Session 1

Seeking synergies: climate finance, effective development cooperation and the 2030 agenda

Mr. Tom Beloe, Aid Effectiveness Specialist, UNDP Asia-Pacific Regional Centre
Dongkang Hall A (3F, K-Avenue)

The session will provide an update on the activities of the Partnership on Climate Finance and Development. It will include presentations of how key partners are taking forward the Partnership objectives at the country, regional and global levels. There will also be opportunities for participants to provide suggestions for further activities as well as to join in the Partnership as active partners.

Given the timing of the meeting taking place recently after the Financing for Development Conference in Addis Ababa and the Sustainable Development Summit in New York, and just ahead of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) COP 21 in Paris the discussion will include a focus on seeking coherence across these international agendas, particularly at the country level.

A panel of representatives from country and international organisations will respond to a set of questions focused on what can be done to maximize synergies between climate finance, effective development cooperation and the implementation of the SDGs at country, regional and global levels.

Focus questions to be addressed in the session:

- What are the challenges and opportunities at the country level for strengthening the management of climate finance and effective development cooperation in ways that support the achievement of the SDGs?
- What role is there for south – south dialogue and cooperation across countries at regional and global levels in taking this agenda of coherence forward?
- What are your recommendations for the Partnership on Climate Finance and Development moving forward?
Session 2

Lessons in assessment and evaluation of South-South Cooperation (SSC) to achieve sustainable development outcomes

Ms. Anthea Mulakala, Director of International Development Cooperation, The Asia Foundation & Mr. Artemy Izmestiev, Policy Specialist, UNDP Seoul Policy Centre

Dongkang Hall B (3F, K-Avenue)

From its inception in 2011, the Global Partnership on Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) placed significant value in engagement of the new and emerging actors. The Busan Outcome document acknowledged that “the nature, modalities and responsibilities that apply to South–South cooperation differ from those that apply to North–South co-operation” at the same time encouraging the rapprochement between traditional donors and providers of South-South cooperation.

The data on South–South cooperation (SSC) is fragmented and insufficient. But just like official development assistance describes only one aspect of relationship between the North and the South, the importance of SSC transcends financial indicators and encompasses cooperation in a broad range of areas including South–South trade and investment, transfer of new technologies, expertise, knowledge sharing and peer learning, making it difficult to quantify provided support and assess the results.

The discussion will focus around the case studies and will feature presentations by the authors and officials from the participating countries. Some case studies (e.g. China–Cambodia, Thailand–Laos) will focus on evaluation of the projects between partner countries. The Brazil–Angola case study will focus on the application of the NeST framework for assessing the quality of SSC. The discussion will address the framework for assessment of the quality of South–South relations.

The discussion will address the following questions:

- Is a common framework for assessing SSC desirable? Why or why not? By whom and for whom?
- What challenges do providers and partners face in trying to assess the quality of South–South relations, approach evaluation and measure the impact of SSC?
- Are existing frameworks used by DAC donors suitable or adaptable?
- What recommendations do we have for the UNDCF, the GPEDC and its voluntary initiatives to harness SSC for the implementation of partners’ development strategies?
Session 3

Financing for Results: Strengthening policy and institutional frameworks for planning and monitoring of resources at country level, leading to improved accountability and results

Mr. Monowar Ahmed and Ms. Suzanne Mueller, GPI Results and Mutual Accountability & Ms. Yuko Suzuki, Policy Advisor, UNDP

Namkang Hall A (B1F, K-Avenue)

The concept of linking various financial flows to country development results is the key element in this session. The Financing for Development (FfD) conference in Addis Ababa in July this year initiated the formulation of Integrated National Financing Frameworks that will play a key role in linking finance to results.

This session aims to combine four topics crucial for effectively financing for results:

- The country’s results framework; which results, indicators, targets, etc.
- Development financing; how to pay for the results that are aimed for
- How to track the changes towards results; using IATI data and development finance information
- How the country manages the changes towards results

These four topics will be shortly introduced and accompanied with country experiences. After these introductions there will be a guided discussion with the participants to generate additional experiences and suggestions for the Global Partnership Initiative (GPI) to continue its activities.

The session is prepared and led by the GPI on Results and Mutual Accountability who is closely cooperating with three regional offices in Asia (AP-DEF), Africa (NEPAD) and Latin America (Proyecto Mesoamerica). These three regional offices are coordinating activities to enhance the use of country results frameworks and its financing.

This session is split into these four topics:

1. Country Results Framework
2. Development financing
3. Transparent development data
4. Managing change
Session 4

Monitoring for accountability: civil society organizations on GPEDC’s second monitoring round

Ms. Maria Theresa Lauron, Co-Chair, CPDE
Namkang Hall B (B1F, K-Avenue)

CPDE regards the second monitoring round as crucial in holding GPEDC members to account for implementing and making progress on their promises. It is already making a proactive contribution to the success of the monitoring exercise, having identified 45 country-level civil society focal points that will support the process through national advocacy, capacity-building and internal accountability on CSOs’ own development effectiveness. So far a key issue emerging from the GPEDC monitoring process is the need to facilitate the interaction among different constituencies – government, civil society, providers, etc – on the ground. Civil society is also eager to create more opportunities for sharing lessons learned from the first monitoring round, as well as broader accountability processes, discussing challenges in promoting mutual accountability at national level. These needs are particularly acute when it comes to assessing the environment in which CSOs operate to determine if they can make their full contribution to development as independent actors (this work relates to indicator 2).

The aim of Korea’s Busan Global Partnership Forum being to ‘focus on progress in implementing the Busan commitments at country level’, CPDE believes a discussion of these issues would be highly relevant and useful, both on a political and an operational level – particularly in view of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The two-hour session is therefore envisaged as a roundtable gathering a few national monitoring coordinators, civil society focal points, as well as representatives from the donor community and other development stakeholders engaged in parallel accountability processes (e.g. the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States). Through the moderation of CPDE’s Co-Chair the panelists will be invited to share best practices, reflect on challenges and answer questions on GPEDC’s monitoring efforts and, more broadly, how to enhance country-level accountability in a post-2015 landscape.

Focus questions for speakers

- What has been your experience with the first monitoring round, particularly at country level? Was the first exercise inclusive and useful?
- What do you see as the main opportunities and challenges at the beginning of GPEDC’s second monitoring cycle?
- What does your constituency need to contribute to the success of the exercise? What are your plans?
- How can civil society help at national level? What can your constituency do to strengthen an enabling environment for CSOs? What more can be done to operationalise the GPEDC indicator on CSO enabling environment?
- What has been the role of providers in making progress on the CSO enabling environment at country level? What has been their contribution locally?
- What can GPEDC do for you to enhance accountability in-country? How can GPEDC monitoring support other parallel accountability processes, e.g. in crisis response and fragile settings? Do you have any recommendations based on lessons learned from other similar exercises?