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SECTION I – INDICATOR FACTSHEETS

Detailed information on each indicator of the Global Partnership’s monitoring framework is provided in the factsheets presented in this Section. These provide details on the methodology underpinning each indicator, including means of measurement, method of calculation and data source.
Indicator 1. Development co-operation is focused on results that meet developing countries’ priorities

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.

The main focus of the indicator (1a) is to measure the extent of use of objectives and results indicators that are drawn from country-owned results frameworks by providers of development co-operation in designing new programmes and projects. Country-owned results frameworks (CRFs) include any form of government-led planning instrument where development priorities, goals and targets are defined in detail. Given that CRFs are often specified at the sector level, priority is given to alignment of providers’ interventions with sector CRFs – although other national and subnational planning instruments can serve as a reference too. The behavioural change pursued by this indicator is to gear development co-operation providers to assess performance based on indicators that are drawn from existing country-led results frameworks and tracked through country monitoring systems and statistics, minimising the use of ad hoc or parallel results frameworks by development co-operation providers.

While the indicator focuses on mapping out providers’ behaviour in different countries and sectors, the data collection is complemented with an additional module (1b) that provides a descriptive assessment on the existence and characteristics of existing CRFs in the country (or alternative country-specific priority-setting mechanisms). This qualitative information will contextualise the country-level findings reported for sub-indicator 1a, 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.

Relevant Busan commitment

The Paris Declaration (§45) and Accra (§23) commitments, as reaffirmed in Busan, called for relying on partner country results frameworks and monitoring and evaluation systems in order to increase the focus on development results that meet developing countries’ priorities.

Specifically, the Busan commitment (§18b) states that, where initiated by the developing country, transparent, country-led and country-level results frameworks would be adopted as a common tool among all concerned actors to assess performance based on a manageable number of output and outcome indicators drawn from the development priorities and goals of the developing country. Providers of development co-operation also agree to minimise the use of additional frameworks, refraining from requesting the introduction of performance indicators that were not consistent with countries’ national development strategies.

Indicator construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Providers’ extent of use of country-owned results frameworks</td>
<td>Extent of use of country results frameworks by providers, for development co-operation programming and results-reporting stages. The questionnaire covers three components:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qg* 1: Percentage of providers’ new interventions that draw their objectives from country-owned results frameworks.</td>
<td>(a) alignment of the intervention’s objectives with existing government-owned results frameworks and planning tools;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qg* 2: Number of results indicators in providers’ interventions results frameworks that are drawn from country-owned results frameworks.</td>
<td>(b) use of results indicators drawn from these instruments; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denominator: Total number of results indicators</td>
<td>(c) use of ongoing government-sourced data to report on the intervention’s results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that, at the empirical level, country results frameworks are often operationalised at different levels (e.g. sector level).
incorporated in providers’ interventions results frameworks.

Q<sup>3</sup>: Number of results indicators that are planned to be reported using ongoing sources of information from existing country-owned monitoring frameworks.

Denominator: Total number of results indicators (output/outcome indicators) that are reported in the intervention’s closing document (i.e. included in the results framework or log-frame)

1b. Assessment of country context

To better understand the country context in terms of existing priority-setting mechanisms, a guided qualitative question focuses on describing the country’s current arrangements to set sector priorities, goals and targets, and in broadly identifying the existence of different planning tools and the overall characteristics of the country’s planning process.

Data source

Country-level data. Data will be collected, validated and aggregated at the country level by the government, with inputs from providers of development co-operation.

Periodicity to be determined at country level depending on needs and priorities and existing mutual accountability review processes.

Aggregation

Aggregated data is reported at the global level (providers of development co-operation). Data will also be reported for each country in order to inform country-level policy dialogue.

The unit of observation is the provider’s intervention in a given developing country. For reporting, the aggregation is carried out by nesting projects per provider in each country, and then averaging the extent of use of existing CRFs by providers at the country level. Reporting per provider at the global level will also be offered.

Baseline

This monitoring round will provide an assessment for the current situation at the country level.

Target

All providers of development co-operation use country-owned results frameworks in preparing their interventions.

Rationale: based on the Busan commitment which calls on all actors to change behaviour in this area.
**Indicator 2. Civil society operates within an environment that maximises its engagement in and contribution to development**

This indicator seeks to assess the extent to which governments and providers of development co-operation contribute to an enabling environment for CSOs (BPa §22a), and to which CSOs are implementing development effectiveness principles in their own operations (BPa §22b).

The indicator relies on a four-module qualitative questionnaire, completed throughout a multi-stakeholder process led by the government, and engaging civil society organisations, providers of development co-operation, and other relevant stakeholders. The dialogue process is designed to incentivise consensus around the responses – although parties can note diverging views on specific survey items if needed.

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.

### Relevant Busan commitment

The specific Busan commitment states that “[we will] implement fully our respective commitments to enable CSOs to exercise their roles as independent development actors, with a particular focus on an enabling environment, consistent with agreed international rights, that maximises the contributions of CSOs to development.” (Busan §22a).

### Indicator construction

The indicator is structured around a four module questionnaire, covering the following dimensions:

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 qualitative 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 (module 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).

### Measure

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

Given the context-assessment approach of this indicator, measurement at the global level will identify cross-cutting and specific challenges in enabling CSO engagement in development, and in identifying common patterns in those country cases that experienced positive transformations of CSO engagement –as to promote peer learning and greater focus on the factors that emerge from the analysis as most relevant conditions for making country-level progress in strengthening CSO engagement.

### Data source

Country-level qualitative data, gathered throughout multi-stakeholder dialogue processes.

### Aggregation

The unit of observation is the individual country, as the qualitative data reflects specific country contexts for inclusive development partnerships involving CSOs, helping parties identify strengths and opportunities at the country level.

At the global level, the evidence will allow highlighting differences in the relevance and level of progress across the dimensions of the assessment.

### Baseline

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.

### Proposed target

Continued progress over time.

Rationale: The Busan Partnership agreement does not offer a basis for a more specific target. The indicator purpose is to provide an entry point for a
policy discussion based on trends observed.
Indicator 3. Engagement and contribution of the private sector to development

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, although the process was adjusted in order to rely on a country-led, multi-stakeholder data gathering process that could ensure transparency and country ownership. It relies on a mix of globally-sourced and country-sourced data, in order to produce a snapshot of the situation in the country.

Relevant Busan commitment

The indicator reflects the commitment to enable the participation of the private sector in the design and implementation of development policies and strategies to foster sustainable growth and poverty reduction (Busan §32b)

Indicator construction

The indicator construction relies on a combination of globally-sourced quantitative scores and country-sourced qualitative assessments on the country context for inclusive public-private dialogue processes.

It is structured around the three following modules:
- **Module 1** assesses the country’s enabling environment and relies on globally-sourced data, which will be provided by the JST to national coordinators to inform multi-stakeholder dialogue in relation to Module 2.
- **Module 2** assesses the country’s readiness for public-private dialogue processes, and relies on a qualitative questionnaire;
- **Module 3** is designed as an optional component, and provides an in-depth assessment (case study) of the quality and organisational effectiveness of a given public-private platform in the country.

Measure

Building up on the information drawn from module 1 and the country-sourced responses for module 2, indicator 3 will provide country-level assessments on the current legal/regulatory context and country readiness to organise and sustain public-private dialogues (PPDs).

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.

Data source

The indicator relies on a combination of globally-sourced and country-level data sources:

- **Module 1** – International indices, including the “Public engagement” index from the Open Budget Survey, as well as the “Voice and Accountability”, “Rule of Law” and “Control of corruption” indices from the Worldwide Governance Indicators.
- **Module 2** – Country-level data.
- **Module 3** (Optional) - Country-level data

Baseline

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.

Proposed target

Continued progress over time.

Rationale: the purpose of the indicator is to provide means to support broader political discussion on enhanced public private cooperation and further mobilisation of the private sector within the Global Partnership
Indicator 4. Transparency: Information on development co-operation is publically available – Implementation of the Common Standard

The purpose of this indicator is to provide information on the state of implementation by development co-operation providers of the “common, open standard” for electronic publication of timely, comprehensive and forward-looking information on resources provided through development cooperation. It aims to support evidence-based policy dialogue on the transparency of development co-operation and to facilitate mutual accountability and learning at the country and global levels. The common standard was endorsed by the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness in July 2012. It is built on the two main systems of the common open standard, namely the OECD/DAC Creditor Reporting System (CRS) and Forward-Spending Survey (FSS), and the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI).

The methodology described in this sheet is still subject to change as a result of additional technical consultations with the IATI and OECD/DAC Secretariats. A finalised methodology will be endorsed early 2016, which will enable findings from Indicator 4 to be included in the 2016 Progress Report.

Relevant Busan commitment

Through the Busan Partnership agreement, providers of development co-operation commit to implement a “common, open standard for electronic publication of timely, comprehensive and forward-looking information on resources provided through development co-operation, taking into account the statistical reporting of OECD and complementary efforts of International Aid Transparency Initiative and others. This standard must meet the information needs of developing countries and non-state actors…. We will [aim to] implement it fully by December 2015” (Busan §23c).

Indicator construction

The indicator will assess availability of information that is reported to the CRS/FSS and IATI. It is based on a composite approach combining the assessment of information reported to the CRS/FSS and to the IATI. The assessments are led by the OECD/DAC and IATI Secretariats, respectively.

In direct response to the Busan commitment, the assessment focuses on three dimensions: i) timeliness; ii) comprehensiveness; and iii) forward-looking nature.

However, the following revisions are being proposed for consultation:

Reflecting the inherently different purpose of the information captured by the existing reporting systems (i.e. OECD-sourced data provides statistical information, while IATI-sourced data generates management information), the key dimensions of the common standard included in the Busan Partnership agreement (timeliness, comprehensiveness, forward-looking) are interpreted in different ways by the OECD-DAC and IATI data sources for indicator 4, and the items accounted for in calculating the scores reflect these differences in regard to the underlying dimensions included in the data source. The proposed approach will take into account these differences in providing the combined reporting of existing data sources on transparency.

The OECD/DAC Secretariat has included a dimension focusing on data accuracy as an integral component of their data sources, relying on manual qualitative assessment of submitted data. On the other hand, the IATI Secretariat notes that a reliable and objective methodology to assess accuracy has not yet been fully developed (the IATI Secretariat is fully committed to

Measurement

A categorical/rubric scale will provide a measure of degree in which each provider of development co-operation has made progress in implementing the common standard.

An overall status of implementation will be assigned separately for information reported to CRS/FSS and IATI, using descriptive scales (excellent, good, fair, and major improvement needed), with sufficient detailed information on each of components and dimensions.

The reporting of assessments will clearly specify that, under the OECD/DAC Statistics umbrella system, CRS assesses transparency for retrospective data (i.e. related to past/recent performance), while FSS focuses on the transparency of forward-looking aid data (i.e. projections).

In cases where only CRS or FSS are available (usually FSS), that would be the only OECD/DAC-sourced assessment reported, with the above-mentioned caveat.

Sub-composite scales for CRS data and FSS data will use the weighted approach. The weights used in the assessment of CRS data are as follows: timeliness (5/20); completeness (3/20) and accuracy (12/20). FSS assessment of forward-looking data will use the following weights: public disclosure of FSS data (1/7); timeliness (1/7); completeness (3/7) and accuracy (2/7).

IATI uses equal weights between each component (timeliness, comprehensiveness and forward looking) for aggregate overall performance of providers. The three sub-components of comprehensiveness are weighted: core (50%), financial (25%) and forward-looking (25%). The IATI reporting scores are adjusted for the coverage of the financial flows reported using the following scale of coverage: Excellent: 80% or over (adjustment factor 1); Good: 60 – 80% (adjustment factor 0.8); Fair: 40 – 60% (adjustment factor 0.6); and Poor: less than 40%
improving the accuracy of IATI data, and will agree on a way to move forward on this topic in its March 2016 meeting). The JST proposes not to include accuracy as part of the indicator at this stage, but requests both the IATI and OECD/DAC Secretariats to work together to develop a reliable assessment of accuracy starting March 2016. In the meantime, the JST will report on the data accuracy dimension provided by OECD/DAC-sourced data separately, as an emerging layer of analysis in the field of development co-operation transparency.

(adjustment factor 0.4). The adjusted IATI scores are converted to the descriptive scales as follows: Excellent (80% or over); Good (60 – 80%); Fair (40 – 60%); and Major Improvement Needed (0 – 40%)

Different scoring methods will be used by the two Secretariats. This means that numerical composite scores will be calculated for IATI, and composite scores (full, half and no-star) will be made for the CRS and FSS respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Aggregation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk review of data available through reporting on the components/dimensions of the common, open standard (CRS/FSS and IATI). No collection of data at the country level is foreseen.</td>
<td>The proposed unit of observation is the individual country providing development co-operation (in the case of bilateral co-operation providers) or organisation (in the case of multilateral providers). Presentation of composite scales will be grouped under the following three categories:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of data for assessment – IATI assessment will be done for 2015 data, while CRS data will be based on 2014 data. FSS assessment will cover CPA 2014-2018, while IATI’s forward-spending information will look at 2016-2019.</td>
<td>• Group A – providers publishing / reporting to both CRS/FSS and IATI;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This monitoring round will establish the baseline for the indicator.</td>
<td>Implement the common standard – All providers of development co-operation are on track to implement by 2015 a common, open standard for electronic publication of timely, comprehensive and forward-looking information on development co-operation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Indicator 5a. Development co-operation is more predictable (annual predictability)**

Paris Declaration commitment to “disburse aid in a timely and predictable fashion according to agreed schedules” (PD §26; reaffirmed in Busan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator construction</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Numerator:</strong> Development co-operation flows reported by provider as disbursed in year n</td>
<td>% of development cooperation funding for the government sector disbursed in the year for which it was scheduled by providers of development co-operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denominator:</strong> Development co-operation flows scheduled for disbursement by provider in year n and communicated to developing country government</td>
<td>Note that this indicator builds on the broad approach used in Paris Declaration indicator 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Aggregation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country-level data (self-reporting by providers of development co-operation)</td>
<td>In order to avoid the situation in which under- and over-disbursements cancel each other out, disbursements “as scheduled” are presented separately from disbursements “beyond scheduled”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggregates are obtained as a weighted average. Scheduled disbursements is used as the weighting variable for disbursements “as scheduled”. For disbursements “beyond scheduled”, actual disbursements is used as the weighting variable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Proposed target for 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 (estimate, 78 countries): 75%</td>
<td>Halve the gap – halve the proportion of development co-operation funding not disbursed within the fiscal year for which it was scheduled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rationale: based on Paris Declaration target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Indicator 5b. Development co-operation is more predictable (medium-term predictability)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Busan commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“By 2013... provide available, regular, timely rolling three- to five-year indicative forward expenditure and/or implementation plans as agreed in Accra...” (Busan §24a).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing country government determines whether, on the basis of its records, a forward expenditure plan is available for each co-operation provider covering the next one, two and three years. The forward spending plan must meet ALL THREE of the following criteria:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  - Made available by the provider of development co-operation in written or electronic form;
  - Sets out clearly indicative information on future spending and/or implementation activities in the country;
  - Amounts are presented (at least) by year using the developing country’s fiscal year.

Additionally, for each year, to answer “YES” the information provided must meet BOTH of the following criteria:

  - Comprehensive in its coverage of known sectors, types and modalities of support; and
  - Amount and currency of funding is clearly stated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated proportion of development co-operation covered by indicative forward expenditure and/or implementation plans for one, two and three years ahead.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data collected at country level (reporting by developing country governments on the availability of forward plans by each provider).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator values for individual providers and for developing countries will serve as a basis for global aggregation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be determined based on data collection in 2013.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Halve the gap – halve the proportion of development co-operation not covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale: following the same approach as for in-year predictability (see indicator 5a).
## Indicator 6. Aid is on budgets which are subject to parliamentary scrutiny

### Relevant Busan commitment

Busan commitment to “…strengthen the role of parliaments in the oversight of development processes” (§21a); and also Accra commitment to “facilitate parliamentary oversight by implementing greater transparency in public financial management, including public disclosure of revenues, budgets, expenditures…” (AAA §24).

### Indicator construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numerator: Development co-operation funding recorded in annual budget for year n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denominator: Development co-operation funding scheduled for disbursement in year n by co-operation providers and communicated to developing country government at the outset of year n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the denominator used in this indicator is the same as that used in the calculation of indicator 5a (annual predictability)

### Data source

- Data collected at the country level (data taken from existing government budgets and self-reporting by providers of development co-operation)

### Aggregation

- The funds recorded in the government annual budget may be greater than or less than those funds scheduled for the government sector from a provider. To avoid these two cases from cancelling each other out, the funds recorded in the government annual budget in excess are reported separately as “beyond scheduled”.

- Aggregates are obtained as a weighted average. Scheduled disbursements is used as the weighting variable for funds recorded “of scheduled”. For funds recorded “beyond scheduled”, funds recorded in the government annual budget is used as the weighting variable.

### Baseline

- To be determined and only available for countries having the calendar year as a fiscal year (data for the denominator are currently available only by calendar year)

- For reference, aid captured in budgets in 2010 as a percentage of aid disbursements (PD indicator 3, 78 countries): 41%

### Proposed target

- Halve the gap – halve the proportion of development co-operation flows to the government sector not reported on government’s budget(s) (with at least 85% reported on budget)

- Baseline year 2010

- Rationale: Paris Declaration target
### Indicator 7. Mutual accountability among co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews

#### Relevant Busan commitment

Paris commitment to jointly assess mutual progress in implementing aid effectiveness commitments (PD §50). Accra commitment to ensure mutual assessment reviews in place in all countries, with stronger parliamentary scrutiny and citizen engagement (AAA §24b).

Busan commitment to encourage participation of all development co-operation actors in these processes (§18d); agree country-led frameworks to monitor progress and promote mutual accountability (§35a).

#### Indicator construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Numerator: Number of countries considered to have a mutual assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denominator: Total number of countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A country is considered to have a mutual assessment in place when *at least four* of the five criteria below are met:

- Existence of an aid or partnership policy that defines a country’s development co-operation priorities
- Existence of country-level targets for effective development co-operation for both developing country government and providers of development co-operation
- Assessment against these targets undertaken jointly by government and providers at senior level in the past two years
- Active involvement of local governments and non-executive stakeholders in such reviews.
- Comprehensive results of such exercises are made public

#### Data source

Country-level data. Self-reporting against established criteria, using UNDESA work on mutual accountability.

#### Aggregation

The unit of observation is the individual developing country (score across five dimensions). Global aggregation based on the % of countries meeting at least four of the five criteria.

#### Baseline

2010 estimate * = 38% (of 78 countries)

* Note that the criteria proposed in the current methodology have evolved since those used to collect the 2010 baseline. As such this is an estimate only

#### Proposed target

All developing countries have inclusive mutual assessment reviews in place

Rationale: Paris target

Note that this indicator takes the form of an improved version of Paris Declaration indicator 12.
Indicator 8. Gender equality and women’s empowerment

In the spirit of the on-going discussions on the universal post-2015 development framework, countries at all stages of development are encouraged to share evidence of their efforts in this area and performance against this indicator. This will advance mutual learning and the exchange of experiences, and strengthen accountability and transparency in financing for gender equality and women’s empowerment.

Relevant Busan commitment

“[We will] accelerate and deepen efforts to collect, disseminate, harmonise and make full use of data disaggregated by sex to inform policy decisions and guide investments, ensuring in turn that public expenditures are targeted appropriately to benefit both women and men.” (Busan §20a).

**Indicator construction**

**Numerator:** Number of countries that have a system for tracking and making public allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment

**Denominator:** Total number of countries

A system will be considered to be in place in the country if at least 1 out of these 3 criteria are met:

1. There is an official government statement on a system for tracking allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment at national or sector level. 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 over time.
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).

Allocations for gender equality will be considered to be made public if criteria 4 is met:

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

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

**Data source**

Data will be collected from the Ministries of Finance at the country level.

**Aggregation**

For this indicator, the unit of observation is the individual developing country. Global aggregation: based on the percentage of developing countries with systems in place.

**Baseline**

Out of the 35 countries that reported on the indicator in the first round of monitoring, 12 countries had systems in place to track and make public allocations for gender equality. Additionally, 5 countries reported systems for tracking allocations but these allocations were not made public.

**Proposed target**

All developing countries have systems that track and make public allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment.
## Indicator 9a. Quality of developing country PFM systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Busan commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paris Declaration commitments to strengthen country systems at the same time as increasing their use (PD §17-30; reaffirmed in Busan §19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indicator construction

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. a comprehensive and credible budget, linked to policy priorities;
- b. effective financial management systems to ensure that the budget is implemented as intended in a controlled and predictable way; and
- c. 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 weighting. See World Bank (2010) for the detailed criteria underpinning each dimension.

### Measure

Same as Paris Declaration indicator 2a

This indicator is based on the World Bank Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA). It takes the value of one CPIA criterion – indicator 13 – which offers a measure of the quality of a developing country’s budget and financial management system.

### Data source

World Bank (existing international dataset, published on an annual basis and available for IDA countries).

### Aggregation

The unit of observation is the individual developing country.

When aggregating to the global level, the measure used is the percentage of developing countries moving up at least one measure (i.e. 0.5 points) since the baseline year.

### Baseline

2010 (for countries participating in the 2011 PD Survey):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPIA PFM Score</th>
<th>&gt;=5</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>&lt;3.0</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Num. of countries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed target for 2015

Half of developing countries move up at least one measure (i.e. 0.5 points) on the PFM/CPIA scale of performance.

Rationale: Paris Declaration target

---

2 Note that an alternative methodology is currently being piloted by the Effective Institutions Platform (EIP) and the Collaborative Africa Budget Reform Index (CABRI), and estimated in parallel for a number of countries.

### Indicator 9b. Use of country PFM and procurement systems

#### Relevant Busan commitment

Paris Declaration (§21, 26) and Accra (§15) commitments, as reaffirmed in Busan. Busan commitment to “use country systems as the default approach for development co-operation in support of activities managed by the public sector” (§19a)

#### Indicator construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Indicator construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numerator: Development co-operation flows using country systems (average of a, b, c and d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denominator: Total development co-operation flows for the government sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where:
- a = Development co-operation funding disbursed for the government sector using national budget execution procedures
- b = Development co-operation funding disbursed for the government sector using national financial reporting procedures
- c = Development co-operation funding disbursed for the government sector using national auditing procedures
- d = Development co-operation funding disbursed for the government sector using national procurement systems

Note that this indicator combines Paris Declaration indicators 5a (use of country PFM systems) and 5b (use of country procurement systems) to offer a single composite indicator

% of development co-operation disbursements for the government sector using the developing country’s PFM and procurement systems (average across use of four components a-d below)

#### Data source

Country-level data (self-reporting by providers of development co-operation)

#### Aggregation

Developing country, co-operation provider, global: total of numerators divided by total of denominators

#### Baseline

2010 (78 countries): 49%

Country target depends on score for indicator 9a above (quality of PFM systems):
- Reduce the gap by two thirds – a two-thirds reduction in % of development co-operation funding not using country PFM and procurement systems for countries with a score of >=5 on indicator 9a
- Reduce the gap by one third – a one-third reduction in % of development co-operation not using country PFM and procurement systems for countries with a score between 3.5 and 4.5 on indicator 9a

Rationale: based on the logic underpinning the Paris Declaration target (though procurement is now one of the four components of country systems included in the indicator, rather than being subject to a separate target)
## Indicator 10. Aid is untied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Busan commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Pursuant to the Accra Agenda for Action, we will accelerate our efforts to untie aid.” (§18e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator construction</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Numerator:</strong> Amount of untied ODA</td>
<td>Same as Paris Declaration indicator 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denominator:</strong> Total ODA</td>
<td>% of ODA that is fully untied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For detailed definitions, see OECD (2013)⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing international data source: self-reporting on tying status by providers of development co-operation through the OECD-DAC Creditor Reporting System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing country, co-operation provider, global: total of numerators divided by total of denominators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 (all bilateral ODA): 79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued progress over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale: Paris target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁴ OECD (2013), Converged statistical reporting directives for the creditor reporting system (CRS) and the annual DAC questionnaire, 11 June, DCD/DAC(2013), available online at: [http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/methodology.htm](http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/methodology.htm)
SECTION II – QUESTIONS AND DEFINITIONS TO GUIDE DATA COLLECTION AT COUNTRY LEVEL

This section provides advice to assist developing country authorities in collecting the data and to enable providers of development co-operation and other stakeholders to engage in the process. It includes guiding questions to support data collection for each indicator using country-level sources of information as well as detailed definitions for key concepts to ensure accurate reporting.

This annex does not include information on indicators 4, 9a and 10, which are assessed through existing international reporting mechanisms.

More specific and detailed questions and answers related to all aspects of implementing the Global Partnership monitoring framework can be found under the “Frequently Asked Questions” of the monitoring section the Global Partnership community space (see Helpdesk Error! Bookmark not defined.).

GENERAL DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development co-operation transactions to be recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development co-operation funding includes all transactions undertaken with the promotion of economic development and welfare as the main objective. This includes Official Development Assistance (ODA), as defined in OECD-DAC Statistical Directives (OECD, 2013)⁵, including grants or loans to developing countries which are concessional in character (if a loan, having a grant element of at least 25%).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, developing countries interested to monitor the effectiveness of (1) other official flows, defined as development co-operation funds coming from official sources at or close to market terms and (2) development co-operation funding from private sources (i.e. private grants) are encouraged to do so, provided that the main objective is the promotion of economic development and welfare.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development co-operation transactions NOT to be recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The following official transactions are excluded from the scope of the Global Partnership monitoring framework and should not be recorded:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• transactions made to beneficiaries that are not based in the country receiving development co-operation funding or to regional organisations which cannot be identified at country level;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• debt reorganisation/restructuring; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• emergency and relief assistance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁵ 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).
**Disbursements**

A disbursement is the placement of resources at the disposal of a developing country as defined above (see development co-operation transactions). 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.

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 also be recorded.

In order to avoid double counting in cases where one provider of development co-operation disburse 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 **Error! Reference source not found.**, 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).

**Disbursements for the government sector**

Development co-operation funding disbursed in the context of an agreement with administrations (ministries, departments, agencies or municipalities) authorised to receive revenue or undertake expenditures on behalf of central government. This includes works, goods or services delegated or subcontracted by these administrations to other entities such as:

- non-governmental organisations (NGOs);
- semi-autonomous government agencies (e.g. parastatals), or;
- private companies.

For the purpose of reporting against indicators 5a (annual predictability), 6 (aid on budget) and 9b (use of country PFM and procurement systems), development co-operation funding focuses on disbursements for the government sector.

**Exchange rates**

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

**Multi-stakeholder dialogue**

A policy process or development initiative that brings together two or more stakeholder groups (government, providers of development co-operation, CSOs, private sector, etc.), in order to establish a dialogue on matters of interest for the different parties, and on the basis of equality among the stakeholders.

In the context of the Monitoring Framework, it includes multi-stakeholder dialogues oriented towards sparking a discussion on the situation of a specific policy issue in the country (e.g. civil society engagement related to indicator 2, or public-private dialogue related to indicator 3). It also includes broader multi-stakeholder dialogue meetings aimed at validating data and/or discussing around the country-level findings of the monitoring process.

**Provider of development co-operation**

A provider of development co-operation is a country, organisation or official agency - including state and local governments and multilateral institutions - that provide development co-operation funding. Under this definition, non-governmental organisations (NGO are considered providers of development co-operation, while private companies are not).

Notes:

i. Data concerning providers of development co-operation that have different entities (agencies of distinct programmes) should be combined.<sup>6</sup>

ii. In order to avoid double counting in cases where one provider of development co-operation disburses funds on behalf of another provider – bilateral or multilateral, it is only the provider of development co-operation who makes the final disbursement to the government that should report on these funds.

---

<sup>6</sup> UN agencies are encouraged to report individually at country level. However, for the purpose of the Global Partnership monitoring efforts, only combined reporting from ALL UN agencies should be included in the Country spread sheet. Results at the global level will be presented under a single heading: "United Nations", with the exception of IFAD.
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.

This also means that all data from providers of development co-operation is expected to be provided according to the developing country government’s fiscal year.

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.

Note that for most indicators, the reporting year of reference is likely to be 2014 (or the fiscal year ending in 2014 or 2015).
INDICATOR 1: DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION IS FOCUSED ON RESULTS THAT MEET DEFEVELOPING COUNTRIES’ PRIORITIES

Note: This is a new indicator. The proposed methodology was developed against the lessons learnt from piloting a previous approach in eight countries during the Global Partnership's 2013-14 monitoring round, and through follow-up consultation rounds with groups of experts on results framework and development planning in developing countries and providers of development co-operation.

What does the indicator measure?

This indicator seeks to measure the extent to which, and the ways in which, transparent, country-led and country-level results frameworks (CRFs) are used by all concerned stakeholders to assess the performance of development co-operation efforts. In particular, the methodology assesses the degree to which providers of development co-operation rely on indicators drawn from existing (sector-level) results frameworks that reflect the country’s development priorities and goals, and minimise the use of additional and parallel frameworks by providers of development co-operation.

The measurement of providers’ use of CRFs focuses on assessing the degree of reliance on existing country-led results frameworks and its related monitoring arrangements by development co-operation providers in designing new interventions. Regarding the extent of use of existing operational CRFs in designing their interventions, the indicator measures the extent of use of objectives and results indicators drawn from existing operational CRFs, often formulated in results frameworks and planning documents at the sector level. Regarding the reporting on development results, the indicator measures the extent of use of results (output/outcome) indicators being monitored and tracked by the government on a regular basis using its own monitoring systems (i.e. in contrast with project-driven / project-specific indicators).

Measuring the alignment of providers’ new development interventions to country priorities in terms of intervention design and type of results reporting provides relevant indication of substantial and sustained use of country-owned results frameworks by providers.

Finally, to better understand the country context in terms of priority-setting mechanisms, a guided question focuses on describing the country’s existing arrangements to set sector priorities, goals and targets.

Data Gathering Process

The national co-ordinator is responsible for the overall data collection and validation process, in liaison with and with providers’ country offices and, if needed, with other colleagues from relevant government institutions/line ministries. Where possible, data can be drawn from the country’s aid management systems. The data gathering process is grounded at the project level (for interventions equal to or above USD 1 million), and aggregated at the provider- and country levels.

---

7 The focus on sector-level results frameworks is based on empirical observation as well as on feedback from developing country experts, for it is often at sector level where development priorities are operationalised into meaningful results indicators. That said, the methodology allows for also relying the assessment of use of indicators set by the government at the national and sub-national levels where this is relevant according to the project’s objectives.

8 By focusing only on interventions that have been recently approved in the year of reference (i.e. in 2015), the indicator aims at reporting on the most recent behaviour of providers (avoiding reporting on projects that were designed in previous years).

9 Guiding questions based on other results-based management diagnostics tools will help focus the responses on key characteristics of country-level priority-setting arrangements. National coordinators are also invited to rely on the evidence facilitated by providers for sub-indicator (1a) to prepare the response.

10 By focusing on interventions (equal to or above USD1 million), the indicator avoids overburdening national coordinators and providers in the data collection effort while still capturing a representative sample of providers’ current practices (i.e. the largest portion of development co-operation financing flows). Simulations with data on interventions approved for 2015 in countries that...
Overall, this methodological approach ensures comparative consistency across countries and within each country, and across providers of development co-operation, generating evidence that could both serve for incentivising greater focus on results that meet developing countries’ priorities; for better understanding the context for strategic planning in the country; and for helping identify areas where institutional strengthening could be most helpful.

### COUNTRY-LEVEL DATA COLLECTION PROCESS: QUESTIONNAIRE

**PROVIDER OF DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION** – Please facilitate the following information to the government’s national co-ordinator for all your programmes/projects approved during 2015 in the country. Only include interventions equal to or over US$ 1 million (original approved amount):

Qp1. What is the approved amount for the intervention (USD)? ______

Qp2. When was the intervention approved (month and year)? ______

Qp3. What is the type of intervention? _____ (Note: options offered in the Excel file)

Qp4. Who will lead the implementation of the intervention? ____ (Note: options offered in the Excel file)

Qp5. What is the sector that the intervention targets? ____ (Note: if multi-sectoral, mark up to three options)

Qp6. Where have the project’s objectives and topics of intervention been drawn from? ___ (Note: options offered in the Excel file)

Qp7. How many results indicators are included in total in the intervention’s results framework or logical framework? ______

Qp8. From these, how many results indicators draw on results indicators included in existing government results frameworks, plans and strategies? ____

Qp9. How many results indicators will be reported using ongoing sources of information directly provided by existing government monitoring systems or national statistics? ____ (i.e. no intervention-specific indicator sources)

*Note for Qp6, Qp8 and Qp9: Please use the comments boxes to provide further details/explain the reported results.*

**Before submission to the national co-ordinator:** In submitting the table to the national co-ordinator, please provide the electronic links (preferably) or attach the means of verification for your estimates (in particular: the interventions’ approval documents, referred government results frameworks and any other planning documents that support your estimate, referred country data sources).

have expressed interest in participating in the 2015-2016 Monitoring Round estimated a manageable average number of projects being assessed in each country. As a reference, the largest providers of development co-operation will report on 2 interventions per country, on average. For very exceptional country cases in which some providers have approved a very large number of interventions during 2015 (e.g. Afghanistan), they are asked to limit their reporting to the 10 largest interventions in that particular country. For providers with no new interventions above USD 1 million, they are asked to report at least on the largest intervention in the country approved in 2015, even if the associated committed resources for the intervention are below USD 1 million.

11 Note to providers of development co-operation: (a) In the event that you approved more than 10 interventions over US$1 million in the country during 2015, limit your reporting to the 10 largest interventions; (b) In the event that you had no new interventions over US$1 million approved during 2015 in the country, but you did approve smaller interventions during that year, please report at least on the largest intervention approved within the year.

12 Given that output and outcome indicators are typically included within the broad definition of results indicators, for the purposes of this survey please focus on assessing the set of outcome indicators included in the intervention’s results framework. In the event that only output indicators are included, please refer to those instead. In the event the intervention did not establish any results framework, mark as zero and indicate the reason for the lack of inclusion (e.g. small technical cooperation, extension of project financing, untied transfer).
GOVERNMENT – In order to provide a response to the following questions, please gather and validate the information submitted by each development co-operation provider, liaising with other government counterparts as needed/if needed. Refer to the specific section for Indicator 1 in the GPEDC country spreadsheet to generate the responses for the questions in this section.

1.A.) EXTENT OF USE OF COUNTRY-OWNED RESULTS FRAMEWORKS BY PROVIDERS OF DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION

For interventions approved in 2015 by all providers of development co-operation:

Qg+1. What is the share of new interventions that draw its objectives from government-led results frameworks, plans and strategies?

Answer: ___

Qg+2. What is the share of results indicators included in the interventions’ results framework/logical framework that draw on results indicators from existing government-led results frameworks, plans and strategies?

Answer: ___

Qg+3. What is the share of results indicators that will rely on sources of data provided by existing country-led monitoring systems or national statistical services?

Answer: ___

1.B.) COMPLEMENTARY QUESTION FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF COUNTRY CONTEXT

Qg1. Briefly describe the main characteristics of the country’s results framework or alternative similar priority-setting mechanisms that the country uses to set development goals and targets.

Answer: ______________________________________ (max. 500 words)

Guiding questions:
  a. Is there a legal framework (law or decree) that regulates how the country sets its development priorities and results at the national and sector levels? If not explicit in a law, how does it operates in practice?
  b. How are institutional responsibilities for setting priorities and monitoring on results allocated within the government, and particularly at the sector level (formally and in practice)?
  c. Are these priorities and results typically defined in detail at the national level (e.g. national development plan) or at the sector/line ministry (e.g. sector strategies and plans)?
  d. Has the country reached a stage in which budget allocations are largely guided by these priorities and results? If not, how would you describe the current situation?
  e. Are other non-government stakeholders (parliament, providers, private sector, civil society, trade unions, subnational entities) engaged in the definition of the country’s priorities, goals and targets? If so, what are the mechanisms of engagement? (Tip: review the feedback and responses related to Indicators 2 and 3 to report on this dimension)
  f. How are providers engaged in helping define and in strengthening the government’s results framework/s or alternative priority-setting mechanisms? (Tip: review the information collected from providers for indicator 1a to report on this dimension)
In addition, if any of the following government documents exist, national co-ordinators are invited to check the relevant boxes and provide the relevant electronic links to these documents:

- Long-term vision document for the country that goes beyond the government’s mandate (typically for 10 years or more)
- Mid-term national development plan or government plan for the country (typically for 4-6 years)
- Medium-Term Expenditure (or Budget) Framework (METF)
- Sector programmes or strategies in any of the following sectors (currently being use for sector planning):
  - Transport
  - Education
  - Healthcare
  - Public Finance
- Common Results Frameworks agreed between the Government and providers of development co-operation
- Joint Government/Multi-Donor Programme, Compact or Facility

**MEASUREMENT OF THE INDICATOR**

Reporting on indicator 1a will provide two different perspectives:

- The first perspective will offer a **provider profile**, reporting on the three dimensions of use of CRFs described above (i.e. objectives, results indicators, sources of information for tracking progress). The information for these three dimensions will be kept disaggregated, and complemented by other contextual information. The table will provide information on some contextual factors that may have an influence on the results of this indicator. Among others, the type of interventions in providers’ current portfolio, or the current level of development of CRFs in partner countries may affect the extent of use of country-led results frameworks.

- The second perspective will present a **country profile**, reporting on the extent of use of CRFs by providers of development co-operation across government sectors, for the three dimensions described above. The information will provide an assessment of current practices in specific sectors, and also help development partners identify potential areas of strengthening. This **country profile** will be incorporated to the country summary sheets, complemented with the contextual information provided by indicator 1b (see below).

**Narrative Reporting for Indicator (1b)** – Brief contextual information on the country’s existing institutional arrangements for setting priorities and targeting results will be provided, relying on the descriptive information gathered throughout the complementary question (Q1), the reported existence of different types of planning instruments used by the government, and the complementary evidence at the sector level identified during the data gathering process for indicator (1a).
### DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Country Results Framework/s (CRF)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 targets to measure progress in implementing them, as stated in the government’s planning documents. In practice, country results frameworks are often broadly stated in national development plans and operationalised in more detail at the sector level (e.g. sector strategies). The definition of country-led results framework used in GPEDC Monitoring Framework allows for the possibility to use equivalent priority-setting mechanisms at the country level since not all countries articulate their priorities through consistent, integrated Country Results Frameworks. For the purposes of this monitoring exercise, the broad definition of CRFs and 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).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Long-term vision</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term vision plans set the longer-term perspective (typically for more than 8-10 years) and development objectives for the country and therefore represent the overarching framework for all Government activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>National development strategies</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National development strategies include Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and/or similar overarching strategies. These are typically prepared to cover a clearly identified period of time covering several years. The quality of these national development strategies in operational terms depends on the extent to which they constitute a unified strategic framework to guide the country’s development policy and include strategic priorities linked to a medium-term expenditure framework and reflected in annual budgets. Inclusive consultative processes involving the full range of relevant development stakeholders at country level ensure sustainability of national development strategies in the medium term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Medium-Term Expenditure (or Budgetary) Framework (METF/MBTF)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium-term Expenditure Frameworks (METF), also known as Medium-term Budgetary Frameworks (MTBFs), are defined as those fiscal arrangements that allow governments to extend the horizon for fiscal policy-making beyond the annual budgetary calendar. Although the approval of the annual budget law remains the key step in which important decisions on budgetary policy are adopted, most fiscal measures have budgetary implications that go well beyond the usual yearly budgetary cycle. As a result, a single year perspective provides a poor basis for sound fiscal planning. METFs/MTBFs usually cover the preparation, execution, and monitoring of multi-annual budget plans and contain both expenditure and revenue projections as well as the resultant budget balances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sector-wide Approach (SWAp)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector-Wide Approach (SWAp) is an approach to international development that brings together governments, donors and other stakeholders within any sector. It is characterized by a set of operating principles rather than a specific package of policies or activities. The approach involves movement over time under government leadership towards: broadening policy dialogue; developing a single sector policy and a common realistic expenditure program; common monitoring arrangements; and more coordinated procedures for funding and procurement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National statistical systems</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme-based approaches</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-term vision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Government/Multi-Donor Programme, Compact or Facility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDICATOR 2 - “CIVIL SOCIETY OPERATES WITHIN AN ENVIRONMENT WHICH MAXIMISES ITS ENGAGEMENT IN AND CONTRIBUTION TO DEVELOPMENT”

Note: This is a new indicator. The proposed methodology was developed through consultation rounds with experts on CSO enabling environment and CSO development effectiveness from developing country governments, civil society and providers of development co-operation.

What does the indicator measure?

This indicator seeks to assess the extent to which governments and providers of development co-operation contribute to an enabling environment for CSOs (BPa §22a), and to which CSOs are implementing development effectiveness principles in their own operations (BPa §22b). It is structured around four modules: (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 qualitative 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 (module 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). 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.

Proposed monitoring 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 Global Partnership Initiative 12 — one of the 39 voluntary initiatives agreed in the GPEDC’s 2014 Mexico Communiqué to foster country-level multi-stakeholder dialogue on civil society-related commitments on key areas of democratic and social inclusiveness. In order to facilitate the process and to ensure an inclusive approach, the national co-ordinator is invited to liaise with a focal point from civil society organisations and a focal point from providers to fill the questionnaire. 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) reconvene 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 that 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

14 The national co-ordinator can decide to engage colleagues from relevant central or line ministries working in relations to CSOs, and will be expected to liaise with the parliament focal point designated at country level for the whole monitoring process.
15 The second monitoring round will provide an opportunity to further simplify the survey tool in subsequent monitoring rounds.
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.).

QUESTIONS TO BE INTEGRATED IN COUNTRY-LEVEL DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

**GOVERNMENT** (in consultation with providers of development co-operation and civil society organisations) [Q²]

Note: A definition for terminology marked with the symbol “*” is provided in the definitions table located after the questionnaire.

**MODULE 1. Space for multi-stakeholder dialogue on national development policies**

**Q¹**. Are CSOs consulted by the government in the design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies? (Yes/No)

If YES: please describe how.

Guiding questions:
   a. Are multi-stakeholder consultation processes institutionalised*, inclusive and accessible?
   b. Do these consultation processes take place at national and/or local levels?
   c. Are there feedback mechanisms demonstrating how different stakeholders’ inputs have been taken into account?
   d. Are traditionally marginalised groups* included in these processes? Do these processes allow for equal and active participation?

If NO: are you aware of any initiative to promote such consultation?

**Q²**. Do CSOs have the right to access government information? (Yes/No)

If YES: please describe how.

Guiding questions:
   a. Is the information timely? Is the information relevant (i.e. addresses key information needs)?
   b. Is this access guaranteed by law? Is this access guaranteed in practice (i.e. there are operational mechanisms in place to address requests for legally-disclosed information and to appeal on request denials)?

If NO: are you aware of any initiative to promote information access?

**Q³**. Are there resources and/or training opportunities for addressing capacity building of all stakeholders (including government, CSOs and co-operation providers) to engage meaningfully in multi-stakeholder dialogue? (Yes/No)

If YES: please describe them.

Guiding questions:
   a. Are these adequate?

If NO: are you aware of any initiative to promote such capacity building?
MODULE 2. CSO development effectiveness*: accountability and transparency

Q4. In practice, are there CSO-managed processes in place to address transparency and multiple accountabilities in CSO operations*? (Yes/No)

If YES: please describe them.

Guiding questions:
   a. Which level of accountability do they address (accountability to donors, governments, constituencies)?
   b. What proportion of CSOs participate in these mechanisms?
   c. How do CSOs certify that they are in compliance with an accountability mechanism?

If NO: are you aware of any initiative to promote the creation of such accountability mechanisms?

Q5. Do CSO-initiated coordination processes exist to facilitate consolidated and inclusive CSO representation in policy dialogue (e.g. umbrella organisation, CSO network, consultation practices)? (Yes/No)

If YES: please describe them.

If NO: are you aware of any initiative to promote the creation of such processes?

Q6. Do mechanisms exist to facilitate coordination on programming among CSOs (collaboration to optimise impact and avoid duplication), and with other development actors? (Yes/No)

If YES: please describe them.

Guiding questions:
   a. At what level (e.g. sector level or more broadly) do these mechanisms exist?
   b. Are these mechanisms institutionalised*, inclusive and accessible?

If NO: are you aware of any initiative to promote the creation of such mechanisms?

Q7. Are there other significant initiatives related to CSO development effectiveness principles [Istanbul Principles* and the International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness*] being implemented at the country level? (Yes/No)

If YES: please describe how.

Guiding questions:
   c. In what ways are CSOs working to improve their practices in relation to particular areas of development effectiveness (gender equality and women’s rights, human rights based approaches, sustaining equitable partnerships) as set out in the Istanbul Principles*?

If NO: are you aware of any initiative to promote such discussion?

Q8. Do CSOs report annually to government on the basic finances, sectors of support, and main geographic areas of involvement in development? (Yes/No)

If YES: please describe how.

If NO: are you aware of any initiative to promote such reporting?
MODULE 3. Official development co-operation with CSOs

Qg+9. Do providers of development co-operation* consult with CSOs on their development policy/programming in a systematic way? (Yes/No)

If YES: please describe how.

Guiding questions:
   a. Are consultation processes institutionalised* inclusive and accessible?
   b. Are there feedback mechanisms demonstrating how CSOs’ inputs have been taken into account?
   c. Do consultations take place at relevant levels (i.e. providers’ headquarters, country offices)?

If NO: are you aware of any initiative to promote such consultation?

Qg+10. Are providers promoting a CSO enabling environment in their co-operation with civil society? (Yes/No)

If YES: please describe how.

Guiding questions:
   a. Through a civil society policy:
   b. Do providers have an overarching civil society policy?
   c. If so, does it explain the purpose and modalities of supporting civil society and working with CSOs?
   d. Through financing mechanisms:
   e. Do providers offer a mix of funding mechanisms that balance support to CSO-defined objectives (CSO "right of initiative"*) with complementary objectives defined by development co-operation recipient and provider country governments?
   f. Is CSO funding reliable, transparent, easy to access, and disbursed impartially?
   g. In their administrative requirements:
   h. Are transaction costs for CSOs minimised?
   i. Are administration and reporting requirements strategic, standardised, and, where possible, harmonised across providers?

If NO: are you aware of any initiatives from providers to further engage in the promotion of CSO Enabling environment?

Qg+11. Is the promotion of a CSO enabling environment an agenda item in providers’ policy dialogue with partner governments? (Yes/No)

If YES: please describe how.

Guiding questions:
   a. Does this dialogue include discussion on appropriate legal frameworks for a free, open and capable civil society?
   b. Does this dialogue include encouragement of CSO engagement in policy processes?

If NO: are you aware of any initiatives from providers to further position the promotion of CSO enabling environment in their policy dialogue?

Qg+12: Do providers share information on their CSO support with the government? (Yes/No)

If YES: please describe how.

If NO: are you aware of any initiative to improve information sharing?
**MODULE 4. Legal and regulatory environment**

Q**13.** Is there a recognition of and respect for CSO freedom (association, assembly and expression), in the Constitution and more broadly in policy, law and regulation? (Yes/No)

If **YES**: please describe how.

If **NO**: are you aware of any initiatives to increase such recognition and respect?

Q**14.** Is the legal and regulatory environment enabling for CSO formation, registration and operation? (Yes/No)

If **YES**: please describe how.

If **NO**: are you aware of any initiatives to make the legal and regulatory environment more enabling for CSOs?

Guiding questions:
- a. Can CSOs operate without being required to form a legal entity?
- b. Is there an enabling law on CSO registration, and in practice are CSOs able to easily register?
- c. Are the grounds for denial of registration and for de-registration clear, with recourse mechanisms, including judicial if needed, in place?
- d. Are CSOs by law and in practice able to pursue a broad-range of self-defined objectives, including human rights and good governance?
- e. Are CSOs enabled by law and practice to regulate their internal governance and affairs?
- f. Are CSOs protected from unwarranted interference* with their privacy and activities?
- g. Do policies and practices relating to CSOs at the country level proactively promote the improvement of enabling conditions and maximising CSO roles in development?
- h. Are there any legal, regulatory, policy or political barriers that limit the possibility of marginalised* individuals to participate in, join, and operate CSOs?

Q**15.** Does the legal and regulatory environment facilitate access to resources for CSOs? (Yes/No)

If **YES**: please describe how.

Guiding questions:
- a. Are there legal, regulatory, policy, or practical barriers for CSOs to seek, secure, and use resources (financial, material, and human), including foreign resources?
- b. Are there legal or policy permissions and incentives* to promote local resource mobilisation and financial sustainability among CSOs?
- c. Where developing country governments fund CSOs, is this funding reliable, transparent, easy to understand, and disbursed impartially?

If **NO**: are you aware of any initiatives to improve access to resources for CSOs?

Q**16.** Does the legal and regulatory environment marginalise certain groups*? (Yes/No)

If **YES**: please describe how.

Guiding questions:
- a. Are there CSOs representing particular groups that receive less favourable treatment due to their specific mandate or activities under the legal and regulatory environment, and in practice?
- b. Are these organisations able to carry out their mandates (such as social dialogue with trade unions)?
If NO: are you aware of any initiatives to improve the legal and regulatory environment for such marginalised groups?

**MEASUREMENT OF INDICATOR**

The questionnaire responses 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.

Given the context-assessment approach of this indicator, measurement at the global level will identify cross-cutting and specific challenges in enabling CSO engagement in development, and in identifying common patterns in those country cases that experienced positive transformations of CSO engagement –as to promote peer learning and greater focus on the factors that emerge from the analysis\(^{16}\) as most relevant conditions for making country-level progress in strengthening CSO engagement.

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.

**DEFINITIONS RELATED TO INDICATOR 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Society Organisations</th>
<th>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 (OECD-DAC/Better Aid, 2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSO development effectiveness</td>
<td>CSO development effectiveness principles (also known as the <a href="https://www.cpde.org/en/ist%E5%9F%BA%E6%9C%AC%E5%8E%9F%E5%88%99">Istanbul Principles for CSO Development Effectiveness</a>) 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 <a href="https://www.cpde.org/en/ist%E5%9F%BA%E6%9C%AC%E5%8E%9F%E5%88%99">International Framework on CSO Development Effectiveness</a>, 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{16}\) The JST will use both Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) methods and Principal Component Analisys (PCA) to: (a) identify the key elements in fostering an enabling-environment for effective CSO contributions to development, and (b) estimating the relative weighting and statistical significance of each factor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CSO enabling environment</strong></th>
<th>The political, financial, legal and policy context that affects how CSOs carry out their work. (OECD, 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSO operations</strong></td>
<td>The capacities to govern, implement and assess activities on the part of the CSO, consistent with its mandate. (CPDE, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enabling law on CSO registration</strong></td>
<td>Includes voluntary registration allowed for any legal, not-for-profit purpose; requiring a small number of founders and/or small amount of assets; based on reasonable, transparent, objective criteria; and providing avenues for judicial or other forms of appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enabling processes/regulations</strong></td>
<td>Includes easy access for all irrespective of location, simple procedure without undue administrative burdens; nominal or affordable fees; timely decision; registration in perpetuity. (CPDE, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Partnership Initiative 12 (GPI-12)</strong></td>
<td>(Formerly &quot;Voluntary Initiative 12&quot;) Global Partnership Initiative 12 is one of 39 voluntary initiatives affiliated with global efforts to advance aid and development co-operation effectiveness under the auspices of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co- operation (GPEDC). GPI-12 addresses the CSO enabling environment framework and guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutionalised processes or mechanisms</strong></td>
<td>Processes or mechanisms are considered institutionalised when they are regular, predictable, transparent, and announced in time to allow participants’ preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Framework on CSO Development Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>See CSO development effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Istanbul Principles</strong></td>
<td>See CSO development effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marginalised groups</strong></td>
<td>Although the nature of socio-economic or political marginalization is very country-specific, examples of groups representing groups of marginalised people frequently experiencing different forms of marginalization or exclusion might include trade unions, women’s rights organisations, human rights organisations, organisations of indigenous people, environmental or land rights organisations, LGBT organisations, organisations of persons with disabilities, etc. (CPDE, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-stakeholder dialogue</td>
<td>A policy process or development initiative that brings together two or more stakeholder groups (government, providers of development co-operation, CSOs, private sector, etc.) on the basis of equality among the stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissions and incentives to promote local resource mobilisation and financial sustainability among CSOs</td>
<td>Legal or policy framework and incentives related to CSOs’ income generation for organisational purposes (i.e. restrictions on non-profits), tax exemptions, customs clearance for foreign in-kind goods, incentives for business and individuals to donate, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right for CSOs to access relevant government information in law and in practice</td>
<td>Right whereby CSOs access information held by public bodies (including other entities that carry out public functions). “Such information includes records held by a public body, regardless of the form in which the information is stored, its source and the date of production.” (Art. 19, ¶ 2 of the <em>International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights</em>, ICCPR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As recognised by the UN Human Rights Committee, “To give effect to the right of access to information States parties should proactively put in the public domain Government information of public interest <a href="and">...</a> make every effort to ensure easy, prompt, effective and practical access to such information. States parties should also enact the necessary procedures, whereby one may gain access to information, such as by means of freedom of information legislation. The procedures should provide for the timely processing of requests for information according to clear rules that are compatible with the Covenant. Fees for requests for information should not be such as to constitute an unreasonable impediment to access to information. Authorities should provide reasons for any refusal to provide access to information. Arrangements should be put in place for appeals from refusals to provide access to information as well as in cases of failures to respond to requests.” (ICPPR, 2011: UN Human Rights Committee, General Comment 34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governments should classify only those data which are proven to harm national security and other vital interests of the State. Moreover, there should be clear classification criteria and register of classified information, which is both established by law and accessible to everyone. Further, classified data should be subject to regular review and declassified if confidentiality is no longer necessary. (A/HRC/20/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of initiative</td>
<td>The term refers to the notion of CSOs as development actors in their own right, whose scope and roles in development are distinct from that of governments and aid providers, and are supported based on their own objectives and activities, and not those defined through their relationship with an aid provider.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interference is unwarranted if it does not meet the standard of Article 22 of the ICCPR: a restriction that is (1) prescribed by law, meaning having a formal basis in the law and precise enough to be able to predict whether a CSO’s conduct violates the restriction; and (2) “necessary in a democratic society” in pursuit of limited, enumerated aims (“national security or public safety, public order, the protection of public health or morals or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others”). “Necessary” means the restriction is proportionate and the least intrusive means available to accomplish the legitimate objective of the restriction. (ICNL, 2012)

Sources:

*Partnering with Civil Society, 12 Lessons from DAC Peer Reviews*, OECD, 2011

*An Enabling Environment for Civil society Organizations: A synthesis of evidence of progress since Busan*, CSO Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (CPDE), 2013

INDICATOR 3: ENGAGEMENT AND CONTRIBUTION OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR TO DEVELOPMENT

Note: This is a new indicator. The proposed methodology builds on tools developed by the World Bank, and was developed through consultation with experts on public-private dialogue.

What does the indicator measure?

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).

Dialogue among interested stakeholders, including discussions within the Building Block on Public-Private Co-operation have confirmed that the monitoring and evaluation framework provided in the Public-Private Dialogue Handbook (B. Herzberg and Wright A., 2006, available online at: www.publicprivatedialogue.org) provides a useful basis for further work on the indicator.

The methodology was adjusted for this indicator, in order to rely on a country-led, multi-stakeholder data gathering process that could ensure transparency and country ownership.

Proposed monitoring process

Modules 1 and 2 aim at capturing a snapshot of the enabling environment for PPD at the country level:

Module 1: the JST will draw on country scores from a series of international indices, including the “Public engagement” index from the Open Budget Survey, as well as the “Voice and Accountability”, “Rule of Law” and “Control of corruption” indices from the Worldwide Governance Indicators. This information will be facilitated to the national co-ordinator as a source of evidence to inform discussions related to Module 2.

Module 2: The national co-ordinator, in liaison with colleagues from relevant government institutions/ministries17, 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 sector18, 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

17 The national co-ordinator can decide to engage colleagues from relevant central or line ministries working on relations with the private sector, and will be expected to liaise with the parliamentary focal point designated at country level for the whole monitoring process.

18 The process for selecting focal points is flexible and may be based on existing country arrangements. That said, in selecting the private sector focal point/s, it is advised to identify one focal point that could represent the largest/more dynamic sectors of the economy, and one focal point that could represent the sector/s generating most jobs (e.g. small and medium enterprises, agricultural sectors, service sectors, etc). See the private sector terms of reference for guidance.
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).

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). Findings emerging from this assessment 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. 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).

QUESTIONS TO BE INTEGRATED IN COUNTRY-LEVEL DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

- GOVERNMENT (in consultation with representatives from the private sector, providers of development co-operation, trade unions, civil society organisations) [Q*]

Note: A definition for terminology marked with the symbol "*" is provided in the definitions table located after the questionnaire.

Q*1. Is the private sector ready and willing to engage and interact with the government?

Answer:
- Score: from 0 (weak) to 10 (strong)
- Qualitative narrative – 500 words (max)

Guiding questions:
- a. Is the private sector organised in way that is sophisticated and considered legitimate by private sector stakeholders? (organisation)
- b. Does the private sector have the capacity to coordinate and align different groups? (coordination)
- c. What is the private sector's level of power and leverage with respect to public stakeholders? (leadership)
- d. Is the private sector willing to invest time and money in conjunction with public partners? (motivation)
- e. Is there private sector compliance to engage in more attractive business model?
- f. Do business leaders understand the private sector's needs and strategic challenges, not only conducting a political role or a rent seeking activity? (quality of business leaders)
- g. Does the private sector demonstrate motivation and leadership to conduct public-private projects*

Q*2. Is the government ready and willing to engage and interact with the private sector?

Answer:
- Score: from 0 (weak) to 10 (strong)
- Qualitative narrative – 500 words (max)
Guiding questions:

a. Does the government demonstrate generalised trust and understanding of the private sector?
b. Does the government demonstrate political will to engage with the private sector?
c. Does the government understand the private sector's needs and challenges?
d. Is there dedicated public sector leadership assigned to the dialogue process with the private sector?
e. Does the government have the capacity to effectively follow up public-private projects?
f. Is the government willing to adapt institutions and public programs to the evolving needs of the private sector? (reforms)
g. Does the government, in designing and implementing sector driven policies, look for private sector engagement and foster innovation? (Quality of sector driven policies)
h. Is there co-ordination at different public levels regarding specific private sector needs?

Q8*3. Is there a potential champion who can facilitate the dialogue process, activate political will and reduce the trust gap between public and private sector stakeholders?

Answer:
- Score: from 0 (weak) to 10 (strong)
- Qualitative narrative – 500 words (max)

Guiding questions:

a. What is the champion’s capacity and legitimacy to break conventional wisdom?
b. Does the champion have an understanding of private sector challenges and strategies to overstep them?
c. Are there any new leaders stepping in? (Emergence of new champions)
d. Do different champions complement each other, and coordinate?

Q8*4. Are logistical, financing and capacity building instruments available to support PPD?

Answer:
- Score: from 0 (weak) to 10 (strong)
- Qualitative narrative – 500 words (max)

Guiding questions:

a. Are there quality programs and mechanisms to help private sector development?
b. Are there sector specific instruments responding to private sector strategic needs?
c. Do stakeholders have the capacity to support innovative projects used later on as success cases?
d. Is the access to such instruments characterised by a low, medium or high level of bureaucracy?
e. Are available instruments to support different aspects of the same project or private sector strategy complementary?

MEASUREMENT OF INDICATOR

Similarly to the measurement of indicator 2, 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 learnt19.

19 Note that data from module 3 will not be aggregated at the country level in reporting on this indicator. The information will be used to provide assessments/case studies of different types of PPD platforms, for learning purposes.
Given the context assessment approach for this indicator, and on the basis of the quantitative and qualitative data drawn from Modules 1 and 2 for Indicator 3, reporting at the global level will identify cross-cutting and specific challenges in facilitating public-private dialogue at the country level, as a proxy to private sector engagement in development. The analysis will identify common patterns in country cases that experienced increasingly favorable conditions for public-private dialogue, and will spotlight specific PPD platforms. Drawing from the analysis of the qualitative and quantitative information, this monitoring round will help identify what the key contributing factors that emerge as preconditions for increased public-private dialogue are.

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.

DEFINITIONS RELATED TO INDICATOR 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnerships for Prosperity (P4P)</th>
<th>P4P is a multi-stakeholder platform hosted at the International Finance Corporation (IFC) that aims to leverage the role of the private sector to support poverty reduction and sustainable development. In the context of the current development landscape, the private sector, a powerful engine of economic growth, has become an increasingly indispensable development partner. For more information, see Partnerships for Prosperity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>The private sector can be defined as &quot;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&quot; (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 &quot;private sector&quot; 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

20 Again, as in Indicator 2, the JST will use both Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) methods and Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to: (a) identify the key elements associated with stronger country-readiness for public-private dialogue, and (b) estimating the relative weighting and statistical significance of each of these factor.
An engagement mechanism to ensure more inclusive and sustainable policy reforms 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 consists in most cases in 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

There is no one widely accepted definition of public-private partnerships or projects (PPP). PPPs are typically medium- to long-term arrangements between the public and private sectors whereby some of the service obligations of the public sector are provided by the private sector, with clear agreement on shared objectives for delivery of public infrastructure and/ or public services. PPPs typically do not include service contracts or turnkey construction contracts, which are categorized as public procurement projects, or the privatization of utilities where there is a limited ongoing role for the public sector. For more information on PPPs, see World Bank’s PPP IRC.

Organisations that serve as intermediaries for the private sector to represent its concerns to the public sector. They may come in many forms (e.g. business membership organisations, chambers of commerce, etc.), and they may be more or less effective at representing their members and providing services.

A policy process or development initiative that brings together two or more stakeholder groups (government, providers of development co-operation, CSOs, private sector, etc.) on the basis of equality among the stakeholders.

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 (OECD-DAC/Better Aid, 2009)
INDICATOR 5A: DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION IS MORE PREDICTABLE
(ANNUAL PREDICTABILITY)

What does the indicator measure?

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.

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.

Proposed monitoring process

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.

QUESTIONS TO BE INTEGRATED IN COUNTRY-LEVEL DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVIDER OF DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qp1. How much development co-operation funding did you disburse at country-level in the reporting year of reference? USD _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qp2. How much of this was for the government sector in the reporting year of reference? USD _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qp3. How much development co-operation funding for the government sector did you schedule for disbursement at country-level in the reporting year of reference? USD _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qp4. For reference purposes only, how much development co-operation funding for the government sector did you disburse through other providers (funds which are not captured in your responses to Qp1 – Qp3 above) at the country level in the reporting year of reference? USD _______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEASUREMENT OF INDICATOR

When disbursements to the government sector are less than or equal to what was scheduled, disbursements “as scheduled” takes the value:

\[
\text{Indicator 5a}_1 (\%) = 100 \times \frac{Qp2}{Qp3}
\]

Global aggregates for Indicator 5a1 are calculated using scheduled disbursements for the government sector as the weighting variable.
When disbursements to the government sector are greater than what was scheduled, disbursements "beyond scheduled" takes the value:

\[ \text{Indicator } 5a_2 \text{ } (%) = 100 \times \frac{Q^{P2} - Q^{P3}}{Q^{P2}} \]

Global aggregates for Indicator 5a_2 are calculated using actual disbursements for the government sector as the weighting variable.

**DEFINITIONS**

Development co-operation funding scheduled for the government sector scheduled for disbursement

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)

What does the indicator measure?

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.

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).

Proposed monitoring process

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.

QUESTIONS TO BE INTEGRATED IN COUNTRY-LEVEL DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

- **GOVERNMENT** – For each provider of development co-operation:

  Has the provider of development co-operation made available a comprehensive forward expenditure and/or implementation plan setting out expected development co-operation flows in...

  Q\(^2\)1. Fiscal year ending 2015? (Yes/No) ____
  
  Q\(^2\)2. Fiscal year ending 2016? (Yes/No) ____
  
  Q\(^2\)3. Fiscal year ending 2017? (Yes/No) ____

  [For all questions if “Yes”, report 1; if “No” report 0]
MEASUREMENT OF INDICATOR

Indicator value for provider P in country C

\[ P_c = \frac{(Q_{g1} + Q_{g2} + Q_{g3})}{3} \]

For country C for 1, 2 and 3 years ahead (\(y=1, 2, 3\)) \(C_y\) = average of Qg1, Qg2 and Qg3 respectively across all providers, weighted by the volume of the provider’s development co-operation disbursed in the reference year used for question Qp1.

\[ C_1 = \frac{\sum_{p=1}^{n}(W_p \ast Q_{g1p})}{n} \]
\[ C_2 = \frac{\sum_{p=1}^{n}(W_p \ast Q_{g2p})}{n} \]
\[ C_3 = \frac{\sum_{p=1}^{n}(W_p \ast Q_{g3p})}{n} \]

Where \(W_p\) = weight assigned to each provider P based on disbursements reported for question Qp1

\[ W_p = \frac{Q_{p1}}{\sum_{p=1}^{n}(Q_{p1})} \]

Note that 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.

The above indicator values for individual providers and for developing countries will serve as a basis for global aggregation.

DEFINITIONS

Forward spending and/or implementation plan

The developing country government should, for every provider of development co-operation participating in the global monitoring process, establish whether or not it holds information on that co-operation provider’s forward spending and/or implementation plans in the country.

The national co-ordinator/reporting entity should consult with ministries or departments responsible for managing development co-operation (typically finance, planning, foreign affairs...) to ascertain whether adequate information has been received from each co-operation provider.

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.
A plan may be available which meets all of the criteria above, but the information provided may vary for different years. In responding to questions Qg1, Qg2 and Qg3, national coordinators should examine the data for each year. (The reason for this is that a forward spending/implementation plan may provide comprehensive information for next year, but not the following year).

For each year, answer 1 (“Yes”) if the information provided meets BOTH of the following additional criteria:

- Comprehensive in its coverage of known sectors, types and modalities of support (for example, a provider using both project and budget support modalities should include the amounts foreseen under both modalities); and
- The amount and currency of development co-operation funding is clearly stated (where support takes the form of technical co-operation and the provision of goods and services in kind, the cost of these planned activities is provided).

Where these above additional criteria are NOT met for a given year, or where the three criteria defining a forward spending / implementation plan (definition above) are NOT met, answer 0 (“No”).
What does the indicator measure?

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.

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).

Proposed monitoring process

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.

QUESTIONS TO BE INTEGRATED IN COUNTRY-LEVEL DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

GOVERNMENT – For each provider of development co-operation:

Q4. How much estimated development co-operation funding was recorded in the annual budget of the reporting year of reference as grants, revenue or loans (concessional and non-concessional)? USD ________

Note that the denominator for this indicator is the same as that used in the calculation of indicator 5a (annual predictability).

MEASUREMENT OF INDICATOR

When funds recorded in the government annual budget are less than or equal to scheduled disbursements for the government sector, disbursements “of scheduled” takes the value:

$$\text{Indicator 6}_1 (\%) = 100 \times \frac{Q^{4}}{Q^{3}}$$

Global aggregates for Indicator 6, are calculated using scheduled disbursements for the government sector as the weighting variable.

When funds recorded in the government sector annual budget are greater than scheduled disbursements for the government sector, disbursements “beyond scheduled” takes the value:

$$\text{Indicator 6}_2 (\%) = 100 \times \frac{Q^{4} - Q^{3}}{Q^{4}}$$
Global aggregates for Indicator 6 are calculated using funds recorded in the government annual budget as the weighting variable.

**DEFINITIONS**

| Annual budget | It is the annual budget 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 Q4. 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

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

Proposed monitoring process
The set of questions to inform the assessment of this indicator (questions Qg5, Qg6, Qg7, Qg8 and Qg9 below) 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 4th Mutual Accountability21 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.

QUESTIONS TO BE INTEGRATED IN COUNTRY-LEVEL DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

GOVERNMENT

Qg5. Is there an aid policy or partnership policy in place defining a country’s development co-operation priorities (or elements of such a policy agreed through other instruments)? (Yes/No)

Qg6. Are there specific country-level targets for effective development co-operation for both the developing country government and providers of development co-operation? (Yes/No)

Qg7. Has an assessment towards these targets been undertaken jointly by the developing country government and providers of development co-operation at senior level in the past two years? (Yes/No)

Qg8. Have non-executive stakeholders (i.e. civil society organisations, private sector and parliamentarians) and local governments been actively involved in such reviews? (Yes/No)

Qg9. Have comprehensive results of such exercises been made public in a timely manner? (Yes/No)

---

21 Launched in August 2015.
MEASUREMENT OF INDICATOR

At the global level, this indicator is calculated as follows:

\[ \text{Indicator 7 (\% of developing countries)} = 100 \times \frac{N_c}{N} \]

where \( N_c \) is the number of countries that meet at least four out of the five criteria Qg5, Qg6, Qg7, Qg8, and Qg9, and \( N \) is the total number of countries.

DEFINITIONS

| **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. |
| **Country-level targets for effective development co-operation** | Country-level targets for effective development co-operation have been established in line with Paris, Accra and Busan commitments. They may, however, go beyond the Busan Partnership agreement wherever the developing country government and providers of development co-operation agree to do so. Targets exist for both the developing country government and providers of development co-operation, providing the basis for assessing: the developing country’s performance in implementing its development strategy; and the performance of providers of development co-operation against agreed commitments to deliver on the quantity, quality and effectiveness of their support. |
| **Mutual assessment reviews** | 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. These assessments are undertaken on a regular basis (e.g. every one to two years) and might be supplemented through independent/impartial reviews. The comprehensive results of such assessments should be made publicly available in a timely manner through appropriate means to ensure transparency. For the purpose of assessing progress against indicator 7, a country is considered to have a mutual assessment review in place when the response to at least four of the five questions Q\text{g}5, Q\text{g}6, Q\text{g}7, Q\text{g}8 and Q\text{g}9 is “Yes”. |
INDICATOR 8 – GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN’S EMPOWERMENT

What does the indicator measure?

This indicator seeks to measure government efforts to track and make public resource allocations for gender equality. It does so by encouraging national governments to develop appropriate budget tracking and monitoring systems and commit to making information about allocations for gender equality readily accessible to the public.

UN Women in collaboration with the OECD-DAC Network on Gender Equality (GENDERNET) has developed a methodology and set of criteria to roll out this global indicator at country level and to monitor performance against this indicator over time.

A country is considered to have a system in place for the purpose of measuring this indicator when at least one out of the first three criteria and the fourth criteria are met (see question Qg13).

Proposed monitoring process

Data on the gender equality indicator will be gathered through the country spread sheet administered to the Ministries of Finance. Collected data at the level of individual countries will be aggregated to present overview of the global progress.

QUESTIONS TO BE INTEGRATED IN COUNTRY-LEVEL DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

GOVERNMENT

Qg10. Is there an official government statement on a system for tracking allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment? (Yes/No)

Qg11. Are allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment systematically tracked? (Yes/No)

Qg12. Is there leadership and oversight of the tracking system by the central government unit in charge of public expenditures? (Yes/No)

Qg13. Is gender equality focussed budget information publically available (e.g. through Parliamentary oversight and civil society scrutiny, publications, websites or other means)? (Yes/No)

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

MEASUREMENT OF INDICATOR

At the global level, this indicator is calculated as follows:

\[ \text{Indicator 8} \ (\% \ of \ developing \ countries) = 100 \times \frac{N_C}{N} \]

where \( N_C \) is the number of countries meeting at least one of the first three criteria (Qg10, Qg11, Qg12) and the fourth criteria (Qg13), and \( N \) is the total number of countries participating in the monitoring process.
### Systems to track allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment

These are the processes and procedures in place 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 even 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.

### Allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment

Allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment 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 equally but 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 an explicit objective but includes women as beneficiaries (indirect allocations).

### Systematically tracked

“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.
INDICATOR 9B: USE OF COUNTRY PUBLIC FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND PROCUREMENT SYSTEMS

What does the indicator measure?
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.

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 below to help providers of development co-operation determine when they are, and when they are not, using country PFM and procurement systems.

Proposed monitoring process
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.

QUESTIONS TO BE INTEGRATED IN COUNTRY-LEVEL DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

 PROVIDER OF DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION

In the reporting year of reference, how much development co-operation funding disbursed for the government sector used...

Q5. ...national budget execution procedures (USD)? ________

Q6. ...national financial reporting procedures (USD)? ________

Q7. ...national auditing procedures (USD)? ________

Q8. ...national procurement systems (USD)? ________

MEASUREMENT OF INDICATOR

At the global level, this indicator is calculated as follows:

\[
\text{Indicator } 9b \% = 100 \times \frac{Q^5 + Q^6 + Q^7 + Q^8}{Q^2}
\]
### Definitions

#### Use of national budget execution procedures

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.

Providers of development co-operation are invited to review all their development co-operation activities with a view to determining how funding for the government sector meet three out of the four criteria below (anything less does not qualify):

1. Are your funds included in the annual budget approved by country legislature? (Y/N)
2. Are your funds subject to established country budget execution procedures? (Y/N)
3. Are your funds processed (e.g. deposited & disbursed) through the established country treasury system? (Y/N)
4. You do NOT require the opening of separate bank accounts for your funds? (Y/N).

#### Use of national financial reporting procedures

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.

Providers of development co-operation are invited to review all their development activities with a view to determining how much funding for the government sector meet BOTH criteria below (anything less does not qualify):

1. You do NOT require maintenance of a separate accounting system to satisfy your own reporting requirements? (Y/N)
2. You ONLY require financial reports prepared using the country’s established financial reporting arrangements? (Y/N)

---

22 **Budget execution** — **Yes**: you do not require opening separate accounts. **No**: you do require opening separate accounts.

23 **Financial reporting** — **Yes**: you do not require a separate accounting system. **No**: you do require a separate accounting system.
Use of national auditing procedures

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.

Providers of development co-operation are invited to review all their development activities with a view to determining how much development co-operation funding for the government sector meet BOTH criteria below:

1. Are your funds subject to audit carried out under the responsibility of the Supreme Audit Institution? (Y/N)
2. You do NOT under normal circumstances request additional audit arrangements? (Y/N)

AND at least one of the two criteria below:

3. You do NOT require audit standards different from those adopted by the Supreme Audit Institution? (Y/N)
4. You do NOT require the Supreme Audit Institution to change its audit cycle to audit your funds? (Y/N)

Use of national procurement systems

 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).

---

24 Note: where development co-operation funding is provided to parastatal entities (for example, public enterprises) and these entities are not subject to audit by the Supreme Audit Institution, the following criteria should be considered:

Providers of development co-operation are invited to review all their development activities with a view to determining how much development co-operation funding for the government sector meet BOTH criteria below:

1. Are your funds subject to audit carried out under the regular audit procedures established for the audit of parastatal entities? (Y/N)
2. You do NOT under normal circumstances request additional audit arrangements? (Y/N)

AND at least one of the two criteria below:

3. You do NOT require audit standards different from those adopted by the partner country for the audit of parastatal entities? (Y/N)
4. You do NOT require a change in the audit cycle of the parastatal entity to audit your funds? (Y/N)

Reserving the right to make an exceptional audit (e.g. when fraud or corruption is discovered) does not count against this criteria.

25 Yes: providers do not require additional audits. No: providers do require additional audits.
26 Yes: providers do not require different audit standards. No: providers do require different audit standards.
27 Yes: providers do not require to change the audit cycle. No: providers do require change to the audit cycle.