

**A GPEDC Monitoring Framework Fit for Purpose:
Delivering effective development cooperation
in support of *Agenda 2030***



**A Summary of the
The Final Report of the Monitoring Advisory Group**

Presented to:

**The Steering Committee and Co-Chairs of the Global
Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation**

September 2016

Summary of MAG's Observations and Advice

This Summary includes all of the Monitoring Advisory Group's main observations and advice, which are the result of a year deliberation on the relevance of the GPEDC's Monitoring Framework. Background for these observations and recommendations below can be found in the main Final Report and its Annexes. Further recommendations for each of the ten indicators in this Framework can be found in the MAG's *Assessing the Current Indicator Framework (Annex Six)*, published as a separate document to accompany the Final Report and this Summary.

MAG advice on synergies with *Agenda 2030* and its review processes

1. Maintain the GPEDC Monitoring Framework as a distinct and unique process in its own right that complements the SDG review process.

The GPEDC adds value through a holistic framework and an inclusive process for assessing progress in effective development cooperation, which is implemented biannually at the country level. It builds on a decade of experience in country implementation, and as such, complements the UN follow-up and review process for *Agenda 2030* and supports the implementation of the *Addis Ababa Action Agenda*.¹

2. Build on the linkages with SDG indicators.

The GPEDC's Monitoring Framework and in particular GPEDC's Indicators One (results that meet developing country priorities) and Eight (gender equality) will play a crucial role in providing comprehensive data and analysis of progress, specifically with respect to indicators for SDG target 17.15 (respect policy space), 17.16 (enhancing global partnerships for sustainable development) and 5c (strengthen sound policies for gender equality).

3. Strengthen the Framework to improve its relevance to 2030 Agenda.

The Monitoring Framework has a unique role as it focuses on the strength of development partnerships and their alignment with the principles and commitments for effective development cooperation. Because of this, the Monitoring Framework should be strengthened and more closely related to an explicit theory of change to overcome current barriers to behaviour and institutional change.²

¹ See Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, "What contributions will the GPEDC make to support the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development?" Background Paper for Global Partnership Steering Committee meeting 29 February – 1 March 2015, Lilongwe, Malawi, accessible at http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/2030-Agenda-GPEDC-contribution_16-02-05.pdf.

² See also Coppard, D., and Culey, C., "The Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation's Contribution to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development," Background Paper for 2015 Busan Global Partnership Forum, Seoul, Republic of Korea, November 23-24, 2015, accessible at http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Plenary-1_Contribution-to-the-2030-Agenda-for-Sustainable-Development_FULL.pdf.

4. Explore options for convergence of GPEDC monitoring and SDG review at country level and in global progress reporting.

The MAG suggests that the JST and relevant Global Partnership Initiatives explore practical ways of convergence for implementing the GPEDC monitoring process with the SDG review process at country level, taking into account the experiences of the second monitoring round. This convergence has the potential to deepen political engagement with the GPEDC Framework. The JST should also advise the Steering Committee on practical options for coordination of the GPEDC biannual monitoring and the opportunities for synergies with SDG assessment and reporting progress.

5. Review the planning processes for SDG reviews as submitted to the July 2016 HLPF.

The MAG encourages the JST to facilitate a study of current planning processes for SDG country reviews (starting with those submitted to the July 2016 HLPF), with a view to understanding the issues in the practical integration of the GPEDC Monitoring Framework.

MAG advice on a theory of change underpinning a renewed GPEDC mandate

6. Develop a GPEDC theory of change.

The MAG recommends that the Steering Committee develop a GPEDC Theory of Change, in consultation with the GPEDC's primary stakeholder constituencies. This Theory of Change should form a foundation for a renewed GPEDC mandate for the Nairobi HLM2.

7. Consider the MAG's implied theory of change.

The MAG offers its considerations and representation of an implied theory of change to assist the Steering Committee process acting on the above recommendation for a GPEDC Theory of Change. See Exhibit One for the MAG implied Theory of Change (in relation to a relevant and useful monitoring process).

8. Develop a GPEDC theory of change shaped by three contextual dimensions

It is the view of the MAG that a GPEDC Theory of Change must be situated in the wider context for development cooperation in which the GPEDC and its different stakeholders operate. This context includes an emerging global development architecture shaped by *Agenda 2030*; the country/global dynamic in implementing commitments; and the interests of non-state development actors and non-traditional providers (SSC).

9. Structure a theory of change informed by the question 'why?'

The GPEDC Theory of Change should be informed by the question, "why," seeking an explanation and the reasons that change may or may not have happened as planned. This analysis and information can provide the foundation for refining what needs to be done to effect change in behaviour in development cooperation.

10. Integrate some key factors affecting the implementing a theory of change in the ‘real world.’

If GPEDC is to develop a theory of change that works in the real world and at the country level, it will need to take into account and address a number of factors, including the following:

- i. Robust incentives for all actors are essential.
- ii. The role of evidence and evaluation is crucial.
- iii. All relevant actors must be inspired by, and identify their actions, with the Theory of Change.
- iv. Behaviour and institutional change takes time, sometimes a great deal of time.

MAG advice on approaches to a revised post-HLM2 Monitoring Framework

11. Strengthen the Monitoring Framework as a core GPEDC resource.

The GPEDC Monitoring Framework should be considered the core resource and a significant comparative advantage of the GPEDC, whose credibility is its relevance to the principles for effective development cooperation and *Agenda 2030*.

12. Confirm the focus for GPEDC monitoring is public concessional finance for development (ODA and SSC) as expressed in processes and actors working to realizing effective development cooperation.

The advice of the MAG is to focus the Monitoring Framework on public concessional finance for development, and only through these public flows, connect with other non-public financial flows. The MAG also acknowledges that a determination of this focus is beyond its purview and is one for the renewal of the GPEDC’s mandate as a Partnership.

13. Make change to the Framework to improve relevance, but respect continuity.

While responding to proposals for relevance and improvements to the Monitoring Framework, the MAG also agrees that continuity in the indicators and their methodologies, where feasible, is essential for understanding progress over time and for the overall credibility of the process with country-level stakeholders involved in its implementation.

14. Give greater prominence to mutual accountability.

MAG members consider mutual accountability (currently Indicator Seven) to be a central, overarching indicator that should be reflected in all dimensions of effectiveness development cooperation. This prominence should be reflected in a revised Monitoring Framework.

15. Add depth to analysis of monitoring outcomes with greater emphasis on evaluation. Review the use of yes/no binary answers for questions in the indicator methodology.

The MAG members consider greater emphasis on evaluation as important ingredients for a more nuanced understanding of the ‘why question’ in assessing monitoring outcomes. Consideration should be given to increasing the emphasis on this element in Indicator One, but with greater emphasis on strengthening country capacities for evaluation. The yes/no binary answer limits a more nuanced overview of the actual conditions and trends for several of the indicators.

16. Adapt the Framework to accommodate the realities of Middle-Income providers / recipients.

In its review of monitoring issues in SSC, the MAG provides the following advice for some modest measures to advance this aspect in the Monitoring Framework:

- i. **For the major middle-income providers, the GPEDC remains a political issue.** Until there is a resolution of a political commitment to fully participate, adaptation of a GPEDC monitoring framework is not the issue, nor would it be helpful as an incentive to the major SSC providers.
- ii. **For other middle-income providers/recipients of development cooperation, for whom the GPEDC is a relevant platform** in which to participate, the MAG suggests a closer examination of the experiences of these provider/recipients in Round Two (such as the analysis provided by Mexico to the MAG) to determine relevant areas in the Framework that recognizes their dual roles in development cooperation.
- iii. **Technical cooperation** makes up a significant share for many middle-income providers. Consideration should be given to adapting a current indicator and/or testing a stand-alone indicator for effective technical assistance.
- iv. **Transparency** is important in itself, but is sometimes challenging for middle-income providers. Nevertheless, greater transparency for SSC is essential for better understanding of avenues for assessing effectiveness of middle-income provider assistance.
- v. **Create space for partner countries to consider SSC.** Development actors might consider appropriate avenues of support, not necessarily within the political framework of the GPEDC, for developing country partners in SSC to engage with SSC counterparts on what they value in SSC in order to move towards a framework for assessing these features of SSC. The MAG acknowledges the current work of southern think tanks on this issue.

17. Enhance engagement at the provider Headquarter (HQ) level in the monitoring process.

The MAG reiterates its concern that the Monitoring Framework be a balanced framework that calls upon all actors, including providers, committed to the Global Partnership to fully participate in a monitoring round. The MAG recommends further discussions with providers and other GPEDC stakeholders to identify key areas of provider institutional policies and practices that are seen to be critical for effective development cooperation. This can inform a provider-specific set of questions or modules in current indicators. The MAG has made some specific suggestions in its proposals for the current set of indicators (See Annex Six and the summary below).

18. Clarify the relevance of the Monitoring Framework for climate finance.

The MAG agrees that climate finance is a relevant area for applying the development effectiveness principles. The Monitoring Framework is most relevant for climate finance that is clearly a public financial resource, delivered through cooperation partnerships.

19. Restructure the Monitoring Framework.

Consider a restructuring of the Monitoring Framework according to the four principles for effective development cooperation, with modular layers for different development actors involved in GPEDC.

MAG advice on existing indicators and potential new areas for indicators

20. Affirm the continued relevance of existing indicators.

Following a detailed review of existing indicators (in terms of relevance, efficiency and usefulness) and a substantial consultation with GPEDC stakeholders, the MAG found that in broad terms, each indicator remains highly relevant to the behaviour and institutional changes required to more fully implement the principles for effective cooperation as well as to contribute to the implementation of *Agenda 2030*.

21. Consider proposals for methodological strengthening and renewed focus to improve the relevance and usefulness of existing indicators.

The MAG identified a number of issues in each indicator that should be addressed in a revised Monitoring Framework:

- i. Methodological areas and issues that require strengthening;
- ii. The need for more inclusive multi-stakeholder engagement with the indicators; and
- iii. The need for further stocktaking and research based on the MAG recommendations and/or the outcomes of the Second Round of Monitoring.

See Annex Six for detailed analysis and recommendations for each of the ten indicators.

22. Consider blended finance as an alternative entry point for Indicator Three on the role of the private sector in effective development cooperation.

A focus on blended finance can be a relevant entry point for applying the principles for effective development cooperation to the private sector as a development actor. Given the stated relevance of blended finance to the achievement of the SDGs, the MAG encourages the Global Partnership/JST to engage in discussions on these mechanisms at HLM2 as a backdrop for developing technical work for an appropriate indicator, post-Nairobi.

23. Consider a separate indicator for private foundations.

The MAG suggests that the best approach to greater inclusion of foundations in the Monitoring Framework is through a separate indicator focusing on the distinct roles of foundations as development actors and their practices relative to the four Busan principles. The JST should work with a representative body of foundations, such as GPI 21, to develop a relevant methodology that builds on existing initiatives and takes account the profile of foundations in different developing countries.

24. Examine existing indicators in relation to coverage of multi-stakeholder initiatives.

The MAG is proposing that existing GPEDC indicator methodologies be examined to determine the degree to which the Global Partnership can assess the extent of multi-stakeholder engagement in its own processes, as well as in the measurement of inclusivity in Indicator

Seven on mutual accountability mechanisms.

25. Enhance existing indicators (such as Indicator Seven) to include coverage of issues related to policy coherence.

The MAG suggests a modest initiative to profile the importance of a whole-of-government approach to realize the SDGs through development cooperation in the GPEDC Monitoring Framework. Minimally the goal might be to initiate dialogue on the need for a cross sector purview and policy linkages. In this regard, consideration should be given to measuring the breadth of the discussions of relevant policies in mechanisms for mutual accountability at the country level, and correspondingly which actors are invited to the table.

MAG advice on carrying forward the finalization of the Monitoring Framework

26. Finalize the Monitoring Framework in early 2017, guided by the outcomes of the Nairobi HLM and by principles and modalities derived from the work of the MAG. (See Exhibit Two for the ten principles and modalities proposed by the MAG).

These principles emphasize a revised Monitoring Framework that is a) Holistic, inclusive and country driven; b) Derived from commitments on the part of GPEDC stakeholders; c) Focused primarily on public development cooperation finance; and d) Incentivizes and influences behaviour and institutional change for more effective development cooperation. The quality of the outcomes from monitoring will reflect the quality of participation and contributions at the country level by all stakeholders. There are trade-offs between simplicity in indicators and methodologies, and contributing meaningful data/assessment. The MAG opts for the latter.

MAG members appreciated the unique opportunity they had to step back and reflect on complex issues not only on the technical aspects of monitoring, but also on strategic issues in measuring and assessing progress in effective development cooperation. The MAG hope that the its observations and recommendations, detailed in our Final Report, serve to strengthen an improved and relevant Monitoring Framework in the context of Agenda 2030. Of course, much work remains following the Nairobi Second High Level Forum in November. The MAG has been an innovative space for reflection. Its members have no hesitation in recommending that a future Steering Committee consider appointing a similar experts body to support their work following the High Level Meeting.