

# Global Partnership Monitoring Reform: Towards new evidence, better accountability and more relevance

Background document for Session IV: “The Global Partnership monitoring reform: towards new evidence, better accountability and more relevance”

21<sup>st</sup> Steering Committee Meeting, 7-8 July 2021

This document provides an update by the Global Partnership Co-Chairs on the monitoring reform and outlines next steps. It is shared with Steering Committee members to discuss:

- 1) A proposal for the contours of the revised monitoring indicator framework;
- 2) An update on work to delve deeper into previously identified issues related to the monitoring process;
- 3) The roadmap for the reform, with a focus on implementation of its next phase.

## Contacts:

Ms. Ashley PALMER, e-mail: [Ashley.PALMER@oecd.org](mailto:Ashley.PALMER@oecd.org)

Ms. Rebekah CHEW, e-mail: [Rebekah.CHEW@undp.org](mailto:Rebekah.CHEW@undp.org)

# 1. Executive Summary

The Global Partnership monitoring reform will lead to a new monitoring proposal – inclusive of an improved monitoring process and revised indicator framework, as well as recognition of the value of monitoring results – for endorsement at the Third High-Level Meeting in 2022. *This document serves as background to inform the Committee’s discussions on the reform at its 21<sup>st</sup> Meeting; it:*

- Suggests a **strategic vision** for the new monitoring proposal:

Reflecting the ambition of the reform endorsed in the 19<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee Meeting, the strategic vision for the revised monitoring is that it will be **(i) centred on collective accountability through inclusive dialogue** and, recognising that inclusive dialogue at country level is key to stimulate action, it will introduce greater focus on whole-of-society approaches and recognise that accountability for commitments looks different in different country contexts; **(ii) more relevant**, aiming to track a more inclusive picture of development co-operation; and **(iii) more strategic**, with a leaner framework that maintains and strengthens linkages to the 2030 Agenda, and focuses on strategic integration with country-level systems and processes.

- Proposes the contours of the new **indicator framework**:

During March-May 2021, nineteen constituency-based consultations [[summary](#)] took place. These provided the inputs for the Co-Chairs’ proposal for the contours of the revised framework. **The contours are areas to take forward to the next [technical] phase of the reform, to determine if, how, and in what timeframe they are ultimately included in the new framework.** These contours will lead to a revised indicator framework that will (i) expand the **inclusiveness and representation of stakeholders**, more accurately reflecting their role in development co-operation, and providing them with relevant and actionable evidence, for accountability and learning, and (ii) allow for a **more tailored and flexible approach** to monitoring that is targeted and more relevant to country contexts, and across co-operation modalities and instruments. **The proposed contours are the following:** (a) collective accountability; (b) transparency; (c) leave no-one behind; (d) data and statistical systems; (e) revitalising and upholding pre-Busan commitments; (f) South-South Co-operation; and (g) Kampala Principles. An additional area of exploration is to look at capturing “effective multilateral donorship”.

- Provides an update on work to improve the **monitoring process**:

In its 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting, the Committee agreed to the Co-Chairs’ identification of **two sets of issues related to the monitoring process**, and to the need for distinct approaches to move forward on each. **Work on the first set of [six] issues (Issues A) has advanced through consultations [[summary](#)]**, and this document summarises inputs from stakeholders towards better understanding causal factors and potential solutions to address these challenges. The other set of **[two] issues (Issues B) were the subject of analytical papers** prepared by the Joint Support Team: on the *implications of altering the timing of the exercise* [[paper](#)] and on *strengthening linkages to the 2030 Agenda* [[paper](#)].

- Outlines **next steps** of the reform:

Technical work on the indicator framework will kick off in the second half of 2021. The Joint Support Team will conduct an initial assessment of scope, feasibility and implications of each of the contours, as well as map out the types of inputs and expertise that will be needed, drawing on external experts and from relevant Action Area groups. **The Committee will be regularly updated and have the opportunity to engage** through the Knowledge Sharing Platform (KSP), where draft technical working papers will be posted, for the Committee’s oversight and feedback. Based on demand, **informal feedback and discussion sessions could also be held** with Committee members and external stakeholders. The technical work will culminate in an **indicative new monitoring proposal to be presented at the 22<sup>nd</sup> Steering Committee Meeting**. Some parts of the framework may be fully fleshed out with draft methodologies while others may be at initial stages of assessing feasibility. This indicative new monitoring proposal will also bring clear decision points on the monitoring process.

## 2. Introduction

Under [Strategic Priority 3 of the 2020-22 Work Programme](#), a reform of the Global Partnership monitoring is underway. It seeks to build on the strengths of the exercise, while addressing challenges that have prevented full achievement of its original vision: to support accountability for Busan commitments and to stimulate dialogue and drive behaviour change towards more effective development co-operation. The reform will lead to a new monitoring proposal – inclusive of an improved monitoring process and an adaptation of the indicator framework, as well as recognition of the value of monitoring results – for endorsement at the Third High-Level Meeting (HLM3) in 2022.

The 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting (December, 2020) saw endorsement of the Co-Chairs' proposal to advance on the reform. The Committee:

- Welcomed the Co-Chairs' update on outcomes of stakeholder consultations (October – November 2020), and agreed with the identification of two sets of issues to be addressed through an improved monitoring process:
  - Six 'technical' issues [Issues A], to be taken forward through a consultative process with stakeholders to invite ideas on how to address them;
  - Two 'strategic' issues [Issues B], to be taken forward through in-depth analysis of options and associated trade-offs to address them.
- Strongly supported the proposal for a 'stakeholder-based approach' to review the indicator framework, appreciating the importance of an inclusive framework that can hold all actors accountable for their commitments to the Busan principles.
- Agreed with the Co-Chairs' suggestion to initiate the review of the indicator framework with attention to:
  - Reflecting the commitments and priorities of each constituency in relation to the four effectiveness principles;
  - Ensuring it better mirrors the multi-stakeholder nature of the Partnership; and
  - Considering systemic issues<sup>1</sup> at the country level, as well as different country contexts.
- Expressed readiness to engage with the Co-Chairs' proposed next steps, including taking an active role in organising constituency-based consultations on the indicator framework.

This document serves as background to inform the Committee's discussion on the monitoring reform at its 21<sup>st</sup> Meeting, by:

- Suggesting a **strategic vision for the new monitoring proposal**, intended as a politically-appealing narrative to communicate about the new Global Partnership monitoring;
- Proposing the **contours of the new indicator framework**, priority areas for in-depth exploration and interrogation in the upcoming technical phase of work;
- Providing an **update on work to improve the monitoring process**, based on both consultations and analysis; and
- Outlining **next steps of the reform**, including upcoming milestones and related implementation plans to achieve them.

---

<sup>1</sup> The core systems, policies, and co-operation architecture at the country level which facilitate co-ordination, dialogue and mutual accountability and are fundamental for partnerships to reach their full potential.

## Strategic Vision for the New Global Partnership Monitoring

Recognising that the reform of the Global Partnership monitoring requires a clear overarching direction, as well as a concise, politically-targeted pitch on the broad strokes of the reform, that can be easily communicated, the strategic vision reflects the ambition of the reform endorsed in the 19th Steering Committee Meeting, and has been further detailed based on insights from the recent consultations. The strategic vision for the revised Global Partnership monitoring is that it will be:

- Centred on **collective accountability** through **inclusive dialogue**
  - Taking into account collective accountability between all actors, and recognising that inclusive dialogue at country level is key to stimulate action and drive progress toward more effective partnerships, the new framework will underscore a shift towards country dialogue at the heart of the monitoring exercise and stepped-up emphasis on using the results of the monitoring for change [but this country-level emphasis will not be at the cost of global dialogue];
  - Reflecting emerging commitments as well as upholding existing commitments, with greater focus on whole-of-society approaches, the roles of multiple actors, and the importance of an enabling environment [at country level, but with that influenced also by global dynamics] to maximise all contributions; and
  - Recognising that accountability for commitments looks different in different country contexts – no longer a one-size-fits-all framework – but also with attention to maintaining an appreciable degree of data comparability across time and globally.
  
- **More relevant**
  - Recognising the different development and partnership landscape with more actors, modalities and complexity, will aim to track the effectiveness of a more inclusive picture of development co-operation (e.g. Private Sector Engagement [PSE], South-South Co-operation [SSC], co-operation with and through the multilateral system).
  
- **More strategic**
  - A leaner monitoring framework and process that pinpoints and prioritises key issues that will encourage greater political momentum and behaviour change;
  - Maintaining and strengthening linkages with the 2030 Agenda, for example by tracking the extent to which development co-operation is being used to deliver on the commitment to leave no-one behind; and
  - More focus on strategic integration with country-level processes and systems, and recognising the need to put the country-level co-operation architecture at the core.

### 3. Contours of a Revised Monitoring Framework

The [Co-Chairs' proposal to the 20<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee](#) Meeting laid out parameters to inform development of the *contours* of the new indicator framework. Captured as “reflection points” to guide inputs during constituency-based consultations, these featured a front-and-centre emphasis on making the Global Partnership monitoring, through what it measures (as well as how, through the process of monitoring: see Section 4), **more representative of the contributions and roles of all stakeholders**. Constituents were asked to reflect on their own **effectiveness priorities, in view of existing commitments to the effectiveness principles**. Constituents also considered both what they [themselves] and others should be held accountable for, with a view to ensuring that stakeholder actions continue to be guided by a **strengthened accountability mechanism**. With a central ambition of the reform being to stimulate more use of results, stakeholders also reflected on **what type of evidence could better support action and behaviour change**.

Led by Co-Chairs, and under the leadership of Steering Committee Members, the Joint Support Team organised 19 virtual constituency-based consultations during March-May 2021 [a consolidated summary of the consultations is available [here](#)]<sup>2</sup>. The rich harvest of insights gathered through the consultations were the primary source of input for formulating the contours, which also considered earlier consultation outcomes and previous relevant work on the monitoring.<sup>3</sup>

Against this conceptual backdrop, the Co-Chairs' proposal for the contours is presented in this section of the document. Contours are areas of the indicator framework which may hold their place, areas which require adjustments, and emerging areas. An important milestone to a fully articulated framework, the **contours are areas to take forward to the next phase of the reform, to be subjected to detailed technical exploration and interrogation, to determine if, how, and in what timeframe they are ultimately included in the new framework**. The Committee should thus note that the **contours should not be equated with future indicators in the framework**.

Co-Chairs expect that these contours will lead to a revised indicator framework that will:

- Expand the **inclusiveness and representation of stakeholders**, more accurately reflecting their role in development co-operation, and providing them with relevant and actionable evidence, for accountability and learning. This is in line with the constituency-based approach agreed by the Committee in its 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting. The revised framework will enhance the focus on a whole-of-society approach to partnerships for sustainable development, taking into account the roles of different actors in making partnerships more effective, and the enabling environments in which they operate.
- Allow for a **more tailored and flexible approach** to monitoring that is targeted and more relevant to country contexts, and across co-operation modalities and instruments (including fragile contexts, federal/non-unitary partner country contexts, middle-income countries/upper-middle-income countries [instruments/modalities, i.e. SSC], and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and other countries with limited resources and/or institutional capacity). No longer envisioned as one-size-fits-all, the framework will have a degree of adaptability, to increase its relevance and promote more meaningful action. Practical options to achieve this adaptability will be explored during the technical work; will consider both the indicators and the monitoring process; and will be mindful of balancing

---

<sup>2</sup> Consultations were held with partner countries (six consultations: organised regionally and with G7+ countries); development partners (five consultations: held with Arab providers, DAC members [two time zones], MDBs, UN entities); civil society; parliaments; trade unions; and philanthropic actors. Elements on monitoring of private sector engagement in development co-operation and the Global Partnership's Kampala Principles were discussed during some of the 19 consultations and complemented by more focused consultations organised with the Action Area 2.1 multi-stakeholder PSE Working Group, the GPEDC Business Leader Caucus and with a small number of additional experts. Action Area 2.3, led by Colombia, provided input for the contour on monitoring South-South Co-operation (SSC) (see page 8), based on initial findings from piloting work with seven countries, and will organise consultations that will inform the more technical work on monitoring the effectiveness of SSC following the 21st Steering Committee Meeting. Steering Committee members representing sub-national governments proposed to engage their constituency on relevant contours as part of a parallel ongoing process, led by UCLG, to develop a policy paper on *Development Co-operation and Local Government*.

<sup>3</sup> For example, [consultations](#) in 2020 which focused on the monitoring process but also touched on the indicator framework; earlier [work on a tailored approach](#) to monitor effective development co-operation in fragile and conflict-affected situations (FCAS); and the review of the monitoring indicators in 2017-18, which built on the [recommendations](#) of the Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG).

trade-offs between tailoring to context and stakeholder needs and maintaining integrity and consistency of the global exercise.

The contours of the new indicator framework can be broadly **grouped across three branches**:

- *Areas that reflect today's development co-operation landscape, with attention to whole-of-society approaches and the diversity of actors engaged in development co-operation;*
- *More traditional areas of effective development co-operation, grounded in government-to-government co-operation but also reflecting the inclusion of other actors; and*
- *Areas that capture a broader picture of development co-operation.*

## **The Contours**

- i. Areas that reflect today's development co-operation landscape, with attention to whole-of-society approaches and the diversity of actors engaged in development co-operation***

### **Collective Accountability**

Mutual accountability for upholding the commitments that are grounded in the four principles of effective development co-operation is at the heart of the Global Partnership monitoring. It is embedded in the vision and rationale for the exercise broadly; more specifically, the existing indicator framework also generates evidence on mutual accountability by looking at whether mutual assessment reviews of development co-operation take place at the country level. The concept of mutual accountability was a foundation of the original aid effectiveness agenda, and while it remains so, it has also been associated with the donor-recipient relationship. The new monitoring is envisioned to more fully and accurately capture the complex multi-stakeholder dimensions of co-operation and partnerships at the country level. With this, reaffirming and strengthening the importance of mutual accountability by reframing it as a broader and more inclusive concept of collective accountability – at different levels, between different actors, and with a focus on learning - signals a clear shift in the way the Partnership aims to uphold the foundational principle of accountability in a way that emphasises the importance of a whole-of-society approach to sustainable development.

The consultations revealed very strong support across constituencies for the monitoring exercise to not only continue to track actions and behaviours related to accountability, but to increase emphasis on this going forward. Upcoming technical work will therefore explore possibilities for a more strategic measurement of accountability mechanisms at country level, with attention to generating actionable evidence of the roles of different stakeholders. There was also support for a continued, and potentially expanded, focus on the enabling environment at country level, which (dis)allows for the actions of all actors to be in accordance with the effectiveness principles. An additional area raised for exploration is that of looking at the accountability of development partners to take joint actions; to harmonise; and to co-ordinate, under the leadership of partner country governments. Stakeholders also welcomed increased accountability for if/how the results of the monitoring exercise itself have been acted on, such as through a measurement in the indicator framework to this affect (in addition to adaptation of the monitoring *process* to focus more on a use-of-results phase). A more meaningful focus on collective accountability is also intrinsically linked to a re-orientation of the monitoring exercise to be centred around inclusive dialogue at country level, as a means to drive progress. With regard to the indicator framework this means assessing if elements of the indicators would be more useful as part of the [follow-up] dialogue on the monitoring results, rather than as part of the actual indicators, towards ensuring that qualitative questions and explanations of the results are unpacked in a dialogue with all stakeholders.

### **Transparency**

Transparency is well recognised as a core principle and fundamental ingredient for co-operation and partnerships to be effective. It is a prerequisite for trust, and by extension meaningful dialogue, amongst

actors. It is the basis of accountability, between partners, but also to citizens. Access to information and data on development interventions is also key to country ownership, for co-ordination and policy leadership of partner country governments. Consultations strongly reaffirmed that the centrality of transparency to the effectiveness agenda should be reflected accordingly in the revised monitoring framework, with many calling for more focus on data transparency at the country level.

The existing measure of transparency focuses on the extent to which development partners make information publicly accessible through their reporting to *global* systems. A key area for exploration during the upcoming technical phase will be to look at how best to balance the global measurement with calls from stakeholders for a strengthened focus on data transparency at the country level, as well as more focus on how commitments to transparency apply to *all* actors and indeed can promote whole-of-society approaches. Linked to the country-level focus, a number of specific considerations were raised, including an interest for the Global Partnership monitoring to capture more granular data (e.g. at the project level), a proposition with benefits but also potential trade-offs for reducing the complexity of the exercise. Other avenues for exploration include capturing elements of data *use* (such as for planning and budgeting decision-making) at the country level, noting that information/data provision can be inspired by evidence of use. Stakeholders also would welcome that an increased country-level focus on data transparency is not limited to technical measures of transparency (such as reporting to national information management systems), but also takes into account transparency at political level, such as by looking at information available and reported to parliaments by partner country governments.

### **Leave No-One Behind (LNOB)**

The preamble of the Nairobi Outcome Document states: *We reaffirm in particular the 2030 Agenda's pledge to leave no-one behind as a philosophy that imbues our work and recognises that development co-operation must leave no-one behind to be effective.*<sup>4</sup> Despite this, stakeholders raised in consultations that LNOB is not explicitly reflected in the monitoring framework, and that exploring ways to track progress on this universal commitment would be welcome. A broad and complex concept, it was also recognised that situating LNOB in the context of effectiveness monitoring will be technically challenging in terms of defining the concept and proposing meaningful measurements to illuminate stakeholder behaviour.

A number of avenues exist for potential exploration during the upcoming phase of technical work. There are promising entry points in the current framework. These could include looking at the degree to which LNOB is integrated in [partner countries'] national results frameworks and in the country strategies of development partners. There could also be a more deliberate focus on the inclusivity of frameworks for mutual accountability. There were calls for the revised monitoring to generate evidence specific to youth and children, with reference to commitments made in Nairobi; the forthcoming technical phase would need to consider carefully the effectiveness niche of any potential youth and children focused element. Stakeholders also reaffirmed the importance of continuing to collect data for SDG target 5c, on public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment.

### **Data and Statistical Systems**

The existence of comprehensive, accurate, and accessible partner country data and statistical systems is critical for increasing the chances for the contributions of all development actors to be effective. Indeed, data and statistics are a relevant aspect of all four effectiveness principles. In Nairobi, partner countries and development partners committed to strengthen national statistical capacities, with an emphasis on the link with transparency and accountability.<sup>5</sup> Recent consultations have reaffirmed widespread interest to explore how the exercise could generate additional evidence – beyond what was captured in past rounds – on efforts to strengthen national statistical capacity.

The existing monitoring framework does measure whether development partners use partner country data and statistics in monitoring implementation of their programs. To strengthen this, stakeholders suggested

---

<sup>4</sup> [Nairobi Outcome Document](#) (NOD), §9

<sup>5</sup> NOD, §76.c, §77.b

going beyond tracking of use of statistical systems, to capture development partners' support to strengthen those systems. A further area of exploration during the upcoming technical work would also be to look at if, and how, the monitoring exercise should more explicitly categorise national statistical systems [and by extension the commitments to use them] as a "country system". It has also been recognised that the actual process of the monitoring exercise can contribute to promoting the use, and strengthening of, national data and statistical systems.

**ii. More traditional areas of effectiveness of development co-operation, grounded in government-to-government co-operation but also reflecting the inclusion of other actors**

**Revitalising and Upholding pre-Busan Commitments**

The Global Partnership acknowledged in Nairobi<sup>6</sup> that much remained to be done to fulfil commitments made prior to Busan. This remains the case today. Consultations pointed to an overall interest to continue tracking these commitments made by partner countries and development partners, but with some stakeholders expressing a view to consider potential adjustments in how they are tracked in order to ensure continued relevance in the current context. Discussions did reveal conflicting views between constituencies on if, and how, commitments should be re-interpreted in today's development co-operation landscape. With respect to these particular commitments, there is interest in capturing more qualitative data which reflects respective and mutual responsibility for progress, while also recognising the roles of a range of actors. This does, however, point to a potential trade-off between enriching data collection and keeping reporting manageable.

Consultations surfaced specific areas for further exploration during the technical phase of work. These include exploring how to bring in more qualitative information and reflect mutual responsibility in connection with the commitment to **predictability**. With regard to the **use of country systems**, the monitoring could capture whether development partners are providing support to strengthen these systems, as well as expanding the definition of these systems to include, for example, national statistical systems. Some stakeholders are interested in exploring the possibility of better reflecting the link between development partners' use of country systems to the quality of those systems. There were also calls to assess the feasibility of capturing support beyond government systems to recognise that significant funding may be delivered outside government systems, while ensuring that the commitment to use government country systems for funding that is channelled through the public sector is not diluted. The **untying of aid**, a commitment made by OECD-DAC members, was also raised. Some stakeholders suggested an expanded measurement that would capture aid that is formally untied but, through procurement processes, is channelled to companies based in the development partners' country.<sup>7</sup> The issue of **alignment** [of development partners' programs with country-defined priorities and results] was also raised. Some expressed interest in exploring ways to refine the measurement of the quality and use of country results frameworks (CRFs), such as to capture whether development partners are supporting the development of country strategies and CRFs, as well as to explore an increased focus on strategic-level alignment.

**iii. Areas that capture a broader picture of development co-operation**

**South-South Co-operation (SSC)**

South-South Co-operation (SSC) is an increasingly potent complimentary feature of international development co-operation and its reflection in the monitoring framework is a priority for the Global Partnership as it embraces the evolving development co-operation landscape. The second High-level United Nations Conference on SSC (BAPA+40) called for enhanced development effectiveness of SSC<sup>8</sup>, and the Global Partnership, in its Nairobi Outcome Document, committed to promoting the effectiveness of South-

---

<sup>6</sup> NOD, §36

<sup>7</sup> Any changes to the untying indicator would require a separate process, as the custodian of the methodology is not the GPEDC but the OECD-DAC's Working Party on Statistics (WP-STAT).

<sup>8</sup> Report of the second High-level United Nations Conference on SSC, §11

South Co-operation<sup>9</sup>, while recognising that this can only be led by Southern Partners. To this end, Colombia's Presidential Agency of International Co-operation (APC) is building on the results of a previous [initiative by Mexico](#) and bringing together Southern Partners from different regions<sup>10</sup> to [examine and pilot](#) how the Global Partnership's effectiveness principles and indicator framework relate to the principles and practices of SSC, in order to better understand how SSC can further increase its contribution to international development and the 2030 Agenda.

The piloting exercise entailing data collection and analysis is currently ongoing, but some very initial findings from this work suggest that country ownership and focus on results are the principles best operationalised in current SSC practices and platforms. Elements related to accountability and inclusive partnerships seem to show the largest divergence in terms of approaches among the different piloting countries, requiring further exploration. The integration of SSC monitoring should pay special attention to issues such as the availability and level of detail of the aggregated information on SSC, as well as the mechanisms for collaboration with civil society and the private sector. The pilot exercise has also highlighted opportunities for identifying good practices and promoting horizontal and mutual learning among Southern countries, and has been appreciated by piloting countries as an opportunity to conduct an 'X-Ray' of internal SSC processes. These learning elements can serve as key incentives for monitoring SSC and should be highlighted in the way SSC is integrated into the Global Partnership monitoring framework.

### **Kampala Principles on Private Sector Engagement in Development Co-operation**

Private sector engagement (PSE) through development co-operation is a key enabler for the 2030 Agenda by leveraging profitable solutions to development challenges directly supporting private partners. With the launch of the [Kampala Principles \(Principles\)](#) in 2019, governments, the private sector and other actors have new guidance to improve their collaboration and partnerships at the country level. The five Principles are deeply inter-woven, fully multi-stakeholder in nature, and deliberately wide in scope, covering the quality of different development co-operation partnerships with the private sector at policy, program and project level, including and beyond financial co-operation such as blended finance. Consultations with the Private Sector Working Group and the GPEDC Business Leader Caucus suggest that the multi-stakeholder nature of the Principles is their main value add; with voluntary commitments for development partners, partner country governments, diverse private sector actors, civil society, trade unions and parliamentarians. A main incentive to monitor progress on PSE is therefore to focus on aspects of the Principles within the GPEDC niche, rather than expanding focus to issues such as private capital mobilisation for the SDGs covered elsewhere. The monitoring should also emphasise strengthening trust and fostering structured learning and evidence-based multi-stakeholder dialogue.

During the consultations, all five Principles were considered critical ingredients for how to track effective PSE, and will thus be considered during technical indicator work. There was particular interest in monitoring Principles 5 (LNOB), 2 (results and targeted impact) and 4 (transparency and accountability), confirming the importance of focusing on the benefits for the most vulnerable, including in the informal sector. Further exploration is needed on how monitoring the Principles could relate to *existing* areas of Global Partnership monitoring; including national development co-operation strategies, mutual accountability, co-ordination and dialogue, the oversight role of parliaments, and/or untied aid. This will help determine whether aspects of the Principles should be tracked as a stand-alone indicator or integrated across the revised framework. Guidance from the consultations to maintain a focus on dialogue (reflected also in Principle 3) suggests absorbing the previous [indicator 3](#) on the quality of public-private dialogue into a new monitoring approach. The previous indicator 3 could be simplified and adapted to focus on inclusive dialogue among all key actors on the qualitative aspects of private sector partnerships. It could also address alignment to host governments' development priorities, simplifying donor procedures when collaborating with businesses at country level, and have a greater focus on results and impact for workers and beneficiaries of development co-operation. Technical indicator work during the next phase will be pursued in tandem with ongoing work by stakeholders on the development of a toolkit on the implementation of the Kampala Principles.

---

<sup>9</sup> NOD, §18

<sup>10</sup> Mexico, El Salvador, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Kenya, Rwanda and Cape Verde.

\*\*\*

*In addition to SSC and monitoring of the Kampala Principles, a revised monitoring framework could also capture “effective multilateral donorship”. An increasing share of official development assistance (ODA) is delivered to and through the multilateral system, according to OECD data<sup>11</sup>. While the current monitoring looks at the effectiveness of multilateral organisations in the way they deliver their funding at country level, recent consultations pointed to an interest to also capture how bilateral partners engage with and fund multilateral organisations in a way that contributes to enhance their effectiveness. Building on and synchronising with existing work and measurements (i.e. UN Funding Compact, OECD-DAC Peer Reviews), forthcoming technical work will explore how effective multilateral donorship could be captured in the revised monitoring framework, for example by looking at core and earmarked contributions of bilateral partners to the multilateral system, the predictability and reliability of their funding, and whether an increased use of the multilateral system - in certain contexts and circumstances - can contribute to enhanced effectiveness.*

#### **Questions for Discussion**

- *Do you agree with the direction of the “strategic vision”? In broad terms, does it reflect how you envisage the revised Global Partnership monitoring? Is it politically appealing and a good basis for moving forward?*
- *Do you agree with the contours of the revised monitoring, which will be the basis for the upcoming phase of technical work?*

---

<sup>11</sup> According to the OECD 2020 Multilateral Development Finance Report, total funding to multilateral organisations increased by 32.4% over the period 2011-2018.

## 4. Update on Work on the Monitoring Process

In its 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting, the Committee agreed to the Co-Chairs' identification of two sets of issues related to the monitoring *process*, and to the need for distinct approaches to move forward on each. Work on the first set of issues (Issues A) has advanced through consultations<sup>12</sup>, which invited further inputs from stakeholders in order to better understand causal factors and potential solutions to address these challenges. The other set of issues (Issues B) were subjected to analysis, the findings of which are made available to Committee members [links to the analytical papers can be found below].

The following is a **summarised update of how work has advanced, on both Issues A and B**, since the 20<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee Meeting. Rather than proposing a decision on the monitoring process at this point in the reform, Co-Chairs suggest that these emerging insights and provisional solutions will continue to evolve during the upcoming technical work on the monitoring framework, with a more suitable juncture for a **decision point on the monitoring process at the next [22<sup>nd</sup>] Steering Committee Meeting**.

### Issues A

As agreed in the 20<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee Meeting, "lead" inputs from specific constituency groups were sought on each of the six issues [see Figure 1], while at the same time inviting all groups to share views across all the issues as well.

**Figure 1: Issues A by main constituency**



### Streamlining and simplifying the process

There are two key elements that have been raised in the consultations for consideration within the context of streamlining and simplifying the process. The first is simplifying the monitoring process, which could be addressed in a number of ways. For example, by making the data collection and/or validation process lighter, or by lightening the indicators, which links to the work on the framework (i.e. less indicators overall or simplifying the existing indicators). In exploring possible options to address this issue, there are several tensions and trade-offs that will need to be balanced. For example, the multi-stakeholder nature must be retained as part of the monitoring process to remain true to the effectiveness principles. Removing or simplifying indicators will reduce the current coverage and the richness of data. Simplification also

needs to be balanced with requests for the monitoring to provide more qualitative information to better contextualise and explain the results. The second element is simplifying the monitoring tools and materials. This will require consideration for how the monitoring guidelines and the Excel data collection tool can be simpler and more accessible yet easily understood and provide sufficient clarity on the indicators and definitions of terms. This should be addressed together with adequate preparation and training for the monitoring exercise, which was also stressed in the consultations as critical, because the complexity or ease of understanding the monitoring process, guidelines and tools can be addressed through adequate sensitisation and learning in the preparation phase.

### Embedding preparation and follow up phases into the process

In terms of strengthening the preparation phase, the consultations surfaced three key challenges: inadequate support/training; weak stakeholder engagement; and limited time to prepare. Regarding better support and

<sup>12</sup> Follow-up consultations (virtual) on the monitoring *process* were held in May 2021 with, respectively, a non-executive group and a development partner group. (Key takeaways can be found [here](#).) Corresponding views from partner countries were gathered from a combination of sources, including discussions on the monitoring *process* integrated into the six [partner country] consultations focusing on the framework during March-April 2021, as well as from previously existing inputs such as the [2020 consultations](#) and the [exit survey with National Co-ordinators](#) following the 2018 round. Co-Chairs will explore how best to ensure ongoing consultation with partner countries (and other stakeholders) in the next phase of the reform and throughout the duration of the reform.

training, partner countries raised four specific ideas: hold workshops for National Co-ordinators at the start of the exercise; ensure resources are available for partner countries that need support; encourage development partners to improve the preparedness of their country-level focal points so that they are ready to engage and support the National Co-ordinator; and, better sensitise stakeholders at global level to make it easier for the partner country to engage and sensitise stakeholders at country level. Some of these suggestions have been previously voiced but unsuccessfully enacted in the past monitoring rounds due to resource constraints, which will need to be considered together with addressing this issue. To address weakened stakeholder engagement, an important consideration raised by many stakeholders in the consultations is the need for greater political awareness and motivation. At global level, a more intense communication strategy could be rolled out to generate awareness and political momentum. It could also be useful to rethink the invitation and launch process of the monitoring exercise so that it generates greater political traction. At country level, there was a resounding call from many constituencies (including partner countries) to hold pre-monitoring workshops to engage stakeholders early on in the process. This would also help to partially allay development partners' concern that some partner countries are not fully committed to the exercise and non-executive stakeholders' concern that in some countries trained and ready-to-engage country-level representatives were not engaged. For some partner countries, support from development partners (or a champion in country) is needed to assist with this. Lastly, allowing sufficient time for preparation is being considered with the overall *occurrence* of the monitoring exercise [see Issues B, below]; it is also connected to institutionalisation of the exercise.

With regard to strengthening the follow-up phase, the overarching challenge is that greater use of results after the monitoring exercise is needed. Partner countries highlighted that there is currently no accountability for actions to be taken on the monitoring results or government recommendations once the monitoring is complete. A key suggestion raised in the consultations is that an explicit action plan and/or roadmap is needed following the completion of the monitoring exercise in order to leverage the results and generate behaviour change. While currently an initiative for 2021, the Action Dialogues present a useful model for a more holistic approach to using the monitoring results. In line with the strategic vision for the monitoring reform, that the exercise have a greater focus on inclusive dialogue, the importance of dialogue among all stakeholders – before, during and after the monitoring exercise – would be a central tenet of the revised monitoring approach. This dialogue also links to addressing feedback in the consultations that more qualitative information is needed to explain and interpret the monitoring results and development actors' actions, as these can be better addressed through dialogue rather than additional data gathering. Development partners highlighted that tailored development partner profiles<sup>13</sup> could be useful to better gauge development partner behaviour and enhance the use of results while also allowing for a more long-term bespoke support structure for partner countries.

### **Better institutionalising the monitoring by integrating it into partner country systems and processes**

Some partner countries have institutionalised the monitoring exercise through policy (e.g. in development co-operation policies, performance assessment frameworks, or country results frameworks of the national development plan), mechanisms (e.g. development co-operation platforms, platforms for civil society engagement and/or public-private dialogue), and/or systems (e.g. information management systems that track development co-operation). In addition to feedback in the consultations, participation in previous monitoring rounds has shown that embedding the monitoring exercise into national processes has multiple benefits. It strengthens existing country systems without creating additional mechanisms; it allows for countries to report more comprehensively on the monitoring indicators; and it promotes engagement and consultation with a wider and more diverse range of country-level stakeholders. Institutionalisation also allows for partner countries to better leverage the monitoring results, including, for example, to provide input to SDG implementation processes and negotiations with development partners. There are, however, two key considerations for greater institutionalisation of the monitoring exercise. The first is that institutionalisation needs to be balanced with maintaining and further strengthening global political momentum for more effective partnerships. This is closely related to the occurrence of the monitoring exercise [see Issues B]. The second is that while there are good practice examples of how the monitoring exercise has been institutionalised,<sup>14</sup> country contexts vary significantly. Some countries have in place a robust development co-operation architecture, with a strong development co-operation policy and a regular and inclusive mechanism for

---

<sup>13</sup> Creating additional products such as development partner profiles would have resource implications.

<sup>14</sup> See for example the Cambodia case study in the [paper](#) on strengthening linkages to the 2030 Agenda [Issues B].

mutual accountability through inclusive, multi-stakeholder dialogue. However, institutional capacity, competing priorities, and underlying challenges related to fragility, among other reasons, can result in weak architecture. Thus, while good practice examples can encourage greater institutionalisation, a flexible approach will be needed to account for the differences in country context.

### **Addressing gaps in development partners' engagement in, and support to, the process**

During the consultations, stakeholders discussed how various aspects of the monitoring exercise affect development partners' engagement in the monitoring exercise. More specifically, the need for high-level engagement and co-ordination between development partners' HQs and country offices was deemed vital to ensure buy-in, with development partners linking their engagement to their perception of the relevance of what the monitoring measures. Some stakeholders suggested that more tailored support is needed (in the form of guides, early stage trainings by HQs) so that country offices fully understand what data is needed, but also understand the rationale for the exercise at a more strategic and policy level. Finding the balance to ensure that the monitoring exercise remains country-led, while also weighing the appropriate role for development partners' HQ in data review is a challenge, and the perception of a lack of genuine ownership of the process by partner countries dis-incentivises development partners to engage. A possible solution to support and simplify data processing would be to build on development partners' efforts to digitalise project information in order to streamline development partners' role in data provision and review. Lightly adapting the indicators to different country contexts could also help increase the relevance of the exercise for development partners, therein increasing their interest including at the political level. An additional challenge is the frequent rotation of [development partner] staff, often in fragile contexts, adding an element of complexity to the exercise. Stakeholders highlighted the need to involve development partner country offices early on, which in turn hinges on partner countries committing to participate as early as possible.

### **A customised support structure for partner countries**

Building on development partners' engagement and support to the process, stakeholders recognised the importance of a customised support structure for partner countries although also highlighted how this is a very intricate issue to address. Suggestions in the form of specific development partner focal points and more institutionalised use of donor co-ordination mechanisms to work alongside the partner countries to respond to needs and provide support throughout the exercise were mentioned as possible solutions. Finally, streamlining and simplifying the monitoring exercise, and embedding it into national processes, could reduce the need for support, at least incrementally from one exercise to the next.

### **Strengthening the whole-of-society approach**

Stakeholders raised the following elements for consideration within the context of how the monitoring process can strengthen the whole-of-society approach: institutionalisation of the monitoring process at the country level with clear entry points for the participation of non-executive actors; capacity building and systematic involvement of identified focal points in all phases of the process at the country level; and strengthened engagement of non-executive stakeholders in the follow-up phase concerning use of results to promote behaviour change. Embedding the monitoring in national dialogue mechanisms and development co-operation architecture was recognised as positive, but stakeholders also pointed to the fact that not all existing mechanisms are truly multi-stakeholder. Overall, National Co-ordinators do face challenges in engaging with diverse country-level actors, calling for the need to appropriately invest in the preparedness of the latter to participate in the exercise; global constituency-specific structures and networks also must play a role in this regard. For example, training activities among non-executive actors in previous monitoring rounds did succeed in facilitating better participation. Another aspect that can facilitate a whole-of-society approach is the simplification of the data collection process. However, such a simplification must also retain data comparability and be followed by an inclusive dialogue process to facilitate not just participation but also wider action on results. Stakeholders also pointed to the value of some level of multi-stakeholder dialogue being in-built to the data collection phase as an incentive for participation and, similarly, to the idea that the opportunity to report one's own data/perceptions also can increase interest in the exercise. Incentivising wider participation also requires giving interested actors clarity on how their involvement in the monitoring will tangibly affect behaviour change and enable the delivery of action plans at the country level. Facilitating wider engagement in the follow-up should be considered together with the time allocated for this phase, vis-à-vis the overall occurrence of the exercise [see Issues B].

Elements of the occurrence of the exercise, [see Issues B below], are also relevant to the engagement of stakeholders. Many stakeholders pointed to the benefit of synchronising the timing of the exercise with partner country government processes; this implies the need for more flexibility for partner countries to decide when and how often to undertake the monitoring. Such synchronisation could help with adapting the exercise to country-specific needs, raising the chances for meaningful use of the results for dialogue and action. This would allow development actors to link the monitoring exercise with their normal reporting schedules, encourage broader interest in the monitoring exercise and more buy-in at the political level. While some stakeholders have argued that biennial frequency does not give adequate time to conduct the monitoring exercise, to ensure meaningful use of results, or to see changes in performance and trends, others have raised concerns that extending the frequency would lead to lost momentum both at country and global levels while also producing less comparable results. Furthermore, some stakeholders maintained that, more than the frequency, other aspects of the exercise (i.e. customised support and engagement issues) are more fundamental to its success.

## Issues B

The complexity of this second set of issues formed the rationale for the Co-Chairs' proposal to advance on them through **analytical papers prepared by the Joint Support Team. Brief abstracts are presented as follows. Committee members are encouraged to read the full papers**, to inform thinking going forward.

- **Making the process more flexible, including looking at the feasibility and implications of altering the timing of the exercise.** Many Global Partnership stakeholders [have voiced](#) that previous monitoring exercises have been time-constrained, too frequent and embedded in a rigid timeframe. These aspects of the **occurrence** of the exercise have reduced buy-in and engagement; limited the time available to take action on the results; and hindered the ability of countries to integrate the exercise within their existing processes and systems. Under the guidance of the Co-Chairs, the analysis by the Joint Support Team [\[full paper\]](#) examines the occurrence of the monitoring exercise, looking specifically at its *timing* (when it takes place), *frequency* (how often it takes place) and *duration* (how long it lasts). The analytical framework focuses on a set of criteria for weighing the benefits and trade-offs of various options for a revised occurrence of the monitoring exercise. That is, each option to adapt the duration, frequency and timing of the monitoring exercise, looks at how the following could be impacted: institutionalisation of the process at country level; increased use of results; enhanced whole-of-society participation; improved engagement by development partners; support to mutual learning and enhanced accountability for all actors; and any implications for the Global Partnership's custodianship of three SDG indicators<sup>15</sup>.
- **Strengthening linkages to the 2030 Agenda.** Global Partnership stakeholders and the Steering Committee alike have [called for](#) stronger linkages between Global Partnership monitoring and the 2030 Agenda. These links include better integration of Global Partnership monitoring with country-level SDG architecture and reporting processes, while also continuing to produce (and potentially increase) evidence for global monitoring of, and policy dialogue on, progress toward the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs. As agreed at the 20<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee Meeting in December 2020, the Joint Support Team, under the guidance of the Co-Chairs, has explored these linkages to the SDGs and set out key considerations in a technical paper [\[full paper\]](#). The paper addresses three key links: the Global Partnership monitoring framework and the SDG indicator framework; global-level processes pertaining to the Global Partnership monitoring exercise and SDG follow-up and review; and, country-level processes. In addition to existing links, a revised monitoring offers new opportunities to further strengthen linkages to the 2030 Agenda, whether through picking up on the element of leaving no-one behind or greater institutionalisation of the monitoring process in a way that allows countries to better link the monitoring exercise to national SDG follow-up and review. While the monitoring reform is still evolving, as this moves forward, the paper provides guidance on how to retain and strengthen current linkages to the 2030 Agenda while also pointing to forward-looking opportunities for new linkages.

---

<sup>15</sup> SDG indicators 5.c.1, 17.15.1 and 17.16.1

## 5. Next Steps and Way Forward

Following discussion at the Steering Committee Meeting in July 2021 on the overall progress of the monitoring reform and a decision on the contours of the monitoring framework, it is expected that technical work will kick off in the second half of the year. With the aim to have a new monitoring proposal ready for endorsement at the High-Level Meeting in 2022, technical work to unpack the contours will need to commence in earnest following guidance from the Steering Committee on the contours. To carry out the technical work, the Joint Support Team, drawing on its expertise and past experience with indicator and methodological development, will conduct an initial assessment of scope, feasibility and implications for each contour, as well as map out the types of inputs and expertise that will be needed for each to be further developed. It is anticipated that these inputs and expertise will draw on external experts including from academia/research community, as well as from relevant Action Area groups.

Following this initial assessment, and as the Joint Support Team pushes ahead with the necessary technical, the Committee will be regularly updated and have the opportunity to engage through the Knowledge Sharing Platform (KSP) as the work evolves. First, it is envisaged that a table outlining how the technical work will move forward (based on the initial assessment) will be available on the KSP by mid-September. This will be a live document and Steering Committee members will be able to comment and provide suggestions directly in the document. Second, as draft technical working papers become available, these will also be posted on the KSP for the Steering Committee's oversight and feedback. Based on demand, informal feedback and discussion sessions could also be held with Steering Committee members and external stakeholders to receive input as the technical work progresses.

The technical work will culminate in an indicative new monitoring proposal to be presented at the next Steering Committee Meeting (22<sup>nd</sup>) at the end of 2021. Given the varying starting points for the different contours, some parts of the framework may be fully fleshed out with draft methodologies while others may be at initial stages of assessing feasibility. This indicative new monitoring proposal will also bring clear decision points on the monitoring process, which will build on the tensions and trade-offs that have been presented in this document.

### Questions for Discussion

- *Do you have further inputs or views to share on the emerging insights and potential solutions highlighted in relation to the monitoring process (Issues A and B)?*
- *Do you agree with the next steps of the reform and the roadmap to HLM3? Do you find that the proposed next steps strike a good balance of utilising internal [JST, AAs] and external technical expertise, with transparency of the process and strategic steering by the Committee?*

# Monitoring Reform: Roadmap to HLM3 (with focus on 2021)

