



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

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

11th Meeting of the Global Partnership Steering Committee
Seoul, 8 October 2016

Contacts

Mr. Thomas Boehler, Tel: +33 1 45 24 87 75, email: thomas.boehler@oecd.org

Ms. Emily Davis, email: Emily.davis@undp.org

SUMMARY OF THE 11TH STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

Representatives of the Global Partnership Steering Committee met with representatives of the Co-Chairs and the Joint Support Team back-to-back with the Third Annual Global Partnership Forum in Seoul, Republic of Korea, on Saturday, 8 October 2016. They provided feedback on elements of a renewed mandate and the revised draft Nairobi Outcome Document and agreed on next steps for their finalisation and endorsement.

I. TOWARDS A RENEWED GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP MANDATE (SESSION 1)

Actions arising:

The JST will work with co-chairs to propose a draft mandate to the Steering Committee by end October 2016, for further consultation. The renewed mandate, once agreed, is expected to be annexed to the outcome document.

The Joint Support Team will develop draft Terms of References outlining prospective roles and responsibilities of Co-chairs and Steering Committee members to be agreed ahead of HLM2.

CPDE is invited to submit to the Co-chairs and JST a detailed proposal for a fourth non-executive Co-chair. JST will develop two alternative sets of Terms of References, based on either a 3 or 4 Co-Chair scenario. Decision on the mandate, Terms of References and number of Co-chairs will be taken by written procedure.

The Working Group on Country Level Implementation will be invited to contribute practical proposals to encourage country-level implementation of agreed commitments in future.

Summary of discussions

Steering Committee members **welcomed the proposed elements for a renewed mandate as a basis for a draft mandate proposal**. In addition to inputs from earlier consultations and feedback from stakeholders and working groups, Steering Committee members also recommended to:

- **Articulate the succinct scope of the Global Partnership.** The Global Partnership does not cover the entirety of the means of implementation, but the effectiveness of development co-operation.
- **Within this scope, focus on supporting concrete action to promote effective development co-operation at country-level.** The mandate should define concrete areas of work, building on the four-point transformation agenda. The Working Group on Country Level Implementation is invited to make specific proposals on how the Global Partnership can **support country-level implementation of agreed commitments** in future.
- **Emphasise the continued importance of work on** agreed effectiveness principles and commitments and the role of evidence and data for accountability.

- **Raise the importance of how development co-operation can benefit all actors, the inclusive nature of the Global Partnership and its ability to facilitate learning and knowledge sharing** in areas of common interest, such as South-South cooperation, but also **peer learning within constituents including through regional organisations.**
- **Convey progress to inform global-level follow-up and review.** The quality of evidence and data produced by the Global Partnership and its ability to help improve the impact and results of effective development co-operation at country level will define its success in the 2030 era. The mandate should clarify how the Global Partnership will contribute to the follow-up and review of SDG 17 as well as the Financing for Development process. With this, it will shape its complementary nature and synergies within the new global architecture.

Working arrangements. The Steering Committee took the following decisions:

- **Hold High-Level Meetings every two years to uphold accountability.** There was discussion concerning the proposal of modifying the frequency of High-Level Meetings (currently 18-24 months, in practice every 2.5 years) to one stand-alone High-Level meeting every four years and, one senior technical level meeting in between after approximately 2 years. There was openness for considering a well thought-through proposal, linking the Global Partnership with the UN High-Level Political Forum hosted by the UN General Assembly at Heads of State and Government level or possibly back-to-back with a World Bank annual or Spring meeting to strengthen synergies and minimise cost. The JST was invited to present a more detailed proposal for consideration by the Steering Committee to make sure that the Global Partnership maintains its relevance and visibility before a decision is made.
- **Ensure continued political momentum in between High-Level Meetings** through global-light and country-focused action and dialogues. This should make best possible use of existing platforms including to organise:
 - **Annual technical exchanges** to discuss monitoring findings and progress;
 - **Specialised policy dialogues**, also building on monitoring findings, to accelerate progress on specific bottlenecks with interested “communities of interest”, coordinated with the work of Global Partnership Initiatives and regional platforms;
 - **Regional dialogues** to engage actors with similar interests and objectives to build consensus and strengthen advocacy around their priorities; and
 - **National multi-stakeholder dialogues on development effectiveness** to translate deliberations into action at country level. Global Partnership focal points could help accelerate progress in all countries and/or at regional level.
- **Prepare Terms of References to clarify roles and responsibilities** of co-chairs and Steering Committee members. They should clarify responsibilities among co-chairs, of Steering Committee members and constituencies, and how they work together.
- **Consider a fourth, non-executive co-chair**, keeping in mind the need to clarify roles further and the caveat of coordination challenges. To inform a decision, CPDE is invited to work with the JST to propose function and scope of work (including how a fourth co-chair would impact the TORs for a 3-co-chair scenario), representation/level

(“Ministerial” character), open and transparent process of rotation among constituencies and regions, open and transparent process of election etc. of a non-executive co-chair.

- Develop a regular **work plan** to agree on priorities and a budget. It serves as internal accountability mechanism to demonstrate progress, to invite contributions and ensure linkages to all parts of the Partnership, including GPIs. Steering Committee members would be responsible for its implementation as heads of specific work streams.
- **Hold Steering Committee meetings twice a year**, if possible back-to-back with other meetings and focus on the implementing of the agreed work plan.

II. THE NAIROBI OUTCOME DOCUMENT (SESSION 2)

Actions arising:

Steering Committee members are invited to **provide consolidated written comments** from their constituency on the latest draft Nairobi Outcome Document (dated 3 October 2016) by Monday, 24 October 2016 to info@effectivecooperation.org. The Joint Support Team will **post all written comments** to a password protected web-page as they are being received and flag possible areas of divergence. Around these possible areas of divergence Co-Chairs will organise groups of affected Steering Committee members in order to iron out any divergences before the Nairobi meeting. The address is: <http://effectivecooperation.org/hlm2-outcome-document-consultations-individual-contributions/> (*To obtain the password please contact info@effectivecooperation.org*). A **revised draft** will be issued in November.

The **Steering Committee agreed to meet** on Tuesday 29 November 2016 in Nairobi, Kenya in parallel to the pre-meetings of HLM2 on the Nairobi outcome document if needed. Please indicate to info@effectivecooperation.org in case you are NOT able to participate on this date.

Summary of discussions

Steering Committee members have greatly welcomed progress made on the revised draft Nairobi Outcome Document and provided initial feedback on structure and style, content, and the proposed process to finalise the document for the Kenyan host to consider:

There was consensus to make efforts in order to **shorten the document** and ensure it is **focused on effective development co-operation**, with an **assertive tone**. It should balance past, present and future concerns in a way that helps ensure the document remains **action-oriented**. The **consistent use of terminology** (principles, actors, “New deal” etc.) and no need to repeat at length the content of other international agreements was highlighted. The **mandate** section should be informed by the outcome of the mandate discussion, and the full mandate should be annexed to the outcome document.

Scope. The document should focus on **issues directly related to effective development co-operation** without duplicating the work of other bodies. It should reflect the paradigm shift embodied by the 2030 Agenda and outline how different actors will improve their contributions to achieve commitments agreed in 2015 without diverging from already agreed language.

Reflecting stakeholder commitments. There was agreement to suggest **raising the level of ambition and be specific and bold about implementing principles and commitments, differentiating by actor.** The following suggestions were made for a focused approach in presenting stakeholder commitments:

- Focus on **commitments related to effective development co-operation**;
- Encourage **stakeholders to agree priorities** as input to the draft outcome document and be realistic about proposed commitments;
- Present commitments in a way that **constituency-specific commitments link to effectiveness principles** and a “lowest common denominator” approach is avoided;
- Highlight **new commitments** but at the same time, in a balanced manner, need **to re-commit to priorities** where progress is lacking and to situate them in the 2030 context;
- **Deepen commitments based on monitoring findings** and what HLM2 can be anticipated to conclude, and ensure they are geared towards **influencing operations**, e.g. by moving from publishing data to using data, and **link them to the 2030 Agenda**, e.g. through greater results focus or referring to commitments from the World Humanitarian Summit.
- Clarify **data publishing commitments** and their exact scope and resolve whether data by development partners can be validated at country level ahead of reporting and, if pre-publication validation is not feasible, suggest an alternative approach;

Feedback on specific issues. Steering Committee members advised to:

- Further exchange on Mexico’s proposal to feature **“Leaving No One Behind”** as a fifth principle of the Global Partnership and focus on how it could be operationalised in the framework of development effectiveness;
- **Keep reference to global challenges** (e.g. public health crisis) from previous version;
- Make appropriate reference to the **knowledge sharing function** of the Global Partnership;
- Ensure **Global Partnership Initiatives** are captured;
- Clarify rationale of **“Aid Effectiveness Committee”** and the **“New Deal”**;
- Clarify how to advance monitoring effectiveness of different stakeholders
- **Civil society**: Include references to labour and human rights and to civil society as independent development actor.
- **Private sector**: Explore the idea of organising meetings among all actors at country level to advance implementation of effectiveness principles;
- **Foundations**: Use the term “institutional philanthropy” as it embraces a greater diversity of actors; refer to the principles of philanthropic engagement and the need for fostering an enabling environment.
- **Regional Platforms**: Include a reference to the importance of regional platforms as key actors in negotiating and building consensus around a contextualised approach to localising the GPEDC mandate and principles at the country level.

Process

It was agreed to dedicate **one full day ahead of the HLM2 to confirm all the elements of the Nairobi Outcome Document**, if it is not being formalised beforehand. Further **outreach to constituents**, in particular BRICS (e.g. through UNDP China workshop 7-9 November 2016), was emphasised. It was discussed whether a **press release** with key decisions encapsulated in the document should be prepared. It was resolved that, prompted by the JST, co-chairs would organize specific groups of implicated Steering Committee constituency representatives in discussions on areas of divergence emerging from comments on the outcome document (e.g. on pre-publication validation of data).