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1. Background information

Over the course of two years of inclusive consultations which were part of the reform of the monitoring exercise, stakeholders of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (GPEDC) have - among other inputs - emphasised that Leaving No One Behind (LNOB) should feature more prominently in its monitoring framework. At the same time, GPEDC stakeholders recognised the technical challenges of formulating meaningful measurements of the broad concept of LNOB within the framework. They called for caution in adding complexity to the framework and avoiding duplication of existing measurements. Along these lines, the Steering Committee (SC) of the GPEDC, agreed that tracking LNOB within the GPEDC framework should be linked to effectiveness principles/commitments, limited to where GPEDC has comparative advantage and assessed across a range of existing measurements.

Within these parameters of scope and relevance agreed by the SC, this background note outlines the proposed approach to increase the focus on LNOB across the monitoring framework. It is based on relevant effectiveness commitments, consultation with GPEDC stakeholders and experts, literature review, and existing measurements.

2. Framing the LNOB focus in the GPEDC monitoring

In the Nairobi Outcome Document (NOD) of the 2nd High-Level Meeting of the GPEDC (Nairobi, 2016), partners reaffirmed the 2030 Agenda’s pledge to leave no one behind and recognised that “development co-operation must leave no-one behind to be effective”. Partners also identified LNOB as their “greatest challenge” and committed to “energise the implementation of all previous commitments with a pledge to leave no one behind”. The NOD also emphasised that more and better data is required to generate knowledge about who is being left behind. Furthermore, it emphasised the role of the private sector in contributing to LNOB. In Nairobi, partners also recognised the need to continue to support gender equality and women’s empowerment, as critical to effective development co-operation, as well as the importance of focusing on children and youth to achieving inclusive, equitable and sustainable development for present and future generations.

Given the vastness of the topic and the various facets of LNOB, the approach adopted in the reform of the GPEDC monitoring framework is to focus – at country level - on several LNOB aspects relevant for the effectiveness agenda. Four components of focus underpin the LNOB dimension under the revised GPEDC framework:

1) Consultation. Under this component the monitoring will provide evidence on whether partner countries and development partners engage a diversity of stakeholders, including representatives of vulnerable and marginalised groups, in the preparation of their national development strategies and country-level strategies respectively; and whether partner countries include representatives of vulnerable and marginalised groups in dialogue on development priorities and results and in joint assessments towards targets for development co-operation.

2) Targets and results. Under this component the monitoring will provide evidence on whether partner countries’ national development strategies and development partners’ country-level strategies include development priorities for women and girls, youth and children – as emphasised in the NOD - and vulnerable and marginalised groups of the population. Evidence will also be generated on whether national development strategies include disaggregated targets and results indicators and development partners use distributional analysis to define targets and results indicators.

---

1 In the Nairobi Outcome Document (NOD), partners reaffirm the 2030 Agenda's pledge to LNOB and recognise that "development co-operation must leave no-one behind to be effective". Partners also indicated LNOB as their "greatest challenge" and committed to "energise the implementation of all previous commitments with a pledge to leave no one behind". Furthermore, in Nairobi, it was emphasised that more and better data is required to generate knowledge about who is being left behind.

2 The rationale for this is that engaging a diversity of actors can help bring in the perspectives of the vulnerable and marginalised to ensure that their interests and needs are represented in development policies and strategies.
3) **Data and statistics.** Under this component the monitoring will provide evidence on whether data-based assessments inform national development plans and development partners country-level strategies as well as whether disaggregated data and statistics are available – from the national statistical systems or other sources - to monitor progress on targets and results indicators for those vulnerable and marginalised.

4) **Targeted focus of private sector engagement.** Under this component the monitoring will provide evidence on whether national development co-operation strategies articulate how private sector should be engaged in development co-operation to specifically target vulnerable and marginalised groups. Evidence will also be generated on whether PSE projects are designed to explicitly target groups of the population who are at risk of being left behind.

While it is appreciated that one way to look at LNOB is to reflect how the distribution of development co-operation from providers is taking place across countries and whether providers are targeting those countries most in need, the GPEDC monitoring focuses on measuring elements relevant to LNOB at country level, in line with the nature of its overall exercise, which looks at the “how” rather than “how much” funding is provided.

Section 3 of this document illustrates in more detail the proposed approach and the specific questions that will be asked to partner countries and development partners to generate evidence on LNOB. It is organised by elements of the framework that will “host” the LNOB-specific questions. To further understand how the proposed approach to increase the focus on LNOB is situated within the broader monitoring framework, Annex II of the document “Annexes to the Revised Proposal: New Global Partnership Monitoring Framework” can be read in conjunction to this document. To this end, the number in parenthesis “(..)” which follows each question in this document refers to the numbering of the questions as indicated under the corresponding element of the questionnaire in Annex II.

### 3. Proposed approach to increase the focus on LNOB within the monitoring framework

#### 3.1. LNOB within partner countries’ development strategies and results frameworks

*(Annex II, page 6)*

The GPEDC measures whether a partner country receiving development co-operation has a national development strategy (NDS) in place and whether it includes results framework(s), which define and tracks the country’s development objectives, targets, and results. [see “National development strategies and results frameworks” of Annex II of the document “Annexes to the Revised Proposal: New Global Partnership Monitoring Framework”].

To capture engagement and consultation of various stakeholders into key development policies and strategies - for a whole-of-society approach to development that can help maximise the potential for leaving no one behind - it is proposed to ask the following:

Which of the following stakeholders have participated in developing the national development strategy/plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>No participation</th>
<th>Consulted</th>
<th>Enacted the plan with a vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parliament</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic civil society organisations*</td>
<td>No participation</td>
<td>Consulted</td>
<td>Participatory process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CSOs representing women and girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 It is also important to note that, focusing on allocations to countries runs the risk of not representing the complexity of LNOB, which persists even within countries. (e.g., within MICs or UMICS, inequalities can be very high and an important part of the population left behind; fragile contexts/SIDS may or may not be those with lower income, but still some groups of the population in these countries may have significant need for support).
- CSOs representing youth and children
- CSOs representing vulnerable groups [add all those that apply]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No participation</th>
<th>Consulted</th>
<th>Participatory process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade Unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic foundations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subnational governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other[^4] [specify]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^4] The reporting tool would allow indicating the different levels that apply.

*Note: while the list could include all possible population groups, those explicitly mentioned have been limited to women, youth and children as sub-categories, represented by CSOs, while other groups can be added as relevant. This is because of the explicit focus on gender equality and women’s empowerment in the 2030 Agenda (through the dedicated SDG 5) as well as strong demand and expectations from GPEDC stakeholders for increased reflection of youth and children across the monitoring framework. Furthermore, challenges faced by women and girls, youth and children, are also explicitly referred to in the NOD.

Does the government use the national strategy/plan (or its progress reports) to inform dialogue with stakeholders groups and/or representatives of vulnerable groups of the population on development priorities and results?  [Yes, No]

If yes, please indicate the stakeholder:
- Dialogue with development partners
- Dialogue with parliaments
- Dialogue with CSOs representing women
- Dialogue with CSOs representing youth and children
- Dialogue with CSOs representing vulnerable groups of the population [add all those relevant]
- Dialogue with Trade unions
- Yes, for dialogue with Private sector
- Yes, for dialogue with Foundations

Setting disaggregated targets and indicators is important to achieve specific results for the most vulnerable and marginalised. Availability of disaggregated data is crucial to monitor progress towards the defined targets and indicators. The national statistical system plays a key role in providing data needed to track progress. To capture these elements it is suggested to ask the following question/s:

The following question is about the development priorities potentially contained in the national development strategy. For this questionnaire, development priority refers to a specific policy area, action, or objective (or similar heading) within the national development strategy/plan. Examples: Uganda’s National Development Plan II prioritized Gender Based Violence as an area for intervention and emphasized ending all forms of discrimination against all women and girls everywhere; Indonesia’s Medium-Term National Development Plan 2020-2024 seeks to actively reduce rural poverty; South Africa’s National Development Plan 2030 includes a specific component for “Persons with Disabilities as Equal Citizens”; or Colombia’s National Development Plan 2018-2022 comprises a cross-cutting area to support ethnic groups.

[If the strategy defines development priorities] Does this strategy define specific development priorities for…?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The poorest</th>
<th>Yes/No/Not applicable to the country</th>
<th>[to be responded for each]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Women and girls  
Youth and children  
Elderly  
People with disabilities  
People in disadvantaged geographical areas  
Indigenous people  
Ethnic minorities  
Internally displaced people  
Stateless people, asylum-seekers and refugees  
Other:  
Sexual and gender identity (LGBTIQ+)  
Population vulnerable to climate change  
Other (to be added by the country as relevant)

Note: while there is recognition that vulnerabilities and inequalities can also occur across individuals and within groups, a group approach to LNOB was deemed necessary to generate evidence that can be associated with specific stakeholder groups.

The following question is intended to provide a proxy of how a development strategy addresses multiple vulnerabilities.

Girls and women represent half of the world population and are often exposed to a combination of risk factors that may result in overlapping vulnerabilities. Does this development strategy explicitly include specific development priorities for the poorest or the most vulnerable women in your country? [Yes, No]  

If yes, please specify for which of the following categories of women in your country:

- Youth (between the ages of 15 and 24).
- Old population (age 65 or older)
- People with disability
- Indigenous people
- Racial groups
- Other

If the national development strategy or government strategic plan defines targets and results indicators in the strategy:

- are targets and results indicators disaggregated?
- is disaggregated data available to monitor progress on those results indicators?

Please provide your answers in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disaggregation level</th>
<th>Are targets disaggregated by…?</th>
<th>Are results indicators disaggregated by…?</th>
<th>Are disaggregated data available to monitor progress on results indicators?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes/No/not applicable to the country</td>
<td>Yes/No/not applicable to the country</td>
<td>Yes, available for all indicators/Ye, available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disaggregation included in the table are drawn from those identified as the minimum disaggregation dimensions for the SDG global indicator framework, in accordance with the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics (General Assembly resolution 68/261).

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans(gender), Intersex persons, gender non-conforming, as well as other individuals whose sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression and/or sex characteristics do not conform to prevailing sociocultural norms. Taking from a UNHCR brochure https://www.unhcr.org/protection/operations/80db21c9254/tip-sheet-applying-unhcr-age-gender-diversity-policy-lgbtq-persons.html. It is worth it to note that while different gender identities are included in the list under question 6, the same is not reflected in questions 7 and 13. This is to recognise that collecting such data can be very dangerous for these individuals in some countries, and therefore should not be universally encouraged.
| Question: Are targets and/or results indicators for any of these groups available in other strategies? If, yes please provide further information to complement your answer above (e.g. name of strategy, link to document) |

| Question: If you have indicated that the national development strategy defines results indicators, to what extent does the national statistical system meet the data demands to track results indicators contained in the national development strategy or plan? |

- Data is available for most indicators (i.e. the majority or more than half of the indicators roughly).
- Data is available for some indicators only (i.e. around half of the indicators roughly).
- Data is available for very few indicators (i.e. less than half of the indicators roughly).

| Question: If you have indicated that the national development strategy defines results indicators, to what extent does the national statistical system meet the data demands to track results indicators contained in the national development strategy or plan? |

- Data is available for most indicators (i.e. the majority or more than half of the indicators roughly).
- Data is available for some indicators only (i.e. around half of the indicators roughly).
- Data is available for very few indicators (i.e. less than half of the indicators roughly).

| Question: Overall, is the data used to report on these indicators timely (i.e. the data is up-to-date and reported frequently)? |

- Yes
- No

| Question: Overall, is the data used to report on these indicators updated regularly (i.e. at determined intervals – weekly, monthly, yearly, etc.)? |

- Yes
- No

| Question: Overall, is the data used to report on these indicators accurate (i.e. it measures what intended to measure)? |

- Yes
- No

| Alternative question: The following question is work-in-progress and could be asked in lieu of the above question 8, to provide an indication of the extent to which the national statistical system meets the data demands to track specific results indicators contained in the national development strategy or plan. The Joint Support Team welcomes views on whether this question can be considered a good proxy to replace question 8 or whether it should complement it. |

- [Your response]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data category</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>[NSS availability]</th>
<th>[Timeliness - Frequency]</th>
<th>[Regularity]</th>
<th>[Timeliness – time-lag]</th>
<th>[Timeliness – time-lag]</th>
<th>[Accuracy]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example:</td>
<td>(3.1)Enrolment rate;</td>
<td>Please select the option that best describes the main type of source used for each indicator:</td>
<td>How often is this indicator updated?</td>
<td>Is this indicator regularly updated (i.e. at fixed intervals)?</td>
<td>Is the data used to report on this indicator up-to-date (i.e. the lag between the date of the update and the reporting period is less than 6 months)?</td>
<td>On a scale from 1 to 4 (where 1 is “I very much disagree” and 4 is “I very much agree”), to what extent does this time lag prevent the data from informing timely policy decisions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>(3.2)Completion or graduation rate;</td>
<td>1. Census and national survey data</td>
<td>1. Less than once a month.</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.3)Competency exam results.</td>
<td>2. Administrative data</td>
<td>2. More than once a month but less than every three months.</td>
<td>2. No</td>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Surveys data from international assessments (such as the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) or Demographic and Healthy Survey (DHS))</td>
<td>3. Every quarter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Survey data generated by civil society organizations</td>
<td>4. Every semester.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Data generated by the private sector</td>
<td>5. Every year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Other data sources</td>
<td>6. Every two years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. More than 2 years</td>
<td>7. More than 2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: [2]  

Example: [4]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3 [Select from the list provided]</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Randomly attributed]</td>
<td>4 [Select from the list provided]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Randomly attributed]</td>
<td>5 [Select from the list provided]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is important that development objectives, targets and indicators for the vulnerable and marginalised are identified through data-based assessments. To capture these elements it is suggested to ask the following question/s:

National governments often use statistical indicators to identify the most deprived population groups (in other words, the population that is at risk of being left behind). Although these measurements often refer to poverty indicators, they may also refer to broader notions of individual wellbeing such as multidimensional poverty index, marginalisation index, or index of vulnerability. In order to identify the population that is being left behind, does the country have such an official data-driven assessment? [Yes, No]

If yes, what is the main measure that is being used to identify the most deprived groups in the country:

- Poverty measurement (e.g. income, expenditure or multidimensional)
- Vulnerability measurement (e.g. to climate change)
- Marginalized measurement (e.g. access to public services)
- Subjective measures (e.g. happiness or life satisfaction indicators)
- Other type of achievements/deprivation information

Is this assessment publicly available? [Yes, No]

If yes, please include web link: [Type here]

When did this assessment last take place? [Specify the concluding year of the data collection YYYY (regardless of the year of publication)]

Is data from this assessment also available at subnational levels (i.e. States/Provinces or more disaggregated levels District/Municipality)? [Yes, No]

Please specify:
- States/Provinces
- District/Municipality
- Other

What are the data sources used in this assessment? [Please tick as appropriate]

- Census and national survey data
- Administrative data
- Surveys data from international assessments (such as the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) or Demographic and Healthy Survey (DHS))
- Survey data generated by civil society organizations
- Data generated by the private sector
- Other data sources [Specify]

Are the development priorities, targets and results indicators in this development strategy informed by this data-driven assessment? [Yes, No]

Please specify:
- Development priorities
- Targets
- Results indicators

(questions 12 to 17.1, pages 10-11)
3.2. LNOB within development partners’ country strategies

(Annex II, page 18)

For each partner country, providers of development co-operation report on the characteristics of their current country strategy/programme, or similar strategic document, which defines their strategic approach in the country. [see “Development partners’ country-level strategies” in Annex II of the document “Annexes to the Revised Proposal: New Global Partnership Monitoring Framework” for the full questionnaire].

To capture inclusion of various stakeholder groups into country strategies and programmes - it is proposed to ask the following question (similar to what is asked to partner countries):

Have any of the following country-level stakeholders [in the partner country] been engaged in the preparation of your country strategy/programme?

- Civil society organisations (CSOs) from the partner country
- CSOs representing women and girls
- CSOs representing youth and children
- CSOs representing vulnerable groups [add all those relevant]
- Trade Unions
- Private sector from the partner country
- Foundations from the partner country
- Subnational governments
- Other providers of development co-operation
- Other [to be specified]

{question 4, page 19}

Does your country strategy include development priorities for … ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes/No/not applicable to the country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>The poorest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Women and girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Youth and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>People in disadvantaged geographical areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Indigenous people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ethnic minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Internally displaced people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Stateless people, asylum-seekers and refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Sexual and gender identity (LGBTIQ+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Population vulnerable to climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Other (to be added by the country as relevant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[to be responded for each]

{question 6, page 20}

Note: this list is the same included in the questions for partner countries (see section 3.1 above). Having the same list could eventually allow a comparison of the groups targeted (by partner country governments and

---

7 In the assessment on the quality of national development strategies and results framework (see 2.1) specific questions are asked in relation to LNOB-related targets and results indicators (in addition to objectives) for different vulnerable groups. Within the country strategies of development partners, these same questions are not asked, because if aggregated in a profile they will lose meaning and would not provide relevant information (while for partner countries that information could be represented in a country profile). Nevertheless, similar questions are asked within the assessment on the use of country-owned indicators by development partners (see 2.3)
development partners, respectively) to see to what extent they match. This could produce relevant insights for a future LNOB dedicated brief.

**In order to define development objectives for the vulnerable and marginalised, it is important to identify those vulnerable and marginalised through data-based assessments. The following question is suggested:**

**How have these groups been identified?**

- Assessment based on existing government data from the National Statistical System
- Assessment based on data from international surveys
- Ad hoc assessment undertaken by your organisation
- If yes, was this assessment shared and discussed (a) with the partner country government and/or (b) with representatives of these groups?
- Joint assessment between the partner country government and your organisation
- Other sources [specify]

{question 7, page 20}

Addressing LNOB requires bottom-up engagement of vulnerable and marginalised or their representatives. Development partners can reinforce their capacity for engagement. To reflect this elements, it is proposed to ask the following:

**Does your country strategy/partnership framework include support to increase the capacity of the following to organise and represent themselves?**

- women and girls
- youth and children
- other vulnerable and marginalised groups [please elaborate]

{question 8, page 20}

3.3. **LNOB within development partners’ country-level interventions**

**(Annex II, page 21)**

The GPEDC monitoring exercise assesses the alignment of development partners’ interventions with country-defined development objectives and results; as well as their reliance on countries’ own statistics to track progress in achieving the intended results. [see “Development partners’ country-level interventions” in Annex II of the document **“Annexes to the Revised Proposal: New Global Partnership Monitoring Framework”** for the full questionnaire].

In the design of the reported intervention, have you used distributional analysis (e.g. poverty indices, deprivation indicators) or disaggregated data to define:

- targets for the beneficiaries? [Yes/No/not applicable to the project]
- results indicators? [Yes/No/not applicable to the project]

{question 8, page 22}

3.4. **LNOB within accountability mechanisms for development co-operation**

**(Annex II, page 12)**

The GPEDC monitoring looks at whether partner countries have accountability mechanisms for development co-operation in place by tracking the existence of: (i) a policy framework that defines the country’s development co-operation priorities; (ii) targets for the country and its development partners; (iii) regular joint assessment against those targets; (iv) active involvement of other stakeholders; and (v) public availability of the results of these reviews. [see the element “Accountability mechanisms” in Annex II of the document **“Annexes to the Revised Proposal: New Global Partnership Monitoring Framework”** for the full questionnaire].
To increase the focus on LNOB within this element of the framework it is suggested to expand the current question about the involvement of actors in accountability assessments to include also representatives of vulnerable and marginalised.

Have other actors been involved in these mutual assessments?

- No, only national government and official development partners have been involved
- Yes, other actors, beyond government and official development partners, have been involved

If yes, which other actors have been involved in these mutual assessments

- CSOs
- CSOs representing youth and children
- CSOs representing women and girls
- CSOs representing vulnerable groups [add all those relevant]
- Private sector
- Trade Unions
- Foundations
- Parliament/legislative body
- Subnational governments
- Academia
- Media/journalists
- Other [specify]

3.5. LNOB within the KP assessment  
(Annex III, page 27)

The Kampala Principles assessment aims to gather information on whether the ‘building blocks’ for effective engagement of the private sector in development co-operation are in place at the national level. To produce information relevant to LNOB, the approach will look at whether private sector partnerships utilize opportunities to maximize results for groups most in need. For development partners, the approach will assess whether private sector partnerships are designed with a clear business case in mind, a clear perspective on sustainable results, and a credible effort to targeting those who are furthest behind. For partner country government, private sector, trade unions and CSO representatives it will assess their respective perception on whether private sector partnerships are developed with the above listed characteristics. The metrics related to LNOB and the full questions can be found in Annex III of the document “Annexes to the Revised Proposal: New Global Partnership Monitoring Framework” (metrics 5).
LNOB within the assessment of the enabling environment for CSOs and CSOs development effectiveness and within SDG 5.c.1 on gender responsive budgeting

The GPEDC monitoring includes an assessment of the extent to which governments and development partners contribute to an enabling environment for Civil Society Organisations (CSOs); and the extent to which CSOs are implementing the development effectiveness principles in their own operations. The assessment already incorporates several elements, relevant to LNOB. These include the extent to which:

- the government consults a diversity of CSOs - including those representing vulnerable and marginalised groups - in the design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies; and in the prioritisation, implementation and monitoring of the SDGs

- CSOs are implementing their development work guided by international human rights standards and principles in a way that:
  i. helps empowering people themselves - especially the most vulnerable and marginalised - to participate in policy formulation and hold accountable those who have a duty to act;
  ii. takes into account the interests of vulnerable and marginalised peoples in the context of their programmatic priorities.

- CSOs working with vulnerable and marginalised groups of the population are effectively protected from discrimination


The GPEDC monitoring framework also includes the SDG indicator 5.c.1 “Countries have systems to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment”. The overall indicator is relevant for LNOB. Furthermore, a specific element of the indicator looks at whether sex-disaggregated data are used to inform budget-related policy decisions. The methodology for this SDG indicator remains unchanged and can be found at: [https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/files/Metadata-05-0c-01.pdf](https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/files/Metadata-05-0c-01.pdf) .

[See also the element “Gender budgeting” in Annex II of the document “Annexes to the Revised Proposal: New Global Partnership Monitoring Framework” for the full questionnaire.]