

AN UPDATED MONITORING FRAMEWORK: REFINEMENTS TO THE CURRENT INDICATORS AND THE WAY FORWARD TO ADAPT TO 2030 CHALLENGES

15th Steering Committee Meeting

21 April 2018 - Washington, USA

This document provides a substantive update on progress made in strengthening the existing monitoring indicators ahead of the 2018 monitoring round, and presents plans for the revision of the framework to be fit for the 2030 Agenda.

This document is shared with the members of the Steering Committee for discussion and endorsement of:

- Proposed next steps to **finalise indicator revisions and launch** 2018 Monitoring Round; and
- Proposed next steps to **adapt the monitoring framework** to the 2030 Agenda.

Contacts:

Mr. Alejandro GUERRERO-RUIZ, Tel: +33 1 45 24 83 63, e-mail: Alejandro.GUERRERO-RUIZ@oecd.org

Ms. Yuko SUZUKI-NAAB, Tel: +1 212 906 6509, e-mail: Yuko.SUZUKI@undp.org

Ms. Rebekah CHEW, Tel: +33 1 45 24 15 66, e-mail: Rebekah.CHEW@oecd.org

Ms. Piper HART, Tel: +1 212 906 5259, e-mail: Piper.HART@undp.org

15TH STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

AN UPDATED MONITORING FRAMEWORK: REFINEMENTS TO THE CURRENT INDICATORS AND THE WAY FORWARD TO ADAPT TO 2030 CHALLENGES

Rationale and objective of the refinement process

1. Upon agreeing on its monitoring framework in 2012, the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (henceforth, the 'Global Partnership') foresaw a comprehensive review of its monitoring arrangements to ensure “relevance to, contribution and fit with any broader international development framework that emerges as a successor to the Millennium Development Goals”¹.
2. The Second High Level Meeting of the Global Partnership (Nairobi 2016) reaffirmed the relevance of existing effectiveness principles, but stressed the need to “update the existing monitoring framework to reflect the challenges of the 2030 Agenda, including the pledge to leave no-one behind”².
3. In this light, the Global Partnership Steering Committee endorsed the refinement process of the monitoring framework around two objectives, sequenced in two phases, accompanied by measures to streamline the country-level monitoring process:
 - a) Refine current indicators based on lessons and feedback from past monitoring rounds; and
 - b) Adapt the monitoring framework to reflect 2030 development challenges.

Phase 1: Strengthening the quality and usefulness of current indicators

4. The objective is to capitalize on the lessons learned from the previous monitoring rounds to strengthen the integrity of monitoring data, streamline the data collection process, and facilitate easier interpretation of, and action on, monitoring results.
5. Steering Committee meetings have guided an inclusive process for the indicators' refinement.³ Table 1 of the Annex provides a step-by-step summary of this process. Specifically, it foresaw that the Joint Support Team (JST):
 - Address the recommendations of the Monitoring Advisory Group;
 - Draw on the expertise of reference groups to review the indicators; and
 - Carry out country testing and public consultation on the proposed refinements before final endorsement by the Steering Committee.
6. To this end, the JST worked with reference groups – close to 50 experts from different countries and organisations – to develop proposals to refine the selected indicators. This work was informed by the Monitoring Advisory Group recommendations and by feedback collected from participating countries and organisations of the 2016 Monitoring Round. This work is now complete, and the developed proposals aim to strengthen the relevance and usefulness of the indicators, while also

¹ Working Party on Aid Effectiveness, June 2012, “Indicators, Targets and Process for Global Monitoring”

² GPEDC (2017) "Nairobi Outcome Document":

³ See summaries of the 7th, 10th, 13th and 14th Global Partnership Steering Committee meetings. The Steering Committee endorsed in October 2017 the approach to refining the existing indicators, whereby six indicators would undergo more substantive revisions.

maintaining consistency and comparability over time⁴. An overview of the proposed indicator improvements is presented in Table 2 of the Annex.

7. The indicator proposals are currently undergoing the agreed consultation processes:
 - An *open online consultation*, to be completed by 9 April 2018, to facilitate feedback from all Global Partnership constituencies to the proposed indicator improvements; and
 - *Field testing* in different country contexts (Liberia, Laos, Mexico and Belarus) to ensure the usefulness and feasibility of the improved indicators for country-level stakeholders.
8. Once these two consultations are concluded, Steering Committee members will receive a summary of the feedback to inform discussion at its Washington meeting on 21-22 April.
9. The following steps will facilitate timely endorsement of the revised indicators and launch of the 2018 Monitoring Round, enabling the Global Partnership to provide fresh evidence on the effectiveness of development co-operation for UN-led follow-up and review of the SDGs in 2019:

Proposed next steps to finalise indicator revisions and launch 2018 Monitoring Round	
Summary presentation of consultation feedback to Steering Committee	Ahead of Steering Committee meeting
Proposals to incorporate and address feedback	Steering Committee meeting 21-22 April 2018
Final contributions from indicator reference groups/experts	April 2018
Endorsement of final indicator methodologies	Steering Committee written procedure May 2018
Launch of the 2018 Monitoring Round	May 2018

Phase 2: Adapting Global Partnership monitoring to reflect challenges of the 2030 Agenda

10. While ensuring timely strengthening of existing indicators to deliver a successful 2018 Monitoring Round, it is also imperative that the Global Partnership responds to the call to adapt its monitoring framework to the pressing challenges of the 2030 Agenda. The SDGs must be achieved on the ground, led by countries themselves. To ensure continued relevance, Global Partnership evidence will need to evolve to assess how effectively development partners' support, through their development co-operation, countries in addressing the core challenges the development community faces today. These challenges include – but are not limited to – transitioning from fragile and conflict-afflicted situations to resilience, achieving gender equality, and mitigating and adapting to climate change.
11. In order to establish the Global Partnership's capacity to adapt and respond to pressing challenges, this work could first look to conflict and fragility, with a view to better tailoring Global Partnership monitoring to the unique needs of countries in fragile situations. Based on this initial work and lessons learned, the Steering Committee could then agree to expand the framework update to other areas and development challenges. This approach responds to the Steering Committee's call in its Dhaka meeting (October 2017) for realistic planning and sequencing of this work.

Tailoring Global Partnership monitoring to fragile situations

12. Progress in fragile and conflict-affected countries is crucial to achieving the SDGs and to meeting the universal commitment to leave no one behind. Today, more countries experience violent conflict than at any time in nearly 30 years. It is estimated that more than half of the world's poor could be

⁴ For example, proposals to replace open-ended qualitative responses with more comparable dimensions enable better comparisons of progress amongst countries and over time (*Indicator 1b* on the strength of national results frameworks; *indicator 2* on civil society's enabling environment and development effectiveness; and *indicator 3* on quality of public-private dialogue).

living in fragile situations by 2030⁵. Yet most of these countries lagged behind in achieving the MDGs, and the risk is high that the same shortcoming will prevent achievement of the SDGs. If the SDGs are not met in conflict-affected and fragile countries, they will not be met at all.

13. International attention and commitment to address the challenges faced in fragile and conflict-affected situations has increased in recent years. Agreement and adoption of SDG16 on peace, justice and strong institutions was an international milestone in this regard. Political momentum has continued to build with the twin United Nations Security Council and General Assembly Resolutions on Sustaining Peace, as well as the World Humanitarian Summit and subsequent New Way of Working initiative⁶. In response, the Nairobi Outcome Document committed the Global Partnership to address the challenge of improving the effectiveness and results of development co-operation for countries in fragile situations.
14. Furthermore, feedback received from the 2016 Global Partnership Monitoring Round indicated a need to adapt Global Partnership monitoring to account more specifically for the context and diverse situations fragile and conflict-affected countries face. According to the 2016 monitoring findings, these countries and their development partners encounter more constraints in realising the principles for effective development co-operation at country level. For example, predictability of ODA to fragile countries remains particularly low and ODA is less aligned to national development priorities and targets. The g7+, a voluntary association of 20 countries from across the globe that are or have been affected by conflict and are now in transition to the next stage of development, were the central voice in identifying this need⁷.

Next steps

15. The Global Partnership proposes to use its convening power to engage key stakeholders and ensure that the update of the monitoring framework is an inclusive process that builds on existing lessons, experience and expertise. This includes, inter alia, drawing on the experience of the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding in developing and testing tailored monitoring approaches amongst its member constituencies.⁸ Additionally, the Global Partnership has gathered feedback from countries in fragile and conflict-affected situations, as part of its overall monitoring and learning cycle, to identify shortcomings, lessons and proposals for improvement.
16. To carry out this work, the Global Partnership will use its well established approach to identify the key effectiveness challenges specific to countries that are in fragile and conflict-affected situations; forge inclusive agreement on the actions needed to address these challenges; and devise measurement approaches to track progress and facilitate mutual accountability and learning. A roadmap to ensure an inclusive process in carrying out these steps will be developed in preparation for the 2nd Steering Committee meeting in 2018.
17. Looking to the Global Partnership's forthcoming 2020 Monitoring Round, the end-deliverable of adapting the Global Partnership monitoring framework to fragile situations would take the form of a new module to the Global Partnership monitoring framework, developed to more explicitly identify and monitor specific effectiveness issues affecting fragile situations. This module would be tested in a small number of countries, in parallel to the 2018 Monitoring Round, and presented to the Steering Committee for final endorsement.
18. In recognition of the diversity of fragile and conflict affected countries, and of the definitional challenges related to this topic, the voluntary nature of Global Partnership monitoring will also underpin this aspect of the monitoring framework. This means that, just as with overall participation in Global Partnership monitoring efforts, countries themselves will decide whether they opt to report, in collaboration with their development partners, against this new module.

⁵ OECD (2016), States of Fragility 2016: Understanding Violence, OECD Publishing, Paris.

⁶ The New Way of Working stemmed from the UN Secretary General's Agenda for Humanity that called for humanitarian and development actors to work towards collective outcomes, over multi-year timeframes, based on their comparative advantage.

⁷ 18 of the 20 g7+ countries participated in the 2016 Monitoring Round.

⁸ A tri-partite partnership that brings together fragile and conflict-affected countries (g7+), OECD-DAC bilateral donors and key multilateral agencies working in fragile contexts (INCAF), and civil society organizations working towards peacebuilding and statebuilding (CSPPS).

19. The 2019 High-Level Political Forum (HLPF) presents the opportunity to share with the international development community the newly developed approach – a Global Partnership Monitoring Framework 2.0. Ultimately, adapting Global Partnership monitoring to reflect the challenges of the 2030 Agenda, specifically in this case the challenges faced by countries in fragile situations, will add to the Global Partnership’s core contribution to UN-led follow-up and review of the SDGs. In addition, updated Global Partnership monitoring can also complement efforts of the United Nations to strengthen and track the effectiveness of its own work at country level.

Proposed next steps to adapt Global Partnership monitoring	
Steering Committee feedback on proposed approach	Steering Committee meeting 21-22 April
Set up an expert reference group	May - June 2018
Convene the expert reference group (2-3 times)	June - October 2018
Presentation of roadmap and preliminary recommendations from the reference group	Steering Committee meeting (2 nd half 2018 tbc)

20. A wide-reaching monitoring meeting is planned to be held in September 2018 to contribute to the overall political momentum on the work of the Global Partnership, with respect to both the 2018 Monitoring Round and its strengthened indicators, as well as the proposed work to adapt the monitoring framework to the challenges of the 2030 Agenda. This event will aim to garner broad engagement and buy-in for the 2018 monitoring round by increasing visibility of the work of the Global Partnership and highlighting how monitoring can drive evidence-based dialogue and lead to concrete actions at country level. The September event will also assist with building support and interest for a Global Partnership Monitoring Framework 2.0 in the lead-up to the 2019 HLPF.

ANNEXES

Table 1. Collaborative process to strengthen current Global Partnership indicators

Step	Outcome	Participants
1 Monitoring Advisory Group Report July 2016	Recommendations to strengthen the monitoring framework and ensure its relevance in post-2015 landscape.	12 high-level experts from partner country governments, bilateral and multilateral development partners, think-tanks, private sector and civil society.
2 Feedback Survey July - August 2016	Multi-stakeholder feedback identifying key challenges and suggestions to increase usefulness.	Participants of 2016 monitoring round. Civil Society went through a specific feedback process on indicator 2 led by Task Team.
3 Regional and Global Meetings September – December 2016	Indicator-specific feedback on relevance, usefulness and efficiency; reaffirmed commitment to update the monitoring framework to reflect 2030 Agenda.	Partner countries and development partners in several regional workshops and meetings. Over 500 participants from all constituencies in pre-HLM2 monitoring workshop, ~4.000 in HLM2.
4 Steering Committee Meeting April 2017 (Washington)	Endorsed the roadmap to update the monitoring framework	
5 Consultations with experts April 2017 – February 2018	Technical proposals to address methodological shortcomings .	Over 50 experts consulted, representing diverse Global Partnership stakeholders.
6 Steering Committee Meeting October 2017 (Dhaka)	Endorsed approach and process to strengthen current indicators	
7 Civil Society consultation January - March 2018	CPDE-led testing of refined methodology for indicator 2	Representatives from civil society organisations from around 20 countries.
8 Online consultation and video conferences March – April 2018	Feedback from stakeholders on each proposed methodology .	Global Partnership stakeholders including partner countries, development partners (headquarters and countries), civil society, private sector, trade unions and other interested actors.
9 On-the-ground feedback March – April 2018	Ensuring refined methodologies are feasible and relevant for different country contexts.	Government and stakeholders in Liberia, Laos, Mexico and Belarus . Indicator 8 methodology tested in 15 partner countries (2017).
10 Steering Committee Meeting April 2018 (Washington)	Endorsement of steps to finalise the indicators' review based on feedback received	
11 Final contributions from experts April 2018	Final adjustments to methodology proposals.	Same experts consulted during the methodological development
12 Steering Committee endorsement May 2018	Endorsement of final methodologies.	Steering Committee through written procedure.
13 Launch 2018 monitoring round May 2018	Invitation letter to countries and organisations officially launches 2018 monitoring round.	Ministerial Co-Chairs
14 Monitoring meeting September 2018	Reinvigorated political momentum and engagement for monitoring effective development co-operation	
15 2018 monitoring round and 2019 UN High Level Political Forum May 2018 – mid-2019	Contribute to SDG implementation by tracking progress of effective development co-operation, spurring dialogue and increasing impact.	Over 100 countries receiving and providing development co-operation and their development partners .

Table 2. Overview of improvements proposed to current Global Partnership indicators

Before	After	Compa-rability	Reporting effort
Indicator 1a – Development partners use country-led results frameworks			
Assessed alignment to country results frameworks only at project level.	Assesses alignment at country strategy and project level. Reduced project reporting efforts by 41%. Clearer guidance and smaller sample improve data reporting and validation.		
Indicator 1b – Countries strengthen their national results frameworks			
Assessed only the existence of country planning tools but not their quality or real use. No reference to SDGs. Uneven quality of responses, no comparability.	Assesses existence and quality of country planning tools and how SDGs are incorporated in country's development strategy. Identifies capacity needs. Simpler questions do not require in-depth knowledge of national planning architecture. Straightforward reporting method (multiple choice).		
Indicator 2 – Civil society organisations operate within an environment that maximises their engagement in and contribution to development			
Binary answers forced non-nuanced answers, not accurately reflecting countries' realities. Open-ended responses made difficult the multi-stakeholder dialogue and led to uneven response rate. No reflection of incremental progress. No comparability.	Scaled approach makes reporting simpler, faster, and facilitates multi-stakeholder participation and consensus. Allows for nuanced responses, comparability across countries and tracking progress over time. Results guide country-level action.		
Indicator 3 – Quality of public-private dialogue (PPD)			
Did not provide enough information on quality, inclusiveness and outcomes of PPD. Uneven quality of open-ended responses and difficult interpretation. Costly optional quality assessment (module 3).	Assesses strength, characteristics and results of PPDs. Scaled approach makes reporting simpler, faster, and facilitates multi-stakeholder participation and consensus. Increases comparability across countries and tracking of progress over time. Dropped costly module 3 but keeps key elements in the questionnaire.		
Indicator 4 – Transparent information on development co-operation is publicly available			
Methodology robust and relevant. Partner countries indicated that the global level assessment should be complemented with country-level perspective.	Methodology unchanged. Partner countries will be invited to indicate the extent to which data from development partners is reflected in their information management systems.		
Indicator 5 – Development co-operation is predictable (annual and medium-term)			
Methodology robust and relevant. Minor challenge is the lack of comparative information on the policies and corporate practices established at development partners' headquarters that may be driving the results.	Methodology unchanged. To address existing challenge, a mapping of current policies and practices related to making development co-operation more predictable is proposed.		

Before	After	Compa-rability	Reporting effort
Indicator 6 – Development co-operation is included in budgets subject to parliamentary oversight			
Methodology robust and relevant. Minor challenge encountered by some participants in understanding how to report on this indicator.	Methodology unchanged. Improved step-by-step guidance to facilitate reporting on this indicator. Provision of background information to help in the contextualisation and dialogue on the results.		
Indicator 7 – Mutual accountability is strengthened through inclusive reviews			
Reflected traditional provider-recipient relations only. Binary responses did not help interpret or take action on results.	Reflects more diverse partnership landscape. Allows nuanced responses and provides actionable information on elements such as regularity, transparency, inclusivity of assessments. Reduced reporting burden by now selecting a scenario (out of 4) that best matches the country's situation, and checking boxes for details. Responses can be drawn from DCF's Global Accountability survey.		
Indicator 8 – Governments have transparent systems in place to track public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment			
Criteria were too general and did not provide sufficient information on quality or use of tracking systems. Did not adequately generate actionable dialogue.	More rigorous assessment on quality and use of tracking systems. Incentivises action and progress over time. Relevance, clarity and easiness of reporting confirmed by 15 country pilots in 2017. Refined methodology confirmed as measurement for SDG 5.c. Becomes universal indicator and critical contribution to the UN HLPF 2019 & beyond.		
Indicator 9a – Quality of countries' public financial management systems (PFM)			
Globally-sourced based on World Bank's Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA). Limited country coverage and no disaggregated information. Difficult interpretation, limited sensitivity to incremental change.	Globally-sourced based on widely accepted PEFA methodology for assessing public financial management performance. Greater country coverage and granularity. Easier interpretations to inform action on results and track incremental progress.		
Indicator 9b – Development partners use country systems			
Methodology robust and relevant. Minor issues in the understanding and interpretation of the use of country systems by some respondents.	Methodology unchanged. Improved guidance with clear definitions and step-by-step assistance to support the data collection process.		
Indicator 10 – Aid is untied			
Methodology robust and relevant. Is limited to <i>formal</i> tied aid (i.e. explicit restrictions) and does not provide information on <i>de facto</i> tied aid levels.	Methodology unchanged. Present estimates of <i>de facto</i> untied aid levels and share disaggregated data at country level to inform discussions.		

Under column "comparability"  indicates partial comparability, key elements are maintained that are critical for continued assessment of progress over time.

Under column "reporting effort"  indicates a slight increase in the number of binary questions. To compensate for that UN Women/GPEDC will provide focal points support for data collection. Fifteen countries pilots already confirmed clarity and easiness of reporting.

*For 1b, the 2011 baseline can be reconstructed for 77 countries allowing tracking of progress.