

# FAQs for Participating in the Second Monitoring Round of the GPEDC: **Indicator 1**

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](mailto:liz.chung@undp.org)

Mr. Nathan Wanner, email: [Nathan.wanner@oecd.org](mailto:Nathan.wanner@oecd.org)

## FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS FOR INDICATOR 1

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 co-ordinators and governments) will be used to refine and expand the post-2015 monitoring framework and future rounds.