

What do stakeholders think about the draft monitoring proposal?

Consolidated feedback from the GPEDC open virtual consultation

25 Oct - 12 Nov 2021

In its [21st meeting](#), the Steering Committee requested the Co-Chairs to accelerate the pace of the reform, by developing a proposal for a new monitoring framework and a revised monitoring process, to be consulted in advance of the next Steering Committee meeting. The proposal by the Co-Chairs, developed with the support of the Joint Support Team (JST), was based on guidance from the Steering Committee and inputs gathered through earlier stakeholder consultations¹.

The [draft monitoring proposal](#), covering both the monitoring process and framework, was the basis for a [virtual consultation](#) which took place between 25 October and 12 November 2021 on the GPEDC Knowledge Sharing Platform (KSP). The objective of the consultation was to collect feedback and test the ideas put forward in the proposal. The proposal was presented for consultation in the form of two documents: a main document with key elements of the proposed changes, and a document with a set of annexes containing a detailed overview of the suggested technical changes. Both documents were made available in English, French and Spanish, and stakeholders could contribute to the virtual consultation in any of these languages. Most stakeholders posted their contributions directly in the KSP. Some stakeholders shared contributions via email and these were posted on the KSP, on their behalf, by the JST. Throughout the duration of the consultation, the JST responded to stakeholders' feedback and requests for clarification in the KSP discussion space.

The consultation questions were:

1) *What are your views on the proposed changes to the monitoring process?*

- *Do you agree with the proposed approach on the occurrence of the monitoring exercise? If not, what concerns do you have and how could these be mitigated?*

2) *What are your views on the proposed draft monitoring framework?*

- *Do you agree with the four "focus areas" and that these areas will help attract political and strategic-level attention to the Global Partnership monitoring evidence?*
- *To what extent do you think the draft framework and evidence to be generated will incentivise participation in the monitoring exercise?*

3) *If your expectation is for a simpler framework, which main measurement areas would you propose to drop?*

¹ Since the beginning of the monitoring reform, there have been extensive stakeholder consultations. A virtual survey in 2020 about the trade-offs related to making changes to the monitoring exercise resulted in 137 responses including 62 from partner countries (summary [here](#)). Later in 2020, there was a series of 9 consultations on the monitoring process (75 participants; summary [here](#)). The first half of 2021 saw a series of 19 consultations (169 participants; summary [here](#)). All of these consultations were inclusive of stakeholder and constituency groups.

The present document is a consolidated summary of the feedback provided during the [consultation](#). Contributions regarding the process (question 1) are presented first, followed by contributions about the framework (question 2). Both are organised by topic. Only one concrete suggestion of a measurement area to be dropped (question 3) was provided². For the original contributions or for further detail, please refer to the [consultation page](#), which also includes clarifications and responses to questions and requests for clarification raised by stakeholders. Some questions are also addressed in the [monitoring background document](#) for the 22nd Steering Committee meeting, which elaborates on the final phase of the monitoring reform as well.

As part of the consultation, the monitoring proposal was downloaded more than **600 times** (all three languages combined). **40 contributions** were received from **37 stakeholders**, including the following countries and organisations:

- **14 Partner Country governments (PC), including those with a dual [provider-recipient] role:** Cambodia; Cameroon; Colombia; Côte d'Ivoire; Egypt; Guatemala; Haiti; Honduras; Malawi; Mexico; Peru; Philippines; Rwanda; Senegal
- **9 Development Partners (DP):** Austria; Canada; European Commission (EC); Finland; Germany; Japan; Portugal; Sweden; UNDP (DRC Country Office and Istanbul Regional Hub)
- **14 Non-executive stakeholders and others (NE):** ADET TOGO; Africa Youth Technical Group; AidWatch Canada; Centre for Global Development (CGD); CIPE; CPDE; IPU; ITUC; Oru-Fogar; Open Data Watch; PARIS21; WINGS; Academia; OECD development co-operation teams specialised in results and CSOs

Summary of feedback about the monitoring process

1. Occurrence:

The proposal to move to open waves received broad support from partner countries, development partners and non-executive stakeholders (8 PCs, 6 DPs, 2 NEs).

- **Support expressed:**
 - Increased flexibility will improve country **institutionalisation and synchronicity** with national/sectoral strategies and other international exercises (6 PCs, 3 DPs, 1 NE).
 - The proposed occurrence could facilitate **engagement of new participants and alleviate reporting burden** (1 PC).
 - Open waves could incentivise countries to **participate in more than one wave** (1 PC).
 - A 3-years monitoring round would provide **several opportunities** to measure effectiveness in the context of the 2030 Agenda and “decade of action” (1 PC).
 - The stronger focus on country ownership should help to **increase data relevance** (1 DP).
 - The emphasis on institutionalisation is an opportunity to help **strengthen countries' capacity** to manage and monitor their development co-operation relationships (1 DP).
 - The proposed approach could facilitate **peer learning** across waves (between country A that has already participated, and country B which is about to partake) (1 DP).
 - The open waves approach could facilitate **thorough data collection and validation** including through better support to participating partner countries (1 DP).

² One country suggested dropping the measurement of parliamentary oversight of development co-operation, since their parliament does not have a decision-making role in international co-operation.

- **Perceived risks:**

- Keeping **the momentum and mobilising partners** through a stretched process is more difficult, especially for smaller development partners, which may result in diminished engagement (2 PCs, 2 DPs, 3 NEs).
- The rolling process raises **resourcing implications** as it will require permanent capacity to support country monitoring and engage stakeholders (2 DPs, 2 NEs).
- The sample of countries per wave may be too small or too large, resulting in **different levels of support to participating countries** (1 PC).
- If this approach leads to a fall in coverage and response rates, the monitoring **results may lack reliability and be insufficiently representative** for development co-operation providers to be challenged (1 NE).
- The proposed occurrence might **reduce institutionalisation**, as more regular rounds would help to better link the monitoring to country processes (1 NE).

☞ Part V of the [background document](#) to the 22nd Steering Committee meeting provides clarifications on the occurrence of the revised monitoring exercise, as well as the risks associated with changing the occurrence of the monitoring exercise to an 'open waves' approach. Detailed information on the occurrence of the monitoring exercise are found in the [full analytical paper](#) shared ahead of the 21st Steering Committee meeting.

- **Suggestions provided:**

- Encourage participation of countries from the same region in the same wave to enhance **peer-learning** (1 PC, 1 DP). **Groupings by region** or country context might allow for more focused partner support with monitoring and reporting results (1 NE).
- Encourage **early enrolment** of participants ahead of the next monitoring round (1 NE).

- **Clarifications requested:**

- How the monitoring exercise will ensure **comparability** over time and between countries (2 PCs, 2 DPs, 1 NE).
- How results will be **aggregated and compared** considering different reporting periods (1 PC).
- How **SDG reporting** can continue considering the need to aggregate data across waves (1 NE).

☞ As noted above, Part V of the [background document](#) to the 22nd Steering Committee meeting provides clarifications on these points.

2. Action Dialogues

- **Support expressed:**

- Action Dialogues can help to **strengthen and systematise the use of monitoring results** at country-level, **improve buy-in** by country-level stakeholders and bring about **behavioural change** (5 PCs, 4 DPs, 2 NEs).
- They provide a **formal, dedicated and high-level platform** to focus on country-level implementation of the effectiveness principles (2 PCs).
- They feed into, and **complement, existing nation-wide or sector-wide** coordination and consultation mechanisms to discuss and disseminate monitoring results (2 PCs).

- **Perceived risks:**

- Action Dialogues risk becoming **an information-sharing exercise on the monitoring results** rather than a **space for dialogue and decision-making** (2 NEs).

- **Suggestions provided:**
 - Ensure that **adequate timing** is dedicated to the **analysis of monitoring results** prior to the Action Dialogues (1 PC, 1 NE).
 - **Scale up Action Dialogues to region-wide dialogues** on monitoring results and encourage sharing of good practices (1 PC).
 - Support Action Dialogues with **a how-to guide** (1 PC).
 - Action Dialogues could also be held within existing parliamentary proceedings such as multi-stakeholder hearings within budget or development committees. This would help building on existing national capacities and empowering the parliament at once (1 NE).
- **Clarifications requested:**
 - How to ensure that the **scope and format** will comprehensively address the outcomes of the monitoring results in each partner country (2 NEs).

3. Monitoring results: Country Results Briefs, Development Partner Profiles and Exit Survey

- **Support expressed:**
 - Country Results Briefs are **essential** as a resource for effective country engagement and use of monitoring results (1 PC, 1 DP, 1 NE).
 - Development Partner Profiles are useful and essential for an **independent review** of the performance of development partners (2 NEs).
 - Post-monitoring exit surveys are welcome (1 PC).
- **Suggestions provided:**
 - Country Results Briefs should **include potential actions and recommendations** in the areas to be strengthened (1 PC, 1 DP).
 - Need to ensure that stakeholders have **early and full access to raw monitoring data** to facilitate their own reporting (1 NE).
 - The exit survey could be **done during the Action Dialogues** (1 NE).
- **Clarifications requested:**
 - Identify clearly **who evaluates who** in the post-monitoring exit surveys (1 PC).
 - How resources will be made available to produce **Country Results Briefs** (1 NE).

☞ Resources are discussed in Part II of the [background document to the 22nd Steering Committee meeting](#).

4. Data collection/validation and related support

- **Support expressed:**
 - Offering **technical support** at country level is welcome (2 PCs, 1 DP, 1 NE).
 - Nominating stakeholder “champions” to support the monitoring exercise is essential to **promote a more inclusive process** (1 DP, 1 NE) and **enhance enrolment of new participants** in the monitoring exercise (1 PC).
 - **Country-level workshops** to launch monitoring rounds and/or validate monitoring results have proven to be effective in reinforcing partnerships and increasing knowledge and motivation to participate in the monitoring exercise (1 PC).
- **Perceived risks:**
 - **The data collection tool remains cumbersome** (2 PCs).
 - Nominating stakeholder champions could hamper **partner countries’ ownership** of the monitoring exercise (e.g. in fragile contexts and conflict-affected states - FCAS) (2 DPs).

- **Suggestions provided:**
 - **Data collection should be simplified and its format clarified**, particularly with regard to the types of data required (e.g. country-sourced statistics versus global data) (1 PC) and overall through improved communication around the monitoring exercise (1 DP).
 - Consider **digitalising data collection and validation** to improve the process (1 DP), for example through an online platform (1 PC).
 - Specific support should be offered to **first-time participants** (1 PC) and to mobilise **specific constituencies** (e.g. CSOs, private sector) (1 PC).
 - Ensure the validity and independence of the data collection process by **recruiting national consultants** to support partner country governments (1 PC) or by **relying on the JST** (1 DP).
- **Clarifications requested:**
 - How resources will be made available for the timely mobilisation of “champions” among non-executive stakeholders (1 NE).

☞ Resources are discussed in Part II of the [background document to the 22nd Steering Committee meeting](#).

Summary of feedback about the monitoring framework

1. Focus areas and general feedback on the framework:

- **Support expressed:**
 - All proposed **focus areas are important** to effectiveness commitments (3 PCs, 3 DPs, 3 NE).
 - New **focus areas are relevant** to take into account challenges linked to SDGs and COVID-19 (2 PCs, 1 NE).
 - This choice of focus areas could help **make GPEDC products more visible** (1 NE).
 - It is a good initiative to **retain most indicators** in the revised framework (1PC, 2 NE).
 - The inclusion of more **qualitative elements** in the monitoring framework is excellent and will provide important information for the Action Dialogues (3 PCs, 1 DP).
 - The framework is more **responsive to different country contexts**, in particular fragile ones (1 PC, 1 DP).
 - The proposal recognises **the efforts of bilateral donors to support the effectiveness of the multilateral system**, which is relevant for bilateral partners that increasingly channel resources through multilateral partners (1 DP, 1 NE).
- **Perceived risks:**
 - There is little clarity about the role of the focus areas in the revised framework (1 NE); the focus areas relate to how data can be grouped in the analysis and in the report, but do not affect the framework itself; the original four **effectiveness principles should be the basic structure of any global report** (1 NE).
- **Suggestions provided:**
 - The framework could recognise the value for development effectiveness of **support provided to CSOs** (1 DP) or delivered **through multilateral organisations** (2 DPs, 1 NE).
 - **Need to avoid duplication** of efforts between the GPEDC forum and the DAC and build on each fora’s strength and value added. For example, the DAC already tackles effective multilateral donorship (1 DP).

- Provide a **detailed monitoring guide** (both on process and framework) for each stakeholder so they are engaged and know what they are going to get from it once it is concluded (1 PC).
- Do not limit monitoring to commitments but also **bring in other data and information** relevant to improving development effectiveness (1 DP).
- **Reduce complexity** wherever possible (1 DP); reduce “overload of data requests” and use globally-sourced data wherever possible (1 DP).
- Recognise in the framework the other implementation **modalities beyond government-to-government** (1 DP).
- **Technical co-operation should also be a provider modality** included as disbursements to the public sector and used for several indicators (1 DP).
- For those aspects of the focus areas that are unique to development partners, data could be collected directly from headquarters of development partners, through a separate indicator framework for example (1 NE).
- Consider an indicator to assess commitments to quality climate finance (1 PC, 1 NE).
- Consider a new indicator to capture the extent to which aid is used as a leverage or a catalyst to generate additional resources (taxes, private investments) or to stem losses (illicit flows, poor return on extractive industry contracts, etc.) (1 NE).

2. Collective accountability, Whole of Society approach and CSO indicator (indicator 2):

- **Support expressed:**
 - The **move from mutual accountability to collective accountability** and Whole of Society approach is welcome (2 DPs). The new contour of collective accountability responds to the broader range of co-operation actors and embraces the Whole of Society approach (1 DP, 1 NE).
 - Dialogue between partner country government and civil society is important and **the preservation of indicator 2** is appreciated (1 NE). It is good that new stakeholders are added to the reporting of indicator 2 (2 NEs).
 - The use of available **global data** sources will help strengthening global reporting (1 DPs, 1 NE).
 - The proposal to **reinforce parliamentary oversight** is welcome (1 DP).
- **Perceived risks:**
 - Collective accountability could give the impression that the focus on **partner country governments’ accountability is fading** (1 DP).
 - **Indicator 2 may not apply as well to trade unions and particularly to foundations;** a revised set of module questions should at least be created for foundations (1 NE).
 - **Parliamentary oversight is not a legal requirement in all countries** and creating a role for it could cause important delays in the development co-operation process (1 PC).
- **Suggestions provided:**
 - Explore simple, practical **adjustments to indicator 2 in light of the DAC CSO Recommendation** (1 DP, 2 NEs).
 - **Measures of CSO accountability** could include commitments on quality disaggregated data generation and transparency, on ensuring aid is inclusive and provided without discrimination (1 DP).
 - **Consult with philanthropies** to decide upon the exact reporting format that small, local foundations will use to report on their enabling environment (1 NE).
 - In line with a whole-of-society approach, **broaden the concept of ownership** beyond government as the owner and implementer of the development process. Clarify how

this will be reflected in indicators 2 and 7 (1 DP).

- While the framework includes the responsibility of partner countries to share information with parliaments, it should also include the **responsibility of development partners** to provide timely information to their partner country national counterparts (1 DP).
- Explore adjustment to indicator 6 to reinforce measures of parliamentary oversight by including a measure of the share of development co-operation provided through direct budget support (1 NE).
- Include information on public-private partnership contracts, extractive industry contracts and foreign loan agreements under the proposed addition to indicator 4b regarding government efforts to provide information to parliaments (1 NE).
- If parliaments are regularly invited to Action Dialogues and exit surveys, there is no need to ask partner country governments whether they shared previous GPEDC monitoring results with them (1 NE).

3. Private sector engagement (PSE) & Kampala Principles (KPs):

- **Support expressed:**
 - The **reflection of the Kampala Principles and the role of private sector in development co-operation** in the monitoring exercise is appreciated (3 PCs, 2 DPs, 1 NE).
 - The suggestions regarding a revised indicator 3 opens up new opportunities to review the role of the private sector **through the lens of the effectiveness principles** (1 NE).
 - Basing the private sector engagement indicator on the methodology used to measure the enabling environment for CSOs is a good approach that **can lead to a robust indicator** (1 NE).
- **Perceived risks:**
 - There may be **low uptake of the Kampala Principles** by stakeholders in the early stages of the next monitoring round (1 NE).
- **Suggestions provided:**
 - **Provide more detailed and operational options to monitor the Kampala Principles** (e.g. inclusion of PSE in policies, strategies and results frameworks; contribution of the private sector to development results; effective partnering of the private sector) (1 NE).
 - Provide **additional guidance** on the selection of stakeholders for the Kampala Principles assessment (1 NE).
 - Include a **measure of the respect for labour rights** by the private sector in the assessment module of the indicator (1 NE) as well as a measure of whether public-private partnership contracts are submitted to national parliaments for review (1 NE).
 - **Clarify links** between the monitoring framework and the measurement of the Kampala Principles (1 DP).
 - **Better articulate the Kampala Principles to the OECD Private finance for sustainable development** (PF4SD) initiative and its *Impact standards for financing sustainable development*, that look at how investors can enhance their contribution to the SDGs, promote impact integrity and avoid “SDG washing” (1 PC).
 - Go beyond an indicator and refocus the monitoring efforts on **capturing the impact of the private sector’s behaviour on the realisation of effective development co-operation**, the Leaving No One Behind pledge and, ultimately, of the SDGs (1 NE).

4. Leaving no one behind (LNOB):

- **Support expressed:**
 - The proposal to **capture LNOB more explicitly is relevant** (3 PCs, 4 DPs). Measuring it could be a pioneering exercise which raises the political profile of the monitoring, enhance new participation and engage more stakeholders (1 PC, 1 DP, 1 NE).
 - With one exception (1 DP), participants agree that LNOB should **not feature as a standalone indicator**/separate set of indicators (1 PC, 1 DP, 1 NE).
 - The framework already captures some **commitments on gender** and could strive to **reinforce those** (2 NEs).

- **Suggestions provided:**
 - It is important to use **national statistics that are disaggregated**, rather than relying mostly on aggregate data which hide many disparities (1 PC).
 - **More elaboration is needed on how LNOB will be measured.** The system should adequately recognise and reward explicit policy commitments, targeting and results for LNOB (1 DP).
 - If LNOB is to be given prominence, need to **think about how it interplays with other important topics** like PSE, FCAS, and South-South Co-operation (1 DP).
 - The monitoring framework should **recognise the catalytic effects of Official Development Assistance (ODA)**, in particular of resources directed towards the commitment on LNOB (1 DP).
 - The focus on LNOB is mainly a few data points suggested for several of the existing indicators, which could be highlighted clearly under each principle, with an overarching message on this aspect, **without requiring to move away from the development effectiveness principles** framework to a specific focus area (1 NE).
 - Consider **adding some questions to indicator 2** (module 4) to allow for some of those considered “left behind” to offer their own reflections on the quality of country engagements (1 NE).
 - Under LNOB, **development partners should be monitored for their aid allocations to countries** (too often still based on geopolitical considerations, not on relative actual needs) (1 NE).
 - While the current monitoring framework already generates data that could be relevant to the Nairobi Outcome Document commitment on youth and children, additional work is required to **streamline the indicators** (1a, 1b, 2, 7, 8) and further development is needed on the segments on youth employment and empowerment; as well as ODA targeted at children (1 NE).
 - Consider adding a data point on the percentage of women in national parliaments under indicator 8 (1 NE).

5. Transparency:

- **Support expressed:**
 - **Transparency remains important** in the context of effective development co-operation and as such should remain in the monitoring framework (1 PC).

- **Suggestions provided:**
 - Reformulate the information collected on AIMS to **focus on government making the information publicly available** rather than focusing on having a system (1 PC).
 - Capture data on whether partner country governments make publically available supreme auditors’ reports (or equivalent) (indicator 1b) (1 NE).

- Suggest to further specify whether **AIMS in partner countries are compatible** with the IATI standard (1 DP).
- Propose **changes to the OECD/FSS methodology** to improve predictability and better align with the Busan commitments (1 DP).

6. Country results frameworks (CRF):

- **Perceived risks:**
 - National coordinators may **not have enough expertise and knowledge to inform** which among the 17 SDGs are included in their National Development Strategies/CRF at goal, target and indicator level (1 NE).
 - **Important elements may be lost with the removal of the fourth 1a sub-indicator.** An alternative could be to ask development partners for the number of evaluations carried out in the reporting year (as a total), and how many are carried out together with country level actors and/or shared with the government, other development partners and/or country level stakeholders (1 NE).
- **Suggestions provided:**
 - When removing complementary questions that do not produce relevant evidence, **retain the question that asks how the 2030 Agenda and SDGs are referenced in the development strategies or plans** (at strategic, goal, target or indicator level) (1 NE).

7. Quality and Use of country systems (UCS):

- **Support expressed:**
 - It is good to **continue promoting the strengthening of partner country systems** (1 DP).
 - The proposed **emphasis on data and statistics is welcome** as they are essential to all four effectiveness principles and constitute an important part of country systems (1 DP, 1 NE).
- **Perceived risks:**
 - UCS has been **limited to the quantification of use of public financial management systems**, which does not capture different realities and contexts (1 DP).
- **Suggestions provided:**
 - More clearly **define the assessment criteria for "quality"** of national systems, as it is considered too ambiguous currently (2 PCs).
 - **Measure beyond public financial management systems** and "accept" use of other country systems for planning, auditing, program planning (2 DPs); include budget support (1 DP).
 - Capture **development partners' support towards enhanced national systems** (e.g. support to coordination/information management systems) rather than only the use of country systems (1 DP).

8. Untied aid:

- **Support expressed:**
 - The review of the framework offers an opportunity to **capture the increasing role of**

the private sector in development effectiveness and expand its reach on untying ODA with a view to capturing more data on both formal and informal tying. This enhanced indicator should draw both from DAC members' data on contract awards and from the experience of governments in the global south (1 NE).

- **Suggestions provided:**

- The monitoring framework could capture the extent to which information on the largest procurement bids and contracts are publically available at country level and shared with national parliaments (1 NE).

9. South-South Co-operation (SSC):

- **Suggestions provided:**

- Develop **specific SSC indicators** and ensure that middle-income countries and those with a dual role **are adequately reflected in the revised framework** (2 PCs).