

Workshop

Unfinished Business: Moving forward to meet the Busan commitments

14 April 2014

Hyatt Regency, Campos Elíseos 204, Polanco, Mexico City

Background

The first High-Level Meeting of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation will take place in Mexico City on the 15–16 April 2014. This workshop presents an opportunity to reiterate the importance of effective development co-operation in meeting the Millennium Development Goals and to identify actions to accelerate the implementation of agreed commitments and demonstrate tangible progress by 2015. Effective development co-operation is also a key part of how the objectives of the next global development framework will be achieved. The two-day forum includes five plenary sessions on key themes for the Global Partnership including a first session on “Progress on Implementing the Busan Commitments: How far have we come?”. This session will review progress and identify actions to boost the implementation of the commitments made at the Fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in 2011.

This workshop will both complement and help delegates prepare for the first plenary session of the High-Level Meeting. It will provide an opportunity for more in-depth interaction among the various stakeholders of the Global Partnership, and help to identify actions needed to meet the Busan commitments.

Objective of the workshop

The main objective of the workshop is to review progress in implementing commitments made in Busan, identify bottlenecks and promote concrete initiatives to enable further progress. The main conclusions of the workshop will be reported to the first plenary session of the High-Level Meeting on “Progress on Implementing the Busan Commitments: How far have we come?” on 15 April 2014.

The workshop will draw on the Global Partnership monitoring report as well as the regional consultations for the High-Level Meeting and other recent preparatory events.

Programme

13.00 - 14.30 Opening plenary: Progress since Busan - Overview of the main findings from the Global Partnership's 2014 monitoring report

Welcome address:

Erik Solheim, OECD-DAC Chair

Niloy Banerjee, Director a.i., Knowledge, Innovation and Capacity Group, Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP

The main monitoring findings will be presented by video. This will be followed by a panel discussion presenting experiences and lessons learned from the monitoring exercise from the perspective of a range of participants involved in the process at the country level.

Panel discussion: "How far have we come in implementing Busan commitments?"

- The monitoring report concludes that this exercise is key for accountability, and that it has set the foundations for sustained improvements in development cooperation post-2015. What is your main conclusion from the monitoring exercise?
- What are the key political messages that merit attention at the High-Level Meeting of the Global Partnership?
- Where have we succeeded in changing behaviour for the better? Where do further challenges remain? What is behind these successes and challenges? Where should we focus attention to accelerate progress?
- How can the Global Partnership monitoring framework best support accountability and inform inclusive dialogue on effective development co-operation, particularly at the country level?

Moderator: Michael Gaffey, Deputy Director General, Irish Aid, Ireland

Panellists

- Tony Tujan, Co-Chair, CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness
- Monica Asuna, Head, Aid Effectiveness Secretariat, National Treasury, Kenya
- Martin Dahinden, Director-General, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, Switzerland

14.30 - 15.00 Coffee Break

15.00 - 17.00 Parallel sessions

Session I: Ownership and results – How to accelerate progress in strengthening country systems through greater use?

Strong country systems – including fiduciary systems, statistical systems, monitoring and evaluation processes and results frameworks – are key to country ownership.

The Busan Partnership agreement emphasises that “transparent, country-led and country-level results frameworks and platforms will 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.” (BP a §18b). Countries and organisations recognise that “the use and strengthening of developing countries’ systems remains central to our efforts to build effective institutions” (BP a §19) and committed to “use country systems as the default approach for development co-operation in support of activities managed by the public sector.” (BP a §19a).

Evidence suggests that achievements made in 2010 around strengthening and using country public financial management and procurement systems have been sustained. However, more is needed to reach the 2015 targets. Preliminary results from piloting the indicator on results frameworks in eight countries indicate great variation in the use of country results frameworks. Further efforts are needed for a better understanding of what drives progress in this area

- What can we learn from country-level experience about strengthening and using country public financial management and procurement systems?
- What are the prospects for further progress? What can we learn from our experience of the use of country-level results frameworks and platforms? What are the challenges and what can be done to overcome them?
- How can providers best adapt their operational policies and instruments to drive progress in using country results frameworks?
- How can international efforts and processes support the country systems commitments and address challenges?

Moderator: Neil Cole, Chief Director, African Economic Integration, CABRI

Panellists

- Muhammad Musharraf Hossain Bhuiyan, Cabinet Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Bangladesh
- Pamphile Muderega, Permanent Secretary, National Aid Coordination Committee, Burundi
- Brian Baldwin, Senior Operations Management Adviser, IFAD
- Noumea Simi, Assistant CEO, Aid Coordination Unit, Ministry of Finance, Samoa

Session II: Inclusive partnerships – How can the Global Partnership ensure that all stakeholders, particularly civil society organisations, can play their role fully as development actors?

The Busan Partnership agreement reaffirms that CSOs are “independent development actors in their own right”. Building on the Accra Agenda for Action, the Busan Partnership agreement calls for an enabling environment in which CSOs can maximise their contributions to development (AAA: para 20c; BPa, 2011: §22a). While there is consensus on the importance of an enabling environment for CSOs to operate and engage in development, there is a range of views on what an enabling environment entails.

- Do we have a common understanding of what is meant by an “enabling environment” for CSOs?
- What elements of an enabling environment, and associated actions to strengthen such elements, could be envisaged for Global Partnership stakeholders in the spirit of the Busan agreement?
- What kind of dialogue mechanisms exists (or could be set up) at country level to facilitate discussions on an enabling environment and inform any assessments on its state and possible room for improvement?
- What are the specific actions that providers of development co-operation can undertake as part of their country programmes and on-going dialogue to ensure that CSOs can exercise their role as independent development actors?

Moderator: Charles Lwanga-Ntale, Regional Director for Africa, Development Initiatives

Panellists

- Nurmambet Toktomatov, Head of Investment Department, Ministry of Economy, Kyrgyz Republic
- Robert Fox, Executive Director, Oxfam Canada
- David Crook, Development Director, Stars Foundation
- Steven Pierce, Special Coordinator for Development Effectiveness, USAID, United States

Session III: Transparency and accountability –Do we have the right information in the right hands at the right time?

Progress on transparency requires action at the global and country level. In Busan, countries and organisations committed to “implement a common, open standard for electronic publication of timely, comprehensive and forward-looking information on resources provided through development co-operation”. The transparency drive is starting to show results. But are our efforts sufficiently geared towards the needs of developing countries for their own planning and budgeting processes, domestic accountability and reporting on service delivery?

Evidence suggests that forward-looking information is still a key challenge: few providers are on track to meet their commitment to provide reliable three-to-five-year forward expenditure information and implementation plans.

- What are the most critical information needs of developing countries which remain unmet? How is the common standard answering the current needs of developing countries?
- What are the remaining obstacles to full implementation of the medium-term predictability commitment? What actions can be taken to address these?

Moderator: Liz Steele, Advocacy Co-ordinator, Publish What You Fund

Panellists

- Alimatou Zongo, Director General, Ministry for Economy and Finance, Burkina Faso
- Klaus Rudischhauser, Deputy Director General, EuropeAid, European Union
- Fuad Albassam, Assistant Director General, OPEC Fund for International Development
- Lucretia Ciurea, Head of Division, State Chancellery, Republic of Moldova

Session IV: More effective development co-operation in fragile states – Are we living up to the New Deal?

The New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States aims to create change by addressing what matters most for people affected by conflict and fragility: putting countries in the lead of their own pathway out of fragility; and building mutual trust and strong partnerships. Through compacts, stakeholders commit to promote one national vision and one plan to guide an inclusive and country-led transition out of fragility.

When endorsing the New Deal in Busan, over 44 countries and international development partners committed to use the five Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals (PSGs) to guide priorities in countries affected by conflict and fragility, and to deliver through strong partnerships built on trust and mutual accountability. The ultimate aim is to ensure successful and sustainable transitions out of conflict and fragility while fostering optimal use of domestic and international resources. There are concrete signs of progress since the New Deal was endorsed in Busan: eight fragile countries and seven development partners have committed to implement the New Deal as a matter of priority; seven countries have completed fragility assessments; members of the International Dialogue have agreed a list of indicators to monitor progress against the PSGs that will be implemented at country level; Somalia has signed a compact with international partners in September 2013 and is planning a joint financing mechanism; Sierra Leone and Afghanistan have signed Mutual Accountability Frameworks that serve as compacts; Sierra Leone and Liberia have implemented New Deal Dashboards to track resource flows to the PSGs.

Yet challenges remain. South Sudan's relapse into conflict in December 2013 took many by surprise. International partners have yet to respond effectively to the ongoing crisis in the

Central African Republic. Several New Deal pilot countries have yet to find a lead donor to partner with in implementing the New Deal commitments. International partners still struggle to adapt their systems to respond to the unique contexts in fragile states, particularly when it comes to risk management and the use of country systems. This session will foster a frank exchange between stakeholders on how to build upon successes to date and how to ensure that partners are positioned to deliver on New Deal commitments at the country level. Topics for discussion may include:

- How can the New Deal enhance the work of national governments and development partners in fragile and conflict-affected environments? What reforms are needed at headquarters and country level to deliver on the PSGs, and the FOCUS and TRUST commitments?
- What is needed for a successful adoption and implementation of New Deal compacts in the future? What are the characteristics of effective co-ordination that compacts offer that can be duplicated into other contexts?
- What entry points does the New Deal provide for supporting international engagement in crisis situations, such as the Central African Republic?
- Recognizing that transitioning from fragility to resilience is a long-term, nonlinear process, how should we define success in implementing the New Deal in the short- and medium-term? What milestones should we set and what support will be needed to ensure they are met?

Moderator: Gregory Adams, Director of Aid Effectiveness, Oxfam America

Panellists

- M. Mustafa Mastoor, Deputy Minister of Finance, Afghanistan (TBC)
- Anne Sipiläinen, Under-Secretary of State, Development Cooperation and Development Policy, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Finland
- Mary Jevase Yak, Deputy Minister of Finance and Economic Planning, Republic of South Sudan
- Samuel Doe, Policy Adviser, Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, UNDP

17.00 -18.00 Strengthening accountability within the Global Partnership – How can future monitoring efforts be further grounded in developing countries’ own systems and monitoring needs to drive progress at the country level?

Lessons from monitoring indicate that the transformation towards country-owned monitoring is both desirable and feasible. Country-led monitoring and accountability paves the way for transparent and evidence-based decision making.

The ambition to rely on country-led processes for “snapshots” of progress for global accountability purposes will require further investment by countries and their development

partners to strengthen national accountability frameworks, particularly to improve the quality of country systems and data.

Country leadership needs to be matched by stronger engagement by providers at the country level. To ensure the legitimacy of global monitoring efforts, which will increasingly be embedded in national monitoring processes, co-operation providers need to do more to re-align their systems and procedures to those of their partner countries. This will be the key to accurately monitor progress and reinforce mutual accountability both at the country and global levels.

Moderator: Jonathan Glennie, Research Associate, Overseas Development Institute

Panellists

- Lei Lei Thein, Deputy Minister, Ministry of National Planning and Economic Development, Myanmar
 - Alex Knox Director of Strategic Partnerships and Coordination Programme, Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
 - Vitalice Meja Coordinator of Reality of Aid, Africa
 - Anthony Smith, Director, International Relations Division, DFID, United Kingdom
 - Mariam Sherman, Director Results, Openness, Effectiveness, World Bank
-
- Your experience around the Global Partnership monitoring framework: how useful is the monitoring process to further embedding a country-led process – what are some of the associated challenges?
 - What targeted action and/or support is needed to further strengthen national aid information management systems/development assistance databases so that they could serve as the main basis for accountability processes and dialogue, both at the country and global levels?
 - How can individual providers of co-operation strengthen internal communication and co-ordination to ensure consistent contributions to country monitoring and accountability processes, and to align their own reporting efforts to those?
 - In the interest of enhancing the mutual learning element of the Global Partnership monitoring framework, how could sharing of experiences among countries – and also providers – be best facilitated?

18.00 - 18.30 Conclusions and identification of messages for the HLM plenary