

# Second meeting of the Steering Committee

## Summary

Second meeting of the Global Partnership Steering Committee  
Bali, Indonesia, 23-24 March 2013

This summary is released for information. An earlier draft of this summary was shared with Steering Committee members for review. Comments were submitted by the World Bank before the deadline of 19 April 2013, and are reflected in this final version.

### **Contacts:**

Mr. Derek Kilner, tel. +1-212-906-5742, email: derek.kilner@undp.org  
Mr. Robin Ogilvy, tel. +33 1 45 24 94 48, email: robin.ogilvy@oecd.org  
Ms. Marjolaine Nicod, tel. +33 1 45 24 87 67, email: marjolaine.nicod@oecd.org

**GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION  
SECOND MEETING OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE  
BALI, INDONESIA, 23-24 MARCH 2013**

**SUMMARY**

**Session 1: Introductory remarks**

1. Ministers Armida Alisjahbana (Indonesia), Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala (Nigeria) and Justine Greening (United Kingdom) welcomed participants to the second meeting of the Global Partnership Steering Committee. In their introductory remarks, the three co-chairs emphasised the importance of the meeting in identifying concrete ways for the Global Partnership to contribute to the post-2015 global development framework.

2. Opening the meeting, Ms Alisjahbana emphasised the importance of linking development co-operation as the “how” of achieving development goals in the context of the discussions of the UN High Level Panel on the post-2015 development agenda in relation to a possible successor to MDG8, building on Busan commitments as well as those made in Paris and Accra. She highlighted how the Global Partnership could help to reduce aid dependency through its focus on development effectiveness. In this context, the focus on domestic resource mobilisation and knowledge sharing was particularly relevant. Ms Alisjahbana identified the ministerial-level meeting as instrumental in showing concrete deliverables on, for example, inclusiveness, governance (including monitoring and knowledge sharing) and financing (including the leveraging of private sector resources). Ms Alisjahbana also emphasised the need to continue outreach efforts, particularly with emerging economies.

3. Ms. Okonjo-Iweala pointed the unique opportunity presented by the final meeting of the UN High Level Panel to make concrete suggestions on how the Global Partnership can add value. She offered several areas for consideration: domestic resource mobilisation, including through effective tax policies and stronger tax administration, addressing illicit flows and other “leakages”, strengthening institutions and systems to help prevent corruption, as well as prosecuting cases of corruption; ensuring that development co-operation contributes to the creation of a better environment for private sector activity, and providing the metrics for “SMARTER” global partnerships in the post-2015 framework.

4. Ms. Greening shared her vision for the Global Partnership becoming the forum for global action on development effectiveness, focusing on the “how” of the post-2015 global development framework. She called for more effective communication around the work of the Global Partnership and its potential. In shaping the agenda for the first ministerial-level meeting of the Partnership, she suggested a focus on transparency and accountability, looking at progress made and identifying gaps. Ms Greening also spoke of the importance of domestic resources for development, pointing to the relevance of more effective collaboration with the private sector, including through the removal of trade barriers, the provision of a climate conducive to investment, and the promotion of responsible private sector development in emerging markets.

5. In the interventions that followed, several participants echoed the Co-Chairs’ desire to establish strong linkages with the discussions of the UN High Level Panel. The United States emphasised the need for an ambitious and aspirational vision framed around the eradication of

extreme poverty. Korea pointed to the strength of the Global Partnership in sustaining political momentum for effective development co-operation. UNDP noted the potential of the Global Partnership as an enabler, and as the “glue” holding together the various fora on different aspects of development co-operation. It suggested that the Global Partnership could be used to push new agendas and provide space to discuss sensitive issues that would be challenging to raise in other settings. The World Bank shared feedback from the multilateral development banks (MDBs), which it represents at the Steering Committee, that the Global Partnership’s comparative advantages include monitoring aid effectiveness, outreach to all stakeholders and knowledge sharing. Civil society (CPDE) recommended that an emphasis on rights in the branding / vision of the Global Partnership, citing domestic resource mobilisation, transparency, accountability and the fight against corruption and impunity as being central to advancing rights in development.

## **Session 2: Implementation of Busan commitments: what’s happening in practice?** (Chaired by Armida Alisjahbana, Indonesia).

6. Emilia Pires, Timor Leste’s Minister of Finance, offered insights into the efforts under way to implement Busan commitments in her country. Ms Pires spoke of the importance of the Global Partnership as a space where the voice of developing countries can be strengthened by joining forces and engaging in an open and frank dialogue with development partners. She went on to speak of the importance of ensuring that development co-operation is fit for purpose, particularly in fragile states, noting that advances in this area will be important for the credibility of the Global Partnership. Ms Pires spoke of the New Deal for fragile states, and called on developing countries to assume ownership for their problems as on step to identifying owned diagnostics and solutions. Transparency was cited as an important principle, with Ms Pires noting that fragile states are rich in resources but need to have a better understanding of the tools available to manage their resources and address leakages. The Global Partnership can play a useful role in supporting greater transparency and better measurement. In this context, Ms Pires emphasised the importance of measuring the right thing in a context-sensitive way: in fragile states, one might prioritise the existence of a tax system over the measurement of users’ perceptions of it, for example – recognising that state- and institution-building efforts take time.

7. Don Steinberg (United States) offered insights on Busan implementation from the perspective of the US government. He noted that the US Congress had agreed an increased foreign assistance budget, and pointed to the pressure that this would place on the administration to the efficient and effective use of resources. Mr Steinberg went on to speak of the progress made by the United States in untying aid, and in promoting greater transparency and predictability of aid. The United States plans to increase the use of national institutions (including governments and civil society organisations), with the aim of channelling an additional USD 1.4 billion through these channels. Mr Steinberg went on to stress that development is no longer a state monopoly: in the context of Rio+20, 450 American multinational companies committed collectively to eliminate net deforestation throughout their supply chains by 2020. The G8 alliance on food security has led 70 companies to raise USD 3.7 billion to finance innovative approaches to supporting market-oriented reforms in developing countries. Mr Steinberg pointed to the importance of defining a new role for aid and identifying ways of reducing the risks faced by private sector actors.

8. Luis Olivera (Peru) outlined how the Paris, Accra and Busan agreements have been embedded in Peru’s national development policies and practices through Peru’s new national policy for international development, which includes action both within and outside the country. The focus of Peru’s efforts has been on strengthening national ownership of effective development with greater inclusion of social actors in the design and implementation of policies. Mr Olivera pointed to transparency, inclusion and accountability as key principles to maximise the impact of local and international resources for development.

9. In the discussion that followed, participants reacted to the initial presentations offered by Timor-Leste, the United States and Peru, and shared their experiences in implementing Busan commitments. Bangladesh reported that it was finalising its Busan implementation plan which integrates global indicators and foresees the collection of monitoring data through the national aid information management system. The European Union (EU) pointed to progress made by its member states in promoting transparency, noting that all member states had finalised implementation schedules for the common transparency standard foreseen in Busan by 2015. The EU also reported on its steps to increase joint programming in approximately 40 countries.

10. The International Business Leaders Forum (IBLF) suggested that Global Partnership's interest in the private sector development should not be limited only to leveraging resources for development and promoting an enabling environment for business. It pointed to the role for business as a partner in development through, for example, public-private partnerships, healthy workers, sustainable supply chains and more sustainable products. IBLF reported on an initiative supported by the building block on public-private co-operation to establish hubs for private sector engagement in Zambia and Colombia.

11. Korea outlined its efforts to implement Busan commitments and cited collaboration with Myanmar on its development strategy which resulted with the adoption of the Naypidaw accord. In its intervention, the OECD/DAC cited Korea as a success story and emphasised the importance of domestic resource mobilisation and sound policy choices. While acknowledging that aid is not the only source of funding for development, the OECD/DAC noted the need for developed nations to fulfil commitments on aid and change behaviour. It updated the Steering Committee on DAC efforts to engage others and open its work to new members.

12. UNDP reported on feedback collected from staff in 88 of its programme countries, indicating that developing countries are leading efforts at the country level to advance the implementation of key Busan commitments. Evidence pointed to stronger linkages between national development strategies, budgets, and efforts to promote transparency and accountability, notably through aid information management systems. It pointed to the importance of multi-stakeholder dialogue, particularly at the sub-national level. It also noted that Paris and Accra commitments remain highly relevant in many of its programme countries and pointed to the need to invest in national systems to support effective delivery.

13. The Association of European Parliamentarians with Africa (AWEPA) noted the relevance of the work being undertaken by the Effective Institutions Platform for domestic resource mobilisation, and also in the context of efforts to strengthen the capacities of supreme audit institutions alongside parliaments as a means of strengthening accountability. CPDE welcomed the positive feedback on progress made by some stakeholders in implementing Busan commitments but cautioned against overstating achievements. It reported on work underway to advance the Istanbul principles for CSO effectiveness and develop measures of the enabling environment for CSOs. It also pointed to the importance of the global post-Busan monitoring framework for tracking progress.

14. Guatemala reported on ongoing dialogue among Central American countries and plans to organise regional workshops to foster common positions and encourage engagement in monitoring efforts. Challenges in the region include finding ways to promote more strategic use of aid to help middle income countries address inequality, as well as engagement with the private sector.

15. Ms Justine Greening pointed to the importance of developing a better understanding of progress at the country level and emphasises the need to translate lessons into actions. Ms Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala welcomed feedback on the impact of the New Deal while cautioning that emerging successes in peace-building and state-building efforts were not sufficient for sustainable

development outcomes. The session chair, Ms Alisjahbana, concluded that a paradigm shift from aid to development effectiveness requires a greater focus on capacity development, as well as efforts in the areas of monitoring and evaluation.

### **Session 3. Vision for the 2013 ministerial-level meeting of the Global Partnership** (*chaired by Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, Nigeria*)

16. The Chair invited discussion on the overall storyline of the first ministerial-level meeting of the Global Partnership, inviting participants to focus on the relevance and added value of the Global Partnership.

17. The OECD/DAC pointed to the added value of the Global Partnership and its first ministerial in bringing political will to efforts to tackle extreme poverty through development co-operation. The United States questioned the extent to which political will had been sustained since Busan, and pointed to the need for the first ministerial-level meeting to generate longer-term momentum and commitment in ways similar to the MDG commitments and targets.

18. Bangladesh emphasised the role that the first ministerial could play in promoting knowledge sharing. Chad spoke of the opportunity presented by the first ministerial to generate political will which was lacking around MDG8, stressing the need for the Co-Chairs to play their role in attracting political attention.

19. The EU noted that the substance of the first ministerial should be prioritised over its timing, and cited several areas in which the ministerial would be of particular relevance: monitoring the commitments made in Busan; showcasing progress made in “new” areas such as co-operation with the private sector and South-South partners, and demonstrating the added value of the Global Partnership vis-à-vis the MDGs and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) processes. It called for more ambitious deliverables with a less technical focus.

20. UNDP stressed the importance of a political vision around the first ministerial, and noted that the eradication of extreme poverty could be part of this. It spoke of the opportunity presented by the ministerial to listen to the priorities of developing countries and engage in a frank discussion on behaviour change.

21. CPDE suggested that the ministerial should have a particular emphasis on “unfinished business”, also stressing local-global linkages. IBLF proposed that the ministerial offers an opportunity to institutionalise public-private co-operation, perhaps leading to a shared roadmap - including the private sector – towards a “collaborative society”. It wishes to see the level of ambition raised so as to create a genuine partnership for development.

22. Timor-Leste informed participants that the g7+ group of countries wishes to see real results at the country level, and that the ministerial could emphasise evidence of progress and challenges in the implementation of commitments. It also noted mixed reactions towards the Global Partnership among UN member states, and informed members of its efforts to brief developing countries on the opportunities presented by the Global Partnership. Ministers from g7+ countries are excited by plans for the first ministerial-level meeting.

23. Korea pointed to the importance of balancing an emphasis on monitoring and accountability with the need and desire for the Global Partnership to examine and address emerging issues in development co-operation.

24. The World Bank suggested that a vision emphasising the eradication of poverty should also include a focus on shared prosperity to address the concerns of middle-income countries. In addition, the World Bank responded positively to the question from the chair to look into

possibilities to make the World Bank's experiences with triangular knowledge sharing available to the Global Partnership. In terms of content, it suggested that the first ministerial should place emphasis on a solid stock-take of progress against commitments. It noted that the MDBs do not necessarily see the comparative advantage of the Global Partnership in domestic resource mobilization and innovative financing mechanisms, as these themes are also being addressed by other fora, including the UN High Level Panel.

25. Peru suggested that the Global Partnership should have social inclusion within its vision. It noted that the Global Partnership could play a role in helping to overcome scepticism on partnership with the private sector. Peru informed members that it had shared the consultation papers with other countries in the Latin America region, some of which expressed an interest in examining indicators in greater detail.

26. Samoa noted that countries in the Pacific region are partnering among themselves to support implementation of Busan commitments and share good practices at the regional level.

27. Summarising the discussion on the vision for the ministerial, Ms Okonjo-Iweala pointed to the value added presented by the first ministerial in helping the Global Partnership to become "the go-to partnership" that will support implementation of a vision centred on poverty eradication, wealth creation and inclusion. Along with her Co-Chairs, she went on to conclude that the meeting would both take stock of progress, and would explore "newer" areas of the Busan agreement, e.g. tax and development co-operation.

28. A range of views were expressed on arrangements for hosting the meeting, its timing, and participation. There was agreement to prioritise:

- Holding the meeting in the fourth quarter of 2013 – two years after Busan;
- Organising the meeting as a stand-alone event, rather than back-to-back with others, recognising that this will offer greater visibility;
- Confirming the willingness of a government or organisation to host the meeting and play a lead role in attracting a high level of participation;
- Pursuing the participation of a limited number of heads of state, the UN Secretary-General, the World Bank President, the OECD Secretary-General, high-level representatives from countries at all levels of development, and prominent leaders from business and the non-state sector;
- A high-profile, modern event making use of technology, and encouraging interactive debate.

#### **Session 4. Exploring substantive deliverables for the 2013 ministerial-level meeting** *(chaired by Justine Greening, United Kingdom)*

29. Introducing the discussion on specific thematic deliverables for the ministerial, Ms Greening shared some initial views on opportunities within each of the four thematic areas identified at the previous meeting of the Steering Committee. She suggested that deliverables on tax and domestic resource mobilisation might include a mix of international reforms, national reforms, and co-operation measures; the discussion on knowledge sharing could be a means of having a discussion among a range of stakeholders, including those engaged in South-South co-operation, and that this would need more work to identify concrete deliverables. Ms Greening suggested that re-framing the discussion on inclusive development to place a greater emphasis

on transparency could make for an agenda around which more countries would feel comfortable engaging.

30. Ms Alisjahbana (Indonesia) gave a brief presentation on knowledge sharing, in which she proposed that the ministerial could aim to address the brokering of knowledge sharing, as well as its facilitation and funding. In the discussion that followed, participants concurred on the need for ways of brokering the sharing of knowledge, as well as the potential role of pilots and the opportunity presented by the ministerial to share success stories on knowledge sharing or case studies. Reference was made to the need for Indonesia's concept to be advanced through existing knowledge sharing hubs and platforms. Civil society noted that the ministerial might look at knowledge sharing across boundaries – e.g. civil society – governments – private sector. AWEPA noted that parliaments could be engaged more in knowledge sharing efforts. A particular focus on the sharing of knowledge on how countries have implemented Busan commitments was identified by some as interesting.

31. Participants expressed a range of views on the theme of inclusive development, with some participants expressing concern that some of the issues proposed in the initial concept by the United States and CPDE (e.g. LGBT rights – in the context of a discussion of marginalised groups) could undermine efforts to build consensus among a broad range of stakeholders (EU, Nigeria), and suggesting that the ministerial should not aim to go beyond what was agreed through a lengthy process of negotiation in Busan (Korea). UNDP/UNDG suggested that the Global Partnership should not actively avoid sensitive issues. It also noted the suggestion by the United Kingdom to discuss transparency, and identified the International Aid Transparency Initiative as an example of efforts that may be of interest.

32. While participants did not discuss the issues of tax and domestic resource mobilisation in detail during this session, Ms Okonjo-Iweala suggested that the added value of the Global Partnership in this area could be in tasking the G8, G20 and other bodies to push for reforms on taxation, illicit flows and transfer pricing to get countries' "own houses in order" in ways that support developing countries' resource mobilisation efforts.

33. Summarising the discussion, Ms Greening noted that there was broad agreement that deliverables for the ministerial should remain broadly focused on existing commitments, emphasising how these could be implemented. She noted that "compacts" or guidelines might be adopted to help advance implementation in selected areas on a voluntary basis. Ms Greening also suggested that the ministerial might offer scope to examine issues relating to institutions in development, but suggested that care be taken to avoid duplicating the efforts of other initiatives and organisations.

#### **Session 5 (a): Recap from Day 1 and Roadmap for 2013** (chaired by Anthony Smith, UK)

34. The Chair began the session by outlining the Co-Chairs' interpretation of what had been broadly agreed from the first day's sessions:

- Vision: a Global Partnership with a clear role in helping to achieve the MDGs and implement a successor development framework; making development co-operation more effective to eradicate extreme poverty, create wealth and promote inclusion; offer a safe and inclusive space to discuss development co-operation.
- Linkages with the High Level Panel on post-2015: agreement that the Co-Chairs would write to the Panel to share ideas emerging from the Steering Committee's consultations; idea of the Global Partnership becoming the open, inclusive "go to" partnership where stakeholders come together to help implement the vision set out in a post-2015 development framework.

- First ministerial-level meeting: broad agreement to aim for a two-day event in the fourth quarter of 2013; emphasis on a limited number of themes aiming to sustain momentum from Busan; Steering Committee members themselves will lead in the preparation of different elements / sessions for the meeting. Flexibility will be needed in grouping together / prioritising themes within a tight agenda.
- Next steps proposed: identifying a host; agreeing on the scope and deliverables for each session; identifying facilitators within the Steering Committee to take the work forward on each session; and agreeing resourcing and organisational arrangements for delivering the meeting.

35. The discussion that followed centred on the substantive focus and agenda of the ministerial-level meeting. Some members expressed interest in putting greater emphasis during the ministerial on the broader vision, including the focus on eliminating poverty, increasing wealth, and promoting inclusiveness (EU, OECD/DAC, Timor-Leste, United States). There was broad support for highlighting the link between the “what” of the post-2015 development framework and the Global Partnership’s contribution to the “how.” The Global Partnership can in particular contribute to implementing Busan commitments; to help increase and improve development finance (including domestic resources and private flows), and by improving knowledge sharing. These contributions could be in support of a potential successor to MDG8, and should also be pursued in their own right. Some members added that discussion of development finance in this context should ensure reference to the continued importance of ODA – including its catalytic role (Chad, Korea, UNDP).

36. There was some interest in having the ministerial review discussions on the post-2015 agenda that will have taken place during the UN General Assembly (Korea), but also recognition that the Partnership should contribute primarily to the “how,” rather than the elaboration of the framework itself. Some members noted that the agenda should be more political in nature so as to attract sufficient interest from ministers (Korea, OECD/DAC, United Kingdom), and some noted that a heavy emphasis on Busan commitments may be too technical (OECD/DAC). Others suggested that technical discussions could be conducted in sessions prior to the full meeting (Korea). Civil society stressed the importance of a strong focus on implementing the “unfinished business” relating to commitments made in Paris and Accra during the session on implementing Busan commitments (CPDE). Others emphasised the importance of ensuring adequate collection of evidence for this session (UNDP).

37. While some members suggested that the work stream on inclusive development could be integrated by focusing on inclusivity throughout the other substantive sessions, others stressed the importance of having a session devoted to seeing that development cooperation promotes inclusion (CPDE, United States).

38. There was a recognition that the private sector workstream is not only about private finance, but about how to engage the private sector more broadly.

39. Some members raised the possibility of including the showcasing the work of the voluntary Building Blocks that emerged from the Busan High Level Forum on the agenda (Timor-Leste).

40. There was strong interest in ensuring the engagement of all key development actors in each of the sessions. Some stressed the importance of including emerging economies and South-South co-operation actors (e.g. the BRICS) if the ministerial is to result in innovative discussions (Korea, Timor-Leste). UNDP stressed the importance of emphasising that the Global Partnership offers an open environment for discussion.

41. Some members urged a more innovative and aspirational approach to the substantive discussion, including a greater focus on bringing together all actors in society – including the private sector and civil society – to achieve development results; promoting the use of ODA in ways that are catalytic (IBLF, United States).

42. Participants discussed the need for a format for the ministerial that balances creative approaches (e.g. “TED Talk”-style interventions) with inclusive discussions that support actions and accountability. Members agreed that some form of statement or communiqué would be needed, but that it should not be a long text setting out new ambitions (already achieved in Busan), and that it must include agreement to take specific actions.

43. In summarising discussions, the Chair noted that there was a clear steer from the Co-Chairs to focus on the four substantive work areas that have been identified; that there is a need to set a vision that will endure through future meetings; and that while none of the four themes will be abandoned, there will be a need for further prioritisation when the committee moves to a discussion of sessions within an agenda for the ministerial.

44. In order to further elaborate how the substantive focus of the work streams and how they can be taken up in sessions at the ministerial-level meeting, the Chair suggested that members of the Steering Committee volunteer to work together on each of the four topics, paying particular attention to: 1) which other members of the Global Partnership should be involved; 2) who key speakers might be; 3) who key partners from institutions with substantive and financial resources might be; and 4) what deliverables could look like.

45. Volunteers for the topics were (to be confirmed following the meeting):

- a. *Domestic resource mobilisation*: IPU/AWEPA, EU, Nigeria, OECD/DAC, Timor-Leste, UNDP
- b. *Private sector*: CPDE, IBLF (Private Sector), UK, US, UNDP, World Bank
- c. *Inclusive development*: CPDE, IPU/AWEPA, Peru, Samoa, US
- d. *Knowledge-sharing*: Bangladesh, Chad, Indonesia, Korea, Peru, Samoa, UNDP, World Bank

46. The Chair indicated that the Co-Chairs would in parallel think about how the work streams could be integrated into a concise agenda. The goal would be to have a draft agenda, including substantive focus of sessions, in advance of the June/July Steering Committee meeting. Groups of countries or organisations – including those beyond Steering Committee members – would then take forward preparations for each agenda item.

47. Several Steering Committee members raised the value of holding the next meeting back-to-back to the UN Development Cooperation Forum in Ethiopia in early June (AWEPA, EU, Korea, UNDP).

48. The Chair noted that additional resources would be needed to organise the ministerial level meeting. The importance of holding workshops to offer consultations on agenda items at the regional level was also noted. UNDP expressed its readiness to support such activities, dependent on funding.

#### **Session 5 (b). Update on monitoring (chaired by Anthony Smith, UK)**

49. The joint support team presented an update on the global monitoring framework, noting that a draft guide to the framework of ten global indicators had been issued, and that the framework draws on a mix of indicators sourced from developing countries and from existing international sources. A tentative timeline for monitoring in 2013 was presented. Steering Committee members were reminded of opportunities to provide strategic guidance to monitoring efforts, promote active and inclusive engagement in monitoring efforts at the country level, and draw lessons on the implementation of MDG8 from some of the evidence that will be gathered through this global process.

50. In terms of timeline, the joint team noted by the time of the next Steering Committee meeting, information on the number of countries participating in the monitoring might be available, as well as some initial evidence from some of the indicators relying on global data collection processes. Steering Committee members pointed to the importance of a dynamic report presented in an informative way, and with a strong narrative on country experiences.

51. Discussions took note of incomplete work on indicators on results and transparency, with the joint support team advising members that they may consider providing political steer through the processes that are informing the development of these indicators. For example, on the transparency indicator, members could offer the necessary political guidance to the ad hoc group on the common open standard so as to enable it to propose appropriate technical solutions.

52. The possibility of including information on additional commitment areas – such as aid fragmentation – was raised (EU). The joint team noted that the ten areas for monitoring were the result of a lengthy process of consultation and prioritisation by the Post-Busan Interim Group. Gathering evidence on areas beyond this would require a decision by the Steering Committee, and may require additional efforts and resources.

53. Some members called on others to provide financial resources to UNDP to enable it to facilitate regional workshops to support the monitoring process (Chad, Samoa). UNDP expressed its willingness to support in this way, subject to the provision of funding.

#### **Session 6. Engagement and outreach efforts** *(chaired by Wismana Suryabrata, Indonesia)*

54. The Chair opened the session by reporting on the recent Asian Development Forum which was organised this year in Indonesia with Korea and Japan, and emphasised the role of the Global Partnership in promoting the involvement of a broad range of stakeholders, particularly emerging economies, to foster inclusive development. Discussions also pointed to the increasing contribution from the international community to development, not only through financial resources but through support to capacity development.

55. Chad pointed to the relevance of existing activities supported by the African Union, such as the African Peer Review Mechanism and regional events. In the future, it would be important to use all opportunities provided by regular meetings of the African Union to engage African countries in the work of the Global Partnership.

56. Timor-Leste mentioned a range of engagement activities that the g7+ group of fragile and conflict-affected states has organised to promote the New Deal. A high-level side event organised during the UN General Assembly in 2012 was instrumental in providing political impetus with the mobilisation of the Heads of State of Indonesia and Liberia and several ministers. The next opportunity for outreach will be during the third International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, which will be held in Washington D.C. in April 2013.

57. The United Kingdom reported on contacts to date with Arab funds and donors, particularly the OPEC Fund for International Development. The OECD/DAC noted that the DAC will have its senior-level meeting on 4-5 April in Paris, during which a session on the Global Partnership has been scheduled.

58. Nigeria listed events during which it has brought the Global Partnership to the fore in Africa, including ministerial-level meetings in the context of the African Union, the Monrovia meeting of the UN High Level Panel, and discussions with private actors.

59. EU outreach opportunities included consultation among member states on the Steering Committee agenda and documentation. The EU has also discussion the Global Partnership in regular discussions with European civil society organisations.

60. UNDP indicated its efforts to support outreach at the country level, promoting the Global Partnership in bilateral discussions. It also consults with UN Development Group agencies via the UNDG advisory group, and will convene working-level meetings on an ad-hoc basis.

61. The World Bank cited its efforts to support consultation among MDBs before and after each meeting of the Steering Committee. The World Bank reported on the plan of MDBs to hold informal MDB coordination meetings on the Global Partnership with the first meeting expected to take place before the next Steering Committee meeting.

62. Samoa is hosting the third SIDS Conference in 2013, and will consult other SIDS on the Global Partnership and the post-2015 agenda. This will be done through country preparations and a regional preparatory meeting. Outreach will also take place through other events, including the Pacific Islands Forum. Samoa also reported back the messages for the Global Partnership that emerged from a technical workshop for the Asia-Pacific region held on 22 March in Bali, supported by the Capacity Development for Development Effectiveness (CDDE) facility.

63. Civil society organisations have merged the previous BetterAid and Open Forum platforms into a new network – CPDE. CPDE also closely engages with the DCF. Within Africa, civil society works with the African Platform for Development Effectiveness, organised under the auspices of the African Union. Engagement at country level includes both outreach to governments on Busan commitments, as well as CSOs' own effectiveness efforts, building on the Istanbul principles.

64. AWEPA has established a virtual parliamentary platform on development effectiveness and the post-2015 development agenda, along with the Inter-Parliamentary Union, and has engaged other parliamentary groupings.

65. The United States conducts outreach to OECD countries, as well as to the business community in the United States, and to civil society. For the latter, the United States works through InterAction, whose 160 members collectively provide more development assistance than does the US government, and through foundations. The United States also noted the importance of the stakeholder survey organised by the joint support team, which also highlighted the great amount of work that needs to be done.

66. Korea raised the importance of engaging with the G20 Development Working Group which will hold three meetings in the coming year, noting that the Global Partnership can offer G20 members a way to engage in dialogue with developing countries, and for Global Partnership members to engage in dialogue with some of the emerging economies not currently participating actively in the work of the Global Partnership steering committee.

67. Peru informed the steering committee of its efforts to keep countries in its region updated on and engaged in the work of the committee. It noted that the Peruvian co-operation

agency, APCI, is working with Germany to organise the Global Dialogue of Agencies and Ministries for International Cooperation and Development, which will be held in Lima on 11-12 April, and that this will offer an additional opportunity to engage and consult others on the work of the Global Partnership.

68. The United Kingdom pointed to the different types of engagement activities that Steering Committee members should co-ordinate: (i) agenda-based engagement – having targeted discussions with stakeholders to plan the ministerial; (ii) regional engagement efforts; (iii) engagement efforts vis-à-vis those stakeholders who may not yet be fully involved in the work of the Partnership, and (iv) individual member efforts to communicate more widely (including online and through social media).

69. Several Members (EU, IBLF, Korea, World Bank) raised the importance of outreach and collaboration by the Steering Committee with the various “building blocks”, so that substantive work done by the latter can inform the work of the Global Partnership and the preparation of the ministerial-level meeting.

70. In summing up, the Chair suggested that common messages could be developed to assist steering committee members in reaching out and engaging with others in advance of the ministerial. Members were encouraged to make use of the new Global Partnership web site ([www.effectivecooperation.org](http://www.effectivecooperation.org)) and social media tools. The Chair suggested that once substantive deliverables were identified, individual members could then reach out to selected countries and organisations that have yet to get involved based on themes that are likely to be of interest to them. The involvement of individual Steering Committee members from the United Kingdom and Korea in the G20 Development Working Group was highlighted as a specific opportunity to strengthen the link with the G20.

71. The joint support team offered a brief update on its support to communication activities. This includes the recent launch of the Global Partnership web site ([www.effectivecooperation.org](http://www.effectivecooperation.org)) and the launch of social media channels (twitter, facebook). It noted that the size and reach of the joint support team is such that mass communication efforts will need to be a collaborative effort involving members and the communications apparatus of their respective organisations and agencies. Targeted articles and op-eds also present opportunities for members to raise the profile of the Global Partnership and their involvement in it. Participants were also informed of the recent launch of the Global Partnership community space, which has built as part of the UN TeamWorks platform (contact [community@effectivecooperation.org](mailto:community@effectivecooperation.org) for access), as well as regular email newsletters.

72. The United Kingdom, Nigeria, Indonesia, Korea, the EU, the United States and UNDP agreed to work in close collaboration to support high-level outreach and engagement efforts on a bilateral basis.

### **Session 7. Next steps** (chaired by Chii Akporji, Nigeria)

73. The Chair summarised the main areas of agreement from the meeting and immediate next steps. She noted that there was a strong interest in linking the Global Partnership to discussion on the post-2015 development agenda, with former offering value in terms of how to achieve the development aims that are agreed.

74. The chair noted the agreement to pursue work around four main themes:

- a. *Domestic resource mobilisation*, including issues of tax, illicit flows, natural resource management and institutions;

- b. *Private sector*, including how ODA can leverage private resources, and how an enabling environment for private sector investment can be achieved;
- c. *Knowledge-sharing*, including work on mapping efforts underway and piloting work within the framework of the Global Partnership;
- d. *Inclusive and transparent development*, including the role of civil society and other actors, and innovative forms of inclusiveness.

75. The Chair noted strong interest in raising the political nature of the agenda, in order to make it more attractive to ministers; and in making the agenda exciting. It was noted that, given the limited time available, and the desire to be innovative in the organisation of sessions, the thematic areas identified are unlikely to map onto agenda items on a one-to-one basis. Teams will take forward the clarification of the themes in the coming days, with the aim of reaching a political level of discussion, determining key partners, suggesting outcomes, and identifying potential lead speakers.

76. The Chair noted the desire to hold the meeting in late November and that a host would be determined as a priority.

77. The next Steering Committee will take place either in early June in Addis Ababa, back-to-back to the DCF; or alternatively in July. Depending on the status of work, there may be need for a fourth Steering Committee meeting, possibly around the UN General Assembly. Members suggested that the Co-Chairs need not always be represented at ministerial-level in Steering Committee meetings.

\* \* \* \* \*

## Annex 1. List of Participants

Co-chairs		
Indonesia	Hon. Armida ALISJAHBANA Minister of National Development Planning National Development Planning Agency	
Nigeria	Hon. Ngozi OKONJO-IWEALA Minister of Finance	
United Kingdom	Hon. Justine GREENING Secretary of State for International Development Department for International Development	
Steering Committee Members		
Bangladesh	Mr. Abul AZAD Secretary, Economic Relations Division Ministry of Finance	+880-2-9113743 secretary@erd.gov.bd
	Mr. Mohammad Jashim UDDIN Senior Assistant Secretary, Economic Relations Division, Ministry of Finance	+88 029 110 219 jimjashim@gmail.com
Chad	Dr. Brahim Adoum BACHAR General Secretary Ministry of Economics & Planning	+235 22 51 71 53 bachar_brahim07@yahoo.fr
	Ms. Vera Brenda NGOSI Head, NEPAD Coordination Unit African Union Commission	+251 11 518 2311 brendangosi@ymail.com
Civil Society representative	Mr. Richard SSEWAKIRYANGA Executive Director, Uganda National NGO Forum	+256 414 510 272 R.Ssewakiryanga@ngoforum.or.ug
	Mr. Matt SIMONDS Liaison Officer/Policy Advisor Trade Union Advisory Committee (TUAC)	+33 1 55 3737 34 simonds@tuac.org
EU	Mr. Gustavo MARTIN PRADA Director, EU Development Policy Directorate	+32498956300 Gustavo.Martin-Prada@ec.europa.eu
	Mr. Vincent GRIMAUD Head of Unit, Aid and Development Effectiveness and Financing, European Commission	+322 296 33 20 Vincent.GRIMAUD@ec.europa.eu
Guatemala	Ms. Ana MENDEZ CHICAS Under Secretary of International Cooperation Secretariat of Planning and Programming SEGEPLAN	+(502) 2232 6212 Ext. 353 ana.mendezchicas@segeplan.gob.gt
Indonesia	Mr. Wismana Adi SURYABRATA Deputy Minister for Development Funding Affairs Allocation of Development Funding Ministry of National Development Planning	+62 (21) 31903106 wismana@bappenas.go.id
	Mr. Tubagus CHOESNI Director for International Development Ministry of National Development Planning	+62217991025 x213 choesni@bappenas.go.id

	Ms. Teni WIDURIYANTI Deputy Director Ministry of National Development Planning	+62 812 8603 944 twiduriyanti@bappenas.go.id
	Mr. Kurniawan (Iwan) ARIADI Deputy Director/Administrative Assistance to the Minister Ministry of National Development Planning Indonesia	kariadi@bappenas.go.id
Korea	Ms. Enna PARK Director-General, Development Cooperation Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade	+82 2 2100 8339 epark85@mofat.go.kr
	Ms. Jinjoo KIM Second Secretary, Development Policy Division Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade	+82 2 2100 8339 jjkim10@mofat.go.kr
Nigeria	Ms. Chii AKPORJI Special Adviser to the CME (Co-ordinating Minister for the Economy) and to the Minister of Finance Ministry of Finance	+234 706 428 8021 cakporji@gmail.com
	Ms. Ada IHECHUCKWU MADUBUIKE Deputy Director, Ministry of Finance	
	Mr. Philip OSAFO-KWAAKWO Advisor on Post 2015 MDGs program	
OECD/DAC	Mr. Erik SOLHEIM DAC Chair, DCD, OECD	+(33-1) 45 24 90 70 Erik.SOLHEIM@oecd.org
	Mr. Jon LOMOY Director, Development Co-operation Directorate	+(33-1) 45 24 90 00 Jon.LOMOY@oecd.org
Parliamentarian representative	Dr. Jeff BALCH Director, Association of European Parliamentarians with Africa (AWEPA)	+31(20)5245678 J.Balch@awepa.org
Private Sector representative	Dr. Darian STIBBE Executive Director, The Partnering Initiative International Business Leaders Forum	+44 20 7467 3600 Darian.Stibbe@iblf.org
Peru	Mr. Luis OLIVERA Executive Director Peruvian International Cooperation Agency (APCI).	+51 (1) 319 3608 luis.olivera@apci.gob.pe
Samoa	Ms. Noumea SIMI Assistant CEO, Aid Coordination Unit Ministry of Finance	+00685 22042 noumea.simi@mof.gov.ws
	Mr. Alfred SCHUSTER Development Cooperation Advisor Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat	+679 331 2600 ext 295 alfreds@forumsec.org.fj
Timor-Leste	Hon. Emilia PIRES Minister of Finance, Ministry of Finance	+61 425 745 051 epires@mof.gov.tl
	Mr. Helder DA COSTA Head of g7+ Secretariat, Aid Effectiveness Directorate Ministry of Finance	+ 670 331 0128 hdacosta@mof.gov.tl

	Mr. Habib ur Rehman MAYAR Senior Policy Specialist, g7+ Secretariat	+ (670) 331 0126 habiburrehman.mayar@gmail.com
United Kingdom	Mr. Anthony SMITH Director, International Relations Division Department for International Development (DFID)	+44 789 987 5956 A-Smith@dfid.gov.uk
	Ms. Hannah RYDER Team Leader Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation Department for International Development	+44 (0)1355 843753 h-ryder@dfid.gov.uk
	Ms. Sian DIXON Assistant Private Secretary to SofS Department for International Development (DFID)	s-dixon@dfid.gov.uk
	Mr. Vel GNANENDRAN Principle Private Secretary to the SofS Department for International Development (DFID)	v-Gnanendran@dfid.gov.uk
	Mr. Guy LEVIN Special Adviser to Justine Greening Department for International Development	g-levin@dfid.gov.uk
UN Development Programme (UNDP)	Ms. Sigrid KAAG Assistant Secretary General and Assistant Administrator Bureau for External Relations and Advocacy	1-212-906-5512 Sigrid.kaag@undp.org
	Ms. Dasa SILOVIC Senior Advisor to UN Assistant Secretary General United Nations - Development Programme (UNDP)	+1 646.346-3204 dasa.silovic@undp.org
United States	Mr. Donald STEINBERG Deputy Administrator US Agency for International Development	+1.202.712-4070 dsteinberg@usaid.gov
	Ms. Rosarie TUCCI Deputy Administrator's Special Assistant US Agency for International Development	+1 202 712 4070 rtucci@usaid.gov
World Bank	Ms. Astrid MANROTH Operations Advisor	+380 44 490 66 70 amanroth@worldbank.org
	Ms. Nicole WYRSCH Advisor, External Affairs, Europe	+33 (1) 40 69 30 35 nwyrsh@worldbank.org

#### UNDP/OECD Joint Support Team

OECD	Ms. Brenda KILLEN Head of Division, Global Partnerships and Policies Division	+ (33-1) 45 24 83 72 Brenda.KILLEN@oecd.org
	Ms. Marjolaine NICOD Senior Policy Advisor	+ (33-1) 45 24 87 67 Marjolaine.NICOD@oecd.org
	Mr. Robin OGILVY Senior Policy Advisor	+ (33-1) 45 24 94 48 Robin.OGILVY@oecd.org
	Ms Claire CONDON Coordinator	+ (33-1) 45 24 78 10 Claire.CONDON@oecd.org

UNDP

Ms. Mereseini BOWER +679 3227714  
Governance and Development Effectiveness mereseini.bower@undp.org  
Specialist, UNDP

Mr. Derek KILNER +1 212 906 5742  
Partnerships Development Analyst derek.kilner@undp.org  
Bureau of External Relations and Advocacy

Mr. Matthew TAYLOR +82.10.2754.2814  
Public Affairs Specialist, Seoul Policy Centre matthew.taylor@undp.org