



**Global
Partnership**
for Effective Development
Co-operation

MEETING SUMMARY

Eighth meeting of the Global Partnership Steering Committee
3-4 September 2015, Mexico City

Contacts:

Ms. Teresita Kelly Lopez-Treussart, Tel: +33 1 45 24 19 79, email: teresitakelly.lopez-treussart@oecd.org

Mr. Derek Kilner, tel. +1-212-906-5742, email: derek.kilner@undp.org

MEETING SUMMARY

OPENING SESSION

1. Juan Manuel Valle Pereña, Mexican Agency for International Development Cooperation (AMEXCID), welcomed Steering Committee members noting that the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (GPEDC) has managed to firmly position itself in the Financing for Development Agenda, and will play a key role in the upcoming United Nations Summit for the adoption of the post-2015 development agenda (25-27 September). Mr Valle welcomed Japan as a new Steering Committee member, noting their role in spearheading GPEDC work on Middle Income Countries. Mexico announced a financial contribution to the Joint Support Team (JST) and warmly welcomed the leadership of the government of Kenya in the preparations for the second High Level Meeting (HLM2) of the GPEDC. Mexico, alongside the other Co-Chairs, will endeavour to support Kenya to ensure a successful HLM2 outcome.
2. Newby Kumwembe, Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development, Malawi, recalled strong progress including the GPEDC Planning Workshop (Brussels, 21-22 January), key side events hosted at the World Bank Spring Meetings (Washington D.C., 19 April), the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 agenda (New York, 20 April), and at the Financing for Development Conference (Addis Ababa, 14 July). The Co-Chairs and Joint Support Team met with Kenyan colleagues in Nairobi to start preparing the ground for HLM2 (18-19 July 2015), and look forward to working closely with Kenyan colleagues to ensure a successful meeting in 2016. The Co-Chairs and Joint Support Team have held regular videoconference calls at senior level on how to best take the GPEDC work forward. Mr Kumwembe suggested continuing efforts to strengthen the contribution of Global Partnership Initiatives (GPIs) and the monitoring framework, including through the work of the Monitoring Advisory Group. The second monitoring round will gather results on the behaviour of international development actors, and this will provide evidence and inputs for HLM2 in Kenya in 2016.
3. Jeroen Verheul, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands, suggested that the GPEDC reflect on whether it is achieving its aim of behaviour change and whether there is a gap between its ambition and what is delivered. He suggested that a collective sense of purpose and further collective action are needed from all members – “don’t ask what the JST and GPEDC can do for you but what you can do for the GPEDC.” He noted the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA), in addition to recognizing the contribution of the GPEDC, has given the UN Development Co-operation Forum (DCF) an important role in relation to development effectiveness, and efforts to strengthen complementarity between the processes should be continued.

SESSION 1: REVIEW OF PROGRESS AND STRATEGIC POSITIONING OF THE GPEDC’S ROLE IN SUPPORTING IMPLEMENTATION OF EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION COMMITMENTS (CHAIRD BY MEXICO)

4. This session assessed progress made and challenges faced by the GPEDC in turning effective development co-operation commitments into action on the ground. The Steering Committee agreed that much has been achieved so far and these achievements should be better captured and communicated to internal and external audiences.
5. The first area of progress is the increasing alignment of the GPEDC with the global development agenda. An important milestone was the recognition in the AAAA of the

importance of development effectiveness principles, as well as of the GPEDC as one of the “relevant forums” to pursue “efforts to improve the quality, impact and effectiveness of development cooperation and other international efforts in public finance” (AAAA, paragraph 58).

6. Second, there is a move towards changing behaviour in development co-operation. The presentations and discussion during this session provided examples of this progress:

- The multi-stakeholder nature of GPEDC has been embraced by many forums.
- The monitoring exercise has shown progress in implementing development effectiveness principles (for instance on ownership).
- Countries and organisations are aligning their policies and practices with development effectiveness principles and commitments. The advances made in and by middle-income countries, countries affected by conflict and fragility, civil society, and providers of development co-operation were highlighted through examples presented by Afghanistan, CPDE, Egypt, EC, Japan and the Philippines.

7. Going forward, the Steering Committee agreed that more should be done to promote behaviour change, mobilise political will, and position the GPEDC as one of the platforms for implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. These efforts should however be focused on the areas where the GPEDC can add value. Concrete suggestions included:

- Steering Committee members should lead by example, taking more action to implement development effectiveness principles (Mexico, USA, and UNDP). They should also further mobilise their own constituencies in this direction (G7+).
- The GPEDC should increase its country focus, using regional and country platforms to involve all stakeholders on the ground, promoting dialogue, co-ordination, coherent actions and mutual accountability (EC, IPU, Malawi, Philippines, ITUC, and UNDP). Members agreed to establish a working group to push this work forward.
- The GPEDC should continue to demonstrate how development effectiveness principles can be implemented (Malawi, Mexico, World Bank), particularly in support of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Malawi and UCLG/FOGAR put particular emphasis on ensuring ownership. Mexico and the World Bank highlighted the importance of monitoring for promoting progress.
- More coherence and synergies should be promoted across different GPEDC work streams, particularly between implementation – including GPIs – and monitoring (CPDE, World Bank).
- The GPEDC should become a knowledge hub: a network for mutual learning by exchanging ideas and policies in support of SDG implementation (Netherlands, Philippines, and DAC Chair).
- The GPEDC should focus on applying effectiveness principles in a few concrete areas (US, EU). The United States suggested a particular focus on domestic resource mobilisation, inclusive partnerships, co-operation with countries affected by conflict and fragility, and promoting transparency, areas where the GPEDC can deliver impact and demonstrate value. Priority areas will continue to be reviewed.

SESSION 2: GPEDC MONITORING FRAMEWORK (CHAIRIED BY THE NETHERLANDS)

8. The Chair opened the session by emphasising the importance of galvanising strong support for and participation in the monitoring framework from all Global Partnership stakeholders. The Netherlands welcomed the excellent progress made in strengthening the monitoring framework since the first High Level Meeting of the GPEDC, including through the effective establishment of the Monitoring Advisory Group.
9. The Joint Support Team invited Steering Committee members to endorse and provide feedback on: the proposed process and timeline for a strengthened second monitoring round; the proposed methodological approach to the four pilot indicators (Indicator 1 on use of country results frameworks, Indicator 2 on the civil society enabling environment, Indicator 3 on public-private dialogue, and Indicator 4 on transparency); and, the proposed approach to reviewing the monitoring framework and ensuring its relevance for post-2015 implementation and accountability efforts. Further work and consultation will be needed to ensure that the proposal on the transparency indicator reflects technical consensus to achieve its endorsement by Steering Committee members in early 2016. The presentation emphasised that the proposed streamlined process and timeline are expected to facilitate increased participation, a more manageable process, better data quality, and a greater use of results [see full presentation: [Towards a Strong Second Monitoring Round: 2015-2016](#)].
10. The JST then moved to outlining the proposed approach for reviewing the GPEDC monitoring framework to ensure its relevance to the post-2015 and Financing for Development (FFD) context which aims to strengthen the GPEDC monitoring framework as a whole by positioning it as an existing, complementary, ready-made platform to support both UN-led FFD follow-up and SDG implementation and mutual accountability efforts [*more specific details are found in Document 3: [Preparing for the Second Monitoring Round \(2015-16\)](#)*]. The JST concluded by inviting all Steering Committee members to actively support and participate in the second monitoring round, and to take advantage of this opportunity to help shape and contribute to strengthening the overall GPEDC monitoring framework.
11. Brian Tomlinson, Director of AidWatch Canada and member of the Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG), shared some insights and key messages from the discussions held at the first meeting of the Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG) (New York, 20-21 May). The first meeting of the MAG allowed members to familiarise themselves with the political complexities and technical challenges involved in undertaking work on the GPEDC monitoring framework. The MAG noted that the GPEDC Monitoring Framework has unique value as a country-driven and multi-stakeholder monitoring exercise. The MAG will continue to endeavour to keep an iterative and inclusive approach to engaging all relevant stakeholders, while providing advice on how to enhance the link between the monitoring process and behaviour change on the ground. Further efforts will be required to address the need for more capacity development at country level to match the ambition of a country-heavy approach.
12. Mr Tomlinson reminded committee members of the common and shared responsibility for advancing work on the monitoring process, and reiterated the MAG's commitment to providing expertise for technical review of the refined measurement approaches and methodologies of the four pilot indicators, including by helping build the necessary political buy-in for the second monitoring exercise to

ensure participation from both developing countries and providers. Further reflection and efforts will be needed to more clearly define what is expected of the monitoring focal points which are the key to facilitating engagement at the country level, as well as to improve accessibility to country level data through the GPEDC monitoring exercise [*more information on the MAG Work Plan is found in presentation and Document 4: [Monitoring Advisory Group Work Plan \(2015-2016\)](#)*]. At its upcoming meeting in Paris (28-29 September), the MAG will discuss the implementation of the second monitoring round, the overall direction for the second Progress Report, and how to ensure the monitoring framework's conceptual relevance to post-2015 SDG accountability efforts.

13. Steering Committee members praised the efforts made by the JST and MAG to advance and strengthen the GPEDC monitoring framework. Members emphasised the unique nature and added value of the monitoring framework as the only example of a country-led monitoring process, providing opportunities to make dialogue and partnerships more meaningful and useful at the country level (EC, IPU, Philippines, and Bangladesh). The United States and the Netherlands also highlighted the importance of the monitoring framework as a learning tool – not just for reporting purposes – as well as the need for making further use of results to foster dialogue, learning and behaviour change at country level. Overall, members welcomed and endorsed the process and timeline for the second monitoring round, while underlining the need for allocating sufficient time for data collection and validation (World Bank), and for review of the results before publication (USA). Some members underscored the risk of engaging stakeholders in an overly technical exercise – the monitoring framework dialogue is political; results should be translated into actionable policy recommendations, and be communicated nimbly (Malawi, Arab Donor Coordination Group). Further efforts will be needed to ensure that the monitoring process is not too heavy and complex, while paying increased attention to competing reporting demands, technical assistance, and capacity issues in-country (Bangladesh, PIFS, World Bank, Malawi).
14. Several Steering Committee members indicated their intention to actively participate in the second monitoring round (Philippines, Bangladesh, CPDE, PIFS, Malawi, and Netherlands). NEPAD, IPU, UCLG/FOGAR, ITUC, and PIFS called for increased engagement and participation in the GPEDC monitoring framework by non-government constituencies and regional platforms, with NEPAD underlining its willingness to support data collection, analysis and country dialogue on the GPEDC monitoring findings drawing on the experience of the African Peer Review mechanism. Mexico noted that making the monitoring framework more useful to all partners, in particular middle income countries and South-South providers, would help increase mutual learning and overall support and participation in the monitoring exercise.
15. There was strong consensus on the approval of the methodology for indicator 2. Some committee members made specific, technical comments on pilot indicators 1 and 3 (EC, IPU, Japan, and the private sector) and were invited by the Chair to submit written inputs to the Co-Chairs by Tuesday 15 September. The Steering Committee mandated the Co-Chairs review written comments on indicators 1 and 3 and at their discretion to endorse the final approach to the indicators or revert to the Steering Committee for full approval. Further discussion and endorsement of the methodology for indicator 4 will take place at the next Steering Committee meeting in early 2016. Japan commented that the indicator 4 (transparency) should also take into account the non-CRS/IATI transparency measures of providers, and avoid assessing their efforts of transparency negatively merely because of their non-use of CRS or IATI (or both), which would be helpful in making monitoring more acceptable to new providers.

Overall, the proposed approach to reviewing the monitoring framework and ensuring its relevance for post-2015 implementation and accountability efforts was well received, with the Chair noting the importance of furthering work on theories of change. The Chair closed the session by encouraging all Steering Committee members to help promote strong participation in the second monitoring round and in multi-stakeholder platforms at country level.

SESSION 3: PREPARATIONS FOR THE SECOND HIGH LEVEL MEETING (CHAIRIED BY MALAWI)

16. Following an introduction by Malawi, Principal Secretary at the National Treasury of Kenya, Dr Kamau Thugge, welcomed the responsibility given to the Government of Kenya as hosts of HLM2. Ambassador Macharia Kamau has been appointed to lead preparation of the meeting outcome document. It is proposed that HLM2 be held in the last week of November or the first week of December.
17. Two days of preparatory meetings are envisaged. A pre-HLM2 stock-taking meeting would consider the outcomes of the second monitoring round and forums would be held for CSOs, youth, philanthropic organisations, the private sector and parliamentarians. The two day high level segment would follow the successful Mexico model with six plenary sessions and side events. An innovation for Nairobi would be forty-five minute “gladiator sessions” held in parallel with plenary sessions in the venue’s amphitheatre, enabling lively discussion of hot issues.
18. The plenary sessions proposed included:
 1. Progress with implementing the aid and development effectiveness agenda – addressing unfinished business and identifying new areas of work. This session would include a focus on North South co-operation and areas arising from the second monitoring round;
 2. Enhancing the quality and impact of partnerships for implementing the SDGs and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. This session would also look at the role of domestic resource mobilisation as a complement to development co-operation;
 3. Improving the quality and impact of international development cooperation – learning from the experience of South South Co-operation and Triangular Co-operation. This session would seek to learn from the experiences of middle-income countries which have made progress in reducing poverty and inequality;
 4. Gender and youth in development – inclusivity and mainstreaming for effective and accelerated development – including exploring how to mainstream gender and youth into effective development;
 5. Leaving no-one behind – effective development co-operation for countries in special situations, vulnerable populations and middle-income countries;
 6. Innovative multi-stakeholder partnerships and inclusive development – where can we scale up and what are the new challenges?
19. Steering Committee members welcomed the proposed HLM2 draft agenda, and thanked Kenya for their efforts and strong leadership. They called for an inclusive approach which allows all actors to demonstrate their contributions to effective development co-operation.
20. Mexico noted that plenary sessions four and five could be linked with fragile states and middle-income countries. These agenda items should not compete with each

other. The Netherlands considered that HLM2 is well-timed, falling a year after the UN Summit agreed the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and enabling a first stock-take of progress.

21. Several members felt that the draft agenda could be further focused (DAC Chair, IPU, USA, Afghanistan, and UNDP). A strong focus should be kept on the unfinished business and on development effectiveness principles, particularly at country level (CPDE, UCLG/FOGAR, El Salvador, and IPU). HLM2 should demonstrate the GPEDC's importance to implementation of the SDGs and the 2030 agenda for sustainable development (Mexico, Netherlands, UNDP) and focus on domestic resource mobilisation, illicit financial flows and other aspects of development finance where the GPEDC has a comparative advantage (USA, DAC Chair, Afghanistan, UNDP). HLM2 will need to demonstrate priorities, principles and impact by showcasing results (USA, Mexico). The "gladiator sessions" could take particular SDGs and discuss how to make their implementation possible at the country level (Netherlands).
22. The Netherlands noted that it may be difficult to strike the right balance between keeping a focused agenda and responding to calls for additional items.
23. Several Steering Committee members emphasised the need to step up overall outreach efforts to Southern providers of cooperation, as well as other key partners, in order to ensure their participation and high level representation at HLM2 (Mexico, Netherlands, Kenya, Egypt, Japan, DAC Chair, and Malawi).
24. Members also suggested the possibility of a working group to assist with HLM2 preparations, keeping the SC informed of progress and helping to advance outreach and resource mobilisation efforts (US, Netherlands, CPDE, UNDP).

SESSION 4: COMMUNICATIONS AND OUTREACH (CHAIRIED BY NETHERLANDS AND MALAWI)

25. The Chair opened the session presenting the three items to be addressed: communications, outreach, and the Steering Committee's role in supporting external communications and outreach.
26. The JST presented an overview of the communications strategy going forward. The proposed framework is an evolution of the previous communications action plan the results of a survey following the HLM1, feedback from the January 2015 Brussels Workshop, and other consultations with GPEDC stakeholders. Key successes from the past strategy include the website and the blog. Areas for improvement include revamping digital platforms to reach out to broader audiences, increasing engagement with other forums, and better tying the GPEDC to the post-2015 agenda.
27. The key target audiences for the GPEDC have been identified as decision-makers, the international development community and thought leaders. In order to better reach these different audiences, the core narrative of the GPEDC should be simplified. The key messages have to reflect a forward-looking posture, avoiding development jargon and focus on how the partnership is contributing to the achievement of SDG 17. In terms of digital strategy, an overhaul of the digital footprint across all GPEDC platforms is needed in order to better serve the needs of key audiences in a user-friendly manner.

28. In terms of practical activities, the JST proposed a website redesign, an update of publications with more targeted messaging, production of a professional video series and a general increase in social media activity across all platforms. Outreach to international media, live-streaming and video interviews are also planned for HLM2.
29. Steering Committee members welcomed the communications strategy and proposals to improve online visibility of the GPEDC. Some members suggested more focus on promoting development co-operation and the development effectiveness principles rather than the GPEDC itself as a brand (UNDP, Arab Donor Coordination Group, USA). Several members made a case for the potential of storytelling –particularly country stories - to accomplish that goal, (USA, Mexico, UNDP, and Netherlands). The results of GPIs could also be better incorporated in the messaging (World Bank, IPU) and country pages in the website could be considered (IPU).
30. In crafting messaging, members suggested emphasising what makes the GPEDC a distinctive partnership. The multi-stakeholder nature of GPEDC was highlighted as a unique feature that needs to be promoted (CPDE, Mexico). On the other hand, its diverse membership presents a challenge in terms of targeting messages (Philippines). There were different opinions regarding the target group. Some propose a focus on the development community (EU) while others believe it is also relevant to expand the outreach to the wider public (UCLG/FOGAR, Japan, IPU). Nonetheless, most agree that messaging should be kept simple and that it should be unified and coordinated so as to guide interactions with different actors (Japan).
31. Members recognised the need to simplify availability of documentation online (World Bank, Arab Donor Coordination Group). Mexico highlighted the importance of two-way communication and the need to receive and incorporate feedback more consistently. IPU invited other Steering Committee members and all GPEDC stakeholders to make further use of social media outlets to increase the rate of success in communicating about Partnership.
32. The Chair closed the session by reminding Steering Committee members of their role as ambassadors for the Partnership within their constituencies. Comments on the communications framework will be incorporated in the revised document, and a communications strategy for HLM2 will be developed in line with the substantive preparations.

SESSION 5: RESOURCE MOBILISATION (CHAired BY MEXICO)

33. Opening this session, Mexico emphasised the need to achieve a level of resource mobilisation matching the level of ambition of the Steering Committee. The total budget needed to implement the ambitious agenda, and endorsed by the Steering Committee in previous sessions, is USD 11 million, but there is a funding gap of at least USD 5 million (not including the costs of the HLM2 in Kenya).
34. The JST made a presentation on progress in [implementing the ongoing work programme and budget](#). The approved activities for 2015-2016 reflected previous Steering Committee requests to strengthen support to monitoring, analytical work that will enhance country-level implementation and learning, as well as the rolling out of a comprehensive communications strategy. In line with these requests, the JST has adjusted the scope of activities and strengthened staffing in key areas –including monitoring, implementation and communications.

35. Despite recent contributions by some stakeholders, the JST highlighted a persistent funding gap of USD 4.98 million on the 2015-2016 budget (or 45 percent of the total). This funding gap is affecting the JST both at the OECD (USD 1.433 million gap) and UNDP (USD 3.547 million). While the JST has been sustaining activities across the Board during the first year of the 2015-2016 work programme, if funding is not forthcoming, the JST will have to scale down delivery of important planned activities from January 2016. Potential impacts on GPEDC's effectiveness illustrating the urgency of the situation include shortcomings in the monitoring process, challenges in communications, limited capacity for events, and putting the advisory functions at risk.
36. Some Steering Committee members indicated an intention to provide earmarked contributions and/or budget contributions. The Arab Donors Group expressed interest in funding for targeted activities related to UN processes. The United States is planning to make a contribution, and also exhorted the GPEDC to broaden its contribution base going forward. The OECD/DAC indicated that the JST has already assumed risks to strengthen delivery capacity, and emphasised the importance of small contributions from a larger number of GPEDC members. The European Commission will explore options for additional funding, both for the JST and the High Level Meeting in Kenya. The United States suggested establishing a finance committee or working group to focus on resource mobilisation and the creation of a sustainable strategy for resourcing the Partnership. The Netherlands closed by highlighting the need to match agreed ambitions with funding, and emphasised the urgency of doing so.

WELCOME, RECAP OF DAY 1 AND NEXT STEPS (CHAIRER BY MEXICO)

37. This introductory session opened with an interactive video prepared by AMEXCID on the work of the GPEDC, highlighting its contribution to the achievement of development outcomes and the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Juan Manuel Valle Pereña then presented the key messages and highlights from the discussions on Day 1 including: i) development effectiveness principles remain at the heart of GPEDC work, with the Partnership's legitimacy arising from the achievement of development co-operation results; ii) the monitoring framework is a core strength of the Partnership and will contribute positively to the follow-up and review of the SDGs; iii) HLM2 will provide a timely opportunity to focus on showcasing success and results, dealing with the unfinished business, and supporting implementation of the SDGs; iv) GPEDC communications will need to focus on promoting development effectiveness, with targeted outreach to key stakeholders; and v) increased resource mobilisation efforts will be needed to close the gap of USD 5 million to support the Joint Support Team's work.

SESSION 6: FINANCING FOR DEVELOPMENT AND POST-2015: SUPPORTING IMPLEMENTATION (CHAIRER BY MEXICO)

38. Claudia Ruiz Massieu, Foreign Minister of Mexico, opened the session by noting the GPEDC can support implementation of the 2030 Agenda through its focus on the effective use of resources. She drew attention to the reference to the GPEDC in Paragraph 58 of the AAAA as a forum to support the quality of development co-operation, complementary to the UN DCF. She noted the GPEDC's role in helping to ensure that development finance delivers results by following effectiveness principles – for example by being more predictable and aligned to national priorities. It can support voluntary exchange and mutual learning between partners. Through the

monitoring framework, it can provide evidence on what is working and not working in the implementation of the development effectiveness principles, which can apply beyond ODA to other flows like South South Cooperation and those from the private sector.

39. Co-Chair Goodall Gondwe, Minister of Finance of Malawi, suggested that the GPEDC can help the international community provide more effective support to implementing the SDGs compared to the MDGs. He noted the need to move from blaming one another to a greater focus on mutual accountability. He emphasised the importance of inclusivity for the 2030 Agenda, and the potential role of the GPEDC in bringing all partners together. He also highlighted the importance of dialogue between countries on what works in development co-operation. He suggested the GPEDC can play a key role in these areas, but does need to demonstrate its legitimacy in convening partners around these objectives.

Co-Chair Lilianne Ploumen, Minister of Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation of the Netherlands, suggested that the GPEDC should focus more on its role as a platform to support mutual learning and knowledge-sharing to remain meaningful in the 2030 agenda. She stressed that this requires a higher level of ambition; it might be more difficult than just engaging in monitoring and reporting. Learning goes beyond publishing policy advice, it is also about building trust between partners, so that lessons can be shared effectively. As an example of this, she noted the potential to approach domestic resource mobilisation in a 'learning' mode and perspective.

40. In the ensuing discussion, Steering Committee members agreed that the Partnership can play an important role in supporting implementation of the 2030 Agenda, highlighting in particular the importance of its inclusive character, its focus on country-level action and dialogue, and its ability to support mutual learning.
41. Several members highlighted that the 2030 Agenda puts a strong emphasis on inclusivity and partnership approaches and that as a truly inclusive platform, the GPEDC can be a critical mechanism to help deliver on this approach. In this regard, further effort should be invested in ensuring that the GPEDC delivers on this potential by further engaging the range of stakeholders, beyond those organisations on the SC, with a special focus on emerging economies.
42. There was strong interest in using the GPEDC to support dialogue and accountability between the range of development partners at the country level (BIAC, CPDE, EU, Foundations, ITUC, PIFS, UCLG/FOGAR, USA). This could include building multi-stakeholder platforms for dialogue in select countries, or supporting existing country- or regional-level initiatives where they exist. Bangladesh, El Salvador, Philippines and PIFS all pointed to the existence of co-ordination platforms for development partners in their countries, with differing levels of success to date in achieving multi-stakeholder participation.
43. Some members emphasised that, beyond support for such platforms, the GPEDC should also help developing countries manage the complexity of development finance involved in the 2030 Agenda (Bangladesh, PIFS). This includes supporting capacity for national institutions to absorb the range of finance, and adapting the effectiveness principles to managing these flows. There were calls for maintaining a strong focus on the unfinished business of the aid effectiveness agenda, including use of county systems (Bangladesh, CPDE), ensuring policy space for inclusive country-level decisions on development (CPDE) and supporting commitments on human rights in development (CPDE).

44. In this regard, El Salvador [shared its experience](#) in embedding effectiveness principles in policies through a national plan for effective co-operation, which can be used for all types of co-operation – including SSC, and decentralised cooperation. El Salvador also noted its efforts to enhance transparency and accountability through a new online platform collecting information on all development co-operation flows.
45. Several members built on Minister Ploumen’s suggestion that the GPEDC be a platform for genuine learning between partners, built on trust and inclusivity (Egypt, EU, IPU, Japan). Members mentioned that true knowledge-sharing requires concerted effort in between High Level Meetings (Japan); that results and lessons should be disseminated at both country-level and between countries; that knowledge-sharing can also support implementation through the local level (Foundations, UCLG/FOGAR); and that learning should ultimately be in support of action and policy change (IPU).
46. The Committee reaffirmed that the effectiveness principles should be the cornerstone for the GPEDC’s work in all areas.
47. Members also identified a need to demonstrate the Partnership’s value addition and legitimacy by focusing on applying the principles in a few priority areas (Afghanistan, EU, ITUC, USA). Areas proposed include ODA; domestic resource mobilisation (DRM) and illicit financial flows; South-South and Triangular Cooperation; private sector partnerships; inclusion and leaving no-one behind; and effectiveness in fragile states.
48. Members suggested that concrete proposals could be made to strengthen the GPEDC’s offer in the areas identified during the session, including through establishing voluntary working groups in the areas of country-level multi-stakeholder platforms; and knowledge sharing and mutual learning. To strengthen the GPEDC’s comparative advantage, Mexico, CPDE and the private sector emphasised the importance of making the Partnership truly representative and inclusive by bringing in more stakeholders to the table.
49. In summing up the session, Minister Ruiz Massieu emphasised that the GPEDC can support implementation of the 2030 Agenda by looking at how developing countries and development partners can maximise the use of resources available. She noted the Partnership will need to demonstrate its relevance by focusing and delivering on its core strengths – particularly its inclusivity; by focusing on applying effectiveness principles to specific areas to demonstrate results – including in DRM; and strengthening the Partnership’s role as a platform for supporting knowledge exchange and learning based on trust. Key next steps will include establishing working groups for SC members and other stakeholders in the areas of country focus/country-level multi-stakeholder platforms and knowledge-sharing; and to strengthen the GPEDC’s inclusive character by further bringing in the range of development actors. The GPEDC will need to become indispensable to the implementation of the FFD and 2030 agendas.

SESSION 7: IMPLEMENTATION SHOWCASE (CHAIRERD BY THE NETHERLANDS AND MALAWI)

50. This session highlighted how different GPEDC stakeholders are implementing the principles of effective development co-operation through various mechanisms, including Global Partnership Initiatives (GPIs). Minister Ploumen opened this session

expressing her belief that GPIs are a key element of the GPEDC; they can show the way forward in implementing effective development co-operation at the country level, showing where change of action is needed to unleash results. Progress has been made over the past years to better link GPIs to broader GPEDC work, particularly through the bi-annual reporting procedure (see [Update on Global Partnership Initiatives](#)) and the “GPEDC Planning Workshop: Strengthening Co-operation to Deliver Results” (Brussels, 21-22 January 2015). But more can be done to increase GPIs’ visibility, encourage contact and mutual learning among GPIs, enhance linkages between GPIs and other GPEDC work streams, and ensure that GPIs contribute to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. A second workshop is planned for early 2016 to look at these issues and mobilise GPIs ahead of the Second High Level Meeting of the GPEDC in Nairobi. The HLM should provide a podium not to those GPIs that have the biggest success, but to those that are able to show steep learning curves (Netherlands).

51. The session featured presentations by four Steering Committee members on their respective efforts to embed principles of effective development co-operation in their work:

- The g7+ presented the initiatives undertaken to [implement the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States \(GPI\)](#). These include: fragility assessments (which evaluate countries in relation to the five peacebuilding and statebuilding goals and inform national development visions and policies), fragile-to-fragile co-operation (through which g7+ countries share experience and knowledge on peacebuilding and statebuilding, natural resource mobilisation and aid management) and memoranda of understanding/frameworks for managing for results (which are helping to ensure mutual accountability between g7+ countries and development partners). Work has started to help g7+ members to adopt the SDGs at the country level. It will be important to understand the meaning of “ownership” as encompassing all groups within a country which is essential to reinforcing legitimacy.
- The OPEC Fund for International Development (OFID) delivered a statement on behalf of the Coordination Group of Arab National and Regional Development Institutions, the Islamic Development Bank and OFID (GPI 32 – Statement of Resolve by the National and Regional Arab development finance institutions, IsDB and OFID). Since 2011, the group collectively adopted the development effectiveness principles. Each institution was encouraged to integrate these principles into their activities and to co-ordinate to alleviate the burden on countries dealing with several development partners. The group issued its first effectiveness report in 2014 (CREST: Commitment, Responsiveness, Effectiveness, Sustainability and Transparency) and a follow-up report is planned for 2016. They are also making efforts to use country systems where possible and will soon publish statistics on their activities using the common standard.
- The Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat showed how the region is demonstrating leadership, focusing on results and engaging in inclusive and mutually accountable partnerships to promote development. The Forum Compact on Strengthening Development Co-operation is promoting application of development effectiveness principles in three key areas: MDG development outcomes, effective institutions and development financing, private sector and infrastructure. Three lessons emerged from the region’s implementation experience: effective development co-operation requires political leadership, strong institutions and capacity development, and mutually accountable partnerships.

- NEPAD presented the African Action Plan on Development Effectiveness (GPI 2) which was agreed after the First High Level Meeting of the GPEDC in Mexico (April 2014). This plan outlines African priorities for effective development co-operation in support of key regional agendas. The African Action Plan is helping to mainstream the implementation of development effectiveness principles and commitments at both national and regional level, with aims to promote: gradual exit of aid dependence towards growth and sustainability; improvement of means of implementation; growth and expansion of innovative domestic resource mobilisation mechanisms; curbing of illicit financial and resource flows to raise adequate financing of Africa's development through its own resources.

52. The ensuing discussion highlighted some areas for attention to ensure more effective implementation going forward. First, there is a need for accelerating progress with implementing development effectiveness principles and commitments beyond the work of GPIs and the monitoring exercise (El Salvador). ITUC put particular emphasis on the ongoing need to ensure democratic ownership and this requires capacity building. Second, there should be stronger reporting on progress ahead of HLM2 in Nairobi – the GPEDC will need to prove its relevance and show what it is doing to support countries to develop (Malawi). Third, there should be greater efforts to link GPIs to broader GPEDC work – including at the country level – and disseminate learning they produce, particularly in relation to their contribution to the SDGs (CPDE, IPU). Finally, El Salvador raised how the GPEDC can help to address inequalities, an issue that is particularly important for Latin America.

53. Steering Committee members did not express any disagreement with the proposed application criteria and process for initiatives wishing to become a GPI (see page 4-5 of [Update on Global Partnership Initiatives](#)).

SESSION 8: KENYA HIGH LEVEL MEETING (CHAired BY KENYA HIGH LEVEL MEETING (CHAired BY MALAWI AND KENYA)

54. Dr. Kamau Thugge, Principal Secretary, National Treasury, reaffirmed Kenya's enthusiasm and high level commitment to hosting the second High Level Meeting (HLM2) of the Global Partnership, while outlining some of its expectations and ambitions for making HLM2 a success including:

- HLM2 will need to demonstrate the comparative advantage of the GPEDC, and how this can be used to support implementation of the post-2015 agenda and the SDGs.
- The unfinished business must not be forgotten – HLM2 will need to address key issues such as transparency, aid untying, predictability, and how to increase development assistance.
- To help further position the Global Partnership in the post-2015 framework, Kenya expects a discussion on domestic resource mobilisation, as well as on how to create an enabling environment for business to thrive.
- In light of the increasing role of public-private partnerships (PPP), more progress and discussion on this will be needed.
- DRM will remain a critical issue for HLM2 – “as the more resources we are able to generate ourselves, the more we will be able to control our destiny.” Yet,

mobilisation of resources should be seen as complementary, rather than as a substitute to development assistance. ODA commitment of 0.7% must be kept.

- HLM2 will discuss the role of GPEDC in the implementation of policies that are critical for economic growth and for the achievement of the SDGs.
 - South-South and Triangular co-operation are critical, and particularly relevant in Kenya, with China overtaking Japan as Kenya's largest development and investment partner. In light of the important role of South-South and Triangular co-operation in the post-2015 agenda, it will be crucial to encourage BRICS' participation in HLM2, through formal and informal outreach approaches.
 - HLM2 will provide a platform for discussing challenges in fragile states and countries in special situations.
 - Recognising the diversity of partners involved in the framework of development co-operation, Kenya will strive for a balanced meeting outcome that reflects the interests and priorities of all, particularly developing countries and other key partners, while keeping a strong focus on the principles of development co-operation and the achievement of development results.
 - Kenya has tried to mainstream issues of youth, women and persons with disabilities in its overall development agenda. Yet, youth unemployment and gender inequalities remain key challenges to sustainable development. Alongside bringing Kenya's experience in the ICT sector, Kenya will champion youth and women's development as part of the HLM2 agenda.
 - HLM2 will also explore the role of multi-stakeholder partnerships and inclusive development by showcasing examples of successful and less successful partnerships.
55. Kenya concluded its intervention by noting its interest in a negotiated HLM2 outcome document, while acknowledging the complexities and investment involved in this approach, compared with a lighter Chair's summary or hybrid approach. More discussion will be held on the final form of the HLM2 outcome document.
56. While noting some suggestions (see also Session 3), overall, the Steering Committee reiterated its agreement and satisfaction with Kenya's proposed draft agenda for HLM2. Some members underlined the necessity of not losing sight of the fulfilment and implementation of the Paris principles of harmonisation, alignment, accountability and transparency (PIFS, El Salvador). Given that implementation of the unfinished business from Paris is still underway, PIFS advised against making new commitments and adding too many issues and priorities to the agenda. Other members welcomed the emphasis on South-South Co-operation and knowledge sharing (El Salvador) and the focus on youth and gender which remain key issues particularly in developing countries (ITUC). The DAC Chair called for driving the HLM2 agenda in a concrete direction, focussing on people and the environment alongside tax and private investments. Mexico emphasised that the critical feature of HLM2 agenda will be the shift to showcasing results.
57. Some Steering Committee members indicated their preference for a practical, focussed and light document in the form of a Chairs' Summary (IPU, EC, Egypt, Japan, and DAC Chair). Other countries called for a third option or hybrid HLM2 outcome document in the form of a Statement of intent, striking a balance between a negotiated outcome and a summary (CPDE, PIFS, and US). Some committee members advised against the engaging in long negotiations so soon after the negotiation of the Post-2015 and FFD outcomes (IPU, EC, and PIFS). In terms of

content, IPU emphasised that the HLM2 outcome document would need to start with a compilation of the findings from the monitoring survey, and identify what further actions to take to meet commitments. Malawi noted that the outcome document would need to take stock of the progress made, and show how the GPEDC is an important tool to support implementation of the SDGs. CPDE voiced its desire for the HLM2 outcome document to confirm previous commitments, while leading to new ones.

58. Members underscored their individual and collective responsibility to do more to enhance outreach efforts to the BICS and other crucial partners to ensure high level participation in HLM2 (Egypt, Japan, DAC Chair, and Mexico). Alongside this, the DAC Chair noted that securing high-level representation in the meeting at an early stage will be critical to ensuring high participation by all stakeholders. CPDE called for further discussion on the nomination of the next Co-Chairs, noting that this should be an inclusive process. Recognising the need for more frequent opportunities to engage with SC members, CPDE suggested the possibility of co-hosting a SC meeting with a government partner. On behalf of the government of Korea, Japan invited all Steering Committee members to participate in the second Busan Global Partnership Forum to take place in Seoul on 23-24 November 2015.
59. Malawi wrapped up the discussion by thanking Kenya for their excellent work on the agenda and preparations for HLM2, noting that strong outreach efforts by members will be needed. Malawi noted that a negotiated outcome document would have political weight, but further reflection would be required to agree the form and content of the outcome document.

SESSION 9: CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

60. Mexico summarised the main conclusions from the meeting building on the key messages from Day 1, while further stressing the GPEDC's main added value of focussing on action at the country level, and involving all stakeholders to promote transformative dialogue, behaviour change and mutual accountability [please see [Key outcomes of the 8th Global Partnership Steering Committee](#)]. Through its unique inclusive, multi-stakeholder nature, the GPEDC can help to deliver the new 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development which will require new ways of working together through coalitions for action, mutual learning and trust. Members committed to increased participation in the Second Monitoring Round and to using its findings to improve development co-operation. The GPEDC is an indispensable platform, but further efforts will be needed to strengthen coherence at all levels, including by mobilising all GPEDC stakeholders to provide the necessary resources to support the Joint Support Team's work and ensure a successful High Level Meeting in Kenya.
61. Next steps include:
 - Agreeing on priority areas to sharpen the GPEDC's impact;
 - Establishing inclusive working groups on country level focus and multi-stakeholder partnerships, and on enlarging the GPEDC role as a knowledge hub;
 - Supporting Kenya to finalise the agenda and process for HLM2, with possible support from a working group on HLM2 preparations;
 - Supporting the establishment of a working group to focus on resource mobilisation and the creation of a sustainable strategy for resourcing the Partnership;

- Stepping up formal and informal outreach to key stakeholders;
- Harnessing the results of and disseminating learning on the GPs, while strengthening their link to broader GPEDC work;
- Producing a compendium of country level and stakeholder-led practices to inspire mutual learning; encouraging strong participation in the Second Monitoring Round; and,
- Enhancing GPEDC communications efforts.

62. Minister Ploumen thanked the host and closed the meeting by noting that the GPEDC is progressing towards a meaningful role in the 2030 agenda by reaching out to all development partners and serving as an inspirational network for learning and knowledge-exchange, recognising the common purpose of the SC members and the broader GPEDC.

ANNEX 1: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

CO-CHAIRS	
Mexico (HOST)	<p>Ms. Claudia RUIZ MASSIEU Secretary of Foreign Affairs</p>
	<p>Mr. Juan Manuel VALLE PEREÑA Executive Director, Mexican Agency for International Development Cooperation (AMEXCID), Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p>
	<p>Ms. Daniela BORBOLLA COMPEAN Director General for Development Cooperation Policy and Planning, AMEXCID</p>
	<p>Mr. Noel GONZALEZ SEGURA Deputy Director General for Policy Planning, AMEXCID</p>
	<p>Mr. Tadeo BERJÓN MOLINARES Director for Development Cooperation Policy, AMEXCID</p>
	<p>Mr. Daniel ROSADO MÉNDEZ Deputy Director for Development Cooperation Policy, AMEXCID</p>
	<p>Ms. Damaris SÁNCHEZ OCHOA Head of Department for Development Cooperation Policy, AMEXCID</p>
Netherlands	<p>Ms. Lilianne PLOUMEN Minister for Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation</p>
	<p>Mr. Jeroen VERHEUL Special Envoy of the Co-Chair of the GPEDC Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands</p>
	<p>Mr. Arjan SCHUTHOF Senior Adviser Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands</p>
	<p>Ms. Lieke WILLEMSSEN Policy Officer, Taskforce Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p>
	<p>Mr. Coenraad HOGEWONING Ambassador of The Netherlands to Mexico Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands</p>
	<p>Ms. Martine Jacoba BUSSTRA Spokesperson to Minister Ploumen</p>

	Ms. Fatimsaara BELHIRCH Private secretary to minister Ploumen
Malawi	Mr. Goodall Edward GONDWE Minister of Finance, Economic Planning and Development
	Mr. Newby KUMWEMBE Principal Secretary, Ministry of Finance
	Mr. Macleod NYIRONGO Advisor to the Minister, Ministry of Finance
	Mr. Daniel JENYA Principal Economist and Personal Assistant to the Minister, Ministry of Finance
2ND HIGH LEVEL MEETING HOST	
Kenya	Dr. Kamau THUGGE Principal Secretary, National Treasury
	Mr. Peter Oganga MANGITI Principal Secretary Ministry of Devolution & Planning
	Mr. Jackson Njau KINYANJUI Director General, Public Debt Management Directorate & Director, Resource Mobilization Department, National Treasury
	Ms. Monica Marren Bura ASUNA Head/ Senior Economist, Aid Effectiveness Secretariat National Treasury
STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS	
Afghanistan/G7+	Mr. Habib UR REHMAN MAYAR Deputy Secretary General g7+Secretariat
Arab Donor Coordination Group	Mr. Fuad ALBASSAM Assistant Director-General OPEC Fund for International Development (OFID)
	Mr. Miguel Eusebio LINARES ALEMAN Senior Operations Officer OPEC Fund for International Development

AU/NEPAD	Mr. Khalil TIMANY Head of NEPAD coordination African Union Commission (AUC)
	Mr. Bob Kalanzi Capacity Development Division NEPAD Planning & Coordinating Agency
Bangladesh	Mr. Mohammad MEJBAHUDDIN Senior Secretary Economic Relations Division, Ministry of Finance
	Mr. Rafique SIDDIQUE Monitoring Specialist (Deputy Chief) Aid Effectiveness Unit, Economic Relations Division, Ministry of Finance
CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness	Ms. Maria Theresa LAURON Co-chair, CSO Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation International Department, IBON International
	Mr. Jorge BALBIS PÉREZ Co-Chair, CPDE and Executive Secretary, Executive Direction Asociación Latinoamericana de Organizaciones
Egypt	Dr. Hazem M. FAHMY Ambassador, Secretary General, Egyptian Agency of Partnership for Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Mr. Hani ADEL DIMITRY YASSA Head of Mission Embassy of the Arab Republic of Egypt in Mexico
El Salvador	Ms. Ryna Elizabeth GARAY ARANIVA Director-General for Development Cooperation Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Ms. Leah Carlota GALDÁMEZ CORTEZ Technician at the General Direction for Development Cooperation Ministry of Foreign Affairs
EU	Mr. Klaus RUDISCHHAUSER Deputy Director-General DG Development and Cooperation – EuropeAid, European Commission

	<p>Ms. Aida LIHA MATEJICEK Head of Unit A2 - Aid and Development Effectiveness and Financing DG DEVCO - Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development</p>
Foundations	<p>Ms. Maria Herminia CABRAL DE OLIVEIRA Director – Partnerships for Development Program Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation</p>
ITUC/Trade Unions	<p>Mr. Wellington CHIBEBE Deputy Secretary General International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)</p>
	<p>Mr. Matt SIMONDS Liaison and Policy, ITUC</p>
Japan	<p>Mr. Ken OKANIWA Deputy Director-General for International Cooperation Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p>
	<p>Ms. Mari MIURA Senior Planning Officer Development Assistance Policy Planning Division International Cooperation Bureau Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p>
OECD/DAC	<p>Mr. Erik SOLHEIM DAC Chair, DCD</p>
Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat	<p>Ms. Charmina SAILI Regional Planning Advisor Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat</p>
Parliamentarians	<p>Mr. Alessandro MOTTER Senior Advisor Inter-Parliamentary Union</p>
Peru	<p>Ms. Nancy Magaly SILVA SEBASTIÁN Policy and Programs Peruvian Agency for International Cooperation (APCI)</p>
Philippines	<p>Mr. Rolando TUNGPALAN Undersecretary National Economic and Development Authority</p>

	Mikhal DE DIOS Third Secretary and Vice-Consul at Embassy of the Republic of the Philippines, Mexico
Private Sector Stakeholders	Mr. John SULLIVAN Executive Director of the Center for International Private Enterprise (CIPE) and Vice-Chairman of the BIAC Development Committee
UCLG/FOGAR	Mr. Berry VRBANOVIC Deputy Treasurer of United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG), Mayor of Kitchener (Canada)
	Ms. Renske STEENBERGEN Project Manager Association of Netherlands Municipalities United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)
UNDP	Mr. Michael O'NEILL Assistant Secretary-General and Director Bureau of External Relations and Advocacy
	Mr. Niloy BANERJEE Director of the United Nations System Affairs Group/BERA
United States	Mr. Alex THIER Assistant Administrator for Policy, Planning and Learning U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)
	Mr. Andrew DITMANSON Program Analyst U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)
World Bank	Ms. Mariam SHERMAN Director, OPSRE
	Ms. Chiyo KANDA Program Manager
MODERATOR	
	Mr. Juan Pablo DE LEO
SPECIAL GUESTS	
Monitoring Advisory Group	Mr. Brian TOMLINSON Director of AidWatch Canada Member of the Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG)

OECD/UNDP JOINT SUPPORT TEAM

Ms. Patti O'NEILL Head of Division, Global Partnership and Policies Division, OECD
Mr. John EGAN Co-ordinator GPEDC, DCD/GPP, OECD
Mr. Alejandro GUERRERO-RUIZ Policy Analyst Monitoring, DCD/GPP, OECD
Ms. Talita YAMASHIRO-FORDELONE Policy Analyst Implementation, DCD/GPP, OECD
Mr. Thomas BOEHLER Policy Analyst Secretariat, DCD/GPP, OECD
Ms. Teresita Kelly LOPEZ-TREUSSART Policy Analyst, DCD/GPP, OECD
Ms. Cibeles CESCA Assistant, DCD/GPP, OECD
Mr. Patrick TIEFENBACHER Senior Policy Advisor, UNDP
Ms. Yuko SUZUKI Policy Advisor, Effective Development Co-operation/BDP, UNDP
Mr. Derek KILNER Partnerships Development Analyst, UNDP