

Global Partnership Event: Reinvigorating Effectiveness for the 2030 Agenda

Paris, 11-12 September 2018

Key Messages – by Session

11 September 2018

Session I & II: Leading country participation in the 2018 Global Partnership Monitoring Round

Objective: Improving the quality, impact and effectiveness of development co-operation is crucial to ensure that the SDGs are achieved. Through its monitoring exercise, the Global Partnership supports partner countries and development partners in tracking the implementation of effective development co-operation commitments. This session aims to generate and share knowledge on how to ensure a successful monitoring round in order to inspire and encourage concrete actions on the part of participating governments as they lead the monitoring exercise. This includes, inter alia, discussion on: collecting robust and high-quality data; engaging all stakeholders through an inclusive process; and embedding the monitoring process to inform co-operation policy and partnership frameworks.

Formal welcome from the German Global Partnership Co-Chair, delivered by **Mr. Udo Weber**, Deputy Head of Division, Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Germany

Moderator: **Mr. Mande Isaora Zefania Romalahy**, Senior Statistician-Economist, Head/Aid Coordination Permanent Secretariat, Office of the Prime Minister, Madagascar

Introductory presentation: **Ms. Hanna-Mari Kilpelainen**, OECD Senior Policy Advisor and GPEDC Joint Support Team Lead; and **Ms. Yuko Suzuki Naab**, UNDP Global Policy Advisor and GPEDC Joint Support Team Lead.

Panellists:

- **Mr. Aliaksandr Vlaskin**, Expert, EU ITA Centre, Belarus
- **Ms. Ana Marcela Calderón**, Responsable de Eficacia de la Cooperación, Alianza Global para el Desarrollo/Dirección de Cooperación, Costa Rica
- **Mr. Innocent Mugabe**, Aid Information Management Specialist, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, Rwanda
- **Mr. Chhieng Yanara**, Minister Attached to the Prime Minister, Council for the Development of Cambodia, Cambodia

Key messages:

- The Global Partnership monitoring exercise is the main tool to maintain political momentum around effective development co-operation and is an important input for SDG follow-up and review, including providing source data for SDG targets 17.16 and 17.15 (partnerships for the goals) and SDG target 5c (gender equality).
- Global Partnership monitoring data is instrumental to make progress at using development co-operation more effectively at the country level by identifying challenges and concrete solutions. The monitoring exercise delivers fresh evidence biennially and serves as an excellent vehicle to inclusively engage with all relevant partners in dialogue on effective development co-operation.
- Sharing lessons is critical to improving the monitoring process and maximising the benefits from participation of different actors. Country experiences and lessons from the past help to address bottlenecks in undertaking the monitoring exercise and better use the results to deliver more effective partnerships.
- Integrating the exercise with national systems and processes is an important factor in ensuring a robust, demand-driven monitoring process. It helps to advance global commitments and strengthen national cooperation policies and strategies, by drawing on existing information management systems for data collection.
- High level political buy-in facilitates engagement in the monitoring process. Better co-ordination among all development actors is needed to maximise the benefits of the monitoring exercise.

Summary:

The monitoring exercise is the vehicle to track the effectiveness of development co-operation, and provides valuable evidence for the SDG and Financing for Development follow-up and review. It drives progress, by providing concrete evidence that can be used to identify where policy and institutional changes are required to ensure all development co-operation is used for maximum development impact.

The monitoring exercise provides a valuable entry point for identifying challenges, bringing together the full range of stakeholders to discuss how to act on the results together. At country-level, results from the 2016 monitoring round have informed the establishment and strengthening of development co-operation policies and provided an opportunity for renewed collaboration between governments, civil society and the private sector. The 2018 monitoring round will deliver fresh data in early 2019 to support evidence-based decision making. The results of the 2018 monitoring round will be showcased at the 2019 Senior-Level Meeting of the Global Partnership.

Lessons from previous monitoring rounds informed improvements to the monitoring framework prior to the launch of the 2018 round. The indicator methodologies and data collection process that underpin the 2018 monitoring round have been strengthened. In addition, work is ongoing to adapt Global Partnership monitoring to ensure that its data remains relevant and useful. This will be rolled out in future monitoring rounds and will include, for example, a tailored approach to monitoring effectiveness in fragile and conflict affected situations, and with regard to private sector engagement for development.

Panellists shared key factors for a successful monitoring round in order to inspire and encourage concrete actions of other participating governments. They also identified challenges experienced in conducting the monitoring exercise and shared possible solutions for partners participating in the monitoring for first time. Key lessons learned from the past rounds include the following.

Linking global commitments to national development cooperation policies, strategies and results frameworks ensures high quality monitoring. Both Cambodia and Costa Rica emphasised that integrating the principles for effective development co-operation into national policies ensures that relevant monitoring indicators are included in national results frameworks and used to report on progress towards the effectiveness commitments as well as to keep development partners accountable.

Integration of the exercise with existing national systems and processes helps ensure a robust monitoring process. Cambodia underscored that a good development co-operation database is a useful starting point to undertake the monitoring exercise. Aid Information Management (or similar) Systems (AIMS) for data collection make it easy to gather information and reduce transaction costs. Rwanda and Cambodia provided useful examples of how AIMS have simplified reporting and assisted with the monitoring exercise.

Political support and coordination within the government facilitates reporting. Costa Rica explained how relevant ministry offices helped the leading ministry to report on specific indicators (e.g. on gender equality and women's empowerment), often through existing sector specific working groups or coordination groups. Rwanda also noted that a clear division of labour helps with coordination and reporting.

Collaboration and coordination among all development actors is essential for a successful monitoring exercise. Some countries encountered difficulties in obtaining information by development partners (some provided partial information, others did not provide any). Lack of coordination among development actors was reported as a challenge by many. Cambodia provided an example of how proactive outreach to all development partners helped them securing accurate data. In some cases this was done by making use of existing dialogue and coordination platforms and by boosting learning through consultations with all relevant actors. In Costa Rica, the government consulted with all actors involved in development co-operation and organised workshops to convey the importance of the monitoring exercise.

Supporting materials and tools in different languages increase participation. Costa Rica recognised that the guiding material provided by the Joint Support Team has facilitated participation in the exercise as well as increased involvement of national actors. Belarus highlighted that the availability of materials in other languages (e.g. Russian) would simplify exercise and further increase participation in next rounds.

Session III: Partner participation in the 2018 Global Partnership monitoring round

Objective: Improving the quality, impact and effectiveness of development co-operation is crucial to ensure that the SDGs are achieved. Through its monitoring exercise, the Global Partnership supports partner countries and development partners in tracking the implementation of effective development co-operation commitments. All development partners have an important role to play in the success of the monitoring round. Strong participation from development partners, at both headquarters and country level, is needed to successfully carry out this exercise. This session aims to identify actions that development partners can take to effectively engage and maximise the benefits of the 2018 Global Partnership monitoring round.

Moderator: **Mr. Udo Weber**, Deputy Head of Division, Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Germany, and GPEDC Steering Committee Co-Chair

Panellists:

- **Mr. Vincent Maher**, Policy Lead on the OECD DAC, Ireland
- **Mr. Vitalice Meja**, Co-Chair, CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness, and GPEDC Steering Committee member
- **Ms. Nicoletta Merlo**, Deputy Head of Unit, Directorate General for International Co-operation and Development, European Commission, and GPEDC Steering Committee member
- **Mr. Kim Bettcher**, Center for International Private Enterprise (CIPE), and GPEDC Steering Committee member
- **Mr. Alessandro Motter**, Senior Advisor, Economic and Social Affairs, International Organization of Parliaments, and GPEDC Steering Committee member

Key messages:

- The Global Partnership monitoring round is an important reality check to track progress on development effectiveness commitments.
- Development partners' headquarters play a crucial role in assisting their delegations at country level to participate, by encouraging country offices to engage with partner governments and providing practical guidance on how to deliver accurate data. The involvement of senior representatives from development actors also helps to strengthen the dialogue and institutionalise the monitoring exercise at country level.
- All development actors have an important role to play in the monitoring exercise. As such, an enabling environment that facilitates multi-stakeholder engagement at country level is essential. Civil society's activities and private sector participation are affected by the political, financial and legal context in which they function. Their contribution to this process can be weakened or enhanced, depending on the conditions that are present in the country. Furthermore, businesses will tend to participate if they understand the process and see it as central to their work.
- Engagement of parliaments in Global Partnership monitoring can be enhanced. This can be facilitated through parliamentary briefings and by inviting members of parliament to join a multi-stakeholder dialogue in country to discuss the monitoring results.
- All partners have an important role to play in addressing capacity constraints. While technical, financial and capacity constraints can limit the engagement of some stakeholders, there are tools and resources available from a variety of sources to support active engagement. The monitoring exercise itself is an opportunity to build capacity and strengthen engagement from all partners.

Summary:

The Global Partnership monitoring exercise supports partner countries and development partners in tracking the implementation of effective development co-operation commitments. Each and every partner, at both headquarter and country level, has an important role to play in making the monitoring exercise relevant and successful.

Both Ireland and the European Commission highlighted that **development partners value the monitoring exercise as a reality check of internationally agreed effectiveness commitments.** Development partners have an important role to play in providing complete and accurate data, as well as engaging in dialogue with their partner country governments. This collaboration can happen directly with the headquarters of development partners but, most commonly, with country offices and embassies. Several examples of good collaboration exist. For instance, in the 2016 monitoring round, the European Commission provided data to 64 of the 81 participating countries. Currently in the 2018 monitoring round, it is providing guidance to their country offices on how to collect accurate data and to avoid discrepancies between data collected at country and headquarter levels. Yet several partner countries noted that they continue to experience difficulties in getting their partners to participate, which results in incomplete or limited information on development co-operation. The Commission underscored that engagement from development partners at headquarter level is essential to improve the motivation and ability of country offices to actively engage. Sending the right message to country focal points can safeguard that commitments made at global level are also implemented at national level. The European Commission highlighted in this regard that headquarter and country offices need to work together.

All development actors have an important role to play in the monitoring exercise. Civil society, the private sector, parliamentarians, trade unions and other national stakeholders each bring critical perspectives. An enabling environment that facilitates inclusive, multi-stakeholder engagement is fundamental to enable their participation. To make it easier for partner country governments to bring in these important actors, it is important that stakeholders interested in participating coordinate among themselves and assign focal points to provide representative views that are constructive and relevant from their constituency. The CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness explained that in several countries, civil society – where there are often thousands of unique civil society organisations - have coordinated and organised amongst themselves to identify and train focal points. This enables the focal points to bring the voices of their networks and constituencies to the government in an informed manner.

Government officials leading the exercise and parliamentarians themselves both see strong benefits to increasing the engagement of parliamentarians in the Global Partnership monitoring exercise. The International Organization of Parliaments provided several suggestions to strengthen and institutionalise collaboration with parliaments. First, the Minister overseeing the monitoring exercise could host a formal briefing to members of parliament explaining the monitoring process, benefits and opportunities. Second, parliamentarians themselves could table a report on the monitoring round that reflects their perspectives. And third, a discussion on the monitoring results could be held with parliamentarians to take stock of the findings.

Limited capacity to engage was echoed during the discussion, highlighting the need for all partners to plan for and address capacity constraints. There are a wealth of tools and resources available from a variety of sources to support active engagement in the monitoring exercise. The Global Partnership provides a multitude of technical resources, including guides, webinars and a help desk to provide technical support. Some stakeholders, including civil society as noted above, centrally organise and train representative focal points. Development partners and regional organisations may assist with financial or

technical assistance, including making the monitoring materials available in the local or regional language. In addition, more systematic engagement by country governments with each of these groups can serve as capacity building. The monitoring exercise itself is an opportunity for all partners to build capacity and strengthen dialogue with other actors.

Beyond engagement in the monitoring exercise itself, the discussion raised a concern that efforts to strengthen country systems are not driving collective action as they once were. It was suggested that strengthening country systems has become a technocratic exercise that does not acknowledge political factors. Nevertheless, success stories still exist. The European Consensus for Development is an example of shared commitment for working better together through increased joint programming, with ambition of reducing fragmentation and increasing effectiveness of joint implementation.

Session IV: Monitoring Clinics

Objective: This interactive session will facilitate a conversation among participants on successful strategies to participate in the 2018 monitoring round, learning from past experiences. Two frequent challenges will be addressed: how to ensure a smooth data gathering process at country level, and how to facilitate effective multi-stakeholder engagement and dialogue in the country. In the final segment, participants will interact with the tools used to collect monitoring data.

This is an interactive session, facilitated by the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team.

In preparation for this session, attendants are asked to think ahead on these two questions, from their various roles in the Global Partnership monitoring process:

- During the data collection phase: What are some examples of frequent challenges or successful strategies in data gathering that need to be considered?
- In facilitating multi-stakeholder dialogue and engagement: Can you provide some example(s) of actions you could take to ensure an inclusive process?

Summary:

One of the key pieces of advice that partner countries who had participated in the monitoring exercise in previous years provided to their peers is to **start early and plan ahead** in order to ensure smooth data collection. In their experience, starting early has many benefits. It can allow participating governments to organise multi-stakeholder awareness workshops; it can enable broad stakeholder engagement; and, it facilitates comprehensive and accurate reporting from development partners through allowing time for review and validation of the data.

Second, some partner countries expressed concern on **engaging their development partners and/or receiving data in a timely manner**. In response, development partners shared their strategies to ensure strong participation and a smooth monitoring exercise. Several bilateral development actors said that they have reached out to their country offices from headquarters to update them on the 2018 monitoring round and the required data. One said that they have prepared guidance documents on the monitoring exercise specifically for their embassies, implementing agencies and country offices. In addition, it was noted that the Global Partnership will share a comprehensive list of country focal points for development partners, CSOs and trade unions with national coordinators, in addition to the [online list of participating partner countries](#) and their focal points.

On multi-stakeholder engagement, partner countries noted the usefulness of **strengthening, and where necessary establishing, regular development co-operation coordination mechanisms for dialogue** not only on the Global Partnership monitoring exercise, but also for long-term discussion on development co-operation and financing strategies. Some partner countries expressed difficulty in setting up ad hoc multi-stakeholder workshops when available resources are limited. In response to this challenge, others noted that when resources are limited they found it easier to organise several shorter bilateral meetings with development partners. Others commented that in the past they have collaborated with development partners to facilitate such workshops.

Some stakeholders noted the difficulty of engaging with partner countries between monitoring rounds, due to political change, changeover of focal points, and reliance on a limited number of individuals with the capacity to carry out the exercise. In response, other partner countries, drawing on their own experience, proposed several solutions including **integrating the effectiveness indicators in to their aid information systems to facilitate streamlined data collection, and organising group training for officials**

that work in development co-operation. Representatives from civil society highlighted that they can support and carry over institutional memory by being involved in regular policy discussions with government and other stakeholders on development co-operation effectiveness. To that end, CSO representatives noted that they have already identified CSO focal points to increase knowledge and information sharing and to facilitate better engagement with the government. All insisted on the importance of continued dialogue and increased institutionalisation of the Global Partnership monitoring exercise to drive more effective partnerships.

Session V: Harnessing monitoring results to drive more effective partnerships

Objective: The aim of the Global Partnership monitoring exercise is to drive more effective partnerships at country level. The final phase of the monitoring round is focussed on spurring dialogue and action on the results. This session aims to explore in practice how countries and partners intend to scale up the use and impact of Global Partnership monitoring results. To achieve this, discussion will focus on concrete actions that countries have used in the past, and could employ during the current monitoring round to drive change at country level, including through reporting on progress, such as using the monitoring results as an input for a Voluntary National Review, and to inform preparation for country level implementation following the 2018 monitoring round.

Facilitator: **Dr. Verena Knippel**, Senior Advisor Capacity Development, Sida, Sweden

Panelists:

- **Mr. Thierry Somakpo**, Assistant to the Technical Secretary of the Monitoring Unit for Economic and Financial Programs, Ministry of Economy and Finance, Ministry of Economy and Finance, Bénin
- **Ms. Randa Hamza**, Senior Advisor for Evaluation and Planning, Ministry of Investment and International Co-operation, Egypt
- **Dr. Yuan Zheng**, Economist, United Nations Development Programme in China
- **Ms. Jacqueline Wood**, Senior Strategy and Policy Specialist, Task Team for CSO Engagement
- **Mr. Alejandro Guerrero**, Monitoring Co-ordinator, Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation Joint Support Team, OECD

Key messages:

- Fully harnessing the results of the Global Partnership monitoring exercise to drive behaviour change is one of the most important aspects of the exercise. In previous monitoring rounds, partner countries have used the results to strengthen national development co-operation strategies, co-ordination mechanisms and partnerships. For results to generate behaviour change, it is crucial to ensure they are communicated in an actionable way that can influence high-level policy decisions.
- For many partner countries, the monitoring exercise has enabled increased engagement and stimulated dialogue with development partners, civil society and the private sector. The dialogue generated by the exercise and its results represent an opportunity to build bridges and increase mutual understanding and trust among stakeholders.
- The monitoring results have helped to introduce the concept of development effectiveness to emerging donors and providers of South-South Co-operation. The monitoring exercise could be tailored to reflect effectiveness issues for emerging donors to serve as a tool for them to track progress.

Summary:

Monitoring results can help to strengthen development co-operation strategies and policies. Sweden described its current efforts to formulate an action plan to improve how the monitoring results are incorporated into its development co-operation strategy and enhance its performance in the 2018 monitoring round. Sweden is exploring how it can then link this action plan with its long-term aim to work

better across the humanitarian and development co-operation nexus. They are also looking at ways in which they can best communicate the monitoring results to their development partners.

Political buy-in is critical to implement policy reform using the monitoring results. Benin noted that the support of senior political figures is key to successfully convening national stakeholders to discuss progress and challenges related to the monitoring results and then advocating for policy reform. In Egypt, political support is crucial to promote bilateral co-operation with several development partners. Others also stressed the role of parliaments and civil society to promote political buy-in.

Partner countries use the monitoring results to support and strengthen national processes. In Benin, the Ministry of Finance aims to develop a report that compares the results of the 2018 monitoring round with previous results with the objective of improving their contribution to the SDGs. In Egypt, the Ministry of Investments and International Cooperation has utilised the monitoring results to discuss bilaterally with development partners ways to make their co-operation more effective.

The monitoring process itself provides an opportunity for stakeholders to meet and discuss progress and challenges with regard to effectiveness indicators. Both panellists and members of the audience underscored that the monitoring results that are the final stage of the monitoring exercise are not the only beneficial feature for partner countries and other development stakeholders. The Task Team for CSO Engagement confirmed that earlier phases of the monitoring exercise also encourages and enables multi-stakeholder dialogue through the collection and validation of data in country. Egypt uses the process to strengthen its relationships with local CSOs and private sector entities. It has helped to raise awareness in Egypt on issues that were not previously recognised as important, including lack of trust and that different stakeholders have very different incentives to engage, which is an essential starting point to addressing such issues.

Countries that have not previously participated in the monitoring exercise can also benefit from the results. UNDP in China, for example, used the data reported by several partner countries as an important source to draft a report on Chinese development co-operation. The publication provided useful insights on the effectiveness of Chinese development co-operation and raised the interest of Chinese officials on the monitoring data and methodology. Members from the audience agreed that the monitoring could serve as a tool for new and emerging donors to develop their own frameworks in the near future.

12 September 2018

Session I & II: Today's drivers of success for a renewed approach to effectiveness

Objective: Working together, through inclusive and effective partnerships that deliver tailored solutions, is essential to realising long-lasting development results and at the heart of the Global Partnership's mission. Effective development co-operation remains a critical and catalysing component of the collective effort to achieve the SDGs. The UN Financing for Development Forum in April 2018 emphasised the importance of effective and high-quality partnerships. It was recognised that development co-operation must be 'smart': flowing to where it is needed most, leveraging private capital, and addressing issues of risk. This indicates that effectiveness is regaining momentum in the political space. In exploring the underlying drivers of increased effectiveness efforts, context specificity and tailored approaches merit greater attention. The aim of this session is to explore underlying factors for more effective partnerships in order to fast track progress toward the SDGs. To this end, this roundtable discussion will seek to identify key drivers of success for reinvigorated and tailored effectiveness efforts. Discussion will centre on key effective co-operation issues that are of particular importance for the international development community in delivering development impact in changing development contexts.

Keynote address: **Mr. Alex Thier**, Executive Director, Overseas Development Institute

Moderator: **Mr. Jonathan Glennie**, Director, Sustainable Development Research Centre, Ipsos

Panellists:

- **Mrs. Carmen Sorger**, Director, Development Relations Division, Global Affairs Canada, and GPEDC Steering Committee member
- **Mr. Noel González Segura**, Director General of Planning & Policies of International Development Co-operation (AMEXCID), Mexico, and GPEDC Steering Committee member
- **Ms. Carole Kariuki**, Kenya Private Sector Alliance, Board Member of Center for Corporate Governance and Nairobi Center for International Arbitration, Kenya
- **Mr. Jeroen Kwakkenbos**, Policy and Advocacy Manager, EURODAD
- **Dr. Yuan Zheng**, Economist, United Nations Development Programme in China
- **Mr. Alex Thier**, Executive Director, Overseas Development Institute

Key messages:

- Participants reiterated that the effectiveness principles remain relevant as a framework to drive sustainable development. In the context of the current development landscape – with an ambitious set of universal and interlinked Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), new and emerging global opportunities, challenges and risks, and a multiplicity of development partners, modalities and instruments for development co-operation – the time is ripe to reflect on the ways in which effectiveness can be adapted to meet new demands and challenges, and regenerate political support for a renewed effectiveness agenda.
- Immense strides have been taken toward greater country ownership. This has been achieved through country governments mainstreaming and prioritising the SDGs into national development planning and financing strategies.
- Opportunities and challenges continue to co-exist for building inclusive partnerships at country level. Greater inclusiveness is critical to deliver on the promise of leaving no one behind.

- Transparency and accountability remain critical pillars for effective partnerships. At country level, mutual accountability requires strong political support from senior figures on both partner countries and development partners.
- As the uptake of public-private partnerships continues rise, both sides need to actively address implementation challenges to manage risk and reduce transaction costs. Establishing a good enabling environment and robust institutional structures for public-private dialogue is critical for effective partnerships.
- Emerging economies, such as China, have become increasingly interested in measuring the quality of development co-operation. The SDGs are the common language for bringing together stakeholders engaged in different modalities of development co-operation.

Summary:

The need to regenerate international political momentum for the development co-operation effectiveness agenda was debated. Some felt that political momentum around effectiveness has waned and it is yet to be taken up as the vehicle to drive long-lasting results for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Some participants expressed that bigger challenges are afoot given the current political climate. Others disagreed that effectiveness had lost momentum, pointing to the many positive examples that show strong engagement on effectiveness issues, suggesting that momentum has shifted from the political sphere to technical implementation. However, participants agreed that if we are to achieve the SDGs by 2030, effectiveness urgently needs to be translated and applied across the new and emerging modalities employed to implement the 2030 Agenda.

Immense strides have been taken toward greater country ownership. Mexico among other countries have imbedded the effective development co-operation principles into their national planning policies and are monitoring the progress in achieving them.

Effective development co-operation is guided by the principle of a focus on results. The short-term notion of ‘value for money’ should not discount the long-term, sustainable returns on investment when upholding effectiveness principles. It was also noted that we need to better showcase when incremental progress is made and the important role that these small steps play in achieving overall progress.

Inclusiveness is key to effectiveness of development co-operation. This was echoed by Eurodad, civil society representatives (CPDE), Swedish parliament representative and the private sector representative (Kenya Private Sector Alliance), etc. It was noted that the greatest strength of the Global Partnership is its ability to bring all actors together on equal footing – ‘under one tent’. The Global Partnership will remain open and continue to be a place for unbounded dialogue, exchange and learning from peers.

Transparency and mutual accountability remain critical pillars for effective partnerships. Yet with the diversification of partnerships and modalities of co-operation, accountability has been less frequently discussed. While transparency is a precursor for better accountability, there seems to be a disconnect between global and country level accountability. Egypt noted that peer reviews are important instruments to stimulate behavioural change with positive effects for strengthened accountability.

To ensure continued relevance, adaptability is vital. There is a diverse array of contexts, modalities, and types of partnerships to which the application of effectiveness must remain nimble. The international community recognises that achieving the SDGs will require the mobilisation and effective use of a wide

variety of resources. Financing modalities beyond traditional approaches, including South-South Co-operation and private sector engagement, continue to gain significance. A private sector representative from Kenya shared that structured, sustained public-private dialogue with the government helps to facilitate an enabling environment for public-private partnerships. It was noted that public participation in this type of policy dialogue, including not only the private sector but also civil society and other stakeholders in-country, has been gaining momentum.

Emerging economies have become increasingly interested in measuring the quality of development co-operation. China has incorporated the SDGs into domestic development planning. With a view to better assess development impact, China's recently established Development Cooperation Agency is exploring a tailor-made approach to monitoring and evaluation of its aid projects. This includes the possibility of developing lighter version of impact assessment of Chinese aid projects in Africa.

Session III: Leveraging country¹-led monitoring results to drive behaviour change

Objective: Country-level implementation of effectiveness principles is an essential driver of development results. In many countries, Global Partnership monitoring triggers a transformative change in the practices and behaviours of governments and development partners alike. This session aims to showcase success stories on how mutual, country-led approaches can drive behaviour change and how these approaches can be strategically applied and scaled up. The session will provide an opportunity to share strategic approaches on how participation in past monitoring rounds has spurred concrete actions, including the establishing of national development co-operation policies or strengthening of multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms.

Facilitator: **Ms. Margaret Thomas**, Director a.i., Development Impact Group, UNDP

Panellists (from East to West):

Asia:	Dr. Arounyadeth Rasphone , Deputy Director General, Ministry of Planning and Investment, Lao People's Democratic Republic Mr. Bernard Woods , Director, Results Management and Aid Effectiveness Division, Strategy, Policy and Review Department, Asian Development Bank
Africa:	Mr. Collins Aseka , Technical Assistant, National Treasury and Planning, Kenya Mr. Chaikou Yaya Diallo , Deputy National Director of Cooperation, Ministry of Cooperation and African Integration, Republic of Guinea
Europe and Middle East:	Mr. Agron Hoti , Advisor, Strategic Planning and Donor Coordination, Kosovo ²
Americas:	Ms. Nancy Silva Sebastian , Director of Policies and Programmes, Peruvian International Co-operation Agency, Peru
Global:	Ms. Beverly Longid , Co-Chair, CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness, and GPEDC Steering Committee member

Key messages:

- Global Partnership monitoring is a powerful instrument to drive more effective partnerships. The monitoring exercise generates data and evidence that can be used by governments and their partners to incentivize policy, institution and system changes as well as behavioural change.
- Results of Global Partnership monitoring have been used to trigger transformative change in countries and organisations. In many cases, participation in past rounds has spurred concrete action, including the establishment of national development co-operation policies or strengthening of multi-stakeholder coordination frameworks and mechanisms.
- The Global Partnership's Compendium of Good Practice will provide guidance on implementation of effectiveness commitments at country level. The Compendium is part of the Global Partnership's efforts to drive global progress and support countries in strategically managing diverse development co-operation resources, highlighting effective practices to deliver on national development targets.

¹ Countries and territories

² References to Kosovo shall be understood to be in the context of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999)

Summary:

Countries have been integrating the effectiveness commitments and the monitoring process in to their national structures and local arrangements. Kenya has domesticated the Nairobi Outcome Document to ensure commitments on effective development co-operation are anchored in local arrangements. Kenya has also developed a joint strategic plan to implement these commitments. In Guinea, participation in past monitoring rounds resulted in greater ownership of the principles for effective development co-operation by national actors (including private sector and civil society), better alignment of development partners to government priorities and better dialogue among stakeholders. It also encouraged the implementation of single database on aid information. Both Laos and CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness emphasised that the Global Partnership monitoring exercise should be institutionalised and embedded in national systems to ensure continuity despite changes in the governments.

Participation in past rounds strengthened multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms. Kosovo³ explained that the monitoring exercise supported the development and strengthening of structures for donor coordination, sectoral working groups and forums, as well as an integrated planning system for development co-operation. In Peru, the Global Partnership monitoring exercise has been the starting point to establish dialogue and coordination among development stakeholders. The monitoring exercise has strengthened and institutionalised effective development co-operation in Peru, as well as increased its focus on country ownership and priorities. In Laos, the monitoring exercise helped to increase mutual accountability and supported the development of a national development co-operation framework that includes traditional and emerging donors, civil society organisations and the private sector.

Results of the monitoring exercise spurred concrete action among development partners. The Asian Development Bank (AsDB) is a good example of how the monitoring results have triggered change in policy and strategic planning. The AsDB has integrated effectiveness issues within its *modus operandi*, by assimilating several Global Partnership indicators into its corporate results framework. Furthermore, following the 2016 monitoring round, guidelines for project design and monitoring were changed to encourage increased use of country results frameworks. Operational policies have also been adapted with the aim of increasing the use of country systems. This has led to AsDB country strategies that are country-led, and have results frameworks that are tied to those of partner countries.

Results from the monitoring exercise have increased the contribution of civil society to development co-operation; however, the shrinking space for civil society is undermining effectiveness efforts. The CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) has been training civil society focal points to better participate in the monitoring exercise and engage in dialogue with the government. However, CPDE highlighted that there is a need to better recognise civil society as development partners that can contribute to sustainable development. This is particularly important in the context of delivering on the promise to leave no one behind, as civil society has a critical role in representing and giving voice to marginalised populations.

Coordination among development partners needs to improve to optimise the use of resources. Many reiterated the lack of coordination among development actors in country as one the main effectiveness challenges. Guinea stressed that partnerships with different actors need to be coherent and harmonised to maximise the impact of resources. In addition, support for capacity building needs to be considered in light of fragmentation of rules and procedures across donors, which exacerbates the ability of governments to absorb development co-operation. It was also highlighted that dialogue with

³ References to Kosovo shall be understood to be in the context of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999)

development partners is currently too bureaucratic, and thematic discussion could help to make this dialogue more efficient.

Citizens and parliaments should be more involved in development co-operation. Dialogue among institutions, citizens and the donor community should be more frequent. Kosovo⁴ shared its experience on how the Ministry of European Union Integration is trying to better engage parliamentarians, civil society and the private sector for more meaningful dialogue and action toward more effective development co-operation.

A more diverse development landscape requires working differently and finding new ways of collaboration. Peru and Laos emphasised the importance of measuring the impact of South-South and triangular co-operation. The current work to adapt Global Partnership monitoring to ensure that it responds to the challenges of the 2030 Agenda and the new development landscape, including new and emerging development actors and modalities, will be useful in this regard.

The Global Partnership is a valued platform to share experiences and lessons on how countries have used the monitoring results to drive behaviour change. The Global Partnership's Global Compendium of Good Practices will be a useful tool in this regard to provide guidance on implementation of effectiveness commitments at country level. The compendium will outline key effectiveness challenges and will propose solutions in the form of actions or behaviour changes.

⁴ References to Kosovo shall be understood to be in the context of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999)

Session IV: Delivering more effectively in fragile and conflict affected situations

Objective: Preventing fragility and conflict and sustaining peace is central to reducing poverty, achieving shared prosperity, and delivering on the universal aspiration to leave no one behind. To this end, working coherently across humanitarian, development and peace efforts in a way that is consistent with national ownership and leadership is critical. The international community has begun to adapt and scale up targeted efforts through various initiatives. Compelling data on effectiveness are urgently needed to inform these ongoing efforts; to reinforce mutual accountability of all partners, and enable the right decisions at the right time. The Global Partnership seeks to tailor its approach to monitoring effectiveness in fragile and conflict affected situations. This session will debate how the Global Partnership can adapt its monitoring to current development challenges related to the 2030 Agenda and the increasingly complex development landscape, with an initial focus on tracking progress on delivering effectively in fragile and conflict affected situations.

Opening remarks: **H. E. Dr. Diene Keita**, Minister of Cooperation and African Integration, Republic of Guinea

Moderator: **Ms. Marika Theros**, Senior Fellow, Institute for State Effectiveness and Director, Afghanistan Engagement Project

Panellists:

- **Mr. Helder da Costa**, General Secretary, G7+
- **Mr. Marc Anglade**, Coordonnateur national du Secrétariat Technique du CAED, Haiti
- **Mr. Charles Tellier**, Head, Fragility, Conflict and Crises Division, Agence Française de Développement (AFD)
- **Ms. Erin McCandless**, Civil Society Platform for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (CSPPS)

Key messages:

- Many of the key challenges to delivering effectively in fragile and conflict affected situations also exist in non-fragile situations, but they are often amplified in these contexts due to higher levels of vulnerability and greater capacity challenges.
- One of the challenges that is particularly acute in fragile contexts is a lack of trust. To achieve inclusive and sustainable development that is shared by all, trust is needed between government and its citizens, with civil society to support the government-citizen relationship, and between government and its development partners. Inclusive dialogue is critical in this regard, to strengthen transparency and build mutual accountability.
- Building trust and strengthening ownership calls for a fresh look at assessing and managing risk. Working together to conduct risk assessments and share risk among partners in fragile and conflict affected situations is critical to building national capacity and supporting long-term development objectives. Ensuring dialogue and planning is inclusive is critical. A strong civil society is essential to brokering trust and building robust ties between the government and its citizens.

Summary:

The challenges to ensuring that development co-operation is effective in fragile and conflict affected situations are similar to those in non-fragile contexts. These challenges, however, are usually amplified and more critical due to higher levels of vulnerability, limited capacity, and greater dependency on ODA. Among these challenges, fragmentation and a lack of country ownership were raised on several occasions.

With regards to **fragmentation**, in her opening remarks the Minister of Cooperation and African Integration for the Republic of Guinea, H. E. Dr. Diene Keita, noted that one of the key challenges that Guinea faces is capacity to visualise and capture a comprehensive picture of development cooperation in the country. Both the g7+ and Haiti echoed the challenge of fragmentation, highlighting the various forms that this can take including fragmentation of resources, activities, partners, reporting requirements and so on. One of the ways that Haiti has tried to manage this challenge has been to develop an aid coordination platform, where data on development co-operation flows are collected from providers every quarter.

The use of country systems was raised as an important mechanism to strengthen ownership. Haiti and the Central African Republic stressed the importance of country ownership, highlighting that this is linked to the use of country systems, which is essential to build capacity, retain skilled staff, and reduce transaction costs and parallel structures. Recognising the costs and missed opportunities of not using country systems, France noted that the French Development Agency (AFD) aims to systematically use country systems.

Building trust among partners was raised by all as a critical element of more effective partnerships. The g7+ underscored the need for development partners to place greater trust in political leaders, flagging the centrality of political legitimacy in securing resilient development gains. Building on this point, France noted that in fragile contexts there is often a lack of trust between government and its citizens that needs addressing. The Civil Society Platform for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (CSPPS) highlighted that a lack of trust sometimes exists due to differing priorities. Guinea highlighted that by identifying and analysing the underlying root causes of fragility, countries can benefit from a nationally owned plan that prioritises key development issues. This provides strategic direction for development partners and can enable greater alignment to these priorities.

The issue of trust and use of country systems was also tied to risk. The g7+ emphasised that to achieve effective development co-operation in fragile contexts we need to shift away from the current climate of risk aversion. Adding to this point, CSPPS highlighted that while there are greater risks in fragile and conflict affected situations these cannot be avoided. Ireland highlighted the need for all partners to work together to address higher levels of risk in these contexts, noting there needs to be transparent discussion about the type of risks faced and actions needed to address these risks when they arise. In this regard, working together to conduct risk assessments and share risk among partners in fragile and conflict affected situations is essential.

A strong civil society is essential to brokering trust and building robust ties between the government and its citizens. Both Guinea and Haiti recognised the importance of civil society as a key partner. Some pointed to ongoing challenges to engage civil society more, including the need to build capacity and ensure that civil society organisations and leaders are representative of society. CSPPS noted that these challenges are compounded by logistical and organisational issues (e.g. lack of information and receiving invitations late), as well as funding constraints including limited core funding for civil society organisations in fragile and conflict affected situations.

Session V: Scaling up private sector engagement to deliver solutions on the ground

Objective: Scaling up effective private sector engagement through development co-operation is one of the strategic objectives of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. Based on evidence from the country level and key issues identified through the Global Partnership's work stream on private sector engagement, this session presents initial findings, facilitates feedback and explores new perspectives from high-level professionals from the private sector and from the constituencies of the Global Partnership. The objective is to contribute to ongoing work on draft guidelines for effective private sector engagement through development co-operation – a key Global Partnership deliverable for the 2017-18 biennium. The session will discuss three key questions on private sector engagement arising from preliminary work on country case studies and offers an opportunity to exchange ideas and include inputs from the audience.

Moderator: **Mr. Henri-Bernard Solignac-Lecomte**, Senior Communications Manager, Development Cluster, OECD

Introduction & Concluding remarks: **Mr. Udo Weber**, Deputy Head of Division, Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Germany, and GPEDC Steering Committee Co-Chair

Scene Setting: **Ms. Shannon Kindornay**, Adjunct Professor, Carleton University, Canada

Question 1: *Should the results of private sector engagement through development co-operation be measured and monitored in order to facilitate evidence-based decision making and scale up successful initiatives? If so, how?* Discussants:

- **Mr. John Simon**, Founding Partner, Total Impact Capital
- **Ms. Daniela Röttger-Jann**, Advisor, Department Corporate Strategy and Impact, DEG
- **Ms. Paola Simonetti**, Deputy Director, Economic & Social Policy, International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC), and GPEDC Steering Committee member

Question 2: *What incentives are the most appealing for the private sector to engage with development partners and what safeguards should development partners put in place to promote a successful partnership?* Discussants:

- **Ms. Carole Kariuki**, Kenya Private Sector Alliance (KEPSA), Board Member of Center for Corporate Governance and Nairobi Center for International Arbitration
- **Mr. Jeroen Kwakkenbos**, Policy and Advocacy Manager, EURODAD

Question 3: *In the context of development co-operation, what are the main challenges to target the most vulnerable population and those furthest behind when partnering with the private sector?* Discussants:

- **Ms. Tatiana María Marcela Martínez Carranza**, Chief of Studies and Capacity Building Department, Vice Ministry of Development Co-operation, El Salvador, and GPEDC Steering Committee member
- **Ms. Staci Frost**, Global Lead, Programme Performance and Quality, Aga Khan Foundation, and GPEDC Steering Committee member
- **Ms. Beverly Longid**, Co-Chair, CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE), and GPEDC Steering Committee member

Key Messages:

- Development co-operation projects involving the private sector can only work if they generate business profits and development results at the same.

- Development partners have much to bring to the table to support effective private sector engagement. Apart from financing and risk-mitigation, they can build trust, for example through inclusive dialogue, and ensure a focus on those left furthest behind, for example by focusing their investments on micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises and by providing frameworks to measure the results of projects that involve private sector engagement.
- A balanced set of incentives and safeguards need to be put in place to attract the private sector as true partner in development. The private sector will not engage in projects if the business case is not clear or not well communicated.
- Local communities and in particular the local private sector should be part of the planning of private sector engagement projects from the outset. They have the knowledge required to identify development challenges and business opportunities.
- Ongoing work on guidelines on effective private sector engagement through development co-operation and the initial proposal to focus on three aspects – the comparative advantages of development co-operation, making private sector engagement work at country level, and ensuring a focus on results and accountability – were welcomed.

Summary:

This session discussed three questions on private sector engagement through development co-operation based on evidence from country level and key issues identified through the Global Partnership's work stream on private sector engagement:

- Should the results of private sector engagement through development co-operation be measured and monitored in order to facilitate evidence-based decision-making and scale up successful initiatives? If so, how?
- What incentives are the most appealing for the private sector to engage with development partners and what safeguards should development partners put in place to promote a successful partnership?
- In the context of development co-operation, what are the main challenges to target the most vulnerable population and those furthest behind when partnering with the private sector?

The results of private sector engagement through development cooperation are often not systematically measured and monitored. Evidence from the country level has shown that even when measured, results are rarely made publicly available, limiting the awareness of PSE opportunities. There are several challenges that contribute to this matter including the lack of common frameworks and objectives, inappropriate monitoring mechanisms and absence of reliable data and information. Private sector representatives highlighted that even for impact investments, which measure financial and non-financial results, specific results frameworks need to be further developed to measure the contribution of investments to development. As an example of how the results of private sector projects can be measured, DEG presented its rating that captures companies' impact for local development along five categories and how they contribute to the SDGs. This new tool measures the creation of decent jobs, community benefits, improve in local income, among others.

Development partners have not put in place incentives and safeguards to attract the private sector to development cooperation projects. The private sector is still not fully aware of what the benefits are to

engage in development projects. Panellists highlighted that access to finance is an important incentive for companies while other stakeholders present at the event noted that development partners could help build trust across sectors. CSOs supported the development of safeguards that favours responsible business practices and local companies and promotes social dialogue.

Inclusive dialogue with local communities is key to focus on local needs and identify development solutions and business opportunities. Panellists emphasised the importance of engaging with affected communities as long-term partners and not merely as recipients of aid to make the relationship work. National and local governments also need to create policies and plans based on participatory processes allowing the population to participate throughout the planning and implementing cycle of national policies and strategies. It was noted by participants that civil society organisations could play an important role to connect governments, private sector and/or development partners with the targeted population.

To reach underserved populations and markets, partner governments and development partners should support micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs). MSMEs could benefit from participating in inclusive dialogues and coordination spaces with governments, development partners and other stakeholders that are oriented to build trust and mutual respect. Development partners could also help to provide much needed access to finance and support capacity building initiatives.

The Global Partnership is working to address these issues through its work on private sector engagement through development cooperation. It has analysed global, regional and sectoral platforms, mapped 919 developed cooperation projects and conducted four country case studies (Bangladesh, El Salvador, Egypt and Uganda) on how development partners work with the private sector at country level. This analytical work, combined with inclusive dialogue with relevant stakeholders, will help the Global Partnership shape inclusive guidelines for effective private sector engagement through development cooperation. The guidelines will be launched in July 2019 at the Global Partnership Senior-Level Meeting.