



**Global
Partnership**

for Effective Development
Co-operation

FAQs for Participating in the Second Monitoring Round of the GPEDC

This document presents frequently asked questions and answers on the second monitoring round of the GPEDC.

Contacts:

Ms. Liz J.E. Chung, email: liz.chung@undp.org

Mr. Nathan Wanner, email: Nathan.wanner@oecd.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| GENERAL QUESTIONS | 6 |
| What does the Global Partnership monitor? | 6 |
| What are the Global Partnership monitoring framework indicators? | 6 |
| How will the findings be used? | 7 |
| How is the Global Partnership monitoring framework related to previous global monitoring initiatives? | 8 |
| How is the second monitoring round (2015-16) different from the first one (2013-14)? | 8 |
| Indicators | 8 |
| Scope of the monitoring round | 8 |
| Strengthened data collection and validation process | 9 |
| Monitoring Advisory Group | 9 |
| Increased coordination / synergies with other monitoring exercises | 9 |
| MONITORING PROCESS | 9 |
| How to join? | 9 |
| When will the monitoring process be carried out? | 9 |
| What support is offered to participating countries and organisations? | 10 |
| Monitoring Guide | 10 |
| Tools for data submission | 10 |
| Help desk | 11 |
| Regional pre-monitoring workshops | 11 |
| PARTICIPATION | 11 |
| Overview of stakeholders' responsibilities in the overall monitoring process | 11 |
| Overview of stakeholders' responsibilities in reporting data | 12 |
| I am a government official of a developing country - what is my role? | 12 |
| I am a government official of a developing country – how can I engage non-traditional development co-operation providers? | 13 |
| At headquarters of an official provider of development co-operation, how do I support data collection and validation? | 13 |
| How does my role as a provider contact point at the country level differ from the role of headquarters? | 13 |
| I am a provider of non-traditional development co-operation, can I also participate in the monitoring? | 14 |
| I am not a government official nor development co-operation provider, how can I participate in the monitoring? | 14 |
| How can I know which specific indicators I should provide input to? | 14 |
| I am a provider of development co-operation but do not have a country presence. How can I report data to government authorities? | 15 |
| I am a Global Programme/Fund, should I report data to government authorities? How can I provide my data? | 15 |
| I am a humanitarian relief agency (e.g. UNHCR, WFP), should I participate in global monitoring efforts at country level? | 15 |
| Can countries which provide south-south co-operation to my country participate in the process? | 16 |
| DATA COLLECTION, VALIDATION AND REPORTING | 16 |
| How is data collected and validated? | 16 |
| What does the term “disbursement” mean? | 16 |
| Should funds from a regional or multi-country programme be recorded? | 17 |
| How should funds disbursed by one provider on behalf of another provider be recorded? | 17 |
| How do I report on multi-bi funds or ‘delegated co-operation’? | 17 |
| In case of multi-bi funds, why does the multilateral agency report to the government of the developing country | 17 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| and not the bilateral agency providing the funds? | 17 |
| What currency should be used for reporting? | 17 |
| What year should be used for reporting? | 17 |
| Can the reporting year of providers of development co-operation be different from the reporting year used in a country? | 18 |
| I am a provider and I have noticed an error in my data, what do I do?..... | 18 |
| Can providers include operational expenses? | 18 |
| What transactions should and should not be recorded in reporting? | 18 |
| Are debt swap programmes included in the definition of ODA? | 18 |
| How to report on non-concessional aid? | 18 |
| If we are contributing to military education and training activities for the army in a specific developing country, can this be considered as ODA?..... | 19 |
| Are education grants and scholarships counted as ODA? | 19 |
| FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS FOR EACH INDICATOR | 19 |
| Indicator 1: Development co-operation is focused on results that meet developing countries' priorities | 19 |
| What does this indicator focus on? | 19 |
| What is a CRF? | 19 |
| There is no CRF in the country for which I am reporting. How can I still provide input for this indicator? | 19 |
| What does the indicator measure? | 20 |
| What is the goal of this indicator in terms of outcomes on development behaviour?..... | 20 |
| How will the current monitoring round (2015-16) inform future rounds for this indicator? | 20 |
| Indicator 2: Civil society operates within an environment that maximises its engagement in and contribution to development | 20 |
| What does this indicator focus on? | 20 |
| What is a CSO? | 20 |
| What is a CSO enabling environment? | 20 |
| What is a CSO development effectiveness? | 21 |
| What does the indicator measure? | 21 |
| What is the goal of this indicator in terms of outcomes on development behaviour?..... | 21 |
| How will the current monitoring round (2015-16) inform future rounds for this indicator? | 21 |
| How can my country engage? | 21 |
| Indicator 3: Engagement and Contribution of the Private Sector to Development | 22 |
| What does this indicator focus on? | 22 |
| What is Public-Private Dialogue (PPD)?..... | 22 |
| What groups belong to the private sector? | 22 |
| What does the indicator measure? | 23 |
| How are each of the modules completed for the indicator? | 23 |
| How will the current monitoring round (2015-16) inform future rounds for this indicator? | 23 |
| How can my country engage? | 23 |
| Indicator 4: Transparency - Information on development co-operation is publically available – Implementation of the Common Standard | 24 |
| What does this indicator focus on? | 24 |
| What is the common standard? | 24 |
| What is the OECD Creditor Reporting System? | 25 |
| What is the OECD Forward-Spending Survey? | 25 |
| What is the International Aid Transparency Initiative? | 25 |
| What does the indicator measure? | 25 |
| Do I need to provide input to this indicator? | 25 |
| Indicator 5a: Development Co-operation is more predictable (Annual Predictability) | 25 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| What does this indicator focus on? | 26 |
| Is the indicator the same as Indicator 7 of the former Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration? | 26 |
| How is information collected for this indicator? | 26 |
| What does the term “scheduled for disbursement” mean? | 26 |
| Indicator 5b: Development co-operation is more predictable (Medium Term Predictability) | 26 |
| What does this indicator focus on? | 26 |
| What does the indicator measure? | 26 |
| How is information collected for this indicator? | 26 |
| What is a forward spending plan? | 27 |
| Why is a weighted average used for aggregation of the indicator? | 27 |
| Indicator 6: Aid is on budget which are subject to parliamentary scrutiny | 27 |
| What does this indicator focus on? | 27 |
| What does the indicator measure? | 27 |
| How is information collected for this indicator? | 27 |
| Should revisions to the annual budget after approval by legislation be included? | 28 |
| Indicator 7: Mutual accountability among development co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews | 28 |
| What does this indicator focus on? | 28 |
| What is a mutual assessment review? | 28 |
| What is an aid or partnership policy? | 28 |
| Is the indicator the same as indicator 12 from the former Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration? | 28 |
| What does the indicator measure? | 28 |
| How is information collected for this indicator? | 28 |
| Indicator 8: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment | 29 |
| What does this indicator focus on? | 29 |
| What criteria are used to measure the indicator? | 29 |
| What do you mean by “systems to track allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment”? | 29 |
| How do you define ‘allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment’? | 30 |
| If a country has systems in place to track but doesn’t make information public, can such country still report on the indicator? | 30 |
| How is data is collected and analysed? | 30 |
| My country is interested in monitoring progress on gender equality indicator. What do I do? | 30 |
| Indicator 9a: Quality of country Public Financial Management (PFM) systems | 30 |
| What does this indicator focus on? | 31 |
| What is a PFM system? | 31 |
| What is the data source for this indicator? | 31 |
| What is the International Development Association? | 31 |
| How is the indicator measured? | 31 |
| Do I need to provide input to this indicator? | 32 |
| Indicator 9b: Use of country public financial management and procurement systems | 32 |
| What does this indicator focus on? | 32 |
| How does the indicator relate to indicator 5 of the Paris Declaration? | 32 |
| Does any development co-operation modality automatically qualify as using country PFM and procurement systems? | 32 |
| How is information collected for this indicator? | 32 |
| What does the use of national budget execution procedures mean? | 32 |
| What does the use of national financial reporting procedures mean? | 32 |
| What does the use of national auditing procedures mean? | 33 |
| What does the use of national procurement system mean? | 33 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| How is information collected for this indicator? | 33 |
| Indicator 10: Aid is untied | 33 |
| What does this indicator focus on? | 33 |
| What does it mean for aid to be tied or untied? | 33 |
| Why is it important that aid is untied? | 33 |
| Are all costs included when looking at the tying status of aid? | 34 |
| Do I need to report on this indicator? | 34 |

GENERAL QUESTIONS

For more detailed information on the Global Partnership 2015-16 Monitoring Round, please refer to the Monitoring guide, available [here](#).

What does the Global Partnership monitor?

The Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (GPEDC), created at the [Fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan](#) in 2011, is an inclusive political forum bringing together governments, bilateral and multilateral organisations, civil society and representatives from parliaments and the private sector, committed to strengthening the effectiveness of development co-operation to produce maximum impact for development.

The Global Partnership monitoring framework tracks progress in the implementation of Global Partnership commitment for more effective development co-operation. It is comprised of a set of 10 indicators based on the four principles, namely, ownership by developing countries, focus on results, partnerships for inclusive development and transparency and accountability.

The GPEDC monitoring framework seeks to capture behavior change: it focuses on “how” stakeholders engage in development co-operation. It is complementary with other accountability frameworks which monitor “what” results and outcomes stem from development co-operation (e.g. the MDGs and SDGs monitoring).

The first monitoring round took place in 2013-14 and results were reported in the [2014 progress report](#). The report covered 46 developing countries and 77 countries and organizations providing development co-operation. The data coverage represented roughly half of official development assistance programmed for developing countries. The 2015-16 monitoring round aims to expand on this coverage, both in terms of participating countries and providers as well as capturing a broader spectrum of development co-operation.

What are the Global Partnership monitoring framework indicators?

The set of global indicators (see table below) includes some indicators which are based on the previous indicators from the Paris Declaration that developing countries have identified as particularly important. Other indicators capture some of the broader dimensions of the Busan Partnership agreement.

| INDICATORS | TARGETS FOR 2015 |
|--|---|
| 1. Development co-operation is focused on results that meet developing countries’ priorities | |
| Extent of use of country results frameworks by co-operation providers | <i>All providers</i> of development co-operation use country results frameworks |
| 2. Civil society operates within an environment which maximises its engagement in and contribution to development | |
| A subset of measures from the Enabling Environment Index | <i>Continued progress over time</i> |
| 3. Engagement and contribution of the private sector to development | |
| Measure of the quality of public-private dialogue | <i>Continued progress over time</i> |
| 4. Transparency: information on development co-operation is publicly available | |
| Measure of state of implementation of the common standard by co-operation providers | <i>Implement the common standard</i> – All development co-operation providers are on track to implement a common, open standard for electronic publication of timely, comprehensive and forward-looking |

5. Development co-operation is more predictable

- (a) annual: proportion of development cooperation funding disbursed within the fiscal year within which it was scheduled by co-operation providers; and **Halve the gap** – halve the proportion of aid not disbursed within the fiscal year for which it was scheduled (Baseline year 2010)
- (b) medium-term: proportion of development cooperation funding covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at country level **Halve the gap** – halve the proportion of development cooperation funding not covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at country level

6. Aid is on budgets which are subject to parliamentary scrutiny

- % of development cooperation funding scheduled for disbursement that is recorded in the annual budgets approved by the legislatures of developing countries **Halve the gap** – halve the proportion of development cooperation flows to the government sector not reported on government’s budget(s) (with at least 85% reported on budget) (Baseline year 2010)

7. Mutual accountability among development co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews

- % of countries that undertake inclusive mutual assessments of progress in implementing agreed commitments **All developing countries** have inclusive mutual assessment reviews in place (Baseline year 2010)

8. Gender equality and women’s empowerment

- % of countries with systems that track and make public allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment **All developing countries** have systems that track and make public resource allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment

9. Effective institutions: developing countries’ systems are strengthened and used

- (a) Quality of developing country PFM systems; and **Half of developing countries move up at least one measure** (i.e. 0.5 points) on the PFM/CPIA scale of performance (Baseline year 2010)
- (b) Use of country PFM and procurement systems **Reduce the gap.** [use the same logic as in Paris – close the gap by two-thirds where CPIA score is ≥ 5 ; or by one-third where between 3.5 and 4.5] (Baseline year 2010)

10. Aid is untied

- % of aid that is fully untied **Continued progress over time** (Baseline year 2010)

How will the findings be used?

Sound evidence gathered through the GPEDC monitoring exercise will be compiled into a global progress report ahead of the ministerial-level meeting of the Global Partnership scheduled to take place in November 2016 in Nairobi, Kenya. Ministers from countries at all stages of development, together with leaders from international organisations, private sector and civil society will use the GPEDC monitoring report as evidence to review progress in implementation of mutually agreed commitments and further facilitate global level policy dialogue to improve effectiveness of development cooperation for maximum development impact.

The multi-stakeholder partnership framework is an integral part of the country-level data collection and validation process. The findings from the monitoring round can inform policy dialogue on the quality and effectiveness of development co-operation at the country, regional and global levels. This dialogue based on evidence can potentially spur actions on the ground and lead to behavior change. In addition, through mutual learning, better solutions can be identified to channel efforts for greater development impact. Feedback from developing countries suggests that they have found the existence of global indicators and targets to be a helpful reference point for negotiating more relevant country-level accountability frameworks.

How is the Global Partnership monitoring framework related to previous global monitoring initiatives?

Previous international efforts to monitor the effectiveness of development co-operation have been grounded in the [Paris Declaration monitoring framework](#). The main differences between the Global Partnership monitoring framework and the Paris Declaration monitoring framework include:

- A **different set of indicators** that was the result of political negotiations among key stakeholders after the Busan High Level Forum. Five indicators (Indicator 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10) have been retained from the Paris Declaration monitoring framework as these were identified by developing countries as particularly important. These were supplemented with five additional indicators (indicator 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8) that capture some of the broader dimensions of the Busan Partnership agreement.
- The Global Partnership monitoring framework seeks to ground country level **data collection in existing national monitoring processes**, using countries' own tools when they exist, according to their own calendar agreed in-country. The aim is to avoid the creation of parallel monitoring tools and cycles and to root international monitoring efforts in what is happening in countries already. However, some ad hoc arrangements will need to be established for countries which want to participate in global monitoring efforts but do not yet have in place processes or tools for collecting the data required for global monitoring.

How is the second monitoring round (2015-16) different from the first one (2013-14)?

(See pages 21-22 of the Monitoring Guide for more information)

Indicators

The second monitoring round builds on the set of indicators used for the first round. However, while the methodologies for the indicators 1, 2, 3 and 4 were still under development during the first round, the second round incorporates refined methodologies for these indicators.

In addition, following a successful monitoring of indicator 8 during the first monitoring round and further discussions with UN Women, indicator 8 is included in the standard set of indicators collected at the country level.

Scope of the monitoring round

The first monitoring round focused its efforts on Official Development Assistance, with voluntary reporting on other official flows (in the form of non-concessional development co-operation funding from official bilateral/multilateral providers)¹. In contrast, the second monitoring round strongly recommends reporting – in addition to ODA flows – on those other official flows, particularly for the increasingly higher number of countries where non-concessional development financing (*other official flows*) is becoming a progressively significant share of all development financing flows (see figure below). Other development flows such as private flows at market

¹ Non-concessional official development co-operation funds were optional in the previous monitoring round. However, there was very little reporting of this type, despite their increasing importance in helping countries finance development. For the second monitoring round, it is strongly recommended to report on these development flows as well – particularly in the case of upper-middle and lower-middle income countries, as they tend to receive increasing volumes of this type of development financing.

term or private grants (e.g. financial and technical support from private foundations, without any kind of official funding) should not be included.

In addition, the JST will be testing the applicability of the current Monitoring Framework to other types of development co-operation (e.g. private foundations activities, south-south technical cooperation) in parallel of the 2015-2016 Monitoring Round. These “pilots” will take place in a number of selected countries (see page 21 for further details on the scope of the Monitoring Round). Contact the Joint Support Team (monitoring@effectivecooperation.org) for more information.

Strengthened data collection and validation process

The JST has introduced the following changes to further facilitate the data collection and validation process, in view of reducing the burden on the national co-ordinator, increasing multi-stakeholder engagement, and improving data accuracy:

- Sensitisation, communications and outreach ahead of the second round
- Appointment of focal points for all stakeholders at global and country levels, with clear roles and responsibilities
- Increased time allocated to data collection, validation, and final review

Monitoring Advisory Group

A group of twelve high-level technical experts was established to provide advice on the Global Partnership’s monitoring activities. The [Monitoring Advisory Group](#) provided strategic recommendations for the finalisation of indicators 1, 2, 3 and 4. In addition, and on the basis of lessons learned during the second monitoring round, the Monitoring Advisory Group will guide the review of the Global Partnership’s monitoring framework to ensure its relevance to the post-2015 context.

Increased coordination / synergies with other monitoring exercises

The second monitoring round has increased synergies with other monitoring exercises, such as the UN-DESA Mutual accountability survey, the monitoring of the International Health Partnership (IHP+) and the New Deal monitoring.

MONITORING PROCESS

This section includes questions and answers on the second monitoring round.

How to join?

Participation is voluntary. All countries and organisations that have endorsed the Busan Partnership agreement are encouraged to participate in Busan global monitoring efforts.

To see the list of countries and organisations endorsing the Busan partnership agreement, click [here](#).

To see the list of countries participating in the 2nd Global Partnership monitoring efforts, click [here](#).

If you are interested to join our efforts and to participate in the second monitoring round of the Global Partnership, kindly indicate participation by emailing to the UNDP-OECD Joint Support Team (JST) at monitoring@effectivecooperation.org.

When will the monitoring process be carried out?

The table below gives an indicative timeline for the Global Partnership 2015-16 monitoring round.

| What | When | Who |
|---|-----------------------------|--|
| Pre-launch sensitisation | June - August 2015 | All stakeholders |
| Appointment of focal points | June – September 2015 | Focal points at country level |
| Launch of the Second Monitoring Round | September – October 2015 | All stakeholders |
| Pre-Monitoring regional workshops (Africa, Asia, Latin America) and availability of other support tools | October - November 2015 | Focal points from developing country governments (i.e. national coordinators). Support tools also made available to other stakeholders |
| Data collection and validation | September 2015 – March 2016 | Developing country governments, providers of development co-operation, parliamentarians, representatives of private sector, CSOs |
| Data submission to OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team | March 2016 (date TBC) | Developing country governments and providers of development co-operation |
| Data processing and final data review | March - May 2016 | OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team, Developing country governments and providers of development co-operation |
| Aggregation, Analysis and Report production | March - September 2016 | OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team |
| Publication of Report | September 2016 | OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team |
| Dissemination and dialogue (including the Second High Level Meeting of the GPEDC - date TBC) | September - December 2016 | All stakeholders |

What support is offered to participating countries and organisations?

Monitoring Guide

To aid stakeholders in data collection and validation at the country level, detailed information is provided in the [monitoring guide](#).

The Monitoring Guide is the main reference document to support participants of the monitoring exercise. Here you will find everything you need to know about the process, timeline, your role and the indicators for the 2015-16 monitoring round of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. This document provides guidelines for all stakeholders participating in the monitoring exercise, including: governments; providers of development co-operation; and other stakeholders (the private sector, civil society organisations, trade unions, parliamentarians and subnational governments).

Tools for data submission

For recording of the data, the UNDP-OECD Joint Support Team has made available two alternative reporting tools, for national co-ordinators to choose: (1) an Country Spreadsheet (Excel file) and (2) an online tool.

Both tools are being shared with the national co-ordinator individually, who will decide which one he wants to use (we advise to try both and use the one that you feel most comfortable with). Both have advantages and disadvantages:

- The *Country Spreadsheet* has the advantage of allowing for easy management of data to be reported, being less convenient to report on the qualitative narrative;
- The *Online Tool* has the advantage of being clearer and allowing for requesting inputs from other stakeholders in an orderly way, but some national co-ordinators may prefer the offline solution due to connectivity problems, or just by greater familiarity with Excel.

In both cases, the UNDP-OECD Joint Support Team will offer an additional spreadsheet (or survey link) in cases where you need to request data from providers of development co-operation and other stakeholders in the country.

Help desk

For any clarification on how to participate, stakeholders are encouraged to use the web-based *Helpdesk* that has been established within the [community space of the Global Partnership](#)². It is intended to provide a peer exchange space to share access to expertise, technical information and good practices and also lists other support tools available for the national co-ordinators as well as focal points for providers and other stakeholders. In offering a “one-stop-shop” for all ad hoc questions on indicators and the supporting methodology (including a *Frequently Asked Questions* section), this centralised support helps to ensure that arrangements for monitoring, while relying on existing sources of data, provide reliable and comparable data across participating countries and organisations. The help desk function is co-ordinated by the JST and brings together specialists from the two organisations, including from the UNDP regional centres and country offices, which play an important role in supporting overall country-level implementation of EDC commitments and monitoring of progress.

To register, please email: community@effectivecooperation.org

For any queries, please contact: monitoring@effectivecooperation.org

Regional pre-monitoring workshop

The JST with the support of various regional platforms, will organise regional pre-monitoring workshops to support national co-ordinators and relevant stakeholders with hands-on training and capacity support for quality data collection, validation and analysis. Regional workshops for Asia-Pacific, Africa and Latin American and the Caribbean will take place during the months of October and November 2015, targeted to national co-ordinators from participating governments. More information about these workshops will be made available on the [community space of the Global Partnership](#).

PARTICIPATION

This section includes questions and answers on participation and the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders in the 2015-16 monitoring round of the Global Partnership.

The roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder are synthesised in the following tables:

Overview of stakeholders’ responsibilities in the overall monitoring process

| Who? | What? |
|---|--|
| Government (Nat. co-ordinator, engaging relevant ministries/ gov, agencies) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oversee and coordinate data collection and validation - Provide data for indic. 1, 5b, 6, 7, 8 - Coordinate the assessment for indicators 2 and 3 - Facilitate dialogue around monitoring results |

² Please go to <https://www.unteamworks.org/node/489590>. This web solution builds on the Global Partnership Teamworks web platform and offers a password-protected ‘intranet’ for Global Partnership stakeholders.

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Providers | - Provide data for indic. 1, 5a, 6, 9b and contribute to data validation - Participate in the assessment for indicators 2 and 3 (focal point) - Participate in dialogue around the monitoring results |
| CSOs | - Participate in the assessment for indicators 2 and 3 (focal point) - Participate in dialogue around the monitoring results |
| Private sector | - Participate in the assessment for indicators 3 (focal point) - Participate in dialogue around the monitoring results |
| Trade unions | - Participate in the assessment for indicators 3 (focal point) - Participate in dialogue around the monitoring results |
| Parliamentarians | - Participate in dialogue around the monitoring results |
| Local authorities | - Participate in dialogue around the monitoring results |

Overview of stakeholders' responsibilities in reporting data

For each indicator:

- ✓ Who reports to the national co-ordinator?
- ✓ What type of data (quantitative or qualitative)?

| INDICATORS | | Gov. | Providers | CSOs | Private sector | Trade Unions | TYPE of DATA |
|------------|---|------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|
| 1 | Use of country results frameworks | ■ | ■ | | | | QUANTI & QUALI |
| 2 | CSO enabling environment | ■ | focal point | focal point | | | QUALI |
| 3 | Private sector engagement | ■ | focal point | focal point | focal point | focal point | QUALI |
| 5a | Predictability (annual) | | ■ | | | | QUANTI |
| 5b | Predictability (medium-term) | ■ | | | | | QUALI |
| 6 | Aid on budget | ■ | ■ | | | | QUANTI |
| 7 | Mutual accountability | ■ | | | | | QUALI |
| 8 | Gender equality and women's empowerment | ■ | | | | | QUALI |
| 9b | Use of PFM and procurement systems | | ■ | | | | QUANTI |

I am a government official of a developing country - what is my role?

The [Monitoring Guide](#) provides guidance for the participation of developing country governments in the monitoring exercise (see particularly section II of the guide).

Governments in developing countries will appoint a national co-ordinator to oversee the collection and validation of country-sourced data. Terms of reference to guide the national co-ordinator's work are available [here](#). The national co-ordinators play a central role in leading monitoring efforts at the country level, by:

- Ensuring that country stakeholders are fully informed about the Global Partnership monitoring efforts and facilitating their contribution to the process;

- Overseeing the collection of country-sourced data either through existing mechanisms and tools or ad hoc processes;
- Organising multi-stakeholder dialogue in support of data consolidation, validation and final review as well as ensuring the overall quality of data;
- Submitting validated data to the JST for Indicators collected at the country level (Indicators 1, 2, 3, 5a, 5b, 6, 7, 8, and 9b).

It is recommended that the national co-ordinator agree with relevant stakeholders on the appointment of a focal point for each stakeholder group in order to facilitate the data collection.

I am a government official of a developing country – how can I engage non-traditional development co-operation providers?

The UNDP-OECD Joint Support Team has sensitised providers at headquarters ahead of the 2015-16 round in order to ensure their active contribution to the monitoring process. The Team reached out to “traditional” providers (i.e. DAC providers) and to “non-traditional” providers as well.

If the developing country is interested in reporting data on non-traditional providers, it is encouraged to reach out to specific providers at both headquarter and country office levels to seek their collaboration in providing relevant information and engaging in consultation. To facilitate this work, the UNDP-OECD can provide contact details for headquarters of non-traditional providers on demand.

During the 2013-14 monitoring exercise, several developing countries decided to report data on Chinese development co-operation. For more information, please consult the UNDP report on [Demand-Driven Data: How Partner Countries are Gathering Chinese Development Cooperation Information](#). It assesses data on Chinese co-operation reported by 11 developing countries, and provides useful insights and specific recommendations on how to engage China as a partner for the GPEDC monitoring.

At headquarters of an official provider of development co-operation, how do I support data collection and validation?

The [Monitoring Guide](#) provides guidance for the participation of providers in the monitoring exercise (see particularly section II of the guide).

In each provider headquarters, a contact point will be appointed ahead of the monitoring exercise for the 2015-16 monitoring exercise. He/she will play a key role in supporting the monitoring process at country and global levels by:

- Informing relevant institutions within the ministry and/or development agency about the forthcoming second monitoring round of the Global Partnership;
- Providing guidance and incentives to country offices to encourage their participation in the monitoring exercise. While the country office will be responsible for ensuring the quality and accuracy of data reported to developing country governments (on indicators 1, 2, 3, 5a, 6, 7, 8, 9b), previous experience has demonstrated that liaison between the provider’s country offices and headquarter in the data collection and validation phase is crucial to further strengthen the quality of reporting.
- Participating in consultations led by the UNDP-OECD Joint Support Team regarding the monitoring of indicators using globally-sourced data (indicators 4 and 10).

In addition, headquarter focal points are invited to organise, initiate and actively participate in discussions on progress and challenges in making development co-operation more effective and in the dissemination of findings at the global level (including at the GPEDC's next High-Level Meeting in Kenya, late 2016).

How does my role as a provider contact point at the country level differ from the role of headquarters?

The [Monitoring Guide](#) provides guidance for the participation of providers in the monitoring exercise (see particularly section II of the guide).

In view of facilitating providers' engagement in the data collection and validation at country level, provider country contact points should work closely with the national co-ordinator to supply and/or validate data for Indicators 1, 5a, 6, and 9a, and to liaise with their headquarters to ensure that the data reported to the national co-ordinator is accurate. In addition, contact points are invited to participate in the multi-stakeholder assessment of indicators 2 and 3.

Providers' country offices are invited to agree with the government on a single focal point for providers in each country, who will facilitate providers engagement in the monitoring process and represent and coordinate with other country-level providers during consultations with the government's national co-ordinator and the focal points for other stakeholders (e.g. private sector, civil society organisations), particularly during the kick-off and validation meetings. Terms of reference to guide the provider focal point's work are available [here](#).

I am a provider of non-traditional development co-operation; can I also participate in the monitoring?

The GPEDC effective development co-operation (EDC) principles can be relevant to all stakeholders involved in development co-operation. With the GPEDC's broadened multi-stakeholder and inclusive nature, non-traditional providers interested in participating are encouraged to do so. Non-traditional providers who have not been contacted by a national co-ordinator, but who wish to be engaged in the monitoring round, are invited to contact the UNDP-OECD joint-support team (monitoring@effectivecooperation.org).

I am not a government official nor development co-operation provider, how can I participate in the monitoring?

The [Monitoring Guide](#) provides guidance for the participation of other stakeholders - including representatives from **civil society organisations, the private sector, trade unions, parliaments and local authorities** - in the monitoring exercise (see particularly section II of the guide).

These other stakeholders are invited to actively support the monitoring process at country and global levels by:

- Liaising with national co-ordinators to ensure that they are represented by focal points at the country level. Terms of reference to guide these focal points' work are available [here](#).
- Participate in the multi-stakeholder assessment of indicators 2 (focal point for CSOs), and indicators 3 (focal points for the private sector, trade unions, and CSOs)
- Participating in multi-stakeholder dialogue on the monitoring results and on mutual review of progress at country, regional and global levels.

How can I know which specific indicators I should provide input to?

The following table summarises, for each indicator, which stakeholders should report data to the national co-ordinator:

| INDICATORS | | Gov. | Providers | CSOs | Private sector | Trade Unions | TYPE of DATA |
|------------|---|------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|
| 1 | Use of country results frameworks | ■ | ■ | | | | QUANTI & QUALI |
| 2 | CSO enabling environment | ■ | focal point | focal point | | | QUALI |
| 3 | Private sector engagement | ■ | focal point | focal point | focal point | focal point | QUALI |
| 5a | Predictability (annual) | | ■ | | | | QUANTI |
| 5b | Predictability (medium-term) | ■ | | | | | QUALI |
| 6 | Aid on budget | ■ | ■ | | | | QUANTI |
| 7 | Mutual accountability | ■ | | | | | QUALI |
| 8 | Gender equality and women's empowerment | ■ | | | | | QUALI |
| 9b | Use of PFM and procurement systems | | ■ | | | | QUANTI |

Guidelines, specific questions and definitions of key terms for these indicators are provided in the [Monitoring Guide](#) (Annex III).

I am a provider of development co-operation but do not have a country presence. How can I report data to government authorities?

Providers of development co-operation in participating countries (see list of participating countries [here](#)) without a country presence (e.g. global programmes – see next question) are encouraged to liaise with national co-ordinators. Focal points at regional or global levels may be identified to coordinate any necessary data provision to national governments.

National co-ordinators are encouraged to ensure that these providers are informed of the process, can report the necessary data and participate in the dialogue at the country level.

I am a Global Program/Fund, should I report data to government authorities? How can I provide my data?

Global programmes such as the Global Partnership for Education, the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation (GAVI), the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS TB and Malaria make an important contribution to development which was recognised in the Accra Agenda for Action. They have increasingly participated in global efforts to monitor the effectiveness of development co-operation through surveys on monitoring the Paris Declaration since 2006 and through the GPEDC's 2013-14 monitoring round. Lessons from previous experiences indicate that some countries had difficulties from time to time to access and report on global programmes' support, as these are not directly present in countries.

To facilitate reporting, steps are being put in place to support countries' inclusion of global programmes in global monitoring efforts. Contact points for global programmes will be shared with national co-ordinators and provider focal points to encourage their inclusion in the monitoring process in- country, including orientation and validation meetings.

I am a humanitarian relief agency (e.g. UNHCR, WFP), should I participate in global monitoring efforts at country level?

Yes. All providers of development co-operation are invited to report their data on relevant indicators at the country level directly to national co-ordinators.

While it is up to each responding provider to use their own criteria to identify which share of their portfolio supports long-term development efforts as opposed to emergency relief and humanitarian assistance of a short-term nature, please note that humanitarian aid should not be included in the reporting. This is because such aid is not predictable by nature and does not usually use government systems.

Can countries which provide south-south co-operation to my country participate in the process?

Participation is voluntary. If your partners of south-south co-operation are willing to provide the necessary data and, are comfortable to have their data included in your data submission through their participation in your country level dialogue and data validation, the UNDP-OECD Joint Support Team will stand ready to provide further guidance.

DATA COLLECTION, VALIDATION AND REPORTING

This section includes questions and answers on data collection.

How is data collected and validated?

More detailed information on the data collection and validation process is provided in the [Monitoring Guide](#).

The national co-ordinator will lead and coordinate data collection and validation for country-sourced indicators, in close consultation with development stakeholders (providers of development co-operation, civil society organisations, parliamentarians, the private sector, trade unions, subnational entities and other actors) in a multi-stakeholder partnership framework.

To collect and validate data, he/she is encouraged to use existing systems and frameworks to the extent possible (e.g. aid information management systems, donor performance assessment frameworks). For more information and illustrative examples of how developing country governments can ground the monitoring process in their own tools (e.g. aid information management systems) and frameworks, see part II of the the [Monitoring Guide](#). Ad hoc arrangements may need to be established for countries which are interested to participate in monitoring efforts but do not have in place processes or tools for periodic collection of country-level data required for the indicators. It is encouraged that data is consulted during the data validation and consultation process by all relevant stakeholders to bridge the data gap and ensure the data quality.

Two tools are made available for the national co-ordinator to submit data to the UNDP-OECD Joint Support Team (these tools can also be used by the national co-ordinator for data collection if need be). Please note that the national co-ordinator is invited to use one OR the other, but not both.

1. A **Country Spreadsheet (Excel file)**. The national coordinator is invited to record data for indicators 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9b in the excel sheets. When data is not available in existing aid-management systems, the national co-ordinator can use a separate Excel file (the “**Provider input file**” which is provided by the UNDP-OECD Joint Support Team) and send it to providers to seek their input.

2. Alternatively, the national co-ordinator can choose to use an **online tool** . National co-ordinators are sent a username and password to access the online tool by the JST. With this username and password, they can save progress and continue the survey later. The national co-ordinator can retrieve the information inputted by providers in real-time, by accessing a reporting link provided along with the username and password. Partial responses are also displayed.

What does the term “disbursement” mean?

A disbursement is the placement of resources at the disposal of a developing country. Resources provided in-kind should only be included when the value of the resources have been monetised in an agreement or in a document communicated to government.

Should funds from a regional or multi-country programme be recorded?

Where development co-operation funding is provided to the developing country as part of a provider of development co-operation’s regional (multi-country) programme and it is possible to identify those activities and disbursements that are specific to that developing country, these disbursements should be recorded.

How should funds disbursed by one provider on behalf of another provider be recorded?

In order to avoid double counting in cases where one provider of development co-operation disburses funds on behalf of another, it is only the provider who makes the final disbursement to the government who should report on these funds. The only exception to this is question Qp14, against which providers should record total development co-operation funds channelled through other providers (in the case of delegated co-operation, funds provided through multilateral organisations, at the country level or multi-donor trust funds administered by another provider).

How do I report on multi-bi funds or ‘delegated co-operation’?

Bilateral contributions channelled through a multilateral agency at the country level or through another bilateral agency (delegated co-operation) for a specific programme should be reported by the multilateral agency or the bilateral agency actually delivering this programme, and not by the bilateral agency providing the funds.

Example: Japan gives USD 1 million to UNICEF for a development programme in Vietnam. UNICEF (and not Japan) should report on the USD 1 million.

In case of multi-bi funds, why does the multilateral agency report to the government of the developing country and not the bilateral agency providing the funds?

In order to avoid double counting in case one provider disburses funds on behalf of another provider (see separate question on reporting multi-bi funds or delegated co-operation), it is **ONLY** the provider who makes the final disbursement to the government who should report on this funds. The only exception is question Qp14, against which providers should record their total funds provided to the country, including those channelled through other providers.

This approach is consistent with the methodology of the monitoring framework of the Global Partnership, which stresses that only the point of delivery reports on certain aspects of the quality of development co-operation funding. This is because the purpose of the monitoring framework of the Global Partnership is to assess the effectiveness with which funds are delivered at the country level, and not to compile accurate aggregates on total funding from a given provider of development co-operation to a particular country.

What currency should be used for reporting?

Reporting should be made in US Dollars. A table of exchange rates is provided in the monitoring section of the [Global Partnership community site](#).

What year should be used for reporting?

The reporting year of reference is **the latest fiscal year of the developing country for which there is information available** on relevant aspects of development co-operation.

Note that for many indicators, the reporting year of reference is likely to be 2014 (or the fiscal year ending in 2014 or 2015).

In developing countries where the fiscal year differs from the calendar year, and where monitoring data is easily available through existing systems, governments may wish to complement fiscal year data with calendar year data. While this would remain optional, it would contribute to facilitate aggregation and comparability of data.

Can the reporting year of providers of development co-operation be different from the reporting year used in a country?

All data from providers of development co-operation is expected to be provided according to the developing country government's fiscal year.

I am a provider and I have noticed an error in my data, what do I do?

The OECD will accept data changes only from the national co-ordinators. Providers should report any errors, changes or anomalies directly to the national co-ordinator of the country in question.

Can providers include operational expenses?

NO, providers' operational expenses should not be included.

What transactions should and should not be recorded in reporting?

The following official transactions are excluded from the scope of the Global Partnership monitoring efforts and should not be recorded:

- Transactions made to beneficiaries that are not based in the developing country or to regional organisations that cannot be identified at country level.
- Debt reorganisation/restructuring.
- Emergency and relief assistance.

Are debt swap programmes included in the definition of ODA?

NO. The Monitoring exercise focuses on development co-operation flows actually going to developing countries. This is the reason why **debt reorganisation/restructuring has been excluded**.

According to the OECD/DAC definitions, debt relief results where there is a reduction in the present valued of debt-service obligations and/or a deferral of the payments due, thus providing smaller near-term debt service obligations. As such, a reduction of debt service obligations does not involve a transfer of flows and is normally not part of any bilateral discussion at country level, except in the case of debt conversions.

Therefore, **debt conversion would be the only case where debt relief could be included** in the reporting for the purpose of the Global Partnership monitoring. The reason is that such an operation involves counterpart domestic currency funds to be used to finance a particular project.

How to report on non-concessional aid?

There is a data column used to indicate whether the funds coming from a development co-operation provider are concessional or non-concessional. When both concessional and non-concessional funds are received from the same provider, the information should be entered as two separate rows.

If we are contributing to military education and training activities for the army in a specific developing country, can this be considered as ODA?

The supply of military equipment and services, and the forgiveness of debts incurred for military purposes, are not reportable as ODA. On the other hand, additional costs incurred for the use of the donor's military forces to deliver humanitarian aid or perform development services are ODA-eligible.

Are education grants and scholarships counted as ODA?

Grants and scholarships for public sector workers can be counted as ODA, but only if the amount figures in an agreement signed between the provider and the partner country government. If there is not an agreement with administrations authorised to receive revenue in the partner country, then none of this assistance should be reported as funds for the government sector. This is because the monitoring framework of the Global Partnership usually excludes transactions to beneficiaries located outside the partner country.

A formal agreement with the partner government for training of civil servants would designate the government as the beneficiary for the purpose of global monitoring. If the only formal agreement however is with the private individual selected for a scholarship or training, then this beneficiary would be considered neither located within the partner country, nor a government entity.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS FOR EACH INDICATOR

This section includes questions and answers on individual indicators.

The [Monitoring Guide](#) provides indicator factsheets (Annex II) and questions and definitions to guide data collection at the country level for each indicator (Annex III).

Indicator 1: Development co-operation is focused on results that meet developing countries' priorities

The [Monitoring Guide](#) provides detailed information on this indicator in Annex III.

What does this indicator focus on?

The purpose of this indicator is to provide objective information on the extent to which, and the ways in which, existing country-led and country-level results frameworks are used by providers as a guiding tool to focus development co-operation on results that meet developing countries' priorities.

What is a CRF?

Country results frameworks (CRFs) define a country's approach to results and its associated monitoring and evaluation systems focusing on performance and achievement of development results. They include agreed objectives and output / outcome / impact indicators with baselines and targets to measure progress in

implementing them, as stated in national development strategies, sector plans, subnational strategies and other frameworks (e.g. budget support performance matrices).

There is no CRF in the country for which I am reporting. How can I still provide input for this indicator?

Country results frameworks are often operationalised at different levels. Therefore, the definition of country-led results framework allows for the possibility to use other equivalent priority setting mechanisms at the country level since not all countries articulate their priorities through consistent, integrated Country Results Frameworks. CRF-like planning instruments include: long-term vision plans; national development strategies; joint government-multidonor plans; government's sector strategies, policies and plans; subnational planning instruments; as well as other frameworks (e.g. budget support performance matrices, sector-wide approaches). In contrast, planning and priority setting documents produced outside the government, such as country strategies prepared by providers, are not considered CRFs.

Where there is no single agreed common Country Results Framework in existence, providers should clearly indicate the results framework that they used in designing their development intervention. In the absence of common CRFs, providers may wish to indicate alignment to other equivalent priority setting mechanisms (if any) such as use of sector plans and strategies. Where relevant they may also refer to national or subnational frameworks.

What does the indicator measure?

The indicator measures the extent of use of country results frameworks by providers, for development co-operation programming and results-reporting stages. The questionnaire covers four components:

- (a) Alignment of the intervention's objectives with existing government-owned results frameworks and planning tools;
- (b) Use of results indicators drawn from these instruments;
- (c) Use of ongoing government-sourced data to report on the intervention's results; and
- (d) Reliance on final evaluations carried out with government support.

These four components are covered through quantitative questions, as well as qualitative information. The qualitative information will contextualise the country-level findings, in order to provide a complete snapshot of the situation at the country level and help inform policy discussions on how to strengthen collaboration between the country's priority-setting institutions and providers of development co-operation.

What is the goal of this indicator in terms of outcomes on development behaviour?

The behavioural change pursued by this indicator is to gear development co-operation providers to assess performance based indicators that are drawn from existing country-led results frameworks and tracked through country monitoring systems and statistics. This should minimise the use of ad hoc or parallel results frameworks by development co-operation providers.

How will the current monitoring round (2015-16) inform future rounds for this indicator?

After submitting the data for the current monitoring round, countries will be asked to provide feedback on their experience in collecting the data for the different indicators, and on the relevance and usefulness of the information captured by these indicators. That crucial feedback from the end-user of this information (national coordinators and governments) will be used to refine and expand the post-2015 monitoring framework and future rounds.

Indicator 2: Civil society operates within an environment that maximises its engagement in and contribution to development

The [Monitoring Guide](#) provides detailed information on this indicator in Annex III.

What does this indicator focus on?

This indicator seeks to assess the extent to which governments and providers of development co-operation contribute to an enabling environment for Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), and to which CSOs are implementing development effectiveness principles in their own operations.

What is a CSO?

CSOs can be defined to include all non-market and non-state organisations outside of the family in which people organise themselves to pursue shared interests in the public domain. They cover a range of organisations that includes membership-based CSOs, cause-based CSOs and service-delivery CSOs.

What is a CSO enabling environment?

The political, financial, legal and policy context that affects how CSOs carry out their work. It can include:

- Laws, policies and practices respecting freedom of association, the right to operate without state interference, the right to pursue self-defined objectives, and the right to seek and secure funding from national & international sources;
- Institutionalised, inclusive and transparent multi-stakeholder dialogue for a;
- Effective support from development providers to empower CSOs.

What is CSO development effectiveness?

CSO development effectiveness principles (also known as the [Istanbul Principles for CSO Development Effectiveness](#)) were agreed upon at the Open Forum's Global Assembly in Istanbul, September 28 -30, 2010. These Principles are the foundation of the Civil Society Partnership for Effective Development (CPDE)'s *International Framework on CSO Development Effectiveness*, which introduces and operationalizes the *Istanbul Principles*. These Principles are meant to guide the work and practices of civil society organisations in both peaceful and conflict situations, in different areas of work from grassroots to policy advocacy, and in a continuum from humanitarian emergencies to long-term development. According to these principles, CSOs are effective as development actors when they: (1) Respect and promote human rights and social justice, (2) Embody gender equality and equity while promoting women and girl's rights, (3) Focus on people's empowerment, democratic ownership and participation, (4) Promote Environmental Sustainability, (5) Practice transparency and accountability, (6) Pursue equitable partnerships and solidarity, (7) Create and share knowledge and commit to mutual learning, and (8) Commit to realising positive sustainable change.

What does the indicator measure?

The indicator consists in a four-module questionnaire (16 qualitative questions). The four modules in the indicator are: (1) space for multi-stakeholder dialogue on national development policies; (2) CSO development effectiveness: accountability and transparency; (3) official development co-operation with CSOs; and (4) legal and regulatory environment.

The questions included in each module draw on the work of the CPDE Working Group on CSO enabling environment and the Task Team on Enabling Environment and Development Effectiveness (modules 1 and 4), the Istanbul Principles for CSO Development Effectiveness and the International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness (module 2), and the OECD-DAC 12 Lessons for Partnering with Civil Society (module 3).

The questionnaire responses will offer detailed qualitative information at the country level regarding the environment in which civil society organisations operate as well as the extent to which CSOs are engaged in development process and enabled to contribute in an effective way.

What is the goal of this indicator in terms of outcomes on development behaviour?

This indicator is primarily built to provide a useful tool to spark multi-stakeholder dialogue at the country level among governments, CSOs and providers, to identify progress as well as room for improvement in CSO enabling environment and CSO development effectiveness.

How will the current monitoring round (2015-16) inform future rounds for this indicator?

This monitoring round will provide the baseline scenario at the country level. Further monitoring rounds will allow tracing trends in terms of progress in strengthening the enabling environment for CSOs, and in refining and further simplifying the questionnaire into the key factors driving change across countries.

How can my country engage?

While the assessment of this indicator will be led by the developing country government, it is crucial that it be carried out in a multi-stakeholder manner. The national co-ordinator is encouraged to identify, in consultation with stakeholders at the country level, a focal point for CSOs and a focal point for providers. These will actively engage in the monitoring process.

The national co-ordinator is encouraged to (1) convene a multi-stakeholder dialogue to kick-off the process, (2) seek CSOs and providers' feedback on the questionnaire (CSO and provider focal points are invited to carry out consultations with their respective constituencies, and to provide consolidated feedback to the national co-ordinator) and (3) re-convene a multi-stakeholder dialogue at the end of the process to jointly discuss and validate the findings, before sending them to the JST. To the extent possible, the national co-ordinator will seek consensus in the responses. Where agreement between stakeholder groups is not reached, focal points are invited to flag any diverging view to the national co-ordinator. In those cases, the level of agreement of each stakeholder group regarding the responses compiled by the national co-ordinator will be registered in a table attached to the questionnaire (1. Question #; (2) Agree / Partially Agree / Disagree; (3) Comment).

Given that Indicator 2 is characterised by a relatively lengthy questionnaire and that the data collection and validation process will entail active participation of multiple stakeholders, developing country governments can decide, on a case-by-case basis, to use the services of a consultant and/or think tank to support the process. The intervention of such a third-party entity could help avoid overburdening the national co-ordinator and ensure that the process enables a neutral and balanced assessment which effectively captures all stakeholders' views. In such cases, the national co-ordinator is invited to inform the JST, who will, to the extent possible, facilitate the process through technical support (e.g. making available standard terms of reference, providing a list of possible consultants, providing technical guidance to steer the consultant's work, etc.).

Indicator 3: Engagement and Contribution of the Private Sector to Development

The [Monitoring Guide](#) provides detailed information on this indicator in Annex III.

What does this indicator focus on?

This indicator focuses on the quality of public-private dialogue (PPD) at the country level. In doing so, it recognises the importance of inclusive dialogue with the private sector for building a policy environment conducive to growth and sustainable development. The indicator builds on tools developed by the World Bank, and is structured around the three following modules: *Module 1. The legal and regulatory context for PPD; Module 2. The country's readiness to host, create or sustain a dialogue process; Module 3. The organisational effectiveness of a given PPD platform.* It is conceived as a mix of globally-sourced data (module 1) and of country-sourced data (modules 2 and 3).

What is Public-Private Dialogue (PPD)?

PPD is an engagement mechanism to ensure more inclusive and sustainable policy reforms occur through a structured and participatory reform process. It refers to the structured interaction between the public and private sector in promoting the right conditions for private sector development, improvements to the business climate, and poverty reduction. Initiatives to promote PPD consist in most cases of establishing a combination of technical working groups, a secretariat and a high-level oversight structure. PPDs are diverse, with a broad scope of activity. For example, they address cross-cutting investment climate issues as well as sector-specific issues; they can focus on rural or urban, national or sub-national levels.

Examples of PPDs include: the Vietnam Business Forum, the Ethiopian Public Private Consultative Forum, the National Competitiveness Council in the Philippines and the National Competitiveness Commission in Colombia. For more information on PPD see www.publicprivatedialogue.org

What groups belong to the private sector?

The private sector can be defined as “a basic organising principle of economic activity where private ownership is an important factor, where markets and competition drive production and where private initiative and risk taking set activities in motion” (OECD-DAC). The private sector includes a wide range of actors such as domestic and foreign companies, large companies and small and medium size enterprises, professional organisations, intermediary organisations.

The assessment of indicator 3 should cover a representative sample of private sector actors, including various groups that play a different role in different sectors and industries of the country’s market, from small-scale informal entrepreneurs to foreign multinational corporations. As a guiding criteria in defining the reference sample of “private sector” actors to have in mind when assessing the country context, identifying the largest sectors in the economy –both in terms of relative GDP contribution (e.g. often dominant business actors in export-oriented economic sectors) and employment generation (e.g. often SMEs and/or informal entrepreneurs) – should help focus the discussions around the survey questions.

What does the indicator measure?

Indicator 3 will provide a comparative assessment on the country context and readiness to organise and sustain public-private dialogues (PPDs), building up on the information drawn from module 1 and the country-sourced responses for module 2. Module 3 (optional) will help deepen the analysis through the case studies of specific PPD platforms, which in turn will facilitate peer-learning regarding different PPD approaches, and disseminate best practices and lessons learnt.

How are each of the modules completed for the indicator?

- **Module 1. The legal and regulatory context for PPD:** the UNDP-OECD Joint support Team will draw on country scores from a series of international indices, including the “Public engagement” index from the [Open Budget Survey](#), data from the [Citizen Engagement in Rulemaking Project](#) from the World Bank, as well as the “Voice and Accountability”, “Rule of Law” and “Control of corruption” indices from the [Worldwide Governance Indicators](#).
- **Module 2. The country’s readiness to host, create or sustain a dialogue process:** this module consists in 4 qualitative questions.
- **Module 3. The organisational effectiveness of a given PPD platform (optional):** this module consists in an in-depth assessment of the effectiveness of a given PPD platform at the country level.

How will the current monitoring round (2015-16) inform future rounds for this indicator?

Findings for Module 3 will primarily serve learning purposes: the JST will draw on them to showcase, in its 2016 global Progress Report, concrete examples and best practices of effective PPD platforms.

This monitoring round will provide the baseline scenario at the country level. Further monitoring rounds will allow tracing trends in terms of progress in strengthening public-private dialogue at the country level, and in refining and further simplifying the questionnaire into the key factors driving change across countries.

How can my country engage?

While the assessment of this indicator will be led by the developing country government, it is crucial that it be carried out in a multi-stakeholder manner. The national co-ordinator is encouraged to identify, in consultation with stakeholders at the country level, a focal point for the private sector a focal point for trade unions, a focal point for CSOs and a focal point for providers. These will actively engage in the monitoring process.

- **Module 1. The legal and regulatory context for PPD:** In the data collection workbook, the national co-ordinator will only need to select the name of his country, and the data will appear automatically. This information can be used as a source of evidence to inform discussions related to Module 2.
- **Module 2. The country's readiness to host, create or sustain a dialogue process:** The national co-ordinator, in liaison with colleagues from relevant government institutions/ministries, co-ordinates the overall data collection and validation process. Where possible, the national co-ordinator is encouraged to use existing in-country platforms to support the process, and to coordinate with the [Partnership for Prosperity](#). In order to facilitate the process and to ensure an inclusive approach, the national co-ordinator is invited to liaise with focal points from the private sector, from providers of development co-operation, from trade unions and from civil society organisations to complete the questionnaire. The national co-ordinator is encouraged to (1) convene a multi-stakeholder dialogue to kick-off the process, (2) seek stakeholder feedback on the questionnaire (focal points are invited to carry out consultations with their respective constituencies, and to provide consolidated feedback to the national co-ordinator) and (3) re-convene a multi-stakeholder dialogue at the end of the process to jointly discuss and validate the findings, before sending them to the JST. To the extent possible, the national co-ordinator will seek consensus in the responses. Where agreement between stakeholder groups is not reached, focal points are invited to flag any diverging view to the national co-ordinator. The level of agreement of each stakeholder group regarding the responses compiled by the national co-ordinator will be registered in a table attached to the questionnaire (1. Question #; (2) Agree / Partially Agree / Disagree; (3) Comment).
- **Module 3. The organisational effectiveness of a given PPD platform:** On an optional basis, the government can decide to assess module 3, which looks into the organisational effectiveness of a given PPD platform, by using a shortened version of the World Bank's existing PPD evaluation wheel (more information on Module 3 is available [here](#)). Given the more in-depth assessment required for this module, it is recommended that interested governments contract a consultant to carry out the assessment. The intervention of such a third-party entity could help avoid overburdening the national co-ordinator and ensure that the process enables a neutral and balanced assessment which effectively captures all stakeholders' views. In such cases, the national co-ordinator is invited to inform the JST who will, to the extent possible, facilitate the process through technical support (e.g. making the available standard terms of reference, providing a list of possible consultants, providing technical guidance to steer consultant's work, etc.).

Indicator 4: Transparency - Information on development co-operation is publicly available – Implementation of the Common Standard

The [Monitoring Guide](#) provides a detailed factsheet on this indicator in Annex II.

Note: this indicator is NOT measured at the developing country level.

What does this indicator focus on?

The indicator is based on the principles underpinning the common standard for publication of information on resources provided through development co-operation. Indicator 4 will focus its assessment on (i) timeliness; (ii) comprehensiveness and (iii) the forward-looking nature of individual providers' electronic publication of information. The indicator relies on data collected by existing international reporting systems, and participants do not need to provide any data input.

What is the common standard?

The common standard in the Busan Partnership agreement refers to a common, open standard for electronic publication of timely, comprehensive and forward-looking information on resources provided through development co-operation. The common standard builds on three existing reporting systems – the OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS)/Forward-Spending Survey (FSS) and the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI).

What is the OECD Creditor Reporting System?

The objective of the CRS Aid Activity database is to provide a set of readily available basic data that enables analysis on where aid goes, what purposes it serves and what policies it aims to implement, on a comparable basis for all Development Assistance Committee members. Data are collected on individual projects and programmes. Focus is on financial data but some descriptive information is also made available³.

What is the OECD Forward-Spending Survey?

To help efforts toward greater predictability and better assess the prospects in aid delivery ahead of time, the OECD conducts the Survey on Donors' Forward Spending Plans, a unique instrument that brings together most bilateral and multilateral aid spending plans – and the only regular, global process of its kind⁴.

What is the International Aid Transparency Initiative?

The IATI standard is a framework for publishing information on development co-operation activities in a timely, comprehensive and forward-looking manner. The IATI Standard requires publication of data about both the organisation and development co-operation activities carried out by the organisation⁵.

What does the indicator measure?

The measurement approach focuses on providers' actual delivery / availability of information that is publically accessible as opposed to performance against their own common standard implementation schedule.

Monitoring relies on existing data and systems. Data published to the OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS), Survey on Donors Forward Spending Plans (FSS), and the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) reporting

³ The CRS database can be accessed at <https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=CRS1>

⁴ See the following link for more information on the OECD Survey on Donor's Forward Spending Plans:

<http://www.oecd.org/development/effectiveness/aidpredictability.htm>

⁵ For more information on the IATI standard, see <http://iatistandard.org/201/introduction/standards/>

systems will be used for the indicator. These systems provide information on the timeliness, comprehensiveness, accuracy, and forward-looking nature of individual providers' electronic publication of information.

A composite approach will be used to measure the state of implementation of the common standard. Taking into account several measurement dimensions, composite scores will be calculated for each component of the common standard, and the scores will be presented separately for each system, with sufficient detail on their composition.

Do I need to provide input to this indicator?

No, separate data collection for the Global Partnership is not required. Information from the CRS/FSS and IATI reporting systems will form the basis of the preparation of a provider profile and aggregation. This information will be disseminated prior to the report to providers and countries so that they can comment on the results and inform the narrative text.

Indicator 5a: Development Co-operation is more predictable (Annual Predictability)

The [Monitoring Guide](#) provides detailed information on this indicator in Annex III.

What does this indicator focus on?

This indicator focuses on predictability of development co-operation within a reporting year. In doing so, it recognises that shortfalls in the total amount of funding for the government sector and delays in the annual disbursements of scheduled funds can have serious implications for a government's ability to implement development policies and strategies as planned. This indicator measures the gap between development co-operation funding scheduled by providers of development co-operation and development co-operation funding effectively disbursed as reported by the provider.

Is the indicator the same as Indicator 7 of the former Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration?

This indicator is *not* identical to indicator 7 of the former Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration, though it is similar in many ways. It aims to provide a better proxy for predictability of disbursements than the indicator used in the Paris Declaration monitoring framework. In contrast with measurement used in the Paris Declaration Monitoring, data for both the numerator and denominator of the indicator are now sourced from providers of development co-operation. The inclusion of disbursements in the measurement of this indicator no longer depends on the recording of these disbursements by the developing country government in its accounts. Further changes include the reference period, which can now be the developing country's fiscal year.

How is information collected for this indicator?

The national co-ordinator is responsible for the overall data collection and validation process, in liaison with colleagues from relevant government institutions/ministries and with providers' country offices. Where possible, data should be drawn from the country's aid management systems.

What does the term "scheduled for disbursement" mean?

Development co-operation funding scheduled for the reporting year of reference n are considered to have been "scheduled for disbursement" when notified to government within the reporting year of reference n-1; it includes development co-operation funding scheduled for disbursement in agreements entered during year n.

Indicator 5b: Development Co-operation is more predictable (Medium Term Predictability)

The [Monitoring Guide](#) provides detailed information on this indicator in Annex III.

What does this indicator focus on?

This indicator focuses on medium-term predictability of development co-operation. In doing so, it recognises that lack of comprehensive and credible forward information on development co-operation funding can have serious implications for a government's ability to plan and implement policies and strategies, deliver public services and design and conduct sound macro-economic policy.

What does the indicator measure?

This indicator measures whether developing country governments have at their disposal a forward expenditure and/or implementation plan for each provider of development co-operation over the period of the next three years. Such plans must cover all known components of the co-operation provider's country programme. For example, they cover all development co-operation modalities used by that provider (e.g. budget support, projects, technical co-operation, in-kind aid) and include estimates of future flows that have yet to be allocated to specific activities or signed in co-operation agreements (i.e. "unallocated" resource envelopes, which will be provided to the developing country, but where the modality/sector/activity of spending has yet to be decided).

How is information collected for this indicator?

The national co-ordinator is responsible for the overall data collection and validation process, in liaison with colleagues from relevant government institutions/ministries and with providers' country offices. Where possible, data should be drawn from the country's aid management systems. Whether or not a forward spending plan exists in a given year is collected with a yes/no response.

What is a forward spending plan?

A forward spending and/or implementation plan meets ALL THREE of the following criteria:

- Made available by the provider of development co-operation in written or electronic form (e.g. a single document or – where appropriate systems are made available in country – entered appropriately in an aid information management system).
- Sets out clearly indicative information on future spending and/or implementation activities in the country, including:
 - programmed or committed resources, where the activity and modality is known; and
 - other resources that have yet to be allocated to specific activities in the country.

Amounts are presented by year (or in greater detail – e.g. by quarter or month) using the *developing country's fiscal year*.

Why is a weighted average used for aggregation of the indicator?

Using weighted averages is intended to provide an estimate of the scale of resources covered by indicative forward expenditure and/or implementation plans. This reflects the relative importance that a developing country attaches to obtaining forward spending information from a large co-operation provider vis-à-vis a small provider.

Indicator 6: Aid is on budgets which are subject to parliamentary scrutiny

The [Monitoring Guide](#) provides detailed information on this indicator in Annex III.

What does this indicator focus on?

The formulation of the budget is a central feature of the policy process in all countries. So the degree to which financial contributions from providers of development co-operation to the government sector are fully and accurately reflected in the budget provides a significant indication of the degree to which there is a serious effort to connect development co-operation programmes with country policies and process and to support domestic oversight and accountability for the use of development co-operation funding and results. Budget support is

always on budget, but other modalities including project support can and should also be recorded on budget, even if funds do not pass through the country's treasury.

What does the indicator measure?

This indicator builds on the broad approach used in indicator 3 of the Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration, while introducing modifications that are intended to make it a better proxy for budget comprehensiveness. In other words, the indicator tries to capture the extent to which budgets cover resources expected at the time of their formulation. The denominator is now the amount of 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 ex-ante aid estimates (indicator 6) from the measurement of predictability, that is the extent to which scheduled funds are actually disbursed or the realism of estimates (captured by indicator 5a).

How is information collected for this indicator?

The national co-ordinator is responsible for the overall data collection and validation process, in liaison with colleagues from relevant government institutions/ministries and with providers' country offices. Where possible, data should be drawn from the country's aid management systems.

Should revisions to the annual budget after approval by legislation be included?

The annual budget refers to as it was originally approved by the legislature. In order to support discipline and credibility of the budget preparation process, subsequent revisions to the original annual budget — even when approved by the legislature — should NOT be recorded under question Qg8. This is because it is the credibility of the original, approved budget that is important to measure and because revisions to the annual budget in many cases are retroactive.

Indicator 7: Mutual accountability among development co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews

The [Monitoring Guide](#) provides detailed information on this indicator in Annex III.

What does this indicator focus on?

This indicator seeks to measure progress made by developing countries in undertaking mutual assessment reviews.

What is a mutual assessment review?

Mutual assessment reviews are national level exercises that engage both developing country authorities and providers of development co-operation at senior level in a review of mutual performance. These reviews should be conducted through inclusive dialogue involving a broad range of government ministries (including line ministries and relevant departments, at central and local level), providers of development co-operation (bilateral, multilateral and global initiatives) as well as non-executive stakeholders, including parliamentarians, private sector and civil society organisations.

What is an aid or partnership policy?

A document which sets out agreed approaches to the delivery of development co-operation in the developing country, containing agreed principles, processes and/or targets designed to improve its effectiveness. This may take the form of a stand-alone policy or strategy document, or may be addressed within another document (for example, as part of a national development strategy or similar). The document has been the subject of an inclusive

consultation between the developing country government, providers of development co-operation and other interested development stakeholders.

Is the indicator the same as indicator 12 from the former Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration?

This indicator takes the form of a modified version of indicator 12 of the Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration (OECD, 2011) to build on the lessons learned and evidence on national-level mutual accountability (including evidence generated by UNDESA for the United Nations Development Co-operation Forum). Further refinements to the criteria and methodology underpinning this indicator have been introduced to better capture the extent of involvement of stakeholders going beyond governments to include civil society stakeholders and parliamentarians, for example.

What does the indicator measure?

A country is considered to have a mutual assessment of progress in place for the purpose of measuring this indicator when at least four of the five proposed criteria are met, providing a graduated assessment of progress.

How is information collected for this indicator?

The set of questions to inform the assessment of this indicator are drawn from the national Mutual Accountability survey administered and rolled-out by UN DESA for the United Nations Development Co-operation Forum (DCF), in close collaboration with UNDP. The assessment of this indicator will further benefit from the Fourth Mutual Accountability survey's more in-depth assessment of the situation, progress, and challenges of establishing and strengthening national mutual accountability frameworks.

At country level, national co-ordinators are encouraged to liaise closely with the UN Country Team/UNDP to explore opportunities to synchronise and harmonise the assessment process by embedding the dialogue on national mutual accountability survey at a validation meeting/consultation for the global monitoring process and vice versa.

For countries participating in the Fourth National Mutual Accountability Survey of the United Nations Development Cooperation Forum, the information provided to the survey on country-level mutual accountability will also be used for the GPEDC indicator 7 providing additional complementary evidence.

Indicator 8: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

The [Monitoring Guide](#) provides detailed information on this indicator in Annex III.

What does this indicator focus on?

The indicator on gender equality and women's empowerment measures the percentage of countries that have systems in place to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment. The indicator aims to address gaps in financing gender equality commitments by promoting transparency in public spending and making governments accountable for adequate allocation of resources for the implementation of gender equality commitments.

This indicator is NOT about measuring the actual allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment. The measurement of allocations is done through separate monitoring mechanisms.

What criteria are used to measure the indicator?

For a country to be considered as having a system in place to track allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment, at least one of the following three criteria should be met, :

1. There is an official government statement on a system for tracking allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment. This can for example be a framework or legislation on gender responsive budgeting.
2. Allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment are systematically tracked.
3. There is leadership and oversight of the tracking system by the central government unit in charge of public expenditures (for example the Finance Ministry or a sector ministry).

For a country to be considered as having systems in place to make public their allocations for gender equality, the following criteria should be met.

4. Gender equality focused budget information is publically available. This could be through parliamentary oversight, civil society scrutiny, publications, websites or other means.

In addition to the above criteria, countries may indicate if they a) use gender-specific indicators and data disaggregated by sex to inform budget allocation decisions at sectoral and/or local/district level; and b) conduct regular impact assessments of budgets which address how women and men benefit respectively from government expenditures.

What do you mean by “systems to track allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment”?

The systems to track allocations for gender equality are the processes and procedures to plan, approve, allocate and monitor public expenditures at the national and sectoral level in a way that ensures that expenditures are targeted appropriately to benefit both women and men. Such systems can include gender budget statements, classifiers, gender markers, and preliminary guidelines as outlined in call circulars. The system in place is overseen by a governmental body, in most cases the Ministry of Finance, that considers gender impact in budget decisions and incorporates measures to mitigate any adverse impact on gender equality and women’s empowerment.

“Systematically tracked” means that a tracking process is planned and regularly conducted. For instance, if the tracking of budgets allocations towards Gender Equality is officially planned and conducted annually by an identifiable or designated body it can be said that allocations for gender equality are systematically tracked.

How do you define ‘allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment’?

These can be defined as:

- Resources allocated at sector and local level for programmes that specifically target only women or girls (direct allocation).
- Resources allocated at sector and local level to actions that target both women and men but where gender equality is a specific objective. For example an action that promotes employment of women and men, equal representation within management posts, and equal pay (direct allocation).
- Resources allocated at sector and local level to actions where gender is mainstreamed. For example, an infrastructure project that doesn’t include gender equality as the principal objective but has specific measures to ensure that women and girls benefit equally with men and boys (indirect allocations).

If a country has systems in place to track but doesn’t make information public, can such country still report on the indicator?

Yes. There are two components of the global indicator, one on tracking allocations on gender equality and another on making such allocations public. If a country tracks allocations but hasn’t developed systems yet to make the information public, it is important to report on the indicator as it indicates that the country is making progress on the indicator.

How is data collected and analysed?

For the gender indicator, data is collected as part of a wider monitoring process undertaken for the Global Partnership 2015-16 monitoring round. Data for the gender equality indicator is collected from the Ministry of

Finance by the designated focal points at the country level. For more information on the data collection process, see the [Monitoring Guide](#) of the Global Partnership.

Once the data collection process is completed, the UNDP-OECD joint support team (JST) will analyse the data to prepare the progress report on the Busan Partnership Agreement. In case of the gender indicator, UN Women will take the lead in analysing the data and compiling the report in collaboration with the OECD-DAC Gendernet.

My country is interested in monitoring progress on gender equality indicator. What do I do?

Countries at all stages of development are encouraged to share evidence on their efforts in this area and performance against this indicator in view of advancing mutual learning and the exchange of experiences. Countries can use the methodology provided in the [Monitoring Guide](#) of the Global Partnership to report progress on the indicator.

For further questions, contact UN Women at gender.financing@unwomen.org and the UNDP-OECD Joint Support Team at monitoring@effectivecooperation.org.

Indicator 9a: Quality of country Public Financial Management (PFM) systems

The [Monitoring Guide](#) provides a detailed factsheet on this indicator in Annex II.

Note: this indicator is NOT measured at the developing country level.

What does this indicator focus on?

The indicator looks at the quality of developing countries' PFM systems by assessing the extent to which there is a comprehensive and credible budget linked to policy priorities, effective financial management systems, and timely and accurate accounting and fiscal reporting, including timely and audited public accounts⁶.

Strong public financial management (PFM) systems are essential for effective and sustainable economic management and public service delivery. States are effective and accountable when they are underpinned by good PFM institutions and systems. Good PFM systems are also indispensable in ensuring that aid is being used to achieve development goals⁷.

What is a PFM system?

According to the Paris Declaration, "Country systems and procedures typically include, but are not restricted to, national arrangements and procedures for public financial management, accounting, auditing, procurement, results frameworks and monitoring (OECD/DAC, Paris Declaration, p. 4)⁸.

What is the data source for this indicator?

⁶ The indicator can be assessed through the World Bank website at:

<http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/IQ.CPA.FINQ.XQ>

⁷ For more information on Public Financial Management systems, see:

<http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/pfm.htm>

⁸ See the following OECD document on the Paris Declaration: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/49066168.pdf>

The data comes from the World Bank Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) and is published for International Development Association countries.

What is the International Development Association?

The International Development Association (IDA) provides interest-free loans — called credits — and grants to governments of the poorest countries⁹.

How is the indicator measured?

This indicator takes the form of a score ranging from 1.0 (lowest) to 6.0 (highest), scored in half-point increments (0.5).

The following three dimensions are rated by the World Bank using established criteria:

- a comprehensive and credible budget, linked to policy priorities;
- effective financial management systems to ensure that the budget is implemented as intended in a controlled and predictable way; and
- timely and accurate accounting and fiscal reporting, including timely and audited public accounts and effective arrangements for follow up.

All three dimensions are given equal weighting¹⁰.

Do I need to provide input to this indicator?

No, separate data collection for the Global Partnership is not required. Information from the World Bank CPIA will form the basis of the preparation of a provider profile and aggregation. This information will be disseminated prior to the report to countries so that they can comment on the results and inform the narrative text.

Indicator 9b: Use of country public financial management and procurement systems

The [Monitoring Guide](#) provides detailed information on this indicator in Annex III.

What does this indicator focus on?

This indicator combines the Paris Declaration 5a (use of PFM systems) and 5b (use of procurement systems) to offer a single composite indicator. It focuses on the use of developing countries' public financial management (PFM) and procurement systems when funding from providers of development co-operation is provided to the government sector, without applying safeguard measures. National systems for the management of funds are those established in the general legislation (and related regulations) of the country and implemented by the line management functions of the government.

How does the indicator relate to indicator 5 of the Paris Declaration?

Indicator 5 of the Paris Declaration also measured the use of partner country PFM systems by the use of budget execution, auditing, financial reporting, and procurement systems. However, the methodology presented the average amount of funding for the government sector through budget execution, auditing, and financial reporting. The amount of funding through country procurement systems was presented separately. For the Global Partnership, the indicator has been condensed to show the average amount of funding for the government sector that goes through the four systems.

⁹ For more information on the IDA, see <http://www.worldbank.org/en/about>

¹⁰ See <http://www.worldbank.org/ida/IRAI-2012.html> for detailed criteria underpinning each dimension.

Does any development co-operation modality automatically qualify as using country PFM and procurement systems?

No particular development co-operation modalities automatically qualify as using country PFM and procurement systems. Most modalities including project support can be designed to use country PFM and procurement systems. A set of criteria are presented in the [Monitoring Guide](#) to help providers of development co-operation determine when they are, and when they are not, using country PFM and procurement systems.

How is information collected for this indicator?

The national co-ordinator is responsible for the overall data collection and validation process, in liaison with colleagues from relevant government institutions/ministries and with providers' country offices. Where possible, data should be drawn from the country's aid management systems.

What does the use of national budget execution procedures mean?

Providers of development co-operation use national budget execution procedures when the funds they provide are managed according to the national budgeting procedures established in the general legislation and implemented by government. This means that programmes supported by providers of development co-operation are subject to normal country budgetary execution procedures, namely procedures for authorisation, approval and payment.

What does the use of national financial reporting procedures mean?

Legislative frameworks normally provide for specific types of financial reports to be produced as well as periodicity of such reporting. The use of national financial reporting means that providers of development co-operation do not impose additional requirements on governments for financial reporting. In particular providers of development co-operation do NOT require: i) maintenance of a separate accounting system to satisfy the provider of development co-operation's reporting requirements, and ii) creation of a separate chart of accounts to record the use of funds from the provider of development co-operation.

What does the use of national auditing procedures mean?

Providers of development co-operation rely on the audit opinions, issued by the country's supreme audit institution, on the government's normal financial reports/statements as defined above. The use of national auditing procedures means that providers of development co-operation do not make additional requirements on governments for auditing.

What does the use of national procurement systems mean?

Providers of development co-operation use national procurement systems when the funds they provide for the implementation of projects and programmes are managed according to the national procurement procedures as they were established in the general legislation and implemented by government. The use of national procurement procedures means that providers of development co-operation do not make additional, or special, requirements on governments for the procurement of works, goods and services (where weaknesses in national procurement systems have been identified, providers of development co-operation may work with developing countries in order to improve the efficiency, economy, and transparency of their implementation).

How is information collected for this indicator?

The national co-ordinator is responsible for the overall data collection and validation process, in liaison with colleagues from relevant government institutions/ministries and with providers' country offices. Where possible, data should be drawn from the country's aid management systems.

Indicator 10: Aid is untied

The [Monitoring Guide](#) provides a detailed factsheet on this indicator in Annex II.

Note: this indicator is NOT measured at the developing country level.

What does this indicator focus on?

The indicator focuses on the tying status of aid.

What does it mean for aid to be tied or untied?

- Untied aid: Loans and grants whose proceeds are fully and freely available to finance procurement from all OECD countries and substantially all developing countries.
- Partially untied aid: Loans and grants which are tied, contractually or in effect, to procurement of goods and services from a restricted number of countries which must include substantially all developing countries and can include the donor country.
- Tied aid: All other loans and grants are classified as tied aid, whether they are tied formally or through informal arrangements¹¹.

Why is it important that aid is untied?

Untying aid generally increases aid effectiveness by reducing transaction costs for partner countries and improving country ownership and alignment.

Are all costs included when looking at the tying status of aid?

Development Assistance Committee (DAC) members have agreed that administrative costs and technical co-operation expenditure should be disregarded in assessing the percentages of tied, partially untied and untied aid. These items should therefore not be included in the data reported in this Table.

Do I need to report on this indicator?

No, the indicator relies on existing data from the OECD-DAC Creditor Reporting System¹².

¹¹ See <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dcdndep/44375975.pdf> for more information on the importance of tied vs. untied aid.

¹² See <https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=CRS1> to access the information in CRS.