



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

2014 OUTCOME REPORT ANNUAL WORKSHOP

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP
FOR EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT
CO-OPERATION

6-7 November, 2014
Seoul, Republic of Korea



Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Republic of Korea

Table of Content

04	Acronyms
05	Executive Summary
	Context:
07	Message from the Government of Korea
08	Chapter 1. Background
10	Chapter 2. Recent Major GPEDC Activities
	Discussion Highlights:
12	Chapter 3. Beyond Busan
14	Chapter 4. Country Ownership, Country Systems
17	Chapter 5. Monitoring
22	Chapter 6. Building Blocks and Voluntary Initiatives
26	Chapter 7. Looking Ahead
28	Chapter 8. Conclusions and Key Takeaways
	Annexes:
31	1. Annotated Agenda
37	2. List of Participants

This report was prepared by the Development Cooperation Bureau of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea, in collaboration with Mr. John Sinclair of the North-South Institute (Canada) and the UNDP Seoul Policy Centre, with inputs from the Joint Support Team of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation.

For more information about the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (GPEDC)
Visit: www.effectivecooperation.org

Key background papers and presentations to the Workshop are available on the MOFA website.
Visit: http://www.mofa.go.kr/ENG/policy/oda/GPEDC/documents/index.jsp?menu=m_20_110_20

Acronyms

- **BRICS** Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa. A network of Emerging Economies.
- **CSO** Civil Society Organisation
- **CRF** Country Results Framework
- **CRS** Creditor Reporting System
- **DAC** Development Assistance Committee of the OECD
- **DCF** Development Co-operation Forum. UN/ECOSOC body.
- **DRM** Domestic Resource Mobilisation
- **FfD** UN Conference on Financing for Development
- **FSS** Forward Spending Plans
- **GPEDC** Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation
- **IATI** International Aid Transparency Initiative. A voluntary multi-stakeholder body.
- **JST** Joint Support Team.
This joint team brings together staff from the UNDP and OECD to support the Global Partnership.
- **LDC, MIC** Least Developed Country, Middle-Income Country
- **MDGs** Millennium Development Goals
- **MF** Monitoring Framework of the GPEDC
- **MAF** Mutual Accountability Framework
- **MOFA** Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea
- **PPP** Public Private Partnership
- **SSC** South-South Co-operation
- **SWAp** Sector-Wide Approach
- **VI** Voluntary Initiatives.
Informal arrangements made at the Mexico HLM to take forward specific Busan Commitments.

Executive Summary

The Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (GPEDC), formed in Busan, Korea, in November 2011, is responsible for supporting the implementation of the Busan commitments as adopted at the HLF-4. The Partnership is a multi-stakeholder framework that brings together providers and recipients of development co-operation, civil society organisations, the private sector and other development actors. Its first High Level Meeting was held in Mexico City in April 2014 where the Government of Korea offered to host an annual workshop.

The first Busan Global Partnership Workshop was held in Seoul in November 2014. Some 150 participants came together for two days of meetings focused on the recent achievements of the Partnership and the key challenges that lay ahead, including those associated with support to the Post-2015 Agenda. Discussions ranged broadly in both plenary and working group sessions. Talks were open and practical in their approach. Participants recognised that the GPEDC's work was ultimately part of a broader political process, both at national and global levels.

An important synergy and complementarity was recognised between the Partnership and the emerging framework of the Post-2015 Agenda, in terms of both the overall mission and the instruments developed, including the possible need for an enhanced Monitoring Framework.

Monitoring (Ch. 5) was a recurring theme in the Workshop's discussions. The 2014 Progress Report on the effectiveness of development co-operation efforts of the Global Partnership was an important unifying element. This first report found a 'glass half-full' performance. The discussions noted particular effectiveness concerns over the underutilisation of country systems, the quality of trust in processes, inclusiveness including a sense of a diminished 'space' for CSO action, gaps in donor transparency, and not least, being seen as often distant from target populations with insufficient linkage with ground realities. A set of Indicator Clinics looked specifically at how to improve the quality and focus of monitoring.

Under the heading of 'Country Level' (Ch. 4), the main discussion dealt with the seeming paradox of the growing quality of country systems in partner countries with no commensurate growth in their use by donors. There was a concern that the Busan principle of country-ownership was not yet deeply rooted. There was a need for greater engagement with partner developing countries and target populations. A results-driven approach was seen as essential, with a preference to link this to a Mutual Accountability Framework.

The Partnership has seen an important role for innovation in co-operation approaches and programming. It sees this as a means of customising its work to match country circumstances through pilots. This approach was discussed in the Workshop under the headings of 'Building Blocks and Voluntary Initiatives' (Ch. 6). The principal topics covered were South-South Co-operation and Middle Income Countries, Public-Private Partnership and Domestic Resource Mobilisation, which were also major topics of the Mexico HLM. South-South Co-operation was recognised as a maturing mechanism in partnership activities as a direct link between developing countries sharing experiences and skills. Public-Private Partnership was also an evolving reality, often linked to changing perceptions amongst private enterprises as to the possibilities of working with a greater alignment with national and global development goals. Domestic Resource Mobilisation has always been understood as a key factor in development, but the workshop discussants saw this as now a more urgent requirement for partner countries and also better understood as a neglected area for donor support. The other Building Blocks highlighted were "Managing Diversity and Reducing Fragmentation" and "Results and Mutual Accountability."

Looking ahead there is a series of key meetings taking place in the coming year, notably a High Level Symposium with the UN DCF, hosted by Korea in April and the UN Conference on Financing for Development in Addis Ababa in July, both taking place ahead of the UN Post-2015 Agenda Summit in September 2015. This will accordingly be a year of new challenges for the Global Partnership.

In drawing its conclusions (Ch. 8) for the coming years, the Workshop saw two main threads: first, the continuity of its core work in strengthening the Partnership as a multi-stakeholder vehicle for supporting effective development co-operation; and second, to align with and contribute optimally to the emerging Post-2015 Agenda with its core goal of eliminating extreme poverty by 2030.

This Report has pulled together a series of 'takeaways' from the comments of participants for consideration in framing the Global Partnerships work over the coming year. A 'must do' was seen as defining a primary, value added role in supporting the implementation of the Post-2015 Agenda. Equally essential was seen the building of a closer, more trusting, relationship, in working at the 'country level' and better engaging the target population. To help meet these and other key objectives, participants suggested that the GPEDC - and themselves as active partners - needed to recommit to the Busan principles by way of 'global light, country focus', along with respect for the Korean approach of 'focus on the practical.'

Message from the Government of Korea

› *By Mr. Shin Dong-ik, Deputy Minister of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

The year 2015 is a turning point in accelerating our joint efforts to eradicate extreme poverty once and for all. Building upon our long-standing development work, including on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), we will collectively renew our commitments toward achieving a new set of development goals under the Post-2015 Agenda. As UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon highlighted¹, however, agreed goals should be actionable, measurable and accountable to make a real impact in better changing people's lives. Indeed, the effective delivery method of development goals matters as much as the actual selection of the Post-2015 development goals.

In this vein, the Korean Government attaches great importance to the potential role of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation in the post-2015 development era. We have initiated the Busan Global Partnership Annual Workshop and the GPEDC Training and Accelerating Program to boost the work of the Partnership as a relatively new alliance of multi-stakeholders in development co-operation.

The key objective of the Workshop is to make it a "knowledge incubator" connected to fieldwork. Notably, drawn upon insights emerging from the Partnership's first monitoring report, the core focus of the workshop was on sharing the showcases and challenges in implementing the Busan commitments on the ground, seeking out optimal approaches to the 'how' of the Post-2015 Development Agenda. In this context, this Workshop report sets out the achievements of a lively and committed dialogue between high-level officials and front line practitioners, civil society representatives, business people and researchers, from both the North and South. This rich diversity reflected the "Busan spirit," which is anchored at the heart of the Global Partnership.

The meeting sought not to make decisions in isolation but to arrive at conclusions rooted in realities on the ground and linked to the global context. In 2015, there will be several important milestones along the way. I am particularly pleased that the UN DCF High Level Symposium will be held in Korea next April. This will be an early opportunity to solidify the desired synergy between the UN process and that of the Global Partnership, especially in the implementation of the Post-2015 Agenda. The Global Partnership will contribute to a pragmatic and practical "enabling framework."

We know a long journey lies ahead in eliminating poverty and providing for inclusive sustainable development. I hope that Korea, as a country that successfully overcame extreme poverty within a few decades, continues to inspire many other countries in tackling their own development challenges through its "lead by example" philosophy and practicality. It is also my hope that the key takeaways from the Seoul workshop in November 2014 will be the first elements in the Global Partnership's support of the Post-2015 Agenda. These outcomes will further form a baseline in assessing our progress at the 2015 Workshop, which my government will be pleased to host.

¹ "The true measure of success of the UN is not how much we promise, but how much we deliver for those who need us most." Acceptance Speech by UN Secretary General, 3 Oct. 2006, New York.

Chapter 1. **Background**

The Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation² (GPEDC) was formed in Busan, Korea, in November 2011. From Monterrey onwards and even before, there had been growing concern over development assistance not delivering the necessary benefits, especially those needed for meeting the MDGs. The cycle from Paris Declaration to Accra Agenda to Busan Partnership has led to important commitments to working together to strengthen the effectiveness of development co-operation. The Global Partnership, as agreed in Busan, embodies this exact goal. It provides the mechanism of multi-stakeholder³ engagement for effective implementation and a monitoring framework for the Busan commitments. In parallel, the proposed UN Post-2015 Agenda with its new set of development goals will provide the context in which effective development co-operation can be put into practice.

In this context, the Korean Government initiated an annual Workshop to “take stock and bring together partners to review implementation of the Busan commitments at country level.” The 2014 Workshop held on 6-7 November in Seoul followed the first High Level Meeting of the GPEDC hosted by Mexico in April 2014. The Seoul Workshop brought together about 150 participants from around the world, including members of the Steering Committee⁴ of the GPEDC, representatives of donor organisations and those from the South, senior officials of developing partner countries (including frontline implementers of development programmes), plus a broad cross-section of civil society organisations (CSOs), private sector leaders and other stakeholders. They shared a common objective of bringing more effective development co-operation to nations and individuals.

The Workshop was organised around a series of plenaries and working groups⁵. The Workshop format was designed to support open interactive discussions. All participants engaged in the discussions of a very full agenda. (See Annex 1 for the full programme, which lists both subjects and key speakers) Plenaries were led by two external moderators. The working groups were run with parallel sessions, each delving more deeply into aspects raised in the plenaries. The closing plenary explored the future role of the GPEDC with a panel composed of members of the Steering Committee.

² For the purpose of readability in this report, where ambiguity is not likely, the text will often refer just to the ‘Partnership’ or the ‘GPEDC’ rather than the full formal title. It also refers just to ‘Co-Chairs’ rather than their representatives.

³ ‘Multi-stakeholder partnerships’ have created their own preferred vocabulary. This report has tended to use ‘donor’ for a Northern/DAC development partner, ‘provider’ mostly for a development partner from the South that is active in South-South co-operation, and ‘partner country’ to refer to a developing country recipient.

⁴ This has new Co-Chairs and an enhanced membership since July 2014.

⁵ Inevitably this report is a compressed synthesis of rich discussions over two days. A cross-section of these presentations and a Concept Note of this Workshop are available on a special MOFA website.

http://www.mofa.go.kr/ENG/policy/oda/GPEDC/documents/index.jsp?menu=m_20_110_20

The closing session heard the current thoughts and recommendations from the GPEDC Co-Chairs, as well as senior officials from the UNDP and OECD/DAC, the two organisations that provide the Joint Support Team for the Partnership.

Given the GPEDC's broad-ranging nature and multi-stakeholder approach, the Workshop provided an institutional bridge among the existing arrangements and activities in a practical way. For instance, selected Building Blocks and Voluntary Initiatives of the GPEDC presented showcases to facilitate the on-going work of the GPEDC and its stakeholders. In addition, the Workshop was held back-to-back with the GPEDC Learning & Accelerating Program⁶ to which senior officers and practitioners from developing countries were invited. This created greater synergy between development partners by narrowing gaps in their understanding of the GPEDC. This practical link should be strengthened and refined for the future of the GPEDC.

⁶ The Korean Government submitted at the Mexico HLM a Voluntary Initiative - the GPEDC Learning & Accelerating Program which is reflected in the Annex (No. 25) to the Mexico HLM Communiqué. The first training program was held on 3-5 November 2014 in KOICA in collaboration between MOFA (Korea), KOICA, the EU and the UNDP Seoul Policy Centre as well as the GPEDC Joint Support Team.

Chapter 2. **Recent Major GPEDC Activities**

› *These notes are provided as context to the detailed discussions of the Workshop.*

First High Level Meeting (HLM): This event was a key milestone for the GPEDC. It was hosted by the Government of Mexico on 15-16 April, 2014. It produced a first formal assessment of progress since Busan on the path to greater development effectiveness. It brought together over 1500 individual participants, including ministers and senior officials from developed and developing countries and international organisations, as well as leaders of civil society organisations, parliamentarians, trade unions, philanthropic foundations and private sector entities.

The meeting issued a communiqué (also refer to the GPEDC website) that re-committed the participants to the spirit and substance of the Busan Partnership. Its broad ranging discussions covered topics of development partnerships, results, transparency and accountability, country ownership, fragility and conflict, and inclusiveness. It explored both principles and practical challenges of implementation, including the matter of political commitment at all levels. It also addressed emerging thematic issues such as Middle-Income Countries, South-South Co-operation and Domestic Resource Mobilization in the work of the Partnership.

A key document released in Mexico City was the 2014 Progress Report. This report framed important parts of the discussions at the 2014 Seoul Workshop. The details and nuances are covered in this report, notably in Chapter 5. The 2014 Progress Report draws on a first monitoring round (2013-14), which gathered data from some 46 developing countries and 77 countries/organisations, providing them with development co-operation. It will be followed by a second round to begin in mid-2015, and its findings will inform the next High-Level Meeting discussions.

The HLM concluded by confirming it would meet every two years. Responsibility passed to the three newly agreed Co-Chairs, Ministers from the Netherlands, Mexico and Malawi⁷ and their colleague-members of an expanded Steering Committee. Their task is to maintain the momentum of the work of the GPEDC in key international fora as well as on-the-ground promotion and implementation of the Partnership's objectives.

They specifically endorsed the Korean Government's offer to host an annual Workshop to bring together partners to review implementation of the Busan commitments.

⁷ Formally selected at the June 2014 African Union Summit.

GPDEC Steering Committee: Since Mexico, there has been one meeting of the Steering Committee under the leadership of the new Co-Chairs. They agreed on a platform with two core themes: the facilitation of best practices on the ground and a sustained and systematic effort to monitor progress. These themes recognise the ‘country-focused’ nature of the Partnership’s mandate.

The Steering Committee also agreed to focus its immediate efforts on seeking out synergies between the Partnership and the Post-2015 Agenda process. In that context the Co-Chairs recently sent a letter to the UN Secretary-General as a contribution to his synthesis report on the Post-2015 Agenda. Their letter points out the synergy between the ongoing work of the Partnership and the international community’s objective of ensuring strong and effective implementation of the Post-2015 Agenda.

They noted that the Partnership was a unique platform for bringing policy and practice together, especially at the country level. It also provided an established approach to monitoring and to multi-stakeholder consultations. They pointed out that the GPEDC also provides an umbrella to broker and cultivate multi-stakeholder initiatives. The voluntary and inclusive philosophy of the Partnership facilitated an equal space for dialogue between all stakeholders, one that was designed to go beyond traditional ‘donor-recipient’ approaches.

Chapter 3. **Beyond Busan**

The tone of the Seoul meeting was set in the opening session. The Korean Foreign Minister stated that the Partnership offers us a platform for realising our visions - of banishing poverty and attaining sustainable development - by action on the ground. He noted four principles rooted in the Paris Declaration and Accra: country ownership; focus on results; inclusive partnerships; and transparency and mutual accountability. These principles flowed from Busan to frame the work of the Partnership.

The Partnership is a facilitator of a process that must be based on the ambitions and capabilities of individual partner countries. However, the outstanding challenge for the Partnership is to translate these broad concepts into a sustainable reality. Discussions at the High Level Meeting in Mexico and within the UN system around the Post-2015 Agenda indicated that there is an eagerness to move on. It is time to focus on the 'how' rather than more talk, including achieving a core goal to eliminate extreme poverty in the next fifteen years.

Speaking in the opening segment of the Workshop, the GPEDC Co-Chairs saw a critical strength in its multi-stakeholder approach and a more inclusive development model. This approach facilitated the creation of a community of practice in which there could be a sharing of experiences across a diverse range of practitioners. They noted that the Partnership, as with other development fora, is sometimes criticised for being overly centred on conferences rather than action on the ground. The Co-Chairs called for commitments to be translated into positive and concrete outcomes.

They noted that today's global environment was far from being perfect. We live in a world of scarce resources with serious economic uncertainties. However, these very constraints reinforce the importance of seeking out best practices and innovative mechanisms that can be shared across nations.

One Co-Chair representative noted some key challenges that needed to be examined in the Workshop, including more interactive working group sessions.

- › exploring how best to link with the implementation of the development goals of the UN Post-2015 Agenda, in line with the December 2014 UN Secretary-General's Synthesis Report.
- › creating more cohesion in the actions of the Partnership. Specifically ensuring through the Steering Committee that there is a sustained and operationally focused engagement.
- › active monitoring of progress against the broad goals of the Partnership. Strengthened monitoring indicators and processes need to be quickly and effectively internalised in working practices on the ground.

-
- › recognising that effective development demands a meaningful partnership, but one that could be made more inclusive. This involves engaging all development actors and also listening to the voices of the most disadvantaged.

Developing country participants picked up many of these messages. One pointed out the importance of looking early on for viable partnerships, both internationally and internally through a broad engagement of the population. They commented that sound partnerships needed to be created 'bottom-up' thus facilitating significant front-end inputs to both the national government and donor-partners. One speaker noted it could perhaps be useful to revive some elements of traditional 'national development planning,' but in a much more consultative, bottom-up manner. Another noted that some elements of traditional conditionality were still in use and without greater partnership in its design this could act as an impediment to country ownership.

Civil society participants were active in many parts of the Workshop's discussions. They wanted an active GPEDC, one with the optimism to see that things can be done. For civil society, progress on inclusiveness was viewed as a key factor. However, they were concerned that while inclusion of CSOs was working well in the formal structures of the Partnership, it was less successful on the ground. Several participants specifically noted that the political and institutional space in which CSOs could work appeared to be shrinking. They saw this as potentially undermining the original spirit of Busan, as re-iterated in Mexico City.

Chapter 4. **Country Ownership, Country Systems**

Country Ownership. A persistent theme of many interventions was that development action had to be ‘on the ground.’ More in-country activity was needed to align country realities with the spirit of the Global Partnership and the Busan Principles. Several interventions suggested that the GPEDC - and for that matter often development partners - were not yet close enough to intended beneficiaries. They saw the Paris Declaration principles of country ownership and alignment as still far from being established as the new normal.

Some participants suggested that this situation was in part a reflection of the imperfect communication between the relatively high level dialogue of GPEDC meetings and structures at the country level. Several participants expressed concerns that important messages discussed and agreed in more formal GPEDC meetings were not always well-transmitted to stakeholders in their home country or institutions. As a consequence, there may be gaps in local follow-ups.

Many participants seemed to feel that, despite good intentions and formal commitments, there were serious deficiencies in implementing the Busan principle of country-ownership. They saw it as an issue of politics (and political perceptions, often about corruption) as much as a technical matter. Several participants raised the need for Partnership approaches to be rooted in political economy analysis as much as operational detail. Problems between donor and recipient could stem from weaknesses in the local results culture or simply the lack of bureaucratic capacity at the country level. Other participants felt the basic cause simply lay in a lack of trust.

A presenter referred to a ‘paradox of progress.’ He had heard evidence of substantial, if not uniform, improvements in the technical quality of country systems, yet still a declining use of and alignment with those same country systems by donors. Often there seemed to be a substantial misalignment between the approach of recipient country and donor. Often the outcome was the use of two distinct systems, not the optimum of one joint system-driven by the country and utilised by the donor. The conclusion of several discussants seemed to be that the GPEDC and its donor-members had to invest at the ground level in helping to bridge this divide of trust. That investment would need to be particularly centred on enhancing the quality of the in-country dialogue between donors, bilateral and multilateral, and their recipient-partners.

Country Systems. Participants in both the plenary and working group sessions raised the issue of an imperfect systems alignment. They felt that, at their simplest, country systems should be about good public financial management and reliable procurement systems. Participants noted that it was often low-income, aid-dependent countries that had made better progress in terms of the quality of country-systems. This was perhaps due to their closer working relationship with donors that can more easily

provide technical and other support in establishing country systems. Also in such countries, many in Africa, one can find prior experience of SWAs and budget support mechanisms which had required more integrated domestic budgetary processes.

Country systems were often weakened by inadequate partnership in their design or upgrading. The country system was then likely to not be designed well enough to meet donor expectations. This gap of expectations was often due to weaknesses that could have been readily resolved by some technical support or where a donor failed to align with a broadly workable country system for reasons of minor technical flaws. One donor noted that an institution's own policy framework (e.g. around safeguards) could inhibit the use of many country systems.

Results and Mutual Accountability⁸. These linked topics are a key GPEDC priority. Effectiveness is not the same as efficiency and must embody a focus on outcomes or impact on the target population. One donor, drawing upon a special survey, pointed to partial success or another glass half-full, with the adoption of Country Results Frameworks (CRF) but also noted that there was less certainty about their impact. CRFs tended to be largely quantitative/macro in content, with little coverage of sometimes important qualitative dimensions. They are often an adaptation of an old PRSP (Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper). On the more positive side, they are starting to be more inclusive, bringing in CSOs and sometimes local private sector organisations as stakeholders/partners.

A Mutual Accountability Framework (MAF) could be an improvement, one that was more consistent with the spirit of the Partnership that frames the GPEDC. The MAF should by definition be a consensus framework, not another vehicle for donor-inspired conditionality nor a recipient's wish-list. Such a framework could serve as the foundation for assessing performance of both donors and country partners, indeed all core stakeholders. Many donors are under their own domestic accountability pressures to set out a uniform set of global priorities (results) that do not always align with the priorities of individual partner countries. In this mismatch, what has precedence: the Busan goal of country ownership or the leverage of aid money?

It was suggested that any results framework needed to be carefully linked to a country-level process of setting measurable and doable performance (outcome) targets. A top-down, largely donor-driven process was unlikely to work. While CRF-like approaches are still very much a pilot process, proven examples are emerging. A participant commented that to be effective the selected indicators needed to be a better alignment between the perspectives of senior policy-makers (increasingly politicians)

⁸ The discussion was mostly centered on the Results-Based National Accountability Framework and led by a relevant Busan Building Block, "Post-Busan Building Block on Results & Mutual Accountability."

and stakeholders involved in implementation. Joint (donor-recipient) exercises, including programming, often create the right environment for shifting attitudes to a viable middle way. A plenary speaker noted that a joint framework would only really work if donors had an effective on-the-ground presence, one with meaningful delegated authority. Such a framework would need to be designed around country-customised indicators and involve a joint monitoring programme. It would often require complementary capacity-building support to the recipient for statistical systems.

CSOs and Private Sector. The Workshop had wide participation from CSOs and several private sector representatives. Their presence reflected a consensus from Busan that both are important contributors to development.

CSOs have worked for many years to shape a distinct definition of their role as independent development actors. CSO participants focused in their comments on the politics of inclusion. Busan HLF-4 and the Mexico HLM had recognised CSO functional independence, and in many developing countries NGOs are widely active in areas ranging from education to rural agriculture to legal/gender rights. However, CSO participants and others expressed concerns that some of these roles are diminishing. They worried that this gap was not a good signal in the context of a Busan-driven Global Partnership.

It was also suggested that CSOs could play a more systematic role in the anticipated data revolution, for example by gathering and analysing key grass-roots data on development effectiveness in important areas such as governance, gender impact and environmental costs.

The Private Sector is an important reality in all economies. Indeed in developing countries it typically contributes to a much higher percentage of GNP and employment, often in the SME sector. However, a participant also noted that migration often led to national professional and technical skills being lost despite being needed for a competitive local private sector in developing countries. A CSO participant remarked that the private sector collectively needed to take a proactive role in defining standards for its activities as a development actor within the Global Partnership. A development official participant added a word of caution that governmental partners, in both North and South, had to temper their expectations and recognise that the private sector was its own master and individualistic in its actions.

Chapter 5. **Monitoring**

Monitoring Framework. The Global Partnership's Monitoring Framework (MF) is a central element in its on-going work. It is a key response to commitments inherited by the GPEDC from Busan. The Framework seeks to monitor the effectiveness of partner-members in meeting the objectives agreed in Busan, as well as ensuring continuity with commitments agreed under the Paris Declaration. Described by a senior Korean official as 'the backbone' of the GPEDC, monitoring is the evidence-based accountability vehicle by which the Partnership assesses its members' commitment to stronger development co-operation effectiveness. The first MF report was released at the Mexico City HLM in April, 2014 under the title "2014 Progress Report."

The Joint Support Team (JST) gave a detailed presentation in the opening plenary, but issues relating to specific elements in the Monitoring Framework were raised in many other plenaries and working groups. The JST presentation was both a status report setting out progress-to-date and an exploration of the continuing challenges in implementing the Framework, including ensuring its relevance to the Post-2015 Agenda. The MF comprises ten indicators, some new to the GPEDC process (e.g. transparency, CSOs, private sector) and some inherited from earlier activities of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness. It is framed around four broad areas ("Shared principles" of the Busan Partnership document): Ownership; Results; Inclusive Development Partnerships; Transparency and Accountability.

The Monitoring Framework is neither a bookkeeping process nor a narrow scorecard for the ranking of individual countries and organisations. Instead it intends to be an accountability exercise for all partners. It is an input to a broader political dialogue on development co-operation and its effectiveness. The JST presentation noted that monitoring indirectly aims at stimulating behavioural change. Critically it offers lessons on what works, what doesn't, and how to improve future effectiveness within the diversity of individual country situations. In the words of one presentation it is a 'two-way mirror,' with an important role for recipients.

However, participants' comments indicated that the monitoring system was still somewhat top-down/donor-dominated and needed to be much more inclusive, engaging stakeholders at all levels and be framed against perspectives from the ground. The JST presentation recognised that there are new challenges implicit in the Partnership's offer of support to the UN in implementing the Post-2015 Development Agenda. The JST, guided by the Co-Chairs and Steering Committee members, will review the Monitoring Framework's relevance to the Post-2015 Agenda and its goals and targets.

In summarising progress as measured by the first Monitoring Report, the JST judgement was that across the array of ten indicators, the glass was half-full. They reported that country-ownership was seen as improving, but as outlined in the previous chapter there were key weaknesses, particularly around the use of country systems. Inclusiveness was now better understood as a goal, but still uneven in the quality of its practice. Transparency, an indicator added by the GPEDC, was judged as still disappointing. However, the growing role of IATI and other transparency indicators point to better progress in the future. Predictability of development assistance - a crucial concern for recipients who want to better manage their budgetary processes, including improved Domestic Resource Mobilisation - was still weak.

In general, participants called for more efforts to increase stakeholder engagement and to attract more countries, including emerging providers to participate in the monitoring exercise. They also called for a stronger data validation process at country level and the need for development partners to report better at the country level.

Indicator Clinic. This discussion looked at how particular indicators could be enhanced. The working group often came to focus on the larger context of the subject matter of the indicators, including lessons learnt. Participants explored approaches that might help in filling the top 'half of the glass,' in achieving development results. They also discussed the specifics of how particular indicators might be technically refined as measures of effectiveness of development co-operation.

In both areas, participants recognised that they were only seeing the first cycle of GPEDC indicators. Improvements in the process and sub-components of the assessments were already being designed for the second phase of monitoring due for reporting in 2016. The Joint Support Team indicated that the set of indicators would need to be refined and possibly complemented with new indicators to ensure relevance to the Post-2015 era.

The JST alerted participants to the Steering Committee's decision to establish an independent Advisory Group to provide technical recommendations on the monitoring system.

Participants shared broad support for the idea of establishing this group, but questions were raised to further clarify its role and membership. Some concerns were expressed as to whether the panel would be independent enough and include substantial inputs from recipient-partners.

Some of the indicators were described by participants as 'broken' but this was seen as a somewhat premature conclusion. However, in the words of a senior participant, the 'bad' indicators need to be fixed. Participants recognised that to design and test indicators on subjects that are often complex and politically sensitive would take more than one round of piloting. Indeed the very act of piloting was an early exercise in better understanding these complexities.

As noted in Chapter 4, participants saw somewhat of a paradox around the still limited use of **country systems**⁹, despite steady improvements in the technical quality of these country systems. These indicators date back to the original evaluation of the Paris Declaration but, as participants noted, the principle was strengthened in Busan to state that use of country systems should be the 'default approach.' In discussing the paradox, some participants felt that the indicated donor hesitation often had political roots, especially in the present environment of aid budget uncertainties. They felt this hesitation was a significant test for the post-Busan Partnership spirit.

Indicator 1 ("Development co-operation is focused on results that meet developing countries' priorities.") was discussed with a focus on issues relating to the absence of a consistent definition of country results frameworks and the presence of often distinct approaches to CRFs (due to inherently different standards and approaches in its design as well as in the nature of its use). All this challenged the work of quantifying the level of providers' alignment. This indicator had been initially tested in eight participating countries. Participants recognised that a larger sample was needed.

Concerning the JST's proposed approach¹⁰ on **Indicator 2 ("Civil society operates within an environment which maximises its engagement in and contribution to development.")**, participants perceived it as a good way to build a common understanding of what is an enabling environment for CSOs. They flagged the importance of including issues related to the legal and regulatory framework within the monitoring process.

The explicit commitment in Busan and later in the Mexico HLM was to see an active and independent role for CSOs in the development process. In particular, the HLM had talked of creating an enabling environment. However, CSOs were still talking of a shrinking space. In this sense, some participants recognised that the continuing absence of an effective GPEDC indicator of inclusiveness left the issue somewhat in the air; this weakened inclusion could be real and a risk to effectiveness. They recognised that politics can play an important role in the realities relating to support for inclusive partnership.

⁹ This falls into the umbrella of the Indicator 9 (Effective institutions - developing countries' systems are strengthened and used) whose measure is comprised of Indicator 9a (Quality of developing country public financial management (PFM) system) and Indicator 9b (Use of developing country PFM system and procurement systems).

¹⁰ This was based both on an in-country questionnaire, engaging developing country governments, CSOs and donor, and a desk study.

Inclusive partnership for the GPEDC also encompasses the search for an enhanced engagement of the private sector, domestic and foreign, as a development partner. This is measured by **Indicator 3 (“Engagement and contribution of the private sector to development”)**. The JST indicated that this indicator had been difficult to create. Participants noted the ambiguous line between regular business profit-making operation and actions in which private companies were incentivised by government or others to invest in projects designed for specific development impact. A complicating factor was that the private sector has no single global organisation able to speak authoritatively for it. Indeed, as was noted by one participant (see Chapter 4), the private sector is inherently diverse and individualistic in its actions, hence unevenly engaged in development co-operation programming.

Transparency (Indication 4: “Information on development co-operation is publicly available.”) is a largely new area of monitoring that was extensively discussed in the workshop. As was noted in the opening presentation by the JST, there are now several international reporting systems at play, but they unfortunately have different coverage, frequency and levels of detail. All are largely donor-driven. Participants felt that there was an urgent need for a universal framework. There is a long history of data publication but it was often dated and rarely disaggregated. It was also noted that little of the data was recipient-based. This meant the data was difficult to cross-check for consistency within a country by the types of investment and their costs. Impact or benefits were rarely measured.

The last few years has seen a substantial increase in the sheer volume of available data. This is mainly due to both having more data collection systems in play and increased pressures from taxpayers to better understand how their money was being spent. One bilateral donor country said it now placed data on its website in real time, including an accountability-linked ‘button’ for the anonymous reporting of corruption. Participants noted that the Monitoring Framework sometimes lacked independently sourced data, as opposed to self-reporting. A UN participant noted that reversing this gap, especially in-country, would demand substantial investments in reporting and statistical capabilities.

Overall, transparency was felt to be improving well. Participants supported the proposal of better co-ordination between the main reporting systems, including the use of standardised reporting matrices. Another idea was to develop a composite indicator drawing upon all three reporting systems (IATI, CRS, and FSS). However, participants noted that unfortunately the most important dataset for most recipient countries, to anticipate future funding i.e. predictability (Indicator 5), showed very poor ratings in the first round of GPEDC Monitoring. They also broadly supported the idea that the indicator could measure actual reporting rather than plans. They highlighted a need to further drive transparency towards countries’ needs.

The mirror half of transparency is **accountability**. It was stated that with timely public information from performance indicators, there is an easy, reliable instrument for exercising accountability. The concept is clear and rules are usually in place, but as one UN official noted, the practice remains flawed. There is also the risk of conflicting layers of accountability: is the focus at the country level or more global? Participants felt that the practical reality is that accountability is best local, even if this means rules are not necessarily uniform. Concerns were expressed about the limited inclusion of recipient-sourced data. Participants noted that working together (i.e. “mutual” accountability) was key to effective country-ownership. Moreover, it would likely strengthen the trust that is essential to a solid partnership.

Future. Participants, briefed at the workshop by the GPEDC Co-Chairs, were enthusiastic about the new challenges presented in their letter to the UN Secretary-General on the Post-2015 Agenda. This proposal would involve the Partnership in making a major contribution to that work. The GPEDC could utilise its experience in the complexities of multi-stakeholder programme implementation. It would be an opportunity to draw upon the Partnership’s work on monitoring systems, its ‘installed capacity.’ One Co-Chair, noting this contribution as the #1 challenge for the Partnership, pointed to already on-going work with the DCF¹¹ to help frame that new partnership with the UN system.

¹¹ A special briefing was given by the UN DESA and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (ROK) at the Workshop on the role of the DCF and a planned UN DCF - Korea High Level Symposium. See also Chapter 7.

Chapter 6. **Building Blocks and Voluntary Initiatives**

This chapter reflects the working group session devoted to a selected set of early examples of Building Blocks (BBs) and Voluntary Initiatives (VIs). The idea of Building Blocks emerged from the Busan HLF-4, whilst Voluntary Initiatives were started at the Mexico City HLM. Their common feature is that they are innovative approaches to specific challenges arising from multi-stakeholder co-operation, as initiated in Busan.

Two sub-sessions explored examples of new ways of co-operation, namely South-South Co-operation (SSC) and Public-Private-Partnerships (PPP). Another session on Managing Diversity focused on how an increasingly diverse array of donors needed to harmonise their working style with recipient partners. Finally in a session on Domestic Resource Mobilisation (DRM) the discussion shifted to the very basic challenge of how to improve national (domestic) savings rates. A focused discussion on the Result and Mutual Accountability BB was on a separate track of the plenary #1, as highlighted in Chapter 4.

A common factor and a point of some controversy between participants is that in today's world of relatively scarcer ODA (particularly grant aid), development co-operation is seeking out new means of augmenting or 'leveraging' that scarce resource. The explicit fear, raised gently by some in this Workshop, is that 'augmenting' will come to be re-written as 'replacing.'

A common remark in the Seoul discussions was that this type of dialogue around innovative processes between development professionals could become an important 'product' of the GPEDC process. The challenge becomes how to make it accessible to the hundreds of front-line officials and CSO staff inside developing countries within the Partnership.

South-South Co-operation (SSC) was described by speakers in this session as a maturing mechanism for a co-operation relationship between two developing countries. The relationship is seen as an act of friendship between equals, rather than the often one-sided style of traditional North-South relations. These SSC relationships were often facilitated by regional or other cultural bonds¹². The co-operation is often in the form of technical support, sharing policies and operational approaches from the current or recent practices of another more experienced Southern country.

The session discussed the rapidly evolving world of South-South Co-operation. The scale and multiplicities of relationships were creating a diversity of SSC models. There were no uniform 'rules.' For example, an African participant described a relationship closer to traditional Western bilateral aid in an infrastructure capital project with a Southern provider. Another participant spoke about changing dynamics as SSC changed the relationship with traditional partners.

¹² An oft-quoted example is Brazil's links with other lusophone countries such as Angola and Mozambique in Africa.

A Southern provider, just a few years earlier a recipient, outlined a new reality of having to demonstrate to his own authorities and local tax-payers that the SSC arrangement was effective and producing development results.

There are now also growing interest in Triangular Co-operation. Typically here a traditional Northern donor is brought into an existing SSC partnership - perhaps to finance going to - scale or to better align its own bilateral projects with the successful piloting done by an earlier SSC project. Another insight put on the table by a Southern provider was an evolution from the one-off nature of the more typical SSC project to a more programmatic relationship, an umbrella approach under which a number of SSC projects could flourish.

Discussion on South-South shows that there is already a rich pool of experience to be shared on this type of programming between developing countries. The GPEDC has the access and insights to facilitate such exchanges on a growing scale alongside other initiatives.

The overall message from the discussions in this session was that SSC is growing well and has great potential. There is probably now a need to take a breath to consolidate approaches and also draw lessons from what is working well.

Public-Private Partnership (PPP). Participants saw an important role for PPPs - defined here as development co-operation partnerships involving the private sector. There is growing scope to pilot initiatives and scale-up successful cases. The session featured examples from two countries, the Philippines where a strong government was driving the engagement with a relatively mature, domestic private sector; and Zambia where a new pilot business hub, an incubator model, is being developed with UK DFID and SIDA support.

Two donor representatives commented on the complexities of mobilising PPP activities. One noted that the quality of partnership was more important than the quantity of aid in PPP situations. They both emphasised that governments in both developed and developing countries do not have the capacity to 'direct' private sector engagement. Successful examples such as Unilever, Heineken and IKEA were still rare, but in these examples the partnering was helped by the private company being already committed to a plan for such an investment.

Supportive multinationals were still limited but leading activist entities are trying to persuade similar businesses to become engaged in Post-2015 linked activities.

A multilateral participant emphasized the need to resolve institutional bottlenecks such as improving the regulatory environment and creating clear legal rights for foreign investors.

Managing Diversity. Participants saw the diversity as both strength and vulnerability in today's complex development landscape. It was a key driver in shaping the Global Partnership as a bridge between actors in a widening array of development actors, from traditional donors to emerging economies to CSOs and private sector actors. Even before the arrival of new actors, differences in policy priorities and procedures/criteria of traditional donors could represent a significant burden for partner countries. Participants in the working group discussion spelt out the still persistent burdens and lost effectiveness from fragmentation, despite commitments on alignment that went back to the 2005 Paris Declaration.

The session recognised the serious need for greater coordination between providers of co-operation. This was necessary even with the growth of country level, recipient-led mechanisms and the use of sector programmes/SWAs. 'Country in the driver's seat' is often still just rhetoric. However, it must become a more widespread reality to obtain the benefits of greater coherence and synergy between donors and national development goals. Monitoring the number of donor and provider missions and how many are actually joint can be useful in alerting all parties to excessive demands on partner countries.

Fragility. The recent successes of the g7+ countries, notably in putting into place the 'New Deal,' was mentioned as an interesting model of how even vulnerable, often neglected, countries were now able to better manage their partnership discussions.

DRM. Although the importance of Domestic Resource Mobilisation has been a basic in development thinking for many years, it remains a major challenge for many developing countries. Busan re-focused attention on this issue and it was a major topic in the Mexico City HLM.

The opening presentation had reminded participants that domestic resources, even in the weakest of developing countries, usually exceeded net ODA. DRM will be an important topic at the Third International Conference on Financing for Development in Addis Ababa in July, 2015. But the participants at this sub-session were also reminded of the key caveat: DRM is not a replacement for ODA but should be seen as a necessary complement. It was noted that DRM had been long neglected by donor officials as a rather dull and technically complex topic. It is also a sensitive topic in terms of the reluctance of the relatively privileged and well-connected politically to pay taxes - a reality in rich developed countries also.

The session heard that the scope for increasing DRM is substantial in most developing countries, both the poorest and most MICs. The challenges are often those of institutional capacity - do they have effective tax codes and the well-trained bureaucrats to collect them? These bureaucrats need skills in countering leakages: tax evasion, corruption, 'black money' transactions, false pricing of export resources and much more. The session was reminded of the potential to tax remittances, but also of the need to remember that these private flows are often gifts between members of poor families. It was pointed out that correcting weak DRM was possible with quite modest technical support, once the core political obstacles are removed.

Voluntary Initiatives (VI). The VI programme had been launched at the Mexico City HLM to provide a framework in which individual groupings, some funded by a donor, sometimes free-standing, could explore key challenges of interest to a range of Global Partnership stakeholders. A Mexican official suggested the VI programme was already proving to be a good starting point for innovation and could be usefully expanded with implementation roles for some CSOs. The Seoul Workshop did not formally review the full array of these Voluntary Initiatives but participants have noted selected ones were well aligned with policy topics under discussion.

Chapter 7. **Looking Ahead**

The Workshop had a full agenda of critical follow-up since the Mexico HLM, but the meeting was also focused on 'what next?' What were the new challenges for the Global Partnership?

The coming months will be very busy, indeed a testing time for the Partnership. A number of key opportunities will present themselves in the next 12 months where the GPEDC will be formally attending or at least several members who sit on the Steering Committee will be actively involved. These include:

2014

- › December UNSG issued the Synthesis Report on Post-2015 Agenda, NY
- › December DAC High Level Meeting (HLM), Paris

2015

- › January GPEDC Steering Committee, Hague
- › January EU-sponsored GPEDC planning meeting, Brussels
- › April UN DCF Korea High Level Symposium (HLS), Songdo
- › July UN Conference on Financing for Development(F4D), Addis Ababa
- › September UN Summit on Post-2015 Agenda, New York

Moreover, the GPEDC will work to organise a variety of 'on the ground' events at the country/regional level, including exchanges between interested countries. These events will be supported by the Steering Committee, with much of the implementation coordinated by the JST.

The meetings listed above are critical elements in the path of the Partnership as it moves forward on the many challenges exposed in Mexico and now Seoul. They are steps in establishing appropriate understandings with the key UN structures involved in finalising and then implementing the Post-2015 Agenda.

The EU-sponsored GPEDC event in January, 2015 was presented as a planning meeting. It will be an early opportunity to look in more detail into how the GPEDC as a partnership can best manage its expanding agenda, including the growing array of Voluntary Initiatives. The focus on being an enabler, facilitating (not doing) work on the ground is key but was recognised to present major managerial challenges to what is a very modestly sized organisation.

The April 2015 DCF-Korea High Level Symposium (HLS) will bring the Partnership together with the parts of the UN system most engaged in supporting Post-2015. Participants had recognised that there are often artificial divisions between actors in overlapping spheres of the global governance system.

The broad 'alliance' represented by the Global Partnership is well-placed to work with the UN in delivering effective and inclusive development, working around the impediments that institutional silos often create.

The HLS represents a key opportunity to refine the content of the working relationships between the Partnership and the UN system. An early challenge identified by several speakers is in the possible creation of a more comprehensive monitoring framework. One GPEDC Co-Chair noted that that enhanced framework needed to focus on indicators that were relevant and timely and critically based upon country level data. This is certainly an area where the GPEDC has already made important steps, but this capacity will need to be extended to help facilitate the effective implementation of the Post-2015 Agenda's goals and targets. This will represent an important challenge.

The conference on Financing for Development was not a direct focus of the Workshop but success in Addis Ababa is a clear prerequisite for a viable Post-2015 Agenda. Discussions in the Workshop (and earlier in Mexico) on how to more effectively engage the private sector and on enhanced Domestic Resource Mobilisation already point to areas where GP members can contribute to shaping doable innovative mechanisms in Addis Ababa that can complement sustained levels of ODA.

All these events converge on the UN High Level Summit on the Post-2015 Agenda in New York (25-27 Sept., 2015). The complex agenda of goals and targets will be daunting to implement even if adequately financed following the FfD meeting. It will involve coordination between the Global Partnership, the Development Co-operation Forum, the High Level Political Forum and other key multilateral bodies. Points raised in the Workshop suggest key parts of this work will need to be done in, often led by the developing South.

Last but not least, the future will also require considerable internal effort within the Partnership. As is also discussed in the final chapter as 'Takeaways,' there are important tasks that the GPEDC must include in its immediate internal agenda. Several speakers had felt that there were critical gaps in internal cohesion. They felt that the Partnership was inadequately engaging its target population, those 'on the ground.' Concerns were also raised by several speakers that the Partnership needed to better recognise the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable, for instance as represented by the goals the g7+ set for itself. This challenge of reaching those 'left behind' is, of course, a central driver of the Post-2015 Agenda.

Chapter 8. **Conclusions and Key Takeaways**

This year's Workshop was particularly timely, positioned between the GPEDC HLM in Mexico and the flurry of major international meetings leading towards the UN Summit on the Post-2015 Agenda next September. The Workshop was also timely because of the fast-approaching MDGs deadline with poverty yet remaining as an enduring reality. 2015 will see agreement on a new universal set of development goals under the Post-2015 framework.

The GPEDC has its own agenda, flowing from its creation as a key instrument for delivery of the 2011 Busan Partnership. However, it has also made a commitment through the Mexico City HLM and the recent message sent by the GPEDC Co-Chairs to the UN Secretary-General to seek a substantive role in the implementation of the Post-2015 Agenda. This objective was endorsed by the Co-Chair representatives and the Korean Foreign Minister in addressing the Workshop.

Participants in the Workshop, ranging from the GPEDC's political leadership to representatives of fragile states and CSOs, came together in recognizing the Post-2015 Agenda as a framework that can guide much of the Partnership's work. Their work was focused and practical. They exposed challenges and sought out solutions. In line with the goal of the Workshop they contributed ideas. They also listened. As individual partners they will remain engaged in supporting the GPEDC goals, including via their individual voices in the UN and its decision-making on the Post-2015 Agenda.

Takeaways

Participants saw the GPEDC role as that of a facilitator, working with the international community to achieve effective development co-operation. There has been solid progress by the Partnership on its core goals, but more remains to be done. The GPEDC is also well placed to be a strong partner for the Post-2015 Agenda.

A number of specific consensus points for action, 'takeaways'¹³, have emerged from the discussions at the Workshop:

- the work of the GPEDC is ultimately a political process, even if much of it is technical. Lack of trust was seen as a major barrier to progress on implementation as illustrated by some Monitoring Report indicators. More attention was needed to political economy dimensions.

¹³ These 'Takeaways' are important messages emerging from the discussions of Workshop participants, including some senior members of the Steering Committee. However, they are not statements of GPEDC policy.

-
- an effective partnership will require partners becoming comfortable with respecting differences over priorities and policies. Leadership is key and often built around innovative approaches, but it also has to be built with partners. An important comparative advantage for the GPEDC resides in the openness of its deliberations. The approach of 'focus on the practical' demonstrated by the Workshop should remain an essential part of the GPEDC philosophy.
 - transparency and openness are at the heart of much of what the Partnership wishes to achieve, but it can also encounter politically motivated hesitation. Yet, along with trust, these are the prerequisites for delivering effective development co-operation results.
 - the GPEDC is committed to finding a substantive role in implementing the UN's Post-2015 Agenda. Meeting this challenge in the coming year is a 'must do' for the Partnership. Ultimately the emerging goals are closely aligned. The Post-2015 Agenda will be the driving framework for almost all partners. With time it should radically transform realities on the ground. The GPEDC's strength will be in bringing together diverse actors to build solutions for effective implementation as well as providing a reality check through its monitoring framework.
 - as is the case with Post-2015, the Partnership needs to recognise that our world is increasingly differentiated. MICs and LICs are diverse groups, not to mention the range of non-state actors. Often South-South is a highly effective option.
 - private sector involvement is critical. However, private businesses are individualistic in their objectives and not driven primarily by development-oriented goals. Moving forward within the GPEDC, there needs to be a framework of shared expectations and responsibilities for their role as development partners.
 - the Monitoring Framework has made substantial progress in a short period of time. Yet there still remain serious gaps. These are often around issues which are not technically difficult but require changes in existing practices and thinking in partner institutions and governments. An effective monitoring system should prove its value as a source of ideas and learning experiences, not just in numbers.
 - monitoring, like action, needs to be closer to the ground. More must be done at and about the local recipient level. This can be an active role for CSOs.
-

- two key weaknesses emerged from the monitoring process. Both were seen as often linked to gaps in trust between partners.
 - use of country systems. Despite significant efforts to improve recipient capacity, actual donor usage is seen as declining. More delegated authority to the field could give an important boost to 'alignment' and programming cohesion.
 - there is a perceived decline in 'space' for CSOs, despite the strong Busan commitments that were reaffirmed at the Mexico HLM.

- finally the GPEDC in the eyes of many, including several Steering Committee members, is seen as being distant from the people. More must be done locally, not just because it is 'right' but also because it is essential for effectiveness and the search for enhanced equity. 'Global-light, country-focus' is defined as the essence of the GPEDC approach, but a number of participants felt it was not yet the common perception or an internalised norm for GPEDC actions.

An Organisational Postscript: Planning the 2015 Workshop

- Situational Context: Implementation of the Post-2015 Agenda - the meeting date will likely be just weeks after its formal Summit level approval.
- Thematic focus: Country showcases and policy platform
- Organisationally:
 - retain the format of being back-to-back with a training event for senior officials and practitioners.
 - leave more space in the timetable for informal interaction. To have more space in plenaries for interventions from the floor.
 - retain the balanced mix of plenaries and working groups.
 - make best efforts to have more senior participation from a) Southern providers and b) private sector leaders.
 - include sessions focused on key 'takeaways,' notably improved trust within the partnership and closer linkages with the target populations/country level implementation.

Annex 1. Annotated Agenda

- Each session will begin with a short presentation followed by an open and interactive discussion.
- Each participant is expected to take part in the Working Group sessions drawn upon the Draft Concept Notes. Each Working Group will have a facilitator and a rapporteur who will summarize the key points of the discussion. A summary of the discussions and the conclusions of the sessions will be submitted to the main moderators for presentation.
- All the sessions including a reception will be held in EWHA Womans University, Seoul.

Day 1

Thursday, November 6, 2014

Time	Session	Activities and Objectives
9:00-9:30 <i>LG Convention Hall (B1)</i>	Opening <i>Welcome & Keynote Address</i>	Welcoming Remark <i>- Mr. Byung-se Yun, Minister, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea</i> Keynote Speeches by GPEDC Co-Chairs <i>- Mr. Juan Manuel Valle Pereña, Executive Director, AMEXCID, Mexico</i> <i>- Mr. Jeroen Verheul, Ambassador at Large for Foreign Trade and International Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Netherlands</i> <i>- Ms. Betty Ngoma, Assistant Director, Debt and Aid Division, Ministry of Finance, Malawi</i>
9:30-11:00 <i>LG Convention Hall (B1)</i>	Plenary Session 1 <i>State of Play on Busan Commitments: From Busan to Mexico and Beyond</i>	Short Presentations and Moderated Discussions by Multi-Stakeholder Panelists <i>Moderator: Mr. Geert Laporte, Deputy Director, European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM)</i> Presentation: Key Takeaway and Vision on Implementation of Busan Principles <i>- Ms. Youngju Oh, Director General, Development Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, ROK</i> Key Messages from the Mexico HLM <i>- Mr. Juan Manuel Valle Pereña, Executive Director, AMEXCID, Mexico</i> Highlights of Progress and Challenges from the GPEDC Monitoring Report <i>- Ms. Brenda Killen, Deputy Director, DCD, OECD</i> <i>- Mr. Niloy Banerjee, Director, UN System Affairs, Bureau for External Relations and Advocacy, UNDP</i> Moderated Discussions: Share Specific Achievements and Challenges from Implementing the Busan Commitments since Busan HLF-4 and Mexico HLM. <i>- Mr. Chhieng Yanara, Secretary General, CDC/CRDB, Cambodia</i> <i>- Dr. Mothae Anthony Maruping, Commissioner for Economic Affairs, AUC</i> <i>- Ms. Ryna Garay, Director General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, El Salvador</i> Report on Concrete Action Plans in Addressing the Challenges and Areas of Priorities Actions. <i>- Mr. Richard Ssewakiryanga, Executive Director, Uganda National NGO Forum, CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE)</i> <i>- Ms. Khine Khine Nwe, Deputy Managing Director, Best Industrial Company Ltd., Joint Secretary General of UMFCCI and Member of Myanmar Investment Commission, Myanmar</i>

Time	Session	Activities and Objectives
11:00-13:00 <i>LG Convention Hall (B1)</i>	Plenary Session 2 <i>Case Studies for Reflection and Inspiration : Best Practices and Lessons Learnt</i>	Short Presentations and Moderated Discussions by Multi-Stakeholder Panelists <i>Moderator: Mr. Charles Lwanga-Ntale, Regional Director and Special Adviser for East & Central Africa, Development Initiatives (DI)</i> Present specific Lessons Learnt and Initiatives at Country-level on the Following: Results-based National Accountability Framework <i>- Ms. Suzanne Müller, Senior Policy Advisor, Quality Assurance and Aid Effectiveness, Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation, Switzerland</i> <i>- Mr. Navid Hanif, Director, Office for ECOSOC Support and Coordination, UN DESA</i> Institutionalized Dialogue for Enhanced Use of Country Systems <i>- Mr. Neil Cole, Executive Secretary of CABRI and co-Chair of Effective Institutions Platform (EIP)</i> <i>- Ms. Manju Senapaty, Lead Planning and Policy Specialist, ADB</i> Improving Predictability and Transparency at Country-level (i.e. Systematic Process for Medium-term and Annual Predictability) <i>- Mr. Lars Danielsson, Ambassador of Sweden to ROK</i> Inclusive Partnerships and Multi-stakeholder Approaches to Development <i>- Ms. Amy Dodd, Coordinator, UK Aid Network (UKAN), CPDE</i> <i>- Dr. Danny Sriskandarajah, Secretary General, CIVICUS</i> <i>- Mr. Modibo Makalou, Special Advisor to the President of Mali, Development and Cooperation Initiatives, Mali</i>
13:00-14:00 <i>LG Convention Hall (B1)</i>	Lunch <i>Briefing of GPEDC Vision</i>	Remarks on GPEDC Vision in Post-2015 and Beyond, Built upon the Mexico HLM <i>- GPEDC Co-Chairs</i>
14:00-15:30	Working Group Session 1 <i>Facilitated policy dialogues in working groups with a reference to participants' own experiences</i>	Breakout Group Discussions Proposed Group Topics: (1) Results-based National Accountability Framework <i>Facilitator: Mr. Niloy Banerjee, Director, UN System Affairs, Bureau for External Relations and Advocacy, UNDP</i> Case presentation: <i>- Mr. Manh Cuong Cao, Deputy Director General, Dept. of International Economic Relations, Ministry of Planning and Investment, Vietnam</i> <i>- Ms. Cristina Matusse, Deputy National Director, National Planning Directorate, Ministry of Planning and Development, Mozambique</i> (2) Institutionalized Dialogue for Enhanced Use of Country Systems <i>Facilitator: Mr. Steve Pierce, Special Coordinator for Development Effectiveness, USAID/EIP Co-Chair</i> Case presentation: <i>- Mr. Mustafa Aria, Aid Management Director, Afghanistan</i> <i>- Ms. Monica Asuna, Senior Economist & Head, Aid Effectiveness Secretariat, External Resources Department, National Treasury Kenya</i> (3) Predictability and Transparency <i>Facilitator: Mr. Arjan Schuthof, Strategic Advisor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Netherlands</i> Case presentation: <i>- Mr. Than Zaw, Director, Central Statistical Organization, Ministry of National Planning and Economic Development, Myanmar</i> <i>- Dr. Narayan Dhakal, Under Secretary, International Economic Cooperation Development, Nepal</i> <i>- Ms. Sari Lehtiranta, Director, Unit for Development Policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland</i>

Time	Session	Activities and Objectives
		<p>(4) Inclusive Partnerships and Multi-stakeholder Approaches to Development including Enabling Environment</p> <p><i>Facilitator: Prof. Eun Mee Kim, Dean, GSIS, EWHA Womans University, ROK</i></p> <p>Case presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Alymbek Orozbekov, Head of International Aid Coordination Department, Ministry of Economy, Kyrgyz Republic - Mr. Benjamin Herzberg, Program Lead, Open Private Sector, Governance Global Practice, WB - Ms. Nwe Zin Win, Chairman of National NGO Network, Myanmar - Mr. Matthew Simonds, Policy Advisor, Trade Union Advisory Committee (TUAC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Built upon the discussions at the Plenary Session 2, briefly present specific achievements (country showcases) in the implementation of the Busan commitments (which may or may not have been captured in the survey exercise). • Share challenges encountered and lessons learnt from implementing the Busan principles in the interactive manner. • Identify ideas for necessary actions and reforms to be undertaken at the field and policy levels, as well as country and global levels, in order to overcome bottleneck challenges and accelerate implementation efforts of Busan principles. <p><i>This session could be also drawn upon the countries cases and discussions among the practitioners around from developing countries invited at the GPECD Accelerating & Training Program by KOICA (3-5 Nov.), particularly given that the participants of the KOICA Program will attend the Workshop as “critical mass.”</i></p>
15:30-15:45	Coffee Break	
15:45-17:00 <i>LG Convention Hall (B1)</i>	<p>Plenary Session 3</p> <p><i>Recap from WG Discussions: Focused Dialogue on Country-level Showcases and Solutions</i></p>	<p><i>Co-Moderators: Mr. Geert Laporte and Mr. Charles Lwanga-Ntale</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make a brief and consolidated report based on the WG discussions, with an emphasis on practical solutions and concrete examples of progress and best practice. <p>Briefings from Respective Facilitators</p>
17:00-17:30 <i>LG Convention Hall (B1)</i>	<p>Plenary Session 4</p> <p><i>GPEDC Monitoring Tools and Processes</i></p>	<p>Short Presentations by GPEDC Joint Support Team</p> <p>Presentations on Lessons Learnt in the First Global Monitoring and Reporting Process and Proposed Ways to Strengthen the Approach and Process for Next Round</p> <p>Presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms. Yuko Suzuki, Policy Adviser and Team Leader, UNDP - Ms. Patti O'Neill, Acting Head of Division, Global Partnerships and Policies, Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD
17:30-19:00	<p>Working Group Session 2</p> <p><i>Strengthening Monitoring Tools and Processes</i></p>	<p>Breakout Group Discussions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This session will be in a form of indicator clinic on selected indicators under review for enhancement, led by the experts. • Review the proposed elements for enhancement, and discuss how this refinement may capture better the elements for monitoring from country-level perspectives and process on the ground. <p>(1) Indicator 1 <i>(Development Cooperation is Focused on Results that Meet Developing Countries' Priorities)</i></p> <p><i>Facilitator: Ms. Suzanne Müller, Senior Policy Advisor, Quality Assurance and Aid Effectiveness, Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation, Switzerland</i></p> <p>Presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms. Elaine Venter, Cluster Lead, UNDP Regional Service Center Africa

Seoul Workshop

Time	Session	Activities and Objectives
		<p>(2) Indicator 2 <i>(Civil Society Operates within an Environment which Maximizes its Engagement in and Contribution to Development)</i> <i>Facilitator: Ms. Jacqueline Wood, Senior Policy Advisor, Secretariat, Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment</i> Presentation: - Mr. Niloy Banerjee, Director, UN System Affairs, Bureau for External Relations and Advocacy, UNDP</p> <p>(3) Indicator 3 <i>(Engagement and Contribution of the Private Sector to Development)</i> <i>Facilitator: Ms. Patti O'Neill, Acting Head of Division, Global Partnerships and Policies, Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD</i> Presentation: - Mr. Benjamin Herzberg, Program Lead, Open Private Sector, WB</p> <p>(4) Indicator 4 <i>(Transparency: Information on Development Co-operation is Publicly Available)</i> <i>Facilitator: Ms. Betty Ngoma, Assistant Director, Debt and Aid Division, Ministry of Finance, Malawi</i> Presentation: - Ms. Yuko Suzuki, Policy Adviser and Team Leader, UNDP</p>
19:30-	Reception & Dinner (ECC, Lee San-Bong Hall (B4))	

Day 2

Friday, November 7, 2014

Time	Session	Activities and Objectives
<p>9:00-9:45 <i>LG Convention Hall (B1)</i></p>	<p>Plenary Session 5 <i>Recap from DAY 1</i></p>	<p>Short Presentations from the Rapporteurs from Each Working Group in Day 1 <i>Co-Moderators: Mr. Geert Laporte and Mr. Charles Lwanga-Ntale</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make a brief, consolidated report on their highlights and conclusions. • Present conclusions and outputs from DAY 1.
<p>09:45-12:00 <i>LG Convention Hall (B1)</i></p>	<p>Thematic Building Blocks Workshop <i>Parallel Sessions on Thematic Discussions Drawing on Selective Busan HLF-4 Building Blocks (BBs) and Mexico HLM Voluntary Initiatives (VIs)</i></p>	<p>Breakout Group Discussions</p> <p>South-South Cooperation & MIC <i>Facilitator: Prof. Taekyoon Kim, GSIS, Seoul National University, ROK</i> Case presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Noel Gonzalez, Deputy Director General for Policy Making, AMEXCID, Mexico - Mr. Akihiko Sunami, Director, Development Assistance Policy Planning Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan - Ms. Karin Vazquez, Researcher, CLACSO Working Group on South-South Cooperation, Brazil - Mr. Nelson Felipe Valdez, Director General, Bilateral Cooperation, Ministry of Economy, Planning and Development, Dominican Republic <p>Public-Private Partnerships <i>Facilitator: Dr. Daniel Coppard, Director of Research, Analysis and Evidence, Development Initiatives</i> Case presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Jeroen Verheul, Ambassador at Large for Foreign Trade and International Development & Special Envoy of the Co-Chair of the GPEDC, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Netherlands - Mr. Rolando Tungpalan, Deputy Director General, National Economic and Development Authority, the Philippines - Ms. Sylvia Mutale, Extractive Sector Partnership Broker, Zambia Business in Development Facility, Zambia - Ms. Khine Khine Nwe, Deputy Managing Director, Best Industrial Company Ltd., Joint Secretary General of UMFCCI and Member of Myanmar Investment Commission, Myanmar - Mr. Benjamin Herzberg, Program Lead, Open Private Sector, WB <p>Managing Diversity and Reducing Fragmentation <i>Facilitator: Mr. Jirka Vierhaus, Senior Policy Advisor, Head of Sector Programme, Federal Ministry, GIZ, Germany</i> Case presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Twesiime Fredrick Tabura, Senior Economist, Aid Liaison Department, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Uganda - Mr. Bashar MD rezaul Siddique, Deputy Secretary, Economic Relations Division, Ministry of Finance, Bangladesh - Mr. Elson Martinho da Cost, Ministry of Finance, Timor-Leste - Ms. Chantal Marijnissen, Deputy Head of Unit, Aid Effectiveness, Financing for Development, European Commission <p>Domestic Resource Mobilization <i>Facilitator: Mr. Daniel Runde, Director, CSIS</i> Keynote Speaker:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dr. Mothae Anthony Maruping, African Union Commissioner for Economic Affairs, AUC <p>Case presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms. Brenda Killen, Deputy Director, Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD - Mr. Richard Ssewakiryanga, Executive Director, Uganda National NGO Forum, CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) - Mr. Cao Manh Cuong, Deputy Director General, Foreign Economic Relations Dept, Ministry of Planning and Investment, Vietnam - Mr. Modibo Makalou, Special Advisor to the President of Mali on Development and Co-operation Initiatives, Mali

Time	Session	Activities and Objectives
12:00-13:00 <i>LG Convention Hall (B1)</i>	Lunch <i>GPEDC and Beyond in Post-2015</i>	Briefing on UN DCF Korea High Level Symposium (April 2015, Songdo) - Mr. Navid Hanif, Director, Office for ECOSOC Support and Coordination, UN DESA - Mr. Sang-uk Yoon, Director, Development Policy Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, ROK
13:00-14:30 <i>LG Convention Hall (B1)</i>	Plenary Sessions 6 <i>Summary of the Thematic Building Blocks Workshop</i>	Report from the Thematic Sessions <i>Co-Moderators: Mr. Geert Laporte and Mr. Charles Lwanga-Ntale</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presentation of the facilitators on key conclusions and recommendations. Briefings from Respective Facilitators
14:30-14:45	Coffee Break	
14:45-17:00 <i>LG Convention Hall (B1)</i>	Plenary Sessions 7 <i>GPEDC's Now and Future: Ongoing Efforts and Recommendations for Strengthening GPEDC's Strategic Work toward More Effective Development Cooperation</i>	Panel Discussion With GPEDC SC, Representatives of Regional Organizations and Key Stakeholders <i>GPEDC Co-Chairs:</i> - Mr. Jeroen Verheul, Ambassador at Large for Foreign Trade and International Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Netherlands - Ms. Betty Ngoma, Assistant Director, Debt and Aid Division, Ministry of Finance, Malawi <i>Members of GPEDC Steering Committee:</i> - Mr. Erik Solheim, DAC Chair, DCD, OECD - Mr. Mohammad Mejbahuddin, Secretary, Economic Relations Division, Ministry of Finance, Bangladesh - Mr. Mothae Anthony Maruping, Commissioner for Economic Affairs, African Union Commission - Mr. Mustafa Aria, Aid Management Director, Budget Department, Ministry of Finance, Afghanistan - Mr. Richard Ssewakiryanga, Executive Director, Uganda National NGO Forum, CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness(CPDE) - Mr. Rolando Tungpalan, Undersecretary, National Economic and Development Authority, the Philippines - Ms. Youngju Oh, Director General, Development Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, ROK <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Brief on the GPEDC vision and work plan for the upcoming year.• Share the recent development on the "joint working group of UN DCF-GPEDC SC"• Discuss strategic opportunities and challenges within GPEDC to accelerate effective and inclusive development cooperation.• Share new perspectives and ideas to move forward with GPEDC.• Present suggestions on how to strengthen GPEDC's engagement and impact both within and beyond the Partnership. Open Discussion
17:00-18:00 <i>LG Convention Hall (B1)</i>	Closing Session <i>Conclusions, Recommendations and Next Steps</i>	Concluding Remarks and Recommendations <i>GPEDC Co-Chairs</i> - Mr. Jeroen Verheul, Ambassador at Large for Foreign Trade and International Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Netherlands - Mr. Noel Gonzalez, Deputy Director General for Policy Making, AMEXCID, Mexico - Ms. Betty Ngoma, Assistant Director, Debt and Aid Division, Ministry of Finance, Malawi <i>OECD DAC Chair</i> - Mr. Erik Solheim, DAC Chair, DCD, OECD <i>UNDP</i> - Mr. Stan Nkwain, Deputy Director/Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Policy and Programme Support, UNDP <i>Co-Moderators</i> - Mr. Geert Laporte and Mr. Charles Lwanga-Ntale <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consolidate key outputs and final recommendations from the Workshop.• Present next steps to be taken until the next Busan GP Workshop. Closing Remarks - Mr. Dong-ik Shin, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, ROK

Annex 2. List of Participants

"2014 Busan Global Partnership Workshop" List of Participants

	Country/Org.	First Name	Last Name	Title/Organization
1	AFGHANISTAN	Mustafa	ARIA	Aid management Director, Ministry of Finance
2		Ahmad Sulaiman	ASLAM	Aid Coordination Manager
3	AZERBAIJAN	Etibar	KARIMOV	Projects Director, Humanitarian Aid and Development
4	BANGLADESH	Bashar MD Rezaul	SIDDIQUE	Deputy Secretary, Economic Relations Division, Ministry of Finance
5		Mejbahuddin	MOHAMMAD	Secretary, Economic Relations Division, Ministry of Finance of Bangladesh
6	BELARUS	Denis	ZDOROV	Senior Counsellor, Department for Economic Cooperation and Sustainable Development Directorate for Multilateral Diplomacy
7		Janos Ferenc	DR. ZAKONYI	Team Leader - EU project (CDFB)
8	BOLIVIA	Navil	AGRAMONT AKIYAMA	Analyst, Financing and Negotiation Unit, Ministry of Development Planning
9	CAMBODIA	Heng	CHOU	Director of Aid Coordination Policy Department, Director General of CRDB/CDC
10		Yanara	CHHIENG	Minister attached to the prime minister and Secretary General of CRDB/ CDC
11	COLOMBIA	David	JARA	Third Secretary, Directorate of International Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Colombia
12	COTE D'IVOIRE	Vassiriki	SOUMAHORO	Chef de la Cellule de Coordination Stratégique au Ministère d'Etat, Ministère du Plan et du Développement
13		Yeboua Koffi Thomas	ADAM	Diplomat, Globalization and Economic Information Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
14	DOMINICAN Republic	Nelson	FELIPE VALDEZ	Director General de Cooperación Bilateral, Ministerio de Economía, Planificación y Desarrollo
15	EL SALVADOR	Jacqueline	MELGAR	Director, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
16		Ryna	GARAY	General Director, General Direction of Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
17	FIJI	Josefo	NAVUKU	Chief Economic Planning Officer
18		Mereseini Qeqe	WAIBUTA	Chief Economist, ODA Budget Division, Ministry of Finance
19	GHANA	Nana Yaw Mark	YANKAH	Economic Officer, External Resources Mobilization Multilateral, Ministry of Finance
20	KENYA	Monica	ASUNA	Senior Economist, Head, Aid Effectiveness Secretariat, External Resources Department, National Treasury
21	KYRGYZ Republic	Alymbek	OROZBEKOV	Head of International Aid Coordination Department, Ministry of Economy
22	LAOS	Arounyadeth	RASPHONE	Ministry of Planning and Investment
23	MALAWI	Betty	NGOMA	Assistant Director, Debt and Aid Division, Ministry of Finance
24	MALI	Makalou	MODIBO	Special Advisor to the President of Mali on Development and Cooperation Initiatives
25	MONGOLIA	Ulziijargal	GONCHIG	Senior Consultant, Financing Policy and Debt Management Department, Ministry of Finance
26	MOROCCO	Radouane	CHAOUKI	Chargé du Dossier GPEDC, Direction de la Coopération Multilatérale et des Affaires Economiques Internationales
27		Mohamed	EL-QASEMY	Chef de Service des Relations avec les Pays de l'Europe Méditerranéenne, Direction du Trésor et des Finances Extérieures
28	MOZAMBIQUE	Victor	MONTEIRO	Senior Technician, National Planning Directorate
29		Florencio Joel	SELE	Head of Department, Department of Studies and Information, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation
30	MYANMAR	Zaw	THAN	Director, Central Statistical Organization, Ministry of National Planning and Economic Development
31	NEPAL	Narayan	DHAKAL	Under Secretary, International Economic Cooperation Coordination Division, Ministry of Finance
32	NICARAGUA	Francis	RODRIGUEZ	Director of Cooperation for Europe General Directorate for Europe Ministry of Foreign Affairs
33	PARAGUAY	Jose Mango	SOLER ROMAN	Director General, National Secretariat of Planning
34	PERU	Nancy Magaly	SILVA SEBASTIAN	Agencia Peruana de Cooperación Internacional

Seoul Workshop

	Country/Org.	First Name	Last Name	Title/Organization
35	PHILIPPINES	Aleli Funtanilla	LOPEZ-DEE	Chief, Division of Monitoring and Evaluation Staff, National Economic and Development Authority
36		Rolando	TUNGPALAN	Deputy Director General (Undersecretary) National Economic and Development Authority
37	RWANDA	Sheila Mutimbo	MUTAVU	The external resources Mobilization officer of the Ministry of Finance and Economic planning
38	SRI LANKA	B.W.G.S. Bogaha Watte	GEDARA	Director, Department of Project Management and Monitoring, Ministry of Finance and Planning
39	TANZANIA	Alex Edson	MWAKISU	Financial Management Officer, External Finance, Aid Coordination Unit, Ministry of Finance
40	TIMOR LESTE	Elson Martinho Da	COSTA	External Assistance Coordinational Officer, Development Partnership Management Unit, Ministry of Finance
41	TOGO	Adjoussi	AKEDAGUE	Planning Economist, Mobilization of Aid and Partnership Division, Ministry of Planning, Development, and Regional Planning
42	TUNISIA	Asma S'hiri	LAABIDI	Legal Advisor of the Government, Presidency of the Government
43	TURKEY	Ömer	ÖZBEY	External Affairs and Partnerships, Turkish International Cooperation and Coordination Agency (TIKA)
44	UGANDA	Matyama	FREDRICK	Assistant Commissioner, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
45		Twesiime	FREDRICK TABURA	Senior Economist, Aid Liaison Department, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
46	UZBEKISTAN	Jamoliddin	AKHUNOV	Chief Officer, Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, Investment and Trade of the Republic of Uzbekistan
47	VIETNAM	Manh Cuong	CAO	Deputy Director General, Dept. of International Economic Relations, Ministry of Planning and Investment
48		Hung Vinh	PHAM	Director, Ministry of Planning and Investment
49	AUSTRALIA	Fiona	LORD	Assistant Director, Global Development Policy Section, Multilateral Development and Partnerships Division, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
50	BELGIUM	Laurent	PREUD' HOMME	Deputy Head of Mission
51	CANADA	Rashmi	SHARMA	Team Leader, International Strategy and Donor Relations
52	CHINA	Ye	ZHU	Third Secretary, Department of International Trade & Economic Affairs Ministry of Commerce
53	FINLAND	Eeva	ALARCON	Counsellor/Deputy HOM, Embassy of Finland, Nairobi, Kenya
54		Sari Hannele	LEHTIRANTA	Director, Unit for Development Policy
55		Ulla Kaarina	JARVELA-SEPPINEN	Senior Adviser, Unit for Development Policy
56	FRANCE	Eric	SANSON	Counsellor Embassy of France, Seoul
57	GERMANY	Jirka Henning	VIERHAUS	Senior Policy Advisor, Head of Sector Programme, GIZ
58	INDONESIA	Kurniawan	ARIADI	Deputy Director for Asian Bilateral Funding, Ministry of National Development Planning
59	JAPAN	Akihiko	SUNAMI	Director, Development Assistance Policy Planning Division, International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan
60		Katsunori	UEHARA	Principal Deputy Director, Office for Global Issues and Development Partnership, Operations Strategy Department, JICA
61	MEXICO	Jose Luis	BERNAL	Ambassador of Mexico in Korea
62		Bernadette G. Vega	SANCHEZ	Director of Monitoring, Evaluation
63		Noel	GONZALEZ SEGURA	Deputy General Director for Policy Making Mexican Agency for International Development Cooperation(AMEXCID)
64		Tadeo	BERJON MOLINARES	Director for International projection Cooperation
65		Juan Manuel	VALLE PERENE	Executive Director, Mexican Agency for International Development Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
66	NETHERLANDS	Jos	BRAND	Brand Consultancy
67		Arjan	SCHUTHOF	Senior Advisor of the Co-Chair of the Global Partnership
68		Jeroen	VERHEUL	Special Envoy of the Co-Chair of the Global Partnership
69	POLAND	Joanna	WASIEWSKA	Head of the Political Economic Section, Embassy of the Republic of Poland in Seoul
70		Mariola	BUSZ-MACHERSKA	Head of Unit, Development Cooperation Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
71	REPUBLIC OF KOREA	Byung-se	YUN	Minister, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
72		Dong-ik	SHIN	Deputy Minister, Multilateral and Global Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

	Country/Org.	First Name	Last Name	Title/Organization
73	REPUBLIC OF KOREA	Youngju	OH	Director General, Development Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs Ministry of Foreign Affairs
74		Sang-uk	YOON	Director, Development Policy Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
75		Hye Ryoung	SONG	Deputy Director, Development Policy Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
76		Eun Byeol	CHOU	Researcher, Ministry of Strategy and Finance
77		Songhee	SON	Manager, Strategic Planning Team, KOICA
78		Jihyun	KIM	Researcher, ODA Research Team, KOICA
79	SLOVAKIA	Kristina	MIKULOVA	Head of Development Cooperation, International Relation Section, Ministry of Finance of the Slovak Republic
80	SWEDEN	H.E. Lars Gunnar	DANIELSSON	Ambassador, Embassy of Sweden in Korea
81		Mattias	CHU	Counsellor, Embassy of Sweden in Korea
82	SWITZERLAND	Andrea	BIRRER	SDC, Junior Advisor
83		Suzanne	MÜLLER	Senior Policy Advisor, Quality Assurance and Aid Effectiveness, Focal Point Aid Effectiveness, Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation
84	UAE	Budour	AL-ALI	International Contributions Executive, Multilateral Partnership, Ministry of International Cooperation and Development
85		Makki	HAMID	Head of Evaluation Section, Monitoring and Evaluation, UAE Ministry of International Cooperation and Development
86	UK	Jennifer	SMITH	Policy Adviser, Department for International Development, DFID
87	USA	Steven	PIERCE	Special Coordinator for Development Effectiveness, USAID, Washington D.C.
88	ADB	Manju	SENAPATY	Lead Planning and Policy Specialist
89	AU/NEPAD	Bob	KALANZI	Africa Platform Officer, NEPAD agency
90		Mothae Anthony	MARUPING	Commissioner for Economic Affairs African Union Commission
91		Florence	NAZARE	Head, Capacity Development Division, NEPAD Planning & Coordinating Agency
92	EU/EC	Marijnissen	CHANTAL	Deputy Head of Unit, Aid Effectiveness, Financing for Development, European Commission
93		Luiza	BARA	Policy Officer, European Commission
94		Erik	SOLHEIM	DAC Chair, DCD
95	OECD	Patti	O'NEILL	Acting Head of Division, Global Partnerships and Policies, Development Cooperation Directorate, OECD
96		Brenda	KILLEN	Deputy Director, DCD
97		Erlend	HAUGEN	Communication Officer
98		Julie	SEGHERS	Junior Policy Analyst, Global Partnership and Policies, Development Cooperation Directorate
99		Gregory	DE PAEPE	Policy Advisor at OECD Tax and Development Programme
100		Teresita	LOPEZ-TREUSSART	Policy Analyst, Global Partnerships and Policies
101	PIF Secretariat	Charmina	SAILI	Regional Planning Adviser at Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
102	UN DESA	Navid	HANIF	Director, Office for ECOSOC Support and Coordination, Department of Economic Social Affairs
103	UNDP	Stan	NKWAIN	Deputy Director/Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Policy and Programme Support, UNDP
104		Niloy	BANERJEE	Director, UN System Affairs, Bureau for External Relations and Advocacy, UNDP
105		Yuko	SUZUKI	Policy Adviser and Team Leader, Effectiveness Development Cooperation, Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP, NY
106		Artemy	IZMESTIEV	UNDP Seoul Policy Centre's Policy Specialist
107		Dmitry	MARIYASIN	Team Leader, New Partnerships and Emerginh Donors, Regional Center for Europe and the CIS, UNDP
108		Derek	KILNER	Partnerships Development Analyst, Bureau for External Relations and Advocacy, UNDP
109		Naw Nau	HTOO	Program Analyst, Civil Society and Media, UNDP
110		Hye Ran	KIM	Development Planning and Effectiveness Specialist, Democratic Governance Pillar, UNDP
111		Emily	DAVIS	Policy Officer, South South Policy Team, UNDP China
112		Wendy	LU MCGILL	Communication Specialist, GPEDC
113		Kirsty	TAYLOR	Communication Associate, GPEDC, UN Seoul Policy Center

Seoul Workshop

	Country/Org.	First Name	Last Name	Title/Organization
114	UNDP	Ashley	PALMER	Governance and Development Effectiveness Specialist, Regional Governance Team, UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub
115		Elaine	VENTER	Team Leader, Knowledge, Innovation Group, Regional Service Center, Africa, UNDP
116	UNGC	Geul	KWAK	Researcher, UNGC
117	WORLD BANK	Benjamin	HERZBERG	Program Lead, Open Private Sector, Governance Global Practice, WB
118	CABRI	Neil Gary	COLE	Secretary General, CABRI
119	CIVICUS	Danny	SRISKANDARAJAH	Secretary General, CIVICUS
120	CPDE	Richard	SSEWAKIRYANGA	Executive Director, Uganda National NGO Forum, CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness
121		Mark Amiel	PASCUAL	Communications Officer, Communications, CSO Partnership For Development Effectiveness
122		Amy	DODD	Coordinator, UK Aid Network (UKAN)
123	CSO Partnership	Javier Bornstein	ORTEGA	CSO Partnership
124	DI	Charles	LWANGA-NTALE	Regional Director and Special Adviser for East & Central Africa, Development Initiatives
125		Daniel	COPPARD	Director of Research, Analysis and Evidence, Development Initiatives
126	Good Neighbors Korea	Sun	KIM	General Director, Good Neighbors Korea
127	KCOC	Jae-eun	SHIN	Director, KCOC (Korea NGO Council for Overseas Development Cooperation)
128	KoFID	Doun	MOON	Program Officer, KoFID (Korea Civil Society Forum on International Development Cooperation)
129	Korea Human Rights Foundation	Anselmo	LEE	Executive Director, Korea Human Rights Foundation / KoFID ROK
130	National NGO Network	Nwe Zin	WIN	Chairman of National NGO Network
131	ODA Watch	Tae Joo	LEE	Chair (Professor, Cultural Anthropology, Hansung University)
132		E Sol	CHO	Researcher, ODA Watch
133	PWYF	Shreya	BASU	Research and Monitoring Manager, PWYF
134	Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment	Jacqueline	WOOD	Senior Policy Advisor, Secretariat, Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment
135	TUAC/ITUC	Matthew	SIMONDS	Liaison Officer / Policy Advisor, Trade Union Advisory Committee (TUAC)
136	UCLG/FOGAR	Marta Catalina	MACIAS	Cooperation Development General Director, Catalan Government, UCLG/FOGAR
137		Lourdes	MOURELO	General Manager, Direccio General de Cooperacio al Desenvolupament, Generalitat de Catalunya
138	CLACSO Working Group	Karin	COSTA VAZQUEZ	Advisor, Strategy and Policy Department, CLACSO Working Group on South-South Cooperation, Brazil
139	CSIS	Conor	SAVOY	Deputy Director, Project on Prosperity and Development, CSIS
140		Daniel	RUNDE	Schreyer Chair in Global Analysis and Director, Project on Prosperity and Development, CSIS
141	ECDPM	Geert	LAPORTE	Deputy Director, European Centre for Development Policy Management Brussels
142	Ewha Womans Univ.	Eun Mee	KIM	Dean & Professor, GSIS Ewha Womans University
143	Korea Univ.	Jin-Wook	CHOI	Professor, Department of Public Administration
144	Kyunghee Univ.	Sang-Hyup	SHIN	Professor, Graduate School of Pan-Pacific International Studies
145	North-South Institute	John	SINCLAIR	Distinguished Associate of the North-South Institute
146	REDI	Suhyon	OH	REDI (Re-Shaping Development Institute)
147	Seoul National Univ.	Taekyoon	KIM	Professor, International Development
148	Best Industrial Company Ltd.	Khine Khine	NWE	Deputy Managing Director of Best Industrial Company Ltd., Joint Secretary General of UMFCCL and member of Myanmar Investment Commission
149	LG	Hyun Jin	JEON	Manager, Corporate Social Responsibility Team, Seoul, LG
150	ZBIDF	Sylvia	MUTALE	Extractive Sector Partnership Broker, Zambia Business in Development Facility

2014 OUTCOME REPORT ANNUAL WORKSHOP

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP
FOR EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT
CO-OPERATION



Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Republic of Korea