

Post-Monitoring Workshop

Reviewing progress and taking stock of a monitoring process for supporting global accountability and future monitoring efforts

27-28 February, Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire
Summary report

Contacts:

Ms. Yuko Suzuki, email: yuko.suzuki@undp.org

Ms. Hanna-Mari Kilpelainen, Hanna-Mari.KILPELAINEN@oecd.org

Ms. Marjolaine Nicod, Marjolaine.Nicod@oecd.org

Quick reference:

- More information on the Global Partnership available at <http://www.effectivecooperation.org/>
- Community space: <https://one.unteamworks.org/GPEDC>
- Monitoring helpdesk: <https://one.unteamworks.org/node/344262>
- Materials presented at this workshop: <https://one.unteamworks.org/node/344258>

I. Introduction

The Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation emerged from an agreement reached at the Fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan, Republic of Korea in 2011. The Global Partnership has given way to a broader international consensus that emphasises partnership approaches to co-operation. This consensus recognises the voluntary and country-specific nature of the efforts and places greater emphasis on making sure that co-operation efforts have a catalytic effect on development.

The Global Partnership also supports accountability for making progress in the implementation of commitments and actions agreed in Busan through an agreed global monitoring framework. It places particular emphasis on behaviour change in development co-operation efforts, which is in turn expected to contribute to the achievement of results as defined in developing countries' development strategies. To this end, the global monitoring framework was rolled out in mid-2013. The monitoring framework emphasises a country-focused approach, drawing on the Busan commitment to agree on frameworks based on national needs and priorities for monitoring progress and promoting mutual accountability at country level.

Participation in the monitoring exercise is voluntary, and 50 developing countries initially expressed their interest to take part in the monitoring. 46 countries completed the collection and submission of country-level data, which provides the basis for the preparation of the first Global Partnership Progress Report to facilitate discussions in the Mexico High-Level Meeting in April 2014. The report is expected to be available for dissemination in mid-March. Open access to the full data set is envisaged together with the report launch.

The joint UNDP-OECD support team organised a post-monitoring workshop on 27-28 February, hosted by the Government of Cote d'Ivoire with the following key objectives:

1. Review progress in implementing selected Busan commitments and craft key political messages arising from the monitoring findings. Provide an opportunity to discuss at technical level the outcomes and challenges related to commitments on ownership and results, inclusive partnerships and transparency and accountability. Exchange lessons and best practices between countries and regions and identify key political recommendations to inform further implementation efforts.
2. Take stock of the monitoring processes itself. Share experiences and lessons to inform future monitoring efforts, with the aim that global monitoring efforts support, and are embedded in, national accountability frameworks.
3. Discuss ways to strengthen methodologies and approaches of pilot indicators. Take stock of experiences in piloting new indicators with a view to inform further work to improve the indicators and methodologies to be more robust and relevant for developing countries.

The workshop was well attended, with 63 participants representing 38 developing countries, UNDP regional and country offices, providers of development cooperation (including Arab Donor Coordination Group representative) as well as civil society. A detailed list of participants can be found [here](#).

This report is structured as follows:

- Section II presents the main conclusions of the workshop;
- Section III provides an overview of the workshop sessions and main outcomes;
- Section IV sets out the follow-up action taken and next steps after the workshop; and
- Section V presents a brief overview of feedback received from workshop participants.

II. Main conclusions

Key emerging messages on outcomes of the monitoring

Reflecting upon the state of play on the implementation of the Busan commitments assessed through a selective set of indicators, **there is a sense of urgency that much more efforts are needed to bring about significant level of behavioural changes** in the development cooperation partnership. Many countries indicated that unfinished aid effectiveness agenda, in particular commitments made in Paris and Accra need to be implemented fully. Shifting from aid effectiveness to development effectiveness does not mean that these commitments were no longer relevant. Many countries indicated that the aid effectiveness commitments and shared principles of effective development cooperation are even more important now in the context of the post-2015 development agenda.

The Global Partnership calls for a country-focused approach, drawing on the Busan commitment to agree on frameworks based on national needs and priorities for monitoring progress and promoting mutual accountability at country level. However, making this realty on the ground, participants called for actions to build **a stronger relationship with shared visions at country level**. Participants emphasized that **reinforcing reforms should not be a unilateral effort by developing countries**. There are mutual actions needed by all stakeholders to make this work. Consolidating regular and inclusive dialogue at country level can further facilitate the sense of shared ownership over the implementation efforts of the Busan commitments at country level.

The Mexico High-Level Meeting presents an opportunity to signal the need for political commitments and actions on key priority areas. In this context, participants noted on **the urgent actions in implementing the commitments made in Busan on the use of country systems, predictability and transparency**. These areas of actions remain important for ensuring that countries own development process. It contributes to sustainable capacity development, allowing allocation of development resources more effectively and aligned to national development agenda. It also enables countries to strengthen the country systems for effective utilisation of both domestic and external development resources. The Mexico HLM therefore needs to focus on why agreed commitments and actions are not yet fully implemented, focusing on concrete actions and acknowledging the political nature of such actions.

Implementing the Busan commitments fully requires **“domestication” of Busan agreements at country level**. At country level, there is a need for deeper reflection and consolidation of what it means in shifting aid effectiveness to development effectiveness and sense of shared responsibility of broader development actors at country level.

Participants also called for stronger engagement and partnership building that is based on trust. Many countries expressed the concerns and frustration that they are taking far more difficult reform agenda and committed to accelerate the reforms at country level, but these efforts have not resulted in the increased trust and use by other partners.

While acknowledging that the global momentum on transparency agenda is stronger than before, participants reiterated the critical need for information on development cooperation be available at country level. The global transparency efforts should not be a stumbling block for enhanced information availability at country level, but concerns were raised by participants on the continuous difficulty in having timely, comprehensive and relevant information reported at country level to inform their development process of planning, budgeting, executing/implementing and monitoring.

With a global light and country focus approach, there is a stronger country ownership and leadership seen in the implementation efforts made by various countries. However, a stronger country ownership and leadership was not always matched with the stronger engagement and continuous commitments by providers of development cooperation at country level. There is a need for a stronger link between HQs and Country Offices of Development Cooperation Providers to drive the efforts in enhancing effectiveness of development cooperation and inclusive and stronger partnerships at country level.

Reflections on a first round of the Global Partnership monitoring efforts

Overall, countries emphasized that the Global Partnership monitoring remains relevant and important, providing a solid evidence base to support global and country level accountability framework in promoting behavioural changes and enhancing the impacts of development cooperation. The meeting concluded that the monitoring exercise should continue to be an important part of the Global Partnership activities and that further emphasis and efforts are needed to ensure that country-level monitoring framework and exercise is supported and strengthened. In particular, countries highlighted the following issues and recommendations for future monitoring process:

- Significant challenges around data reporting by development partners were noted at country level. Participants underscored the essential need for data to be reported, validated and verified at country level. Many countries expressed the significant concerns when data validated/verified at country level is questioned or changed by HQ authorities and/or country offices are unable to provide the information at country level. This poses a considerable challenge in ensuring that monitoring efforts support country-focused implementation efforts.
- Inclusive engagement of broader stakeholders/partners was noted to be important to ensure a meaningful monitoring to support countries' efforts in enhancing impacts of development cooperation. Some participants have also noted on the need to ensure all relevant partners at country level should take part in the monitoring exercise.
- There was a strong call for actions for strengthening country-level institutional information management system as an important tool to support country monitoring efforts/exercise.
- In supporting country taking stocks of its implementation progress and efforts, participants emphasized on the need for a country chapter to be introduced in a next round of the

monitoring process. This further supports country ownership and leadership by promoting country-level consultations and dialogue on the outcomes of country's progress and challenges.

- On the indicator relating to gender equality, there was a strong call for all the countries to participate in monitoring of this indicator.

III. Sessions and main outcomes

Session 2: Global Partnership Monitoring Framework – approach and overall findings

The Joint Support Team presented the overall key messages emerging from the outcomes of the Global Partnership Monitoring Framework as well as states of play for each indicator, with views to discuss overall reflections and perspectives from countries with regard to what the overall findings tell us on the implementation progress and challenges. This was followed by panel discussion of country perspectives on key findings [Panel format – views from Moldova, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, and Cote d'Ivoire].

The following guiding questions were used to generate lively discussions on key findings:

- *What do you take as key headlines from the monitoring findings? Any major challenges/constraints to implementing the selected commitments from your country perspective?*
- *What are the political messages that should be brought forward for the Mexico HLM and a possible key element which should be considered for a communique*
- *Alongside political messages, are there key recommendations/actions that need to be addressed at the technical level?*

The plenary discussions as well as panel discussions focused on the following issues:

- Participants observed that unfinished agenda of aid effectiveness remains unfinished. There are significant level of behavioural changes needed on both side. At country level, there will be a need for stronger leadership with shared visions on development and development cooperation/partnership. On the side of providers of development cooperation, there is a need for political commitments and actions to reform their own cooperation strategy.
- Reinforcing reforms should not be unilateral efforts. There was a sense of frustration that countries are making efforts on public reforms, public financial management reforms, and policy changes to make development planning and implementation process effective and efficient. Yet, there seems to be an issue of trust. The mutual accountability process should evolve around trust, but resistance to use the country systems remains.
- Dialogue at national level is crucial if we are to address policy and behavioural changes. Full implementation of the Busan commitments is not only about technical work/technical perfection, but also about facilitating and strengthening mutual trust. Consolidating dialogue at country level can facilitate strengthening of mutual trust.

- Domestication of Busan agenda was considered a priority action. This may mean countries clarifying what it means by shifting aid effectiveness to effective development cooperation agenda and enhancing national framework for effective development cooperation.
- Development effectiveness/effective development cooperation means a more coherent and coordinated framework of development cooperation and partnership. Broader cooperation framework and inter-ministerial and multi-stakeholder engagement was considered an important aspect for national efforts.
- Busan commitments underscore an important role of other actors, acknowledging that everyone has a role to play. This spirit needs to be anchored into a national action plan of implementing the Busan commitments.
- At global level, the outcomes suggest that there is an issue of behavioural changes. Countries question whether development partners are rising up to the challenge of implementing the Busan commitments fully. Stronger political leadership was noted to be important. In particular, issues such as transparency, predictability and use of country systems were noted as remaining priority issues. Managing and integrating technical assistance into national framework remains one of the major challenges.
- The monitoring exercise and review of outcomes enables countries to deepen the efforts to make further progress by taking stock of where we are but also why certain progress were made and challenges remain. Country specific chapters which were part of the Paris Declaration monitoring framework in this regard were useful inputs to country process. Further consideration should be made in bringing a country chapter back to the Global Partnership monitoring framework.
- Development cooperation landscape is changing, and further efforts should be made to involve broader development stakeholders into this process, including civil society organisation as well as providers of South-South cooperation. Many countries noted on the need for having a comprehensive picture on development cooperation they receive to allow meaningful mutual accountability process and framework. Having a broader picture on development cooperation and what support is provided is a critical aspect of countries being able to be accountable for development cooperation and support they receive and development results they achieve. Further consideration and efforts were noted to be useful in strengthening systems to include broader cooperation information to support strategic planning, alignment, and accountability process.
- Observation was also made on the engagement and commitment of development partners at country-level monitoring exercise. Availability of data/information was noted to be a major challenge in terms of facilitating country-monitoring process as well as supporting national development efforts.

Session 3: Taking stock of the country-level monitoring process – what worked and what did not

The overall objective of this session was to reflect on a country monitoring process and discuss how future monitoring process can be strengthened and embedded in national monitoring and accountability process/framework.

The session started with a presentation from the joint support team on the Global Monitoring Framework: taking stock of a country monitoring process. Following the introductory presentation, the session consisted of four group discussions on two topics, including (1) data collection and validation panel discussions; and (2) consultation and mutual accountability process.

Discussions highlighted the following reflection and key lessons learned on a monitoring process:

Data collection/validation process:

- Considerable challenges were noted on data collection and validation. Data submission and reporting by development partners were not always forthcoming despite numerous follow-up made by country authorities.
- Data collection and validation should be undertaken at country level. Any quality assurance of data should be undertaken by country offices with their HQs prior to them reporting it into a country monitoring process and/or a country-led information management systems/procedures.
- There seems to be a large disparity between HQs and country offices engagement. Some countries observed that some of the country offices were not willing to engage/contribute noting that they had not received an instruction from their HQs.
- Some development partners were also not fully aware of the indicators (definitions, criteria, etc.), and sensitizing development partners on the indicators facilitated engagement of development partners.
- Regular meetings and dialogue facilitated data collection and validation in many countries. There is a need to look at institutionalizing the dialogue to facilitate the future monitoring process. Such dialogue should be taken place and strengthened in existing dialogue framework where applicable.
- National aid information management systems were used by some governments to track the data and monitor the Global Partnership indicators. The use of national AIMS was noted to be a good practice, facilitating institutionalized data collection process.

Partnership and consultation process

-

Session 4: Global Partnership monitoring approach – lessons learned to enhance future implementation efforts

The objective of this session was to discuss in details a methodology of piloting indicators to inform further monitoring framework. The session was opened with an overview presentation from the joint support team on pilot indicators in terms of methodology and preliminary outcomes of the pilot, which was followed by group discussions on the following topics:

- (1) Results indicator; lessons and future recommendations
- (2) Country systems: assessing quality and use of country systems
- (3) How to ensure a country-focused approach to measuring private sector engagement, civil society enabling environment and transparency.

Issues that arose in the group discussions are summarised below.

Results indicator; lessons and future recommendations

Can we ask Diego to provide several bullet points here from the discussions?

Quantifying the degree to which development partners embrace and utilise country result frameworks was presented as a pioneering attempt to stimulate mutual accountability, and further cement ownership at country level. In this respect, the workshop participants eloquently welcomed the new approach proposed in the pilot for its (i) clarity, (ii) intuitive design, (iii) ease of implementation and interpretation, and (iv) its ability to generate constructive exchanges between host Governments and development partners.

Whilst the meeting offered ample opportunities to reflect on the pilot's preliminary results and their implication, the focus of the discussions centred around the pilot's methodology including the processes of data collection and aggregation. Additional aspects of the workshop deliberations touched on measurement sustainability strategies and the indicator's longevity in view of the evolving nature of the development cooperation landscape, particularly in the context of the post-2015 development framework.

The following observations represent key highlights emerging from the group discussions:

- Pre-existing challenge: Development partners often view/interpret country result frameworks as a means of holding Governments to account, rather than as a tool to inform their own programming and results reporting.
- In depth discussions on the indicator design unveiled a general discomfort with the utilisation of predefined development cooperation delivery modalities (e.g. budget support, basket funding) as proxies for the effective utilisation of country result frameworks. To this end, participants questioned the indicator's ability to quantify the actual utilisation of country result frameworks vs. development partners' commitment to support local PFM systems.
- On a similar note, the participants provided substantive evidence to challenge the link between delivery modalities such as basket funding and the use of country result frameworks. Finally, the pilot participants highlighted the identification of projects on-budget vs. projects off-budget as a significant challenge in the process of compiling and aggregating data.
- In forging a practical way forward, participants suggested a more balanced approach to analyse the use of country result frameworks. One which incorporates Government perceptions of DPs' ability to utilise country result frameworks, as well as DPs' reflections on host Governments' ability to establish satisfactory enabling environments. More specifically, the dialogue culminated with a clear suggestion to replace the financial

elements of the proposed indicator with a component of DPs' perceptions of Governments' effective implementation and utilisation of country result frameworks.

- This “mirror-based-approach”, capitalising on the Global Partnership’s goal to enhance partner dialogue and promote qualitative appraisals of the intricate dynamics governing Government-DP relations, is expected to yield a more accurate assessment of development partners’ true potential to fulfil their global commitment to fully embrace and utilise country result frameworks.
- Notably, all participants voiced an urgent need to factor in the changing landscape of development cooperation by reaching out and inclusively documenting attitudes and degrees of utilisation of country result frameworks by non-traditional partners, civil society, the private sector, and even key foundations providing significant financial support to a large number of countries globally.
- Lastly, the participants expressed great interest in (i) the scale-up of the pilot to include a broader and more diverse set of countries, and (ii) the institutionalisation of such efforts at country and/or regional level. Key interventions in support of this agenda include strengthening of national statistics and their management structures, whilst fostering greater alignment between national planning and budgeting cycles to strengthen the link between policy design, implementation and result-based monitoring and evaluation systems. Key pre-requisite: Strong national leadership.

Country systems: assessing quality and use of country systems

A number of countries indicated that the indicators on the country systems remain one of the foundational aspects on effective development cooperation agenda. To this end, the following observations were made on the methodology of assessing quality of country systems and outcomes emerging from the indicator on use of country systems.

- Quality of PFM is measured through CPIA. Participants noted the use of CPIA in assessing quality of country systems is posing a challenge and conflict of interest. Lack of transparency in the assessment process was also noted to be a major challenge. To this end, while acknowledging the need to continue using the CPIA in the medium-term due to lack of appropriate alternative, there is a need for a neutral/independent assessment of the quality of PFM and this should be considered as one of the urgent issues to be addressed in the Global Partnership monitoring framework.
- While participants took note of an on-going work by the Effective Institutions Platform in coming out with an assessment methodology, participants also raised concerns on the fact that the EIP is considered a donor-driven platform with a limited opportunity (financially as well as from human resource point of view) to deepen the partner countries/developing countries engagement in this process. Furthermore, many countries consider the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessment as a neutral and credible process where countries are fully engaged and the efforts should be made in strengthening and expanding the coverage of the assessment. They also raised a concern that having another methodology and process in addition to PEFA poses a significant challenge in ensuring adequate and appropriate engagement of countries in the process.

- Participants also took a note that the Busan commitments on the use of country system as a default means that the onus is on the side of providers of development cooperation to justify why they are not able to use the country systems rather than the use is dependent on the quality. Participants also took a note of the outcomes that there seems to be weak correlation between the quality and use and poses a question as to whether there is a need for continuous monitoring of both indicators.
- Participants also discussed the outcomes of the use of country systems. There was a sense of frustration, noting that countries have made substantial efforts in reforming and strengthening the country systems. They indicated that it is the same development partners that invest in country's efforts in strengthening the country systems, yet they themselves have not been able to use the systems they help to strengthen. It was noted that countries have been made to understand that HQ policy has not been able to enable the use of country systems. Participants noted that future dialogue on this should focus on the reasons for NON USE, as using the weak quality as a reason is not convincing.
- In the context of shift from aid effectiveness to development effectiveness, participants underscored that the use of country systems is even more important than before – it builds the foundations for ownership agenda as well as in the context of implementation of the Post 2015 development agenda.

How to ensure a country-focused approach to measuring private sector engagement, civil society enabling environment and transparency

Hanna-Mari?

Session 5: Recommendations for future monitoring – reporting back from the group/clinic discussions and Conclusion

- There is the essential need for data to be reported, validated and verified at country level to make the global-light, country-focused approach of the Global Partnership monitoring framework. The significant concerns was noted on data validated/verified at country level is questioned or changed by HQ authorities and/or country offices are unable to provide the information at country level. The meeting recommended that data reporting, validation and verification of the indicators monitored through the country monitoring framework should be made at country level. Any quality assurance of data should be made by providers of development cooperation before the data is reported at country level.
- Inclusive engagement of broader stakeholders/partners was noted to be important to ensure a meaningful monitoring to support countries' efforts in enhancing impacts of development cooperation.
- There was a strong call for actions for strengthening country-level institutional information management system as an important tool to support country monitoring efforts/exercise.
- In supporting country taking stocks of its implementation progress and efforts, participants emphasized on the need for a country chapter to be introduced in a next round of the monitoring process. This further supports country ownership and leadership by promoting country-level consultations and dialogue on the outcomes of country's progress and challenges.

- On the indicator relating to gender equality, there was a strong call for all the countries to participate in monitoring of this indicator.

IV. Follow-up action taken and next steps

- The joint support team shared the key messages and outcomes of the workshop with the Co-Chairs of the Global Partnership as well as Mexico immediately following the meeting.
- The set of final country data will be made available to participating countries shortly. The report will also be finalized shortly for further inform the substantive preparation of the Mexico HLM.

V. Feedback from participants