Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation

Post-monitoring Workshop
Abidjan, Cote d’Ivoire, 27-28 February
Objectives of the workshop

1. Review progress in implementing selected Busan commitments → craft key political messages arising from the monitoring findings (day 1)

3. Take stock of the monitoring process itself → lessons for strengthening the process to support accountability nationally and globally (day 1)

5. Discuss ways to strengthen pilot indicators → help to inform further work to refine approaches (day 2)
Monitoring approach and key findings

- **Paris Declaration evaluation**: Ownership, alignment and harmonisation, results and accountability are relevant for all forms or co-operation. Their implementation has contributed to strengthen standards of partnerships and legitimised demand particularly from developing countries that good practice be observed.

- **Busan: country-led monitoring**

- **46 countries submitted data.** Expectations for broader future participation: countries revising accountability processes to reflect Busan principles.

- **Over 70 co-operation providers** reported data to national governments. Process reviews the quality of almost half (46%) of global “country programmable aid”
Emerging Key Messages: Glass Half Full

- Effectiveness and accountability matter
- Core ‘aid effectiveness’ gains broadly sustained – a good basis for further progress by 2015?
- Reform takes time but it works – need to continue investing, also in ‘younger’ Busan commitments
- Inclusiveness is on the table – but not yet a full reality
- Transparency drive starting to show results – but these need to be geared towards countries’ needs
- Countries increasingly own monitoring – need to support data quality and providers’ country engagement

Commitments → action → behaviour change

- Monitoring spurs actions and reinforces accountability – use what we have and make it work even better…
OWNERSHIP AND RESULTS

- Use of country results frameworks
- Aid on budget
- Quality and use of country systems
- Aid untying
Indicator 1 – use of country results frameworks

- **Target:** all providers use country results frameworks by 2015
- **Measure:**
  - % of funds disbursed through modalities which allow for alignment with countries’ programming, implementation and annual reporting cycles
  - Government perceptions: direct use; and support to developing and strengthening these systems
- **State of play:** too early to say
  - Indicator piloted in 8 countries; 17 partners
  - Preliminary conclusions: great variation among providers; but consistent provider behavior across countries
  - Multilaterals performing better than bilaterals?
- **Way forward:** what are the operational procedures and instruments that need to be put in place for further progress?
Indicator 6 – aid on budget

• **Target:** halve the proportion of development co-operation flows not reported on government’s budgets – with at least 85% reported on budget

• **Measure:**
  • % of disbursements scheduled for the government sector included in the government budget estimates for the same year
  • Change in the denominator (scheduled disbursements instead of actual disbursements)

• **State of play:**
  • 64% in 2013 (compared to 57% in 2010)
  • 7 countries have reached the target of 85%
  • Important variations across countries + interpretation
  • Notable recording of funds on budget beyond what was scheduled
  • Fund inclusion gaps also exist

• **Way forward:** need for greater transparency and regular exchange of information
Indicator 9a – quality of PFM systems

- **Target**: half of developing countries mover up at least one measure (0.5 pts on the PFM/CPIA scale)
- **Measure**: a comprehensive and credible budget; effective financial management systems; timely and accurate accounting and fiscal reporting/audit
- **State of play**:
  - No overall change since 2010: 3 countries moving upwards, 3 countries moving downwards
  - Additional evidence: Open Budget Initiative
- **Way forward**: alternative measure – work underway from the Effective Institutions Platform
Indicator 9b – use of PFM and procurement systems

- **Target**: reduce the gap in the use of PFM and procurement systems (2/3 for CPIA >= 5; 1/3 for CPIA between 3.5 and 4.5)
- **Measure**: % of funds through national budget execution procedures; financial reporting procedures; auditing procedures; and procurement procedures
- **State of play**:
  - 49% of funds use national systems; no change since 2010
  - 15 countries have a use above 60%
  - 14 countries saw an increase; 22 countries saw a decrease
  - Weak correlation between quality of systems and use
  - Recognition of the need for a gradual approach in fragile states (e.g. Somali ND compact)
- **Way forward**: how to promote greater use – and encourage providers to implement their operational policies (most have updated them)?
Indicator 10 – aid is untied

- **Target**: continued progress over time
- **Measure**:
  - % of ODA that is fully untied
  - Bilateral providers only (reporting to OECD/DAC CRS)
- **State of play**:
  - 79% in 2012 (compared to 77% in 2010)
  - Progress in the coverage of the reporting status: only 3.5% not reported
- **Way forward**:
  - some reporting inconsistencies remain: is it a political or technical issue? Can greater value for money be achieved through international bidding for the remaining activities which are tied?
Inclusive partnerships

• Enabling environment for CSOs
• Private sector engagement
• Gender equality
Indicator 2 – Enabling environment for CSOs

- **Target**: continued progress over time
- **Measure**:
  - CIVICUS EEI dimensions related to NGOs legal and regulatory framework
  - 2 subdimensions
- **State of play**:
  - Too early to say – indicator not available (due to limited data availability)
  - Some examples of progress – major challenges in many countries
- **Way forward**:
  - Further thinking needed on possible measurement and collection of primary data
  - How to promote country level dialogue on the CSO enabling environment in existing accountability frameworks and provide a basis to feed into the CIVICUS EEI?
Indicator 3 – Private sector engagement

- **Target:** continued progress over time
- **Measure:** quality of public-private dialogue as a proxy
  - Institutionalised mechanism/formalised structures to facilitate dialogue
  - Representativeness of private sector actors engaged in the process
  - Outcomes of the dialogue (e.g. reform proposals)
- **State of play:**
  - Too early to say – indicator ready to be piloted shortly
- **Way forward:**
  - Need to identify what’s the best way of taking this indicator forward
  - Who does what?
Indicator 8 – Gender equality

**Target:** all developing countries have systems to track and make public gender equality allocations by 2015

**Measure:**
- % of countries with systems in place
- 2/4 criteria: official government statement; allocation systematically tracked; leadership and oversight with ministry of finance; public availability of budget information (mandatory)

**State of play:**
- 12 countries have a system in place
- 4 countries have a system in place but allocations not made public
- Initiatives in most countries not having systems in place

**Way forward:** what support needed to ensure that countries have such systems in place?
TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- Transparency
- Predictability (annual and medium-term)
- Mutual accountability
Indicator 4: Information on development co-operation is publicly available

- **Target?** Full implementation of the common, open standard by 2015
- **Measure:** assess providers’ reporting to the OECD/DAC and IATI systems through 3 criteria: timeliness, comprehensiveness, forward looking nature
- **State of play:** a good start…Average provider: data once a year, data 6-9 months old. Information for 50% of data fields. 75% provide forward looking information.
- **Way forward:** more frequent reporting, fresher data. More systemic completion of data fields, start with country envelopes. How to translate this into support for countries’ strategic planning?
Indicator 5a: Annual predictability

- Measure: proportion of funding disbursed within the fiscal year for which it was scheduled
- Target? Halve (2010-2015) the proportion of funding not disbursed as planned
- State of play: some progress, 84% disbursed according to plan. 22 countries received less than scheduled (17 more). Large variations 40% <= 240%, also within countries. Noteworthy absence of disbursement schedules.
- Way forward: Eliminate funding shortfalls; improving accuracy of funding schedules (also upwards); providing disbursement schedules in the first place.
**Indicator 5b: Medium-term predictability**

- Measure: availability of forward expenditure plans from providers for 1, 2 and 3 years ahead; proportion of funding covered by forward expenditure plans
- Target? Halve the proportion of funding not covered by forward expenditure plans
- State of play: a good start, but Busan commitment not met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Way forward: Adjusting providers policies/procedures so that plans can be regularly updated and communicated. Address possible mismatch between information provision at global and country level
Indicator 7: Mutual reviews of progress

- Measure: four / five criteria
- Target: All countries have in place mutual assessment reviews
- State of play: some progress 70% meet 4/5 criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aid/ partnership policy in place</th>
<th>National targets (gov &amp; partners)</th>
<th>Progress assessed regularly</th>
<th>Local gov / non-executive stakeholders</th>
<th>Results made public in timely manner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Way forward: Encouraging momentum to build on, efforts are underway. Need targeted action to make reviews more inclusive and transparent.
**What are the important messages from your perspective?**

1. **From your perspective, what is the key message?**
   - *Is progress happening? Are we on track to meet our targets?*

2. **What came out of the process for you?**
   - *Progress, what kind? Why so?*
   - *Challenges, what kind? Why so?*

3. **What are the successes / lessons to build on? What needs to be done to overcome bottlenecks?**