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1. Introduction

Pilot Exercise to establish a Monitoring Framework for the Effectiveness of South-South Cooperation

Since the Accra High Level Forum on aid effectiveness held in 2008, the international community has recognized that SSC has characteristics that distinguish it from traditional cooperation (OECD, 2008, p. 5). This same argument continued to be reiterated similarly in the following meetings of the same type. For this reason, several countries of the Global South have stated that the monitoring framework currently used for traditional cooperation does not fully reflect their role as providers of South-South Cooperation. In this sense, and considering that for the Global Partnership it is a priority to start recording the progress of SSC in terms of effectiveness, it became necessary to develop a monitoring framework adapted to cooperation from the South, with an emphasis on technical cooperation and their differentiated commitments.

Therefore, from 2015 to 2018, GPEDC supported the Government of Mexico in the implementation of a first framework to monitor SSC. This approach based on the monitoring methodology that was already applied for Official Development Assistance (ODA), adjusting the existing indicators to ensure that they were relevant for the measurement of SSC. This exercise resulted in a first approximation to a possible structure for measuring the cooperation offered by the countries of the Global South, developing a first Monitoring Framework for the Effectiveness of South-South Cooperation, which generated different recommendations and comments for the Mexican case.

Based on the results found by Mexico, this pilot exercise sought to test the Monitoring Framework for the Effectiveness of South-South Cooperation developed by the Mexican team, to identify its potential and possible limitations when measuring the application of the four Effectiveness Principles for SSC in the contexts of the different participating countries. This with the aim of presenting a Framework of Indicators for South-South Cooperation, which has been already validated with the pilot countries, at the 2022 High-Level Meeting. It is important to consider that within the framework of the Strategic Priority 3 of the GPEDC Work Program 2020-22, the ODA Monitoring Framework is also currently in a process of
The purpose of this exercise is to contribute to the design and characterization of a more robust methodology to measure the effectiveness of SSC, thus following up on what is established in paragraph 11 of the BAPA +40 Conference Report. In this sense, the pilot exercise will contribute to the construction of a first mechanism that allows measuring the application of the effectiveness principles for SSC, which can be applicable in different countries. In addition, it aims to become an instrument that allows the characterization of different practices carried out by countries in terms of SSC.

On the other hand, it seeks to contribute to the understanding of how SSC is being developed in each of the participating countries, from a comparative perspective with the other States that are part of the exercise, identifying their strengths and areas of opportunity. The Country Reports aim to provide evidence that allows decision-makers to manage SSC more effectively and respond with actions to commitments on effectiveness.
2. Methodology

This activity sought to test the Monitoring Framework for the Effectiveness of South-South Cooperation, developed by the Mexican team, to identify its potentialities and possible limitations for measuring the application of the four principles of Effectiveness for SSC in different contexts. Its aim is to present a Framework of Indicators for South-South Cooperation at the 2022 High-Level Meeting of the GPEDC, which has been validated with different pilot countries and may be useful to measure the effectiveness of SSC in different States of the Global South.

Thus, it was desired that the pilot monitoring exercise provided a broad and diverse perspective on the applicability of a possible new Monitoring Framework. In this sense, 7 countries from different geographical regions participated, which have different characteristics in their cooperation exercises:

- **Africa**: Kenya, Cape Verde
- **Latin America**: Colombia, El Salvador, Mexico
- **Asia**: Bangladesh, Indonesia

In that way, in first place, we implemented the existing Framework of Indicators in the participating countries, to explore its scope and if it was adjusted to the needs of this exercise. Additionally, we held a meeting with the team of experts that developed this first exercise, in order to understand what information they sought to collect and for what purpose.
Afterwards, based on that first exercise and in accordance with the analysis of the obtained results, we made the necessary modifications to the existing methodology. In that way, we could satisfy the requirements and the objective of this new exercise, and increase the veracity of the data collected and the comparability between the results. In this sense, a new Framework of Indicators was established, associated with a new mechanism for information collection. This new questionnaire has 62 questions organized into four modules, one for each Effectiveness Principle. The questions are mainly single or multiple-choice, and some have sub-questions based on the main answer.

In that order of ideas, this report seeks to present the results obtained by applying this new framework of indicators and its associated questionnaire. For this, we created the Multidimensional Index of the Effectiveness of South-South Cooperation. From the form applied to each country, we selected 40 questions and regrouped them according to their ability to collect information associated with each of the indicators that make up each principle. As an example, the principle of national appropriation has three indicators: connection with the National Development Plan, connection with cooperation strategies, and alignment. The latter has seven questions detailing the presence or degree of depth of SSC alignment in the country’s results frameworks.

### Table 1: Multidimensional Index of South-South Cooperation Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators:</th>
<th>Selected questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country Ownership (0.25)</strong></td>
<td>• Q4, Q7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Connection with the National Results Framework (NRF) (0.02)</td>
<td>• Q8, Q11, Q11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Connection with National Cooperation Strategy (NCS) (0.05)</td>
<td>• Q12, Q13, Q14, Q15, Q16, Q17, Q18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Alignment (0.18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus on Results (0.25)</strong></td>
<td>• Q20, Q23, Q24, Q28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Governance and information management (0.125)</td>
<td>• Q25, Q26, Q27, Q29, Q32, Q34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Monitoring, evaluation and reporting of results (M&amp;E) (0.125)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transparency and Mutual Accountability (0.25)</strong></td>
<td>• Q35, Q35.1, Q36, Q37, Q38, Q39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Mutual accountability (0.125)</td>
<td>• Q40, Q40.2, Q42, Q43, Q44, Q45, Q46, Q48, Q49, Q50, Q51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Availability and public access to information (0.125)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusive Partnerships (0.25)</strong></td>
<td>• Q56 – Q57, Q58, Q59, Q60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Inclusion and representation (0.2)</td>
<td>• Q61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Joint action (0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each principle has a weight of 0.25. However, within each principle, the distribution of weights is different and depends largely on the number of questions associated with the indicator. In total, both weights must always add up to 0.25. This balancing of poundage based on the number of questions helps to avoid depending on one or a few questions that can be very changeable, giving stability to the exercise.

The other questions that were not included in the index are used as additional and control information for it. In addition, they contribute to the characterization of the SSC.

Once weights were assigned to the different indicators, the total number of possible points that could be obtained per indicator was added. In that way, it was possible to standardize the entire exercise according to the points obtained in each question. Subsequently, the entire exercise was scaled to 100, to make the results comparable and to have an easy-to-read measurement scale.

To conclude, it is necessary to mention that this exercise compiles case studies developed from questionnaires applied to qualified informants on the subject studied. However, it is still a qualitative exercise that was represented through a mathematical approach. Therefore, the pilot does not seek to homogenize the cooperation provided by each State. On the contrary, it is expected that the exercise will make it possible to find an indicator framework that is broad enough to measure SSC actions that are being developed in different backgrounds, but that at the same time makes it possible to compile and compare the data. In this way, we expect that the mechanism will function as a basis to develop a higher level of understanding about the differences and similarities that exist around the development of SSC in different countries. Likewise, that the results and evidence collected by this exercise leads to concrete and in-depth discussions about what can be understood as good practices in SSC.

The pilot exercise does not seek to homogenize the cooperation provided by each State. On the contrary, it is expected that the exercise will make it possible to find an indicator framework that is broad enough to measure SSC actions that are being developed in different backgrounds, but that at the same time makes it possible to compile and compare the data.
3. Outcome 1: Country Ownership

a. Connection with the National Results Framework (NRF) (0.02)  
Score = 75

Indonesia’s national development plan or strategy frequently mentions international cooperation and includes specific references to SSC. In this sense, the country’s score on this indicator is 75, the same as the regional average of Asia and Africa (75), and much higher than Latin America’s performance (33.3).

b. Connection with National Cooperation Strategy (NCS) (0.05)  
Score = 50

Additionally, the country currently has a national development strategy or guideline for international cooperation activities, which references SSC only at the goal level or in the descriptive part. For this reason, Indonesia’s performance on this indicator is at a medium level, with a score of 50, above Africa’s regional average performance (33.3), the same as Asia’s (50) average, and below Latin America’s performance (83.3).

Table 2: Country Ownership Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indonesia</th>
<th>Indicators of Component 1: Country ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connection with the National Results Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connection with National Cooperation Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Outcome 1: Country Ownership

c. Alignment (0.18)

In general terms, the countries of the sample have a high level of alignment. Indonesia is not the exception to this performance, with a score of 70, similar to the sample countries' average. Therefore, it is important to highlight, that the organization in charge of managing SSC considers that the country's guidelines, standards, and strategic frameworks are strongly effective or helpful in promoting SSC.

Additionally, in its role as provider, the partner country priorities are always included, however, as a beneficiary its priorities are only frequently included. Also, in both of its roles, Indonesia only includes national and cooperation priorities. Therefore, there is still work to be done regarding the inclusion of its national priorities, and of subnational priorities in both roles. For these reasons, the country considers that the SSC initiatives in which they participate are moderately aligned with the national results’ framework/national development plan.

General remarks

Considering these elements, Indonesia shows a medium-high level of application of good practices in terms of Country Ownership, obtaining a total score of 66.4. According to the results, the country still has work to do in achieving a more detailed inclusion of SSC in the national development strategy or guideline for international cooperation activities. Also, there is an opportunity for the country to improve the inclusion of its priorities, which are only frequently included when acting as a beneficiary, and of subnational priorities in both roles.
4. Outcome 2: Focus on Results

Table 3: Focus on Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance and information management</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring, evaluation and reporting of results</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Governance and information management (0.125)  Score = 87.5

Regarding governance and information management, it is significant to note that this is the indicator in which the participant countries obtained the lowest results. Despite this, Indonesia has an outstanding high performance on this indicator, which suggests that the organization responsible for managing SCC has excellent practices in this area and a strong culture of data and information.

The country has a score of 87.5, considerably overcoming Africa’s (18.8), Latin America’s (39.6), and Asia’s (59.4) average. Indonesia has a data governance document for SSC, which is currently in use. Also, the organization strongly uses the information provided by Data Governance Framework (DGF) to prospect for SCC opportunities. Likewise, generating information for the DGF is a strong objective of SSC activities. In addition, the organization has completed a process for managing data quality issues and currently uses it.

e. Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting of results (M&E) (0.125)  Score = 90.5

In the case of monitoring, evaluation, and reporting of results, Indonesia
4. Outcome 2: Focus on Results

Performance is at a high level. The organization has completed the processes for monitoring and evaluating SSC activities, and they are both currently in use. Therefore, they rate the quality of the metrics used to evaluate and monitor the performance of SSC projects as good and always use metrics to evaluate the collection, storage, and use of data related to SSC activities. Also, the country does have an incentive plan for meeting goals and almost always incorporate learnings from previous experiences into new projects.

Taking into account those elements, Indonesia obtained a score of 90.5, which is higher than the regional performance of Africa (33.3), Latin America (66.7), and Asia (69).

General Remarks

Considering the factors mentioned above, Indonesia obtained a score of 89 in the development of good practices related to Focus on Results, which locates the country at a high level. This shows that there exists a strong data culture inside the organization that manages cooperation, which promotes the use of metrics to evaluate the collection, use, and storage of information, especially associated with CSS. In general terms, this was the principle in which the participant countries obtained the lowest scores. For that reason, see consider it valuable that Indonesia shares with other countries from the Global South its practices related to the Focus on Results principle, especially those related to the use and management of data and information.
5. Outcome 3: Transparency and Mutual Accountability

f. Mutual accountability (0.125)  Score = 55.6

The country carries out joint monitoring with its partner countries of the progress of the activities every year, and jointly evaluates the progress of the activities with them. In addition, when participating in SSC projects, and establishing the monitoring indicators for a project, it clearly defines what responsibilities correspond to each of the parties. Both in the case of partner countries, for providers and beneficiaries, and for the allied actors (civil society organizations, academia, private sector, etc.). Additionally, if there are differences between the provider and the beneficiary of a project, there are mechanisms to solve them jointly.

Therefore, Indonesia obtained a score of 55.56, surpassing the average performance of Africa (38.9), but below Latin America (63), and Asia (66.7). In this order of ideas, and disregarding the good practices the organization already applies, the country still can improve the frequency with which it carries out joint follow-ups.

Table 4: Transparency and Mutual Accountability Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indonesia</th>
<th>Indicators of Component 3: Transparency and mutual accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutual accountability</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and public access to information</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5. Outcome 3: Transparency and Mutual Accountability

g. Availability and public access to information (0.125)  

Score = 43.8

In terms of availability and public access to information, there is a legal requirement in the country to produce regular reports on the management, results, and lessons learned from SSC activities at a national level. These reports are made annually and are communicated 6 months after the information is collected. They are freely and publicly available and include their methodologies and databases. Despite this, they are not published in open format or accessible online without the need to register or request access to the data, but they can be downloaded. Additionally, the entity has mechanisms to verify the veracity of the reported information. In this case, it requests information related to results.

However, Indonesia does not make SSC reports and information accessible to stakeholders outside the country.

Indonesia uses the reported information for managing development cooperation by a national government institution and to share with partners for country-level coordination. These are 2 of the 4 more mentioned purposes by the participant countries.

Taking into account the previous elements, it is recommended that the country continues working in compliance with the principles of open data governance in terms of cooperation. Also, Indonesia could work on the frequency of reports and in making the published information more timely.

General Remarks  

Score = 49.7

Taking into account the previously mentioned elements, Indonesia is at a medium level of development of good practices in Transparency and Mutual Accountability, with a score of 49.7. The country can continue working on the frequency of joint monitoring and the publication of reports. In this sense, Indonesia has the possibility of expanding the application of the principles of open data governance. Especially the ones that refer to online access to information and the use of an open format.
6. Outcome 4: Inclusive Partnerships

h. Inclusion and representation (0.20)  \[ \text{Score} = 72.4 \]

The country does have partnership or coordination mechanisms to review, design, and monitor with development actors the cooperation needs that are indicated in the national results frameworks, which work in the same way for SSC. In the last year, Academia was engaged in these mechanisms.

In terms of inclusion and representation, Indonesia’s relationship with Academia, PS, and CSOs is at a medium-high level (scenario 3). Participation generally includes the most relevant actors from different sectors, however, the levels of influence and respective roles within the dialogue processes are unevenly distributed, with some actors controlling the agenda and decision-making process. As a result, less influential participants tend to disengage or limit their contributions.

In terms of the relevance of dialogue and exploration of differences, Indonesia’s relationship with Academia, PS, and CSOs is at a medium-high level (scenario 3). Different sectors are largely focused on opposing the development issues of concern, leading to more conflict and limited substantive dialogue or action. As a result, existing dialogue efforts are abandoned or do not address a combination of issues of concern to both sides.

Table 5: Inclusive Partnerships Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Component 4: Inclusive partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusion and representation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint action</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted Average</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Outcome 4: Inclusive Partnerships

i. Joint action (0.05)  
Score = 75

In terms of joint action, Indonesia's relationship with Academia, PS, and CSOs is at a medium-high level (scenario 3). Joint action resulting from dialogue initiatives is mixed: many dialogue processes manage to mobilize actors to support joint collaboration (e.g., influencing policies, public-private partnerships). However, some initiatives remain at the level of dialogue and fail to move to joint action or collaboration.

General Remarks  
Score = 72.9

Regarding Inclusive Partnerships, Indonesia showed a medium-high level of application of good practices, with a score of 72.9. The country has a homogeneous relationship with the different actors for the distinct components, maintaining a medium-high relationship with the PS, the CSOs, and the Academia. In that sense, we recommend that the country analyze which factors of its current engagement with each of the three actors could be improved, so they can get to a high-level relationship.
7. Conclusions

Table 6: General Results

Indonesia: Multidimensional Index of SSC Effectiveness
Draft version

<table>
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7. Conclusions

- Indonesia has the best practices in governance and information and data management and in monitoring, evaluation, and reporting of results. The country stands out markedly with respect to the sample of countries studied. Indonesia has formal monitoring and evaluation processes, which allows it to have such outstanding performance.

- Indonesia has good practices in inclusion and representation indicators, that point to the development of inclusive partnerships around SSC.

- There are opportunities for improvement in the indicator of connection with National Cooperation Strategy.