

Outline of Key Findings Emerging from the Monitoring Evidence

Global Partnership Monitoring Framework

Fifth meeting of the Global Partnership Steering Committee
13-14 February 2014, Abuja, Nigeria

This document presents an update on the status of the 2013 round of monitoring the Busan commitments. It presents a snapshot of the preliminary findings from the data gathering exercise.

Contacts:

Ms. Marjolaine Nicod, tel. +33 1 45 24 98 32, email: hanna-mari.kilpelainen@oecd.org

Ms. Hanna-Mari Kilpelainen, tel. +33 1 45 24 98 32, email: hanna-mari.kilpelainen@oecd.org

Ms. Yuko Suzuki, tel. +1 212 906 6509, email: yuko.suzuki@undp.org

INTRODUCTION

This document outlines the emerging key findings from the 2013 stock take of progress. The joint support team is carrying out final data checks, and results are still subject to confirmation. Final monitoring results will be compiled into the progress report, launched in mid-March to inform discussions at the Mexico High-Level Meeting. This report will be an important contribution to support evidence based dialogue and international accountability for implementing commitments and actions agreed in Busan.

Participation in Global Partnership monitoring efforts is voluntary. The Global Partnership monitoring framework consists of 10 indicators and associated targets for 2015. Six indicators are measured using data collected at the level of individual developing countries, while four indicators draw on other sources of information and are established through desk reviews. The monitoring framework was launched in June 2013, in the form of an introductory workshop for developing countries and monitoring guidance. Eventually, 43 developing countries submitted their data and completed the exercise.

Preliminary findings are presented below (see table on page 2). Steering Committee members are invited to provide guidance in crafting political messages arising from the evidence:

- *How could these findings be framed and presented to different political audiences in a way that facilitates action oriented discussions on progress in Mexico?*

Scope of Global Partnership monitoring efforts in 2013

- Country-level data collection process completed in 43 developing countries.
- Continuous engagement of 35 countries since the final round of monitoring the Paris Declaration in 2011, providing a basis for some comparison over time on selected indicators.
- Countries engaging in global monitoring efforts for the first time: Côte d'Ivoire, Congo, and six Pacific Island countries.
- Growing interest and broader participation expected in the future: interest from countries looking at ways to consolidate their own monitoring and review processes to reflect Busan principles (e.g. Afghanistan, Bosnia, South Africa, New Deal countries).
- Involvement of over 70 co-operation providers reporting data to national governments.
- In terms of funding, the monitoring process reviews the quality of approximately one third of global country programmable aid, including several of the top aid recipients (e.g. Congo Dem. Rep., Vietnam, Ethiopia, Kenya and Tanzania).

10 indicators	2015 targets	State of implementation* <i>(subject to final data checking)</i>
Ownership and results of development co-operation		
Indicator 1. Development co-operation is focused on results that meet developing countries' priorities	All providers of development co-operation use country results frameworks	<i>Too early to assess progress</i> – indicator piloted in 10 countries Preliminary feedback suggesting great variation in use among providers but consistent behaviour across countries
Indicator 6. Aid is on budgets which are subject to parliamentary scrutiny	Halve the gap – halve the proportion of development cooperation flows to the government sector not reported on government's budget(s) (with at least 85% reported on budget)	<i>To be confirmed</i> - some progress expected between 2010 and 2013
Indicator 9. Developing countries' systems are strengthened and used	Half of developing countries move up at least one measure (i.e. 0.5 points) on the PFM/CPIA scale of performance Reduce the gap in the use of PFM and procurement systems (by two-thirds where CPIA score is ≥ 5 ; or by one-third where between 3.5 and 4.5)	<i>Previous achievements sustained but more needed.</i> No overall change in the quality of countries' public financial management systems: progress achieved between 2005 and 2010 sustained in 2013. <i>Previous achievements sustained but more progress needed.</i> No change in use of country systems: progress achieved between 2005 and 2010 sustained in 2013 (around 50%, TBC)
Indicator 10. Aid is untied	Continued progress over time	<i>Some progress.</i> 79% of bilateral ODA is untied (in comparison with 77% in 2010). Progress also made in reporting tying status.
Inclusive development partnerships		
Indicator 2. Civil society operates within an environment that maximises its engagement in and contribution to development	Continued progress over time	<i>Too early to assess progress</i> – further thinking needed on measurement due to data limitation. Mixed picture with evidence of positive examples of government efforts to facilitate the work of CSOs while important challenges prevailing in many countries.
Indicator 3. Engagement and contribution of the private sector to development	Continued progress over time	<i>Too early to assess progress</i> – indicator pilot ongoing.
Indicator 8. Gender equality and women's empowerment	All developing countries have systems that track and make public resource allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment	<i>A good start.</i> One third of the countries have systems in place with indications of others committed to track gender allocations more systematically.
Transparency and accountability to each other		
Indicator 4. Information on development co-operation is publicly available	Implement the common standard	<i>A good start</i> in implementing the common standard but more efforts needed particularly on transparency of forward information – as confirmed by indicator 5b.
Indicator 5(a) annual predictability: proportion of development cooperation funding disbursed within the fiscal year within which it was scheduled by co-operation providers	Halve the gap – halve the proportion of development cooperation funding not disbursed within the fiscal year for which it was scheduled	<i>To be confirmed</i> - some progress expected between 2010 and 2013.
Indicator 5(b) medium-term predictability: proportion of development cooperation funding covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at country level	Halve the gap – halve the proportion of development cooperation funding not covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at country level	<i>A good start but more progress needed:</i> some encouraging data provision for 1-2 years ahead, but serious effort needed to implement Accra commitment of 3-5 years ahead.
Indicator 7. Mutual accountability among co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews	All developing countries have inclusive mutual assessment reviews in place	<i>Some progress:</i> 50% of the countries have mutual assessment reviews in place in 2012 (45% in 2010 with fewer criteria) but more effort needed to make such reviews inclusive and transparent.

EMERGING POLITICAL NARRATIVE

On the Monitoring Framework

- An evidence-based approach has been the key characteristic of international effectiveness efforts since 2005. In Busan developing countries called for the continuation of a global monitoring framework to uphold accountability and support country-level implementation efforts.
- The Global Partnership monitoring framework was designed to reflect the Busan spirit of a country-led approach; developing countries choose when and how they engage with global monitoring efforts, based on their own data, planning cycle and country priorities. This approach draws on, and contributes to, strengthen countries' own accountability processes.
- Two years after Busan, developing countries confirmed that global accountability for the Busan principles and, in particular, the focus on core aid effectiveness commitments matter: 43 developing countries submitted their data to inform political discussions on progress in Mexico.
- This group includes countries of low and middle income status, from all regions (Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America, Central Europe and Asia).
- Countries such as Cote d'Ivoire, Congo and Pacific Island States have engaged in global monitoring efforts for the first time.
- An increasingly diverse set of co-operation providers such as members of the Arab Coordination Group and emerging economies are participating in accountability processes at the country level. This engagement reflects the diversity of the Global Partnership and is recognised as an important manifestation of the spirit of inclusiveness forged in Busan.

Implementing the Busan principles [preliminary conclusions – subject to final confirmation]

- Overall, the glass is half full. Efforts to implement the commitments are underway. With concerted and targeted action to build on achievements and address bottlenecks, further progress can be demonstrated by 2015.
- Country ownership continues to strengthen. Progress achieved in 2010 around strengthening and using country systems, although falling short of desired Paris/Accra targets, has broadly been sustained despite pressure on development co-operation programmes. Whether strengthened ownership is translating into increased use of countries' own results frameworks to guide development co-operation on the whole is too early to say.
- Inclusiveness – the core of the Busan Partnership agreement – is translating into stronger recognition and engagement of non-state development actors, including private sector and civil society. Full engagement of these actors in national systems and accountability process and recognition of their contributions to development will, however, require more time and effort in a development co-operation architecture that is still skewed towards a government centred, north-south setting.
- The transparency drive is starting to show results – but these need to be geared towards countries' needs. Increased availability of information is not yet translating systematically into greater support to countries' strategic planning. Continued effort is needed for the high-level political commitment to work its

way through co-operation providers' systems and procedures to allow truly transparent and predictable co-operation, where information is geared towards supporting developing countries own planning needs and activities.

- Mutual accountability for implementing agreed commitments is growing stronger – which is underscored by the observations around the monitoring process itself. Greater transparency and inclusiveness is still needed to fully reflect mutual accountability among all relevant stakeholders for shared effectiveness principles.

The way forward

- **Reform takes time – but it works.** Sustained progress in 'aid effectiveness' commitments such as use of country systems, aid on budget and predictability shows efforts taken since 2005 are having an impact. These commitments, agreed to in 2005, have required profound transformations in the way development co-operation is managed and delivered. That this reform has yielded results encourages continued investments in 'younger' Busan commitments to further articulate action and behaviour change required, and to pursue these reforms with a view to demonstrating initial progress by 2015.
- **Monitoring spurs further action.** Continued monitoring of progress will help track the translation of political rhetoric into action and behaviour change, which in turn will encourage further political ambition to make development co-operation more effective.
- **There is strong demand for country-owned monitoring.** Lessons from monitoring efforts indicate that the transformation towards country-owned monitoring is both desirable and feasible. Several countries beyond those currently participating in the Global Partnership monitoring process are articulating their own mechanisms to review progress on Busan commitments.
- **Country-led monitoring and accountability paves the way for transparent and evidence-based decision making.** The benefits of increased country leadership and more embedded monitoring efforts have not come without challenges: relying on countries' existing data collection cycles and tools has incurred data gaps and a less comprehensive data set. The ambition is to rely fully on country-led processes for simple 'snapshots' of progress for global accountability purposes. This will require further investments to strengthen national accountability frameworks, particularly to improve the quality of country systems and data.
- **Empower country operations to be Busan compliant.** Country leadership needs to be matched with strengthened engagement of providers at country level to ensure legitimacy of global monitoring efforts which will increasingly be embedded in the national monitoring processes. For this to work, co-operation providers need to address apparent disconnects between headquarters and country office operations. This will be key to accurately monitor progress and reinforce mutual accountability both at the country and global levels.
- **Use what we have and make it work better.** Plans are underway to review lessons learned and strengthen the existing methodology and approach to ensure that global monitoring efforts remain relevant to developing countries' needs and priorities. A more comprehensive review of the global arrangements for monitoring Busan commitments could be envisaged in 2015 with a view to assessing their fit with, and contribution to the implementation arrangements emerging for the new global development framework.