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Tracking implementation of Busan principles

1. Focus on Results
2. Country Ownership
3. Inclusive Partnerships
4. Transparency & Accountability

10 indicators track the four principles
How Did It Go?

- **Big success in participation** and coverage thanks to the initiative and leadership from countries (more participation than ever before).

- **81 countries** led national monitoring processes
- **125+ development partners** engaged (multilateral & bilateral)
- **Hundreds of non-state actors** participated in consultations (civil society, private sector and others)
- **Overall, 3,000-4,000 people** involved in all 6 continents
Also in terms of coverage of development co-operation

Participating countries assessed the behaviour of development partners for:

**US$ 44 billion**
- in development co-operation flows:
  1. Use of country systems
  2. Predictability
  3. Aid on Budget

**US$ 72 billion**
- in development co-operation commitments:
  1. Alignment to national priorities
  2. Use of national results frameworks for M&E

3,000 development projects assessed (half of them in Africa alone)
FOCUS ON RESULTS
Use of country led results frameworks

- Countries lead in defining their own strategic development priorities (99%)

- Development partners align well to these frameworks in designing their interventions (85%)

- Results alignment weaker in implementation phase
  - Indicators drawn from government frameworks (62%)
  - Indicators rely on government sources of data (52%)
  - Interventions plan a final evaluation involving government (48%)
OWNERSHIP
Country systems

- **Quality of country systems** (CPIA) show some decline, the picture is mixed; more countries making progress than experiencing setbacks over past decade

- Progress in **use of country systems** remains slow (51%)
  - Driven by greater reliance on PFM systems, procurement lagging behind
  - Development partners’ track record very mixed; MDBs score highest, bilaterals beyond DAC made greatest progress

- Improvements in the quality of systems lead to higher use of these systems

- Use of country systems spans different co-operation modalities
Untying and predictability

- **Untying has reached a plateau**
  - Different profiles, some making progress; ‘de facto’ untying remains an issue

- **Stagnation in predictability**: annual predictability 83%; three years ahead 71%.
  - Predictability links to ‘institutionalised partnership’ and local implementation capacity
  - Limited predictability hampers country planning, including national budgeting
  - Remaining systemic consideration: Why can some be predictable but others not?
INCLUSIVE PARTNERSHIPS
Inclusive partnerships

- **Civil society organisations** are improving co-ordination
- **Readiness to engage** non-state actors:
  - Majority countries – and development partners – consult CSOs to inform policies
  - Willingness on public and private side to engage, particularly around topics of mutual benefit

- **Challenge is making this engagement systematic:**
  - Lack the instruments, logistics and facilitators that could make engagement more meaningful
  - Development partners’ important support role in strengthening dialogue mechanisms and supporting champions & facilitators amongst civil society and private sector.
TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY
Transparency

• Busan ambition for a **common standard not fully realised** – three global systems remain distinct, each with their purpose

• **More and better information** is available
  • Moderate progress in upgrading reporting practices
  • Incorporation of new publishers

• Challenges remain on **timeliness and forward-looking** information (impacting predictability and funding on budget)

• Transparency **requires efforts on several fronts**
  • Mixed profiles: good reporting to a specific platform does not automatically imply equally good reporting to other platforms
  • Systemic challenges, but also a culture change
Aid on budget and gender budgeting

• Two-thirds of development co-operation funding (67%) is now on budget overseen by parliaments
  • 15 countries and 26 partners met target (85%)
  • Importance of partners’ budget cycle alignment, investing in larger country programmes implemented through national systems; countries’ budget planning processes and systems, appropriate budgetary rules and processes

• Almost three quarters of countries (73%) have gender tracking systems in place, close to half (47%) make the information public

• Challenges on transparency and linking gender budget tracking with the policy planning and budgeting process, and with wider public financial management reforms
Mutual Accountability

- Mutual assessments are increasing, although inclusiveness continues to be a challenge
  - More than two-thirds of countries assess progress towards country-level targets together with their partners.
  - Roughly half (46%) meet the requirements associated with inclusiveness and transparency
  - A closer look at 2014 and 2016 sample reveals progress across most of the criteria
- Established mutual accountability structures are formulated around traditional development assistance, a need to rethink structures to reflect SDGs partnership approaches
Takeaways and possible next steps?

• **Deepening commitments around results** – extending results alignment to the monitoring and evaluation phases. Linking results information to policy and planning.

• **Targeting support for inclusive partnerships** – more systematic engagement of civil society in policy formulation and programming, dedicated support to local mechanisms for public-private dialogue

• **Strengthening transparency and predictability** – reforming information delivery to real-time approach, addressing political and systemic bottlenecks to provision of forward-looking information at global and country level

• **Learning new ways to manage risks** – innovative approaches to advance country systems agenda

• Incorporating a **whole of government approach** to effective delivery of development co-operation – addressing systemic/political constraints by engaging different ministries