

# Overview and status of global monitoring efforts

Third meeting of the Global Partnership Steering Committee  
25-26 July 2013, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

This document provides an overview of the Global Partnership monitoring process and steps envisaged to collect, analyse, present and disseminate findings in the second half of 2013. The document sets out: an update on progress in rolling out the Global Partnership monitoring framework; an outline of evidence to be generated, including the scope and structure of the first progress report and possible evidence gaps; and plans to disseminate and communicate findings.

This document is shared with Steering Committee members *for discussion*. Steering committee members may find the questions presented at the end of this document (“V. Next steps”) to be helpful as they consult with others and prepare for the discussion.

## **Contacts:**

Ms. Marjolaine Nicod, tel. +33 1 45 24 98 32, email: [hanna-mari.kilpelainen@oecd.org](mailto:hanna-mari.kilpelainen@oecd.org)

Ms. Hanna-Mari Kilpelainen, tel. +33 1 45 24 98 32, email: [hanna-mari.kilpelainen@oecd.org](mailto:hanna-mari.kilpelainen@oecd.org)

Ms. Yuko Suzuki, tel. +1 212 906 6509, email: [yuko.suzuki@undp.org](mailto:yuko.suzuki@undp.org)

## OVERVIEW AND STATUS OF GLOBAL MONITORING EFFORTS

### 1. Introduction

The document provides an overview and scope of global monitoring efforts to date. The purpose of the discussion is to reach a common understanding within the Steering Committee of what can be expected from the evidence generated ahead of the first ministerial-level meeting.

On the basis of discussions, Steering Committee members may wish to reflect on how they can strengthen the Global Partnership's ability to look back and address challenges by:

- Helping countries and organisations to gather timely and accurate data for the 10 indicators;
- Examining what the global monitoring framework can tell us and identifying potential gaps in the evidence base;
- Agreeing on ways that members can find/commission key complementary evidence to support the ministerial-level meeting;
- Identifying and facilitating events to discuss and disseminate findings to different target audiences before the ministerial-level meeting.

### 2. Progress in rolling out the Global Partnership monitoring framework

#### 2.1 *Reinforcing the political mandate for global monitoring*

The Global Partnership monitoring framework provides a key source of evidence for the Global Partnership as a whole to look back and reflect on progress on effective development co-operation.

A sound evidence base is vital for sustaining political momentum, promoting accountability and driving progress. Regular stock-takes help to identify challenges and boost efforts further where needed. Reviewing progress also provides an entry point for sharing experiences and knowledge between various stakeholders and co-operation modalities. The most important aim is mutual learning and strengthened partnerships.

Given the importance of taking stock of progress ahead of the forthcoming ministerial-level meeting, the Co-Chairs sent in June 2013 [a letter to ministers and heads of organisations](#) which have endorsed the Busan Partnership agreement, emphasising the importance of using the Global Partnership monitoring framework and its guidance to gather data. Recognising the voluntary nature of the global monitoring process, the Co-Chairs also emphasized the importance of qualitative information and welcomed case-studies particularly from those that have not previously been involved in these processes but would like more recognition for their contributions to development.

The evidence gathered through the Global Partnership monitoring framework will be compiled into a global progress report ahead of ministerial-level meetings of the Global Partnership.

#### 2.2 *Supporting country-level data collection and dialogue*

To date, 40 aid recipient countries have expressed strong interest in participating in global monitoring efforts (list in Annex 1). In some cases, these countries have reported that national mutual accountability / development partnership frameworks are already in place to provide data, and where this is not the case arrangements will be made to gather the data through other

processes. Some countries have already advanced rapidly in rolling out the process at country level including the organisation of national consultations.

At the same time, when countries received the draft monitoring guidance for consultation in March 2013, many expressed strong demand for workshops to support their participation. In response, and as follow-up to the Steering Committee's discussions in Bali, the UNDP-OECD joint support team organised a workshop for developing country governments on 12-14 June in Copenhagen, bringing together more than 40 participants from over 30 countries. The objective of this workshop was to facilitate peer exchanges and discussions and to deepen understanding of monitoring at the country and global level. It also provided an opportunity for countries to exchange views on priorities and interests regarding the broader agenda of the Global Partnership. Based on Copenhagen discussions and direct feedback received from about 20 countries and organisations on the draft guidance, the support team finalised and disseminated the Guide to the Global Partnership Monitoring Framework at the end of June.

Discussions in Copenhagen confirmed that many developing countries have taken the lead in translating the Busan Partnership agenda into their own development frameworks and are engaging in dialogue with development partners, including a wider range of stakeholders than before – in some cases civil society, businesses, partners engaged in south-south co-operation, and foundations. Countries highlighted the usefulness of the key Busan principles of country ownership, transparency, focus on results and inclusivity. They said these had been particularly helpful in raising awareness and getting all actors involved; strengthening focus on results and accountability; taking forward key institutional reforms; and streamlining climate change finance in the broader development agenda.

At the same time, countries also emphasised the need for a stronger political push to ensure real buy-in to Busan principles and engagement from all actors. Noting limited awareness around the Global Partnership at the country level, Copenhagen participants urged the support team to ensure more effective communication, helping all stakeholders to reach out to their decision makers and particularly supporting communication between co-operation providers' headquarters and their country representations.

In addition, a series of regional workshops are planned by regional organisations/institutions and/or Steering Committee members with the support of and/or in collaboration with the UNDP global team and regional centres (see document 3 for a list of potential opportunities). The aim of these workshops will be to focus on the broader implementation of Busan principles in region-specific contexts. Such workshops will not only provide a forum for peer learning / knowledge sharing on implementation of Busan commitments, they would also support the gathering of qualitative, anecdotal or case study-based evidence of progress made in broadening efforts on aid effectiveness to address the effectiveness of development co-operation in a larger sense. In this way, the workshops will be essential to inform the preparation of the first ministerial-level meeting.

Several countries have also requested advisory and operational support to help strengthen country-level data collection. In response, a virtual help-desk has been set up in the Global Partnership community site to provide day-to-day support. The help-desk includes all relevant materials concerning the monitoring framework as well as a regularly updated section for Questions and Answers. A generic monitoring email account has been established to centralise help-desk support.

UNDP is also trying to respond to requests at the country level, but the extent to which UNDP can do so depends on resource availability at regional and country level as well as existing country coordination structures and frameworks. In this context, a pilot approach is being considered to provide dedicated support in a few pilot countries.

### **2.3 Update on selected indicators**

This section provides a brief description on the status of “new” indicators which do not draw on the previous monitoring framework of the Paris Declaration. Progress has been made in most, although in some cases, it might not be possible to gather evidence beyond a sub-set of countries. Where this applies, it is set out clearly below. Further details on opportunities to engage will be made available on the Global Partnership community space.

#### ***Indicator 1 - Development co-operation is focused on results that meet developing countries' priorities***

The purpose of this indicator is to provide a basis to better understand progress in strengthening co-operation providers' use of country-led results frameworks and their associated monitoring and evaluation systems. Finding the right balance between the need for an accurate and credible measure and the feasibility of the assessment remains a major challenge.

The Copenhagen workshop on the Global Partnership monitoring framework provided an opportunity to gather feedback from a wide range of countries. They confirmed that the proposed definition of looking at both a country's approach to results frameworks and its associated monitoring and evaluation systems is relevant for capturing key aspects of countries' results frameworks. There was a preference to keep the measurement easy to manage, looking at actual behaviour of providers of development cooperation. The complex nature of the indicator as well as various approaches to country results frameworks were discussed in detail during the Copenhagen workshop. There is a keen interest to look into qualitative aspects of this indicator, as many developing countries consider this indicator to provide an entry point to strengthen dialogue on this important agenda at country level. To this end, it was agreed that more detailed and targeted consultation would take place in August-September in a selected number of countries interested to pilot the indicator, under the guidance of the support team.

#### ***Indicator 2 - Civil society operates within an environment that maximises its engagement in and contribution to development***

The purpose of this indicator is to provide a basis for understanding progress in strengthening the enabling environment for civil society. Consensus was reached in 2012 to draw on a new Enabling Environment Index (EEI) under development by CIVICUS: the World Alliance for Citizen Participation. CIVICUS has developed an EEI under the guidance of a multi-stakeholder Advisory Group, with technical support from academia as well as in consultation with the CSO Platform for Development Effectiveness. CIVICUS launched a draft pilot index for consultation in April and is currently finalizing the Index on the basis of stakeholder feedback, including several in-country consultation opportunities.

It had been initially envisaged that the Global Partnership indicator on the enabling environment for CSOs would focus on sub-dimensions of the CIVICUS-EEI relating to the Busan commitment, which is to enable CSOs to exercise their role as independent development actors and to maximise their contribution to development. Due to limited data availability for the selected sub-dimensions of the EEI that have direct bearing on CSO activity, it is challenging at this stage to use the EEI to construct an indicator that would alone provide a robust basis for meaningful dialogue on the state of enabling environment for CSOs within the Global Partnership. It is proposed to build on CIVICUS work on the EEI and use additional qualitative evidence to provide a preliminary narrative on the state of enabling environment for civil society.

The EEI represents a pioneer approach to providing a globally comparable measure of the state of the enabling environment for CSOs. Concerted international efforts to address remaining gaps in data availability would help to provide more comprehensive evidence to underpin political dialogue in the future.

### ***Indicator 3 - Engagement and contribution of the private sector to development***

The purpose of this indicator is to provide a basis for understanding progress in strengthening the engagement and contribution of the private sector to development. As this is challenging to measure directly, “quality of public-private sector dialogue” has been used as a proxy. It draws on the work of the World Bank Institute on public-private dialogue and good practice principles, originating from a collaborative initiative between several organisations in the early 2000s. It consists of a composite index looking at the effectiveness of dialogue, including: i) the existence of an institutionalised mechanism or formalised structures; ii) aspects of the representativeness of private sector actors involved; as well as iii) basic indications on the outcome of the dialogues (e.g. number of reform proposals and reforms enacted).

The framework for measuring quality of dialogue has been shared for consultation with key stakeholders, particularly those involved in the work of the Public-Private Cooperation Building Block. Although it is unclear at this stage to which extent this work can translate into an indicator, it will provide a basis for: a better understanding of the nature, structure and sustainability of collaborative processes between public and private sector actors; country-level dialogue on capacity development needs and advisory services; and further mobilisation of the private sector within the Global Partnership.

A number of countries have indicated their interest to participate in final consultations on the indicator construction and piloting. The piloting will happen through desk reviews and targeted interviews in August-September. It is envisaged to review the initial findings and to validate the methodology through consultations in September-October.

### ***Indicator 4 - Transparency: information on development co-operation is publicly available***

The purpose of this indicator is to provide an understanding of how transparent various providers of development cooperation are about their cooperation, and how they are becoming more open. It will have four elements which are derived directly from Busan Partnership commitments: i) timeliness of information; ii) level of detail of information; iii) forward looking nature of the information; and iv) coverage of the information.

The support team is working closely with the secretariats managing the two main systems of the common open standard, namely the IATI reporting system and the OECD/DAC Creditor Reporting System and Forward Spending Survey, to resolve the pending technical issues related to the indicator construction and identify practical ways for continued collaboration in piloting the indicator in the coming months. Further refinement is needed on the approach to coverage of flows and actors as well as the definition of targets and ways of assessing progress in light of the schedules that individual providers have adopted to implement the common, open standard. The challenge is to develop a robust enough measure while at the same time keeping the focus on the key transparency issues that matter for development. Piloting a new measurement approach will offer an opportunity to test the methodology in 2013, assess its strengths and weaknesses and, if appropriate, refine the measurement in the future. Stakeholder feedback on the indicator concept is being facilitated through the above mentioned secretariats and through the ad hoc group on the common standard with a series of consultations planned over the next few months.

### ***Indicator 8 - Gender equality and empowerment of women***

The purpose of this indicator is to provide an understanding of the extent to which developing countries have systems in place to track and make public allocations on a gender basis. UN Women developed the indicator in close collaboration with the OECD/DAC Network on Gender Equality (GENDERNET), and tested it in March-April 2013 in 15 countries.

Overall the responses showed that countries are at varied levels on the development of their systems to track gender allocations. Findings indicated that 7 of the 15 pilot countries considered that they had a system in place to track and make public allocations for gender equality. Two additional countries reported having systems in place but that this information was not available to the public. UN Women is planning to support the rolling out of the indicator in 20 countries in 2013 and all its 65 programme-countries by 2017, through integration of the indicator in the annual reporting process of the organisation.

The support team has received feedback that a wider set of countries might be willing to provide data on this indicator, beyond those that UN Women has targeted already. Thus, guidance for reporting on this indicator has been included, on an optional basis, for submission of country-level data to the support team by mid-September.

### 3. Evidence to be generated through the Global Partnership monitoring framework

#### 3.1 Expected scope of evidence for the 2013/14 Progress Report

The support team will prepare the first progress report ahead of the ministerial-level meeting scheduled for early 2014, drawing on the findings from the 10 indicators. The purpose of the first progress report is to present a global snapshot of progress in implementing Busan commitments.

This interim stock-take of progress will provide a useful basis to get an understanding of the level of implementation to date, showing what works and areas where efforts need to be strengthened on selected commitments underpinned by the agreed set of indicators.

However, while the report will provide a good sense of where we are on the road towards 2015, there will be some limitations in the extent to which we will be able to assess the distance travelled. For some of the indicators which were measured previously under the Paris Declaration monitoring framework, it will be possible to assess progress. For the new indicators which will be measured for the first time, the report will establish the baseline. In addition, information may be patchy across countries and across indicators, given the different sources of information used to gather evidence. Therefore the support team will also draw, to the extent possible, on complementary relevant evidence of a more qualitative nature to enrich the analysis.

The table below provides an overview of the evidence that is expected to be available in the second half of 2013 to inform the preparation of the first ministerial-level meeting. Annex II provides a more detailed description of the information that is expected to be generated through the Global Partnership monitoring framework and identifies possible gaps in evidence.

#### Global Partnership monitoring framework - Overview of expected evidence coverage

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Indicator value 2013</i>	<i>Change over time captured in 2013</i>	<i>Add.evidence: qualitative</i>
1. <b>Results:</b> extent to which providers of development cooperation use developing countries' results frameworks (aggregation: developing countries and providers)	●	○	○
2. <b>CSO enabling environment:</b> state of the environment conducive to maximize CSO engagement and their contribution to development (aggregation: developing countries)	○	○	●
3. <b>Private sector engagement:</b> quality of public-private dialogue that ensures private sector participation in the design and implementation of private sector development and investment related reforms (aggregation: developing countries)	●	○	●

Indicator	Indicator value 2013	Change over time captured in 2013	Add.evidence: qualitative
4. <b>Transparency:</b> extent to which providers of development co-operation implement the common, open standard on aid information (aggregation: providers)	●	○	○
5. <b>Predictability:</b> extent to which development co-operation funding is disbursed within the year for which it was scheduled (annual predictability); and extent to which forward spending or implementation plans are available (medium-term predictability) (aggregation: developing countries and providers)	●	◐	◐
6. <b>Aid on budget:</b> extent to which development co-operation funding is recorded on national budgets (aggregation: developing countries and providers)	●	●	○
7. <b>Mutual accountability:</b> number of developing countries conducting inclusive mutual assessment reviews (aggregation: developing countries)	●	●	◐
8. <b>Gender equality and women's empowerment:</b> number of developing countries with systems in place to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment (aggregation: developing countries)	◐	○	◐
9a. <b>Use of public financial management and procurement country systems:</b> quality of developing countries' budget and financial management systems (CPIA assessment for IDA eligible countries)	◐	●	◐
9b. <b>Use of public financial management and procurement country systems:</b> extent to which providers use country public financial management and procurement systems (aggregation: developing countries and providers)	●	●	○
10. <b>Aid untying:</b> extent to which aid is fully untied (OECD/DAC members) (aggregation: developing countries and providers)	●	●	○

● = coverage for most of the countries/organisations participating in global monitoring efforts      ◐ = partial coverage      ○ = limited or no coverage

### 3.3 Presentation of findings

The support team will review, analyse and present the data gathered from the different sources. A preliminary draft report outline is presented below for reference.

Title: 2013 Report - Progress in Making Effective Development Co-operation More Effective		
Chapters	Purpose and Scope	
<i>PART I</i>		
1	Overview of Findings  <i>Are we on track to deliver our commitments and achieve targets?</i>	A synthesis of trends at the global level, presenting aggregate progress against the 10 indicators and associated 2015 targets  A possible overview of major differences across countries and providers of development co-operation, (subject to data comparability)  Appropriate graphs, charts and boxes to facilitate access to data

2-3-4	<p>Progress and challenges in implementing Busan commitments, drawing on the 10 indicators clustered around the key Busan principles as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Ownership, and results</b> (PFM/procurement systems; aid untying; results; gender equality)</li> <li>- <b>Inclusive partnerships</b> (CSOs; private sector)</li> <li>- <b>Transparency and accountability</b>(transparency; predictability; aid on budget; and mutual accountability)</li> </ul> <p>Guiding questions:</p> <p><i>Where do we need to take action to accelerate progress?</i></p> <p><i>What are the emerging lessons learned from focusing on effective development co-operation?</i></p>	<p>Thematic chapters cluster evidence on related issues to deepen the analysis of progress, identifying positive trends and remaining challenges and bottlenecks.</p> <p>For each indicator, detailed analysis presenting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Progress (or where no baseline is available, preliminary narrative on the state of implementation), drawing on findings generated by the monitoring indicators</li> <li>- Evidence of progress generated through additional monitoring efforts or indicators – if any, including context specific and sector initiatives</li> <li>- Lessons learned on success factors and bottlenecks</li> <li>- Examples of innovative practices and approaches, particularly those showcasing country level perspectives, with emphasis on results</li> </ul> <p>Specific initiatives that could be highlighted (depending on data availability) :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- conflict and fragility – contribution of the New Deal to Busan implementation</li> <li>- concrete examples of ways to enhance the impact of co-operation from a broader range of modalities (e.g. initial insights to aspects of south-south co-operation or co-operation based on non-concessional funding)</li> </ul>
5	Building smarter partnerships - country level initiatives	A chapter to document country level experience with results and accountability frameworks and building more inclusive partnerships
<i>PART II</i>		
Statistical annexes		<p>Statistical data on the Busan indicators provided by country and providers of development cooperation as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Country data: 1 table per indicator</li> <li>- Provider data: 1 table per indicator</li> </ul>

## 4 Dissemination of findings, access to data and follow-up

### 4.1 Report launch and associated communication efforts

The hard-copy report will be made available with sufficient lead time before the ministerial-level meeting (approximately 6-8 weeks before the meeting to the extent possible, depending on exact dates once confirmed). An early launch of preliminary findings could be envisaged a few weeks before the launch of the full report (e.g. by the end of 2013/early 2014). It would be helpful if Steering Committee members could identify international/regional opportunities for dissemination of findings to different target audiences.

The report will be published and the findings disseminated in a transparent manner and available online.

### 4.2 Public access to data

For the support team to produce the first progress report in time to inform the ministerial-level meeting (if scheduled for early 2014), data on all the indicators will need to be available for analysis **no later than mid-September**. A detailed timeline is provided in Annex III but remains tentative given the current uncertainty over dates for the ministerial-level meeting.

Transparency in this process is critical. To ensure that all stakeholders get the most of the data, the support team will make the full data set available once it is finalised. Possible tools and platforms are being considered (e.g. [OECD.Stats](#)). This will allow all to access and analyse the data and present the findings in different ways.

### 4.3 Follow-up

Considering that the global monitoring framework offers the potential to test the ground for the future, it is important to see this as a learning process and ensure that we also take stock of lessons, challenges and room for improvement. To this end, building on the first stock-take of progress, it would be useful to follow-up with regard to how the “country-focused” approach of relying on country reporting systems could be further strengthened within the context of supporting national mutual accountability frameworks/country compacts.

Beyond informing the extent to which stakeholders are implementing agreed commitments, monitoring efforts represent a tangible contribution to realise MDG8 on a global partnership. Efforts to assess the quality of development cooperation are an essential counterpart to international discussions on financing for development, which focus on the quantity of resources for development. The Steering Committee may wish to consider a more comprehensive review of the global arrangements for monitoring Busan commitments and emerging lessons with a view to assess their relevance for and contribution to the post-2015 UN development framework.

## 5. Next steps – possible points for discussion by the Steering Committee

- Helping countries and organisations to gather timely and accurate data for the 10 indicators:
  - Are stakeholders on track to collect data at country-level and does their experience fit with plans set out in this paper?
  - Are there more countries and organisations that need to be involved and what can be done for further mobilisation?
  - Are the planned regional consultations enough to support mutual learning and sharing of experience?
- Examining what the global monitoring framework can tell us and identifying potential gaps in the evidence base;
  - What are the key questions of political relevance that the monitoring process will help us to answer?
  - Are there other areas beyond the scope of the 10 indicators where complementary evidence could further support meaningful political dialogue?
  - What can individual Steering Committee members bring to the table to fill some of the identified evidence gaps (see list in section 3.2), drawing on existing work or commissioning additional works?
  - How do Steering Committee members see the findings of the monitoring process being translated into recommendations for the ministerial-level meeting?
  - Do members currently have at their disposal relevant evidence on implementing Busan commitments that they would like to share with others as a starting point for discussion on how to address emerging trends?
- Discussing and disseminating findings:
  - Should there be an early launch of the findings prior to the full publication or the report or is a launch 6-8 weeks before the ministerial-level meeting good enough?
  - How could individual Steering Committee members help to disseminate the findings by organising launch events or through other ways?

## ANNEX I – Countries interested to participate in global monitoring efforts

*(list being updated regularly on the Community Site of the Global Partnership)*

Note: On the basis of on-going communication with developing countries, further countries can be expected to indicate their interest in the coming weeks.

Country/Pays
Armenia
Bangladesh
Benin
Burkina Faso
Burundi
Cambodia
Cameroun
Cape Verde
Côte d'Ivoire
Democratic Republic of Congo
Dominican Republic
Egypt
Ethiopia
Grenada
Guinea Bissau
Honduras
Indonesia
Kenya
Kiribati
Lesotho
Madagascar
Malawi
Mali
Marshall Islands
Micronesia
Mozambique
Nauru
Nepal
Niger
Niue
Palau
Peru
République Centrafricaine
Republic of Moldova
Samoa
Senegal
Sudan
Tanzania
Togo
Yemen

## ANNEX II – Overview of expected evidence to be generated through the Global Partnership monitoring framework

Indicator	Expected number of countries covered	Expected timing	Potential gaps
1. Results	Findings from piloting the indicator in a limited number of countries (exact number to be determined after discussions in Copenhagen and on the basis of available resources)	Indicator to be piloted from July-September	Quality of country results frameworks (including on aspects such as inclusiveness)
2. CSO enabling environment	Countries covered by the piloting phase of the EEI + addition evidence from CPDE	Preliminary EEI data available in July	CSO effectiveness and implementation of Istanbul principles
3. Private sector engagement	Findings from piloting the indicator in a limited number of countries (exact number to be determined on the basis of on-going consultations within the building block and feedback from discussion in Copenhagen)	Desk work to be conducted in August/September	Broader aspects of private sector contribution to development : e.g. role of private philanthropy, business environment
4. Transparency	Data available on all providers reporting to the OECD/CRS and/or participating in the IATI process	Desk work to be conducted in September/October	Progress on transparency for countries and organisations that are not part of the OECD/CRS or IATI Transparency issues beyond the common, open standard: e.g. fiscal transparency in developing countries
8. Gender	Data available on UN Women programme countries + additional self-selected countries participating in global monitoring	UN Women programme countries: on-going	Quality of systems to track gender allocation
10. Untied aid	OECD/DAC data available for 25 DAC members	2011 data available (2012 data available at the end of 2013)	Information limited to OECD DAC members and not always reflecting the reality in countries
5. Predictability 6. Aid on budget 7. Mutual accountability 9. PFM and procurement country systems	About 35 countries to date  More in-depth analysis of the state of mutual accountability (e.g. UNDESA work – scope and timing to be confirmed)	Deadline for submission of country-level data: July/August	Quality of country procurement systems and PFM systems Parliamentary oversight over budgets

## ANNEX III – Timeline for the efforts to generate and disseminate evidence in 2013

Note: this timeline is tentative and may require adjustments depending on the exact timing of the ministerial-level meeting in early 2014.

<p><b>June 2013</b></p>	<p><b><u>Support to roll-out country-level data collection and validation</u></b></p> <p>Workshop organised for developing country governments to support the rolling out of the monitoring framework of the Global Partnership.</p> <p>Based on feedback received from countries, Monitoring Guidance and country spread sheet finalised and circulated to the national co-ordinators in participating countries as well as other stakeholders.</p> <p>On-going support to national co-ordinators for data gathering, validation and submission.</p>
<p><b>July - August</b> <b>...until</b> <b>13 Sept 2013</b></p>	<p><b><u>Data collection and validation</u></b></p> <p>The national co-ordinators facilitate country level data collection in collaboration with development partners, including convening consultations and dialogue for data validation.</p> <p>Subsequently, country co-ordinators submit to the support team <b>by 13 September 2013</b> the completed country spread sheet based on data available at the country level.</p> <p>Information on indicators drawing on global processes is gathered under the co-ordination of the support team.</p>
<p><b>August-September 2013</b></p>	<p><b><u>Data processing and review</u></b></p> <p>Consolidation and aggregation of country-level data and desk reviews for indicators drawing on global-level data sources.</p> <p>Full country data tables are sent to national co-ordinators for final review in consultation with relevant stakeholders. In the case of any errors in the data, national co-ordinators notify the support team.</p> <p>To the extent possible, data arising from the globally sourced indicators will be shared, as available and relevant, with country level stakeholders.</p> <p>Providers of co-operation also receive for information their full set of data pertaining to each country in which they have reported data to the government.</p>
<p><b>October-December 2013</b></p>	<p><b><u>Report production</u></b></p> <p>Data is analysed by the support team and used as a basis for the progress report to inform political dialogue at the first Ministerial Meeting of the Global Partnership.</p> <p>Exact timeline for publication and dissemination of findings to be confirmed. This will include on-line access to the full set of data.</p>