



**Global
Partnership**
for Effective Development
Co-operation

MEETING SUMMARY

Seventh meeting of the Global Partnership Steering Committee
19-20 January 2015, The Hague, Netherlands

Contacts:

Mr. Derek Kilner, tel. +1-212-906-5742, email: derek.kilner@undp.org

Ms. Julie Seghers, tel. +33 1 45 24 90 36, email: julie.seghers@oecd.org

OPENING SESSION

1. Lilianne Ploumen, Minister for Foreign Trade and Development Co-operation of the Netherlands, welcomed the Steering Committee members by recalling poverty eradication as the overall objective of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (GPEDC). Minister Ploumen presented the key points on the agenda, including a discussion on the global events and processes where the GPEDC can contribute, particularly the UN Post-2015 Development Agenda and Financing for Development processes.
2. José Antonio Meade Kuribreña, Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Mexico, reaffirmed the goal of eradicating poverty within one generation and highlighted how the GPEDC is a platform that advances results and effectiveness. He stressed the importance of the year 2015 with key events such as the Conference on Financing for Development and the 2015 Summit, as well as the Climate Change Conference, all of which feature opportunities to showcase the concrete results achieved through the GPEDC. He also stressed the strategic importance of south-south co-operation and the need to promote it within the context of the GPEDC.
3. Goodall Gondwe, Minister of Finance, Economic Planning and Development of Malawi, expressed gratitude to Minister Lilianne Ploumen for hosting the Steering Committee. He emphasised the importance of engaging southern and developing countries in the GPEDC to effectively achieve its aim of eradicating poverty.

SESSION 1: CONTRIBUTING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POST-2015 DEVELOPMENT AGENDA (CHAIRIED BY THE NETHERLANDS)

4. The session opened with a presentation from the Netherlands on the timeline for key UN processes related to the post-2015 development agenda, including the negotiations leading up to the international conference on Financing for Development (Addis Ababa, July 2015) and the post-2015 summit (New York, September 2015); as well as the meeting of the High Level Political Forum; the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and discussions hosted by the President of the UN General Assembly (see [calendar of events](#)).
5. The presentation noted that key elements of the shift from the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) include universality (an inclusive agenda involving all countries); multidimensionality (involving social, economic, and environmental dimensions); multi-actor nature (involving government, CSOs, private sector, international organisations, and other actors); and covering a range of financial and non-financial resources.
6. The July Addis Ababa meeting was identified as a key window of opportunity to input to these processes. Potential entry points include a lead role in supporting partnerships; integrating effectiveness principles into the agenda; supporting monitoring of commitments and mutual accountability; supporting knowledge-sharing and best practices on key issues; and organising side-events that can bridge these GPEDC offerings to the negotiation process.
7. Minister Ploumen provided further views, suggesting the GPEDC can serve as a global hub where actors come together to share knowledge and expertise – including good and bad practices, particularly relating to how to work with a range of partners - and bring this information to the post-2015 discussions. She also mentioned that

open data will be an important element for the post-2015 agenda and efforts around transparency, including IATI could provide a contribution in this area. She identified monitoring as a key issue and highlighted the need to align GPEDC monitoring efforts with the post-2015 agenda. She called for identifying concrete entry points in preparatory meetings, and noted in this regard that the Netherlands will host a tax and development conference in July, for which the GPEDC can provide an important input.

8. In the ensuing discussion, members noted that the GPEDC should focus on contributing to the means of implementation for post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals (EU, Philippines, US). Some mentioned the need to focus on policies in addition to finance (EU); to broaden focus from ODA and engage new actors (Malawi); and to support enabling environment (US).
9. Members highlighted that the GPEDC's link to the post-2015 agenda should focus on the Busan principles (CPDE, Afghanistan), with members making particular reference to country ownership and use of country systems (CPDE, Afghanistan), tailored approaches to specific country contexts (Afghanistan), human rights and gender equality (CPDE) and the role of local governments in implementing the Busan principles in practice (UCLG, El Salvador). The importance of mutual trust was also highlighted (EU, Afghanistan).
10. Members also underlined the GPEDC's role in supporting post-2015 implementation through its focus on country level actions (CPDE, EU, PIFS). Members highlighted the need to show evidence that the effectiveness agenda works (CPDE, EU); and raised the importance of the monitoring process (Malawi) and the need to enhance complementarity with the monitoring process of the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States (Afghanistan). Others mentioned the value of peer reviews to support learning and accountability (PIFS); the need to focus on how to do partnerships well (Egypt); and the importance of harnessing the work being done by Building Blocks and Voluntary Initiatives (Foundations).
11. Members saw the GPEDC supporting post-2015 implementation through sharing good practice and through local-government-level peer exchange (UCLG). Others raised the need to focus on concrete lessons learned that apply to particular types of partnerships, rather than focusing on broad general lessons (US).
12. The GPEDC's potential in supporting post-2015 implementation in specific contexts was mentioned. These included identifying solutions for fragile states that promote country ownership and increased use of country systems (Afghanistan); focusing on the local level (UCLG); and continuing to enhance the relevance of the GPEDC for the private sector. For the latter, the importance of a defined work plan, effective communication, and collection of evidence was noted (private sector). Members also flagged the GPEDC's potential to focus on the role of development co-operation in domestic resource mobilisation (USA). Several members also raised the GPEDC's inclusive multi-stakeholder nature as a key value added in contributing to the post-2015 processes (CPDE, Foundations, USA). Members also noted the importance of drawing on regional processes (PIFS).
13. In terms of concrete entry points to the post-2015 processes, members raised the importance of building links to particular bodies or actors, including the UNDCF (CPDE); the post-2015 and Financing for Development (FfD) facilitators and the UNSG's partnership facility (Egypt). Members also raised the usefulness of identifying concrete deliverables to showcase at the FfD and post-2015 meetings.

14. In her concluding remarks, Minister Ploumen emphasised the need for the Co-Chairs to take a leading role in promoting the GPEDC offering for the post-2015 development agenda. In this regard she highlighted the GPEDC's focus on building trust, speaking about real experiences on the ground and providing enablers for development.

SESSION 2: THEMATIC PRIORITIES FOR THE GPEDC THROUGH TO THE NEXT HIGH-LEVEL MEETING (CHAIRIED BY MEXICO)

Feedback on GPEDC priorities and focus

15. The JST presented the main findings from the GPEDC survey undertaken in late 2014 to gather views on past accomplishments and reflect on the future direction of the GPEDC. Overall, 32 respondents took the survey, mostly from developing country governments, civil society, international organisations, local authorities and trade unions.
16. The survey results produced several recommendations to the Steering Committee, among which the need to implement aid and development effectiveness commitments; to strengthen the global monitoring framework; and to focus on the core value added of the GPEDC as its major contribution to the Post-2015 Development Agenda. The full [set of survey responses and recommendations](#) is available to all GPEDC stakeholders.
17. In the following discussion there was a call from parliamentarians for stronger recognition of the crucial role played by parliaments in promoting transparency and accountability for GPEDC commitments, particularly the ones on monitoring aid and development budgets, which was recognized by the Co-Chairs.
18. Following the survey results the Steering Committee moved on to discuss various GPEDC related events recently hosted by Steering Committee members and the feedback and conclusions of those events. In addition to the three most recent workshops on which members reported back in more detail, several other events were hosted over the past year including a High-Level Seminar on "Managing for Development Results", hosted by the Islamic Development Bank Group and the OPEC Fund for International Development (OFID) together with the institutions of the Coordination Group in June 2014.
19. Korea reported back on the annual Global Partnership workshop held in Seoul in November 2014, which was preceded by a two-day Learning and Acceleration Programme on the Global Partnership. The outcome document noted the shrinking space for CSOs and highlighted trust as a key issue in making progress on the ground. Korea invited the Steering Committee to provide inputs on the focus of future annual workshops, which will increasingly offer the opportunity to reach out to the private sector and the BRICS countries.
20. The AU/NEPAD reported back on the African regional consultations held in Kinshasa in November 2014. A key message emerging was that developing countries are eager to see commitments turn into action and ensure that aid is used to catalyse effective development. The GPEDC should prioritise issues like domestic resource mobilisation and illicit financial flows in the post-2015 context, as well as focus on corporate governance of extractives and mutual accountability standards. Special attention was paid to the need for an Advisory Group on monitoring and for more

proactive involvement in the monitoring exercise by the countries being monitored. Aligning regional and global visions for the GPEDC to national priorities also emerged as an important outcome of the African consultations.

21. Minister Meade presented the outcomes of the Mexico City workshop on southern approaches to the development effectiveness agenda on 3-4 December 2014. The meeting provided a starting point for a common vision for southern partners in the GPEDC, recognising that its principles may be applied differently across countries. The discussion also addressed how the monitoring indicators can be applied to south-south co-operation, particularly those on results frameworks, transparency, predictability and mutual accountability. At the same time, designing multi-dimensional poverty indicators was seen as essential to better capture the challenges faced by least developed and middle-income countries alike, particularly in the post-2015 context.
22. In the following discussion there was a call for the GPEDC to be more action-focused and act as a hub of global good practices and policies on poverty eradication. Aid, tax and private investments were highlighted as three crucial resource flows to strengthen development impact (OECD/DAC). Some Steering Committee members called for further efforts to ensure stronger participation by southern countries and their citizens in the GPEDC, with a focus on reducing inequality among stakeholders. They also raised the importance of enhancing the GPEDC outreach at country level; looking more deeply at private investment modalities, labour standards and social care; implementing time-bound Busan commitments; and differentiating among middle-income country needs based on structural economic issues (Trade Unions, El Salvador).
23. Overall, current thematic priorities were viewed as relevant and worth deepening further, particularly knowledge sharing, triangular and south-south co-operation; use of country systems; and the role of the private sector in development. The monitoring framework and its further strengthening were also highlighted as an essential part of the GPEDC's value proposition (MDBs/World Bank).

SESSION 3: THEMATIC PRIORITIES FOR THE GPEDC THROUGH TO THE NEXT HIGH-LEVEL MEETING (CONT) (CHAIRD BY MEXICO)

Discussion of thematic priorities

24. Minister Meade opened the session by presenting the [Memoire](#) of the Mexico City High Level Meeting (HLM) of the GPEDC, which is available on the GPEDC's website. He provided a reminder of the five priority themes established for the HLM - 1) Progress since Busan and inclusive development; 2) domestic resource mobilisation; 3) development co-operation in middle income countries; 4) south-south co-operation and knowledge sharing; and 5) partnering with the private sector – and suggested these still remained relevant. Subsequently, members expressed a desire to maintain the current thematic priorities, while going into more detail in certain areas and focusing on impact on the ground.
25. Within the broader theme of progress since Busan, Members suggested greater focus on how to effectively use development co-operation in fragile states. Afghanistan, on behalf of the g7+ group of fragile states, called for the GPEDC and New Deal processes to be aligned more closely, including in terms of the monitoring process. The New Deal review taking place this year was flagged as one opportunity

to do so. The 2016 World Humanitarian Summit was also identified as an area for potential synergies (OECD/DAC, Afghanistan, UNDP).

26. Afghanistan, on behalf of the g7+ group of fragile states, noted the group's focus on political dialogue between development partners, and mentioned some emerging substantive priorities for the group. A first area is public-private partnership, including support for financial guarantees. Addressing the issue of risk for private investment in fragile states was also raised as a priority (Private Sector). A second area is support for domestic resource mobilisation, as fragile states often have the lowest share of domestic resources and particular challenges with statistical capacity. A third area is regional co-operation for fragile states, particularly relating to transit and infrastructure. Members noted that instruments and lessons derived from the GPEDC in areas like domestic resource mobilisation and private sector partnership can be adapted and applied to fragile settings (US). Members also noted the importance of inclusive development and of supporting effective institutions – including a strong role for parliaments – in fragile states (CDPE, IPU).

Within the area of progress since Busan, members also suggested maintaining a strong focus on strengthening country ownership; considering issues of under-aided countries; sustaining focus on providers' commitments related to use of country systems and doing more to measure the quality of parliamentary review of assistance – beyond the proportion of assistance that appears on budgets subject to parliamentary review (El Salvador, IPU, Malawi, UNDP).

27. On the issue of Domestic Resource Mobilisation (DRM), the Chair mentioned the importance of building on the momentum of recent work in this area, including efforts to strengthen tax co-operation, expand the tax base in developing countries, improve transparency, and address base erosion and profit shifting. Members noted that the objective of work in this area is to ensure that important generators of resources – including profitable companies – pay taxes to developing countries. Members also highlighted the potential to showcase a concrete deliverable in the area of development co-operation and domestic resource mobilisation (Malawi, EU, UNDP).
28. Members reaffirmed the relevance of continuing to focus on development cooperation in middle-income countries (MICs). The Chair noted the importance of looking at the role of development co-operation in the transition to middle-income status; better understanding the co-operation needs of MICs; and addressing issues around multidimensional measurement of poverty and development in MICs, all of this in order to reduce the inequality gaps between countries and inside the developing countries.
29. Members noted that the GPEDC should focus on operationalising work in the priority areas above into actions on the ground. Members noted the need to effectively draw on and capture the work of the Building Blocks and Voluntary Initiatives; to expand the monitoring process to a wider range of countries; to use regional and other workshops to help capture evidence of progress on the ground; to consider a global “partnerships centre” that can provide an overview of development partnerships and gaps in using partnerships for post-2015 implementation; and the importance of action at the local and regional level (EU, OECD/DAC, UNDP, Netherlands, Korea, UCLG/FOGAR). Members also noted that efforts should contribute to tangible deliverables that can be showcased at the next HLM. Peru presented the Peruvian Agency of International Cooperation (APCI)'s initiative to hold a regional consultation on the Effective Cooperation Agenda in May 2015. Peru also noted interest in contributing to the GPEDC's work in the areas of development co-operation in MICs, south-south and triangular co-operation, working with the private sector MICs,

SSC/TC, and the implementation of the Busan commitments with an inclusive approach.

SESSION 4. OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT (CHAIRER BY MALAWI)

30. Committee members acknowledged their responsibility in reaching out to and engaging with constituencies, as well as building bridges with global processes. In order for this outreach to be effective, members highlighted the need for clear messages and priorities (Malawi, USA); clarified Steering Committee procedures (Malawi, EU); and a better understanding of the boundaries of each constituency (Malawi, EU, Philippines).
31. Members shared their experiences regarding outreach modalities. They highlighted the importance of coordinating internally and externally to agree on and deliver consistent messages (Mexico, MdBs). They emphasised the strategic role of regional platforms and organisations in engaging with stakeholders, sharing evidence and supporting capacity-development (Bangladesh, PIFS, AU).
32. Discussions underlined the need to further engage with stakeholders such as MICs, the private sector, local authorities and foundations and to involve more countries in the monitoring process (Malawi, EU). The importance of building functional linkages with Voluntary Initiatives and Building Blocks was highlighted (CPDE). Members discussed ways to further open Steering Committee meeting discussions to broader stakeholders of the GPEDC (CPDE, Netherlands). CPDE's proposition to nominate a non-government Co-Chair was noted, at the same time having three ministerial Co-chairs was considered of strategic importance in the post-2015 discussions, and it was suggested to revisit this possibility after the next HLM (Netherlands).
33. Minister Ploumen raised the need to provide resourcing for the GPEDC Joint Support Team and announced a contribution of EUR 500,000 to both UNDP and OECD. The EU also announced a contribution of EUR 200,000, and Minister Meade noted that Mexico is also considering a contribution to the JST. Members noted the importance of reporting on results of contributions (EU). Mexico also emphasized the high financial costs associated with hosting of the HLM.

SESSION 5. NEXT STEPS AND CONCLUSIONS (CHAIRER BY THE NETHERLANDS)

34. Minister Ploumen concluded the first day of the meeting by noting that the priorities identified for the GPEDC High-Level Meeting in Mexico remain valid and must be deepened, including with regard to fragile settings. Resource mobilisation – both global and domestic – should feature high on the GPEDC agenda, and so should accountability. Minister Ploumen also stressed the issue of quality of development partnerships, emphasising the importance of inclusiveness, participation and mutual learning from all development actors, including parliamentarians and trade unions.
35. Minister Ploumen continued by recalling the need for the GPEDC to find synergies with other global fora around major events in 2015 to share best practices and bring added value. To this regard she presented the GPEDC as a hub to share knowledge, with related initiatives at the core of its actions. She invited the Steering Committee to reach out to emerging economies, particularly China

36. Minister Meade confirmed these conclusions, adding that the Steering Committee must reflect on three crucial aspects of the GPEDC: poverty measurements, which are critical to its eradication; institutional building and long-term investments; and domestic coherence and alignment with national development priorities, especially with regards to this year's Financing for Development conference, the Sustainable Development Goals, and the climate change summits. Minister Meade concluded by recalling the contribution of the GPEDC to global shared learning.
37. In addition to the points above, Minister Gondwe stressed the importance of monitoring commitments at country level and of maintaining the GPEDC's focus to full implementation of existing effectiveness commitments.

SESSION 6. STRENGTHENING THE GPEDC MONITORING FRAMEWORK (CHAIRIED BY MEXICO)

38. Acknowledging that a robust and credible GPEDC monitoring framework is essential for enhanced accountability and transparency and forms a key asset of the GPEDC, Committee members welcomed the work carried out by the JST to strengthen the monitoring framework and gave broad endorsement for the JST to proceed according to the proposed approach, incorporating several recommendations detailed below. Committee members' crucial role in ensuring dialogue, engagement, and political outreach around the monitoring was emphasised throughout the discussion.

Committee members endorsed the JST's recommendations and proposed way forward to strengthen the process of the second GPEDC monitoring round (track 1 of the three tracks presented in the [Steering Committee monitoring document](#)). The need for the Steering Committee to bring more stakeholders to participate in the second round was highlighted (Korea, El Salvador). Members called for a timeline that is realistic both to roll-out the exercise at country level and to enable the delivery of the Second Progress Report ahead of the next High-Level Meeting (EU, Malawi, Netherlands, Mexico). The Netherlands called for the finalisation of indicator refinement by 1 July 2015. Members underlined the need to further link the second monitoring cycle with existing platforms and tools, in particular with regional processes (NEPAD, PFIS, CPDE), UN-led processes (Arab donors, UNDP, PIFS), the New Deal monitoring (Afghanistan g+7), and on-going work carried out by foundations (Foundations). Members suggested further efforts to ensure the impact of GPEDC monitoring reports (USA), and underlined the critical role of Steering Committee members and other stakeholders participating in the monitoring to help gear a successful second monitoring round (UNDP, Malawi).

39. Committee members endorsed the next steps proposed by the JST to refine the methodologies for the four global pilot indicators (track 2 in the monitoring document). Members underlined the need for further consultation with relevant stakeholders (Parliamentarians, Bangladesh, Private sector) and a better overview of the envisaged timeframe as well as updates in between Steering Committee meetings (MDBs) [Note: a monitoring process map has been prepared by the Joint Support Team as a follow-up to the Steering Committee meeting and is attached to this summary].
40. While endorsing the proposed approach to review and ensure the relevance of the monitoring framework for post-2015 implementation and accountability efforts (track 3 in the monitoring document), Committee members called for the identification of stronger links between the GPEDC's monitoring efforts and the post-2015

accountability framework, underlining the importance of political outreach by Steering Committee members to ensure these linkages (Mexico, Arab Donors, PIFS).

41. Before moving on to the Advisory Group, the Chair noted that answered to specific questions raised would be addressed in writing by the Joint Support Team [Note: a “Q&A” document is attached to this summary].
42. Strong support was expressed for the establishment of the monitoring Advisory Group. Some called for drawing on expertise from within Steering Committee members’ organisations (USA, EU, NEPAD, MDBs), with some members highlighting the need to emphasise technical expertise (CPDE, Mexico, Netherlands, PIFS) and to strive for a degree of neutrality/impartiality (NEPAD, Malawi, CPDE). To reflect the discussion, the Co-Chairs compiled a room document [‘Principles for the Advisory Group’](#) which was endorsed in the meeting.
43. The Steering Committee agreed that with the incorporation of the above-mentioned principles, the Advisory Group’s terms of reference would be considered adopted. Members also agreed on a transparent process for the nomination of the Group’s members under the Co-Chairs’ leadership, whereby Steering Committee members are invited to nominate – on behalf of their constituencies – technical experts for the Advisory Group. In the interest of ensuring credibility of the monitoring process, it was agreed that members of the Group will act impartially and without regard to interests of any organisation to which they are affiliated. This means that should Steering Committee members be exploring any nominees that may have an affiliation with a Steering Committee member, or any stakeholder participating in Global Partnership monitoring efforts, such nominee shall be drawn from monitoring and evaluations functions, not from policy making functions. At the same time, the Co-Chairs welcomed and encouraged nominations beyond Steering Committee members’ own organisations or stakeholders immediately related to the Global Partnership. Co-Chairs underlined that receiving a diverse set of nominations from Steering Committee members will be vital to secure an Advisory Group set-up that reflects not only the technical expertise but also the regional diversity, gender balance and various perspectives necessary to ensure a technically credible monitoring and accountability framework to support post-2015 implementation and accountability efforts. On the basis of the nominations submitted by the Steering Committee members, the Co-Chairs will present for approval a transparent proposal on the composition of the Advisory Group which reflects the breadth of participation in the GPEDC.
44. The Chair (Mexico) concluded by emphasising that GPEDC monitoring is a joint effort, and that the monitoring framework includes critical tools for demonstrating that the Busan principles work and that we have results to show for our efforts. He highlighted that monitoring activities form the bulk of the JST budget, and reminded members of the importance of adequately financing this important work. On the forthcoming Advisory Group, he reiterated that credibility of the group was paramount, and underlined that for this reason the group would not be confined to experts with financial backing from their respective organisations, but would rather be financed from the JST budget as originally proposed. This will enable a group composition that provides the neutral, technical advice necessary to ensure a strengthened monitoring framework that is in the interest of the full GPEDC.

SESSION 7. PUTTING PRIORITIES INTO ACTION (CHAIRD BY MALAWI)

45. Malawi introduced three country case studies demonstrating effective multi-stakeholder partnerships on the ground. These cases were among the five finalists selected by the Co-Chairs among the fifteen submitted by GPEDC stakeholders last autumn. The short presentations featured a public-private partnership by health insurer PharmAccess in Nigeria; a female entrepreneurship initiative by the Center for International Private Enterprise (CIPE) and the Bangladesh Women's Chamber of Commerce; and the Nepali-USAID partnership Aid Data, which aims to provide better aid management data for more transparency and accountability.
46. The following discussion highlighted other similarly inspiring multi-stakeholder initiatives, as well as the need to ensure institutional capacity building and alignment to national development strategies in implementing multi-stakeholder partnerships (Foundations, Mexico). It was also announced that all country case studies would be available on the GPEDC website and that stakeholders would have the opportunity to vote for the best case study among the five finalists.
47. In the second part of the session the Steering Committee discussed possible deliverables out of the GPEDC priorities confirmed for the next biennium. In the immediate term it was proposed to focus on concrete actions and deliverables of ongoing Busan Building Blocks and Mexico Voluntary Initiatives, building on the outcomes of the GPEDC planning workshop in Brussels (21-22 January) and to regroup the Building Blocks and Voluntary Initiatives under the common name of Global Partnership Initiatives to highlight the joint efforts coming together under the GPEDC umbrella (Netherlands).
48. In addition, it was announced that the Development Co-operation Forum Symposium in Korea in April would allocate a break out session to discuss GPEDC issues. The OECD Global Forum on Development and the plan of a technical workshop in its margins was also mentioned as an opportunity to facilitate discussions on the measurement of development finance in preparation for the Financing for Development conference in Addis Ababa in July, highlighting the GPEDC's role in advancing dialogue and effective development partnerships (Korea, OECD/DAC, US).

SESSION 8. WAYS OF WORKING AND RESOURCES (CHAIRD BY THE NETHERLANDS)

49. Opening this session, the Netherlands reiterated the importance of having the Global Partnership initiatives use a common brand while recognising their different modalities. More efforts should be made to work through these Initiatives and to link them more closely to the work of the Steering Committee. Global Partnership initiatives could also be grouped according to thematic priorities and a planning meeting could be envisaged prior to the second High-Level Meeting, perhaps in early 2016, to include those stakeholders that cannot participate in the 2015 Brussels workshop (US, EU).
50. Difficulties to clearly define the boundaries of certain constituencies were highlighted. It was agreed that members with overlapping constituencies (e.g. EU, OECD/DAC, Korea) would clarify their representation and internal consultation mechanisms at the next Steering Committee meeting so as to promote a division of responsibilities for outreach and engagement, and that those members who are unclear about their

constituency report on a possible clarification by the next Steering Committee meeting (Netherlands).

51. Steering Committee members were informed about recent communications activities and given an overview of the communications products available to promote the GPEDC. It was noted that conveying clear messages on the GPEDC's mission and activities can be challenging, and that more efforts will be necessary to sharpen and reflect its substantive focus in future communications materials (private sector).
52. In terms of outreach, the interest of recipient countries to have an overview of development finance and co-operation, including from emerging providers, was noted, and in this context the importance of outreach to emerging providers was emphasised as a way to strengthen the GPEDC (OECD/DAC).
53. The JST presented a budget for 2015-16 activities of USD11 million (USD 4.85m for OECD and USD 6.15 for UNDP) as specified in the [resource mobilisation note](#). The Joint Support Team has faced a significant shortfall in meeting its resource requirements to deliver an ambitious programme as envisaged in the original work programme (an activity overview for 2013-2014 is annexed to this document). The work programme for the next two years calls for significantly more resources for the Joint Support Team to strengthen its support to monitoring, analytical work that will enhance country-level implementation and learning as well as communication. The increase includes the costs of communication related activities which were previously not funded out of the Joint Support Team's budget. This does not include direct expenses for the next HLM. UNDP noted a funding gap of USD4.6m. Welcoming recent pledges by the EU and the Netherlands, Steering Committee members acknowledged the need to address the remaining funding gap. Some members requested an overview of JST activities for 2013-14 conducted with previous contributions (US); and further details on the planned activities and budget for 2015-16, including how the "global-light country-heavy" approach is reflected, prioritization of activities if a resource gap persists (EU), and more information on the structure of the Joint Support Team (Netherlands).

SESSION 9. CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS (CHAIRD BY THE NETHERLANDS)

54. The Netherlands summarised the main conclusions from the meeting in terms of priorities, ways of working and next steps. With regards to GPEDC priorities, it was agreed that existing substantive work would be deepened by focusing on how to improve the quality of multi-stakeholder development partnerships. In particular, future work should focus on implementing aid and development effectiveness commitments, including in fragile settings and under-aided countries; and enhancing the effectiveness of development finance, including aid, private investments and domestic resource mobilisation. Accountability will remain a key priority through the work carried out on monitoring.
55. The GPEDC will position itself to make a solid contribution to promoting the coherence of major policy discussions throughout 2015 (Financing for Development, Post-2015 Summit, and COP 21), with the emphasis on the implementation of the agreements that will result from those discussions. Finally, the GPEDC should become the hub to share knowledge about what works and what doesn't in development partnerships.

56. In terms of its ways of working, the GPEDC will continue to represent a voluntary alliance of the willing. Stakeholders' commitment to operationalise principles for high-quality development partnerships forms the core of the GPEDC. Steering Committee members will lead on building political momentum for behaviour change towards strengthened development partnerships that help achieve the future SDGs. The GPEDC has proven that an inclusive multi-stakeholder partnership can work, both at country and global level. However, there is still scope for improvement and more efforts are needed to demonstrate impact and results. As GPEDC ambassadors, Steering Committee members are responsible for reaching out to their constituencies, engaging other players and building bridges with other global processes.
57. Next steps will include enhancing communication between the Co-Chairs and the Steering Committee; refining the global monitoring framework, including by establishing an Advisory Group under the Co-Chairs' leadership (process described in paragraph 45); ensuring sufficient resources for the GPEDC to deliver; linking up to key events in 2015 to sharpen and showcase concrete deliverables, for example at the Financing for Development conference, the Post-2015 Summit, the DCF Symposium, and through the upcoming conference on tax and development organised by the Netherlands. In the immediate term, the Brussels workshop will set up a roadmap for Global Partnership initiatives to strengthen the implementation of the GPEDC vision and priorities.
58. The Steering Committee endorsed the DCF-GPEDC action plan for strengthening synergies between the two fora.
59. The next Steering Committee meeting will take place in Mexico City on 3-4 September 2015.

ANNEX 1: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

CO-CHAIRS	
Netherlands (HOST)	<p>Ms. Lilianne PLOUMEN Minister for Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation</p>
	<p>Mr. Christiaan REBERGEN Director General International Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p>
	<p>Mr. Jeroen VERHEUL Ambassador-at-large for Development Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p>
	<p>Ms. Fatimazhra BELHIRCH Special Advisor, Taskforce Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p>
	<p>Mr. Arjan SCHUTHOF Strategic Advisor, Taskforce Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p>
	<p>Ms. Laura PLATENKAMP Policy Officer, Taskforce Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC), Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p>
	<p>Ms. Lieke WILLEMSSEN Policy Officer, Taskforce Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC), Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p>
	<p>Ms. Sandra DE JONGH Policy Officer, Taskforce Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC), Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p>
Malawi	<p>Mr. Goodall Edward GONDWE Minister of Finance, Economic Planning and Development</p>
	<p>Mr. Newby KUMWEMBE Principal Secretary, Ministry of Finance</p>
	<p>Mr. Macleod NYIRONGO Advisor to the Minister on Global Partnership, Ministry of Finance</p>
	<p>Ms. Betty NGOMA Assistant Director, Debt and Aid Management, Ministry of Finance</p>
	<p>Mr. Daniel JENYA Principal Economist and Personal Assistant to the Minister, Ministry of Finance</p>

Mexico	Mr. José Antonio MEADE KURIBREÑA Secretary of Foreign Affairs
	Mr. Juan Manuel VALLE PEREÑA Executive Director, Mexican Agency for International Development Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Mr. Juan Manuel GÓMEZ ROBLEDO VERDUZCO Under Secretary for Multilateral Affairs and Human Rights, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Ms. Daniela BORBOLLA COMPEAN Director General for Development Cooperation Policy and Planning, Mexican Agency for International Development Cooperation (AMEXCID)
	Mr. Noel GONZALEZ Deputy Director General for Policy Formulation Mexican Agency for International Development Cooperation
STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS	
Afghanistan/G7+	Mr. Mustafa ARIA Aid Management Director Budget Department, Ministry of Finance, Afghanistan
	Mr. Habib UR REHMAN MAYAR Senior Policy Specialist G7+Secretariat, Ministry of Finance, Timor-Leste
Arab Donor Coordination Group	Mr. Said AISSI Advisor to Director-General OPEC Fund for International Development
	Mr. Fuad ALBASSAM Assistant Director-General for Public Sector Operations OPEC Fund for International Development
AU/NEPAD	Ms. Florence NAZARE Head, Capacity Development Division NEPAD Planning & Coordinating Agency
	Mr. Jean-Yves ADOU Senior Policy Officer African Union Commission

Bangladesh	Mr. Mohammad MEJBAHUDDIN Secretary, Economic Relations Division Ministry of Finance
	Mr. Mehdi Musharraf BHUIYAN Coordination and Communication Officer Economic Relations Division, Ministry of Finance
CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness	Mr. Richard SSEWAKIRYANGA Executive Director, Uganda National NGO Forum CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness
	Ms. Maria Theresa LAURON Co-chair, CSO Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation International Department, IBON International
Egypt	Dr. Hazem M. FAHMY Ambassador, Secretary General Egyptian Agency of Partnership for Development
El Salvador	Ms. Ryna Elizabeth GARAY ARANIVA Director-General of Development Cooperation Vice Ministry of Development Cooperation
	Mr. Amílcar MEJÍA Technician of Cooperation and Development Studies Vice Ministry of Development Cooperation
EU	Mr. Klaus RUDISCHHAUSER Deputy Director-General DG Development and Cooperation - EuropeAid
	Ms. Luiza BARA Aid and Development Effectiveness and Financing DG Development and Cooperation - EuropeAid
Foundations	Mr. David CROOK (Day 1) Development Director STARS Foundation
	Ms. Maria Herminia CABRAL (Day 2) Director Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian
Korea	Ms. Youngju OH Director General, Development Cooperation Bureau Ministry of Foreign Affairs

	Ms. Hye-Ryoung SONG Deputy Director, Development Policy Division Ministry of Foreign Affairs
OECD/DAC	Mr. Erik SOLHEIM (Day 1) DAC Chair, DCD
	Mr. Jon LOMOY (Day 2) Director, DCD
	Mr. Jens SEDEMUND Executive Advisor Office of the DAC Chair, DCD
Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat	Mr. Alfred SCHUSTER Development Cooperation Advisor Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
Parliamentarians	Mr. Martin CHUNGONG IPU's Secretary-General Inter-Parliamentary Union
	Mr. Jeff BALCH Director Association of European Parliamentarians with Africa (AWEPA)
Peru	Ms. Nancy SILVA SEBASTIÁN Director (a.i.) of Policy and Programs Peruvian Agency for International Cooperation (APCI)
Philippines	Mr. Rolando TUNGPALAN Undersecretary National Economic and Development Authority
Private Sector Stakeholders	Mr. Thomas DE MAN Chairman, BIAC
	Ms. Albena MELIN Principal Operations Officer – IFC Head of Secretariat Partnerships for Prosperity – P4P
TUAC/ITUC	Mr. Wellington CHIBEBE Deputy Secretary General International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)
	Mr. Matt SIMONDS Liaison/Policy Officer International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)

UCLG/FOGAR	Ms. Annemarie JORRITSMA (Day 1) Vice President of United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG), President of the Association of Netherlands Municipalities (VNG) and Mayor of Almere
	Ms. Renske STEENBERGEN Policy Officer, International Affairs VNG International
UNDP/UNDG	Mr. Michael O'NEILL Assistant Secretary-General & Assistant Administrator Bureau of External Relations and Advocacy
	Mr. Niloy BANERJEE Director of the United Nations System Affairs Group
United States	Mr. Alex THIER Assistant Administrator for Policy, Planning and Learning U.S. Agency for International Development
	Mr. Steven PIERCE Special Coordinator, Development Effectiveness U.S. Agency for International Development
World Bank	Ms. Mariam SHERMAN Director, OPSRE World Bank Group
	Mr. Frank WISSING MADSEN Senior Monitoring and Evaluation specialist, Operations Policy & Country Services World Bank
MODERATOR	
	Mr. Henry BONSU Journalist, Broadcaster, Conference Host and Keynote Speaker
SPECIAL GUESTS	
Brazil	Ms. Elizabeth Sophie MAZZELLA DI BOSCO BALSÀ Minister-Counsellor, Embassy of Brazil in The Netherlands
	Mr. Pablo P.S. Romero Third Secretary, Embassy of Brazil in The Netherlands
China	Embassy representative, The Hague

OECD/UNDP JOINT SUPPORT TEAM

Ms. Patti O'NEILL

Head of Division, Global Partnership and Policies Division, OECD

Ms. Bathylle MISSIKA

Acting Head of Division, Policy Dialogue, Development Center, OECD

Ms. Hanna-Mari KILPELAINEN

Policy Analyst, DCD/GPP, OECD

Ms. Farida BENA TCHAITCHIAN

Policy Analyst, DCD/GPP, OECD

Ms. Julie SEGHERS

Junior Policy Analyst, DCD/GPP, OECD

Ms. Laëtitia CHRISTOPHE

Assistant, DCD/GPP, OECD

Mr. Derek KILNER

Partnerships Development Analyst, Bureau of External Relations and Advocacy, UNDP

Ms. Yuko SUZUKI

Policy Adviser, Effective Development Co-operation/BDP, UNDP

Mr. Patrick TIEFENBACHER

Senior Policy Advisor, Development Effectiveness, Development Impact Group, Bureau for Policy and Programme Support, UNDP