/UNDP will increase its communication to UN Country Teams/UNDP Country Offices in seeking their engagement in the monitoring process as well as supporting the national focal points in undertaking the process, should there be a demand and resources.
- The monitoring guidance and country spread sheet were finalised based on the feedback received and disseminated to countries and other stakeholders on 1 July.
- All relevant materials of the monitoring workshop and country-level data gathering (participating countries and country-level focal points) have been uploaded on the community space of the Global Partnership and all workshop participants have been provided with access codes so that they can use this web resource.
- In terms of the timeline for the monitoring process, some countries expressed the need for more time than originally envisioned to gather the monitoring information. With the aim of allowing country stakeholders maximum time for gathering data, but at the same time ensuring the necessary lead-time to prepare a progress report for the ministerial level meeting, a final data submission deadline of 13 September has been communicated to countries after the workshop (Note: at the time of finalising this summary, the deadline has been extended until 31 October).

V. Feedback from participants

Overall, most participants stated that their expectations for the workshop had been met. On a scale of 1(not relevant) to 5(highly relevant), all workshop sessions received an average scoring between 4 and 5. Participants placed particular importance to receiving clarifications on data collection, the process and the methodology of monitoring as well as guidelines, timeline and

next steps to facilitate the work. Indicator clinics and country presentations were considered the most significant assets of the workshop. Sharing of good practices and comparing experiences was found particularly relevant and helped participants to better grasp the main challenges of data collection at country level.

At a more general level, a better understanding of Busan commitments and what these imply at the country level were other positive dimensions of the workshop. Participants valued the opportunity to link country deliberations to global discussions. Some participants also underlined that this event helped them build networks and peer contacts. Also a number of responding participants expressed their satisfaction regarding the logistical preparation of the workshop.

Main 'take aways' for participants included:

- Respondents welcomed the opportunity for an update on indicators and better understanding of how to manage the monitoring process at the country level and support synergies between the Busan indicators and national monitoring frameworks. Some participants also noted that the workshop helped them to realise that work remains at country level to further refine and identify measurable indicators.
- Several national coordinators confirmed that they will use what they have learnt at the workshop to prepare and conduct the monitoring effort at country level and expand the dialogue with stakeholders, including mobilising UNDP country offices, CSOs, private sector and broader government.
- Some respondents specified that they will organize a stakeholder meeting in order to pass on the information and training received, and make sure that everyone is well-prepared for the exercise.
- Some participants saw the workshop as an opportunity for them to underline the importance of political support and commitment for advancing the Busan agenda at the country level and improving inclusiveness. On a more general level, some stated that the workshop strengthened their understanding of enhancing broader partnerships with development actors beyond the monitoring process.

Suggestions for Improvement

Feedback forms from participants flagged a number of ideas and suggestions that the joint support team can take away and build on for following similar events. These include:

- More time on indicators clinics to cover technical issues and process;
- More group work or informal discussions and less plenary;
- Several participants suggested that relevant documents should have been shared in advance, especially the presentation on indicators clinics;
- Some thought it would be good to involve experts who designed the indicators (e.g. CIVICUS, UN-Women) and also to involve more development partners.

A compilation of participants' feedback, including evaluation figures for each workshop session, can be found [here](#).