

Room Document: Findings from exchanges with members on the new GPEDC Delivery Model

As Background Information for Session 2 of the 24th Steering Committee Meeting:

This document summarises findings from informal exchanges with members and other partners during September/October 2022 to better understand the effectiveness ecosystem in different country contexts and how the GPEDC offers can incentivise inclusive dialogue and action at country level. Based on these findings, and building on the 2021 GPEDC review recommendations, the monitoring reform, Action Dialogues and members' guidance at the 23rd Steering Committee meeting, members are invited to discuss the following questions in session 2:

- Do the findings from the different deliberations on a new GPEDC delivery model provide all the **elements to frame, concretise and justify the proposals made in the draft annexes 2 and 3** that relate to the delivery model and ways of working?
- What are **next steps** you propose to advance the design and implementation of the new delivery model? **What role can you play** in specific terms for this?

This document is supporting material to inform the discussion on the draft annexes and should be read in conjunction with outcome document draft Annex 2 and 3.

Contacts:

Ms. Andrea Ries, Switzerland andrea.ries@eda.admin.ch;

Mr. S. Kite Nduwa & Th. Somakpo, DRC skitnduwa@yahoo.fr / thierrysomakpo@yahoo.fr

Mr. A. K. Azad, Bangladesh akazadjewell@gmail.com

Mr. Vitalice Meja, Non-executive Co-Chair meja@roafrica.org

1. Introduction

Over the last two years, GPEDC stakeholders have engaged in an **open and inclusive process to shift action on effective development co-operation to the country level** (while maintaining global accountability). This was initiated by the GPEDC Review in 2021, prioritised in the GPEDC monitoring reform process and the roll-out of the Action Dialogues, and guided by the Committee throughout this cycle, including by developing and testing relevant instruments and tools across diverse Action Areas in the 2020-22 work programme.

To achieve this goal, the GPEDC leadership has the opportunity to **rally political leaders behind a member-led approach to action at country and local level** at the 2022 Effective Development Co-operation Summit.

This new approach – **the GPEDC delivery model – hinges upon political uptake of the GPEDC’s offer at country level.**¹ This, in turn, requires practical recommendations to engage relevant communities within the effectiveness ecosystem at country level, in different country contexts. Concrete commitments related to this are proposed in the draft Annex of the Outcome Document (see separate background document).

The GPEDC’s various instruments and products serve as drivers of change and are offered to pursue country action. They are conceptualised to be used by stakeholders at country level to start or deepen (sometimes difficult) conversations and encourage policy action to deliver better together on agreed priorities. They are also tailored to support and reinforce existing country-level coordination and dialogue structures, and should not be perceived as additional work or burden. These offers are also outlined in the draft annex – the new monitoring (Annex 1) and the tools for country action (Annex 4), while improved GPEDC working arrangements (Annex 3) and new TORs for the Co-Chairs and Steering Committee members (for adoption) will also support a more member-led approach.

Steering Committee members have welcomed the proposed contours of the new GPEDC delivery model² and agreed to advance work on this in September/October 2022 to further clarify its practical and resource implications. They agreed that the model should help apply the effectiveness principles in ways that address development challenges countries are facing. While this should be done mainly at the country level, continued linkages to regional and global processes are important to promote learning and ensure accountability. Members also supported the idea of including a summary of the main proposals in the Summit’s outcome document annexes.

The remainder of this document summarises **findings from the recently held informal conversations as well as other previous relevant deliberations by members**, including related to the monitoring reform, the action dialogues and Steering Committee members’ guidance since the beginning of the Review process on this topic. It concludes a **proposal of implications for the new delivery model to ensure it yields the behaviour change expected at country level for further consideration.**

¹ The new Delivery Model will inform, but be distinct from, Committee members’ deliberations on a future work programme and its financing. Important links between the two include the future role of thematic work (similar to the Action Areas of the current work programme) and the exact support functions of the JST.

² https://www.effectivecooperation.org/system/files/2022-06/SCM23_governance_paper_ENG_0.pdf

2. Linking to Countries' Ecosystems: Lessons and experiences

GPEDC Co-chairs have invited all constituencies to informal exchanges in order **to better understand the demand for effectiveness action at country level and how to incentivise the uptake of the GPEDC offers across the development co-operation ecosystems in different country contexts** and related communities, as well as their dynamics and sensibilities regarding effective development co-operation.

During these conversations, stakeholders have raised **a range of dilemmas, tensions, and practical challenges and opportunities** related to coordination and effectiveness at country level, which has also been impacted by the trend in global development cooperation architecture. They have discussed what the GPEDC can offer to address these challenges and how this offer can be leveraged (or used) better to inform and strengthen country-level dialogue and coordination. They also raised what kind of capacities exist and where at country level, and how best to build on these capacities and available resources to ensure sustainable collaboration among all relevant actors.

The following are key takeaways:

- **No two countries are alike.** The broader political economy and context is the defining feature of any development co-operation taking place at country level – the political and security situation, governance and rule of law, dependency on foreign aid etc. This impacts the architecture and landscape of actors, and their willingness, capacity and availability to engage, within government and beyond. Over time, and across priorities, very different effectiveness concerns or issues may thus drive conversation.
- **The complexity and dynamism of national ecosystems has fundamentally changed dynamics at country level.** With bilateral support, where the effectiveness agenda has originated, being heavily complemented in many contexts by multilateral support or that to or through civil society or the private sector, partners involved in programming often lack practical guidance on how to apply the effectiveness principles across diverse modalities. Development partners have highly diverse roles in this set up, and government focal points have challenges in raising effectiveness concerns and often lack support, both at political and technical level. While there may be some expectation for the role of the UN development system and other multilateral partners to support country-led efforts through their respective mandates, the funding trend does not fully enable them to play an increasingly important role³.
- **Any external offer must balance the need to seamlessly integrate into existing processes, while upholding a principled approach with enough flexibility.** Streamlining effectiveness considerations into existing national policies and coordination structures requires a deep understanding of the architecture and depends on trusted relationships with relevant 'shakers and movers'. An open culture is vital to discuss sticky issues, develop creative, practical and flexible offers, and focus development action on those furthest behind. Stakeholders must adapt to changing conditions, sometimes quickly, for example, following government changes.
- **The policy framework and dialogues at national, sectoral and local level are entry points for effectiveness actions, especially if well supported and inclusive:**
 - The policy framework: The processes to design national development, development co-operation and financing strategies and related results frameworks,

³ For example, 62% of UN funding was earmarked in 2020, compared to 51% in 2015.

sectoral or thematic strategies, as well as development partners' own country strategies, all offer opportunities to foster inclusive dialogue and partnerships across government and society.

- **Dialogue:** The policy framework is shaped by a diverse layer of dialogues within government, between government and citizens, their representatives and other non-executive stakeholders and partners, and between government and development partners. Political forums, where they exist, must be underpinned by appropriate technical expertise and evidence. Well-functioning donor coordination can be vital to support country-led action, in particular in fragile and aid dependent contexts. It is a major engine of the interactions with the government and other stakeholders where they exist. In contexts where donor coordination is not strong, champion partners can play a vital role in advocating for inclusive multi-stakeholder processes, for instance.
- **Sectoral Level:** Multi-stakeholder dialogues with development partners often exist at sectoral level in the form of sectoral working groups led by line ministries, at times with non-state stakeholders involved. Stakeholders mentioned the challenge of linking the effectiveness principles and related evidence to discussions in sectoral dialogues.
- **Local Level:** With a strong focus on localised co-operation convening and sensitising local stakeholders requires substantial efforts from all constituencies, as well as careful coordination with national governments. Local actors themselves, often at the forefront of development efforts, require support and must be made aware of possible roles to play in ensuring co-operation is effective.
- **There is consensus about the importance of transparency related to the different types of development co-operation flows and practices**, including for partner country governments in their Aid Information Management or similar systems to track progress and hold partners answerable for effectiveness commitments, including forward-looking spending plans.
- **There is strong demand for targeted peer-learning spaces at regional level.** Many partner country governments are eager to learn from other countries how to successfully create and manage multi-stakeholder dialogue platforms, engage with each other to share experiences, and shape regional priorities together.
- **Global emphasis and linkages to relevant processes at the international level remain key**, for governments and non-state actors alike, to ensure political momentum, learning and accountability. It is critical to bring issues to global attention, but also benefit directly from relevant global policy debate if relevant to country contexts.

With the monitoring being at the heart of the GPEDC's offer, the following **lessons from the consultations on the monitoring reform** should also be kept in mind:

- The monitoring reform, which took place over the past two years, involved extensive and inclusive consultations, with stakeholders from country, regional and global levels. Stakeholders strongly re-affirmed the value of the monitoring exercise; this supports the contention that it continue to be the **prime offer and anchor of GPEDC's efforts**.
- Stakeholders emphasised that the monitoring should continue to be a global accountability exercise, but welcomed exploration of how to more systematically institutionalise it in existing country-level processes and systems. Consultations reflected at length on

how to increase the likelihood that monitoring results would lead to country-level dialogue, action planning, and behaviour change.

- For this, it was raised that **technical aspects of the exercise need to be separated from efforts to engage and incentivise involvement** – from an early stage – of relevant actors at the strategic/decision-making level.
- All constituencies also acknowledged the **benefits of, and opportunities presented by, the inherent multi-stakeholder nature of the monitoring exercise**.
- There were also attendant reflections on the **practical challenges of out-reaching, communicating, and engaging multiple and diverse actors**, not least in contexts where existing dialogue structures are not fully inclusive or not yet established.
- Against this backdrop, many representatives of partner country governments, who lead the exercise in their countries, consistently raised **concerns about whether, and what kind of, support would be available to them**.
 - Experience from previous monitoring rounds has shown that many partner countries faced challenges in implementing the exercise in its full scope (both all aspects of the process, and/or fully completing the data collection). The new monitoring exercise that will be rolled out in 2023 envisions a country-level process which is more extensive, requires additional layers of coordination, and involves a bigger constellation of stakeholders.
 - Several countries mentioned that financial resource constraints also limit their ability to fully participate in the monitoring process.
- These findings are largely in line with experiences from the series of Action Dialogues held in 2021 and 2022 across Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa, and Asia, which stimulated multi-stakeholder discussions and mobilised a wide constituency of partners. Recurring themes focussed on the need for country adapted approaches, which were responsive to the partnership landscape of a country in support of national development priorities. They further highlighted the need for support to take forward effective development cooperation efforts at country level, in line with specific capacity gaps partner countries may experience.
- In addition, a number of Action Dialogues highlighted the need for support in putting in place the right combination of policies, strategies and systems to drive effective development cooperation. With regards to systems, a focus on data and M&E as anchors to achieve greater impact were highlighted. It was stressed that partner countries and development partners must continue to invest in strengthening national development cooperation architecture for more inclusive partnerships, with the GPEDC providing a critical anchor to catalyse these efforts.

3. Implications for the new delivery model and action at country level

The informal exchanges with members and other partners have shown that:

- **The delivery model is not one-size-fits-all, but a selection of targeted, ‘tailorable’ and easily accessible products the GPEDC offers in response to country needs.** It aims to animate all stakeholders in a dynamic and complex environment to take action through existing structures and at different levels. This will be driven by the monitoring, ensuing dialogue and the dashboard and supported by other conversations, including in sectors, on priority themes or linking up to stakeholders, including locally.
- **A multi-stakeholder structure at country level is critical to ‘institutionalise effectiveness’** and make it a truly member-led effort. This requires adequate and sustainable capacity support and commitments from relevant partners, with clear responsibilities to ensure adequate support and follow-up. This supports countries to move from commitment to action.
- **The transition into this new member-led approach will take place gradually** and has to be driven by the monitoring roll out and the learning from the ensuing dialogues, as well as the uptake of other GPEDC products at country level. All stakeholders will have to engage in advocacy and outreach to raise awareness on how GPEDC products can add value to existing priorities and processes in-country.
- **A robust linkage to regional and global processes will remain essential.** This can also benefit from new ambitions to improve the working arrangements, including by using partner country caucuses at regional level for a more streamlined two-way knowledge sharing effort between global and country level through key regional partners. This also requires important JST support.

Based on this, the success of the GPEDC **to drive behavior change and generate impact at country level** hinges upon:

- a) The capacity of the GPEDC to **propose simple but flexible instruments** (such as the GPEDC monitoring exercise) that is responsive to various country contexts and interest;
- b) the capacity of all the different GPEDC stakeholders engaged to **support, upon request, partner countries in establishing and convening relevant multi-stakeholder dialogues**, embedded in existing structures and in line with needs;
- c) the **efficient functioning of the GPEDC’s governance** (Steering Committee, Co-Chairs and High-Level Meetings), including channels for accountability and learning, in line with the original Partnership’s functions agreed in Nairobi in 2016; and
- d) the **willingness of the GPEDC’s stakeholders to lead on or participate in thematic initiatives** as part of the GPEDC’s work programme activities and with links to country efforts, and associated knowledge sharing and learning efforts.
- e) The importance of **‘ring-fenced’ core secretariat support** of the OECD/UNDP JST that is cost-efficient and streamlined.