

Appendix I. Summary of Feedback to Proposed Refinements to the Current Indicators¹

| INDICATOR 1A: DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS USE COUNTRY-LED RESULTS FRAMEWORKS | |
|--|---|
| Methodological proposal under consultation: Indicator 1a | |
| <p>SUMMARY</p> <p><i>Particular appreciation for the introduction of a strategic level assessment; overall reduced reporting burden; and possibility to provide an explanation for limited use of Country Results Frameworks.</i></p> <p><i>Suggestions below propose clarifying definitions, reporting process, and scope of projects being assessed. Some stakeholders also suggest reflecting inclusiveness issues and increasing understanding of the drivers of use of country results frameworks.</i></p> | |
| <p>CONTRIBUTORS: BELARUS, CANADA, CPDE, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, EL SALVADOR, EUROPEAN UNION, G7+, GERMANY, GPI ON RESULTS AND MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY, ITALY, ISLAMIC DEVELOPMENT BANK GROUP, KENYA, LAOS, MARSHALL ISLANDS, MONITORING ADVISORY GROUP'S CHAIR, NIGERIA, PAPUA NEW GUINEA, PHILIPPINES, PORTUGAL, SWEDEN, TIMOR-LESTE, UNDP, UNICEF, UNITED KINGDOM, UNITED STATES</p> | |
| KEY SUGGESTIONS | JST RESPONSE |
| Make space for the inclusion of complementary information on reasons for not using national results frameworks both at strategy and project level. | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> |
| Measure the presence of statistic systems for data collection in the country, availability of disaggregated data, and development partner's actions to strengthen them. | <i>This suggestion goes beyond agreed scope of indicator and would increase reporting burden.</i> <i>Readily available evidence will be facilitated (e.g. World Bank 'Statistical Capacity Index', Paris21 indexes and ODA statistics).</i> |
| Clarify the data collection and validation process (e.g. involvement of headquarters, government validation, risk of double counting, reporting regional interventions). | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> |
| Clarify reporting sample (criteria, modalities of development co-operation, definition of approved project). | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> |
| Remove step on agreement with government on which 6 intervention to report (no needed as guidance clearly states the selection criteria). | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> |
| Ensure relevance for fragile contexts. | <i>Ways to address this suggestion will be considered for subsequent monitoring rounds.</i> |
| Address issues of mutual assessment reviews at country level. | <i>This issue is addressed in indicator 7.</i> |
| Clarify definitions in the questionnaire (e.g. 'partnership frameworks', 'priority areas', 'jointly defined with government', 'indicators drawn from Country Result Frameworks'). | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> |
| Include whether there is a mechanism for costing national development plans and aligning ODA to resulting budgetary priorities. | <i>This issue is addressed in indicator 1b</i> |
| Clarify reasons for not including information on strategic level alignment in the numerical calculation of SDG 17.15. | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>For continuity, and as endorsed by the Inter-Agency</i> |

¹ The JST's proposals to address specific suggestions are aligned with the five overarching guidelines presented on page 1 of this document. Should the Steering Committee modify these guidelines, the JST will re-align its responses to specific suggestions with the agreed final guidelines.

| | |
|--|--|
| | <i>Group on SDGs, the quantitative score for SDG 17.15 builds on the assessment at project level, while the new strategy level assessment will provide context information to interpret the results.</i> |
| Financial management and systems strengthening is more accurate proxy to country ownership than alignment to national development plans. | <i>This issue is addressed in indicators 9a and 9b.</i> |
| Country results tied to political timelines and interests risk that development partners align to outdated or biased objectives and results indicators. | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>Methodology allows for reflecting alignment to short term government plans.</i> |
| The methodology only relies on technical approach rather than a political and multi-stakeholder approach. | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>The monitoring process includes a multistakeholder validation and discussion of the findings.</i> |
| The use of country sources of data to track progress depend on data availability and can penalise development partners that work in countries that lack statistical infrastructures. | <i>This issue is addressed in indicator 1b.</i> <i>Indicator 1b provides country context regarding availability of statistics.</i> |
| The use of country sources of data to track involvement of the government in evaluations depend on quality of government evaluation structure and can penalise development partners that work in countries with incipient structures to carry out evaluations. | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>In countries with limited capacity, at minimum governments can be consulted when development partners define the scope of evaluations.</i> |
| Assess inclusiveness of partnership frameworks. | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> |
| Add questions from Paris Declaration about whether development partners set out preferred modalities for delivering (budget support, sector wide programming). | <i>This issue is addressed in this indicator.</i> <i>Modalities are captured in reporting tool.</i> |
| Add questions from Paris Declaration about whether development partners plan joint missions with other development partners (including government and other country stakeholders). | <i>This suggestion goes beyond agreed scope of indicator and would increase reporting burden.</i> <i>Coordination costs to report and validate this new element would be too high.</i> |
| Reflect elements of inclusive accountability taking into account also the non-state actors. | <i>This suggestion will be addressed in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>This will be done without duplication with indicators 2 and 7.</i> |
| Undertake additional series of interviews in selected partner countries to collect complementary information to the questionnaire results. | <i>While relevant, this suggestion requires complementary analysis. Future Steering Committee meetings will guide prioritisation of this and similar requests.</i> |
| Analyse how development partners can balance between the need to articulate results reporting for corporate needs with the need to align to CRFs and jointly report on country-level results. | <i>This suggestion would require additional, complementary analysis. Future Steering Committee meetings will guide prioritisation of this and similar requests.</i> <i>A suggestion to address this issue has been made to the OECD results community.</i> |

INDICATOR 1B: COUNTRIES STRENGTHEN THEIR NATIONAL RESULTS FRAMEWORKS

Methodological proposal under consultation: [Indicator 1b](#)

SUMMARY

Particular appreciation for the refined proposal addressing the quality –not just existence– of national results frameworks, a simpler reporting approach, and the reference to country progress in taking up SDGs.

Suggestions below propose ways to clarify a common interpretation of terminology; examine coherence between different government planning tools and with the budget process; clarify the complementarities and interlinkages between this and other GPEDC indicators; reconsider the inclusiveness and transparency of national results frameworks; and reassess the approach to refer to SDG uptake by the country.

CONTRIBUTORS: BANGLADESH, CPDE, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, EL SALVADOR, EUROPEAN UNION, GERMANY, GPI ON RESULTS AND MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY, ITALY, KENYA, MONITORING ADVISORY GROUP'S CHAIR, PAPUA NEW GUINEA, PHILIPPINES, SWEDEN, TIMOR-LESTE, UNICEF, UNITED KINGDOM, UNITED STATES

| KEY SUGGESTIONS | JST RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| Assess the quality of national statistics office and monitoring and evaluation systems. | <i>This suggestion would increase reporting burden.</i> <i>Instead, readily-available data will be facilitated to complement the findings (e.g. World Bank 'Statistical Capacity Index', Paris21 indexes and ODA statistics).</i> |
| Measure the existence of a priority list or pipeline of investment projects to support the achievement of the country strategies and objectives. | <i>This issue is partially addressed in indicators 1b and 1a.</i> <i>Indicator 1b assesses whether results planning is costed and informs budgeting decisions. Indicator 1a looks at whether development partners approve projects in line with country priorities.</i> |
| Clarify definitions (e.g. 'participatory process', 'results frameworks', 'strategic plan'). | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> |
| Cross-reference score for building block 1 ('inclusive results frameworks') with indicator 2 ('space for CSO dialogue on national development policies') and adjust it to reflect inclusiveness or not. | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>Guidance will encourage cross-referencing responses for consistent country picture. Country profiles could discuss 'inclusiveness' transversally, bringing together evidence from multiple indicators.</i> |
| Complement current assessment of statistics for results reporting with a metric on the degree to which M&E systems are institutionalised within government. | <i>This suggestion would require additional, complementary analysis. Future Steering Committee meetings will guide prioritisation of this and similar requests.</i> |
| Assess planning-budget co-ordination as it increases the quality of Country Results Frameworks. | <i>This issue is partially addressed in the indicator.</i> <i>The indicator provides a light assessment on the extent to which planning informs budgeting.</i> |
| Ask question to determine number of SDG goals, indicators and targets incorporated or referenced. | <i>The suggestion goes beyond agreed scope of indicator and would increase reporting burden.</i> <i>Carrying out such assessment would entail a complete mapping of all indicators included in national results frameworks, and whether these align with the SDGs.</i> |
| In the context of SDGs, see if indicators identify horizontal issues (e.g. gender issues). | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> |
| SDG uptake by countries is not mandatory therefore should not affect the scoring. | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> |

| | |
|---|---|
| Separate sector strategies from sub-national strategies. | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> |
| Measure the share of priorities, targets and indicators in the national plan that were included in latest reporting. | <i>The suggestion would increase reporting burden.</i> <i>Defining the 'denominator' would require an exhaustive mapping of all priorities, targets, and indicators in countries with more than one, complementary strategic planning documents (e.g. when sector plans define the indicators and targets).</i> |
| Complement question on linkages between planning and budgeting with sub-question on whether priorities and targets are mentioned in the national budget. | <i>The suggestion goes beyond agreed scope of indicator and would increase reporting burden.</i> <i>This would require developing an approach to measure implementation of performance-based budgeting, which few participating countries have in practice.</i> |
| Scoring system does not reflect concerns for lack of inclusion. Not including civil society or parliament would still give a 70% score for setting up a national framework | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> |
| Clarify definition of Country Results Frameworks to avoid different interpretations | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> |
| Ambitious data collection requires high capacity. The questionnaire could be simplified by reducing number of questions | <i>While in general the refinements aim at reducing reporting burden, in this case they respond to stakeholders' requests to ensure relevance.</i> <i>Country testing confirmed that the questionnaire is easy to answer accurately on the spot in a variety of country contexts, including in fragile situations.</i> |
| Consider different sources of information other than internet to assess the transparency and availability of national plans (internet coverage differs by country and other sources may be usually used in some countries). | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>National results frameworks need to be easily accessible to all actors that commit to use them (including development partners), but 'hard copy only' would not qualify as a transparent and accessible framework.</i> |
| Assess country development co-operation policy if not yet covered by other indicators and about linkages with indicator 7 and 2 on transparency and inclusiveness. | <i>The first issue is addressed in indicator 7.</i> <i>The second issue is addressed in the referred indicators.</i> <i>Relevant evidence from these indicators will be included in discussing the results for this indicator.</i> |
| Methodology does not establish how countries can evaluate progress in using national mechanisms by development partners. | <i>This issue is addressed in indicator 1a.</i> |

INDICATOR 2: CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS OPERATE WITHIN AN ENVIRONMENT THAT MAXIMISES THEIR ENGAGEMENT IN AND CONTRIBUTION TO DEVELOPMENT

Methodological proposal under consultation: [Indicator 2](#)

SUMMARY

Particular appreciation for new scale system that simplifies the reporting process, permits nuanced view on civil society participation, allows for tracking incremental progress and cross-country comparability, and for the inclusion of direct link with SDGs.

Suggestions below propose clarifying definitions and adjusting the language in the questionnaire to reflect specific issues. Some contributors propose solutions to address the limitation of the reporting process in terms of neutrality and inclusivity. Others suggest the inclusion or removal of specific questions.

CONTRIBUTORS: BANGLADESH, BELARUS, BURUNDI, CPDE, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, EL SALVADOR, EUROPEAN UNION, G7+, GAMBIA, GERMANY, ISLAMIC DEVELOPMENT BANK GROUP, ITALY, KENYA, LAOS, LIBERIA, MONITORING ADVISORY GROUP'S CHAIR, NIGERIA, OXFAM, SWEDEN, SWITZERLAND, TASK TEAM ON CSO DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVENESS AND ENABLING ENVIRONMENT, TOGO, UNDP, UNICEF, UNITED KINGDOM, UNITED STATES.

KEY SUGGESTIONS

JST RESPONSE

Allow for complementary comments to the questions to clarify any additional issues that are not reflected in the pre-defined levels.

This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.
Additional comments will be allowed in the reporting tool.

To ensure neutrality and inclusivity of the multi-stakeholder dialogue, the UN Special Rapporteur on Rights to Freedom of Assembly and Association could play a key role in overseeing data collection.

This suggestion goes beyond agreed scope of indicator.
The mandate of the UN Special Rapporteur is established by the Commission on Human Rights and assumed by the Human Rights Council. The involvement of the UN Special Rapporteur follows its own special procedure.

To enhance representation and inclusiveness of CSOs in the process, an intermediary could run the process allowing for anonymised results to be delivered to government. The government should then explain the reasons for not taking forward the consensus reached by CSOs.

This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.
The guide will encourage participating stakeholders to clarify the multi-stakeholder approach that they will adopt for reporting at the beginning of the exercise.

Allow diverging opinions (or multiple questionnaires) and reflect them in the report.

These suggestions will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.
The reporting tool will allow diverging answers for government, CSOs and development partners.

Adjust the wording of questions, better reflect specific issues in the current questionnaire, levels and/or characteristics of practices (e.g. issue of government-owned CSOs; CSOs accountability to the public and society; development partners enabling actions; bureaucratic obstructions and intimidations to CSOs action; transparency around the guidelines, decision, and criteria of decision making in the legal and regulatory decision environment).

These suggestions will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.
To the extent possible, the questionnaire will be reformulated to address these suggestions.

Clarify language in the questionnaire (e.g. 'financing CSOs', 'human rights based approach', difference between 'consultation' and 'dialogue').

These suggestions will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.

Focus the section on freedom of expression more directly on CSOs, given the focus of the indicator and module.

This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.

| | |
|---|---|
| Rename module 1 into 'Space for CSOs dialogue on national development policies' as it relates to CSO dialogue and not multi-stakeholder dialogue. | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> |
| Conflicting suggestions to remove/keep question about CSOs sharing of information on their development interventions with the public including with the government: - remove the question as it is already covered in the questionnaire (with some proposed adjustments to the language of existing questions); - keep the question as it responds to long-standing interest of country-level stakeholders (not sufficiently addressed by other questions). | <i>These suggestions will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>The JST will:</i> 1) <i>verify whether the questionnaire (or other indicators in the framework) sufficiently cover the issues;</i> 2) <i>if not, adjust the language of existing questions to ensure adequate coverage of the issue (pre-condition to remove the question);</i> 3) <i>if step 2 is not possible, keep the questions in the current questionnaire.</i> |
| Conflicting suggestions to remove/keep question about development partners sharing of information on their development interventions with the public including with the government: - remove the question as CSOs can be further disabled through public information on their funding arrangements; - keep the question with substantial revisions to reflect only if development partners make available information on their CSOs support through IATI; - keep the questions as development partners can use their discretion when making information about their CSO flows public so as not to put CSO recipient at risk. | |
| Include a question on development partners' funding modalities to support/work with CSOs. | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>The addition will depend on the possibility to remove another question in order not to increase the reporting burden.</i> |
| Assess the extent to which a healthy and diverse civil society is seen as contributing factor to SDG 16 by the government and by development partners. | <i>This suggestion goes beyond agreed scope of indicator and would increase reporting burden.</i> <i>Other indicators (1a, 1b and 7) provide contextual indications on the matter.</i> |
| Complement the assessment with in-depth desk review to incorporate accurate and independent feedback from civic actors and organisations. | <i>This suggestion would require additional, complementary analysis. Future Steering Committee meetings will guide prioritisation of this and similar requests.</i> <i>Contextual data sourced from existing global indicators will be provided in the reporting tool to facilitate the multistakeholder dialogue. The report will also refer to other relevant research.</i> |
| Assess development partners' individual progress toward their commitments through a comparable quantitative indicator. | <i>This suggestion would increase reporting burden and requires complementary analysis. Future Steering Committee meetings will guide prioritisation of this and similar requests.</i> |
| Define CSOs as including trade unions and foundations. | <i>These suggestions will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>Guidance will suggest the CSO focal point(s) to consider consulting trade unions and foundations where relevant to country context.</i> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Ensure that the scoring method does not lead to misleading results.</p> | <p><i>These suggestions will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>The scoring method will be adjusted to ensure that scores in all modules are adequately accounted in the definition of the final category.</i></p> |
| <p>Ensure more SDG-related language referring to CSOs commitment on SDGs' achievement.</p> | <p><i>These suggestions will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>More SDG language beyond the questionnaire is already reflected in the characteristics of practice.</i></p> |
| <p>Reduce number of questions by prioritising different issues.</p> | <p><i>While in general the refinements aim at reducing reporting burden, in this case they respond to stakeholders' requests to ensure relevance.</i></p> |

| INDICATOR 3: QUALITY OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE DIALOGUE (PPD) | |
|--|---|
| Methodological proposal under consultation: Indicator 3 | |
| SUMMARY | |
| <p>Most contributors appreciate the continued focus on Public-Private Dialogue and consider the elements covered as relevant. They also welcome the concise questionnaire.</p> <p>Suggestions below propose clarifying definitions, reporting process, and the scope of questions. Some stakeholders also suggest ways define inclusive PPD recording the participation of other social actors, not just SMEs. Several contributors acknowledge that public-private dialogue does not fully cover the general commitment to maximise private sector contribution to sustainable development. Future monitoring could expand the scope in that direction.</p> | |
| CONTRIBUTORS: BANGLADESH, CAMEROON, CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL PRIVATE ENTERPRISE, CPDE, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, EL SALVADOR, EUROPEAN UNION, EU-GUATEMALA, GABON, G7+, GERMAN DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE, GERMANY, KENYA, LAOS, MONITORING ADVISORY GROUP'S CHAIR, NIGERIA, PAPUA NEW GUINEA, SWEDEN, TIMOR-LESTE, TRADE UNIONS, UNDP, WORLD BANK | |
| KEY SUGGESTIONS | JST RESPONSE |
| Clarify some concepts and definitions (e.g. 'PPD', 'shared value', 'trust'). Additional suggestions to rephrase question wording for clarity. | <i>These suggestions will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> |
| Clarify rationale for list of issues covered in public-private dialogues. Provide further guidance on which initiatives should be considered and how this links with the module on quality of PPD. | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>The issues for PPD discussion listed in module 1 link with SDG targets for which private sector action is required. Guidance will clarify that responses to module 2 on average quality of PPDs refers to PPD initiatives that are discussing the selected issues.</i> |
| Add additional issues to the list of issues covered in public-private dialogues (e.g. health, gender equality, illicit financial flows, limited disclosure policies regarding development results). | <i>This issue is addressed in this indicator.</i> <i>The issues for PPD discussion listed in module 1 link with SDG targets for which private sector action is needed. Nevertheless, the indicator also allows for the inclusion of additional sector or thematic issues as relevant to each country context.</i> |
| Broaden the definition of inclusive dialogue to go beyond SME participation in the dialogue (including: who 'relevant actors' refer to; whether these include trade unions, other social actors, and/or foundations; separate trade unions from cooperatives; include the entirety of socio-economic partners involved in social dialogue and in the policy-making environment). (Q3) | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>The guidance will clarify the roles and responsibilities of participants, and fine-tune the definition of inclusive dialogue, while carefully avoiding burdening the multi-stakeholder process.</i> |
| Assess the extent to which issues addressed are relevant in producing development results and not only in terms of addressing issues of concern to both sides (not always synonymous). (Q4) | <i>This suggestion goes beyond agreed scope of indicator and would increase reporting burden.</i> <i>The guidance will be strengthened to ensure that the response to module 1 (which deals with whether issues being discussed are relevant for development results) informs the answers to this question on whether dialogue is balanced or one-sided.</i> |
| Results are addressed in both questions 5 and 6. Need to make better distinction between them. Better not to conflate organisation or process with results. | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>Guidance and wording will clarify that, for question 5, we refer to [results-oriented] organisational effectiveness, while question 6 explores whether PPDs drive greater joint action and achieve actual results.</i> |
| Assess how PPD is contributing to National Development Plans. | <i>This issue is now addressed in this indicator and in 1b.</i> <i>The indicator explores the extent to which PPDs help shape public policies in practice. In response to this consultation, indicator 1b will consider whether private sector actors are consulted in developing the national development plans and strategies.</i> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Questions do not assess alignment of private sector to National Development Agenda and SDGs. | <p><i>This suggestion goes beyond agreed scope of indicator and would increase reporting burden.</i></p> <p><i>GPEDC monitoring focuses on effectiveness of development cooperation. This issue goes beyond our focus. Nevertheless, current GPEDC work stream exploring guidelines for effective private sector engagement through development co-operation may help inform a module on this matter.</i></p> |
| Some descriptions of levels are too generic and easily contentious. | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Language in questionnaire will be refined to increase candour and accuracy in responses.</i></p> |
| Measure the frequency of PPD meetings. | <p><i>This issue is addressed in this indicator.</i></p> <p><i>Regularity of meetings is covered in question 5.</i></p> |
| Allow respondents to provide further information and clarification on their answers using a comments box. | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> |
| Consider assessing which sector ministries are more able to engage with the private sector to reflect challenge of coordination between ministries. | <p><i>This suggestion goes beyond agreed scope of indicator and would increase reporting burden.</i></p> |
| Clarify on what basis focal points are invited and what experience is needed. | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> |
| Differentiate between the domestic private sector and local subsidiaries of multi-national enterprises. | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> |
| Add a separate indicator focusing on the distinct roles of foundations as development actors and their practices relative to the four Busan principles. | <p><i>Ways to address this suggestion will be considered for subsequent monitoring rounds.</i></p> <p><i>This issue is partially addressed in this indicator.</i></p> <p><i>Inclusiveness of PPD is covered in question 5.</i></p> |
| Several suggestions to assess commitments by the private sector as stated in the Nairobi Outcome Document; broaden the focus of the indicator to include other related issues (such as impact of private sector value chains, compliance with labour and environmental standards, blended finance, among others); and assess the contribution of private sector and foundations to development in coherence with development effectiveness principles. | <p><i>Ways to address this suggestion will be considered for subsequent monitoring rounds.</i></p> <p><i>This suggestion would require additional, complementary analysis. Future Steering Committee meetings will guide prioritisation of this and similar requests.</i></p> <p><i>Ongoing GPEDC work stream on private sector engagement through development co-operation will set the foundations to develop a monitoring approach.</i></p> |
| Include issues such as strengthening local democratic ownership and country policy space in the context of different realities of external private sector investments and their dialogue with government. | <p><i>Ways to address this suggestion will be considered for subsequent monitoring rounds.</i></p> |
| Find out number of private sector companies who invested in the country as an indication of development. | <p><i>This suggestion goes beyond agreed scope of indicator and would increase reporting burden.</i></p> |
| Clarify how the results obtained are representative of the realities in each country. | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Guidance will clarify how to report in the indicator in ways that approach a representative picture of reality in the country. Complementary research could be considered by Steering Committee to deepen the understanding of private sector engagement as a contributor towards sustainable development.</i></p> |

INDICATOR 7: MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY AMONG DEVELOPMENT ACTORS IS STRENGTHENED THROUGH INCLUSIVE REVIEWS

Methodological proposal under consultation: [Indicator 7](#)

SUMMARY

This indicator is recognised as a key element of the Global Partnership monitoring exercise. Particular support for the increased nuance added, reflecting complex development co-operation realities, and therefore deepening the relevance and usefulness of the indicator, while remaining comparable.

Feedback relates to strengthening linkages with other global processes, collecting more comprehensive information, further reflecting the differentiated roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders, clarifying definitions and easing the data collection process.

CONTRIBUTORS: BANGLADESH, CSO PARTNERSHIP FOR DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVENESS, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, EL SALVADOR, EUROPEAN UNION, G7+, GERMANY, INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION, KENYA, LAOS, LIBERIA, MONITORING ADVISORY GROUP CHAIR, PAPUA NEW GUINEA, PHILIPPINES, SWEDEN, UNDP, UNICEF, UNITED KINGDOM, UNITED STATES

KEY SUGGESTIONS

JST RESPONSE

Complementarity and duplication exists between the indicator and the Development Cooperation Forum Mutual Accountability Survey. Suggest simplifying the Global Partnership framework/process by using this existing data source.

The additional elements included in the revised methodology respond to stakeholders' requests to ensure relevance. While one of the overall aims of the refinement process is to reduce the reporting burden, in this case, these elements are considered necessary.

The Global Partnership monitoring emphasizes an inclusive country-level process of data collection, review, validation and dialogue. The monitoring process itself facilitates evidence-based policy dialogue among different stakeholder groups and the results and analysis informs decision-making. Mutual Accountability Survey responses are confidential due to a request made to UNDESA by Member States. Countries participating in the survey are encouraged to draw on their existing responses, and to inform country-specific, inclusive and evidence-based dialogue on mutual accountability issues.

Additional qualitative information should be collected related to specific country context and challenges in order to better understand how to strengthen mutual accountability going forward. This may include collecting information on coordination used to support mutual accountability frameworks, including, if possible, an assessment of the quality of these systems.

This issue is partially addressed in this indicator. This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.

Further space (comments box) will be provided for respondents who would like to elaborate on specific challenges. Supporting guidance will point to coordination mechanisms as a key area that may be helpful to address in these responses.

Under the element on the existence of a mutual accountability framework, include a question on whether this framework includes requirements for joint evaluation.

This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.

This will be reflected in question 3 under level 4 (i.e. high-quality joint reviews could also include joint evaluations).

Stronger linkages with other Global Partnership indicators are required, including, for example, how development co-operation frameworks relate to national development strategies.

This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.

| | |
|---|---|
| Define the concepts of 'cooperation framework' and 'partnership framework' to ensure consistency and comparability across country results. | <i>These suggestions will be addressed in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> |
| Remove the concept of 'collective accountability' as it does not reflect the multiple, reciprocal commitments made by various stakeholders in the Nairobi Outcome Document (NOD). | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> |
| Collect information on development partners' experiences with engaging in coordination systems and other mechanisms used to support the implementation of mutual accountability frameworks. | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>A light, optional approach to collate that complementary information on development partners' perspectives on country-level coordination mechanisms will be devised.</i> |
| Proposed scales and characteristics of practice should better reflect the dynamic roles played by different development stakeholders in the process of national development planning. | <i>This issue is partially addressed in indicator 1b.</i> |
| Include sub-national governments as a possible stakeholder group to be included in national mutual accountability frameworks and systems. | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> |
| Further clarify the distinction between scale levels. | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> |

INDICATOR 8: COUNTRIES HAVE TRANSPARENT SYSTEMS TO TRACK PUBLIC ALLOCATIONS FOR GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT

Methodological proposal under consultation: [Indicator 8](#)

SUMMARY

Particular support for the substantive refinements made to strengthen the relevance and comprehensiveness of the indicator, capturing the realities of gender-based budgeting processes; the rigour of the questionnaire; and the comprehensive list of definitions. Appreciation of the indicator as the source of evidence for SDG indicator 5.c.1 and its recent reclassification to a tier 2 indicator.

Feedback relates to including additional elements in the methodology to further capture nuances in gender-based budgeting processes across countries, clarifying concepts and definitions and providing additional support during the monitoring process.

CONTRIBUTORS: BANGLADESH, CAMEROON, CANADA, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, EL SALVADOR, EUROPEAN UNION, GERMANY, GLOBAL FUND FOR WOMEN, KENYA, MONITORING ADVISORY GROUP'S CHAIR, NIGERIA, SWEDEN, UNDP, UNICEF, UNITED STATES

| KEY SUGGESTIONS | JST RESPONSE |
|--|---|
| <p>The binary (yes/no) questions are not sufficient to capture the complexity and challenges of gender-based budgeting processes under different country contexts. Collection of qualitative information is requested to allow for identification of challenges in making and tracking gender equality and women's empowerment budget allocations.</p> | <p><i>This issue is addressed in this indicator.</i> <i>The proposed methodology generates qualitative information linked to each criterion. This information provides concrete examples of current policies, practices and challenges. This can be used to inform discussions at country level, and help understanding the challenges of gender-based budgeting processes.</i></p> |
| <p>There is interest for more granularity in the three-tier country classification system, especially for the 'approaches requirements' criterion, which could apply to most participating countries without a disaggregated indication of country performance.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>Disaggregated country information per question and per criterion is available to inform country performance and discussion of results.</i></p> |
| <p>The methodology should include an assessment of the engagement of women's rights organisations in the gender-based budgeting process. For example, whether there is space for dialogue.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion goes beyond agreed scope of indicator and would increase reporting burden.</i></p> |
| <p>Clear and comprehensive definitions of key terms and concepts are required to ensure sound understanding of the questionnaire and how it contributes to reporting on SDG indicator 5.c.1.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> |
| <p>Women's rights organisations should be substantively engaged with the national coordinator in the data collection process.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>The monitoring guidance will encourage national coordinators to engage women's rights organisations in the monitoring process.</i></p> |
| <p>The questionnaire has become much more detailed and significantly increases reporting burden on partner countries.</p> | <p><i>The additional elements included in the revised methodology respond to stakeholders' requests to ensure relevance. While one of the overall aims of refinements is to reduce the reporting burden, in this case, these elements are considered necessary.</i></p> |
| <p>The link between the indicator and effectiveness is not clear in the proposal.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> |

| INDICATOR 9A: QUALITY OF COUNTRIES' PUBLIC FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS | |
|--|--|
| Methodological proposal under consultation: Indicator 9a | |
| <p>SUMMARY</p> <p><i>The proposal to use the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) methodology to measure the strength of a country's public financial management (PFM) systems rather than the Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) methodology is welcomed. The selected PEFA dimensions accurately represent the core aspects of PFM systems to be assessed.</i></p> <p><i>Feedback relates to the method to arrive at an aggregate score and the responsibility for this process, comparability of the 2011 and 2016 PEFA methodology, use of the questionnaire for countries that do not have recent PEFA reports publically available, comparability across countries that have completed PEFA assessments at different times and clarifications on definitions.</i></p> | |
| <p>CONTRIBUTORS: CAMEROON, CANADA, EL SALVADOR, EUROPEAN UNION, GERMANY, KENYA, MONITORING ADVISORY GROUP CHAIR, OPEN GOVERNMENT PARTNERSHIP, PAPUA NEW GUINEA, PEFA SECRETARIAT, SWEDEN, TIMOR-LESTE, UNICEF, UNITED KINGDOM, WORLD BANK</p> | |
| KEY SUGGESTIONS | JST RESPONSE |
| Improvement in 5 of 9 dimensions might be too ambitious of a target. Suggestions to address this include calculating the net change in dimension scores or using a points system to showcase the level of improvement or deterioration for each dimension, resulting in an overall score for a country. | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>It is proposed that the points' systems method be used. This method is similar to that used by the World Bank to inform the International Development Association (IDA) 18 replenishment.</i></p> |
| The link between selected PEFA dimensions and the aspects of PFM systems covered by CPIA-13 may not be necessary and it may make sense to select all PEFA dimensions for which a national government is responsible to ensure all aspects of PFM systems are included in the indicator assessment. | <p><i>This suggestion would increase reporting burden.</i></p> <p><i>Given that some countries may not have recently completed PEFA reports available and will therefore use the questionnaire, it will not be feasible to significantly expand the number of dimensions assessed.</i></p> |
| Under the dimension on budget classification, additional information should be collected related to partners' efforts to align co-operation classifications to international budget classification standards to promote better integration and interoperability between partner and country systems. | <p><i>This suggestion goes beyond the agreed scope of the indicator and would increase reporting burden.</i></p> <p><i>This is an important issue but may not be best captured under indicator 9a.</i></p> |
| Add additional information to indicate where dimensions are directly comparable and where comparability is indirect, direct but with additional requirements or non-existent. | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Further clarification related to level of comparability will be provided. For those dimensions for which a comparison is not possible, no trend will be given and this dimension will be omitted from the final calculation of the indicator score. As all future PEFA assessments will use the 2016 methodology, this issue will be assuaged over time.</i></p> |
| It is important that the same process, definitions and guidance used by the PEFA Secretariat in undertaking full PEFA assessments be used to ensure consistency in scores for countries using the questionnaire rather than a completed PEFA report. | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Relevant PEFA assessment definitions and guidance will be provided for countries using the questionnaire.</i></p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>The process and responsibility for reviewing PEFA scores and assessing whether overall improvement has been achieved should be clarified in the document.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be addressed in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> |
| <p>A clear reference to the timeliness of the publication of information should be included with references to the dimension on public access to fiscal information to be consistent with the PEFA methodology.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> |
| <p>While procurement and external audit are included in the selected dimensions, they are not included in the narrative description of core aspects of PFM systems.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> |
| <p>Remove the description of the indicator that is included in some cases alongside the description of the dimension in Annex II.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> |
| <p>Clarify how the indicator would be assessed if no PEFA assessments had been completed.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Further clarification on the use of the questionnaire for countries that have not recently completed PEFA assessments will be provided.</i></p> |
| <p>Clarify how the questionnaire provided will be comparable with PEFA assessment scores.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>The questionnaire is the same as is used for collection of data for the relevant PEFA dimensions.</i></p> |
| <p>For countries that have not recently completed a PEFA assessment, a country's CPIA score, or another recognised assessment, should be used for the indicator assessment, alongside the questionnaire.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion would increase reporting burden.</i></p> <p><i>It is recommended that only one assessment be used to determine the overall score for the indicator to ensure consistency and comparability.</i></p> |
| <p>PEFA assessments do not take place in all countries or on a regular basis, meaning that comparability of results may be an issue. This challenge may necessitate an extension of the monitoring process.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>It will be further clarified that because of the significant time required to show meaningful change through PFM reforms, it will still be possible to show an overall trend in strengthening of country systems even if not all countries are reporting on improvements made in the same 3-5 year timespan. Further, countries will have the opportunity to update relevant PEFA dimension scores using the questionnaire.</i></p> |

FEEDBACK RECEIVED ON INDICATORS (4, 5A, 5B, 6, 9B, 10) WITH UNCHANGED METHODOLOGIES

| FEEDBACK ON APPROACH TO COMPLEMENT THE REST OF INDICATORS (4, 5A, 5B, 6, 9B, 10) | |
|--|---|
| Proposal under consultation: Other refinements | |
| <p>SUMMARY</p> <p><i>The methodology for indicator 4 (transparency) remains unchanged. Support was received for collecting complementary information at country level for indicator 4, as access to information on development co-operation is vital for governments to effectively plan and allocate resources and the information included in global systems, for various reasons, has been noted as often not easily accessible and usable for country governments. This will allow for data on development to be cross-referenced.</i></p> <p><i>The methodologies for indicators 5a&5b (predictability) remain unchanged. Some diverging views were expressed between moving to coverage beyond official development assistance to not adding to this indicator.</i></p> <p><i>The methodology for indicator 6 (aid on budget) remains unchanged. Support was expressed for the strengthened guidance to facilitate reporting on indicator 6 and for using secondary sources of data to provide context (e.g. quality of parliamentary oversight).</i></p> <p><i>The methodology for indicator 9b (use of country systems) remains unchanged. Several of the comments received focussed on how this indicator could be slightly adjusted to better reflect development partners that engage in countries with weak PFM systems.</i></p> <p><i>The methodology for indicator 10 (untied aid) remains unchanged. There were several requests to include complementary information on the quality of local procurement system (already captured in the revised indicator 9a), the impact of using private sector instruments and the impact of channelling development co-operation to the country bypassing the government (e.g. to/through private sector firms, for-profit NGOs, CSOs) .</i></p> | |
| <p>CONTRIBUTORS: BELARUS, CANADA, CPDE, EURODAD, EUROPEAN UNION, GERMANY, IATI, KENYA, JAPAN, LAOS, LIBERIA, MEXICO, MONITORING ADVISORY GROUP’S CHAIR, PHILIPPINES, PORTUGAL, SUDAN, SWEDEN, UNITED STATES</p> | |
| INDICATOR 4: INFORMATION ON DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION IS PUBLICLY AVAILABLE | |
| KEY SUGGESTIONS | JST RESPONSE |
| Clarification needed on how the proposed complementary information generated at country level will affect indicator 4 scoring. | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>The evidence will not affect indicator 4 scoring but highlight gaps in ensuring that information reaches its users (demand side).</i></p> |
| The complementary information could also track partner country governments’ efforts to improve their information management systems (whether they are public, compatible with IATI data etc.) and to capture information published by development partners. | <p><i>Ways to address this suggestion will be considered for subsequent monitoring rounds.</i></p> <p><i>Nevertheless, optional questions covering some of these issues are included in the current proposal.</i></p> |
| The complementary information does not address country level availability of aid information accessible to development actors outside of government. | <p><i>The suggestion is addressed in the proposal.</i></p> <p><i>Q3 asks whether the information management systems is publicly available, also requiring to add the electronic link if so. Indicator 2 also covers this issue. Future iterations might consider the quality, comprehensiveness and accessibility of such information.</i></p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>An open question to both providers and partner countries regarding available tools at country level could be useful.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion would increase reporting burden.</i> <i>The complementary information already captures actual behaviour of development partners and governments in using aid management systems (or similar systems) to collate and disclose all available information at country level (in locally understood language), according to the Busan criteria (comprehensive, timely and forward-looking data). Countries also highlight what is the information management system they rely upon for this purpose (whether an AIMS or something different).</i></p> |
| <p>For the complementary information, disaggregate questions 1 to 3 by system (e.g. FMIS, AIMS, DMS) so the partner government can indicate which development partner is captured in which system.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>Questions 1 to 3 will be integrated/simplified into a single question covering these issues.</i></p> |
| <p>For the complementary information in question 4, it is unclear which 'type of information' would correspond to the selected 'average frequency' if there are multiple responses selected. This question could be limited to AIMS.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>Guidance will clarify that the two elements 'type of information' and 'average frequency' should be assessed independently, reporting on the average behaviour of <u>most development partners</u>, even if there are top performers. AIMS alone would not cover some country realities (e.g. middle income countries, SIDS).</i></p> |
| <p>The proposed methodology for complementary information does not consider the source of data (IATI, DAC CRS/FSS or other). It would be helpful to specify the data source.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>The team will consider the possibility to reflect that element in the optional questions, to allow for better linkage with indicator 4 and policy implications of the results.</i></p> |
| <p>The proposed methodology for complementary information requires partner countries to list the total number of development partners in their country manually when this could be drawn from IATI.</p> | <p><i>This issue is addressed in the monitoring reporting tool.</i> <i>In launching the monitoring round, national coordinators are asked to select the names of all their development partners. This information is automatically reflected in several other indicators, to reduce reporting burden. Unfortunately, IATI does not include all potential development partners yet (e.g. China).</i></p> |
| <p>The draft questionnaire for the complementary information to partner countries is too detailed and will complicate the process further.</p> | <p><i>The additional elements included in the revised methodology respond to stakeholders' requests to ensure relevance. While one of the overall aims of refinements is to reduce the reporting burden, in this case, these elements are in high demand.</i> <i>Country testing has shown that partner country governments strongly support including this complementary question, and that they are willing and able to report on it. Nevertheless, the JST will remain flexible and supportive to account for uneven country capacities.</i></p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>The complementary information, which includes both financial and results information, seems to go beyond the scope of the Busan commitment on transparency, and suggests that a donor country is only transparent if it discloses ODA information on the supply side in addition to the demand side (included in partner country systems).</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>The guidance will clarify that the complementary information responds to development partners’ commitments in the Nairobi Outcome document and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. Feedback at country level (both from governments and non-state actors) indicates that while development partners may report at global level, this information does not flow at country level. Partner countries have expressed difficulty in accessing these global repositories of data due to capacity constraints and technical and language barriers. Nonetheless, this complementary information only contextualises, but does not change, the results of GPEDC indicator 4 on global transparency.</i></p> |
| <p>Draw on existing lessons from IATI country pilots and efforts by DFID and the Netherlands to promote transparency.</p> | <p><i>Ways to address this suggestion will be considered for subsequent monitoring rounds.</i></p> |
| <p>The current indicator 4 (<i>global transparency</i>) should focus on the quality of available information, a balanced approach between the three dimensions of the indicator (timeliness, comprehensiveness, and forward looking information), and recognising gradual implementation by different development partners.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion is partly addressed in the methodology. This suggestion however would require additional, complementary analysis. Future Steering Committee meetings will guide prioritisation of this.</i></p> <p><i>The quality dimension is currently addressed independently by OECD-DAC and IATI bodies. GPEDC reporting on this indicator will be disaggregated to show the underlying sub dimensions for the scores and existing trade-offs (e.g. quality, comprehensiveness vs timeliness).</i></p> |
| <p>The current indicator 4 is too ‘ODA-centric’, and meeting the timeframes are difficult for countries with a sub-national, fragmented aid sector.</p> | <p><i>Ways to address this suggestion will be considered for subsequent monitoring rounds.</i></p> <p><i>At the moment, indicator 4 covers transparency issues of both Official Development Assistance and non-concessional official funding (in OECD classification, ‘other official flows’). As broader measures of development finance are internationally agreed, this indicator may evolve to stay relevant. Country testing also revealed that a whole-of-government picture of both national and subnational development co-operation is a challenge for both development partners and partner countries. This will require further analysis.</i></p> |
| <p>INDICATOR 5A & 5B: DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION IS PREDICTABLE: ANNUAL AND MEDIUM-TERM PREDICTABILITY</p> | |
| <p>Make the information used by partner countries to compare more open and transparent donors in the report.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Interlinkages between GPEDC indicators will be presented in the report to tell a comprehensive story on the transparency and other principles.</i></p> |
| <p>Coverage beyond traditional forms of ODA should go beyond sovereign loans to cover other instruments, such as private sector instruments.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion would require additional, complementary analysis. Future Steering Committee meetings will guide prioritisation of this and similar requests.</i></p> <p><i>GPEDC work stream assessing private sector engagement through development cooperation could inform the development of a monitoring approach.</i></p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| Clarification needed on how 'mapping current policies and practices related to making development co-operation more predictable' would be done. | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> Complementary research will provide a basis to explore the drivers of predictability. |
| No further data collection is needed through complementary questions to avoid overloading the monitoring framework. | <i>The indicator methodologies will not be changed.</i> No complementary questions at country level are anticipated. |
| INDICATOR 6: DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION IS INCLUDED IN BUDGETS SUBJECTED TO PARLIAMENTARY OVERSIGHT | |
| Include sub-national parliamentary approval. | <i>This suggestion would increase reporting burden.</i> <i>While relevant, the suggestion would raise coordination and data mapping costs. Alternatively, JST could provide existing contextual indicators on multilevel governance arrangements in participating countries (e.g. from Polity IV database).</i> |
| Include other mechanisms (e.g. government budget, gazettes) so this indicator can better reflect when this information is reported through other means and is publically available. | <i>This issue is addressed in indicator 6 and in the complementary information proposed for indicator 4.</i> |
| If OECD DAC has data on the share of support given to sub-national public entities, it should be included somehow. | <i>This suggestion goes beyond agreed scope of indicator and would increase reporting burden.</i> <i>GPEDC monitoring and the OECD DAC Creditor Reporting System use incompatible approaches (recipient vs provider perspective; different reference fiscal year for reported data).</i> |
| Include information on the possibilities or challenges for the inclusion of technical cooperation in the reporting task. | <i>This suggestion would require additional, complementary analysis. Future Steering Committee meetings will guide prioritisation of this and similar requests.</i> |
| Data collection and validation of bilateral support that is channelled through multilateral agencies may cause double counting or reporting differences, which is problematic for development co-operation included in the budget. | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>Clear guidance to avoid double counting will be set out in the monitoring tools and guidance.</i> |
| INDICATOR 9B: DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS USE COUNTRIES' OWN PUBLIC FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS TO IMPLEMENT THEIR CO-OPERATION PROGRAMMES WITH PARTNER GOVERNMENTS | |
| Clarify more clearly that 'on-budget' is not equal to 'on-treasury'. | <i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i> <i>Indicator 9b does not report whether funds are 'on-budget' but whether they were disbursed relying on recipient countries' own budgetary norms and systems for expenditure management, as opposed to development partner's own corporate policies (e.g. separate bank account, authorisation process for expenditures).</i> |
| Include the development partner's overall performance on procurement, and the amount of procurement contracts won by firms based in the recipient country either directly by the provider or through recipient country systems, broken down by type of modality. This would support indicators 3, 4 and 10. | <i>This suggestion would require additional, complementary analysis. Future Steering Committee meetings will guide prioritisation of this and similar requests.</i> <i>OECD already provides estimates on 'de facto' untied aid with that level of granularity in its statistics (Creditor Reporting System). Capturing that issue through GPEDC monitoring would increase the reporting burden unduly.</i> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>The indicator provides misleading or incomplete results for a development partner that works in countries with weak PFMs. It should reflect rather than penalize all development cooperation contexts, especially fragile or LDC countries, often with institutions and systems that require further capacity building in PFM before full use of PFM.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Country context information will accompany the reporting of results on use of country systems, as the commitments of strengthening and using country systems have always been intertwined.</i></p> |
| <p>Include an optional space for development partners to explain non-use of country systems, as well as a space for governments to include information on public financial management reform programmes.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>It is anticipated that this optional space is provided to help partners highlight their internal or external constraints to increase the use of country systems.</i></p> |
| <p>Providers that practice other modalities such as technical cooperation rather than budget support can be disadvantaged by this indicator. Not all developing co-operation must go through official financial and budget systems, some for legitimate reasons.</p> | <p><i>This issue is addressed in the indicator.</i></p> <p><i>The indicator only assesses whether development co-operation channelled through/to government uses country systems. It does not assess flows by-passing the government. Research and previous rounds show that many modalities of development cooperation beyond budget support (which is minimal) have used moderate to strong country systems, by refining their policies and country-level practices. The main obvious exception is in-kind technical cooperation.</i></p> |
| <p>Include monitoring of development partners' direct support to non-governmental organisations.</p> | <p><i>This issue is addressed in indicator 2.</i></p> |
| <p>Does not measure development activities that are being implemented to foster PFM in those countries, which is an important pre-condition to its use.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Space will be facilitated to allow development partners indicate whether they are providing capacity-building support to strengthen the government systems they are expected to use according to the Busan commitments.</i></p> |
| <p>Clarification needed on how 'information about the development partner's corporate policy regarding the use of country systems' would be provided.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion would require additional, complementary analysis. Future Steering Committee meetings will guide prioritisation of this and similar requests.</i></p> <p><i>Complementary research could guide partners in addressing this effectiveness commitment of the Paris/Busan 'unfinished business'.</i></p> |
| <p>INDICATOR 10: AID IS UNTIED</p> | |
| <p>While development partners might score well on this indicator, if a majority of aid is channelled through CSOs linked to the partner country, isn't this a form of tied aid as well? How can it be reformed to be credible towards partner countries and their citizens?</p> | <p><i>This suggestion would require additional, complementary analysis. Future Steering Committee meetings will guide prioritisation of this and similar requests.</i></p> <p><i>Current OECD estimates on 'de facto' untied aid focus on private firms from donor country. Capturing allocation issues between international and partner country CSOs requires reforming the current assessment of Untied Aid. A first step would require redefining the definition of untied aid at the OECD Development Assistance Committee.</i></p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Include a question to partner countries on their views related to tied aid as it may not reflect the results reported to OECD.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Partner countries will receive most recent disaggregated estimates on untied aid in the data reporting tool. An optional comment box can allow them to comment on the results. In the original methodology this was already offered, as additional country comments were allowed for all indicators.</i></p> |
| <p>Include data on the value of ODA contracts awarded to companies in donor countries to allow comparison of different development partners' performance and a counter-point to formal tying data.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion would require additional, complementary analysis. Future Steering Committee meetings will guide prioritisation of this and similar requests.</i></p> <p><i>This may require modifying the methodology to report on untied aid to the OECD Creditor Reporting System, which goes beyond GPEDC's mandate.</i></p> |
| <p>Collect complementary information to better understand untying aid quality and trends with regard to local procurement systems as weak local procurement systems affects commitments on untying aid.</p> | <p><i>This issue is addressed in indicator 9a.</i></p> <p><i>It includes a PEFA dimension assessing the quality of country procurement systems.</i></p> |
| <p>Include analysis on the use of private sector instruments and its possible impact on aid untying/ de facto tied aid.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion would require additional, complementary analysis. Future Steering Committee meetings will guide prioritisation of this and similar requests.</i></p> |
| <p>Make more prominent the definition of untied or tied aid in light of emerging various development financing modalities per country.</p> | <p><i>This suggestion will be incorporated in finalising the monitoring approach and guidance.</i></p> |