



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

UPDATE ON GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVES – REPORTING JUNE 2016

[DRAFT 10 JUNE]

Global Partnership Initiatives' Acceleration Workshop
21-22 June, Barcelona, Spain

This document lists responses from Global Partnership Initiatives to the third call for GPI bi-annual reporting (June 2016). All responses are reproduced in their entirety as provided to the GPEDC Joint Support Team.

This document is a preliminary version and contains only the responses submitted to the Joint Support Team by Friday 10 June 2016. The final list including submissions received after 10 June will be shared with participants ahead of the meeting.

Contacts:

Ms Talita Yamashiro Fordelone, Tel: + 33 1 45 24 95 94, email: talita.yamashirofordelone@oecd.org

Ms Valentina Orrù, Tel: + 33 1 45 24 60 40, email: valentina.orrù@oecd.org

**GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVES' RESPONSES TO
THE THIRD CALL FOR BI-ANNUAL REPORTING (JUNE 2016)**

GPI 3: Additional efforts on International Aid Transparency Initiative.....	3
GPI 4: Business Hubs.....	6
GPI 10: Country Dialogues for Using and Strengthening Local Systems.....	8
GPI 12: CSO Enabling Environment Framework and Guidelines.....	11
GPI 13: Development Impact Bonds	14
GPI 14: The role of local and regional governments in effective development.....	15
GPI 17: EU Joint Programming: Helping to Manage Diversity	17
GPI 21: Guidelines for Effective Philanthropic Engagement.....	20
GPI 36: Welcome the development of the “Tax Administration Diagnostic Assessment Tool” (TADAT).....	23
GPI Managing diversity and reducing fragmentation (former Building Block)	25
GPI 18: Further work on Managing Diversity and Reducing Fragmentation.....	25
GPI 22: Highlighting the problem of potentially under-aided countries	25
GPI Results and Mutual Accountability (former Building Block).....	27
GPI 40 Promoting Effective Partnering.....	29
GPI 41 Agricord.....	31

GPI 3: Additional efforts on International Aid Transparency Initiative

Key progress made and lessons learnt since the inception of the GPI

The primary purpose of this Global Partnership Initiative, agreed by IATI members at the High Level Meeting in Mexico in 2014, was to encourage Busan endorsers to accelerate their efforts to implement the common standard for electronic publication of timely, comprehensive and forward-looking data on their development cooperation activities by December 2015, in line with the commitment made in paragraph 23c of the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation. IATI was also a core element of the Busan Building Block on Transparency, and this GPI relates to effective development co-operation principle 4 – transparency and accountability.

Overall progress in meeting this commitment is measured by the transparency indicator developed by the GPEDC as part of the Global Partnership Monitoring Framework. In order to support this effort, as well as to inform IATI's own work to improve data quality, IATI members have agreed a methodology for measuring the IATI component of the transparency indicator across the three key dimensions of timely, forward-looking and comprehensive data. This information is updated on a nightly basis for all IATI publishers via the IATI Dashboard, enabling a real-time view of their progress.

The analysis in this report is based on a snapshot taken from the IATI Dashboard on 31st May 2016 and focuses on the subset of IATI publishers who endorsed Busan and are therefore bound by the transparency commitment. This data has been shared with the GPEDC Joint Support Team and will form the basis of the IATI component of the transparency indicator assessment.

Summary of results

1) Timeliness - a big win for IATI publishers

Access to timely data on development cooperation has consistently been identified as a top priority by partner countries, who need this information to plan and manage resources effectively. IATI publishers have made significant progress on this since Busan, and in this latest assessment:

- 56% now publish IATI data on at least a quarterly basis with a time lag of no more than three months, while 31% meet the gold standard of publishing to IATI on a monthly basis with a time-lag of one month.
- The results are even more impressive for the subset of publishers who are IATI members - 74% of this group publish data on at least a quarterly basis and 45% are publishing on a monthly basis.

Given that no-one was publishing timely data at the time the Busan commitment was made in 2011, this represents a major success story for IATI publishers, while the enhanced performance of IATI members underlines the value of active participation in this multi-stakeholder partnership, offering greater opportunity for peer learning and support among members.

2) Forward-looking - some progress, but still a challenge

Access to forward-looking data is another top ask from partner countries and while some progress has been made, this demand continues to present challenges for many IATI publishers. The latest assessment confirms that of the IATI publishers who endorsed Busan:

- While 56% publish at least some forward-looking data on activities for 2016-2018, many publish only a tiny percentage, with only 22% providing forward looking data on over half of their activities.
- Again, the performance of the subset of IATI members is significantly better, with 77% publishing at least some forward-looking data, and 32% providing this for over half of their current activities.

Discussions with IATI publishers suggest that the difficulties they face in publishing forward-looking data

tend to reflect technical challenges within their internal systems, political barriers to the publication of future budgets or in some cases, a business model that makes this impossible, rather than any unwillingness on their part to make this information public. Given the importance of this data to partner countries, this is an area that merits further discussion in order to overcome these barriers where possible.

3) Comprehensive data - significant progress

Partner countries also need a complete picture of the resources available to them. On this dimension, IATI publishers have made significant progress. Of the IATI publishers who endorsed Busan:

- 78% of IATI publishers score 60% or more on this dimension, with 38% scoring 80% or more.
- IATI members do even better, with 90% scoring 60% or more, and 52% scoring 80% or more.

4) Overall performance

The IATI Dashboard calculates an overall score for each publisher based on their performance against each of these three dimensions which is then adjusted by their coverage ratio (the percentage of their total spend that is published to IATI). Publishers with an overall score of 80% or more are judged excellent, while those scoring between 60-80% are judged as good. On the basis of this assessment:

- 38% of IATI publishers who endorse Busan are rated as good or excellent, with 16% in the excellent category.
- Amongst the subset of IATI members, the proportion rated as good or excellent increases to 55%.

5) Progress made by non-Busan endorsers

The second element of the IATI GPI encouraged other actors who had not endorsed Busan to take voluntary action to improve the transparency of their data along similar lines. On this too, IATI can demonstrate good progress. The total number of IATI publishers has increased to over 460, and this includes DFIs, private sector organisations, philanthropic foundations, and hundreds of national and international CSOs.

6) Promoting greater use of data

While IATI has played a key role in improving the supply of data on development cooperation, it is the use of that data, especially at country level, that has the potential to be truly transformative in terms of development outcomes. The final element of the IATI GPI urged developing countries and providers of development cooperation to work together to promote greater use of data. This is now a top priority for IATI, and one that members will discuss at their forthcoming Members' Assembly in June where providers of Aid Information Management Systems will also provide updates on their specific work in this area, notably in Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Chad, Cote d'Ivoire, Madagascar, and Senegal.

GPI's activities at country level

[26 partner countries are members](#) of IATI, and play an active role in its Members' Assembly and Technical Advisory Group. During a recent governance restructure, two partner countries – Bangladesh and Madagascar – took seats on IATI's new Governing Board, with the former as the Vice Chair of the IATI Board, reflecting the multi-stakeholder nature of the initiative.

Policy messages from GPI experience to inform discussions and decisions at the 2nd High-Level Meeting of the GPEDC (29 November – 1 December 2016, Nairobi, Kenya)

- The success of IATI publishers, and especially of its members, in improving the transparency of their development cooperation over the past five years demonstrates the value of multi-stakeholder initiatives in driving progress on specific issues. This could provide a useful model for progress on other priorities at the Nairobi HLM.
- The Busan 23c commitment to transparency has been critical to IATI's success, giving its members and publishers a clear, time-bound target to aim for. This underlines the importance of using High-Level

Meetings to make specific, time-bound political commitments.

- The ongoing monitoring of this commitment via the IATI Dashboard has enabled the IATI Technical Team as well as IATI publishers and members themselves to track their progress, and identify the steps required to improve the quality of their data. This kind of ongoing monitoring has been invaluable in supporting incremental progress.
- The big win on IATI has been increasing the timeliness of the data, and good progress has been made with regard to the publication of comprehensive data. The publication of forward-looking data has proved more challenging, as many IATI members and publishers say that they do not capture the relevant data within their internal systems. Given the importance of improving predictability, this is an issue that merits further discussion at the Nairobi HLM.
- While IATI has been successful in increasing the availability of data on development cooperation, it is the use of that data that will be transformative, and this is IATI's priority going forwards.

Actions that could be agreed at the 2nd High Level Meeting to accelerate progress towards principles and commitments for effective development co-operation

IATI's experience confirms that having specific, time-bound commitments, and monitoring those on an ongoing basis are crucial in driving progress. IATI members will be considering their priorities for HLM2 at their forthcoming Members' Assembly meeting in Copenhagen, but previous discussions suggest that these are likely to include support for a renewed and enhanced commitment on transparency, potentially with an emphasis on promoting data use especially at country level.

GPI 4: Business Hubs

Key progress made and lessons learnt since the inception of the GPI

BPA supports the creation of locally-owned and run country-level platforms or Hubs that systematically bring together government, business, donors, the UN and NGOs, build trust and align interests, innovate and support win-win partnerships that contribute to the Sustainable Development Goals. The platforms advance implementation of the commitments on 'focus on results' and 'inclusive development', and are an essential mechanism to engage business as a partner in development. BPA is also developing the 'art and science' of platforms for partnership, testing, codifying and maturing platforms as an essential technology to achieve the SDGs.

BPA has supported the development of platforms in:

- **Zambia:** the platform engages business, facilitates dialogue and innovation, and directly supports public private partnership action on key business and development challenges. Results include building a conducive partnering culture through partnership trainings and through roundtables on the concepts of shared value and inclusive business with several hundred CEOs; a partnership innovation series for job creation with the Ministry of Finance; and the catalyzing of a range of partnerships including around vocational skills development, 'cassava to starch' and solar powered mini-milling plants.
- **Mozambique:** the 'LINK' facility supports the development of inclusive business and partnerships, including the development of the Construction Industry Skills Training and Certification Partnership and the Beira Plastics Recycling Partnership.
- **Colombia:** the Colombia Business in Development Hub creates and accelerates cross sector partnerships through inclusive business models and value chains. Key include taking ten partnerships (focused in agriculture, textiles and services) to the feasibility stage. The Facility has also been chosen by the government of Colombia as a key mechanism for engaging the private sector on post-conflict treaty and reconciliation.
- **East Africa:** BPA supported the creation of the Humanitarian Private Sector Partnership Platform (HPPP). Led by World Vision and UNOCHA, and launched in March 2016, the platform aims to engage the private sector and support the development of partnerships to improve the reach, quality and timeliness of the humanitarian system and in helping to strengthen disaster management across the region.
- **Asia Pacific:** BPA is supporting World Vision in the development of a cross-sector incubator for new solutions to development and humanitarian problems, with an initial focus on water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) in the Asia Pacific region. Centered in Singapore, the incubator will bring together business, NGOs and government to develop and scale up innovative approaches.

BPA held a two-day workshop in Mexico for practitioners from 11 different platforms for partnership from around the world. The workshop drew out and exchange the experiences of running platforms and contributed to a major new publication: *Platforms for Partnership: Emerging good practice on engaging business as a partner in development*.

GPI's activities at country level

See above.

Policy messages from GPI experience to inform discussions and decisions at the 2nd High-Level Meeting of the GPEDC (29 November – 1 December 2016, Nairobi, Kenya)

To achieve the SDGs will require an unprecedented level of collaboration across all sectors of society. The interconnectedness of the prosperity of business, the prosperity of society and the prosperity of the environment means that only by aligning interests and combining the complementary resources of government, business and civil society can we hope to achieve sustainable development. This mainstreaming of collaboration, and in particular the engagement of business in development, requires a deliberate and targeted effort – it won't just happen.

One essential mechanism to make this happen is 'platforms for partnership'. These platforms are an ongoing mechanism to catalyse collaboration for development in a systematic way. Platforms undertake activities to convene and align government, business, non-governmental organisations, civil society organisations, donors and other development actors around a particular issue or geography, facilitate innovative collaborative approaches and directly broker and support new partnering action.

To unleash the power of partnership towards the SDGs, governments and other development actors need to invest in the development of such platforms. Wherever possible, they should build on and extend existing mechanisms such as public-private dialogue platforms that could become public-private partnership action platforms, and should explicitly be multi-sectoral through engaging business associations and civil society groups as part of their governance.

For full policy messages, see: Delivering on the Promise: In-country multi-stakeholder platforms to catalyse collaboration and partnerships for Agenda 2030, <http://bit.ly/1XzjWYB>

Actions that could be agreed at the 2nd High Level Meeting to accelerate progress towards principles and commitments for effective development co-operation

Participants could agree to invest in the development of platforms for partnership that would accelerate inclusive development partnerships, a focus on results, country ownership and the engagement of the private sector as a partner in development.

GPI 10: Country Dialogues for Using and Strengthening Local Systems

Key progress made and lessons learnt since the inception of the GPI

The 'Country Dialogues for Using and Strengthening Local Systems' were launched in April 2014 at the Mexico High Level meeting by the Effective Institutions Platform (EIP). Country dialogues involve country level action, led by partner countries, towards the greater use and strengthening of country systems (UCS), alongside better integration of aid in the budget cycle; **this directly contributes to the achievement of Indicator 9a and 9b of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC).**

The GPI initiative has contributed to the principles and commitments of effective development co-operation in two main ways:

1. Producing knowledge products: the EIP is drafting a policy paper that considers the current implementation of Busan's commitment on using country systems by default. The paper will provide the background for the 2016 GPEDC high level meeting (HLM) discussions on this theme. The paper draws its conclusions from the lessons learnt through the country dialogues, quantitative aid data analysis and qualitative analyses of development partners' (DPs) practices.

2. Organizing country level political dialogues: since 2015, the EIP has launched country dialogues in two pilot countries: Senegal and Bangladesh. Somalia and Afghanistan have expressed interest and commitment to implement the dialogue in their respective countries through the secretariat of the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (IDPS). In each pilot country, the EIP has intervened at the request of the country. In each context, the EIP used a four-step approach. The EIP has:

- Conducted fact-finding missions to research on the current aid modalities used by DPs and the main bottlenecks to achieving the implementation of Indicator 9b.
- Pursued a preliminary dialogue has been organized between DPs, different branches of the government and civil society to identify priorities areas where progress would be technically and politically achievable.
- Supported a consultation, using a national consultant, with all stakeholders, undertook an in-depth analysis of the priority areas, and formulated actionable steps that could enhance the use of country systems.
- Organized a national high level dialogue to propose to government and DPs the actions identified and a timeline to implement them, seeking all parties' formal commitment.

The EIP adopts a broad definition of country systems, encompassing all dimensions of Public Financial Management (PFM), which includes planning, budgeting, treasury, internal and external control, procurement, reporting, as well as other dimensions of the decision making cycle such as monitoring. The first achievement of the dialogue has been to harmonise views across the Government and between Government and Development Partners on the definition of use of country systems. Discussions enabled partners to distance themselves from a misconception that the use of country systems simply means the use of budget support. Partners are encouraged to adopt an approach that considers how all aid modalities can be used as a basis for an increased integration of aid along the public management chain.

Dialogues relate to Global Partnership principles 1, 2, 3 and 4 through several channels. For example, as aid integration in the PFM planning phase implies that aid is aligned to national priorities (including national development plans and sectoral planning documents), dialogues contribute to improvements in ownership of development priorities by development countries. Greater clarity amongst diverse stakeholders on how aid is channeled by various development partners allows for increased transparency and accountability of development cooperation. As defined by the Development Cooperation Forum (DCF) mutual accountability implies "Clear institutional structures and responsibilities for managing aid, supported by strong political leadership from recipient governments and parliaments". By creating a safe space for discussion between all parties and building consensus amongst diverse stakeholders, the dialogues generate confidence

amongst the actors in their problem-solving abilities and contribute to enabling more inclusive partnerships at the country level.

Furthermore, the dialogue facilitated open voluntary exchange and mutual learning between partners; this enhanced the value of partnerships in action, contributing to SDG 17.15. By offering the opportunity for defining practices and responsibilities within government in managing aid flows and information and sharing lessons learned from past reforms, the dialogue contributes to strengthening public financial management and more generally to “develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels (SDG 16.6)”. For instance, examples of the actionable steps that the dialogues have considered include: developing jointly defined processes through which development projects are defined, planned and evaluated using the national structures in place and strengthening the links between aid management platforms and national budget documents.

GPI’s activities at country level

Senegal

A preparatory mission was held in early June 2015 in collaboration with the Collaborative Africa Budget Reform Initiative (CABRI). Meetings were held with government officials from Ministry of Finance, Line Ministries of Health and Education, the Court of Audits, as well as development partners including WB, USAID, European Union, GIZ, UNDP. The meetings enabled participants to build a joint understanding around use of country systems and identify which components of country systems should be prioritised for the dialogue. An initial mapping of country systems and how donors are currently using them was undertaken by the EIP and formed the basis for discussions held during the preliminary dialogue.

On September 2-4th 2015, representatives from the Senegalese government, DPs and civil society organisations (CSOs) met for the preliminary dialogue. The initial mapping was discussed by stakeholders for validation and prioritisation. The focus areas jointly identified were budgeting, planning, reporting and procurement. Further analysis is being conducted with CABRI on these priority areas in order to identify short-term actionable steps, alongside a long-term trajectory to strengthen and enhance their use, which will be validated during the final country dialogue due in June 2016. This will be the opportunity for high-level officials from all constituencies to commit to the actions identified to improve results on the use of country systems.

Bangladesh

A fact finding mission was conducted by the EIP from August 23-26th 2015. Meetings were conducted with several development partners and government directorates, following a questionnaire that was shared with the respondents before and after the mission. The results of the conversations helped shape the strategic focus of the preliminary dialogue which took place on February 2-4th 2016. The dialogue produced two main outcomes: i) a joint assessment of the process of the PFM reform, and of its results in terms of use of the country system ii) an identification of critical areas (problem statements) where improvements are needed for more effective PFM and for enhancing the use of country systems. Based on the priority areas identified, a case study has been undertaken to identify concrete steps that could be endorsed at the high level dialogue. The high-level dialogue is due to take place in July 2016.

Next steps:

- Senegal high level dialogue (June/July 2016)
- Bangladesh high level dialogue (July 2016)

Policy messages from GPI experience to inform discussions and decisions at the 2nd High-Level Meeting of the GPEDC (29 November – 1 December 2016, Nairobi, Kenya)

Some of the lessons learned so far include:

- The country dialogues are not an “all or nothing” approach: the EIP adopted a broad approach to UCS during the dialogues; this approach considers all aid modalities as a basis for using at least some dimensions of country systems. For example, while project support is not channeled through the treasury, it could be considered as using some dimensions of country systems as long as it is recorded on budget.
- Quality and exhaustive aid information is the first step for using country systems: recipient governments

need to see donors' aid projects in the context of their own domestic resources for effective planning and budgeting. For this purpose DPs need to regularly update aid information on country data management mechanisms (such as AIMS in Bangladesh). In turn, these platforms need to make efficient use of the information, by linking it to national planning and budgeting processes.

- “Global commitment, local solutions”: enhancing UCS in a specific country is the result of a strong high-level political commitment from the local government to improving their systems. Local engagement is crucial to inspire confidence in DPs about the strength of the national systems. Country dialogues, such as the ones organized by the EIP in Bangladesh and Senegal, facilitate a collective understanding of the obstacles to increase the use of local systems. For example, DPs appreciate the dialogue as an opportunity to share feedback on the past reform outcomes with the government. This process boosts a high level involvement from local government and development partners to follow up on the engagements resulting from the dialogue.
- Depending on the procedures of each donor, there is a varying margin of maneuver at country level for amending their implementation modalities. For this reason, the EIP mobilizes through country dialogues in parallel, local actors and development agencies, encouraging them to pilot experimental measures in the countries where the initiative takes place.
- A broad spectrum of government services (statistical, procurement, audit, planning institutions and parliament) and civil society need to be included to ensure the support and follow-up on the changes that will be adopted as result of the initiative.

Actions that could be agreed at the 2nd High Level Meeting to accelerate progress towards principles and commitments for effective development co-operation

Participants could agree on the following actions:

- Improve transparency and harmonization of diagnostic tools used by DPs at country level to assess the quality of country systems and discuss with the government the possibility to mutually agree on one joint framework. A joint framework will harmonize DPs evaluations of the efforts that the country has put in place to improve its PFM and jointly assess persisting fiduciary risks. This framework could be discussed with national authorities to ensure its relevance for the context and could inform collectively decisions about which aid modalities to be used in the country.
- At county level, more evidence could be collected to prove the cost-effectiveness of different aid modalities. Hard figures, comparing the efficiency of aid delivered through national systems as opposed to the one channeled through external mechanisms (International NGOs and Multilateral agencies) should be made available to DPs. These figures could help DPs assessing the transaction costs they have to bear for not using country systems and weight them against the risks associated to further aligning their aid to the systems.
- Should the debate shift from country to local systems? GPEDC partners could start a discussion around whether the measurement of UCS need to be updated to maintain momentum for an enhanced used of more aligned aid modalities? UCS measurement could be widen to include disbursements for non-government sector (local CSOs and private-sector)that are aligned to national objectives and reported on budget.

GPI 12: CSO Enabling Environment Framework and Guidelines

Key progress made and lessons learnt since the inception of the GPI

The Task Team (TT)'s GPI-12 initially aimed at three deliverables: a) country-level multi-stakeholder dialogues on CSO enabling environment and CSO development effectiveness, b) refined Indicator Two definition and monitoring approach and c) CSO Enabling Environment Framework and Guidelines.

The TT successfully contributed to refining the Indicator Two monitoring approach. A group of TT participants representing partner countries, the International Donor Group and CPDE participated in the Joint Support Team's (JST) informal working group on Indicator Two. The refined Indicator Two monitoring process and content draws from the GPI-12 design and from TT input in the informal working group. Overall, TT input is reflected in the four-part framework for Indicator Two; the multi-stakeholder approach; the concept of Focal points, and the opportunity to engage third party consultants.

Though the TT had laid the groundwork toward launching multi-stakeholder dialogues in four countries, following its contribution to refining the Indicator Two monitoring approach the TT revisited its GPI-12 approach to avoid overlap with the official Indicator Two testing and monitoring. Seeking synergies with the refined Indicator Two monitoring process TT participants agreed to instead conduct a Stock-take of the Indicator Two monitoring process as a new GPI-12 component.

The aim of the Stock-take is to provide commentary on the process, challenges and opportunities of the Indicator Two monitoring exercise, including perceptions of country level stakeholders on the ideal and actual Indicator Two monitoring process and questionnaire content. This is being done by collecting information and perspectives from multiple stakeholders in 11 countries (see question 3 for the list). The Stock-take will result in a report which will be available in July 2016.

The TT anticipates that the Stock-take will be a useful source for the GPEDC and its Monitoring Advisory Group as it examines the GPEDC Monitoring Framework in 2016 – and specifically indicator 2. The Stock-take findings will also be useful for the 2016 Progress Report reflections on Indicator Two monitoring challenges and opportunities.

As regards the CSO Enabling Environment Framework, in many respects the Framework is already fairly well articulated in the Indicator Two questionnaire. The TT's CSO Enabling Environment Guidelines will aim to widen and deepen a common understanding of what is meant by the four components of the Indicator Two framework, and practically, what practices stakeholders can implement to make progress. The Guidelines will draw from country case examples that the TT seeks to gather through the Stock-take, as well as from sources provided by TT participants and beyond. It will also draw from a TT-commissioned study on country-level Multi-stakeholder Initiatives which was completed in early 2016.

GPI-12 seeks to advance progress in achieving the principle of inclusive development partnerships through: broadening and deepening understanding of Indicator Two; contributing to the development of a multi-stakeholder approach to Indicator Two monitoring; and provision of guidelines. More specifically GPI-12 seeks to advance the commitments of democratic ownership, provision of an enabling environment for CSOs and CSO development effectiveness.

The TT also participates in a core group co-organizing HLM2 Plenary 7 on enabling environments for inclusive partnerships.

Regarding the SDGs, the TT developed a discussion paper on the GPEDC and SDGs Monitoring Frameworks. It recommends Indicator Two as an important complement to SDGs monitoring particularly as regards SDGs 16 (peaceful and inclusive societies and effective institutions) and 17 (means of implementation). The TT also provided input supporting the OECD/UNDP indicator proposal for target 17.16.

GPI's activities at country level

As part of GPI-12 a Stock-take of the Indicator Two monitoring exercise is being conducted in 11 countries: Mozambique, Kenya, Uganda, Cameroon, Kyrgyzstan, Myanmar, Armenia, Egypt, Sudan, Honduras and Costa Rica. Country-level consultants/researchers have been hired to collect information and perspectives on the Indicator Two monitoring process from multiple stakeholders, including the National Coordinator, Focal points, etc. The consultants have engaged in document review, conducted interviews and where possible participated in multi-stakeholder data gathering and validation sessions. In each country up to 14 interviews have been conducted, including with representatives of organizations that have not been involved in Indicator Two monitoring. The country-level consultants/researchers will submit a country report to the TT, which in turn will develop a consolidated report on the challenges and opportunities of the Indicator Two monitoring method and questionnaire content. The report is expected to be available in July 2016.

Through GPI-12 the TT is also attempting to gather sources on good practice at country level in relation to the four components of Indicator Two to inform the CSO Enabling Environment Guidelines that the TT will develop for HLM2.

Policy messages from GPI experience to inform discussions and decisions at the 2nd High-Level Meeting of the GPEDC (29 November – 1 December 2016, Nairobi, Kenya)

The TT hopes to be able to gather lessons around Indicator Two through its Stock-take. However, as the Stock-take is ongoing the findings are still very preliminary and therefore not ready for distribution. One broad and very preliminary reflection that the TT could offer is that even more care needs to be given to guide multi-stakeholder initiatives and processes in the monitoring of Indicator Two (and where relevant other indicators). It cannot be taken for granted that multi-stakeholder initiatives and processes will happen, or that if they do, they will be genuinely multi-stakeholder, or foster constructive and ongoing dialogue. Thought and time needs to be given to (testing) the design, and time and patience are necessary to build trust. Concerted effort is needed if multi-stakeholder balance is sought, ideally also in between monitoring rounds. Certain skills and competencies are needed, for instance for the National Coordinators and Focal Points. These preliminary learnings are in line with some of the findings of the TT-commissioned study on Multi-stakeholder Initiatives.

From the preliminary learnings of the Stock-take we are also finding that as regards inclusive partnerships not all stakeholders are fully aware of the corollary commitments and what they entail. This seems to suggest that there is a need to further build common understanding of what the various commitments – including in relation to Indicator Two - entail in practice. The TT's CSO Enabling Environment Guidelines can play a role in this regard.

Meanwhile, multi-stakeholder engagement is widely promoted and even considered the panacea for effective cooperation, evidenced for example by the prominent role given to multi-stakeholder partnerships in implementation of the SDGs. In light of the above the TT believes it would be beneficial if the HLM2 agenda and outcomes address the apparent need to create shared understanding of the principle of inclusive partnerships and its corollary commitments by looking at questions such as 'What do inclusive partnerships and multi-stakeholder engagement look like?' and 'What needs to be in place to have an environment conducive to partnering that is inclusive and engages diverse stakeholders?'

Actions that could be agreed at the 2nd High Level Meeting to accelerate progress towards principles and commitments for effective development co-operation

The most recent version of the plenary 7 concept note has the objective of "build[ing] a common understanding of the features and requisites of an enabling environment and supporting infrastructure and for multi-stakeholder partnerships". It also includes the phrase that "GPEDC stakeholders to announce concrete actions that promote effective partnering by the launch of one or more Global Partnership Initiatives (GPIs) and/or other actions to advance and support the GPEDC's role in supporting and monitoring multi-stakeholder partnerships for achieving the SDGs." As reflected in the response to question 4, the TT finds that actions are needed to build a common understanding and further commitments toward inclusive multi-stakeholder partnerships.

More specifically as regards the TT's post-HLM2 actions: The TT will evaluate the Stock-take process in the next months leading up to the HLM2. This will inform the TT's position as regards its role in the next years. The TT could for instance again seek to support the GPEDC in development of a further revised Indicator Two monitoring approach, and possibly also consider whether there is a role for the TT to play in providing some form of support or training for multi-stakeholder initiatives at country level. The TT may also continue with activities such as the Stock-take, promotion of the CSO Enabling Environment Guidelines, and TT studies to observe, study and advance multi-stakeholder initiatives. Though the TT is a multi-stakeholder body comprised of three constituencies, cooperation with other stakeholders could also be considered. These are however very preliminary ideas and need further reflection and consultation within the TT.

GPI 13: Development Impact Bonds

Key progress made and lessons learnt since the inception of the GPI

The scoping of the DIB to address the spread of Rhodesian Sleeping Sickness in Uganda is complete. We continue to explore funding interest from donors to take the DIB to full implementation following provisional interest from prospective investors. At the same time, we have mapped out existing and potential options for the development of other DIBs.

GPI's activities at country level

If support is agreed for the Uganda DIB, then activities will be implemented at the country level, but managed from DFID London.

Policy messages from GPI experience to inform discussions and decisions at the 2nd High-Level Meeting of the GPEDC (29 November – 1 December 2016, Nairobi, Kenya)

Nothing specifically on DIBs at this stage. However, may be messages for Economic empowerment of women and youth – inclusivity and mainstreaming for effective and accelerated development

Actions that could be agreed at the 2nd High Level Meeting to accelerate progress towards principles and commitments for effective development co-operation

Nothing at this stage, but possible future potential to get donors aligned behind one DIB to trial the mechanism.

GPI 14: The role of local and regional governments in effective development

Key progress made and lessons learnt since the inception of the GPI

As was reported on in earlier occasions, the scope of our GPI has shifted slightly, given the fact that initial funding that was foreseen under the GPI on Development of country roadmaps for local and regional governments has not become available. This has implied a shift of focus and means that we cannot work on implementation in-country, but rather focus on analysis and research. To make sure that we also connect to what is being done by other stakeholders,

We are currently analyzing the results of a global survey on the way in which local governments around the world are being included in the definition, implementation and monitoring of national development strategies. Inclusion of local and regional governments in these national strategies is important to ensure that priorities and needs identified on the ground reach the national guidelines, which supports the attainment of the sustainable development goals.

We have gathered surveys from local government associations from all different continents which showcase good examples of institutionalized and meaningful involvement of Local and Regional Governments (LRGs), often through their Local Government Associations (LGAs). They also point out several cases of lacking/minimal involvement of LGAs in national development strategies. These are collected in a publication, together with the results of the surveys, and will become available this summer.

This is in line with the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, which calls for support for the inclusion of local and regional governments in the dialogue on development cooperation, from definition to implementation, monitoring and evaluation of country results frameworks. In both the Busan Partnership document and the Accra Agenda for Action, it is stated that donors and other development actors should commit to “work more closely [...] with local authorities [...] in preparing, implementing and monitoring national development policies and plans” (Accra Agenda for Action), because “[...] local governments play critical roles in linking citizens with governments and in ensuring broad-based and democratic ownership of countries’ development agendas.” (Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation). The Busan Partnership document also states that further support to local governments will be given to enable them to assume more fully their roles above and beyond service delivery, enhancing participation and accountability on sub-national levels.

This study and its results do not only emphasize the need for inclusive development, in which all levels of government, as well as all other relevant stakeholders, are involved. It also calls for democratic broad-based ownership of development priorities within development countries at all levels, and for transparency regarding strategies and priorities.

Contribution to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals

Research shows that 65% of the SDGs will need to be implemented with the local governments around the world: they are the layer of government closest to people and can be true drivers of change. Including local governments in national development settings will ensure that local needs are included in national priorities and this will ensure the attainment of the SDGs, if done in partnership in a transparent and meaningful way. This concerns all SDGs.

The further attention of the GPEDC for multi-level multi-stakeholder platforms in-country will contribute to achieving Sustainable Development Goal 17: Partnership for the goals.

GPI’s activities at country level

No (although we are in close contact with local government associations in 40 countries on their involvement in national development strategies)

Policy messages from GPI experience to inform discussions and decisions at the 2nd High-Level Meeting of the GPEDC (29 November – 1 December 2016, Nairobi, Kenya)

The study that has been referred to earlier will be available in summer. This study will contain a list of policy messages and lessons learned that can inform discussions at the HLM2. Some of these include:

- It is important to trigger a process of national dialogue and multi-level multi-stakeholder consultation process with the participation of national and subnational governments and their national associations, bilateral and multilateral donors and civil society, to assure a participatory formulation process and effective development policies.
- Central governments and the international community need to recognize local governments as full-fledged and indispensable partners for national dialogue, and ensure that inclusion of local government associations in national dialogue is formally laid down in a code or in legislation. Local and regional governments (if possible through their local government association) should be involved in all stages of the development of national development policies: definition, implementation and monitoring.
- Bottom-up definition of priorities is crucial: we come across many cases where national priorities are not aligned with local ones and this can imply a waste of time and funds. Good examples can be found in countries in Europe; in the Netherlands a Code of Inter-administrative Relations exist, in other countries consultation of local governments is regulated by law..
- To ensure meaningful contributions from local government associations, national governments and the international donor community should continue to support local governments and their associations. This can be achieved amongst others through peer to peer cooperation by other local governments and their associations.

Actions that could be agreed at the 2nd High Level Meeting to accelerate progress towards principles and commitments for effective development co-operation

Strengthening/enhancing local involvement in national development strategies will accelerate progress towards the principles of inclusiveness/inclusive partnerships, ownership, results and accountability & transparency. We propose the following actions for the HLM2 participants to agree upon:

1. Call for true inclusion of LRG in national consultation frameworks

Mirroring the multi-level and multi-stakeholder composition of the GPEDC at global level, the GPEDC members should ensure the establishment of institutionalized national consultation frameworks in all countries, with clear mandate for stakeholders, including local and regional governments. All policies and strategies that concern local governments, should have a mechanism through which these are included in the definition, implementation and monitoring. This is in line with the Busan document, as stated under question 2 of this survey.

2. Adjustment of monitoring framework

For the moment, local governments are not taken into account in the monitoring exercise of the GPEDC. It is crucial that local governments are taken on board in the monitoring exercises. So far, local governments have not been mentioned, not in the indicators, nor as an important stakeholder for discussions in the monitoring process. Suggestions have been provided to the Joint Support Team earlier this month.

Both issues should be further explored with the Working Group on in-country implementation.

To illustrate the importance of local involvement in national development strategies, and the necessity of the above actions, several cases from the study can be shared with the GPEDC members at HLM2.

GPI 17: EU Joint Programming: Helping to Manage Diversity

Key progress made and lessons learnt since the inception of the GPI

Joint Programming as a vehicle for meeting & achieving the SDGs

Joint Programming is a mechanism for EU and its Member States to provide a coordinated response to support partner country national development policy implementation. It is in itself a Busan commitment (Article 25a.) and reflects EU collective endeavour for development effectiveness. The recent Council Conclusions on Joint Programming sets out JP as a vehicle for meeting the sustainable development goals (SDGs). Forthcoming Joint Strategies will be aligned to national policies aimed at achieving the SDGs.

Joint programming is strongly results-orientated in that most new strategies feature a joint results framework. Cambodia, for example, has just undergone its first review based on established indicators.

The State of Play, as of June 2016

Since 2011 Joint Programming has increasingly shown concrete value and benefits such as better intra-EU coordination, transparency, division of labour and aid effectiveness. An independent evaluation is ongoing and its findings will be considered to further improve joint programming. New Council Conclusions adopted on 21 May 2016 gives a renewed vision for Joint Programming, not only as a commitment to aid effectiveness but a step towards building a stronger Europe.

Joint Programming is gradually increasing its synergies with the EU Country Roadmaps (RMs) for engagement with Civil Society (CS) which are now in place in more than 100 countries and demonstrate the added value of joint action in one of the areas considered key for EU cooperation.

GPI's activities at country level

The following five serve to illustrate where progress has been made and actions/activities implemented:

1. Cambodia

Following agreement on timeline & key steps, 2014 saw the finalization and launch of the Development Cooperation and Partnership Strategy 2014-2018 (in consultation with stakeholders). The value added of JP was evident in: greater trust within the EU as well as with the Government of Cambodia, better understanding of individual programmes, DoL & improved policy dialogue, increased effectiveness & efficiency through joint analytical work and M & E as well as less aid fragmentation.

The first monitoring report of the European Development Cooperation Strategy for Cambodia 2014-2018 measures the impacts of collective efforts in 5 core areas such as governance, agriculture, sector and rural development, physical infrastructure, private sector development & employment generation, capacity building and human resource development. The monitoring system works through the established processes for Government and development partners' joint monitoring processes at the national and sector level – therefore fully aligned to national systems (report soon to be available on the website dedicated to Joint Programming). JP in Cambodia has built upon synergies with other EU policy initiatives. The CSO Roadmap analysis is now included in the Joint Programming joint analysis and the roadmap indicators will be further included in the joint programming monitoring framework during the mid-term review process anticipated in late 2016.

2. Palestine

Work towards an EU Joint Programming document in support of Palestine's National Policy Agenda for 2017-2020 is at an advanced stage of preparation. A zero draft of the Joint Analysis is in circulation and the Joint Strategy is expected to be finalized by July 2016, to be synchronised with the next 7 year national cycle 2016 – 2022). The initial benefits of the JP process are recognised by the Palestinian Government. A total of EUR 1.2 – 1.3 billion in development funds calls for better cooperation and coordination for

resources to be effectively employed in such a complex context. The process has been bottom up and decentralised. "Sector fiches" have been progressively built and proved useful to enhance EU coordination and sector dialogues. 2015 saw the introduction of the Results Framework (RF) in these sector fiches. A Roadmap for CSO engagement has been agreed and plans have been cemented for expanded support to and participation & accountability of non-state actors.

3. Senegal

In Senegal, the current JP process is building on the initial /interim Joint Programming strategy agreed in Nov 2014. Work on a deeper version of the JP strategy for 2018-2020 began in May 2016, of which CSO engagement will form an integral part. The Roadmap for CSO engagement was approved by the EU & 6 MS while HoDs provided a report on JP progress in July 2015. Signature of the JP document is expected in Q3 of 2017.

4. Ethiopia

Joint programming in Ethiopia is at an advanced stage with a joint programming document in place and numerous examples of joint implementation/action. Together the EU and 20 MS conducted a joint analysis of Ethiopia's national development plan for the 2011-2015 period (GTP) and a EU+ Joint Cooperation Strategy for Ethiopia, one of the first joint documents in the ACP region. It describes Ethiopia's context and challenges, guiding principles for future cooperation, EU+ mutual priorities and the commitment to progressively introduce full joint programming by 2016, the start of the new national development plan, GTP II. At the sector level, the EU leads coordination in governance and nutrition while the UK leads in job creation, Italy in gender and Germany in natural resources.

5. Laos

Good progress has been made. A Joint Programming document has been drafted and is in the process of approval for substitution of the MIP. Laos constitutes the first case of "replacement", where a fully-fledged JP strategy replaces bilateral programming documents. This full European Joint Strategy for Lao PDR for 2016-2020 is synchronized to its 8th National Socio-Economic Development Plan. DoL has featured strongly and policy dialogue has proved more successful through joint approaches. Partner country ownership has strengthened and there has been notable success in agreeing a Joint Results Framework. An official launch of the joint programme is expected to take place around the time of the July 2016 ASEAN Summit in Vientiane.

Policy messages from GPI experience to inform discussions and decisions at the 2nd High-Level Meeting of the GPEDC (29 November – 1 December 2016, Nairobi, Kenya)

Partner governments should actively promote Joint Programming at the EU level and beyond. In some cases partner governments have shown hesitations and fear that the JP would imply slow or rigid processes and loss of flexibility. These hesitations should be addressed, a shared understanding should be built around JP and its implications and solutions jointly seeked in order to ensure that all partners step up JP.

Joint Programming seeks to improve coordination including through transparency, data availability and sharing of information. Using and supporting local aid management systems where feasible would also be an asset. This would serve to also improve as mutual accountability, to ensure better harmonisation in the delivery of aid. Moving towards data use (not only publication) and greater use of aid management systems will also speed up progress towards the Busan commitments

Joint programming should be seen as a vector for coordinating the EU response to new agendas and emerging topics such as migration and climate change. Joint Programming reduces aid fragmentation & transaction costs and provides greater complementarity, through better division of labour. In this regard, Joint programming serves as a vehicle and method for meeting and achieving the sustainable development goals (SDGs).

Actions that could be agreed at the 2nd High Level Meeting to accelerate progress towards principles and commitments for effective development co-operation

All providers (donors, partner governments & civil society) should be accountable in the way they jointly programme their development cooperation. Lessons learned with JP should be shared in order to build a

new generation of joint strategies supporting the SDGs.

Based on experience and progress made in Joint Programming, actions which would advance progress towards Busan principles and commitments include better use of aid data for improving coordination among the EU and its member states. Linking this to a joint results framework would help identify the comparative advantages of different actors and in doing so articulate ways in which targets and results can be achieved. Improving data availability and the use of data generated through this exercise would deepen our commitment to transparency and predictability. Greater use of aid management systems would also help to amplify the benefits and impact of Joint Programming.

GPI 21: Guidelines for Effective Philanthropic Engagement

Key progress made and lessons learnt since the inception of the GPI

The Guidelines are a practical and non-binding tool developed to help foundations improve development outcomes through collaboration with governments.

Building on the political acknowledgement at the GPEDC's First High-Level Meeting (Mexico, 2014), the OECD netFWD has used the Guidelines to broker the dialogue and cooperation between foundations and government in India, Mexico, Myanmar, Kenya and South Africa.

Each country pilot focuses on a specific issue (ex. child and maternal health in India, entrepreneurship in Mexico, etc.). These country pilots are collecting data on the relationship between foundations and governments while helping local stakeholders identify concrete steps – in the form of action plans – for more effective future collaboration.

Since 2014, the country pilots helped advance the implementation of several principles for effective development co-operation:

- “Inclusive development partnerships”: The country pilots contributed to enhanced collaboration between foundations and governments in support of more impactful development. More specifically, in Phase I, the pilots helped assess the nature of engagement between foundations and government, as well as capture obstacles, good practice and expectations from both sides, through the use of a questionnaire (one for foundations, one for government). In Phase II, during one to two workshops, the participating actors developed a set of recommendations and possible targets (‘action plan’), highlighting how engagement between foundations and the government can be made more effective.
- The initiative also contributed to the principle of “enhanced ownership of development priorities by developing countries”, as the selection of pilot countries stems from demand from local actors themselves, in countries where both foundations and the government are willing to collaborate.
- Finally, the initiative might also contribute to a greater “transparency and accountability”. In India for example (see below), one of the recommendations coming out of the study will be to push for more transparency from foundations to build trust with the government.

Some of the emerging country-level findings are presented below. An overall analysis and a compilation of all country case studies will be presented at the HLM2.

In Mexico, the diagnosis of current collaboration practices is now finalised and provides interesting learnings:

- Foundations most value partnering with the Mexican government to reach a broader scale and enhance their impact on the quality of life of the Mexican people.
- On the other hand, the government is interested in working with foundations because of their proximity to local communities and what opportunities this presents to increase legitimacy and improve and adjust policies targeting them.
- Civil society organisations and foundations are very hard to differentiate legally in Mexico. Thus, anyone can set up an organisation and call it a foundation without an initial endowment, which is one of the main features that usually define a philanthropic foundation. Another challenge, both for foundations and the government, is finding an interlocutor to speak with on the other side. On philanthropy's end, no nationwide association of foundations exists in Mexico for government to contact when it wishes to consult or explore partnerships with foundations. On the government's end, the high turnover, where up to 80% of staff change when a new president takes office, is a problem.
- Another challenge is the high level of mutual mistrust and prejudice that impairs collaboration.
- An action plan will focus on support to entrepreneurship as a key priority for the country and a way to deliver greater development outcomes.

In India, the diagnosis is now being developed and provides some early findings:

- India is a complex environment because of its size, demography and fragmentation: the 29 states are responsible for basic services delivery and priorities greatly vary among them. Foundations increasingly understand they have a role to play in fostering social innovation, and would be willing to partner with the government to go to scale. However, such a framework does not exist yet and foundations lack the entry points to build this type of partnerships.
- On the government's end, civil servants expressed mistrust and suspicion towards philanthropy, whose intentions and activities they know little about.
- Some of the main emerging recommendations would consist in pushing for more transparency from foundations to build trust, and setting up a platform where foundations can link up with government representatives and discuss the modalities to scale up the impact of their projects.

GPI's activities at country level

Country pilots are now being implemented in Mexico, India, Myanmar, Kenya and South Africa.

The final output of each pilot will be a case study consisting of: 1) a diagnostic assessment of the nature of engagement between foundations and government based on the results of the questionnaire, including challenges and opportunities identified during workshop discussions; 2) a country-specific set of recommendations and possible targets ("action plan") highlighting how engagement between foundations and the government can be made more effective.

An overall analysis and a compilation of all case studies will be presented at the HLM2 to provide feedback on how the OECD netFWD has ensured the guidelines' 'implementation and follow-up' (Global Partnership HLM Communiqué, Mexico, 2014), but also to offer governments and philanthropists with evidence-based recommendations on how to enhance the impact of collaboration in support of more effective development while re-emphasising the importance of engaging with foundations more strategically.

The pilot in Mexico is the most advanced one. The country report that comprises the diagnosis and the recommendations is now finalized.

In India, the questionnaires have been sent to both foundations and the government representatives. The workshop to co-develop a set of recommendations and possible targets to be jointly achieved ('action plan') will be held in July 2016.

In Myanmar, the questionnaires are now being adapted to the national context.

In Kenya, the kick off meeting will be organized in June 2016, in cooperation with the Kenyan Office of the Deputy President. The theme selected for the pilot is the youth vocational skills training.

The discussions are also ongoing with the government in South Africa (Department of Science and Technology) to launch a country pilot around issues of technology and innovation.

Policy messages from GPI experience to inform discussions and decisions at the 2nd High-Level Meeting of the GPEDC (29 November – 1 December 2016, Nairobi, Kenya)

Foundations' contribution to development, not only through financial support, but also through knowledge and expertise, should be acknowledged.

The efforts made to strengthen the effectiveness and quality of cooperation between foundations and governments, through the Guidelines and the country pilots, should be welcomed and further encouraged. The country pilots should be expanded to additional countries. The ongoing country pilots should be integrated into more action-oriented initiatives, such as the Accelerating Impact 2030 led by the OECD Network of Foundations Working for Development and other development partners.

Those efforts should be reflected in the revised GPEDC monitoring framework (as a contribution to SDG 17.16), in line with para 57/58 and 42 of AAAA.

Actions that could be agreed at the 2nd High Level Meeting to accelerate progress towards principles and commitments for effective development co-operation

The OECD netFWD-led initiative Accelerating Impact 2030 offers foundations an opportunity to further engage in cooperation and concrete partnerships with governments and other development partners.

The initiative helps foundations to become better equipped to engage in effective multi-stakeholder partnerships to implement the new global agenda. Specifically, Accelerating Impact 2030 will provide a tailored support to groups of foundations that wish to build multi-stakeholder coalitions to tackle an issue of common interest in specific countries. Some of the country pilots mentioned above might be included in the initiative if the national stakeholders wish to engage in multi-stakeholder partnerships to tackle a specific issue at the country level.

The initiative will also offer a methodology to capture the impact of multi-stakeholder partnerships involving philanthropy, as well as the 'acceleration factor' of foundations.

GPI 36: Welcome the development of the “Tax Administration Diagnostic Assessment Tool” (TADAT)

Key progress made and lessons learnt since the inception of the GPI

TADAT is an internationally supported tool that provides an objective and standardized performance assessment of a country's tax administration system. It is a collaborative effort of the following partners: European Commission, Germany, Japan, The Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, The United Kingdom, The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The G20 Development Working Group on Domestic Resource Mobilization supports the continued development of the TADAT and, as part of its monitoring framework, reports on progress with the tool.

TADAT helps identify and understand the tax administration system's strengths and weaknesses with the objective of setting reform objectives and identifying priority actions for implementation. Following a period of intensive field-testing, the TADAT Field Guide was rolled out for public use on November 18, 2015. The testing process involved 17 country pilot tests, and extensive consultations with tax administration experts, academia and the wider public.

Various technical assistance providers and TADAT-assessed countries have found the tool to be technically sound and a much-needed standard approach to identifying variations from international good practices. A number of countries that participated in the pilot testing phase are already using the results to refine their tax administration reform plans.

Supporting countries in Domestic Resource Mobilization is a key Sustainable Development Goal 2016-2030 adopted by the UN General Assembly in September 2015 and TADAT will play an important role in achieving this goal. TADAT assessments facilitate a shared view among all the stakeholders about the health of the tax administration and places government authorities, international organizations, bilateral aid agencies and technical assistance providers on the same page about what is working well and what is not. The tool furthermore helps focus on setting common reform objectives, establishing priorities and sequencing implementation.

GPI's activities at country level

TADAT Assessments:

During the period of January – May, 2016 a total of 9 TADAT assessments were conducted in the following countries: Comoros, Tanzania, Jordan, Ethiopia, Serbia, FYR Macedonia, Namibia, Vietnam and Zambia. A total of 24 assessments have been conducted since February 2014.

Training of TADAT Assessors:

A TADAT assessment must be undertaken by trained TADAT assessors—a key quality assurance consideration of the TADAT Secretariat. Training is provided for potential assessors either through online/web-enabled training modules or through workshops. Registration details for the training are available on the TADAT website (www.tadat.org).

The first online training course offering was from July 2015 to September 2015, using the contents of FG version 5.0. The second offering (January 2016 to-date) took into account changes made in the FG rolled out in November 2015. As of April 21, 2016, 325 individuals from 61 countries from across Africa, Asia and Pacific, Europe, Middle East and Western Hemisphere regions undertook the online or workshop-based learning programs. Of these, 313 trainees passed a supervised/proctored TADAT examination. Of the 313, 148 are 'Trained TADAT Assessors' and 165 are 'TADAT Trained persons—non-assessors.'

As of mid-April 2016, a total of 15 training workshops have been held in the USA (x3), United Kingdom, Rwanda, Jordan (x2), Slovenia, Tanzania, Belgium (x2), Lebanon, Switzerland, Ethiopia, Azerbaijan.

Policy messages from GPI experience to inform discussions and decisions at the 2nd High-Level Meeting of the GPEDC (29 November – 1 December 2016, Nairobi, Kenya)

It is important to note that tax administrations in all countries face the same basic challenges, and the years since the onset of the global financial crisis have exposed weaknesses in many tax administrations, including those in advanced economies. The effects of the crisis have lent renewed urgency to fair,

efficient, and effective tax collection systems.

Actions that could be agreed at the 2nd High Level Meeting to accelerate progress towards principles and commitments for effective development co-operation

An endorsement of TADAT's importance to achieving the SDGs by the 2nd High Level Meeting would be welcomed, along with an encouragement for countries to participate in the work of TADAT.

**GPI Managing diversity and reducing fragmentation (former Building Block)
 GPI 18: Further work on Managing Diversity and Reducing Fragmentation
 GPI 22: Highlighting the problem of potentially under-aided countries**

Key progress made and lessons learnt since the inception of the GPI

As a Co-Chair of the respective GPI Germany – in close cooperation with Uganda – has continuously worked on taking forward the activities of the GPI i.e. the former Building Block. Undertaken activities since December 2015 mainly concentrated on the planning aspects and hosting arrangements required for the next GPI meeting which is now expected to take place in third or fourth quarter of 2016. The aim of the meeting will be to review the commitments made in chapter 25 of the Busan Declaration and derive a set of follow up actions if necessary. It will also serve as platform to discuss progress regarding actions committed to in the "Light Work Plan 2013-2015" of the GPI and the contribution of the GPI to the 2030 Agenda.

Further activities last year focused on improving the communication channels of and developing a corporate design for the respective GPI. An update of the GPI's website is planned to improve access to information and ultimately to promote enhanced participation of members. Moreover the current logo of the GPI was reviewed and ideas for a potential redesign thereof were gathered. These efforts are meant to support the idea of a common identity of GPIs under the GPEDC-umbrella.

One milestone of the GPI was the commissioning of the stock-take report "The Busan Commitments on Managing Diversity and Reducing Fragmentation: Stock-take and Emerging Issues" in 2014. The report is based on two case studies focusing on Rwanda and Bangladesh. It summarizes findings on "Managing Diversity and Reducing Fragmentation at the Partner Country Level" (part 1), "Proliferation & Coordination of Multilateral Aid"(part 2), and "The Issue of Under-aided Countries"(part 3). A workshop is envisaged to focus on adjustments to fit for purpose in the 2030 context.

GPI's activities at country level

No

Policy messages from GPI experience to inform discussions and decisions at the 2nd High-Level Meeting of the GPEDC (29 November – 1 December 2016, Nairobi, Kenya)

Stronger focus on managing diversity: While a high degree of aid fragmentation is typically associated with higher transaction costs, partner countries also see a clear advantage of a well-managed plurality of aid sources. Donor predictability and transparency are preconditions for effective aid management which gain an even higher relevance in the new multi-stakeholder context of the 2030 agenda.

Due to the changing and dynamic world order, the global development financing landscape has changed rapidly. It has become more complex and diverse with new and different development actors who have different financing modalities and targets. The ambitious and universal 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development will require a huge increase in the quantity and diversity of resources in order to achieve universal goal of leaving no one behind. The increase in the quantity and diversity of resources will demand more capacity support, knowledge sharing, skills revolution and technology transfer and the strengthening of associated institutions.

Stronger efforts to identify, monitor and possible funding mechanisms for under-aided countries and under-aided sectors or topics are needed: In order to fulfill commitment §25c of the BPD, there is a need to establish a methodology to identify horizontal and vertical lack of funding. The methodology developed by the OECD provides a good starting point for identification of under-aided countries and similarly for under-financed sectors or functions (in-country and/or multilateral).

Actions that could be agreed at the 2nd High Level Meeting to accelerate progress towards principles and commitments for effective development co-operation

Participants should agree on a set of principles and/or measures improving the development effectiveness

in the new context. Multiple stakeholders with multiple approaches need a common set of principles but also a frame which responds specifically to their type of development support. Another approach could be to strengthen the existing structures amongst donors and find common grounds e.g synergies between OECD DAC/IATI/aid management information systems, guidelines for sector-wide development partner mapping, joint analysis with options for division of labour and the harmonisation (in the sense of synergy creating NOT rationalization) of programming and implementation.

GPI Results and Mutual Accountability (former Building Block)

Key progress made and lessons learnt since the inception of the GPI

After Busan, the GPI organised two progress workshop in Africa, for French and English speaking countries. In February 2013 a GPI management workshop discussed the workshop results and decided to continue working on the R&MA topics by:

- Short questionnaire for all GPI members (±50) how to continue
- Writing a concept paper for the Mexico HLM 2014 (<http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Results-discussion-paper-final-draft-9-April.pdf>)

The meeting also appointed two new Co-Chairs: Bangladesh and Switzerland. They took over from UK.

After the HLM 2014, one of the topics from the concept paper was elaborated into a proposal for a GPI pilot programme on 'Enhanced Use of Country Results Frameworks', presented at the GPEDC planning workshop in January 2015 in Brussels.

Objectives of this pilot programme:

- How to improve the use of partner country results frameworks
- How to integrate accountability for results at country level in the post-2015 era
- How to create effective country-region-global linkages
- How to integrate financing and results processes

The last objective on linkages between financing and results was added after the Addis meeting on development financing (July 2015) and AP-DEF Bangkok's experiences with Development Finance Assessments. The programme is organised and coordinated by three regional offices: NEPAD Agency and APDev Johannesburg for Africa, AP-DEF Bangkok for Asia-Pacific and Proyecto Mesoamerica in Latin America and Caribbean. The co-chairs facilitate inter-regional coordination to arrive at global messages.

The first kick-off workshop was organised by the African region in April 2015, followed by a second one in April 2016, see <http://www.africa-platform.org/events/africa-region-pilot-programme-enhancing-use-country-result-frameworks-follow-meeting>. The Asian region organised workshops on linking the Development Finance Assessment with a stronger results focus in October 2015 (<https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B89yNO-4zVx2c3c3NTlrMmh3MUk>) and March 2016. The first LAC regional workshop will be held 14-15 June 2016.

The coming period will be used to develop inter-regional communication to arrive at joint messages for the Nairobi HLM.

GPI's activities at country level

Each regional office is working with a number of countries in this pilot programme. Africa: Benin, Kenya, Mozambique, Madagascar, Cameroon, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda. Asia: Bangladesh, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Mongolia, Nepal and Vietnam. LAC region: Honduras, Belize, Paraguay, Peru, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Panama.

The countries discuss together the use of country results frameworks, planning/financing linkages and SDG integration. Subsequently they discuss further within their countries. Follow up discussions among the countries in follow-up workshop in September 2016.

Policy messages from GPI experience to inform discussions and decisions at the 2nd High-Level Meeting of the GPEDC (29 November – 1 December 2016, Nairobi, Kenya)

Policy messages will be finalised in September 2016. These will focus on topics like:

- Institutional arrangements and linkages
- Planning-finance integration
- Domestication of SDGs
- Capacity developments needed

- Domestic resource mobilisation
- Evidence for results
- Private sector and CSO involvement in results achievement

Actions that could be agreed at the 2nd High Level Meeting to accelerate progress towards principles and commitments for effective development co-operation

Practical suggestion for Partner Countries how to improve their country results frameworks.

Practical suggestions for Development Partners how to support partner countries' priorities and results

GPI 40 Promoting Effective Partnering

Key progress made and lessons learnt since the inception of the GPI

The main purpose of the Promoting Effective Partnering Initiative (PEP in brief) is to raise the bar for effective partnering to meet the SDGs. To that end, the 5 co-convening organisations of PEP, each pioneers in competence building for partnering, collaboration, brokering and collective leadership, have joined forces since September 2015 around the driving question: “What will it take to unleash the partnering potential for the SDG”. Each partner brings its knowledge, networks and unique vision to PEP. By working together and through creating shared value, PEP models the required move from competition to collaboration and PEP invites other organisations and practitioners to join forces.

Since its launch, PEP has endeavoured to provide a **reference point** for clarity and orientation around collaborative approaches, an **anchor** for connecting the wide range of partnering practices and practitioners, and a **driver** of innovative and effective practice. Its objective is to: gather and make knowledge about current practice available; explore contradictions and common challenges; build new knowledge where there are gaps and promote and support widespread improvement in partnering practices.

The past months, PEP partners identified a number of areas of critical importance for which additional information and knowledge needed to be gathered, analysed and validated. The first fruits of PEP’s work are made publicly available on PEP’s website www.effectivepartnering.org. In this online environment, PEP is slowly but steadily contributing to the growing body of emerging knowledge and experiences regarding partnering processes and experience, the landscape of partnering approaches, aligned findings around the basics of effective partnering, SDG and context-specific findings and the monitoring of the effectiveness of partnerships. The results of the work to date have been vetted and peer-reviewed by partnering professionals and are now open for public scrutiny.

During the coming months, PEP will reach out to the wider partnering community (policymakers, practitioners and researchers) with the aim to engage all in the drafting of guidelines for effective partnering. These guidelines are to inform partnering efforts and will suggest ways and means to improve partnering conditions. PEP will launch efforts to create safe spaces for learning and exchanges on effective partnering and it will intensify its work in facilitating access to knowledge, guidelines and support for effective partnering.

GPI’s activities at country level

Not applicable

Policy messages from GPI experience to inform discussions and decisions at the 2nd High-Level Meeting of the GPEDC (29 November – 1 December 2016, Nairobi, Kenya)

Policy message:

- Partnering across sectors is essential to achieving the SDGs

However...

Cross-sector partnerships are on-going working relationships that operate across typical organisational boundaries in order to achieve greater inclusion, innovation and reach. They are a mechanism for creating more embedded and sustainable solutions to the increasing number of local and global challenges that confront us. Cross-sector partnerships are based collaboration, pooled resources, equitable engagement and collective decision-making. However, experience to date suggests that such collaboration – however well intentioned – can be highly challenging. In fact, many partnering arrangements fall far short of meeting needs, expectations and hoped-for goals. This is often due to conflicting interests, changing contexts, poor partnering practices, and unmanageable complexities to mention just a few.

Policy messages to raise the bar for effective partnering:

- We need to **learn from what has not worked** in MSP endeavours to date and **focus on doing better**.
- Establishing and managing effective partnerships is an art that requires **investments in dedicated expertise and time by governments, civil society and business alike**.
- We should collectively agree and adopt a common language and an agreed set of guidelines for effective partnering to support the emergence of partnerships that deliver on their promises.

Actions that could be agreed at the 2nd High Level Meeting to accelerate progress towards principles and commitments for effective development co-operation

PEP believes that we can do better in effective partnering through the establishment of a vibrant alliance of initiatives, platforms, capacity building organisations, policy makers, practitioners and researchers that can together drive the partnership movement and create a step-change in the quality and quantity of partnering for the SDG worldwide, amongst others through launching and supporting three highly interlinked processes:

- An iterative and multi-stakeholder process towards establishing, testing, validating and implementing a set of common guidelines for effective partnering
- The establishment of safe spaces for learning and exchanges on effective partnering
- The creation of facilitated access to knowledge, experiences and support for effective partnering

GPI 41 Agricord

Key progress made and lessons learnt since the inception of the GPI

2011-2016 progress

1. Since 2014, five Governments (Belgium, Finland, France, the Netherlands and Switzerland), as well as the European Commission and IFAD, joined hands to support one common program for strengthening farmers' organisations and agricultural co-operatives, on a multi-annual basis.
2. Since 2011 implementation of this one joint program is secured by 5 more agri-agencies, including two agri-agencies from developing countries. The newest are from Senegal (2011), the Philippines (2011), Finland (2013), Germany (2014) and Spain (2014). This brings the total to 12 agri-agencies mandated by farmers and rural organisations from 10 different countries (Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Senegal, Spain, Sweden and the Philippines). In 2016, a regional farmers' organisation from Africa has formally expressed to investigate ways to become an agri-agency and member of AgriCord.
3. In 2015, the overall joint program of AgriCord supported 211 farmers' organisations from 47 countries for the projects requested and implemented by them, mainly on farmer led economic initiatives (70%) but also on organisational strength and inclusiveness, policy elaboration and advocacy, and institutional development. 73% of the projects include specific activities for empowerment of women and youth.
4. The peer-to-peer involvement of farmers' organisations and cooperative agri-businesses in the "North" as well as in the "South", as service providers to each other, has increased. In 2015, 55% of the advisory services to farmers' organisations in AgriCord's joint programme are implemented by farmers' organisations themselves.
5. AgriCord is developing a new partnership with CTA and the Pan African Farmers' Organisation on information, new technology and inclusion of youth for farmers' organisations. IFPRI and private sector are interested in co-funding.
6. In developing countries, the agri-agencies are increasingly brokering between farmers' organisations and local financial institutions, development banks and the (local and international) agro-business. The proportion of investments mobilised by farmers' organisations through private loans and private investments is increasing. Between 15 and 20% of the investments of the supported cooperatives originates from private loans.
7. In 2016, as GPI, AgriCord elaborated, for the 2nd time, one joint – consolidated – report and presented this report to the five participating governments, to the European Commission and to IFAD. For transparency of aid flows to farmers' organisations, reporting on impact is structured per country and per farmers' organisation. The network monitors evidence of impact on incomes as well as on food security of family farmers. All stakeholders have online access to all key information on activities and budgets, via Agro-info.net (web-based database).
8. Farmers' organisations developed their own transparent financial management and their own institutional monitoring and evaluation systems. 73% of the supported farmers' organisations between 2013-2015 implemented an organisational capacity assessment. 80% of the farmers' organisations assessed have reached a score of at least 50% for accountability.
9. AgriCord participates in the preparation of the plenary session on empowerment of youth and women in the second HLM in Nairobi in 2016. AgriCord also supports the Pan African Farmers' Organisation to organise a side event on inclusion of youth.

GPI's activities at country level

The joint program (GPI) supports farmers' organisations and agricultural co-operatives in (more than 70) developing countries worldwide. The program respects the geographical and thematic priorities of the 5 participating governments and of the EU within one coherent overall effort. 44% of the farmers organisations supported are active at local level, 30% at sub-national level, 20% at national level and 6% at the international level. Some of the agri-agencies, member of AgriCord, have country or regional offices

for close by coaching of farmers' organisations.

One particular part of the GPI deserves to be highlighted. In several countries, a specific effort is done, with support of the Swiss SDC and IFAD, to improve the involvement of farmers' organisations in public development programs. The joint program promotes a multi-stakeholder participation in public programs, involving government, farmers' organisations, other civil society organisations and private sector. In 2015-2016, AgriCord is working in the following 10 countries within this Facility: Bolivia, Burundi, Burkina Faso, Haiti, Ivory Coast, Madagascar, Philippines, Republic Democratic of Congo, Togo and Vietnam.

Policy messages from GPI experience to inform discussions and decisions at the 2nd High-Level Meeting of the GPEDC (29 November – 1 December 2016, Nairobi, Kenya)

Lessons learned for further policy making: the AgriCord GPI shows

1. that support from different governments can be combined in one co-ordinated effort, implemented by farmers' organisations themselves, but respecting the geographical and thematic priorities of each government.
2. that the governance and implementation of this type of international co-ordination increasingly involves farmers' organisations from developing countries, which constitutes an operational and effective platform for both North/South and South/South co-operation between agricultural organisations and professionals.
3. that predictable and flexible disbursements of funds to farmers' organisations, based on short term budget planning of the farmers' organisations themselves and within long term partnerships, are a necessary condition for sustainable development of farmers' organisations' competences and operations, and certainly in fragile contexts.
4. that farmers' organisations can be drivers of multi stakeholder partnerships at the national and at the local levels and – in particular - that farmers' organisations are crucial actors to establish sustainable partnerships between farmers and traders or financial institutions.
5. that farmers' organisations can play an important role in economic integration of rural youth and prevention of their migration, by integrating youth better in their governance structures, by lobbying for an enabling environment, by facilitating access to resources and new technology and by creating economic and market opportunities for youth.

Actions that could be agreed at the 2nd High Level Meeting to accelerate progress towards principles and commitments for effective development co-operation

1. More efforts can be done to make support to farmers' organisations demand driven and flexible to use by farmers' organisations, along with changes in their organisation and context. All stakeholders can also make a joint effort to make aid flows to farmers' organisation and the results achieved by farmers' organisations, more transparent.
2. Further effort should be made in making donors analysing their impact in an overall framework rather than focusing on activities they have financially contributed to. The consolidated monitoring and evaluation system of AgriCord can function as a model in that respect.
3. Further efforts can be done to promote peer to peer advisory services between farmers' organisations and their cooperative businesses worldwide – in particular to strengthen capacities of farmers' organisations to go into markets. Existing networks for peer to peer exchange can be valorised as much as possible. Further efforts should be done to harmonise these multiple initiatives and networks.
4. Further efforts can be done to decentralise public funds for agricultural development (along with the decentralisation process in developing countries) and to have them governed by local stakeholders and farmers' organisations in particular.
5. All stakeholders (governments, civil society organisations, farmers' organisations, agri-agencies...) can further improve their efforts for inclusion of rural youth and can include inclusion of youth in their monitoring and evaluation framework. Domains of indicators should be agreed upon between donors.
6. Efforts can be increased to make farmers' organisations' initiatives bankable or to link them to value chain finance.