

FAQs for Participating in the Second Monitoring Round of the GPEDC: **General Questions**

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

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	All providers 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	Continued progress over time
3. Engagement and contribution of the private sector to development	
Measure of the quality of public-private dialogue	Continued progress over time
4. Transparency: information on development co-operation is publicly available	
Measure of state of implementation of the common standard by co-operation providers	Implement the common standard – All development co-operation providers are on track to implement a common, open standard for electronic publication of timely, comprehensive and forward-looking information on development co-operation.

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 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.

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.

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.