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DOC 1: Draft Agenda

In preparation of the second High Level meeting of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation on 28 November to 1 December 2016 in Nairobi, Kenya, this conference will enable development partners to reflect on progress made in improving the effectiveness of their development co-operation, discuss further collective action to accelerate progress, agree a common vision of the Global Partnership’s future direction and structure their inputs to the Nairobi Outcome Document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1: 29 September 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening session</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00-09:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Suleiman Jasir Al-Herbish, Director-General of the OPEC Fund for International Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session I: Findings of the Global Partnership monitoring: What does fresh evidence say about progress in making development co-operation more effective?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:15-10:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants are invited to react to the preliminary findings and emerging messages of the 2016 Progress Report and discuss their implications for the Nairobi Outcome Document with a view to informing subsequent sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator: Ms. Nadine Gbossa, Head of Division, Global Partnerships and Policies, Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring findings – how do development partners fare?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Hanna-Mari Kilpeläinen, Team Leader GPEDC, Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial reactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background: (DOC 2) Preliminary findings from 2016 Progress Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 10:15-10:30 | Coffee break |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session II: Advancing effective development co-operation to help achieve the SDGs: key challenges, bottlenecks and the way forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:30-12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This session will identify priorities by development partners to accelerate progress in enhancing the quality, impact and effectiveness of development co-operation and the adherence to agreed effectiveness principles – ownership, results, inclusive partnerships, transparency and accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part I will identify proposals for how development partners can address bottlenecks and challenges in more effectively delivering their development co-operation. Structured around the four principles, participants will discuss areas and actions for improvement on each of the ten Busan indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator: Mr. Jeroen Verheul, Ambassador at Large for Development Co-operation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EU viewpoints ahead of the Global Partnership High Level Meeting

Mr. Klaus Rüdischauser, Deputy Director General, DEVCO, European Commission

**Introductory presentations**

- Mr. Fuad Albassam, Assistant Director-General, Public Sector Operations Department, OPEC Fund for International Development
- Mr. Aslak Brun, Director, Climate, Global Health and Sustainable Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway

**Group work and interactive discussion in plenary**

Background: (DOC 2) Preliminary findings from 2016 Progress Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00-13:00</td>
<td>Lunch break</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session II (continued): Advancing effective development co-operation to help achieve the SDGs: key challenges, bottlenecks and the way forward**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:00-14:30</td>
<td><strong>PART II: Adapting commitments - how to change to reflect the new development co-operation landscape?</strong>&lt;br&gt;Part II explores how development partner commitments should be further developed to adapt to the challenges and demands of the 2030 Agenda. Building on expectations from partner countries, it aims to identify development effectiveness priorities by different development partners to contribute to the achievement of the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Moderator:</strong> Mr. Jeroen Verheul, Ambassador at Large for Development Co-operation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Netherlands&lt;br&gt;<strong>What does Africa expect from the development partner community? A snapshot from the Africa workshop (14-16 September)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Ms. Betty Ngoma, Assistant Director for Debt and Aid Management, Malawi&lt;br&gt;<strong>Q&amp;A</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>New priorities for effective development co-operation in the 2030 era</strong>&lt;br&gt;Ms. Anna Hammargren, Deputy Director-General, Head of the Department for International Development Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden (TBC)&lt;br&gt;Ms. Nadareh Lee, USAID Senior Development Counselor and US Delegate to the OECD Development Assistance Committee&lt;br&gt;<strong>Interactive discussion</strong>&lt;br&gt;Background: (DOC 3) Africa Regional Workshop Summary and (DOC 4) Recommendations from the Monitoring Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session III: A transformational agenda for the Global Partnership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:30-16:00</td>
<td>Participants will discuss how the Global Partnership should adapt and prioritise action to optimise its contribution to help realise the 2030 Agenda. The session aims at identifying a shared vision for a re-energised Global Partnership that builds on its original mandate and harnesses its strengths and synergies in a new global development landscape. Questions related to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the working arrangements of the Global Partnership can also be discussed.

*A transformational agenda – the proposed renewed mandate*

Ms. Nadine Gbossa, Head of Division, Global Partnerships and Policies, Development Co-operation Directorate and Ms. Hanna-Mari Kilpeläinen, Team Leader GPEDC, Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD

*The Global Partnership in the 2030 landscape*

H.E. Mr. Macharia Kamau, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Kenya to the United Nations in New York and Chief Negotiator of the Nairobi Outcome Document

*Interactive discussion*

Background: (DOC 5) Elements for a renewed mandate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:00-16:15</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session IV: An ambitious Nairobi outcome document: Shifting gear to accelerate and encourage progress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:15-18:00</td>
<td>Participants have an opportunity to discuss the draft Nairobi Outcome Document. The session serves to reflect on specific offers and commitments development partners can make in the Nairobi outcome document and to collect their expectations of other stakeholders’ actions in making their development co-operation more effective. The outcome document will be introduced by H.E. Mr. Macharia Kamau, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Kenya to the United Nations in New York and Chief Negotiator of the Nairobi Outcome Document. Background: (DOC 6) Draft Nairobi Outcome Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:30-20:30</td>
<td>Informal dinner at the Restaurant Fuhrgassl-Huber, 1190 Wien, Neustift am Walde 68. Transportation will be provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Day 2: 30 September 2016

#### Session V: Consolidating inputs to Nairobi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9:30-11:30 | This session will provide an opportunity to take stock of the first day of discussion to consolidate key actions on next steps to improve progress on development effectiveness and crystallise inputs to the Nairobi Outcome Document and a renewed mandate of the Global Partnership.  
Moderator: Mr. Klaus Rüdischhauser, Deputy Director General, DEVCO, European Commission  
*Interactive discussion* |

#### Session VI: A successful 2nd High Level Meeting – ensuring high-level participation and adequate support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11:30–12:30 | This session will update participants on preparations of the 2nd High Level Meeting and address questions related to opportunities and expectations for high-level participants at HLM2. It will also provide an opportunity to discuss areas where support is needed to finalise preparations.  
Briefing by Mr. Arjan Schuthof, Senior Advisor, GPEDC Task Force, Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
*Q&A and discussion*  
Background: (DOC 7) HLM2 Agenda and One Pager |

#### Closing session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12:30-13:00 | *Conclusions and next steps*  
Mr. Jeroen Verheul, Ambassador at Large for Development Co-operation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Netherlands  
*Closing remarks*  
Mr. Suleiman Jasir Al-Herbish, Director-General of the OPEC Fund for International Development |
| 13:00-14:00 | *Light lunch buffet* |
Engagement in the 2016 Monitoring Round

Participation

The 2016 Progress Report mobilised an unprecedented number of governments, development partners and non-state actors. The participation levels compared favourably to similar monitoring rounds on development co-operation effectiveness carried out during the last decade – including the 2011 Paris Declaration survey. The number of development partners reporting to this exercise has increased significantly, with a doubling since 2010 (see Annex B).

There was good geographical representation of all regions and development partners. 125 countries reported either as recipient or as provider of development co-operation (see Annexes A and B for full list).
Coverage
The 2016 monitoring round covered an important share of development co-operation, representing close to three-quarters of development assistance programmed to these 81 participating countries. These countries assessed whether USD 72 billion in development co-operation commitments was aligned to national priorities and whether it used country-defined results frameworks and monitoring and evaluation systems for implementation. Countries also assessed whether USD 44 billion in development co-operation flows used country systems, were predictable, and where included in national budgets submitted to parliaments.

Key Findings

The overall analysis suggests that:

**Countries** have made progress in planning for development results; recording development finance in budgets submitted to parliaments; tracking public allocations for gender equality; and in setting up arrangements for regular consultation with civil society and other actors in drawing up national development strategies. However, more needs to be done in emphasizing the focus on results during implementation of policies and programmes; strengthening public financial management and procurement systems (individual success stories mixed with declines in quality in other countries); and in ensuring an enabling regulatory environment and more meaningful and sustained engagement with civil society and the private sector.

**Development partners** showed a good level of alignment to national priorities and focus on results at the level of projects and programmes, as well as strong engagement and support to enable civil society’s contributions to development. Most partners recorded good levels of transparency, experiencing improvements since 2014. Most partners also made some progress in using partner countries’ public financial management systems, and increasing annual predictability of development co-operation. In contrast, countries’ procurement systems were used less often, and the level of use of country-led results frameworks and monitoring & evaluation systems to track project success is moderate. Untying aid continues to hover around the 80% peak reached in 2010, with no further improvement.

Specific analysis of the findings for each indicator organized according to the four Global Partnership principles is presented below, disaggregated by countries’ and development partners’ performance where relevant.

### FOCUS ON RESULTS

| Alignment with priorities and results set by developing countries – Indicator 1 |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
|                             | **COUNTRIES’ PERFORMANCE**     | **DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS’ PERFORMANCE** |
| Countries have taken the lead in defining | Consistent with countries’ progress, 85% of |
Development priorities: 99% of participating countries have defined priorities, targets and indicators as a basis for national development efforts.

development partners’ new interventions draw their objectives from country-led results frameworks (particularly national development plan and sector strategies). However, at later stages of implementation (e.g. monitoring progress, evaluation), development partners do not plan to rely to the same extent on countries’ own frameworks (monitoring indicators and data) nor engage the government in tracking and measuring results.

### Development partners’ performance in using country-led results frameworks

#### Good focus on country-defined priorities when designing new interventions (% of interventions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL PROVIDERS</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN agencies</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral development banks</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral partners (DAC)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bilateral partners</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical funds and initiatives</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other international organisations</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Moderate use of country results information to monitor new interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of results indicators from government-led results frameworks</th>
<th>% of results indicators relying on government sources of data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL PROVIDERS</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral partners (DAC)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bilateral partners</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral development banks</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN agencies</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical funds and initiatives</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other international organizations</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

OECD/GPP/GPEDC
27 September 2016
Limited government involvement in evaluations of projects and programmes

COUNTRY OWNERSHIP

Strengthening and use of Country systems – Indicator 9

COUNTRIES’ PERFORMANCE

Quality of public financial management systems (PFMs) has increased in 18% of the 60 countries for which CPIA data is available compared to 2010. However, 58% of countries show no substantial change and for 23% the quality of public financial management declined.

DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS’ PERFORMANCE

Progress in use of country systems remains slow. 51% of disbursements for the government sector used country systems in 2015. Overall, improvements in the quality of PFMs lead to higher use of country systems by development partners – with the exception of very aid-dependent countries, where higher use of country systems is explained by the need to support the government budget.

Overall trends in use of country systems

A. Budget Execution
B. Financial Reporting
C. Auditing
D. Procurement
Total Use of Country Systems (A+B+C+D)

2010 2015
Progress is stagnating on annual and mid-term predictability. Annual predictability was maintained at 83% but remains short of the target of 90%. Medium-term predictability levelled at 71% while the target is 85%. Development partners are still not able to provide information on their forthcoming co-operation flows 3 years ahead, which is much needed for developing countries’ planning purposes. The move towards project-based interventions and, more generally, volatility of development co-operation, might explain the lack of progress. Limited progress in predictability and in sharing with developing countries accurate estimates of projected disbursements was found to be hampering progress in other commitments, such as including development co-operation on budget.

1 This indicator does not assess countries’ performance.
Untied aid – Indicator 10

Untied aid seems to have reached a ceiling, hovering around 80% since 2009. With some exceptions, most development partners reaching that level seem to experience difficulties to go beyond this threshold. There are differences between ex-ante and ex-post untying, where more progress is still needed at de facto untying – for DAC bilateral partners, even when development co-operation is formally untied, half the amount of development co-operation in procuring goods and services is still going back to suppliers in the development partner’s own country. This calls for addressing structural constraints related to engaging suppliers from broader locations and particularly from developing countries.

Share of untied aid (2005-2014)

INCLUSIVE PARTNERSHIPS FOR DEVELOPMENT

Inclusiveness of Development Partnerships (enabling environment for CSOs) – Indicator 2

COUNTRIES’ PERFORMANCE

In most countries governments are taking measures to promote dialogue with civil society organisations (CSOs) on national development policies. In 94% of countries, CSOs have the right to access government information. Almost 90% of governments consult CSOs in the design, implementation and monitoring of
national development policies – even if consultation efforts could be more systematic. More action needs to be taken to build capacity of CSOs to engage in multi-stakeholder dialogue.

**Government support for multi-stakeholder dialogue on national development policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSOs have the right to access government information</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government consults CSOs in the design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are resources/training for building capacity of stakeholders to engage in multi-stakeholder dialogue</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS’ PERFORMANCE**

Most development partners are also contributing to an enabling environment for CSOs by dialoguing on this issue with country governments and by consulting with CSOs on their development policy and programming. However, there is most room for improvement in sharing information with governments on their CSO support and consulting CSOs in a systematic manner.

**Official development partners’ co-operation with CSOs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of a CSO enabling environment is an agenda item in providers’ policy dialogue with partner governments</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development partners promote a CSO enabling environment in their co-operation with civil society</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development partners share information on their CSO support with the government</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development partners consult with CSOs on their development policy/programming in a systematic way</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inclusiveness of Development Partnerships (quality of public-private dialogue) – Indicator 3**

**COUNTRIES’ PERFORMANCE**

Both governments and private sector actors are willing to engage in dialogue, but these partnerships do not always materialise due to lack of high-level leadership (or absence of champions/facilitators), and weak instruments and logistics to facilitate such dialogue. The latter factor affects the quality of public-private dialogue in close to half of the reporting countries, signalling the need for development partners to support governments in creating effective instruments and platforms for effective public-private dialogue.

---

2 *This indicator does not assess development partners’ performance.*
TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Transparency – Indicator 4
DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS’ PERFORMANCE

Driven by the significant progress made by some publishers as well as the incorporation of many new publishers, there has been an increase in the supply of publically available information on development co-operation. Progress has been most notable in the timeliness and comprehensiveness of the information that is made publically available, while the publication of forward-looking information continues to present a challenge for many development partners. Moving forward, investments in corporate processes and information management infrastructure with adequate capacity may help to improve the supply of publically available information on development co-operation. As the quantity and the quality of this data continues to improve, more attention will need to be given to the use of the data, especially at the country level.

Development co-operation on budget – Indicator 6
DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS’ PERFORMANCE

Progress is continuous but the Busan target (85%) is not met. 67% of development co-operation funding scheduled by partners for the public sector is on budget (a notable increase of 13% compared to 2010). The share of funding recorded in budgets that exceeded the partners’ forecasts increased from 17% to 27% since 2010. This signals important mismatches in information and hinders effective planning, budgeting and execution if development efforts.
Gender equality and women’s empowerment – Indicator 8

COUNTRIES’ PERFORMANCE

73% of countries indicated having one of the three basic elements that are associated with ‘having in place systems to track resources allocated for gender equality and women’s empowerment’, and nearly half of countries reported all three conditions for having a system in place. This represents a very positive trend since Busan and a notable stepping-stone towards gender-responsive budgeting. The number of countries reporting on this Indicator increased overall (from 35 to 79), with increases in both countries with systems in place and countries with systems in place that make data public. Additionally, of the sub-set of countries that reported on the indicator in both monitoring rounds, those with transparent systems doubled from 10 to 20. Going forward, more progress is needed in making these systems transparent – critical for management and accountability purposes – and in linking gender budget tracking with the policy planning and budgeting process, including strengthening of availability of quality, sex-disaggregated data to allow for effective tracking.

Mutual Accountability – Indicator 7

COUNTRIES AND DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS’ PERFORMANCE

An increasing number of countries have national aid policies in place that are approved by parliament, with country level targets that are mutually agreed and regularly reviewed. However, the review of progress against these targets does not adequately engage local governments and non-executive stakeholders, nor are results of these reviews made public.
Indicator 7: Countries that undertake inclusive mutual assessment of progress

Overall progress in establishing inclusive mutual assessment reviews

Progress in developing the key elements for inclusive mutual assessment reviews

- Aid/Partnership policy
- Country-level targets
- Assessment against these targets
- Involvement of local governments and non-executive stakeholders
- Results made public

Results made public

Involvement of local governments and non-executive stakeholders

Assessment against these targets

Country-level targets

Aid/Partnership policy

2014 (baseline) 2016 (same 2014 countries)
## ANNEX A.

### ENGAGEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N. of partner countries reported</th>
<th>Development partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-69</td>
<td>World Bank; EU Institutions; Japan; World Health Organisation; UNDP; United States; Germany; UNFPA; UNICEF; Canada; Switzerland; France; Australia; Food and Agriculture Organisation; IFAD; OPEC Fund for International Development; African Development Bank; Asian Development Bank; Sweden; WFP; United Kingdom; IOM; Korea; Denmark; New Zealand; Norway; UN Women; Global Fund; International Monetary Fund; Kuwait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-14</td>
<td>Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization; Netherlands; Spain; UNAIDS; Belgium; International Labour Organisation; Italy; China; Islamic Development Bank; Finland; UNESCO; United Nations Industrial Development Organization; Austria; Global Environment Facility; Inter-American Development Bank; Ireland; Luxembourg; UNEP; Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa; UNODC; Chinese Taipei; UN Habitat; UNHCR; United Arab Emirates; BOAD; Development Bank of Latin America (CAF); European Bank for Reconstruction and Development; India; SFD; UN AGENCIES; United Nations Office for Project Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or less</td>
<td>Czech Republic; Organization of American States; South Pacific Community; Saudi Arabia; Turkey; UN Peacebuilding Fund; Adaptation Fund; African Capacity Building Foundation; Arab Fund; BIDC; ECOWAS; International Atomic Energy Agency; Lithuania; Portugal; South Pacific Regional Environment Program; UNCDF; African Union; Aga Khan Development Network; Angola; Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Foundation; Brazil; Caribbean Development Bank; Carter Center; Central American Bank for Economic Integration; Christoffel Blindenmission; Colombia; Congo; Council of Europe Development Bank; El Salvador; Equatorial Guinea; European Investment Bank; Forum Fisheries Agencies; Gabon; Heinrich Boll Foundation; Iceland; International Finance Corporation; International Tropical Timber Organization; Iran; Iraq; IUCN; Mexico; Monaco; Morocco; Nordic Development Fund; OEI; Pacific Environment Community Fund; Pacific Regional Infrastructure Facility; Panama; Papua New Guinea; Romania; Rosebud Trust; Deakin; Russia; SAARC Development Fund; Slovak Republic; Slovenia; Southern African Development Community; UEMOA; UN CERF; UN Joint Programme on Local Governance; UN Mine Action Service; UN Volunteers; UNCTAD; UNECE; UNOCI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Development partners were sorted by number of participating countries that reported on their program.
Figure. Development partners participation by type, number of development partners
ANNEX B. Participating countries and territories by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Reporting countries and territories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Africa</strong></td>
<td>Angola; Benin; Burkina Faso; Burundi; Cameroon; Central African Republic; Chad; Comoros; Congo; Côte d'Ivoire; Democratic Republic of the Congo; Egypt; Ethiopia; Gabon; Gambia; Guinea; Kenya; Liberia; Madagascar; Malawi; Mali; Mauritania; Mozambique; Niger; Nigeria; Rwanda; Sao Tome and Principe; Senegal; Sierra Leone; Somalia; South Sudan; Sudan; Tanzania; Togo; Uganda; Zimbabwe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Asia</strong></td>
<td>Cambodia; Lao People's Democratic Republic; Mongolia; Myanmar; Philippines; Timor-Leste; Vietnam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</strong></td>
<td>Albania; Armenia; Belarus; Kosovo*; Kyrgyzstan; Moldova; Tajikistan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latin America &amp; the Caribbean</strong></td>
<td>Bolivia; Colombia; Costa Rica; Dominican Republic; El Salvador; Guatemala; Honduras; Paraguay; Peru; Saint Vincent and the Grenadines; Uruguay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pacific</strong></td>
<td>Cook Islands; Fiji; Kiribati; Marshall Islands; Micronesia; Nauru; Niue; Palau; Papua New Guinea; Samoa; Solomon Islands; Tonga; Tuvalu; Vanuatu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Asia</strong></td>
<td>Afghanistan; Bangladesh; Bhutan; Nepal; Pakistan; Yemen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This document or any map included in the herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.
DOC 3: Africa Regional Workshop Summary

Africa Regional Workshop on the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation Post-Monitoring Results and Preparations for the 2nd High Level Meeting (HLM2)

14-16 September 2016, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Key Political Messages to HLM2

Progress and Challenges for Effective Development Cooperation

Monitoring:
- Remains an important part of GPEDC and has the greatest potential to contribute to the achievement of AU Agenda 2063 and Agenda 2030 respectively;
- We call for a review of the Monitoring Framework to be aligned to the needs of AU Agenda 2063 and Agenda 2030 and an Action Plan for implementation be developed. HLM2 should lead to binding commitments from all stakeholders;
- We call on GPEDC to deepen the role of regional organizations in the implementation and monitoring of GPEDC commitments;
- We call upon development partners to harmonise their data on African country systems and commit to strengthen our data collection, analysis and dissemination capacities;
- We strongly urge development partners to use and adhere African country systems. This calls for enhanced use of Country results Frameworks (CRFs);
- We commit to strengthen our Development Cooperation Policy Frameworks to adapt to the changing landscape of development finance;
- Adopt recommendations from the Monitoring Findings in reviewing the GPEDC commitments.

Aid Dependency and Flows:
- We acknowledge that Domestic Resource Mobilization remains the most sustainable form of funding Africa’s development transformation. We commit to strengthen policies, mechanisms/instruments and institutions to deepen and promote DRM;
- Aid can play a strong catalytic role for Africa’s development and achievement of Agenda 2063. In this regard, we call for aid to be directed towards productive sectors and economies;

We note with concern the reducing volume of aid and call upon development partners to meet their 0.7% GNP pledge and not compromise this with flows towards challenges in migration being experienced where ODA is being considered to cover humanitarian assistance, as well as, further increase grants and concessional lending towards LDCs.

Enabling Environment for Multi-stakeholders:
- We will deepen our work on enabling environment for CSOs and private sector to promote the implementation of GPEDC, AU Agenda 2063 and Agenda 2030 and call upon CSOs and private sector to strengthen their transparency and accountability towards the achievement of socio-economic transformation. Further, we call upon all multi-stakeholders to support the sensitization of all CSOs on Istanbul principles.
GPEDC Contribution to Agenda 2030

- We propose that GPEDC be transformed into a platform for achieving behavioural change on partner contribution towards implementation of SDGs;
- GPEDC Mandate should be reviewed to reflect the needs of Means of Implementation of Agenda 2030;
- GPEDC principle on Results based outcomes must be consistent and aligned with the National Development Plans and their respective Results Frameworks for impact;
- Development Partners should provide support for capacity development towards aligning AU Agenda 2063 and Agenda 2030 with the National and Regional Development Plans.

South-South Cooperation

- South-South Cooperation agenda must be defined and led by the South, including the definition of its delivery and monitoring framework; and in the Continent’s case, it should be framed and driven by African countries with the African Union and Regional Economic Communities with a secondary or supportive role of international development agencies and partners;
- We recognize that African countries have different financial needs for development and commit to strengthen and deepen the role of South-South Cooperation in providing complimentary resources towards the continent’s transformation agenda;
- We commit to create an enabling environment for the promotion of knowledge and technology transfers, south-south investments and free movement of capital, services and persons;
- We commit to strengthen the role of South-South Cooperation in deepening the role of regional integration in Africa’s transformational agenda;

Business Sector’s Contribution to Sustainable Development

- We urge the business sector to promote responsible, inclusive and sustainable business practices, including curbing illicit financial and resource flows from Africa, in line with the needs of the SDGs Agenda;
- We commit to strengthen the role of domestic business sector e.g SMEs through providing an enabling environment to access financial services thus contributing to SDGs implementation;
- We urge business sector to strengthen and align their cooperate social investment and SDG related programmes to the National Development Plans;
- We are committing to sensitize the private sector on their role in the GPEDC;
- We commit to mitigate risks emanating from public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) and apply GPEDC principles in the delivery of PPPs projects;

Economic Empowerment of Women and Youth

- We call on governments to fully implement youth and women employment and empowerment policies in all sectors;
- We commit to create structures for effective mobilization, participation and inclusion of women and youth in planning, budgeting, implementation and monitoring of development programmes at all levels;
- We urge for the creation of an enabling environment including financial facilities and legal framework to support women and youth employment, empowerment and initiatives.
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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.  

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 Sc (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.

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/recipientsof 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.

**Exhibit One: Representation of the MAG’s Theory of Change (GPEDC Monitoring Process)**

**Exhibit Two - Principles for Refining the Monitoring Framework**

*Exhibit Two*
MAG Guiding Principles, Parameters and Modalities

for a Revised Post-Nairobi GPEDC Monitoring Framework

1. The GPEDC takes a holistic approach to monitoring effective development cooperation. The monitoring framework has been developed as a holistic and inter-related set of indicators for effective development cooperation, one which adds value on the means of implementation and complements SDG review at country level.

2. The monitoring framework and its indicators are derived from actual commitments made by stakeholders in the Global Partnership. The monitoring framework is derived from actual commitments made to ensure effective development cooperation, initially in Busan in 2011 (taking up unfinished business from Paris and Accra), supplemented by the High Level Meetings of Mexico (2014) and Nairobi (2016).

3. The focus of the GPEDC monitoring indicators is on public development finance in context of multi-stakeholder partnerships supporting development finance for the achievement of the SDGs. While achieving effective development outcomes is the goal, the focus of the GPEDC monitoring framework is changing practices and stakeholder behaviour in development partnerships, linking the “how” or “means of implementation” (GPEDC) to the “what” (the specific SDGs) through development cooperation.

4. Methodologies are derived from a country-driven framework for monitoring. The unique value of the framework is that it is driven and coordinated in implementation and content by partner countries, lead by a National Coordinator, but includes country level focal points for all Global Partnership actors.

5. The purpose of monitoring is to incentivize and influence behaviour and institutional change in development cooperation. The purpose of monitoring is the collection of relevant data and assessments of progress, not for its own sake, but to contribute directly to incentives and ongoing processes of dialogue at all levels to influence behaviour and institutional change. Creating incentives for change and dialogue on core issues of development cooperation is the benchmark for the usefulness of the evidence developed by any given indicator.

6. The monitoring framework reflects the GPEDC principle of inclusivity. Given the inclusive multi-stakeholder character of the Global Partnership in which all stakeholders have a meaningful voice, the monitoring framework must reflect the principle of inclusivity, and balance in contributions, in both the scope of the indicators and in their methodology.

7. All actors in the Global Partnership must see their contributions to development cooperation in the monitoring framework. Recognizing the distinctive ways in which different actors in the Global Partnership engage in development cooperation, the framework must include indicators that are seen to be relevant, efficient and useful by each type of actor (partner country, provider, CSOs, trade unions, private sector, foundations, parliamentarians, middle-income providers).

8. The quality of the outcomes from monitoring will reflect the quality of participation and contributions at the country level by all stakeholders. The success of the monitoring framework lies in balanced obligations for all stakeholders to actively and fully participate in its implementation at country level. The quality of monitoring data will only be as good as the quality of information provided by all stakeholders at the country level, not just partner country governments.

9. Global provider-related indicators will remain relevant. While a country-driven process, global provider-related indicators in the current framework and in any future framework will remain relevant measures of progress, but may need to be aligned better with country-level implications.

10. There are trade-offs between simplicity in indicators and contributing meaningful data/assessment. There is a balance between a highly simplified monitoring framework and indicators that can contribute meaningful data and assessments to enable dialogue and behaviour change. Given the purposes for the monitoring framework in relation to behaviour and institutional change, and its linkages with SDG reviews, the MAG has opted to stress inclusion and meaningful information.
**DOC 5: Elements for a renewed mandate**

**DRAFT WORKING DOCUMENT**

Elements for a renewed mandate

With the adoption of 2030 Agenda, the Global Partnership is at a crossroads. Effective development co-operation is a prerequisite for sustainable progress in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, and the Global Partnership is recognized as a solid foundation for the multi-stakeholder partnership needed for effective development co-operation. At the same time, the Global Partnership needs a renewed vision to re-galvanize collaboration by all actors to advance the effectiveness of development co-operation. Success will depend on its ability to further deepen the interplay between traditional development assistance, southern development actors, private investment, and civil society for results at scale. It will also be defined by its contribution to the global policy debate on effective development co-operation with evidence and lessons from the country level.

The Nairobi High-Level Meeting will endorse a renewed mandate, and Global Partnership Co-Chairs will provide a proposal for broad stakeholder consultation early October 2016. To inform deliberations during the Technical Seminar with EU Member States’ Experts, this working document presents for consideration some elements for a renewed mandate. It provides key background information on the Global Partnership (section I), identifies key challenges and success factors for revitalised Partnership (section II), and proposes a four-point agenda for transformation in (section III).

Participants at the technical seminar are invited to consider whether these elements provide a foundation for a renewed mandate and a revitalised Global Partnership, and whether other elements should inform its transformation and repositioning in the global development context to ensure relevance, value-added and complementarity.

I: Driving behavior change for more effective development co-operation

The Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation was signed in 2011. 161 countries and heads of multilateral and bilateral institutions, representatives of public, civil society, private, parliamentary, local and regional actors committed to strengthen the effectiveness of their development co-operation through four principles: (i) Ownership of development priorities by developing countries; (ii) Focus on results; (iii) Inclusive partnerships; and (iv) Transparency and mutual accountability. The Global Partnership was established to support and ensure accountability for the implementation of these principles and related commitments, and to facilitate knowledge exchange and mutual learning to scale up development results.

Through its monitoring framework, the Partnership generates country level data and evidence on progress in meeting agreed effectiveness principles. The Partnership currently assesses the effectiveness of international development co-operation with more than 80 developing country governments, generating data on the effectiveness of their development co-operation with over 120 development partners including and beyond governments. It provides evidence to inform policy dialogues between stakeholders on areas of progress and challenges where further work is crucial to scale up the results of development co-operation. By tracking the progress of public, private and civil society actors against their effectiveness commitments, it promotes mutual accountability and motivates behaviour change towards more effective development co-operation.
II: A new momentum to deliver on the SDGs

With the adoption of agenda 2030, the Global Partnership is at a crossroads. Development co-operation is recognized as a means of implementation of the SDGs. The Addis Ababa Action Agenda calls for a revitalized global partnership to further the interplay between traditional development assistance, southern development actors, private investment, and civil society for results at scale. For this, the Global Partnership is recognized as a solid foundation for the multi-stakeholder partnership needed for effective development co-operation. Yet over the past years, the Global Partnership has lost its impetus. It needs a new vision to re-galvanize collaboration by all actors to advance the effectiveness of development co-operation. Success depends on its ability to address four key concerns:

- “Mutual Accountability”: Unblocking the bottlenecks that hinder progress on principles for effective development co-operation, and modernizing its monitoring framework to reflect the challenges for 2030, including the pledge to leave no-one behind;

- “Mutual Benefits”: Unleashing the potential of development co-operation as a catalyst for public-private partnerships for development results at scale;

- “Mutual Learning”: Learning from southern partners and from different modalities of development co-operation to strengthen the effectiveness of development co-operation;

- “Evidence and data”: Generating essential evidence and data from the country-level to inform assessment and policy dialogue on the effectiveness development co-operation.

III: A four-point agenda for transformation

The task ahead is to steer the transformation of the Global Partnership to remain a unique platform to advance the effectiveness of development co-operation, and to deliver practical results that contribute to the achievement of the SDGs.

Mutual Accountability: Sustaining commitment to effective development co-operation

The current effectiveness principles are the ‘GPS’ of development co-operation: They offer an accountability framework to measure the progress of governments in tackling the effectiveness of their development co-operation. The results of the 2016 monitoring round show that development partners are progressing on effectiveness goals. First, the diversity of development partners monitored through the effectiveness framework is higher than ever: It involves over 120 development partners, including OECD-DAC countries, multilateral development banks, European Union institutions, the United Nations development system, partners such as the OPEC Fund for International Development, the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and China, as well as global funds and programmes. Results show successes on alignment and transparency. Also, civil society, parliaments and local governments are using the Global Partnership to strengthen the accountability of development partners towards citizens and beneficiaries. Yet, challenges persist in some longstanding commitments (see part 1 of this paper). Furthermore, not all development actors are able to relate to the existing indicators, most of which are designed

around official development co-operation, and focus on effectiveness aspects of financial co-operation.

The way forward: Evidence and data from the country-level are essential to uphold accountability and inform policy dialogue on effective development co-operation. Moving forward, the Global Partnership must focus its resources on evidence and data that meet the needs of developing countries, and provide development partners with a clearer understanding of the effectiveness of their assistance. In addition, effectiveness principles need to evolve. A key constraint is that current commitments on alignment, predictability, transparency and accountability, relate mainly to public partners. To be relevant, the Global Partnership ought to develop targets that encompass the ability of public partners to engage with southern partners, businesses and philanthropies to bring development co-operation results to scale. This includes furthering adapted modalities of development co-operation that support the goal of leaving no-one behind.

Mutual Benefits: Unleashing the potential of development co-operation as a catalyst for public-private partnerships

The achievement of the SDGs is influenced by the capacity of the development community to mobilize private investment and ingenuity towards this agenda. Recent surveys show that for those businesses willing to engage in the SDGs, a business case rationale such as seeking growth or opening new markets is their top motivation. The renewed mandate of the Global Partnership provides an opportunity to commit development actors to lever development co-operation as a catalyst for business investments based on mutual benefits. Through development co-operation governments, development partners and philanthropies can play a catalytic role in helping companies articulate a business case, remove barriers, and de-risk innovation and investments in sectors that are crucial for SDGs attainment. There are successful cases of public-private partnerships around government development strategies. While the mutual benefits are potentially enormous, inadequate development co-operation instruments and practices prevent this from happening at scale and at a faster pace.

The way forward: The Global Partnership should articulate effectiveness commitments that gauge the capacity of the development community to engage private companies in a partnership that mutually benefits business strategies and development goals. For this, the renewed mandate of the Global Partnership ought to support development partners adapt their behaviour and instruments for partnerships with the private sector. This should include the setup of a caucus of likeminded business and foundation representatives to advise the Global Partnership on public-private collaboration. Such a transformation is also vital for middle-income countries that are looking to innovate modalities of development co-operation in their efforts to leave no-one behind. Second, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda calls for increased transparency and accountability in philanthropy, and closer co-operation with governments and other stakeholders. While philanthropic organisations have developed standards on data and accountability the Global Partnership’s monitoring framework needs to be updated to advance their alignment to effectiveness principles and their capacity to work with governments and businesses.

---
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Mutual Learning: Learning from different approaches to strengthen the effectiveness of development co-operation

The nature, goals and modalities of South-South co-operation differ from those of North-South co-operation. The Global Partnership has not been able to engage with southern development partners around the global commitment to learn from each other and maximize the potential of diverse approaches to development co-operation. Discussions have stumbled on common standards to assess the effectiveness of development co-operation. Yet, there is a genuine interest to learn from southern partners’ approaches, innovations, and achievements to mutually strengthen the results of development co-operation. The renewal of the mandate of the Global Partnership is an opportunity to jointly set up a platform for stakeholders to learn from their diverse approaches to development co-operation, recognising their unique characteristics and respective merits.

The way forward: The Global Partnership needs to build in its way of working mutual learning from different models of development co-operation.

Evidence and data: Positioning the Global Partnership as a prized source of evidence on the effectiveness of development co-operation and for SDG/FfD follow-up

The comparative advantage of the Global Partnership is its capacity to generate country-level data on the effectiveness of development co-operation for sustainable development. The Development Co-operation Forum reviews trends in development co-operation and the FFD Follow-up Forum reviews and discusses commitments on the effectiveness of development co-operation. Both have the convening power to hold actors to account at the highest level. The Global Partnership can make a distinct contribution to these processes by delivering the country-level data and evidence from its monitoring process. Re-focussing the mission of the Global Partnership on its strengths would eliminate areas of duplication with these fora.

The way forward: The renewed mandate of the Global Partnership should lead to the modernization of effectiveness commitments and its monitoring framework to more fully reflect the distinctive contribution of the different actors in development co-operation. This entails assessing the effectiveness of philanthropic foundations, and of development co-operation policies and instruments to leverage private investment. The country-level data collection process should be strengthened to ensure the integrity and relevance of data. Data, results and real-world lessons from monitoring would be fed into the UN system through contributions to the Inter-Agency Task Force reviewing Financing for Development commitments; regular presentation at the annual High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development, the primary international reporting mechanism on the SDGs; and through co-operation with the Development Co-operation Forum, which would benefit from specific data on progress on the effectiveness of development co-operation.
The Nairobi Outcome
Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation
Towards an Inclusive and Accelerated Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
1st December 2016

1. We, Heads of state and government, ministers and high representatives of developing and developed countries, together with heads of multilateral and bilateral development agencies, financial and regional development institutions, as well as parliamentarians, local and regional authorities, the private sector, civil society, trade unions and philanthropic organizations, meeting in Nairobi Kenya to take stock of the implementation of development effectiveness principles and commitments and to shape how existing and new development actors can partner effectively to implement and realize the 2030 Agenda.

2. The Nairobi Second High Level Meeting builds on the Rome Declaration on Harmonisation (2003), the set of principles adopted in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005), the Accra Agenda for Action (2008), the Fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan (2011) where the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) was born, and the outcome of the First High-Level Meeting of the GPEDC in Mexico City (2014).

3. We recognize the progress made in the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) over the last 15 years, such as reduction in the levels of poverty, fighting disease and hunger, and promoting gender equality. We also note that progress has been slow and uneven, with poverty and inequality levels remaining high especially in Africa, least developed countries, landlocked developing countries, small-island developing states, and middle income countries. Exposure to risks and the inability to cope with adverse effects of global economic and social shocks, the youth bulge, unemployment and underemployment, climate change, migration challenges, non-resilient livelihoods, insecurity and the threat of terrorism are global realities that must be addressed to achieve the 2030 Agenda.

4. The Nairobi Second High Level Meeting takes place after the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, the Twenty-First Conference of Parties (COP 21) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the World Humanitarian Summit (2016) which present unprecedented opportunities for achieving effective development cooperation and eradicating poverty in the world.

5. We particularly appreciate the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development for its people-centred, universal and transformative approach to development. We recognize that it is a renewed commitment to eradicate poverty and fast-track inclusive and sustainable development, with gender equality and investment in young people at its centre. The scale and ambition of this new agenda requires effective development cooperation and inclusive partnerships to ensure its successful implementation as envisioned in SDG 17.
6. To this end, the principles of aid and development effectiveness - ownership of development priorities by recipient countries; focus on results; inclusive development partnerships; harmonization and coordination; mutual accountability; and transparency - are a driving force in the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. These are underpinned by existing international commitments on human rights, decent work, gender equality, environmental sustainability and disability.

7. We recognize that the global development financing landscape has changed significantly, with new and different development actors, and complex financing modalities, instruments and targets. The ambitious and universal 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development will require a huge increase in the quantity and diversity of resources if we have to achieve our universal goal of leaving no one behind. To achieve this objective will require effective coordination and harmonization of all sources of development finance, translating global principles and normative decisions to regional, national and local levels.

8. We reaffirm the critical role of Official Development Assistance (ODA) in catalyzing other development resources and capacity development in recipient countries, and recognize that South-South and Triangular Cooperation is an important source of financing, complementary to North-South Cooperation. We recall and reaffirm previous commitments by provider governments to reach 0.7 per cent of their Gross National Income (GNI) as ODA, as well as allocate 0.15 - 0.20 per cent of GNI to Least Developed Countries.

9. The Nairobi Second High Level Meeting hereby endorses the following commitments which will enable the GPEDC to sustain political momentum for the successful implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development through universal collective and unique lens of effective development cooperation.

Progress, challenges and lessons since Busan

10. As reinforced in the 2030 Agenda, each country has the primary responsibility for its own economic and social development and the role of national policies and development strategies cannot be over emphasized. We therefore call upon partner countries to take stronger leadership and ownership of their national development agenda.

11. We recognize the slow progress in fully aligning development cooperation with the national development strategies, planning processes and budgeting systems of recipient countries. We as development actors commit to accelerate progress in fully aligning development cooperation to partner countries, national development strategies, planning processes and budgeting systems.

12. We reiterate that the shared principles of transparency and accountability are relevant to all GPEDC stakeholders including development finance institutions, the private sector, civil society organisations and providers of South–South Cooperation. We commit to apply these principles in a differentiated way in order to reflect each constituency modality and unique contribution to 2030 Agenda.

13. We reiterate that country systems safeguard ownership of partners’ development priorities. Strong country systems and institutions, effective dialogue mechanisms and quality information/data management systems are critical for management of all forms of
development finance and cooperation. We, as providers of development cooperation, commit to accelerate efforts to use partner countries' Public Financial Management (PFM) systems and support their strengthening where necessary.

14. We acknowledge the role of Country Results Frameworks (CRF) in assisting the partner countries to manage for development results and ownership. We commit ourselves as a matter of urgency to the use of CRF. Where some countries have not yet been able to develop and use the CRF, provider countries should support development and implementation of the same.

15. We recognize that capacity development is important if all the private sector players in recipient countries are to participate in local and international procurement. We as providers of development cooperation commit to accelerate untying of development finance particularly for least developed countries and support capacity development of private sector players to fully participate in local and international procurement.

16. We note that there has been slow progress on the transparency commitment since Busan and Mexico, especially in increasing the availability of timely financial data available and publication of forward-looking data. We acknowledge that more development actors are now publishing their data with the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) Standard. We as providers of development cooperation commit to first validate the data with partner countries before submission to IATI to promote ownership. We commit to use the validated data at the country level.

17. We acknowledge that quality, accessible, timely, and reliable data disaggregated by age, gender, geographic location, income quintile and disability will be needed to help in the measurement of progress in development cooperation. We affirm our commitment to intensify efforts to strengthen statistical capacities in developing countries. This will improve partner countries' national monitoring exercises and public sector debates.

18. We endorse open data standards and platforms for making development data more accessible and understandable to promote focused and effective intervention. We encourage more institutionalised involvement of data communities and the media to enhance data use at sub national levels.

19. We acknowledge that data collection on youth and gender based activities is important in informing inclusive planning and development. We commit to formulate, implement, and monitor policies, safeguards and frameworks that promote social equality and eliminate all forms of discrimination and violence. We also commit to pay special attention to high rates of youth unemployment, employment of women and youth in vulnerable sectors, unpaid care and domestic work. We will continue to call for gender and youth mainstreaming and targeted affirmative action in the formulation and implementation of all financial, economic, environmental and social policies.

20. We acknowledge that women and youth must equally benefit from development cooperation. We commit to accelerate our efforts to unleash the potential of women and youth as dynamic contributors to societal development. We commit to fully involve women and youth in formulation of policies, programmes and priorities that affect them.

21. We acknowledge the essential role of national parliaments through enactment of legislation and adoption of budgets, and their role in ensuring accountability for the effective implementation of national commitments. We as partner countries commit to
submit national aid or development cooperation policies to parliament for review and that progress reports on the implementation of the policies is presented to parliament annually.

22. We commit to strengthen the capacity of parliaments as key institutions of representation, legislation and oversight, as well as other public finance management institutions. To this effect, we commit to increase our efforts in oversight strengthening of Parliaments and other oversight bodies. We further commit to include parliament in consultations regarding investment and trade agreements, as well as public private partnerships, and to submit those agreements for parliamentary scrutiny.

23. The AAAA recognizes that the foremost driver of Domestic Resource Mobilization (DRM) is economic growth supported by sound macroeconomic policies and an enabling environment at all levels. We will ensure that development cooperation contributes to the implementation of DRM initiatives, including through the strengthening of capacities of national tax authorities and development of innovative tax and financing instruments. We commit to ensure that development cooperation contributes to the support of DRM initiatives through innovative financing instruments and by strengthening the relevant institutions.

24. We note that development efforts of many developing countries continue to be undermined by high capital outflows. We commit to support accountability mechanisms, systems and reforms to combat illicit financial flows, recognizing the role of developed countries in elimination of tax havens and policies that attract and facilitate these flows. We commit to harmonization of tax policies and strengthening of systems to stop illicit flows and accelerate repatriation of stolen funds and assets to countries of origin. We recognize the Addis Tax Initiative formed in response to the AAAA as a way to boost capacity on Domestic Resource Mobilization and illicit flows.

25. We recognize the positive contribution of migrants for inclusive growth of countries, and that play a crucial role in most economies. We also recognize that international migration requires streamlining through coherent and comprehensive policy frameworks to enable countries to tap into the potential of remittances as a complementary source of development finance. In line with the 2030 Agenda, we commit to reduce the average transaction cost of migrant remittances by 2030 to less than three per cent of the amount transferred; and to ensure that no remittance corridor charges higher than five per cent by 2030, while maintaining service coverage.

26. We commit to improve partnership frameworks and policies for the private sector including finding better ways to align with public sector plans, budgets and frameworks. We encourage investment in innovative private-sector initiatives to explore, share and replicate models of public-private partnerships, ensuring fair and transparent risk sharing arrangements and alignment with the implementation of Agenda 2030. The Private Sector should be guided by existing instruments such as ILO Conventions, UN Principles on Business and Human Rights and OECD Guidelines for Multi-national entities and be integrated into development cooperation accountability frameworks at national level.

27. We commit to fostering an enabling policy environment for business, including transparent legal and regulatory systems, women and youth access to credit, favourable tax incentives for domestic micro, small and medium enterprises while regulating tax holidays for multinationals, and other supporting conditions as essential to mobilizing domestic and international capital to advance the development agenda. We recognize that comprehensive policy actions are needed to conserve the rule of law, enhance the
predictability of policymaking, and unlock entrepreneurship in order to fully enable sustainable development. In this context, we encourage the sharing and coordination of internationally-agreed policy instruments, tools, and initiatives conducive to sustainable development.

28. We acknowledge the essential contribution of foundations to development, not only through financial support, but also through knowledge and expertise, acting as catalytic agents of resources and relations. We welcome the efforts made to strengthen the effectiveness and quality of cooperation between and within foundations, governments and other development stakeholders, as reflected in the progress report of the piloting of the Guidelines for Effective Philanthropic Engagement.

29. We therefore recommend expanding country pilots, through initiatives such as the Accelerating Impact 2030 initiative led by Network of Foundations Working for Development and other development partners. We commit to further focus on partnerships with philanthropy, reflecting these efforts in the revised GPEDC monitoring framework, and in line with the AAAA.

30. We note that COP21 has established an enhanced transparency framework for action and support that will provide a full overview of aggregate financial support for climate change mitigation and adaptation. Access criteria for the Climate Fund should be kept as simple as possible so that LDCs can access it in a timely manner. We as providers of development cooperation shall ensure that the Climate Fund is considered in addition to development finance.

31. We reaffirm that South-South Cooperation (SSC) is an important element of international cooperation for development as a complement to, not a substitute for, North-South Cooperation. We urge the UN Office for South-South Cooperation to develop a concrete and flexible global framework for SSC and Triangular cooperation.

32. We acknowledge that many Middle Income Countries (MICs) are not able to access sufficient and affordable financing from other sources to meet their needs, and usually experience reduced concessional finance. We commit to ensure that development cooperation addresses the transition challenges faced by countries joining the middle income category. We reiterate the need to develop policies that are sequenced, phased and gradual as exit strategies for countries transitioning from lower to middle-income status. We commit to support the process of refinement towards a more comprehensive inclusive MICs’ indicator.

33. We recognize that inclusive, coordinated and effective multi-stakeholder partnerships are necessary for the realization of effective development. We commit to upscale our efforts in ensuring an enabling environment for inclusive, multi-stakeholder partnerships as well as for individual actors to perform their complementary roles in a transparent and accountable manner. We emphasize that multi-stakeholder partnerships should not substitute but complement development efforts of national governments. We commit to strengthen and deepen partnerships with the private sector, civil society organisations, parliaments and trade unions to achieve national, regional, continental and global development goals. We commit to increase the quantity and diversity of resources that will enable productive multi-stakeholder partnerships, including more capacity support, knowledge sharing, skills revolution and technology transfer and the strengthening of associated institutions.
34. We recognize the meaningful participation of civil society organizations (CSOs) as complementary partners in effective development cooperation. We reiterate the need for institutionalized democratic space and an enabling environment as agreed in Busan and the Istanbul Principles for CSO Development Effectiveness, to ensure their full participation in development processes at national and regional level.

35. We recognize that states under conflict experience challenges in fostering socio-economic development. We note the importance of better management of political and social diversity and the promotion of greater dialogue within and among countries. We acknowledge the positive role women and youth can play in conflict resolution, and we will work to ensure that in fragile contexts, priority shall be given to empowering people as independent development actors in their own right. We commit to support effective development cooperation in fragile states to enhance capacities to prevent, manage and resolve conflicts in order to ensure stability and development.

Enhancing the Role of the Global Partnership

36. **Mandate of GPEDC:** As we align ourselves with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, we remain focused on our core purpose of facilitating implementation and monitoring of development cooperation commitments, consistent with The Paris Declaration, The Accra Agenda for Action and The Busan Partnership Document. We commit to enhance coherence, inclusivity, stronger mutually beneficial partnerships and multi-stakeholder dialogues, and facilitate knowledge sharing, among various actors with the aim of achieving effective development development.

37. We acknowledge and affirm the complementarity between the GPEDC and the Development Cooperation Forum (DCF) in order to optimise the use of development resources. We commit to strengthen the synergies with the DCF. We recognise that the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA) establishes the global standard for facilitating development financing in increasingly dynamic partnerships. We commit to further enhance the symbiotic relationship between the GPEDC and the DCF, in order to ensure optimal development impact.

38. **Structure of GPEDC:** We recognize GPEDC’s unique nature as a multi-stakeholder platform to support the implementation of 2030 Agenda and promote inclusive growth and hence reduce poverty. We also acknowledge the need to embrace a ‘globally light’ and a ‘country heavy’ presence of the GPEDC. We commit to set up inclusive national structures, which will build on existing structures, as the GPEDC manifestation in each country, in which partners work together to implement GPEDC commitments. We will endeavor to include vulnerable and marginalized populations within country structures, including rural communities, indigenous people, women and young people. The GPEDC Steering Committee, supported by Joint Support Team, will focus on providing policy guidance to national equivalents and collect information as needed.

39. We will formulate explicit roles and responsibilities coupled with accountability measures for the Co-Chairs, Steering Committee and the Joint Support Team. This will include development of Terms of Reference and a set of governance guidelines which will guide decision making processes, engagement and accountability to constituencies. We will also develop Terms of Reference for the host country of the GPEDC high level meetings accordingly.
40. **Monitoring Framework**: The Busan Monitoring Framework remains the foundation of the GPEDC and will serve as one of the reliable sources of data for the Sustainable Development Goals’ follow up and review process. We will expand the GPEDC monitoring surveys to capture the totality of flows, including but not limited to ODA, with indicators for non-sovereign/private moneys such as philanthropy. We will identify new ways of measuring development cooperation in support of achieving the SDGs while ensuring that the monitoring process is country-led, inclusive and multi-stakeholder in nature.

41. We will continue to adhere to the effective development principles in our own governance and working arrangements, in particular, transparency and mutual accountability to and by all stakeholders.

**Annexes**
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### One Pager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session Title</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00-08:30</td>
<td>Stakeholder forums and a workshop to consider findings from the Global Partnership's 2nd monitoring round.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:30-09:00</td>
<td>OPENING CEREMONY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30-10:15</td>
<td>PLENARY SESSION: Taking Stock - Progress and challenges for effective development</td>
<td>Amphitheater Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-10:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:15</td>
<td>PLENARY SESSION: Moving forward - How effective development can deliver the 2030 Agenda</td>
<td>Amphitheater Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15-12:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45-13:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45-15:00</td>
<td>VI Lunch - Ministerial/Head of Delegation meeting</td>
<td>Side Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-15:30</td>
<td>Side Event</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-16:00</td>
<td>PLENARY SESSION: Inclusive and effective development - Cooperation to achieve the SDGs - Lessons learned from South-South and Triangular Cooperation</td>
<td>Amphitheater Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-16:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30-17:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00-17:45</td>
<td>PLENARY SESSION: Our shared future - Achieving prosperous business, prosperous society, and a prosperous environment</td>
<td>Amphitheater Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:45-18:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00-21:00</td>
<td>Cocktail Reception</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00-22:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:00-09:00</td>
<td>Side Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00-09:45</td>
<td>PLENARY SESSION: Economic empowerment of women and youth</td>
<td>Amphitheater Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:45-10:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:15</td>
<td>PLENARY SESSION: Our greatest challenge - Leaving no one behind</td>
<td>Amphitheater Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15-11:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45-12:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-13:15</td>
<td>Side Event</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:15-14:00</td>
<td>Side Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00-16:00</td>
<td>PLENARY SESSION: From global goals to action - Unleashing the power of partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-16:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45-17:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30-17:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Second High-Level Meeting of the Global Partnership: Towards Inclusive and Accelerated Implementation of the 2030 Agenda

28 November–1 December 2016, Nairobi, Kenya

Preparatory days
The Second High-Level Meeting (HLM2) will be preceded by two preparatory days (28–29 November, 2016), providing the opportunity for a range of stakeholders to meet in advance of the High-level Ministerial segment.

A Workshop to consider findings from the Global Partnership’s second monitoring round.

A series of Forums for:

- Civil Society
- Youth
- Foundations
- Women
- Private Sector
- Parliamentarians

High-level ministerial segment
The two-day high-level meeting (30 November–1 December 2016) will offer a unique platform for heads of state, ministers, heads of major international organisations and leaders from civil society, the private sector, foundations, local government and parliaments to showcase successes and identify innovative approaches.

The meeting will include seven plenary sessions, parallel discussions on bottlenecks, a series of side events, and marketplace stalls for showcasing successful innovation, implementation, and sharing knowledge.
Special focus on empowering women and youth

Accelerated efforts are needed by all partners to unleash the power of youth and women as dynamic contributors to society. The Government of Kenya will lead special focus discussions on Economic empowerment of women and youth – inclusivity and mainstreaming for effective and accelerated development at the HLM2.

Agenda

Day 1 – 30 November 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07.30-08.30</td>
<td>SIDE EVENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.30-09.30</td>
<td>OPENING CEREMONY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.30-11.00</td>
<td>PLENARY SESSION: Taking Stock: Progress and challenges for effective development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Global Partnership was established to improve development co-operation, ensure accountability for implementing Busan commitments, facilitate knowledge exchange and support country level implementation. Five years on from Busan, it’s time for an honest reflection on progress, highlighting achievements and identifying bottlenecks. In this session we will agree on actions to strengthen country leadership and institutions, through smarter and more transparent development co-operation that achieves results that matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.30-10.15</td>
<td>09.30-10.15 Amphitheatre Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.15-11.00 Amphitheatre Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-11.30</td>
<td>Morning Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30-13.00</td>
<td>PLENARY SESSION: Moving forward: How effective development can deliver the 2030 Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An ambitious and universal 2030 Agenda calls for an equally ambitious and comprehensive response from all development actors. It will require strong political leadership, a revitalised Global Partnership and redoubled efforts by all development actors to improve the quality, effectiveness and impact of their co-operation. This plenary will highlight the importance of effective development to delivering the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It will also emphasise the added value that the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
operation will play in supporting development actors to do so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.00-14.00</td>
<td>SIDE EVENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00-14.00</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00-15.00</td>
<td>SIDE EVENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 15.00-16.30   | PLENARY SESSION: *Inclusive and Effective Development Cooperation to Achieve the SDGs: Lessons learned from South-South and Triangular Cooperation*  
               | South-South Co-operation actors are growing in number, volume, and impact. This plenary will highlight how South-South and Triangular Cooperation contribute to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals, enhanced by an inclusive approach involving state actors, the private sector, trade unions and civil society working together.  
               | 15.00-15.45 Amphiltheatre Discussion  
               | 15.45-16.30 Amphiltheatre Discussion  
| 16.30-17.00   | Afternoon Break                            |
| 17.00-18.30   | PLENARY SESSION: *Our Shared Future: Achieving Prosperous Business, Prosperous Society, and a Prosperous Environment*  
               | To highlight the essential role of business in the achievement of the SDGs and provide inspiration and practical guidance for how governments and others can support responsible, inclusive and sustainable business.  
               | 17.00-17.45 Amphiltheatre Discussion  
               | 17.45-18.30 Amphiltheatre Discussion  
| 19.00-20.30   | Cocktail Reception                         |

**Day 2 – 1 December 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.00-09.00</td>
<td>SIDE EVENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 09.00-10.30   | PLENARY SESSION: *Economic empowerment of women and youth*  
               | [Awaiting concept note]  
               | 09.00-09.45 Amphiltheatre Discussion  
               | 09.45-10.30 Amphiltheatre Discussion  
| 10.30-11.00   | Morning Break                              |
11.00-12.30 | **PLENARY SESSION:** *Our greatest challenge: Leaving no-one behind*  
The global community has committed to achieving an ambitious agenda for sustainable development, promising that no-one will be left behind. We aim to achieve sustainable development for everyone, everywhere – for all countries and groups, and for the most vulnerable in our societies. This plenary will identify those at most risk of being left behind. It will focus on fragile and conflict affected situations and people who are marginalized in middle-income countries, showcase action being taken to address the challenge of leaving no-one behind and agree ways in which all actors can work together to achieve sustainable development.  

11.00-11.45 | Amphitheatre Discussion  
11.45-12.30 | Amphitheatre Discussion

12.30-13.30 | SIDE EVENTS

12.30-12.45 | Lunch Break

13.30-14.30 | SIDE EVENTS

14.30-16.00 | **PLENARY SESSION:** *From global goals to action: unleashing the power of partnerships*  
For successful achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals, partnering among all sectors of society is essential. It is time to unleash the power of partnerships by engaging in an open and honest dialogue about how governments, civil society organizations, business, parliamentarians, trade unions, academia, philanthropy and local governments, can work together and deliver on the SDGs. This session aims to identify key success factors for inclusive partnership and further action needed to enable, catalyze and support effective multi-stakeholder partnerships.

16.00-16.30 | ENDORSEMENT OF THE OUTCOME DOCUMENT

16.30-17.00 | CLOSING CEREMONY

**Organisation of the HLM2**
The HLM2 is organised by the Government of Kenya with support from the Global Partnership’s three co-chairs (Malawi, Mexico and the Netherlands), Steering Committee members and the Joint Support Team provided by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development and the United Nations Development Programme.