



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

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 of 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 \geq 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.

2014	83%
2015	70%
2016	57%

- 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

Aid/ partnership policy in place	National targets (gov & partners)	Progress assessed regularly	Local gov / non- executive stakeholders	Results made public in timely manner
---	--	--	--	---

- 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?*