



Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation
Monitoring Framework

INDICATOR 4B:

**Information on development co-operation is publically available
and used at country level**

Methodology

Draft for consultation

Summary:

Transparent information on development co-operation is a crucial condition for effective partnerships and for accountability purposes. To date, the Global Partnership monitoring framework only addressed this commitment from a supply-side perspective, looking at whether information had been made available at global level in online platforms, such as those at the OECD and IATI. The indicator did not address whether the information was indeed flowing to partner countries.

This new indicator 4b measures the extent to which development co-operation information is also incorporated in partner countries' information management systems, and whether those governments are in turn making it available to their citizens.

Note: The following draft methodology, put forth by the Joint Support Team of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation, builds on the Nairobi Outcome Document, the technical advice of the Monitoring Advisory Group and lessons learned following the 2016 monitoring round.

Background

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda recognise the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (Global Partnership or GPEDC) as a solid foundation to drive more effective development co-operation. To meet the ambitions of the 2030 Agenda, the Global Partnership must deliver evidence and data that address the needs of countries in better monitoring the effectiveness of their development efforts. In the [Nairobi Outcome Document](#), the international development community stressed the need to “update the existing monitoring framework to reflect the challenges of the 2030 Agenda, including the pledge to leave no-one behind”.

To address these challenges, the Steering Committee of the Global Partnership outlined an inclusive strategy to refine the monitoring framework, following a three-track approach:

1. Strengthening the current 10 indicators to ensure their relevance for the 2030 Agenda context;
2. Adapting the scope of monitoring to address major systemic issues critical to the 2030 Agenda, such as climate change, gender equality, conflict and fragility as well as progressively reflecting all the modalities and development co-operation actors;
3. Enhancing the impact of the monitoring process by improving the quality and inclusiveness of country-level monitoring and facilitating follow-up and action on the results.

The refinement of the Global Partnership monitoring framework is guided by the Nairobi Outcome Document, the [technical advice](#) of the Monitoring Advisory Group and the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team, and lessons learned in the 2016 monitoring round, including feedback from participating countries. The refinement began in April 2017 and is drawing on the technical assistance of expert groups, related to specific thematic areas, paired with iterative consultations with relevant stakeholders and country-level testing.

The refined indicators will be used in the third Global Partnership monitoring round, scheduled to be launched in May 2018. Further revisions will be incorporated in subsequent monitoring exercises. Findings from the third monitoring round will feed into high-level political processes, in particular the 2019 High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development.

METHODOLOGICAL PROPOSAL
**INDICATOR 4B: INFORMATION ON DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION IS
PUBLICLY AVAILABLE AT COUNTRY LEVEL**

1. Introduction

This document presents a proposal to establish a new Global Partnership indicator – Indicator 4b – measuring the availability of information on development co-operation at country level. To inform the development of this indicator methodology, the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team of the Global Partnership followed the advice of the Monitoring Advisory Group, coupled with consultations with a broad range of development stakeholders.

This document presents the rationale for adding this indicator and an overview and assessment of expert input and independent analysis. It concludes with a proposal for a measurement approach. The proposal is open for general consultation and will be piloted, with the entire methodology, in four countries in March 2018. Based on feedback received during the public consultations and country piloting, the indicator methodology will be further adjusted and submitted to the Global Partnership Steering Committee. Upon Steering Committee endorsement, the refined indicator methodology will be included as part of the Global Partnership 2018 monitoring round, scheduled to be launched in May 2018.

2. Rationale

Accountability in development co-operation, between governments and development partners –as well as towards citizens, civil society and other development stakeholders– is vital to ensuring efficiency and effectiveness in development activities and thereby maximise impact. Transparency of development co-operation is the basis for enhanced accountability, as information on past, current and future efforts contribute to hold public officials accountable for their performance and use of resources. Additionally, information systems that ensure access to high-quality and timely information on development co-operation help governments in planning and managing resources for results and can guide development partners in co-ordinating their support with other providers, as to avoid fragmentation and duplication of efforts.

The commitment to increase transparency in development co-operation has become a priority among development partners. In the Busan Partnership Agreement, they committed to continue efforts to enhance the public availability of timely, comprehensive and forward looking information on resources provided through development co-operation, and to strengthen the capacities of country-level stakeholders to make better use of this information for decision-making and accountability (BPa §23).

The results from the 2016 monitoring round illustrate widespread overall progress into that direction, with more development partner than ever publishing information on their development co-operation programmes to global repositories and shared standards.¹

¹ See pp. 100-106 in OECD/UNDP (2016). *Making Development Co-operation More Effective: 2016 Progress Report*. Paris/New York: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation

The Nairobi Outcome document (NOD), a negotiated result of the Second High-Level Meeting of the Global Partnership, reconfirms that the principle of transparency is relevant to all Global Partnership stakeholders. In the NOD, development partners went a step further in committing themselves to work together to improve the availability, accuracy and use of information on development co-operation at the country level, striving to publish data on all ongoing activities, as regularly as possible, including detailed forward-looking data as well as data on results and evaluations, wherever available (NOD §77). It also emphasises the need to strengthen national systems throughout the data cycle, from data generation to data use for decision-making, guiding investments, and targeting and allocating public expenditure (NOD §74, §76f). Through the NOD, development partners providing support also commit to making development co-operation more transparent, meeting the information needs of partner countries, citizens and other stakeholders.

The current Global Partnership indicator on transparency of development co-operation² provides information on the disposal of data at global level (i.e. supply side) but does not reflect whether the information becomes available and used at the country level (i.e. demand side). This provides the rationale for a complementary indicator that would reflect this latter aspect. The combination of former indicator 4 on global transparency, now relabelled as 4a, and the new indicator 4b on country level transparency will provide a full assessment of the extent to which the principle of transparency is being upheld at all relevant levels.

3. Overall assessment

Global transparency is considered critical not only as part of the commitments made in Busan, but also in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. However, there is also a need to measure data availability and data use at the country level. This is in line with the broader commitment made in the BPA, which highlights the importance of **availability and public accessibility of information** on development co-operation at the country level specifically. The Busan commitment also emphasises the need for partners to strengthen systems for transparency as well as the **capacity of all stakeholder to use** information to inform decision making and hold each other accountable (BPA §23).

With this in mind, a report by the Global Partnership Monitoring Advisory Group³ notes that there is a need for the transparency indicator to assess **in-country access and usability** of development co-operation information. Similarly, country-level data collection from the Global Partnership monitoring exercise confirms that partner countries still face challenges regarding the access to information on development co-operation for development planning, budgeting, execution and monitoring and evaluation. Finally, most of the information being made publicly available focuses on financial flows and development activities, but information on results is more limited, hindering global and country-level accountability.

To further strengthen the usefulness and relevance of this indicator, the Monitoring Advisory Group recommended that the Global Partnership monitoring framework attempts to **capture demand for data at country level**, including understanding the way that development co-operation information is acquired, managed and presented.

² Indicator 4: Transparent Information on Development Co-operation is Publicly Available

³ The Monitoring Advisory Group was established in 2015 to provide technical expertise and advice to strengthen the Global Partnership monitoring framework and ensure its relevance in the evolving post-2015 landscape. The group is composed of 12 high-level experts from developing country governments, development co-operation providers, think tanks and civil society organisations. From mid-2015 to late 2016, the MAG performed a full assessment of the 10 indicator monitoring framework and the monitoring process.

4. Indicator proposal

This note proposes the development of a new, complementary indicator to assess the **availability and use of information on development co-operation at country level**, in line with NOD commitments and country level needs.

Following the Monitoring Advisory Group advice, it is suggested that the indicator focuses on availability of information on development co-operation reported through governments' Management Information Systems (MIS), or equivalent data collection tools.

Given that there is a diversity of management information systems used by governments, the indicator uses a broad definition of MIS as any computerised database, organised in a way to support information-gathering and decision-making.

There are a number of common MIS, including Financial Management Information Systems (FMIS) and Debt Management Systems (DMS) that support regular public financial management in the country. In addition, specialised systems have emerged in the context of development co-operation, such as the different types of Aid Information Management Systems (AIMS) that are frequently used to track external resources for development, as well as related development activities and results. Many of these government systems allow for development partners to feed information on their support on a regular basis, either directly or by linking these systems to global repositories or to open data standards like IATI, where donor information may have been released in a timely, comprehensive manner, and forward-looking plans could also be available.

The proposed indicator will assess the **percentage of development partners whose information is reflected in a country's Management Information System**, or equivalent reporting system. The specific methodology to construct the indicator is discussed in the section 5 and a detailed description of the questionnaire guiding the data collection is found in the Annex.

Nonetheless, it is intended that this be considered a starting point for measurement of the availability and use of development co-operation information at country level, with the aim to strengthen the coverage of this indicator overtime. It is important to note that, while sources of development financing continue to increase and MIS are being adjusted to reflect these evolutions, this indicator will be further adjusted accordingly, to fully reflect the underlying commitments on transparency endorsed in Nairobi (see Box 1).

Box 1. Expanding the scope of the indicator in the future

To fully reflect the multiple commitments on transparency in full, a further refined version of indicator would measure the availability of transparent information on development co-operation at country level by calculating what percentage of the total amount of development co-operation received is reflected in partner government management information systems, and whether these systems are transparent to the public.⁴ It should also measure the quality of this information and its use relative to country-level needs.

⁴ Publicly accessible is defined as availability without restriction, with a reasonable time, without a requirement to register, and free of charge.

While such an assessment is intended for the 2020 monitoring round, this will require addressing the following two challenges:

(1) The first challenge is that in order to calculate the percentage of information covered by various MIS, or equivalent report mechanisms, as described above, a complete picture of the entirety of development co-operation received by a country in a given timeframe would be necessary. However, at this time, this information is not systematically and comprehensively available for all countries. Part of this challenge relates to the unfinished work to internationally agree on a common definition and standard for a broad definition of 'development co-operation' beyond Official Development Assistance and in line with the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on Financing for Development. Current proposals are underway (e.g. the OECD's Total Official Support for Sustainable Development, or TOSSD), but a consensus does not exist at this time. Subsequently, there is also not an agreed international system that can provide a benchmark to calculate an appropriate denominator (i.e. total development co-operation from a development partner to a given country) for an indicator that would reflect the percentage of information reported through various MIS or equivalent report mechanisms at country level.

(2) In the same vein, regarding the use of data on development co-operation, it is envisaged that the indicator will ideally assess whether the information made available through MIS or equivalent reporting systems responds to the needs of various end-users. However, additional research and consultations are required to define 'information needs' for various user groups, in consultation with country users and the relevant data gathering platforms, systems and standards.

Future iterations of the indicator will build on the experience of the 2018 monitoring round, which provides a solid foundation to further expand into the issues of comprehensiveness and usefulness. Anticipating this process, optional qualitative questions are added to the proposed indicator, which will generate baseline information to inform further refinement.

5. Methodology

The proposed indicator to measure the availability of information on development co-operation at country level is the percentage of development partners providing development co-operation that are included in a government's Management Information System or equivalent system out of the total number of development partners providing development co-operation to the country.

Data sources

The government's national co-ordinator is responsible for data collection, in liaison with colleagues from the relevant government institutions; specifically, those responsible for maintaining the government MIS or equivalent reporting system, if any.

In defining the list of development partners working in the country, and whether information on their development co-operation programmes is available in the government's information system, the national co-ordinator should refer to the reporting year (fiscal year 2017 for 2018 monitoring).

Questionnaire

The proposed questionnaire is composed of 4 questions addressing which development partners have information reflected in country management information systems, which government

information systems are used, whether the system is publicly accessible, and some general characteristics of the information (type of information, average frequency of reporting).

Note: To guide future refinement of the indicator, an optional set of questions (section B) is included in order to collect complementary information.

Scoring Method

The indicator will measure the percentage of development partners providing development co-operation that are included in a government's Management Information System (MIS) or equivalent reporting system. The data source is developing country government reporting.

$$\text{Indicator 4b (\%)} = 100 \bullet \frac{\text{Number of development partners working in the country that are reflected in a country's management information system or equivalent reporting systems}}{\text{Total number of development partners working in the country}}$$

The total number of development partners shall include all bilateral and multilateral development partners of development co-operation working in the country, including South-South Co-operation.

Indicative presentation of results

Country	Percentage of development partners working in the country that are reflected in the country's management information system (or equivalent)	Government management system used	Information in government system is public
Country A	80%	AIMS	Yes
Country B	34%	Excel-based	Yes
Country C	95%	FMS	No
Country D	20%	None	No
...
Country n	90%	IFMIS	Yes

ANNEX I. METHODOLOGY FOR INDICATOR 4B

1. PROPOSED QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Transparency of development co-operation information at country level

Q1. Please provide a complete list of bilateral and multilateral development partners working in the country, and mark whether any information on their development co-operation has been reported through your country's management information system, or equivalent system:

Development Partners: Name of Organisation or Agency	Is information on this partner's programme available in the country's management information system
Development Partner 1	Yes
Development Partner 2	No
...	...
Development Partner n	Yes

Q2. Please indicate the management information system(s) the government uses to collect information on development co-operation:

- Public Financial Management Information System (FMIS)
- Aid Information Management System (AIMS)
- Debt Management System (DMS)
- Excel based or similar
- No government system for this purpose (e.g. only bilateral exchanges on demand)
- Others – *please specify* _____

Q3. Is the information included in this system(s) publicly available? [Yes/no]

If yes, please provide the link _____

Q4. For most of your development partners, please indicate the type(s) of information generally collected and the average frequency of reporting:

Most of your development partners report...	
<i>These types of information:</i>	<i>On this average frequency:</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> Commitments	<input type="checkbox"/> Weekly or daily
<input type="checkbox"/> Scheduled disbursement	<input type="checkbox"/> Every month
<input type="checkbox"/> Disbursement	<input type="checkbox"/> Every 3 months
<input type="checkbox"/> Expenditure	<input type="checkbox"/> Every 6 months
<input type="checkbox"/> Intended Results	<input type="checkbox"/> Yearly
<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved Results	<input type="checkbox"/> Less frequent than every year

B. Optional questions to inform further refinement of the indicator

Q1. What types of development finance flows are covered by this system?

- Official Development Finance (ODA)
- Non-concessional loans
- Grants
- South-South and/or Triangular Co-operation
- Technical development co-operation
- Foreign Direct Investment
- Remittances
- Blended Finance or other impact investment vehicle
- Other – *please specify* _____

Q2. How is the accuracy of the information included in this system verified?

[Open ended question]

Q3. How is the information included in this system used by the national government?

[Open ended question]

REFERENCES

- GPEDC (2011). *Busan Partnership Agreement*. Busan: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation; Available at http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/OUTCOME_DOCUMENT_-_FINAL_EN2.pdf
- GPEDC (2015). *Monitoring Guide 2015-2016. Technical Note*. Paris/New York: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. Available at <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/2015-2016-GPEDC-Monitoring-Guide.pdf>
- GPEDC (2016a). *Nairobi Outcome Document*. Nairobi: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation: Paris/New York. Available at <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/OutcomeDocumentEnglish.pdf>
- GPEDC (2016b). *A GPEDC monitoring framework fit for purpose: Delivering effective development cooperation in support of Agenda 2030*. Paris/New York: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. Available at <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/MAG-Final-Report.pdf>
- GPEDC (2016c). *Assessing the Current Indicator Framework: A compendium of MAG advice on the ten indicators*. Paris/New York: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. Available at <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Assessing-the-Current-Indicator-Framework-Annex-Six.pdf>
- GPEDC (2017a). *The Global Partnership Monitoring Framework for 2030 - Concept Note*. Technical note 1. Paris/New York: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. Available at <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Concept-note-Global-Partnership-Monitoring-Framework-2030.pdf>
- Publish What You Fund. 2016. *Aid Transparency Index 2016*. London
- Renzio, P. & Simson, R. (2013). *Transparency for what? The usefulness of publicly available budget information in African countries*. London: ODI