Participating in the Second Round Monitoring

Summary report

Regional workshop in the Asia Pacific, 7-8 October 2015, Bangkok, Thailand

This document presents the outcomes of the Regional Pre-Monitoring Workshop in the Asia-Pacific regions.

Contacts:
Ms. Yuko Suzuki Naab, tel. +1.212.906.6509, email: yuko.suzuki@undp.org
Ms. Marjolaine Nicod, Tel + 66 (0) 9 94 39 77 86 marjolaine.nicod@undp.org
Mr. Alejandro Guerrero, Tel: + 33 1 45 24 83 63, email: alejandro.guerrero-ruiz@oecd.org
Ms. Julie Seghers, Tel: + 33 1 45 24 90 36, e-mail: julie.seghers@oecd.org

**Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.**

I.   Introduction

The regional monitoring workshop in Asia-Pacific was organised by the joint UNDP-OECD support team, hosted by the Asia-Pacific Forum Development Effectiveness, with financial support provided by the European Union. This workshop aimed to facilitate the rolling out of the Global Partnership monitoring framework. The workshop targeted developing country government officials (i.e. national coordinators), with the objective to ensure that governments have the information and guidance they need to lead the monitoring process in-country. In addition, the workshop offered an opportunity for developing countries to be updated on the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (GPEDC) agenda and to exchange views on priorities and interests relating to the work of GPEDC, in particular in the leads up to the next High Level Meeting in Kenya late 2016.

The workshop was attended, with 45 participants representing 22 developing countries, UNDP regional and country offices, providers of development cooperation as well as civil society and private sector. A list of participants can be found in Annex 1.

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

II.   Main conclusions

Discussions highlighted that countries in the region have been embarking on implementing the effective development co-operation principles, with focus on strengthening institutional frameworks and systems for managing development finance and cooperation coherently and effectively. **There is a wealth of country-led initiatives and efforts, both to operationalize/localize the broader Busan agenda and to monitor progress.** Examples include: Nay Phi Taw Accord for Effective Development Co-operation in Myanmar; Joint Co-operation Strategy in Bangladesh; Vientiane Declaration on Partnerships for Effective Development Co-operation in Laos, a single monitoring framework for development cooperation that embeds the GPEDC indicator in Cambodia as well as the Pacific Islands Forum's Compact on Strengthening development coordination which is based on mutual and shared commitment and accountability to lifting the economic and development performance of the region.

Building an integrated approach to managing development flows (beyond ODA) will be critical to achieve the SDGs. Internalising and localising the ambitious agendas of SDGs, Financing for Development (FfD) and effective development cooperation (EDC) in an integrated and coherent manner is needed, as the limited resources available at the country level. In this context, **effective development cooperation is key for financing sustainable development**

2

and implementation of the 2030 Agenda, and there is need to establish coherence between the different processes (UN/SDGs, FfD, GPEDC). The participants called for the GPEDC to play an important role in the FfD follow-up and SDGs implementation and review. Some participants underscored the importance of the GPEDC taking a clear formal role in monitoring the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA) and the SDGs.

While the share of ODA relative to other finance flows is decreasing in the region, ODA remains important and there will be increasing pressure to demonstrate its value added and effectiveness. **Principles and commitments agreed in Paris, Accra, Busan and Mexico should continue to guide the efforts to make development cooperation more effective.** To this end, urgent attention was called by the participants that unfinished business of Paris, Accra, and Busan should be taken seriously and acceleration of efforts to fully implement the agenda and commitments is needed.

The GPEDC monitoring efforts can support addressing challenges in making development cooperation more effective at the country level. The monitoring should not be considered as a technical exercise only, nor seen as a stand-alone activity. **The GPEDC monitoring is about generating information and evidence and identifying gaps and opportunity so as to foster inclusive multi-stakeholder dialogue and incentivise behaviour change.** Monitoring therefore should be seen as an integral progress for accelerating institutional and policy reforms as well as strengthening institutionalised multi-stakeholder policy dialogue that are needed for SDGs implementation.

With regard to the country monitoring efforts, the participants emphasised the need for two-way communication between HQs and country offices of the providers of development co-operation. Partners at the country level do not always convey the same messages as those coming from their colleagues in HQs. More structured and stronger communication efforts were noted as important. In addition, countries also asked for support from partners at the country level to fully engage and provide timely data/information during the second round monitoring. Continuous lack of information with regard to development cooperation and finance were among key challenges in countries to manage development cooperation and finance effectively.

The second High-Level Meeting in Kenya will provide a timely opportunity to review progress made in implementation of effective development cooperation principles, particularly to track the unfinished business of aid effectiveness at the country level. It will also provide an opportunity to reflect upon the principles of the GPEDC in the post-2015 context, including roles of the South-South Cooperation and development effectiveness in Middle Income Countries context.

In practical terms, countries highlighted:

- The need for **clear roles and responsibilities** to guide participation in the monitoring effort and the need for equally clear instructions to be delivered to providers of co-operation both at HQ and country offices. Participants pointed to the lack of awareness and commitment to monitoring from many providers at the country level.

- The need for tools to facilitate **information sharing**, and the importance of finding ways to keep up dialogue and mutual learning within and between regions.

- The importance for some countries of **regional and country support** was highlighted throughout the discussions, with specific resources and support needed for countries to lead the monitoring process, including the new indicators being rolled out (i.e Indicator 1

3

on use of country results frameworks, Indicator 2 on CSO enabling environment; and Indicator 3 on Public-Private Dialogue). The joint support team emphasised the demand-driven nature of UNDP country and regional support, and encouraged countries to lead in defining their specific support needs and engaging development partners.

III.   Sessions and main outcomes

Day 1, Session 1: Opening

Monowar Ahmed (Bangladesh)

- The Asia-Pacific Development Effectiveness Facility (AP-DEF) plays a key role to bringing development actors together to share experience and learn on managing development finance and promoting effective development co-operation. Based on the previous mutual exchange, it is noted that strong accountability frameworks at the global, regional and national levels are needed to translate commitments to actions. While ODA is decreasing, it needs to be more effective. In this context, it remains important to review progress made since Paris, Accra, Busan, Mexico and Addis to better understand what works and what doesn't. Aid and development effectiveness agendas will contribute to the implementation of the AAAA and the SDGs.

- Bangladesh is strongly committed to the GPEDC monitoring. To carry out the monitoring exercise, countries need time and resources. Equally, providers of development cooperation are also requested to encourage their local offices not only to participate in the survey but also to engage in and support in-country dialogue.

- The GPEDC monitoring should open to flows beyond ODA, and needs to take up a clearer role in the implementation of AAAA and SDGs.

Caitlin Wiesen (UNDP Regional Service Center for Asia and Pacific)

- 2015 represents a turning point in history. The SDGs represent a formidable opportunity to embark on a transformative development agenda in achieving sustainable development. Implementation such an ambitious agenda will require governments to mobilise a wider range of resources than ever. The challenge will be to ensure that these resources are used effectively to achieve results.

- While the share of ODA to the region decreasing, ODA remains important in the region, particularly to some LDCs and SIDS. Strengthening the effectiveness of ODA remains essential and much more remains to be done to deliver on agreed commitments. The GPEDC contribution in this area is critical, not the least for its monitoring framework, which provides a tool to account on progress in implementing agreed commitments, including at the country level. The principles of ownership, results and accountability have demonstrated their relevance for public finance, beyond ODA.

- Monitoring is not just about counting beans. Indicators focus on behavior change in development cooperation practices which can lead to better development outcomes. Monitoring can help to keep the spot light on important issues.

- At country level, the GPEDC monitoring process goes beyond collecting data. The process provides useful evidence to inform dialogue on what works and what doesn't. In many countries where monitoring is grounded in existing systems, the process has also led to

4

important improvements in the availability and quality of data on development cooperation efforts.

Session 2: Effective development co-operation – shaping partnerships through multi-stakeholder dialogue and the contribution of the GPEDC

The session began with an overview presentation from the joint support team (Yuko Suzuki Naab) to set the scene for discussions: What is the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (GPEDC), how can it make a difference in the context of Financing for Development and Post-2015 implementation framework, and how can countries engage?

This was followed by country perspectives on effective development cooperation principles and quality of partnerships in the post-2015 and Financing-for-Development context, with panel discussions of views from Myanmar presented by Thuzar Khin, Bangladesh presented by Rafique Siddique, and CSO perspective presented by Nancy Jolo from Solomon Island. This session was facilitated by Monica Asuna from Kenya who highlighted the vision and expectation for the next High Level Meeting in Kenya 2016. The session considered the following guiding questions:

- How can effective development cooperation principles help support the implementation of the SDGs?
- What has been the experience of countries in the region? What works in effective development cooperation principles to achieve better results? What are the most pressing challenges and how can they be overcome?

The discussions centered on the following:

- The GPEDC is utilised by countries to support their efforts for more effective development co-operation, through localisation of the principles and stimulating/strengthening in-country dialogue and coordination. For example, Myanmar localised the principles through the Nay Pyi Taw Accord and action plan. Bangladesh has also been using the principles of effective development cooperation to achieve more results on the ground through strengthening their mutual accountability framework such as the Development Cooperation Policy and Joint Cooperation Strategy.

- In the efforts to utilise and manage development cooperation more effectively, countries have also taken steps to establish a publically accessible online information management system, with the view to improve transparency of development cooperation flows and activities. This includes: "Mohinga" Aid Information Management System (AIMS) in Myanmar and a home-grown AIMS in Bangladesh. However, challenges remain with regard to data collection, including not sufficient information on disbursements reported by providers and not adequate visibility of what International NGOs, NGOs, and CSOs support/implement.

- Countries have also taken steps to strengthen development impacts of cooperation through improving development planning and implementation coordination across line ministries (i.e. establishment of Sector Working Groups) and alignment of cooperation with national priorities. Further efforts are needed to improve monitoring and evaluation (M&E) capacity in sector/line ministries, sub-national and regional levels.

5

- From CSO perspectives, the importance of ensuring an enabling environment for CSOs was reiterated, noting that an enabling environment can facilitate CSOs to provide constructive contributions and meaningful engagement in national development efforts. To this end, while efforts are underway in many countries to improve the CSO enabling environment and increased private sector contribution to development, there is a need to strengthen awareness of effective development cooperation among stakeholders. To enable effective CSO engagement, access to adequate resources and support was raised as an important area for consideration.

- In light of the changing development financing landscape in the region, countries in the region are looking beyond ODA, including through mapping all types of development finance flows in the country and making policy recommendations for more effective management of these flows. This is facilitated through Development Finance Assessments (DFAs) supported from the UNDP Bangkok regional hub. Building an integrated approach to manage flows (ODA and beyond) will be critical to achieve the SDGs. This means internalising and localising the ambitious agendas of SDGs, FfD, and actions for more effective development cooperation in an integrated and harmonised manner, which may require some important policy and institutional adjustments.

- Effective Development Cooperation remains relevant in implementing the SDGs and Addis Ababa Action agenda (AAAA). In this context, the importance of timely information from providers and other stakeholders was noted in order to allow countries to plan and implement their strategies. To this end, there is need for a stronger commitment from all stakeholders to implement the effective development cooperation principles to achieve the SDGs and FfD agendas.

- The GPEDC has a clear role and value added in its focus on how behaviour of development stakeholders impact more effective cooperation, based on the four principles (country ownership, results focus, inclusive partnership, and transparency and accountability). The GPEDC has a role to play in supporting the implementation of the SDGs at the country level in an inclusive and coherent manner (including CSOs, private sector, emerging partners).

- The HLM 2 in this context will provide a timely opportunity to review progress made in implementation of effective development cooperation principles and actions, in particularly tracking the unfinished business of aid effectiveness at the country level. It will also be an opportunity to revisit the principles of the GPEDC in the post-2015 context (including SSC and MICs). To this end, political outreach is critical to engage all stakeholders to the Partnership.

- The Global Partnership monitoring framework provides a useful opportunity to identify ways in which to strengthen effective development cooperation and support successful partnerships for SDGs implementation. The monitoring will be a team effort, and the value of an inclusive partnership and dialogue around the monitoring should not be overlooked.

Global Partnership Monitoring Workshop

Session 3: The GPEDC Monitoring Framework – purpose and overall approach

The OECD/UNDP Joint Support Team presented the overview of the GPEDC Monitoring Framework: its purpose and overall approach as well as lessons learned and outcomes from the first round of the GPEDC monitoring which took place in 2013-2014. The presentation highlighted that the GPEDC monitoring focuses on behaviour change: "how" are stakeholders engaging in development co-operation? Are they effective? The GPEDC monitoring stimulates broad-based dialogue and learning, and supports mutual accountability, encouraging all stakeholders to match commitments with action. Its country-focused approach aims to strengthen country leadership, encouraging the grounding of monitoring (data collection and dialogue) in the country's own national processes (i.e. data collection through country-level aid management systems, monitoring process embedded in mutual accountability frameworks), with the view to spark multi-stakeholder policy dialogue and accountability at the country level.

Christina Gangan from Moldova shared country perspectives on the monitoring process from the first round. Moldova's experience demonstrates the critical importance of country leadership combined with a well-established partnership with all relevant stakeholders. Moldova is using its aid management platform to ensure that data collection and validation relies on a very structured process but also pointed to the importance of strengthening the partnership approach from the from the stage of identifying national priorities in the national development strategy and sector plans all the way down to providers using the country's indicators as well as monitoring and evaluation systems as a basis for their own planning and reporting requirements. Moldova highlighted the importance of the previous monitoring round, which provided evidence to engage in multi-stakeholder dialogue and to foster joint actions for more effective development cooperation at country level.

The open discussions were facilitated by Violeta Corpus from the Philippines, considering the following questions:

- ▪ Why do we do it? How does it help to inform country level dialogue?
- ▪ Where do we see progress in making development cooperation more effective? What are the incentives necessary to change behaviour? What are the persistent challenges?
- ▪ What are the lessons learned, challenges encountered and recommendations from the previous monitoring round?

The discussions centred on the following:

- • There is high level of interest from countries to participate in the second round. However, countries which will be undertaking this for the first time anticipate some difficulties and require stronger technical support and resources. In addition, for countries not having a country information management systems, there is need for ad hoc tools to support country data collection.

Data collection and validation
- • With regard to data collection and validation, participants raised the issue of discrepancies between government recording and providers reporting. However, it was also noted that using AIMS or strengthening the country information management systems would make the exercise lighter. For example, the experience of Myanmar using IATI data to feed into the AIMS was highlighted, while there is a need to clarify whether IATI data can be used to support this

7

exercise more systematically. Both Myanmar and Bangladesh noted that IATI could not be used for some of their development partners' because of different data formats (e.g. commitments versus disbursements). This concern will be brought to the attention of the IATI Secretariat for clarification and potential follow-up.

- Difficulties of aligning different fiscal years between the government and the providers were noted as challenges experienced in the first round.

- The responsibility of the data collection falls too heavily on the governments, and to this end, the need to ensure systematic awareness building and sensitization at all levels (global, regional and country) was raised, noting that country offices of some providers are not fully aware of the exercise. In order to ensure timely submission of validated data, there is need to ensure effective communication between HQs and Country Offices so that providers at country level are aware of this exercise and provide timely information.

- Cambodia's experience of working with one lead donor (i.e. UNDP Country Office) to facilitate the data collection was shared as a good practice. In addition, some countries also noted on the need for technical support and resources given that the monitoring exercise adds burden on the national coordinators.

Usefulness of the exercise
- The GPEDC monitoring can lead to institutionalised multi-stakeholder dialogue. In this regard, there is need to strengthen CSO and private sector engagement in the consultations around the monitoring exercise itself.

- There is also need to make the report more useful, strengthening key recommendations ahead of the HLM 2, to ensure that the results directly feed into the HLM 2 preparation. The second rounds' timeline will provide more time for dissemination and discussion of findings. The JST is working with Kenya to make sure that the results from the monitoring feed into the HLM 2 outcome document preparation. The role of regional platforms in deepening analysis and dialogue on the results will also be useful to bring about key recommendations and messages into the HLM 2 preparation.

- The monitoring process tends to focus on technical issues, but can potentially help address some difficult issues which require political level attention. The technical work can contribute to unlock certain bottlenecks.

- Engaging broader stakeholders (such as emerging partners) was also noted as important. The GPEDC monitoring is country driven, and through the country level database/management information systems, there was some useful reporting on data and information for some of the emerging partners during the 1st monitoring. For example, UNDP China has undertaken an analysis of the data available for 12 partner countries[1]. The report can also provide useful lessons for countries to reach out to more partners.

- Concrete examples of how the GPEDC monitoring can be grounded in countries' own systems and processes were also shared, including: Ethiopia; Burkina, Rwanda and Cambodia.

---

[1] UNDP (2015), Demand-Driven Data: How Partner Countries are Gathering Chinese Development Cooperation Information

Session 4: Introduction to the 2nd monitoring round, including process, roles and responsibilities, and timeframe

- The OECD/UNDP Joint Support Team presented the envisaged process, timeline and roles and responsibilities for the second round monitoring. Mr. Kim Lumang Bopatafrom from Cambodia shared their experience as to how the monitoring exercise is rooted in country systems to limit transaction costs through a single monitoring process and framework for global and national monitoring. The Development Cooperation and Partnership Strategy localises definition of development effectiveness, and its results framework promote and monitor development effectiveness principles, strengthening the link of development effectiveness monitoring to national planning process. Cambodia's ODA data base is used to undertake the routine monitoring and will be used for the second monitoring round.

The following questions and comments were raised during the session, which was facilitated by Cao Manh Cuong from Vietnam. Feedback from participants provided useful insights on ways to strengthen the GPEDC monitoring tools, including the Monitoring Guide and support facilitation at country level:

- To facilitate the data collection and validation process, the JST will offer national co-ordinators with two alternative methods to report data collection and validation for the indicators. One method involves using a country worksheet (excel file) to report the data – and this is particularly advised for countries able to retrieve the data from their Aid Information Management Systems. The second option involves reporting onto an online survey. Countries can choose to report on any of the two options as they see best fit for their particular needs.
- With regard to the range of providers encouraged to report and the type of transactions to include (e.g. ODA and other official flows of a non-concessional nature), it was clarified that each country will decide based on what makes sense for their own development effectiveness efforts as well as drawing on their existing frameworks.
- For providers who do not have a country office, the Joint Support Team will liaise with HQs to identify focal points which national coordinators can contact for data collection.
- The usefulness of focal points for providers, CSOs, private sector, parliament and others was noted. To support identification of focal points for CSOs, parliaments and others, the Joint Support Team is coordinating with Steering Committee's representatives of these constituencies. Country-level focal points for these constituencies will be determined at the country level in consultation with relevant stakeholders.
- There was debate regarding the scope of data to be reported and the extent to which going beyond ODA (i.e. flows such as CSOs/NGOs, private sector foundations, etc.). It was clarified that the intension is to test the applicability of monitoring framework beyond ODA in several countries. The Joint Support Team encouraged countries interested to explore this option to let them know of their interest.
- Equally, participants also raised their concerns on the difficulty to follow-up on the monitoring and implementation of cooperation that is channelled through NGOs.
- The proposal to introduce Country profiles in the second global monitoring report was well received, noting that this will provide a useful reference point for future dialogue and development effectiveness efforts in country. In this context, it was recommended to carry out a comparison of findings from 2 rounds in order to track progress over time.

- Some countries noted the possible lack of data availability. However, it was noted that process should not be stalled because of lack of full comprehensive information. The focus is to get things rolling to support dialogue and coordination efforts at the country level.
- The importance of embedding the monitoring process in country's existing coordination and development planning and accountability frameworks was recognised. In this regard, there is need for the government entity (national coordinator) in charge of conducing the monitoring to plan this exercise and outline the consultation process already at the beginning of the process. In addition, there was recognition that country context and challenges vary from country to country. The monitoring process could also identify some possible ways forward (including strengthening AIMS and coordination/dialogue process).

Session 5 and 6 – New indicators and Indicator Clinics

During the session 5 on Day 1, the Joint Support Team presented the background, main characteristics of refined methodology for new indicators (Indicator 1 on use of country results framework; Indicator 2 on CSO enabling environment; and Indicator 3 on Public-Private Dialogue). Following this presentation at the end of Day 1, the three indicator clinics were facilitated by the JST. The indicator clinics considered the following questions:

- What does the indicator mean/measure?
- What are the expected measurement challenges and how to address them?
- What are the foreseeable challenges to ensure effective data collection, particularly for indicators requiring a multi-stakeholder process? What are the recommendations to incentivize participation of relevant stakeholders?

Indicator-specific feedback from clinics

Indicator 1: Use of Country Results Framework
Indicator 1 aims to provide objective information on the extent to which, and the ways in which, existing country-led and country-level results frameworks are used by providers as a guiding tool to focus development co-operation on results that meet developing countries' priorities. It focuses on project above 1 million approved in 2015, referring to the projects which the approval process has been finalised in 2-015. Provides are expected to share a list of projects above 1 million.

Participants questioned about ODA funding that goes to CSOs to see if this will also be part of the scope of the monitoring. To this, if they are above 1 million threshold, they should be included in this monitoring exercise. It will also provide a good opportunity for governments to identify how these funds are channelled and whether they have clear linkages to the country results framework.

Indicator 2: CSO enabling environment
This is a new indicator and its approach for monitoring focuses on country-level survey based on the four module questionnaire, covering the following dimensions:
- Space for multi-stakeholder dialogue on national development policies;
- CSO development effectiveness: accountability and transparency;
- Official development co-operation with CSOs; and
- Legal and regulatory environment

Participants raised interest in this indicator, noting that it is innovative and provides a useful tool to spark dialogue at the country level. Its focus on multi-stakeholder approach was also welcomed, noting that it would contribute to more institutionalised dialogue.

However, given varying country contexts in terms of different levels of maturity/organisation and coordination mechanisms of CSOs, it will be important to identify the right people to engage, utilising the existing frameworks/platforms. To this end, participants raised questions as to whether there is any guidance for identifying the national focal points for CSOs. CPDE is undertaking sensitisation on this process with their members on the ground. Acknowledging different country context, countries were encouraged to the extent possible build on existing platforms of CSO engagement. The role of UNDP and UNCT was also raised as potentially supporting countries with this process. To support countries undertaking this monitoring, it was suggested for the national coordinators to also be informed on possible CSO focal points identified through the CPDE process to support facilitation of the monitoring at the country level.

Given the heavy process, there is need for intensive yet user-friendly communication efforts along with user-friendly survey tool to support this process. The issue of additional resources and support was flagged from participants. To this, development partners at the country level will also be encouraged to support the assessment.

Indicator 3: Public – Private Dialogue
Indicator 3 focuses on the quality of public-private dialogue (PPD) at the country level. In doing so, it recognises the importance of inclusive dialogue with the private sector for building a policy environment conducive to growth and sustainable development. The indicator relies on a combination of globally sourced quantitative scores and country sourced qualitative assessments.

Similarly to Indicator 2, participants noted the usefulness of this indicator as it can promote and facilitate more institutionalised dialogue at the country level. Similar to the issues/challenges raised for Indicator 2, different levels of maturity and organisation of private sector coordination were noted, which requires a flexible approach to undertake this monitoring. Other issues raised for Indicator 2 including a process for identification of focal points for private sector and the need for sensitisation were also shared for this indicator.

Indicator 5a and 5b: Predictability

These indicators measures the degree of annual predictability (5a) and the medium-term predictability (5b).

Participants demonstrated a good understanding of this indicator and measurement. As such, no major questions on the methodology was raised. However, there was a strong outcry about information gaps and discrepancies experienced by the country government on predictability. To this end, it was suggested that in order for this indicator to be meaningful for country development planning and implementation of development strategies, it would be better to inform the indicators from the government records. Participants also flagged that if providers of development cooperation are to report on this indicator, it is difficult for government to validate information. At the same time, a challenge was also noted that if we are to use government data, this will leave out some of the cooperation which does not go through treasury (i.e. Technical Assistance). It was noted for countries that have AIMS, this assessment is easier, as providers are requested to provide planned disbursement information as well as forward-spending information to AIMS.

With regard to medium-term predictability, a suggestion was made to adjust the language to better reflect the way providers operate (i.e. forward looking expenditures frameworks). To this end, it

was suggested to adjust the language as needed at the country level, as long as it is still in line with the purpose of this indicator.

Furthermore, difficulty of getting this type of information from non-traditional partners was noted. These partners provide loans, so information is already available through the public debt records/systems, and these information is typically available and activities are on budget. There will be a need to bilaterally discuss with those providers at the country level whether extracting the data from these country systems will be adequate or not.

Indicator 6: Aid on Budget

Indicator 6 focuses on the degree in which development cooperation funding that is scheduled for disbursement that is recorded in the annual budgets approved by the legislatures of developing countries, which support facilitation of parliamentary oversight by implementing greater transparency in public financial management, including public disclosure of revenues, budgets, expenditures…

There was no specific discussion/questions or concerns made on this indicator.

Indicator 7: Mutual accountability
Indicator 7 focuses on the status in which mutual accountability among co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews, based on the five criteria including: existence of an aid or partnership policy; existence of country-level targets for effective development cooperation; existence of assessment against these targets undertaken jointly; existence of active involvement of local governments and non-executive stakeholders in such reviews; and public availability of the comprehensive results of such exercise.

Participants noted that the criteria are simple, but yes/no questions does not provide much information as to why and why not. To this end, the JST noted on the existence of the UNDCF Mutual Accountability survey (which is currently ongoing) and the importance of this survey as a way to get more in-depth information. Reporting cycles this time are aligned between the GPEDC monitoring and the UNDCF Mutual Accountability survey and that this can and will facilitate and support this indicator process, including through using the UNDCF analysis as complementary evidence to enrich the GPEDC report.

Indicator 8: Gender equality and women's empowerment
This indicator tracks the progress with regard to country's systems to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment.

Participants noted that this indicator provides a good initial step for countries to reinforce the gender equality and women's empowerment issues, but the assessment may be too basic to generate useful dialogue at the country level, and the additional analytical questions could provide more useful narrative. Participants also asked whether there is any good practice/examples of countries that have good systems in place to facilitate mutual learning.

In addition, participants also noted the importance of this indicator supported by a relevant responsible unit/ministry in charge of gender responsive budgeting in order to assess the status well, and there is also a need for support at the country level for facilitating useful dialogue on this. To this end, JST will share the list of countries with national coordinators contact with the UN Women who can provide technical support needed at the country level.

Indicator 9a and 9b: quality and use of public financial management systems
Indicator 9 a is based on the World Bank Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) with regard to the quality of public financial management systems, and Indicator 9b tracks the progress with regard to development co-operation disbursements for the government sector using the country's PFM and procurement systems.

With regard to Indicator 9b, participants noted that the information is to be provided from providers, but there is a need to verify discrepancies on data with country's own sources. To this end, participants requested that the JST outreach to providers ahead of the process, requesting providers of development cooperation to submit necessary data/information early in the process, to allow robust verification process by the national coordinators. Further clarification was also provided in case country systems are used, but providers are using additional safeguards; such situations do not qualify as using country systems

Indicator 10: Untying aid
This indicator is based on global sourced data from the OECD/DAC Credit Reporting System.

Participants raised the concerns that there are big discrepancies between reporting to the DAC and what is observed at the country level, suggesting that measuring aid untying should be done at the country level. The methodology to measure untying of aid is fairly complex, thus currently measured through the global data. However, if countries wish to track this at the country level, this can be incorporated into the country's data/information collection process to begin addressing the information gap.

General observations

There is a general concern raised by participants with regard to the difficulty of having timely and relevant information not only for monitoring but also for coordinating and managing development cooperation for development results. While the devil is in details, monitoring is not an exact science. While challenges remain with regard to availability of information, the monitoring can support identifying where gaps exist and generate dialogue at the country level.

There is need for more regular and frequent communication to facilitate and support the monitoring and to promote inclusive multi-stakeholder dialogue at the country level. Development stakeholders (including country offices of development cooperation providers) are not always fully aware of this process, their role and responsibility, hampering the quality of the process as well as potential value of the monitoring for institutionalizing multi-stakeholder dialogue.

Session 7 and Wrap-up Session: Policy dialogue on effective development cooperation: priorities for the 2016 HLM, use of findings from the 2nd global monitoring round and evidence needs beyond the indicators

Monica Asuna from the Government of Kenya sets out the following key questions for the session:

- What do we want out from the HLM 2 and what kind of outcome document should the HLM 2 aim for?

- How can providers and recipient governments together review progress of unfinished business? As a recipient, what do we expect from providers?
- What issues do we want to raise so that we are all accountable to each other?
- What political outreach efforts needed to make the HLM 2 success and how do we want to shape the HLM 2 agenda?
- Would there be a role for the GPEDC to play in future global development agendas?

Erin Palomares from CPDE (Reality of Aid Network, Philippines) shared the CSO perspectives with regard to the GPEDC's role and expectation for the HLM 2. She underscored the importance of establishing coherence between the different processes (UN/SDGs, GPEDC), calling for the GPEDC to take a clear formal role in monitoring AAAA and SDGs. With regard to the HLM 2, the GPEDC's added value is its inclusive nature; its unique governance structure, which allows non-executive actors to engage in dialogue on equal ground; its emphasis on country leadership and ownership; as well as its emphasis on monitoring and accountability for implementing the effective development cooperation commitments. Thus, monitoring is core of what the GPEDC does, providing useful information and evidence from its country-focused approach. She noted that through the global monitoring framework and exchange of knowledge, stakeholders can hold each other to account. This will be important for the implementation of the SDGs.

The HLM 2 will therefore need to demonstrate this comparative advantage of the GPEDC in follow-up and review of the FfD and SDGs implementation. She also emphasised in this context that inclusive development cooperation and accountability for unfinished business of aid effectiveness should form a critical basis for the HLM 2 agenda. The Busan principles recognise the importance of the enabling environment for CSOs as a building block for inclusive development process. Realising the CSO enabling environment depends on the extent to which all development actors are able to live up to their commitments and responsibilities. The monitoring provides a useful step forward in ensuring accountability, but there is a risk of using monitoring as a purely technical exercise. Changing behaviours and improving enabling environment requires political and policy actions, thus monitoring should be equally seen as a political exercise. She underscored in this regard that monitoring should not be seen as a stand-alone activity and that there is need to foster dialogue and incentivise change, positioning monitoring as an integral process for advancing policy reforms. She also reiterated the importance of regional platforms such as AP-DEF in increasing the country focus mandate of the GPEDC by facilitating regional dialogue, sharing lessons, and increasing mutual accountability.

Joanna Pinkas from Australia reflected on the workshop, noting that providers have signed up to Paris, Accra, and Busan, and this has changed the way traditional providers work. These principles are incredibly important for providers. She also highlighted the importance for all GPEDC stakeholders to be more involved to work together for more effective development cooperation

Participants reiterated the importance of the GPEDC monitoring feeding into the content of the HLM 2 and its expected outcome. In this context, linking the GPEDC with AAAA and SDGs will be an important contribution at the HLM 2. While some of the time-bound targets are set for 2015, the HLM 2 should also explore whether new targets are needed to continue advancing the development effectiveness agenda. Kenya confirmed that Busan commitments (carried from Paris) are still valid for many countries.

Some countries have seen good progress with regard to inclusion of CSOs and private sector in development process, noting that the indicators in these areas will further support this progress.

14

Equally, it is important to engage emerging partners more in the GPEDC and for the HLM2. To this end, participants raised the importance to better understand how we might track cooperation with new actors. Participants noted that it will be important for the HLM 2 to address these varying approaches and expectations in order to mobilise the interest of all actors. The voluntary/multi-stakeholder nature of the GPEDC makes it complicated as to how we make it inclusive for everyone without losing the progress that the countries have made on development effectiveness agenda. Some countries expressed concerns that with the focus on development finance, the focus on the unfinished business may get event more diluted

Tom Beloe (UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub) closed the workshop, reiterating the support that the AP-DEF offers with regard to facilitating mutual learning about good innovations and new institutional reforms. AP-DEF puts a great emphasis on evidence for policy and institutional reforms. It is the time to begin to engage on the substantive frame for the HLM 2, and the AP-DEF will continue to engage with countries on this in preparation of the HLM2. Yuko Suzuki Naab (JST/UNDP) also echoed that the HLM 2 presents an incredible opportunity to bring the principles and the actions on effective development cooperation at the country level to shape global dialogue for making development cooperation work better. The strength of the GPEDC lies in its country-focused and inclusive multi-stakeholder character are changing the cooperation dynamism at the country level. The GPEDC monitoring can further support this. In this context, monitoring is not about technical perfection; it is about using the process itself to strengthen the dialogue and conversations at the country level. The Joint Support Team stands ready to support this process.

Annex – List of Participants

Country	Participant	Title
Armenia	Ms. Aneta Babayan	Acting country co-ordinator, Economic Development Policy Department, Ministry of Economy
Bangladesh	Mr. Monowar Ahmed	Additional Secretary, ERD
Bangladesh	Dr. Md Rezaul Bashar Siddique	Deputy Secretary, ERD
Bangladesh	Mr. Kabir Ahamed	Economic Counsellor & Alternate Permanent Representative of Bangladesh to ESCAP
Bangladesh	Mr. Rafique Siddique	Monitoring Specialist, Aid Effectiveness project, UNDP Bangladesh
Bangladesh	Ms. Karolien Caesar	Project Manager, UNDP Bangladesh
Bhutan	Ms. Tandin Wangmo	Senior Program Coordinator, Gross National Happiness Commission
Cambodia	Mr. KIM Lumang Bopata	Vice Chief of Policy Department, Council for Development of Cambodia
Fiji	Mr. Ledua Vakaloloma	Acting Chief Economic Planning Officer, Ministry of Finance
Fiji	Mr. Nilesh Prakash	Chief Economic Planning Officer, Strategic Planning Office, Ministry of Finance
Fiji	Dr. Asif Chida	Private Sector Deveopment Specialist, UNDP Pacific Centre
Kenya	Mrs. Monica Asuna	Head, Aid Effectiveness Secretariat, the National Treasury
Kenya	Ms. Caroline Dzame Mweni	Economist/Deputy Head Aid Effectiveness Secretariat, the National Treasury
Kyrgyzstan	Mr. Omurbek Kenzhebaev	Chief Economist, Investment and PPP Department, Ministry of Economy
Lao PDR	Mr. Sysomphorn Phetdaoheuang	Deputy Director General of Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Planning and Investment
Mozambique	Mr. Sérgio Hele	Head of program Aid Unity, Ministry of Economy and Finance
Mozambique	Mr. Luca Monge Roffarello	Economic Advisor, UNDP Mozambique
Moldova	Mrs. Cristina Gangan	Senior Advisor, Monitoring and Evaluation Division, General Directorate for Policy Coordination, External Assistance and Central Public Administration Reform of the State Chancellery.
Mongolia	Mr. Gantulga Badamkhatan	Director of Department of Development Financing and Debt Management, Ministry of Finance
Myanmar	Ms. Thuzar Khin	Deputy Director, Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of National Planning and Economic Development
Myanmar	Ms. Thidar Win	Staff Officer, FERD, Ministry of National Planning and Economic Development
Myanmar	Mr. Leigh Mitchell	Senior Development Effectiveness Adviser, Foreign Economic Relations Department (FERD), Union Ministry of National Planning and Economic Development (MNPED), Government of the Republic of the Union of

		Myanmar / European Union Delegation to Myanmar
Myanmar	**Ms. Khine Khine Nwe**	Joint Secretary-General, Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry
Myanmar	**Ms. Hyeran Kim**	Program Specialist, UNDP Myanmar
Myanmar	**Mr. Min Sann**	Program Analyst, UNDP Myanmar
Nepal	**Mr. Yoga Nath Poudel**	Under Secretary, International Economic Coordination and Cooperation Division, Ministry of Finance
Nepal	**Mr. Justin Shone**	Advisor/Development Consultant
Pakistan	**Mr. Zafar Hasan**	Joint Secretary, Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Finance Economic Affairs Division
Papua New Guinea	**Mr. Floyd Lala**	Assistant Secretary, UN/EU and Aid Effectiveness, Department of National Planning and Monitoring
Philippines	**Ms. Violeta S. Corpus**	OIC-Director, Monitoring and Evaluation Staff, National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA)
Philippines	**Ms. Erin Palomares**	Coordinator, Reality of Aid Network, CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE)
Philippines	**Mr. Florante G. Igtiben**	Assistant Director, Public Investment Staff, National Economic and Development Authority
Philippines	**Ms. Maria Luisa Isabel Jolongbayan**	Programme Analyst, UNDP Philippines
Solomon Islands	**Ms. Nancy Jolo**	Development Services Exchange (DSE), CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE)
Tajikistan	**Mr. Mehroj Rajabov**	UNDP Project Consultant, UNDP Project "Support to Sustainable Aid Coordination and Effective Development Cooperation" under SCISPM
Tajikistan	**Mr. Vali Musaev**	Project Manager, UNDP Project "Support to Sustainable Aid Coordination and Effective Development Cooperation" under SCISPM
Timor Leste	**Mr. Elson Martinho Da Costa**	External Assistance Coordination officer, Development Partnership Management Unit – Ministry of Finance
Tonga	**Ms. Ilaisaane Lieti Sili**	Principal Economist, Ministry of Finance and National Planning
Vanuatu	**Mr. Lester Roan Sunghk**	Senior Policy Analyst, Department of Planning
Vietnam	**Mr. Cao Manh Cuong**	Deputy Director General, Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Planning and Investement
Australia	**Ms. Joanna Pinkas**	Policy Manager, Australian Government, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Switzerland	Suzanne Mueller	Senior Policy Advisor, Aid Effectiveness Focal Point, Swiss Development Cooperation
	Jos Brand	Coordinator, GPEDC Initiative on Results and Accountability
OECD	Mr. Alejandro Guerrero	Monitoring Specialist, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
OECD	Ms. Julie Seghers	Policy Analyst, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
Korea	Mr. Artemy Izmestiev	UNDP Seoul Policy Center
HQ	Ms. Yuko Suzuki Naab	Global Policy Advisor, Effective Devleopment Co-operation, UNDP BPPS
Bangkok	Ms. Caitlin Wiesen	Chief, RPPS
Bangkok	Mr. Thomas Beloe	Programme Advisor
Bangkok	Ms. Marjolaine Nicod	Development Effectiveness Specialist
Bangkok	Ms. Supansa Kajavong	Programme Assistant