

Strengthening the relevance of the GPEDC monitoring framework Opportunities and Entry Points

Background

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development will reflect a **fundamental shift in the development finance and partnership architecture**. It will set a much broader agenda than the MDGs: alongside continuing development priorities such as poverty eradication, health, education, food security and nutrition, it will set out a wide range of economic, social and environmental objectives, it will promise more peaceful and inclusive societies and it will define means of implementation. Its scope will be universal, including developed and developing countries alike, and will involve a broader range of ministries. While establishing the vital role of governments, the 2030 Agenda will recognise the increasing role of a wider range of actors contributing to development. At the country level, this shift will imply the need for a enhanced coordination among stakeholders and development partners; improved policy coherence from both providers and recipients; a greater role envisaged for Southern partners and other development actors such as the private sector and civil society organisations; stronger accountability processes; and better tracking of the full range of development finance resources.

Making development co-operation and partnerships more effective will be crucial to achieve this ambitious agenda. The Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (GPEDC)'s Co-Chairs and Steering Committee have and continue to chart a way forward to strengthen the GPEDC's role and contribution to the post-2015 era. They acknowledge that the GPEDC should draw on its unique value as a global multi-stakeholder platform and should further unpack and concretise the development effectiveness principles and see how they are applicable in different substantive focus areas for different partners and in different contexts. A key contribution of the GPEDC lies in its monitoring: while producing evidence is an end in itself, it constitutes a vehicle to strengthen political dialogue and learning, and to drive policy change for all stakeholders.

The **GPEDC's monitoring framework** seeks to capture behavior change leading to more effective development co-operation, focusing on "how" stakeholders engage in development (i.e. assessing the quality of development partnerships). Its inclusive country-led monitoring approach and process can provide a complementary, ready-made platform to help support UN-led Financing for Development and SDGs implementation and follow-up and review efforts. Ahead of its second High Level Meeting in November 2016 (Nairobi), the GPEDC is engaging in a **reflection on making its monitoring framework fit for the post-2105 development landscape** (["Track 3"](#) of the GPEDC's monitoring work agreed at its 7th Steering Committee Meeting in The Hague, January 2015). The GPEDC's **Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG) has been mandated to support this thinking and to propose advice and recommendations by mid 2016.**

This document provides background information and outlines possible opportunities and key questions to guide the MAG's advice on making the GPEDC monitoring framework relevant to support the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It focuses on two interlinking areas for which the **MAG's contribution will be useful: *strengthening the framework and positioning it in the post-2015 and FfD processes***. Section 1 (pages 2-6) outlines possible areas of review to strengthen the GPEDC monitoring framework – including its indicators, scope, and process – in light of the changing development landscape and to further respond to stakeholders' needs. The MAG is expected to produce recommendations on how to improve the monitoring framework. Section 2 (page 6-9) briefly presents SDGs and FfD outcomes and processes, highlights possible entry points and windows of opportunities to link the revised GPEDC monitoring framework with these processes. The MAG is expected to provide advice on the GPEDC's positioning strategy.

SECTION 1. AREAS OF REVIEW TO STRENGTHEN THE GPEDC'S MONITORING FRAMEWORK

1.1. Key strengths of the current monitoring framework

The unique value of the GPEDC's current monitoring framework lies in (1) its focus on development co-operation effectiveness, which no other platform has specific focus on, (2) its developing country government-led data collection process and (3) its inclusive approach, all development stakeholders – including providers of development co-operation, representatives from parliaments, CSOs, trade unions and the private sector – being invited either to report data or to participate in data validation.

1.2. Proposed approach for the review exercise

The current monitoring framework will need to be revised in order to reflect the changing development landscape and to ensure that it covers effectiveness-related issues that still matter at the country level. The MAG is expected to identify relevant areas of review, and to make recommendations on possible revisions, including on the indicators, the scope and the process of the monitoring exercise. This proposed approach to review the monitoring framework could materialise into a think piece to be delivered ahead of the GPEDC's High Level Meeting in Nairobi (November 2016).

To conduct this review exercise, the MAG will build on (1) its in-house pooled expertise, (2) feedback received from participants during the second monitoring round (bottom-up evidence gathered through the "stress-testing" exercise) and (3) guidance from the GPEDC's Co-Chairs and Steering Committee members.

1.3. What could be improved?

a. Reviewing the indicators?

- **The current indicators**

The monitoring framework consists of a **selective set of 10 indicators** with targets for 2015, which measure progress in the implementation of effective development co-operation principles (i.e. developing country ownership, focus on results, inclusive development partnerships, transparency and mutual accountability). These indicators were [proposed by the Post-Busan Interim Group \(PBIG\)](#) and endorsed during the last meeting of the Working Part on Aid Effectiveness in June 2012. While five of the indicators stem from the monitoring framework of the Paris Declaration, the other five were introduced in 2012 to capture some of the broader dimensions of the Busan Partnership agreement. The indicators focus on **tracking behavior change**: how do development stakeholders (including developing country governments, providers of development co-operation, civil society organisations and the private sector) engage in development co-operation and partnerships? Are they being effective?

- **The "stress-testing" exercise**

In order to feed into the MAG's reflection, the UNDP-OECD Joint Support Team proposes to conduct a "stress-testing exercise", which consists in using the GPEDC's second monitoring round in 2015-16 to collect stakeholders' feedback on the relevance (does the indicator reflect a current challenge" for you?), the efficiency (do you get enough value for the effort of collecting this data?) and the effectiveness (is the evidence produced useful and actionable for you?) of each indicator. (See the proposed table on stress-testing questions). The proposal is to pose, for each indicator, two questions on relevance, two on efficiency and two on usefulness/effectiveness. Participants would be asked to rate the indicators, e.g. from 1 (not relevant at all) to 5 (very relevant). The questions on relevance and efficiency would be incorporated into the excel file sent (1) to the national co-ordinators in charge of collecting data at the country level, and (2) to focal points for providers, parliamentarians, CSOs and the private sectors engaged in the monitoring exercise at the country level. The two questions on usefulness/effectiveness would have to wait until the

actors can see the findings at the end of the process (they could be distributed as a final survey during the summer of 2016). Such a survey could also provide an opportunity to ask them if they plan to use the evidence to carry out policy dialogue, prioritise discussions, organise a roundtable around it, or prepare action plans, etc.

Questions for consideration:

- Does the MAG agree with the JST's proposed approach to carry out the stress-testing exercise?
- Is this approach adequate to endow the MAG with useful evidence to build a proposal in view of a meaningful review of the monitoring framework?
- What methodology should the MAG establish to process the information gathered from this exercise?

- **Guiding principles to take into consideration in reviewing the set of indicators**

The MAG is invited to agree on principles that will guide the review of indicators. Possible principles could for instance aim at (1) maintaining a selective set of indicators, in order to keep the process manageable and limit the burden on developing country governments; (2) ensuring that the required data is, to the extent possible, drawn from existing national data systems; (3) maintaining a level of comparability over time (noting that five of the current indicators can be traced back to the Paris Declaration surveys); (4) ensuring data accuracy and neutrality

Questions for consideration:

- Are the indicators relevant? (i.e. do they reflect challenges that stakeholders are experiencing in managing development flows?)
- Are the indicators efficient? (i.e. is the effort to collect the data commensurate to the value of findings?)
- Do the indicators generate findings that are actionable and useful to prioritise areas of improvements?
- Which indicators require further strengthening?
- Should additional indicators be envisaged?
- Do the indicators monitor commitments from different stakeholders in a balanced way? (i.e. are they more demanding on developing countries than on other stakeholders?)
- Should the mix between country-sourced and globally-sourced data be maintained? (i.e. in the current framework, indicators 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9b use country-sourced data, while indicators 3, 4, 9a and 10 use globally-sourced data).
- Should easily quantifiable measurement approaches be favoured?
- Acknowledging their focus on aid relationships, are the current GPEDC indicators fully relevant to SDG implementation, and if not how might they become more relevant?

b. Expanding the scope of the monitoring exercise?

- **The landscape of development flows**

Developing countries are managing increasingly complex international sources of finance for development. As shown in the table below, development resource flows fall into four different categories, depending on whether they come from official or private sources, and whether they are concessional or non-concessional. The most well-known and classic of development co-operation transactions is classified as official development assistance (ODA), which is concessional aid, provided from official sources. However, funds may also be provided from official sources at or close to market rates (e.g. non-concessional loans), and these type of transactions fall under the category of other official flows. Development co-operation financial flows may also come from private sources, either through concessional modalities (i.e. private grants) or through non-concessional modalities (i.e. private flows at market terms).

- **The current scope of the monitoring exercise**

The GPEDC monitoring currently captures data from developing country governments and from official providers of development co-operation (the government can choose to report on traditional and non-traditional providers). The exercise primarily focuses on ODA which includes all transactions undertaken i) with the promotion of economic development welfare as the main objective and ii) at concessional financial terms (if a loan, having a grant element of at least 25%)¹. However, in view of capturing a more comprehensive picture of development resource flows' effectiveness, participating governments that are interested in reporting on a broader range of development co-operation transactions (i.e. other official flows) are encouraged to do so, provided that such transactions are undertaken with the promotion of economic development and welfare as the main objective.

While private grants and private flows at market terms will not be captured during the second round, indicator 2 (CSO enabling environment and development effectiveness) and indicator 3 (quality of PPD) will provide an opportunity to learn more about how CSOs and private sector actors engage in development at the country level. In addition, the JST is exploring the possibility to pilot a broader reporting scope in a few countries, where key SSC providers, CSOs, foundations and businesses will be invited to report financial flows (private grants and private flows at market terms) on relevant indicators. Findings from this piloting exercise will be useful to feed into the MAG's reflection on broadening the monitoring scope.

	Concessional	Non-concessional
Official	ODA	Other official flows
Private	Private grants	Private flows at market terms

- **Possible areas of expansion**

The MAG is invited to reflect on whether expanding the scope of monitoring would provide a more relevant and meaningful framework within the post-2015 development landscape. The following questions can guide preliminary discussions.

Questions for consideration:

- Should we expand the scope of the monitoring exercise? What would the implications be?
- Should the range of actors reporting to the process be broadened? (i.e. beyond developing country governments and cooperation providers?)
- Should the type of flows reported be broadened (beyond ODA and other official flows?)
- How can the monitoring framework be relevant for different partners in different contexts (e.g. effectiveness in LDCs versus in MICs; effectiveness for traditional donors versus for SSC?)

c. Reviewing the monitoring process?

- **The global-light, country-focused approach**

As emphasised in Busan, the monitoring framework was conceived following a "global-light, country-focused" approach. In particular, the Busan Partnership agreement particularly foresaw:

- Country-led efforts to put in place frameworks to monitor progress and strengthen mutual accountability for the effectiveness of development co-operation, and in turn development results.

¹ This monitoring exercise uses the current ODA definition (detailed definitions available in OECD-DAC Statistical Directives (OECD, 2013), available online at: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/methodology.htm>). The OECD/DAC's current work to modernise the definition of ODA will only take effect from 2018 on (more information available at: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/understanding-development-finance.htm>).

- Global-level agreement, by June 2012, on a framework – including a selective and relevant set of international indicators and targets – that will be used to monitor progress towards more effective development co-operation

Questions for consideration:

- What are the issues, challenges and opportunities arising from a country-led monitoring process?
- How can a country-led and country-focused monitoring process conduct to meeting global commitments and behavior change?
- What is the current state of country monitoring frameworks?
- What structures currently exist? Are they adequate? What is the level of stakeholder representation?

- **Balancing government leadership and inclusiveness**

The monitoring exercise is characterised by developing country leadership: the national co-ordinator, who usually sits in the ministry of planning or finance, leads and coordinates data collection and validation at the country level. However, in line with the spirit of Busan, the process encourages an inclusive approach: providers and other relevant stakeholders (representatives from parliaments, CSOs, trade unions, the private sector, etc.) are invited to actively engage in the data collection and validation process, and to participate in discussions on effective development co-operation at the national, regional and global levels. In order to facilitate multi-stakeholder participation, the second monitoring round will rely on the appointment of focal points for each stakeholder group at the country level. In addition, the objective is to use, to the extent possible, existing in-country platforms.

Questions for consideration:

- Should the revised framework aim for a similar balance between government leadership and inclusiveness?
- Should multi-stakeholder dialogue be further encouraged? If so, how can this be done without overburdening the process?

- **Timing and periodicity: monitoring on a rolling basis or following biennial rounds?**

The PBIG originally envisaged that, in order to produce periodic progress reports (every 18-24 months), the JST would draw on existing sources of data when they are available (see the [PBIG's proposal](#)). This meant that data collected routinely at the country level as part of existing exercises to monitor development co-operation would be used to inform global indicators which rely on country-level information rather than administering global questionnaire-based surveys at fixed points in time (as was the case with the Paris Declaration Survey). Developing countries were encouraged to ground data collection in existing national monitoring processes, according to their own calendar agreed in country but using the standard methodology and definitions agreed at the international level. Such data was then meant to be released on a rolling basis, as they become available, for aggregation and use in global analysis. In practice, this "rolling-basis" approach proved difficult to implement, and the current approach tends to mix a rolling-basis approach and a cyclical approach (i.e. rounds). During the first round, some countries built on existing systems and processes to acquire the necessary data (or at least to support the data collection), while others set up purely ad hoc structures for the purpose of this exercise.

Questions for consideration:

- What timing and periodicity modalities should be established for the revised monitoring framework?

- **Complementary analysis**

The PBIG foresaw that the selected set of indicators would be supplemented by qualitative approaches and broader reporting on relevant aspects of the Busan Partnership in order to generate richer analysis of

progress and ensure reporting that goes beyond a narrower focus on quantitative indicators (see the [PBIG's proposal](#)).

Questions for consideration:

- What complementary approaches could be used to assess progress?
- What should the areas of focus be?

d. Strengthening accountability?

In view of encouraging behaviour change and mutual accountability, the GPECD uses monitoring findings to exert moral persuasion and peer pressure against time bound targets. While the current set of indicators measures progress against commitments made in Busan (see the [Busan Partnership agreement](#)), it is still unclear whether the outcome of the High Level Meeting in Nairobi (November 2016) will establish new commitments (as in Paris, Accra and Busan), or will consist in a more flexible document (as in Mexico).

Questions for consideration:

- What mechanisms could be established to strengthen mutual accountability? (e.g. distinguished awards and other forms of recognition?)

SECTION 2. LINKING THE GPECD MONITORING WITH THE SDGs AND FFD PROCESSES

While the draft 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Addis Ababa Agenda for Action (AAAA) refer to the establishment of dedicated global frameworks to follow-up and review progress, they both emphasise the need to build on existing platforms and processes, the AAAA explicitly mentioning the GPECD (OP 58).

The section below identifies windows of opportunities – emerging from the draft 2030 Agenda and the AAAA – to position the GPECD monitoring in the implementation, follow-up and review efforts. The MAG's inputs, advice and recommendations would be useful to further define a strategy to position to GPECD's monitoring within these processes.

2.1. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: possible entry points for the GPECD

Relevant sections of the draft 2030 Agenda:

- [OP 17.16](#) and [OP 17.17](#) on Goal 17
- [OP 72](#) to [OP 91](#) on Follow-up and Review

a. Key features

The outcome document for the UN Summit to adopt the Post-2015 Development Agenda provides a people-centred plan of action for development between now and 2030. It includes 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and 169 associated targets. While SDGs 1-16 are mainly oriented towards increasing development outcomes, SDG 17 focuses on strengthened means of implementation and a revitalised global partnership for sustainable development. The means of implementation will also be "complemented and supported" by the AAAA.

Possible entry point:

While the SDGs mainly focus on development results/outcomes, the GPECD brings a distinctive focus on the effectiveness and quality of means of implementation. Making sure that development processes (i.e. the "how") are effective is a crucial step to ensure increased development results and outcomes.

b. Follow-up and review mechanism

At the 70th session of the UNGA in September 2015, the UN SG will present a proposal for the organisational and institutional arrangements of the follow-up and review at the global, regional and national levels. This section outlines the preliminary features of this follow-up and review mechanism – as currently described in the draft 2030 Agenda (OP 72 to 91).

The draft 2030 Agenda calls for the establishment of a **robust, voluntary, effective, participatory, transparent and integrated follow-up and review framework**, which will operate at the **national, regional and global levels**. The follow-up and review processes will be guided by a set of **agreed principles**, including national ownership; open, inclusive, participatory and transparent processes; building on existing platforms and processes where they exist. The Goals and targets will be followed-up and reviewed using a **global indicator framework**. In March 2015, the United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC) created an **Inter-agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (IAEG-SDGs)**, composed of Member States and including regional and international agencies as observers. The IAEG-SDGs has been tasked to develop a proposal for the global indicator framework. The proposal is to be presented to the UNSC in March 2016 for review and approval, and adopted thereafter by the ECOSOC and the General Assembly. The framework is to be based on the proposal by the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals (OWG) of a set of 17 goals and 169 targets, which are expected to be adopted, with possibly some limited revisions, at the UN High-Level summit in September 2015. The IAEG-DGs will discuss its proposed framework at their second IAEG-SDGs meeting on 26-28 October in Bangkok, and its final proposal is to be submitted to UNSC by the 30 November. The set of global indicators will be **complemented by indicators at the regional and national levels which will be developed by Member States**.

Possible entry point: Incorporating GPEDC indicators into the SDGs' global indicator framework

The OWG's goals and targets are rather silent with regard to "quality" of cooperation/partnerships in general. While the GPEDC can help ensure that development co-operation and partnerships are used effectively to support results in the substantive areas covered by Goals 1 to 16, a specific entry point could be SDG 17, which includes targets related to core areas of GPEDC work on multi-stakeholder partnerships, particularly Goal 17.16 (Mobilise and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources to support the achievement of the SDGs through multi-stakeholder partnerships) and Goal 17.17 (Encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships). Placing the GPEDC's indicators against 17.16 and 17.17 may help positioning the GPEDC framework within the post-2015 context. This may mean deepening the thinking around how the GPEDC monitoring framework monitors quality of "partnerships".

From 11 August to 7 September 2015, the IAEG-SDGs launched an open consultation on the proposed global indicator framework with all countries, regional and international agencies, civil society, academia and the private sector. Through this open consultation, the OECD-UNDP has proposed the incorporation of the following GPEDC indicators:

- Indicator 7 (on mutual accountability) is being proposed as a possible indicator under Goal 17.16.
- Indicator 2 (on CSO enabling environment and development effectiveness) and indicator 3 (on quality of public-private dialogue) are being proposed as possible indicators under Goal 17.17.

It is not certain as to whether these proposals will be retained during the Member States expert group discussions. The OECD and UNDP will follow-up on this proposal. If these indicators are retained, evidence emerging from the GPEDC monitoring could feed into the SDG Progress Report.

The draft 2030 Agenda calls for countries to fully engage in conducting regular and inclusive reviews of progress at sub-national, national, regional and global levels. At the global level, the **High Level Political**

Forum on sustainable development (HLPF) will have a central role in **overseeing a network of follow-up and review processes**, working coherently with the General Assembly, ECOSOC and other relevant organs and forums.

- Follow-up and review at the HLPF will be informed by an **annual SDG Progress Report** to be prepared by the Secretary General in cooperation with the UN System, based on the global indicator framework and data produced by national statistical systems and information collected at the regional level.
- The HLPF, under the auspices of ECOSOC, will carry out **regular reviews**, which will be voluntary, while encouraging reporting, and include developed and developing countries as well as relevant UN entities and other stakeholders, including civil society and the private sector.
- **Thematic reviews** of progress on the SDGs, including cross-cutting issues, will also take place at the HLPF.
- The HLPF will meet every four years under the auspices of the General Assembly, and will provide high-level political guidance on the agenda and its implementation (the next HLPF meeting will take place in 2019).
- The HLPF will support participation in follow-up and review processes by the major groups and other relevant stakeholders. These actors will be invited to report on their contribution to the implementation of the Agenda.
- The UN SG, in consultation with Member States, will prepare a report for consideration at the 70th session of the UNGA (September 2015) in preparation for the 2016 meeting of the HLPF, which outlines a proposal for the organizational and institutional arrangements and responsibilities of the follow-up and review and the global level.

Possible entry points: Contribution to the HLPF's work

The GPEDC can provide inputs/evidence stemming from the monitoring exercise (and other tools, i.e. Global Partnership Initiatives) to:

- feed into the HLPF's regular review
- feed into the HLPF's thematic reviews of progress on the SDGs (effective development co-operation being a cross-cutting issues).

2.2. The Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA): possible entry points for the GPEDC

Relevant section of the AAAA:

- *OP 50 and OP 58 (International development cooperation)*
- *OP 125 to 134 (Data, monitoring and follow-up)*

a. Key features

The AAAA lays out the steps the international community promises to take to fund the world's new sustainable development agenda. It addresses all sources of finance (including domestic public resources, domestic and international private business and finance, international development co-operation, and international trade), and covers cooperation on a range of issues including technology, science, innovation, trade and capacity building. It outlines how this range of actors will be working in partnership to ensure adequate financing for essential social services and infrastructure.

The document **acknowledges the importance of effective development cooperation**: it recognises "common goals and common ambitions to strengthen international development cooperation and maximize its effectiveness, transparency, impact and results" and welcomes "the progress achieved in elaborating the principles that apply to our respective efforts to increase the impact of our cooperation" (OP 50). It welcomes "efforts to improve the quality, impact and effectiveness of development cooperation and other international efforts in public finance, including adherence to agreed development cooperation effectiveness principles" (OP 58).

In addition, the AAAA **explicitly refers to the GPEDC**. Indeed, it establishes that, while the main vehicle for pursuing these efforts within the United Nations is the **Development Co-operation Forum (DCF)** of ECOSOC, United Nations Member States will also “take account of efforts in other relevant forums, such as the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation, in a complementary manner” (OP 58).

Possible entry points:

The GPEDC has a distinctive but complementary role to that of the DCF. As an inclusive, multi-stakeholder partnership, the GPEDC is well placed to develop solutions to difficult and diverse challenges for development finance and development co-operation. The GPEDC and DCF will continue to strengthen synergies in jointly contributing to effective development co-operation, including through the joint DCF-GPEDC Roadmap.

The AAAA recognises the importance of quality and effectiveness of co-operation and partnerships, and the possible application of agreed “development effectiveness” principles to other resources (beyond development co-operation, to private finance for instance). Expanding the scope of the monitoring framework to a broader set of development actors could strengthen the GPEDC’s contribution to the AAAA follow-up and review.

b. Follow-up and review mechanism

The AAAA establishes a dedicated and strengthened follow-up process that will use existing institutional arrangements and will include an **ECOSOC FfD Forum** which will meet annually for up to five days, alongside the High Level Political Forum (HLPF). Every four years, a **High Level Dialogue on FfD (HLD)** will be convened (OP 132). The AAAA supports, complements, and helps contextualize the 2030 Agenda’s means of implementation targets (SDG 17). Currently, how the review and follow-up mechanisms for the AAAA and the 2030 Agenda will be consolidated and/or complemented remains unclear.

Possible entry point: The GPEDC can provide inputs to this process through interventions and participation at the FfD Forum and HLD.

It is also intended that the UN Secretary-General convene an **inter-agency task force**, which will “report annually on progress in implementing the financing for development outcomes and the means of implementation of the post-2015 development agenda and advise the intergovernmental follow-up thereto on progress, implementation gaps and recommendations for corrective action” as an input to the FfD Forum (OP 133).

Possible entry point: The GPEDC is well placed to make its analysis and substantive inputs available to the work of this inter-agency task force. Evidence of and experience with aid and development effectiveness commitments will be identified through the GPEDC’s monitoring framework, lessons learned in Global Partnership Initiatives and other GPEDC work. GPEDC High Level Meetings provide an important opportunity to inject these findings into the FfD follow-up process. Contributions from other initiatives – including regional workshops; the annual Seoul workshop; a follow-up to the Brussels Workshop; and GPI reporting – can be made available to the Task Force and highlighted at the FfD Forum.

Conclusion

The MAG is invited to use the opportunity of its second meeting on 28-29 September 2015 in Paris to further discuss issues and questions related to (1) strengthening the monitoring framework and (2) positioning it in the post-2015 and FfD follow-up and review mechanisms. During the meeting, the MAG is expected to agree on its work plan for the six coming months, regarding the questions and entry points proposed in this paper (track 3).

Annex - Table of key events and possible entry points in the Post-2015 and FfD processes

		Post-2015 framework	AAAA follow-up	GPEDC related events
2015	September	15 Sept – Opening of the 70 th session of UNGA (NY) 25-27 Sept – UN Summit for the adoption of the post-2015 development agenda (NY)		2 nd Meeting of the MAG (Paris)
	October	15 Oct - Deadline for final comments on updated list of possible indicators for post-2015 26-28 Oct – 2 nd Meeting of the IAEG-SDGs to review work done and remaining issues (Bangkok)	5-6 Oct: "Realising the AAAA at country-level: Using development Finance to achieve country results", GPI R&MA (Bangkok)	7-8 Oct – regional monitoring workshop (Bangkok) Late Oct – regional pre-monitoring workshop Africa (TBC)
	November	15 Nov – final amendments on indicator proposal by IAEG-SDGs 30 Nov – submission of document by the IAEG-SDGs on an indicator proposal to 47 th session of the UNSC	4-6 Nov – DCF High Level Symposium, (Kampala)	2-3 Nov – regional pre-monitoring workshop LAC (Mexico) 18-20 Nov – KOICA acceleration and Learning workshop (Seoul) 23-24 Nov – 2 nd Global Partnership Forum (Seoul) Nov - Pacific Regional Development Cooperation Workshops (Pacific Islands Forum secretariat)
2016	January			GPI workshop (TBC)
	February			9 th GPEDC SC meeting (TBC) Feb – Africa Regional Meeting in the Africa Action Plan on Development Effectiveness and preparatory meeting for the HLM2, AU and NEPAD (Kampala)
	March	8-11 March 47 th session of the UNSC - Endorsement of the Global Indicator Framework		
	April		8-10 April - UN DCF High Level Symposium (Brussels)	3rd meeting of the MAG (TBC)
	May			
	June			
	July	July - ECOSOC High Level Segment incl. UN DCF and UN HLPF ECOSOC FfD Forum		10 th GPEDC SC meeting (TBC)
	September	13-26 Sept – 71 st session of the UNGA (NY)		
	November			Late Nov – 2 nd High Level Meeting of the GPEDC (TBC)