

Third meeting of the Steering Committee

Final summary

Third meeting of the Global Partnership Steering Committee
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 25-26 July 2013

Contacts:

Ms. Farida Bena, tel. +33 1 45 24 90 16, email: farida.tchaitchianbena@oecd.org
Mr. Derek Kilner, tel. +1-212-906-5742, email: derek.kilner@undp.org
Mr. Robin Ogilvy, tel. +33 1 45 24 94 48, email: robin.ogilvy@oecd.org
Ms. Yuko Suzuki Naab, tel. +1-212-906-6509, email: yuko.suzuki@undp.org

**GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION
THIRD MEETING OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE
ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA, 25-26 JULY 2013**

SUMMARY

Session 1: Welcoming remarks and special session on effective development co-operation in Africa (*chaired by Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, Nigeria*)

1. The Co-Chairs of the Global Partnership welcomed participants to the meeting. In their introductory remarks, they emphasised the need for participants to strengthen links with the post-2015 development agenda and to sharpen the vision and deliverables for the first ministerial-level meeting of the Global Partnership.

2. Minister Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala (Nigeria) welcomed several governments and organizations invited to join the meeting as observers: the African Union (hosting the event); the Arab Donor Coordination Group, Brazil, China, India, South Africa, Turkey, the Rockefeller Foundation and the STARS Foundation. She also recognized new members that have joined the Global Partnership – the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development and Latvia – welcoming their active engagement in the Partnership and encouraging other governments and organizations to consider joining.

3. Minister Okonjo-Iweala noted the relevance of holding the Steering Committee meeting in Africa, where effective development co-operation is a particularly urgent priority. Recalling the four principles of effective development cooperation (country ownership, focus on results, inclusive partnerships, and transparency and accountability), she highlighted how the African continent needs to look at issues like equitable growth, resource management, effective institutions, inclusion, knowledge exchange, the role of the private sector, development in middle income countries, and employment. Ms Okonjo-Iweala expressed gratitude to the African Union for hosting the meeting and for holding a preparatory high level event on domestic resource mobilisation and links to development co-operation in Africa. She underlined the need to maintain a strong link with the post-2015 development agenda and to clarify what concretely needs to happen to ensure the growth of the Global Partnership and the success of the ministerial-level meeting.

4. Minister Armida Alisjahbana (Indonesia) recalled that the Global Partnership provides a platform to discuss the “how” of the post-2015 development agenda. She welcomed the engagement of a wide array of development stakeholders at the meeting and noted their crucial role in promoting the shift from aid to development effectiveness, particularly on issues like domestic resource mobilisation, knowledge sharing and the private sector. She also pointed to their inclusion as being the comparative advantage of the Global Partnership. Ms Alisjahbana went on to highlight the progress made since the last Steering Committee meeting to strengthen links with the post-2015 discussions, most notably through an open letter to the High Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the post-2015 development agenda and the recognition of the important contribution of the Global Partnership in the High Level Panel's report.

5. Minister Justine Greening (United Kingdom), who could not attend the meeting due to the late change of dates for the meeting, delivered remarks by video, highlighting that the

Partnership was a UK priority, and suggesting three priorities for the ministerial-level meeting: (1) to ensure the consultation process is as inclusive as possible, bringing business, civil society and other groups together and using creative online consultation processes; (2) to enhance linkages to the post-2015 development agenda by showing what the Global Partnership means at country level and by keeping the level of the conversation political; and (3) to clarify ways of working, roles and responsibilities, with the co-Chairs planning to meet more frequently and all members championing specific issues. Minister Greening took the opportunity to announce her intention to champion the role of business in development.

6. The Deputy Chair of the African Union Commission (AUC), Mr. Erastus Mwencha, welcomed participants and recalled the turning point marked by the Busan Partnership in agreeing common goals and differentiated responsibilities. Mr Mwencha underlined the Global Partnership's role as a forum that can help advance discussions around four priority pillars for Africa: (1) peace and security; (2) governance and shared values; (3) integration; and (4) institutions and capacity building. He emphasised the role of strategic partnerships, particularly with the private sector, to improve African infrastructure. He also highlighted domestic resource mobilisation and effective institutions as key to moving beyond aid dependency. In tackling these issues he encouraged Steering Committee members to keep a regional perspective, and to maintain a consistent approach with the post-2015 agenda.

7. Mexico announced that it would host the first ministerial-level meeting of the Global Partnership in 2014. Mexico noted that the meeting, coming at a major crossroads for development cooperation, will be a major opportunity to showcase concrete actions and progress on the ground. Mexico stressed the need to engage other key global processes, particularly relating to post-2015 development discussions, including the UN Development Cooperation Forum (DCF), the follow-up to the Monterrey Consensus and the Doha Declaration on Financing for Development (FfD), the Rio+20 Conference on Sustainable Development and processes within the UN General Assembly. Mexico also recalled its proactive involvement in discussions on development co-operation architecture over the past decade, building on its comparative advantage as both a recipient and provider of development co-operation. Mexico is in the process of forming a strong team to support preparations for the meeting, which will be led by the Executive Secretary of its development co-operation agency AMEXCID.

8. Ethiopia's State Minister of Finance and Economic Development, Mr. Alemayehu Gujo, underlined Ethiopia's active role in advancing development effectiveness since the Paris Declaration in 2005. He noted that Ethiopia has strengthened national capacity for effective aid management, drafted comprehensive national development strategies, integrated public finance management systems, and made advances in procurement. However, he noted remaining challenges, such as aid fragmentation, weak alignment to national policies, and accountability. The adoption of the Busan Partnership agreement, he noted, recognises the value of shared principles, common goals and stronger, differentiated agreements within a broader and more inclusive framework. As a potential middle income country in the future, Ethiopia concluded by signalling its interest in following the discussions on South-South and triangular co-operation, as well as on the participation of the private sector, transparency and results and mutual accountability.

9. The AUC reported back from the high level event on aid as a catalyst for domestic resource mobilisation in Africa, held on 24 July. The AUC discussed how domestic resource mobilisation is important to move beyond aid dependency and consolidate Africa's ownership and management of its own resources, noting that the issue also features prominently in Africa's Agenda 2063 and common position on post-2015 development. However, Africa still faces challenges, including weak capacity in revenue collection; fragile tax structures and insufficient tax administration; large tax breaks for multinational companies; a large informal sector that is not captured in the average tax base; an underdeveloped private sector; low domestic savings; and ineffective stock exchanges. Illicit financial flows are also part of the equation, pointing to the

need for technological, not just physical, infrastructure and stronger capacity in technology management.

10. As part of their recommendations to the Steering Committee, participants in the preparatory event had highlighted the need for a robust enabling environment for the private sector, including peace and security. They also suggested supporting domestic resource mobilisation at both technical and political level by welcoming and building on the G8's work on tax avoidance and evasion, fighting corruption, building stronger tax administration, and higher capacity in managing technology and improving stock exchanges, supervising trade settlements and publishing trade data. On illicit financial flows, there was a call for a coordinated "track it, stop it, get it" approach. The AUC also recommended facilitating remittance inflows, while promoting greater transparency in transaction costs. There was support for civil society and parliaments to play an oversight role on human rights, peace and security, and good governance. Aid should play a catalytic role in addressing the challenges above. In the spirit of the Busan principle of country ownership, it was underlined that while Africa cannot act alone, it should take the lead in scaling up domestic resource mobilization, and play a strong role in developing this agenda item for the Global Partnership's first ministerial-level meeting.

11. Chad stressed the importance of supporting the economic growth of the African continent and called for providers of development cooperation to firmly engage in domestic resource mobilisation. Chad agreed with the AUC's 'track it, stop it, get it' approach to illicit financial flows, and supported development of the domestic private sector as a way to broaden the tax base. Chad also recommended expanding public-private partnerships and achieving higher transparency in dealing with multinational enterprises from the extractive industry.

12. The World Bank, representing multilateral development banks, noted the relevance of development effectiveness for Africa, which is both the fastest-growing continent and the world's largest recipient of aid. Multilateral development banks remain committed to priorities like the increased use of country systems, country ownership and higher transparency. The World Bank also recognised the importance of developing new forms of partnerships to sustain the growing collaboration with middle income countries and noted a key role for the Global Partnership in helping forge these partnerships through an inclusive approach at the country level. The World Bank emphasised the importance of building capacity, particularly in fragile states, in implementing the Busan and New Deal commitments and the role the Global Partnership's knowledge sharing work can play in this context. The World Bank also noted the need for public-private partnerships and innovative financing mechanisms to facilitate investment in key areas, such as infrastructure.

13. Bangladesh reminded participants of the forthcoming Asia regional workshop on implementation of the Global Partnership and its linkage to the Post-2015 development agenda, to be held in Dhaka on 25-27 August.

14. The United States stressed the need for a stronger drive to fulfil the Busan commitments in the run-up to 2015, and highlighted that domestic resource mobilisation, transparency and inclusiveness are strongly intertwined. The United States suggested setting targets on domestic resource mobilisation on a country-by-country level as a way to promote concrete progress on the issue.

15. The European Union reaffirmed its prioritization of a focus on domestic resource mobilisation and linked it to the issue of transparency and aid as a catalyst of other forms of development finance. The EU also recalled that it has recently approved binding regulations on the related issue of natural resource management.

16. The Rockefeller Foundation noted its participation in the network NetFWD, and spoke of its focus on equitable growth and resilience building as two main pillars underpinning a variety of

African-led initiatives. The Rockefeller foundation also asked for a permanent seat for foundations in the Steering Committee.

17. Turkey noted that significant differences can be found across the African continent, from transitioning countries in the North, to successfully growing economies, to fragile states, which still heavily dependent on aid. Turkey drew attention to the need to support functional and autonomous state institutions and infrastructure in places like Somalia, where Turkey is leading international efforts. It called for domestic resource mobilisation, the support for public-private partnerships and the sharing of experiences by Southern partners as fresh tools to provide additional resources for development.

18. In closing the session, Ms Okonjo-Iweala encouraged the AU to take into account the specific ideas and comments made by Steering Committee members to advance the discussion on domestic resource mobilisation. She expressed satisfaction at the general support for action on this issue and made clear that this should be an African-led agenda.

Session 2: Preparing for the first ministerial-level meeting of the Global Partnership: Vision and elements of an agenda (*Chaired by Armida Alisjahbana, Indonesia*)

19. Introducing the session, Ms. Alisjahbana explained that the Co-Chairs had – on the basis of discussions at the second meeting of the Steering Committee and inputs from Steering Committee members following that meeting – formulated an initial proposal for the content of the first Ministerial-level meeting of the Partnership. Ms Alisjahbana emphasised her desire to see the ministerial-level meeting bring together a large range of actors, and identified it as an important opportunity to promote linkages with the post-2015 development agenda.

20. The United Kingdom presented the draft agenda for the ministerial developed by the three Co-Chairs, outlining the consultative process led by the Steering Committee to date (see Document 1). In addition to the theme- and session-specific outcomes, a number of overarching political / strategic deliverables were proposed including strong engagement from all constituencies and actors; a set of agreed actions to improve development co-operation; and consensus on the role of the Global Partnership in relation to the post-2015 agenda.

21. Mexico, as the host of the ministerial-level meeting, stressed its desire to see the Partnership serve as a high-level enabler a post-2015 development framework. Mexico expressed its willingness to work with others and invest in a successful event. Mexico took note of the work undertaken by the Co-Chairs and Steering Committee on an initial agenda, and explained its intention that the agenda should be shaped further to:

- place greater emphasis on middle-income countries (MICs), their development challenges, and their role in development partnerships;
- explore South-South and triangular co-operation, which extends beyond knowledge sharing;
- make the link with the post-2015 framework and the sustainable development agenda in the aftermath of Rio+20;
- strengthen civil society participation, and consider how youth and parliamentarians might be engaged more strongly in the agenda.

22. Mexico explained that possible dates for the ministerial in 2014 were being discussed with the Co-Chairs and that a final decision should be announced soon. It stressed its desire to

see strong regional and multi-stakeholder consultations, initiated by members, in the run up to the meeting.

23. In the discussion that followed, several members concurred with the need to identify / clarify / advance linkages between the work of the Global Partnership and the evolving – much broader – post-2015 development agenda (UNDP, EU, World Bank, IPU, OECD/DAC). The Global Partnership could play a role in proposing goals and targets for effective development co-operation in the post-2015 framework, for example (World Bank).

24. Some members also suggested revisiting the name of the “ministerial-level” meeting as some felt it does not adequately capture the inclusive nature of the Global Partnership. Ideas suggested included “Global Development Leaders meeting” (EU). Other participants also questioned whether the name of the Global Partnership itself might be changed to “Busan Global Partnership” for further clarity, though there was no agreement on this.

25. Participants pointed to the need for the meeting to be a political and action focused event, and for an emphasis on demonstrating progress made since Busan (CPDE, Korea, Timor-Leste, OECD/DAC). Timor-Leste conveyed the particular importance placed by g7+ countries on using the meeting to showcase progress in the implementation of Busan and New Deal commitments. OECD/DAC emphasised the importance of continued DAC efforts to implement Busan commitments and pointed to the need to showcase success stories at the meeting. There was general agreement on the need for a communiqué, with some suggesting that this should focus on actions to implement commitments, rather than renegotiating commitments made in Busan (CPDE). Several suggested that the format of the sessions should reflect the inclusive, multi-stakeholder nature of the partnership.

26. Inclusive development was identified as important by CPDE and the United States. Both suggested that the theme needs to feature more prominently on the agenda, with CPDE explaining the relevance of this theme to the shared principles agreed in Busan, and the US expressing its concern with the shrinking space for civil society activity globally. IPU made the link with democratic governance and the role of parliamentarians. The Rockefeller Foundation expressed its support for the inclusive development agenda, and asked how the role of foundations might be better reflected in this work.

27. There was broad support for Mexico’s proposal to explore how South-South and triangular co-operation could feature in the agenda. Bangladesh informed participants of its recent participation in a meeting on triangular co-operation hosted by Portugal in May 2013, bringing together 69 participants from 47 countries. The Lisbon meeting identified several ways forward to better track, learn from and promote triangular co-operation, and proposed that findings from this policy dialogue could inform discussions at the Global Partnership ministerial.

28. Several participants expressed broad support for the ideas on tax and domestic resource mobilisation set out in the Co-Chairs’ proposal. Chad made specific reference to the previous day’s discussions, convened by the African Union, identifying tax, domestic resource mobilisation and knowledge-sharing as those elements of the proposal that are most important for Africa. The OECD/DAC welcomed African leadership on the tax/domestic resources agenda, and pointed to its ability to play a role in this area. It also informed participants of on-going DAC work to review key development finance concepts and measures, inviting others to contribute to this work.

29. The UK, OECD/DAC and IBLF pointed to the “Building Blocks” established in Busan as potential sources of inputs and content for the agenda.

30. South Africa welcomed Mexico's emphasis on middle-income countries, noting that the partnership offered an opportunity to engage emerging and middle income countries on an international dialogue on development.

31. Brazil expressed its agreement with the emphasis on knowledge-sharing and pointed to the opportunity presented by the Global Partnership to share experiences of development cooperation.

32. OFID introduced the work of the Arab donor co-ordination group and offered an overview of OFID's own efforts to implement selected Busan commitments (e.g. use of country systems; revisiting policies and approaches to results and transparency).

33. Concluding the session, the Co-Chairs noted that there was broad endorsement of the initial elements proposed in the co-chairs' agenda for the ministerial-level meeting, and concurred with the need for further scoping work and consultation (e.g. on MICs; inclusive development). There was also broad agreement that any communiqué should stay focused on implementing Busan commitments, rather than re-opening discussions on those commitments or seeking to expand them.

Session 3: Preparing for the first Ministerial-level meeting of the Global Partnership: Progress since Busan (chaired by Anthony Smith, United Kingdom)

34. The United Kingdom invited discussion on ways in which political messages can be prepared for this first session of the Ministerial-level meeting, drawing on the on-going global monitoring process as well as complementary evidence that can highlight key progress and challenges in implementation of the Busan commitments.

35. The World Bank suggested that this session should help enable discussions on development effectiveness at the country level including, but not limited to, scaling up the use of country systems and communicate the Global Partnership's potential contributions to the post-2015 agenda in the areas of private sector development, knowledge sharing, development effectiveness and transparent and inclusive development.

36. IPU noted that they are currently looking at developing an indicator to assess how effectively parliaments are tracking development assistance, and may bring some of the evidence from this work to the ministerial-level meeting.

37. Timor Leste on behalf of the G7+ partner countries endorsed the outline of the session as included in the concept note, stressing the need to ensure partner countries' perspectives in further refinement of the substance of this session. Samoa also noted that dialogue among partner countries from the regional workshops could further inform the key priority issues for this session.

38. Discussion highlighted the importance of strong political messages in this session of the ministerial-level meeting in order to set the tone for further dialogue on development cooperation. Nigeria added that the session needs to bridge the progress made and challenges encountered in implementing the Busan commitments on development effectiveness with a demonstration of the Global Partnership's value added in light of the emerging post-2015 agenda that reflects a changing development landscape.

39. The United States emphasized that the Global Partnership is a framework to achieve the vision set out in Busan. In this regard, focusing specifically on what diverse groups have accomplished in taking the agenda forward will be a unique asset to contribute to the Post 2015 dialogue. The UK also reinforced in this context the need for this session to be forward-looking in

ensuring that the discussions should not only focus on North-South discussions but also on inclusive dialogue on progress since Busan.

40. CPDE suggested in this context that the session may be divided into two segments, with one segment focused on demonstrating what has been achieved, drawing on monitoring as well as qualitative evidence that can be provided by various partners; and a second segment deepening dialogue on inclusive development, possibly focusing on democratic country ownership as an anchor. There was broad consensus that this session should look at evidence on how inclusive development has been delivered on the ground, in the same way as the other three core principles of development effectiveness would be examined. A preparatory meeting on inclusive development was also proposed ahead of the ministerial-level meeting to allow for adequate discussions. However, the UK and others questioned whether this was the right way to ensure a strong focus on inclusivity – suggesting that the format of all sessions and the meeting overall – should be made as inclusive as possible.

41. Mexico emphasized the critical importance of political messages building on the monitoring process. Mexico also noted broader and deeper engagement of stakeholders is important, and there is a need to push for more countries to participate in the monitoring process.

42. UNDP also emphasized the need to ensure that unfinished aid effectiveness aspects be considered in this session, and that the session could also demonstrate how inclusive partnership is operationalized at country level, and include a strengthened focus on mutual accountability.

43. Overall, the discussion highlighted the political importance of this session in demonstrating progress and challenges since Busan in implementing commitments; and that the session should set the political tone in bridging the follow-up on commitments with future work and challenges in responding to the changing development landscape. There was also interest in clarifying the specific outcomes and deliverables of the session.

Session 4: Advancing focus themes for the ministerial-level meeting *(chaired by Anthony Smith, United Kingdom)*

44. In this session, Steering Committee members discussed the other three sessions contained in the Co-Chairs' proposal for the ministerial-level meeting on knowledge-sharing; domestic resource mobilization; and the private sector (see Document 1).

Knowledge-sharing

45. Indonesia presented the latest draft of its concept note on knowledge-sharing. Noting that facilitating knowledge exchange and sharing of lessons learned is one of the Global Partnership's mandates, Indonesia noted that the main objective of its proposal is to strengthen sustainable development results through sharing knowledge of lessons learned and involving broader stakeholders by promoting South-South and triangular cooperation.

46. Major deliverables for the knowledge-sharing session could include 1) launching pilot activities and toolkits to scale up country-led knowledge hubs; and 2) developing a "hybrid knowledge-sharing platform". These hubs and platform could facilitate knowledge sharing on specific substantive areas (e.g. Busan commitments, domestic resource mobilization, private sector, middle income countries, poverty reduction, disaster response); providing a brokering mechanism; and helping optimize existing funding sources. Indonesia stressed the potential for using this work to contribute to the post-2015 agenda, as well as the need to link with G20 thematic platforms and the DCF.

47. The ministerial-level session could include a panel discussion with sub sessions on presenting the hybrid knowledge hub and presenting country experiences. Indonesia welcomed the interest of Korea and the World Bank in continuing to actively contribute to this work, and noted that other countries and organizations are welcome to contribute as well.

48. Several members raised the importance of clarifying what the outcome and deliverables would be for this session (EU, OECD, UK, UNDP). In terms of policy advice, Nigeria suggested distinguishing between “just-in-time” knowledge required to address an immediate demand, and deeper knowledge on approaching specific sectors, noting that for the former an online system to collect existing methodologies and instruments could be a deliverable. A follow-up event on results in South-South and triangular co-operation was also suggested as a possible deliverable (World Bank).

49. Members also urged further clarity in defining the value-added of the discussion on knowledge-sharing relative to discussions in other fora. Members noted that the proposed knowledge-sharing platform would require financial resources, and that the scope of the proposal should thus be well-defined (Korea, World Bank).

50. Members suggested there could be value in sharing knowledge related to the Busan commitments (Korea); offering case studies and toolkits in the various workstreams for the ministerial-level meeting (World Bank); focusing on South-South co-operation (EU, World Bank); and ensuring that knowledge is also shared by developing/recipient countries, as well as civil society and parliaments (Indonesia, Nigeria, OECD). Members also flagged the importance of making sure that all constituencies have the technical capacity to participate in and make use of the proposed knowledge platform (Samoa).

51. On behalf of multilateral development banks (MDBs), the World Bank summarised the MDBs’ contribution to the knowledge sharing concept note for the Global Partnership, which MDBs submitted to Indonesia before the Steering Committee meeting. MDBs propose a pragmatic approach for the Global Partnership’s knowledge sharing work of networking country-led knowledge hubs; developing practical guidance for results-focused knowledge exchange, including south-south and triangular knowledge exchange; piloting the guidance in the topical areas of the Global Partnership’s work; and mapping existing knowledge sharing hubs and platforms. On behalf of MDBs the World Bank offered MDB support for this work going forward.

52. Some expressed a desire that the knowledge-sharing session contribute to the post-2015 development agenda discussions, both through adding knowledge-sharing as an issue to the post-2015 agenda and using it to promote knowledge-sharing around other issues in the post-2015 framework (Indonesia, World Bank).

53. Some members suggested that the proposed agenda item on knowledge-sharing at the ministerial-level meeting could be merged with a proposed discussion of South-South and triangular cooperation.

54. The World Bank offered to host the political and technical side events in the margins of the annual World Bank/IMF meetings, which were flagged as an important milestone for this work area.

Domestic resource mobilization

55. Ms. Okonjo-Iweala briefly introduced her background paper on domestic resource mobilization, which was presented at the previous day’s African Union high level event on domestic resource mobilization in Africa. She noted that in a context of declining ODA, opportunities must be identified to draw on domestic resources, flagging important work that has

been done by the Africa panel on illicit flows chaired by former South African President Thabo Mbeki; by the G8 on transfer pricing; and on natural resource management.

56. Ms. Okonjo-Iweala suggested that preparations for a session at the ministerial-level meeting could be taken forward by a working group including the African Union; 1-2 African countries; and other organizations, including a role for civil society, parliaments, and the private sector. A focused background paper could be prepared, and deliverables should be ambitious by concrete.

57. In terms of the discussion at the ministerial-level meeting, Ms. Okonjo-Iweala proposed a strong link to the post-2015 development agenda discussions, and the work of the High Level Panel. Potential links include possible goals relating to managing natural resource assets governance and effective institutions; and creating a global enabling environment and catalysing long-term finance.

58. The Steering Committee expressed broad support for the Co-Chair's proposal, particularly on issues of illicit flows; transfer pricing; support for tax administration/reform; and citizen accountability for tax policy.

59. CPDE also stressed the importance of addressing tax avoidance – both at the level of country-level incentives for investors and at the level of international rules; and addressing risks associated with extractive-led growth.

60. Some members suggested that agreeing targets could be an important part of a deliverable, noting their use in norm creation and encouraging positive competition (EU, US). Members urged some clarification of the concept of the catalytic role of ODA.

61. The AUC noted that Africa is preparing a common position on the post-2015 development agenda, with a High Level Committee appointed on the issue. The AU is also preparing Agenda 2063 which includes an ambitious domestic resource mobilization agenda. The AUC also flagged the relevance of discussions at the previous day's event on domestic resource mobilization in Africa, including case studies from DRC (improving systems for revenue collection) and Rwanda (electronic systems).

Private sector

62. IBLF started by pointing out that the proliferation of international processes discussing the contribution of the private sector to development may lead to confusion. In particular, more clarity on the added value of the Global Partnership to this regard would be beneficial. The private sector group is already proactively involved in the Rio+20 process on Sustainable Development, as well as in the establishment of the High-Level Political Forum.

63. IBLF presented the concept note prepared for the meeting. The note included three main elements: (1) promoting an enabling environment for private sector engagement in development; (2) innovative mechanisms to leverage private sector investment; and (3) business as a partner in development, including cooperation between business and the public sector and civil society.

64. Each of the three elements could be promoted as "show case" ideas (Ted-style talks were presented as a possible component of all agenda items in the Co-Chairs proposal). A deliverable could include a roadmap for achieving progress in these three areas, with progress reported at the next ministerial-level meeting. Thought pieces in each area could be prepared in advance. The private sector statement prepared for the Busan High Level Forum could be an important base. IBLF noted that all three elements not need necessarily be included at the ministerial-level meeting; and that there could be a pre-event to cover some ground.

65. Several members suggested the need to narrow the focus of the agenda. At the same time, the discussion highlighted several other areas that could be picked up in this session. Several members raised the importance of the role of the government in developing the private sector in developing countries (Chad, Nigeria, AU, OFID). OECD/DAC argued that it would be important to build discussions on the evidence gathered on the ground.

66. Within the three proposed substantive areas, there was considerable support for focusing on multistakeholder partnerships at the country level involving business, as this takes forward the spirit of the Busan outcome document. There was interest in highlighting specific partnerships that have worked on the ground with a view to scaling up good practices; and focusing on dialogue mechanisms in country (IBLF, UK, UNDP, US). There was also interest in framing discussion in terms of effectiveness, and how government can help business contribute to development and how business can help achieve government development priorities (Mexico). There was also support for strongly linking the work to the post-2015 development agenda, demonstrating ways in which the goal of partnering to achieve the development agenda can be achieved, and possibly contributing to post-2015 indicators (UK, US).

67. The World Bank offered MDB support to the private sector workstream and highlighted the opportunity to formulate recommendations on the contribution of the private sector to the post-2015 development framework. Together with other Steering Committee members, it also suggested that a strong link to strengthening the investment climate would be important to attract the attention of ministers. There was discussion of whether the Global Partnership would be the most appropriate forum for discussions on the enabling environment for business.

68. Other potential areas of focus included the informal sector (Nigeria, AU); small and medium enterprises (CPDE, OECD, AU, OFID); local private sector (OECD); the role of foundations, including impact investing (Rockefeller); human rights and decent work (CPDE); transparency (US); natural resource management (AU); and the important role of policy coherence with trade, investment, and other policies – especially relevant to middle income countries that are not dependent on aid for financing (Mexico, South Africa).

69. Members encouraged efforts to provide links to other areas of the agenda including domestic resource mobilization, inclusive partnerships, and knowledge-sharing.

70. In terms of deliverables, there was interest in tailoring these to private sector demand, so as to encourage high-level participation from businesses. CPDE suggested the possibility of a compact or document on how different actors can work together, building on the model of the Advisory Group on CSOs and Effectiveness established after the Paris High Level Forum.

71. Members suggested that any declaration might be incorporated into the broader communiqué from the meeting.

72. In terms of other actors to involve in preparations for the session, the discussion raised the potential roles of the private sector Building Block and of the Global Compact.

Session 5: Update on global monitoring efforts

73. The joint support team presented on progress and next steps in the implementation of the global monitoring framework linked to the Busan Partnership agreement (see Document 2: Overview and status of global monitoring efforts). The consultative process leading to the finalisation of the country monitoring guidance was outlined, as well as initial indications of countries' willingness to participate in the global process (over 40 developing countries have confirmed their participation). On-going methodological work on some indicators was

summarised, as were opportunities for stakeholders to support the process more broadly. The team clarified the focus of its report, which is based around the ten indicator areas agreed. Steering Committee members were invited to consider other types of evidence that they might want to bring to ministerial-level discussions, which will not feature in the progress report being prepared by the joint team.

74. In the discussion that followed, several countries pointed to the importance of the global monitoring framework, and mentioned on-going country-level initiatives that would help to feed this (e.g. Samoa and Pacific islands efforts to monitor progress regionally; g7+ monitoring efforts, which are complementary).

75. Participants called for extending the timeline for data submission in view of the timing of the ministerial-level meeting, noting that this could help bring additional countries into the process. Chad confirmed that the African Union was working to raise awareness of the monitoring process in the region and encourage participation by its member countries.

76. Several participants identified the need for advisory support and technical assistance to countries participating in the process (Chad, World Bank, UNDP), with some pointing to UNDP's potential to provide support in this area. UNDP noted that its ability to provide such support would depend on voluntary contributions from members to close its significant funding gap linked to Global Partnership support activities.

77. The EU asked for more concerted efforts to complete methodological work on some of the remaining global indicators. The United States noted that expectations in relation to the evidence base for the first ministerial-level meeting would need to be managed carefully, given the challenges associated with some indicators, and the baseline nature of some of the evidence that will be generated.

78. Several countries and organisations noted that they were making efforts to brief country offices and field missions to enable them to play a supportive role in the monitoring process: all EU field missions have been briefed on the process; the World Bank expressed the MDBs' willingness to inform their country offices and asked that the support team make a standard one-pager available for communication purposes. It was proposed that a short standard guidance note for donors be developed with the support of the joint team to facilitate this outreach.

79. Summing up the discussion, the Co-Chairs noted the need to manage expectations in relation to the evidence base carefully. They identified the need for more effort on the part of Steering Committee members to ensure broad participation in the process, and concurred with the suggestion that timelines be revisited to ensure that the broadest evidence base is available in time for the ministerial-level meeting. The Co-Chairs took note of on-going country-led efforts to monitor Busan implementation, and suggested that countries could play a greater role in communicating on such initiatives.

Session 6: Promoting the work of the Global Partnership *(chaired by Wismana Adi Suryabrata, Indonesia)*

80. The UK reported back from a few global events it had attended since the previous Steering Committee meeting in Bali. The UK noted that the topics discussed within the Global Partnership had consistently been raised in all key fora, such as international taxation at the G8 summit and knowledge sharing at the G20 Development Working Group meeting. The UK and OECD had also jointly organised a workshop on the Global Partnership for its constituency in July.

81. Nigeria reported back from the DCF High Level Symposium, which took place in Addis Ababa in June. The Global Partnership featured prominently in a well-attended outreach event where a range of development actors had the opportunity to showcase concrete examples of country-level implementation of the Busan commitments. Steering Committee members attending the Symposium also met with the UN Under-Secretary General for Economic and Social Affairs, Mr. Wu Hongbo and agreed that the support team should work with DESA to collaborate further.

82. UNDP reported back from the first-ever conference on Southern providers, which was jointly organised by the government of India and UN DESA in New Delhi in April. A frank and productive discussion highlighted the comparative advantage of South-South development co-operation as being demand-driven, non-conditional, mindful of country ownership, and based on common but differentiated responsibilities. The final recommendations from participants included strengthening the collection of evidence and data analysis to translate good co-operation practices into standards; improving evaluation and quality control; establishing regional and national platforms of common interests to address challenges and identify solutions in Southern development co-operation; and strengthening multilateral and regional support, in particular for capacity building and knowledge sharing.

83. Mexico added that many participants in the Delhi meeting were critical of the Global Partnership, as they perceived it as OECD-driven. The meeting also generated a lively discussion on whether 'traditional' and Southern providers share the same level of responsibility for providing development co-operation, and there was interest in framing this discussion within the setting of the ministerial-level meeting.

84. Members flagged relevant upcoming events, including the private sector forum on Africa at the next UN General Assembly and the South-South Development Expo in Nairobi.

85. Several participants also raised the issue of the role of observers in future meetings and, more broadly, of the composition of the Steering Committee. In this regard, the private sector noted that it would be challenging to share its Steering Committee seat with philanthropic foundations, given the different roles and agendas of these two groups.

86. The UK proposed establishing a number of working groups to advance the discussion on specific themes envisioned for the ministerial-level meeting. It was agreed that it would be less cumbersome to identify champions for each theme of interest, as described in the summary of Session 7 [see below]. Steering Committee members also agreed to use the community space to organise themselves, share information and consult with all Global Partnership members on themes.

Session 7 – Milestones and division of labour in the lead up to the ministerial level meeting (*chaired by Anthony Smith, UK*)

87. The Steering Committee discussed key milestones and substantive preparatory work needed in the lead up to the ministerial-level meeting, including further member-led work on agenda preparation and deepening and broadening stakeholder engagement. To this end, the session agreed on seven areas for further elaboration, and identified champions for each area to take the lead in this work. The Co-Chairs noted that not all of these areas would necessarily result in a stand-alone session.

Themes	Champion
1. Implementation of the Busan commitments	EU, CPDE
2. Domestic resource mobilisation	Nigeria, AU, EU
3. Knowledge sharing	Indonesia, World Bank, Korea
4. Private sector	World Bank (MDBs), UK, Private sector
5. Middle Income Countries	Mexico
6. South-South and triangular cooperation	Mexico, Indonesia, Bangladesh
7. Inclusive development	US, CPDE

88. The session also agreed on the following three phases of the preparation and key milestones in the lead up to the first Ministerial Meeting.

89. Between July and October, lead countries or organizations (champions) within the Steering Committee have been tasked with consulting more broadly across Global Partnership members on the areas of focus, reaching out to the Building Blocks and other existing networks, identifying what additional analytical work is required, and developing strengthened proposals on each session or the agenda more broadly (e.g. format). In some cases, an introductory concept note might be required. In others, the starting point would be strengthening the co-chairs proposal for that session. The next Steering Committee meeting (early October) is expected to agree on a final structure for the agenda and a set of deliverables for the ministerial-level meeting.

90. Between October and January a more detailed plan and logistics for each session of the ministerial-level meeting will be prepared. A smaller core-team of the co-chairs, host and support team would need to lead on this. The Steering Committee will then meet early next year to endorse a final detailed agenda and to launch a final phase of consultation, outreach and engagement, including with media.

91. From January until the ministerial-level meeting, the Steering Committee as well as the broader membership of the Global Partnership will work to secure agreement around a set of concrete outcomes and deliverables for the first ministerial-level meeting, including agreeing on a communique and securing high-level political support and media visibility for the expected outcomes.

Session 8: Resources and ways of working

92. The OECD/UNDP support team presented its Activity Report, highlighting achievements in its first year in existence and detailing continued challenges, particularly related to a persistent shortfall in resources for the UNDP part of the team, which was affecting its ability to play a strong role (see Document 4). The team flagged the desire expressed at Busan and after to establish a globally light and flexible support facility without establishing new institutional structures.

93. The team presented an overview of the achievements it has supported in its first year, through July 2013, including: the establishment of the Global Partnership; preparation of three Steering Committee meetings; development and rolling out of a monitoring framework; several outreach and consultation efforts; and communications activities including a website, social media, and the Teamworks community space.

94. While demand for support activities will only increase in the run-up to the ministerial-level meeting, the team noted that it continues to face a major funding shortfall – particularly on the UNDP side – and that without sufficient additional resources, support functions will need to be scaled back and ultimately phased out, with country-facing support work likely to be

particularly impacted. The team pointed to the “A” and “B” scenarios presented in the Activity Report.

95. Discussion by Steering Committee members emphasized the importance of securing funding for the full envisioned programme of the support team (Scenario A). Mexico indicated that it will need the full engagement of the support team to successfully prepare the ministerial-level meetings, and that it will thus be important to ensure the team’s funding. Developing countries also raised the importance of securing funding to enable further country and regional support for the monitoring process and consultations, including through organization of workshops. There was also a suggestion to consider linking provision of resources to some level of engagement in the Global Partnership’s work.

96. The UK indicated it would work with the support team to help mobilize others and understand what additional supporting documentation might be necessary for the team to secure financial support.

Session 9: Any other business and next steps (*chaired by Chii Akporii, Nigeria*)

97. On the issue of relations between the Global Partnership and the Building Blocks, the CSO Platform for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) urged the Steering Committee to maintain strong communications with them in preparation for the ministerial-level meeting, given their expertise and potential contribution to the selected thematic areas. The US supported this proposal. The EU suggested inviting Building Block representatives to the next Steering Committee meeting, and noted that the private sector building block would likely play a strong role in further preparations. UNDP suggested also exploring alternative modalities for consulting such networks efficiently, including through online consultation and webinars.

98. Concerning the governance structure of the Steering Committee and the role of observers, several participants noted how the contribution from non-members had made the discussion richer. Others pointed to the need for rotating both observers and Steering Committee members to ensure a fair and balanced representation. The UK co-Chair recalled that while the final decision on membership should be taken at the ministerial-level meeting, it would be good to continue with the practice of inviting observers to Steering Committee meetings for the time being. Several members also suggested those organizations that had formally requested Steering Committee membership also be invited in future as observers. The Co-Chairs agreed to consider the feedback above in preparing future Steering Committee meetings.

99. Regarding the name of the ministerial-level meeting, the joint support team agreed to propose several options to Global Partnership members by way of an online survey.

100. Turkey announced that it would soon publish its development co-operation strategy and that it hoped that the ministerial-level meeting would provide guidance, particularly on the topic of public-private co-operation. It also noted the relevance of other themes to its agenda, like domestic resource mobilisation and knowledge sharing.

101. The next Steering Committee meeting will be planned for October, potentially back-to-back to the World Bank/IMF Annual meetings. A fifth Steering Committee meeting should be held early next year to finalise preparations for the meeting in Mexico.

* * * * *

Annex 1. List of Participants

List of Participants - Third Steering Committee Meeting Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation

25-26 July, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Co-Chairs

Indonesia

Hon. Armida ALISJAHBANA

Minister of National Development Planning
National Development Planning Agency

Mr. Wismana Adi SURYABRATA
Deputy Minister for Development Funding Affairs
Allocation of Development Funding
Ministry of National Development Planning

Mr. Tubagus CHOESNI
Director for International Development
Ministry of National Development Planning

Mr. Kurniawan (Iwan) ARIADI
Deputy Director/Administrative Assistance to the Minister
Ministry of National Development Planning

Mr. Mada DAHANA
Senior Planner, Directorate for International Development
Ministry of National Development Planning

Nigeria

Hon. Ngozi OKONJO-IWEALA

Minister of Finance, Federal Ministry of Finance

Ms. Chii AKPORJI
Special Adviser to the CME (Co-ordinating Minister for the Economy) and Hon Minister of
Finance
Ministry of Finance

Ms. Ada IHECHUCKWU-MADUBUIKE
Deputy Director, International Development Fund
International Economic Relations Department
Ministry of Finance

United Kingdom

Mr. Anthony SMITH (representing Hon. Justine Greening)
Director, International Relations Division
Department for International Development (DFID)

Ms. Hannah RYDER
Team Leader
Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation
Department for International Development

Ms. Louise THOMAS, UK Embassy in Addis Ababa

Steering Committee members

Bangladesh	Mr. Abul AZAD Secretary, Economic Relations Division Ministry of Finance
Chad	Dr. Brahim Adoum BACHAR General Secretary Ministry of Economics & Planning
CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness	Mr. Antonio TUJAN JR. Co-chair, CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness International Director, IBON Foundation, IBON Ms. Mayra MORO-COCO Policy and Advocacy Manager Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID)
EU	Mr. Vincent GRIMAUD Head of Unit, Aid and Development Effectiveness and Financing, European Commission
Korea	Youngju OH Director General, Development Cooperation Bureau Ministry of Foreign Affairs Ms. Jinjoo KIM Second Secretary, Development Policy Division Ministry of Foreign Affairs
OECD/DAC	Ms. Ana Paula FERNANDES Counsellor, DAC Vice-Chair and DAC Permanent Delegate Permanent Delegation of Portugal to the OECD Ms. Yukiko OKANO Counsellor, DAC Vice-Chair and DAC Delegate Permanent Delegation of Japan to the OECD
Parliamentarian representative	Mr. Martin CHUNGONG Director of Division of Programs, Co-Chair of Aid and Accountability Management Group Inter-Parliamentary Union Aleksandra BLAGOJEVIC Program Officer, International Development Inter-Parliamentary Union
Private Sector representative	Dr. Darian STIBBE Executive Director, The Partnering Initiative, IBLF Mr. Mogese GEBREMARIAM Ethiopian Employers' Federation
Samoa	Ms. Noumea SIMI Assistant CEO, Aid Coordination Unit Ministry of Finance Mr. Alfred SCHUSTER Development Cooperation Advisor Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
Timor-Leste	Mr. Helder DA COSTA Head of g7+ Secretariat, Aid Effectiveness Directorate Ministry of Finance Ms. Felicia CARVALHO Program and Coordination Officer, g7+ secretariat

UNDP/UNDG Ms. Sigrid KAAG
Assistant Secretary General and Assistant Administrator
Bureau for External Relations and Advocacy

Mr. Paolo GALLI
Cluster Leader, Multilateral Affairs and UN Coherence Cluster, BERA, UN Development Programme (UNDP)

United States Alex THIER
Assistant Administrator
Policy, Planning and Learning
U.S. Agency for International Development

Mr. Steven PIERCE
US Representative to the DAC
Permanent Delegation

World Bank Ms. Astrid MANROTH
Operations Adviser, Openness and Aid Effectiveness

Ms. Julia NIELSON
Acting Director and Special Representative to Europe
France, G20, OECD Delegate

Observers

African Union Commission (AUC)
(Host organisation) H.E Mr. Erastus Mwencha, Deputy Chairperson, African Union Commission (representing H.E Dr. Nkosazana Dlamini ZUMA, Chairperson of the AU Commission)

H.E Dr. Anthony Mothae Maruping, Commissioner for Economic Affairs

Mrs. Florence Nazare, Head Capacity Development Division, NEPAD Planning & Coordinating Agency

Mr. Jean Yves Adou, Senior Programme Officer – NEPAD, NEPAD Coordination Unit, Bureau of the Chairperson

Mr. Ramatlali Nkhahle Edward, Special Assistant to the Commissioner for Economic affairs, Economic Affairs Department

Mr. Amadou Cisse, Senior Policy Officer, Economic Affairs Department

Mr. Abia Sunday Udoh, Policy officer, Economic Affairs Department

Mrs. Ndinaye Charumbira, Policy Officer, Economic Affairs Department

Arab Donor Coordination Group Mr. Said AISSI
Advisor to Director-General, Operations Management
OPEC Fund for International Development

Brazil Marcelo Adrião BORGES
First Secretary
Embassy of Brazil in Addis Ababa

China Liang ZHEN
Office of the Embassy of P.R. China

Ethiopia Hon. Alemayehu Gujo
State Minister of Finance and Economic Development
Ministry of Finance and Economic Development

Mexico Mr. Luis Javier CAMPUZANO
Ambassador, Permanent Representative to UNEP
Permanent Representative of Mexico to UNEP
Embassy of Mexico in Nairobi

NOEL GONZALEZ
Deputy Director General for Policy Making
Mexican Agency for International Development Cooperation

Mr. Juan Alfredo MIRANDA
Ambassador, Ethiopia

Rockefeller
Foundation Mr. C.D. GLIN
Associate Director, Africa Region
ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

South Africa Simon FERREIRA
Deputy Director: Social cluster
National Treasury

STARS Foundation Ms. Muna WEHBE
CEO, STARS Foundation

Turkey Dr. Mehmet YILMAZ
Head of External Affairs and Partnerships Department
Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency

Joint Support Team

M. Alain AKPADJI
Aid Effectiveness Adviser
Africa Regional Service Centre, Ethiopia, UNDP

Mrs. Farida BENA
Policy Analyst, OECD

Mr. Gerardo BRACHO
Senior Policy Analyst, OECD

Ms. Brenda KILLEN
Head of Division, Global Partnerships and Policies Division, OECD

Mr. Derek KILNER
Partnerships Development Analyst
Bureau of External Relations and Advocacy, UNDP

Mr. Robin OGILVY
Senior Policy Advisor, OECD

Ms. Yuko SUZUKI
Policy Adviser, Effective Development Co-operation/BDP, UNDP

Ms. Meron TAMRAT
Africa Regional Service Centre, Ethiopia, UNDP

Mr. Matthew TAYLOR
Public Affairs Specialist, Seoul Policy Centre, UNDP

Ms. Elaine VENTER
Team Leader, Capacity Development, RSC Johannesburg, South Africa, UNDP