

CSO PARTNERSHIP FOR DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVENESS (CPDE)
Contribution to the 9th GPEDC Steering Committee meeting
Lilongwe, 29 February – 1 March 2016

TOP RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE STEERING COMMITTEE

On meeting objective 1: Provide substantive guidance for preparations of the 2nd GPEDC High-Level Meeting –

- a) Aim for an ambitious conference that re-affirms the **importance of effective development co-operation**; fosters **learning for higher accountability**; recalls our **mutual responsibility** and provides guidance for implementing unmet commitments; and calls for more commitments, particularly on **inclusive development**;
- b) Reinstate the importance of **enabling environment** in the Plenary Session on multi-stakeholder partnerships;
- c) Ensure the HLM2 outcome document is the result of a **transparent process** and **inclusive negotiations building on previously agreed commitments**.

On meeting objective 2: Update on progress of GPEDC monitoring activities and support to implementation efforts –

- a) Strengthen the second monitoring round so it becomes a truly effective tool for **inclusive policy dialogue** at country level;
- b) Revise the global monitoring framework building on an agreed GPEDC **Theory of Change**.

On meeting objective 3: Sharpen GPEDC contributions to the implementation and review of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development –

- a) Promote effective development co-operation as a **universal and distinct agenda** on its own;
- b) Highlight GPEDC's unique **multi-stakeholder model** and **focus on the qualitative impact** of development outcomes in Agenda 2030 discussions;
- c) Showcase **GPEDC as a partnership founded on inclusive development and dialogue**. GPEDC should be presented as providing both substantive contributions and relevant tools for the implementation of Agenda 2030 at global and country level;
- d) Anchor future GPEDC substantive contributions in the development effectiveness **principles** agreed in Busan and consistent with agreed international commitments on **human rights, decent work, gender equality, environmental sustainability and disability**;
- e) Ensure continuity in GPEDC's substantive work by keeping the focus on **existing thematic priorities**.

On meeting objective 4: Identify key priorities to strengthen GPEDC mandate and working arrangements

Preamble: CPDE objects to the suggestion that GPEDC's ultimate purpose should be to become a multi-actor knowledge hub only

- a) Carry out a systematic **internal review of GPEDC** before revising its mandate. The Steering Committee should provide the leadership to ensure this task is completed before agreeing any changes;
- b) Agree on an **explicit GPEDC theory of change** based on the review findings, which shall inform a revised GPEDC mandate if necessary;
- c) Set up a **transparent and inclusive governance renewal** process in the lead up to HLM2; **include a non-executive Co-Chair** to reflect the truly multi-stakeholder nature of the partnership;
- d) Consider holding shorter political HLMs and organising **more substantive discussions** in between;
- e) **Clarify and strengthen GPs' contribution** to specific GPEDC commitments.

Overall comments

The CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the agenda and documentation prepared for the 9th GPEDC Steering Committee meeting. We take note of the four meeting objectives and find the agenda to adequately capture what needs discussing in Lilongwe.

In addition to the top recommendations above, CPDE wishes to draw special attention to the following issues:

1. Revising GPEDC's current mandate and ways of working for the next fifteen years may be premature without an evidence-based, participatory analysis of the Partnership's achievements and challenges. The proposed revised mandate also seriously undermines GPEDC's accountability mandate, which is at the core of GPEDC's value proposition. While CPDE appreciates the effort to make GPEDC more relevant to the implementation of Agenda 2030, we believe **any revision to GPEDC's mandate should be grounded in a systematic review of GPEDC's first few years and in a clearer, agreed articulation of its theory of change.**
2. The HLM2 outcome document should be **negotiated in a transparent and inclusive manner**, by taking into due consideration the views of governmental and non-governmental stakeholders alike and following the multi-stakeholder process that was adopted in Busan. The consultation process suggested in the revised political roadmap is remarkably government-centric and marginalises other development actors, including several members of the Steering Committee. Also, the suggested process does not clarify whose responsibility it will be for reaching out to individual non-executive constituencies to gather their positions on the outcome document. **GPEDC has a wealth of institutional and technical experience** beginning with the Paris Declaration negotiations and the Busan outcome document process. This experience should inform the current choice of modalities for the negotiations of the Nairobi outcome document.
3. GPEDC's **governance renewal** process should be transparent and inclusive, as espoused in the founding principles of the GPEDC. Views about the next round of Co-Chairs and criteria for selecting future Steering Committee members need to be **openly discussed within GPEDC in the lead up to HLM2 and at the conference itself.** CPDE is willing and available to participate in these discussions.
4. As **HLM2** preparations move forward, CPDE wishes to recall the lessons learned from HLM1, in particular the need for the conference to **address both successes and challenges** in delivering impact. The risk otherwise will be to focus on success stories only, which neither reflect the full reality on the ground nor contribute alone to the credibility of GPEDC. This will be particularly relevant in discussing the findings of GPEDC's second Progress Report.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS BY STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA ITEM

Session 1. Progress on the GPEDC monitoring to support the 2030 Agenda

First and foremost, CPDE would like to recall that monitoring is only one, although very valuable, tool for promoting stronger accountability. As such, we believe GPEDC brings a broader added value in supporting the implementation of Agenda 2030. Session 5 of the present document further looks into this.

For the purpose of monitoring, CPDE appreciates the efforts made by the Joint Support Team and the Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG) to strengthen the GPEDC global monitoring framework so far. In particular, we have closely followed the finalisation of the first four indicators and made a concrete contribution to the e-consultation on the transparency indicator (see Annex II). **CPDE also strongly supports the second GPEDC monitoring round**, having identified CSO focal points in sixty out of the 81 participating countries so far. This level of effort has been unprecedented for CPDE and we hope it will contribute to constructive collaboration with the National Coordinators at country level across all indicators, and especially around Indicator Two on the CSO Enabling Environment.

CSOs hope the second monitoring round will not only show positive behavior change in development co-operation, but also **offer a relevant example of inclusive multi-stakeholder dialogue that countries can replicate** in implementing Agenda 2030 and other key development processes at country level. This will be especially important for countries where civic space is shrinking and where CSOs are currently excluded from key consultations on SDG implementation.

CPDE is keen to further strengthen the global monitoring framework after the second round. We welcome the MAG's paper on the **need for an explicit GPEDC Theory of Change**, which we see as a fundamental pre-requisite to both producing a better monitoring framework and revising the scope of GPEDC as a whole.

Key recommendations for Session 1:

- Reflect CPDE's compromise solution in finalising the transparency indicator, as proposed in Annex II;
- Strengthen the second monitoring round by ensuring it promotes inclusive dialogue to support Agenda 2030 at country level;
- Strengthen the global monitoring framework building on an agreed GPEDC Theory of Change.

Session 2: Updates on country level implementation efforts and way forward

CPDE welcomes the progress made by the two working groups on country-level implementation and knowledge hubs and hopes this substantive discussion will continue to bear fruit in the coming months. We are particularly interested in extracting key issues that can **help universalise the effective development co-operation agenda** and make it relevant to other global development fora and, more importantly, to people and planet.

With regard to the **country-level implementation** working group, **CPDE agrees** with its proposal **to strengthen the key enablers** that can accelerate effective development co-operation by articulating democratic country ownership through policy frameworks, by institutionalizing inclusive multi-stakeholder policy dialogue and by providing evidence for this dialogue. Some of our members have developed technical expertise in a number of areas related to these enablers and can further contribute to this work. CPDE recommends a more balanced focus on successes, as well as points for improvement, particularly when it comes to the GPEDC country briefs and country practices. We think identifying gaps and challenges is just as essential to learning as showcasing best practices in development co-operation. We also recommend developing tools that can enable not just the experts but, more importantly, the people who are meant to benefit from development co-operation.

With regard to the knowledge hubs working group, **CPDE strongly supports** the proposal to have **an internal review of GPEDC** as a crucial knowledge base. It is high time we reflected on the overall work carried out by GPEDC since it was first launched in Busan over five years ago before making any changes to its mandate and

ways of working. For this review to be credible, it will need to be run by a small group of GPEDC members reporting to the Steering Committee and based on agreed terms of reference. CPDE is ready to contribute to this important exercise as a Steering Committee member¹.

On the other hand, **CPDE opposes the suggestion that GPEDC's ultimate purpose should be to become 'a multi-actor knowledge hub** at global, regional and national level'. Knowledge sharing is already one of the core functions of GPEDC, as clearly stated in the original GPEDC working arrangements document, so there is no need to set up duplicate structures nor a dedicated Global Partnership Initiative (GPI). Rather, CPDE recommends improving current knowledge sharing mechanisms following some of the practical steps highlighted in the Preliminary Note developed by the working group on knowledge hubs. CPDE can provide further feedback on these steps, if necessary. Overall, reducing GPEDC to a mere knowledge hub would miss the main goal for establishing GPEDC in the first place, which was 'to support and ensure accountability for the implementation of commitments at the political level', as per BPa paragraph 36a.

Regarding the **themes** on which GPEDC needs to focus, CPDE agrees it would be better to select fewer issues at a time. While GPEDC must closely follow the discussion of Agenda 2030 in fora like the HLPF and UNDCF/ECOSOC, we would also like to **reaffirm the universality of effective development co-operation as a distinct agenda on its own**. As such, building on what was proposed at the last Steering Committee meeting in Mexico City last September, CPDE reiterates its support for substantive discussions that are **anchored in the four development effectiveness principles** of country ownership, results focus, inclusive development partnerships, and transparency and accountability. These principles should be used as a development effectiveness lens through which any specific substantive issue is to be addressed. Annex I illustrates an example of how this approach might work for future GPEDC meetings, building on other SC members' proposals.

Regarding the Global Partnership Initiatives (GPIs), CPDE finds the latest report to be significantly improved, both in terms of substantive updates and overall structure. However, **we would like to see clearer and stronger linkages between** the activities carried out by **each GPI and the specific development co-operation commitment** they are supposed to advance, as recalled in the opening paragraph of the report. Consistency between GPIs and existing development co-operation commitments should be the major factor guiding our discussion and helping us determine if GPIs are actually contributing to fulfill those commitments or just exploring new ideas. This is particularly the case of those GPIs focusing on other forms of development co-operation than traditional aid.

Key recommendations for Session 2:

- Deepen the work on the key enablers of GPEDC country-level implementation, paying equal attention to successes and challenges alike; ensure this work enables development co-operation 'beneficiaries' as well;
- Carry out an internal review of GPEDC under the leadership of the Steering Committee before agreeing any changes to GPEDC's mandate and ways of working;
- Anchor future GPEDC substantive contributions in the development effectiveness principles agreed in Busan;
- Clarify and strengthen GPIs' contribution to specific development co-operation commitments.

¹ See session 4 of the present document for further elaboration on this issue.

Session 3. Making progress on preparations for HLM2

CPDE has supported the preparations for the second HLM from the beginning and continues to do so through its representatives, who sit in all plenary working groups, as well as in the over-arching HLM2 core group. We also circulated **comments to the draft HLM2 agenda** in December 2015 (see Annex III). In addition, we would like to highlight the following emerging issues:

- We regret that the title of the last plenary session (Six) currently no longer mentions the **enabling environment** for inclusive, multi-stakeholder development partnerships². In this regard, CPDE would like the Steering Committee to revert back to the original name for the session to put adequate emphasis on enabling environment as the foundation of truly effective multi-stakeholder partnerships;
- As for GPEDC secretariat's efforts to seek further inputs through its additional call for volunteers, we also regret that this call did not take into **account the extensive consultation process** followed by members like CPDE to ensure their nominees fully represent their own constituency. As a result, we now see individual group members who are given the same level of consideration as collective platforms without necessarily having to reflect the views of their constituency;
- CPDE is also concerned about most of these planning groups **delaying the start of their activities**, as well as being unable to manage their work effectively. For example, at the time of writing over 25 members have joined the group planning Plenary Session Six on multi-stakeholder partnerships. CPDE stands ready to take a proactive role in planning activities in support of the working groups.

Ultimately, CPDE hopes HLM2 will re-affirm the importance of effective development co-operation and lead to **renewed political will**, turning the four development effectiveness principles into **concrete commitments** at global level. The level of political ambition for HLM2 in this regard should be one that meets these obligations, as well as inspire rejuvenation both at global and country level. At the country level HLM2 should lead to either establish or enhance **robust mutual accountability platforms with clear timelines for implementation** and support by all GPEDC constituencies.

On the HLM2 format, we agree with the overall structure and support the use of amphitheatre sessions to feed into plenaries. CPDE also looks forward to contributing to preliminary meetings, such as the CSO, Women and Youth fora and side events, and hopes adequate time (e.g. a full day) will be devoted to the pre-HLM stocktaking exercise.

In terms of the process envisaged to produce an outcome document, **CPDE strongly supports a negotiated outcome** that takes into due account the views of non-executive stakeholders. In this regard, we find the process outlined in the Revised HLM2 Political Roadmap to be seriously skewed towards a government-centric approach that marginalizes other relevant development actors, including some Steering Committee members. A similar approach was tested for the first HLM in Mexico, leading to a Communiqué that did not live up to expectations and at times threatened to backtrack on Busan commitments. CPDE calls for inclusive and transparent negotiations where **all GPEDC constituencies have an equal say** in line with the multi-stakeholder nature of the partnership. All drafts should be accessible to all GPEDC members in order to ensure timely feedback. A negotiated outcome document should **avoid re-opening discussions on previously made commitments**, but rather build on them and strengthen their implementation. This should be clarified from the start of

² See the original title for Plenary Session Six in the draft HLM2 agenda circulated on 30 November 2015.

negotiations. The structure, process and timelines for negotiations must be collectively agreed to by the SC members. CPDE recommends the adoption of the **negotiation framework that was used in the lead up to and in Busan** with the Steering Committee taking up what used to be the role of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness.

Key recommendations for Session 3:

- Ensure the HLM2 outcome document is the result of transparent and inclusive negotiations;
- Adopt the negotiation framework that was used in Busan;
- Build on previously agreed commitments.

Session 4. The GPEDC going forward

On the GPEDC mandate

CPDE takes note of the need to review GPEDC's current mandate in light of the context of the post-2015 framework. For this exercise to be meaningful we believe it is important first of all to **re-affirm the raison d'être for GPEDC** envisioned in the Busan Partnership Agreement, which is primarily 'to support and ensure accountability for the implementation of commitments at the political level' (para. 36a). Accountability for the implementation of the Busan commitments is also explicitly mentioned as part of the GPEDC's core functions³. High-Level Meetings were designed to further promote accountability and provide guidance for more effective development co-operation. CPDE fully endorses this mandate and functions and has been a forceful GPEDC supporter under these terms.

The discussion paper on the GPEDC mandate and working arrangements, however, seems to go in a very different direction, which CPDE cannot endorse due to the following considerations:

- The paper either **downplays or ignores GPEDC's accountability role**, even when discussing the global monitoring framework, whose purpose is now defined as 'contributing evidence on the quality of development partnerships and promoting behavioural change'⁴.
- The paper **over-emphasises the voluntary nature** of the GPEDC in an attempt to attract those development stakeholders who have so far hesitated in participating in the partnership, e.g. BRICS countries. While this move may be shared by many GPEDC members it is based on assumptions with no guarantee of a successful outcome. In addition, how further openness and flexibility would promote behaviour change is left unexplained.
- While there is a need for GPEDC to align its work with UN processes such as Agenda 2030 and Financing for Development, **GPEDC should also maintain its own independent policy space** to debate the effective development co-operation agenda without diluting it. GPEDC would hardly keep its added value if its vision, mission and ways of working simply mirrored those of its most relevant UN interlocutors.
- Challenges in the way GPEDC and its Steering Committee work are apparent, yet there is **neither a theoretical foundation nor empirical evidence** that the way forward proposed would be better than what we have. We lack a rigorous, objective analysis of what GPEDC has achieved since its establishment, how it has performed and why.

³ See *Revised Proposal for the mandate of the Global Partnership*, June 2012.

⁴ See *Discussion Paper on the GPEDC mandate and working arrangements*, Part II.

CPDE therefore believes **the Steering Committee or a delegated representative body should carry out a more systematic review** of GPEDC activities, achievements and ways of working before revising its mandate. Ideally, this review should be led by a small group of GPEDC members and address the issues raised by the Monitoring Advisory Group in its implicit Theory of Change discussion documents.

As a following step, CPDE recommends the findings of the review **inform an explicit GPEDC theory of change**, which we currently lack. Only then will the Steering Committee be in a position to revise the GPEDC mandate, if necessary. For now **CPDE recommends extending GPEDC's current mandate and ways of working** until those two pre-conditions (internal review and explicit theory of change) are met. CPDE is willing and available to contribute to both exercises. Accordingly, we do not agree with the suggestion to proceed with a revision of the GPEDC mandate by April 2016.

On GPEDC governance

CPDE agrees with the need to revisit the current co-chairing arrangements in order to better reflect the diversity of the partnership. We once again call for a significantly **more transparent and inclusive process** for nominating the next round of GPEDC Co-Chairs. This process too should be led with the full involvement of all Steering Committee members, who should have the opportunity to evaluate potential candidates. CPDE also asks that the next round of Co-Chairs identify **more frequent and concrete opportunities to engage non-executive Steering Committee members**, like civil society, in joint decision-making, including the possibility of adding a **non-executive GPEDC Co-Chair**. CPDE has repeatedly and consistently asked for this because we believe adding a non-executive Co-Chair will greatly help reflect GPEDC's true multi-stakeholder nature. CPDE would also support holding shorter, leaner HLMs to sustain political momentum while ensuring that **more substantive discussions** are held in between them. The cluster approach adopted during the Working Party era might be helpful in reaching this balance, allowing for deeper discussions on **why** change happens – or does not.

Similarly, the process leading to a renewal of GPEDC's Steering Committee should be fully transparent and inclusive. CPDE recommends a task force of interested Steering Committee members support the Co-Chairs in identifying **possible options for a renewed Steering Committee model** and share the outcome of this work at the next Steering Committee meeting in July 2016.

CPDE once again notes that the current HLM2 agenda does not make room for a discussion of governance issues and we remain concerned that they will be debated behind the scenes, as it was done in the lead up to the first HLM. We strongly **recommend a revision of the HLM2 agenda** to reflect a more open GPEDC governance renewal process.

Key recommendations for Session 4:

- Extend GPEDC's current mandate and ways of working;
- Carry out a more systematic, internal review of GPEDC's achievements and ways of working;
- Agree on an explicit GPEDC theory of change based on the review findings, which shall inform a revised GPEDC mandate if a revision is deemed necessary;
- Set up a transparent and inclusive governance renewal process in the lead up to HLM2;
- Consider holding shorter, leaner HLMs with more substantive discussions in between them.

Session 5. Effective development co-operation and the 2030 Agenda: Emerging priorities and GPEDC contribution

Please also refer to CPDE's position under Sessions 2 and 4.

CPDE broadly agrees with GPEDC's envisaged contribution to Agenda 2030, in particular through its three components of monitoring and policy review of effective development cooperation; political momentum for more effective development cooperation; and support for country-level implementation of effective development cooperation in support of the SDGs. We would like to **add the unique role GPEDC** can play in stating the importance of effective development co-operation. GPEDC can share the outcomes of **qualitative evaluations** of development impact, as well as promote its **inclusive, multi-stakeholder model** in UN and other inter-governmental settings. GPEDC can help focus the attention on how development processes unfold, as much as what development results they produce, particularly at country level, where the action is.

In terms of GPEDC's substantive priorities, GPEDC can make an important contribution to Agenda 2030 by **championing the principles agreed in Busan**, namely country ownership, focus on results, inclusive development partnerships, and transparency and mutual accountability. GPEDC can and should recall how these principles are consistent with agreed international commitments on **human rights, decent work, gender equality, environmental sustainability and disability** and represent the cornerstone of effective development. The Global Partnership should also recall how the development effectiveness principles guide our actions, in particular how they help deepen, extend and operationalise **democratic country ownership** of development policies and processes.

CPDE supports the issues selected for HLM2 and hope the following phase will ensure a good degree of **continuity** in GPEDC's substantive work by continuing to focus on existing thematic priorities. We take note of the recommendation that non-executive Steering Committee members organise at least one internal consultation on HLM2 during the summer and are already planning a number of related initiatives.

Key recommendations for Session 5:

- Reaffirm the importance of the effective development co-operation agenda;
- Highlight GPEDC's unique contribution and multi-stakeholder model in Agenda 2030 discussions;
- Champion the development effectiveness principles in SDG implementation;
- Ensure continuity in GPEDC's substantive work by focusing on existing thematic priorities.

Session 6. Preparations for the second HLM of the GPEDC in Kenya

Please refer to CPDE's position and key recommendations under Session 3.

Final remarks

As announced at the 8th Steering Committee meeting in Mexico, CPDE and several other non-executive Steering Committee members (parliamentarians, trade unions and local governments) are looking into the possibility of one of them **co-hosting a Steering Committee meeting together with a supporting government**. Given that HLM2 preparations are in full swing, we would like this meeting to take place after the conference in the first half of 2017. We are happy that the government of **El Salvador** has just announced its intention to co-host a Steering Committee meeting in 2017 together with one of the non-executive Steering Committee members mentioned above. CPDE looks forward to contribute to this important endeavour, which will surely lead to a productive discussion.

ANNEX I.

Proposed restructuring of future Steering Committee/GPEDC discussions

At the 8th Steering Committee meeting in Mexico City several SC members suggested restructuring future SC discussions around the four Busan principles to ensure GPEDC would add value to related debates in other fora. Below is a revised version of the matrix proposed at the meeting, which builds on internal CPDE discussions. In particular, CPDE would like to ask that future SC meetings set aside some time to discuss the **unfinished aid business** agenda, as well as **specific challenges faced by civil society** in implementing the inclusiveness principle.

CPDE suggests that each SC meeting **address issues that undermine inclusiveness in development**, including in conflict and fragile settings, for marginalised communities and groups. CPDE also asks that the SC **discuss and take action on those factors that threaten CSOs’ full contribution to effective development co-operation**, in consideration of the increasing attacks to civil society’s initiatives in both developed and developing countries around the world. Each meeting could revolve around either a principle (see example in the Country Ownership column) or a substantive priority (see example in the Agenda 2030 and AAAA line).

Anchoring substantive discussions in the development effectiveness principles also means ensuring the outcomes of the discussion are consistent with agreed international commitments on **human rights, decent work, gender equality, environmental sustainability and disability**, as agreed in Busan. CPDE calls for the adoption of a human rights-based approach throughout this process.

Steering Committee members should have the opportunity to play a more proactive role in shaping future meeting agendas.

GPEDC substantive priorities	Development effectiveness principles			
	Country ownership	Focus on results	Inclusive development	Transparency and mutual accountability
Unfinished aid business (including monitoring)	<i>should be discussed at each SC meeting and at HLMs as a regular session</i>			
Agenda 2030 and Financing for Development (AAAA)	<i>e.g. Meeting 1, Session 1</i>	<i>e.g. Meeting 1, Session 2</i>	<i>e.g. Meeting 1, Session 3</i>	<i>e.g. Meeting 1, Session 4</i>
South-South and Triangular cooperation	<i>e.g. Meeting 1, Session 2</i>			
The role of MICs in development cooperation	<i>e.g. Meeting 1, Session 3</i>			
Fragile states and situations of fragility	<i>e.g. Meeting 1, Session 4</i>			
Business in development	<i>e.g. Meeting 1, Session 5</i>			
Etc.				

ANNEX II.

CPDE's proposal to finalise GPEDC's transparency indicator Submitted via e-consultation on 10 December 2015

- 1) *Should information on each donor be presented separately or as one composite (aggregating all systems together)? Should the information be presented separately or as one OECD classification (combining CRS and FSS) and one IATI classification?*

CPDE values GPEDC's efforts to finalise the transparency indicator by consulting its members. At the same time, we are deeply concerned about the delays and challenges in completing this work, a full four years after the Busan Partnership Agreement was agreed. With the monitoring process for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) being established in 2016, it is of utmost urgency that this matter be resolved in order to ensure the complementarity and utility of GPEDC monitoring. We also wish to recall the Busan commitment to implement a common, open standard for the electronic publication of timely, comprehensive and forward-looking information on development co-operation resources by December 2015".⁵(BPA, 23c). Providers should do whatever they can to honour this commitment.

In reply to the first question, CPDE recognises there are fundamental differences between the OECD and IATI classification, which would be challenging to capture in one composite score during this monitoring round. A couple of CPDE members have already laid out options to calculate this score should this approach be followed. Alternatively, CPDE recommends presenting information on each donor separately through two different scores, with an explanation of what each score represents. Similarly, OECD and IATI classification could be presented as two distinct sets of information, with a similar explanation of why it is not feasible to merge the two classifications at this point. It is essential that the final scores and corresponding calculation of the monitoring process be open, transparent and publicly available.

In addition, CPDE strongly recommends that the second Progress Report clearly summarise the process undertaken by OECD and IATI to agree a common, open standard and highlights the key future steps that will be necessary to make progress on this agenda.

- 2) *Until all systems are in a position to include a measurement of accuracy, the question is whether it should be included just for CRS/FSS when forming the categorical classification during the current round of monitoring, present available accuracy information separately, or exclude this dimension until future rounds of monitoring when the methodology can be applied more consistently across the systems?*

In reply to the second question, CPDE appreciates the importance of accuracy in assessing the quality of data provided on development co-operation resources. We strongly recommend that both IATI and CRS/FSS develop robust and transparent methodological approaches to assessing accuracy or data quality in consultation with development stakeholders. This assessment should be incorporated into future rounds of monitoring. The 2016 Progress Report should give priority to the key components of timeliness, comprehensiveness and forward-looking nature of the information provided in presenting the data, in accordance with article 23 c) of the Busan Partnership Agreement.

⁵ BPA article 23c)

ANNEX III.

CPDE's comments to the draft HLM2 agenda Submitted to the Joint Support Team on 17 December 2015

CPDE would like to thank GPEDC's Co-Chairs for the opportunity to comment the Agenda of the second High-Level Meeting (HLM2). We appreciate being consulted from the beginning and look forward to collaborating proactively with you throughout the planning process to ensure the conference moves the effective development co-operation agenda forward.

General comments

CPDE believes the agenda represents a comprehensive summary of what needs discussing in Nairobi. We take positive note of the willingness to ensure continuity in substantive discussions and welcome the addition of the important theme of economic empowerment of women and youth.

We hope the draft document circulated will only be the starting point of a more ambitious agenda going forward, particularly in terms of inclusiveness. The introduction should elaborate on the importance of adopting a truly inclusive approach to each session and side event – something that is currently only mentioned in a footnote – as inclusive dialogue is at the heart of GPEDC.

Based on experience from HLM1 in Mexico, the conference would gain from fewer, longer discussions. This recommendation is especially relevant to Plenary session one on Progress with implementing the unfinished aid effectiveness and Busan commitments and to the amphitheatre sessions. For these sessions to address both successes and challenges in delivering impact, as the document states, there is a need for more adequate time for a balanced, frank views exchange. CPDE suggests giving a speaking space for CSOs to reflect on the process and results from the monitoring exercise. The risk otherwise will be to focus on success stories only, which neither reflect the full reality on the ground nor contribute to the credibility of GPEDC.

CPDE is interested in adequate and meaningful participation in the preparations of all Plenary Sessions and in leading Plenary Session six on multi-stakeholder partnerships. Suggested names of CPDE representatives are listed at the bottom of this document. On a related note, CPDE would also like to nominate CPDE's Co-Chair, Ms. Maria Theresa Nera-Lauron, proposed leader for Plenary Session six, as a prospective member of the HLM2 Working Group.

On process

CPDE welcomes the formulation of an outcome document for HLM2. We strongly urge that this document be negotiated and that the negotiation process be inclusive and transparent. All drafts should be accessible to CPDE members in order to ensure timely CSO feedback. A negotiated outcome document should avoid re-opening discussions on previously made commitments, but rather build on them and strengthen their implementation. This should be clarified from the start of negotiations. CPDE also recommends holding at least one Steering Committee meeting during HLM2 to facilitate negotiations.

Similarly, the process leading to a renewal of GPEDC's governance and mandate should be fully transparent and inclusive. However, the HLM2 agenda does not make room for a discussion of these two issues and CPDE is concerned that they will be debated behind the scenes, as it was done in the lead up to and in Mexico. We strongly recommend a revision of the HLM2 agenda to reflect a more open GPEDC governance renewal process.

Specific comments and recommendations

- On the introductory section: CPDE suggests balancing the contribution GPEDC can make in terms of mutual learning with its key role in ensuring accountability and norm-setting, as both are core GPEDC functions (*“It will do this through taking stock of implementation of development effectiveness principles, providing a mutual learning and norm-setting platform on development effectiveness”*).
- On Plenary one: more time for this session is essential – see comments above. In addition, CPDE recommends the revised agenda primarily emphasise the linkages between this session and the findings from the second Progress report, which will provide the evidence for the discussion.
- On Plenary two: in the spirit of a truly inclusive, multi-stakeholder approach, the discussion should also touch on SDG16 on inclusive societies and how they can contribute to more effective institutions. To foster continuity and lessons learned, GPEDC should use this session to highlight key issues from its work stream on tax, domestic resource mobilisation and development – something that the current draft only mentions as a possibility.
- On Plenary three: CPDE recommends unpacking the definition of South-South co-operation ‘experiences’ so that both successes and challenges are addressed through a more balanced approach (see broader comments above). While the focus of this session is on Southern provider countries, CPDE believes the issue of poverty in some of them should nevertheless be highlighted and linked to the broader discussion in Plenary five.
- On Plenary four: we greatly appreciate the opportunity to focus on two key population groups, like women and youth. CPDE recommends considering also other marginalised groups that should be included in the effective development co-operation debate, for example indigenous people. We look forward to discussing options for planning this session with the other organisers.
- On Plenary five: CPDE welcomes a sharper focus on development co-operation in situations of violence, conflict, fragility, as well as in middle-income countries (MICs). In this regard, we would like the revised agenda to explicitly mention inequality as a key issue for people living in poverty in MICs – which currently represent half of the world’s poor – so that HLM2 can directly address how development co-operation can contribute to solving this challenge.
- On Plenary six: we look forward to discussing civil society’s role in multi-stakeholder partnerships. CPDE believes this is a conversation that should also involve other key stakeholders like parliamentarians, trade unions and the local governments. We are happy to discuss our work on indicators two and three of the monitoring framework and welcome the opportunity offered by this session to discuss how GPEDC is fostering inclusive development partnerships across the board.

On core groups and HLM2 working group

CPDE would like to nominate the following representatives to participate in the working groups on:

- ✓ Plenary session one (Progress with unfinished agenda) – CPDE would like to participate in this group. Our proposed representative is Luca de Fraia, Luca.Defraia@actionaid.org
- ✓ Plenary session two (Supporting the SDG and Addis agenda) – CPDE would like to participate in this group. Our proposed representative is Jeroen Kwakkenbos, JKwakkenbos@eurodad.org
- ✓ Plenary session three (South-South and Triangular Co-operation) – CPDE would like to participate in this group. Our proposed representative is Erin Palomares, epalomares@realityofaid.org

- ✓ Plenary session four (Women and Youth): CPDE would like to participate in this group. Our representative is CPDE's Co-Chair Patricia Akakpo, tricakaps@gmail.com
- ✓ Plenary session five (Leaving no-one behind/fragile settings and MICs): CPDE would like to participate in this group. Our representative is Izabella Toth, Izabella.Toth@cordaid.nl
- ✓ Plenary session six (Multi-stakeholder partnerships) – CPDE would like to lead the working group in charge of planning this session. Our appointed candidate is CPDE's Co-Chair Ms Maria Theresa Nera-Lauron, tlauron@aprnet.org. Ms Lauron would also be CPDE's candidate for joining the over-arching HLM2 working group.

Please copy CPDE's secretariat (secretariat@csopartnership.org and policy@csopartnership.org) in your related correspondence.