



Elements and options for a draft renewed mandate

Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation Steering Committee Meeting
14 – 15 July 2016
New York

Contacts

Mr. Thomas Boehler, Tel: +33 1 45 24 87 75, email: thomas.boehler@oecd.org

Mr. A. Hannan Ismail, Tel. + 1 212 906 5471, e-mail: abdul.hannan@undp.org

DOCUMENT 4

The Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation Options for a renewed mandate¹

This document presents options towards a renewed mandate for the Global Partnership based on lessons learned from the implementation of the Busan Partnership Agreement and the evolving development landscape. The document builds on the findings from stakeholder consultations conducted by the Global Partnership's Steering Committee via the joint support team in May-June 2016. It is submitted to the Steering Committee to inform stakeholder discussions on the renewed mandate. The renewal of the Global Partnership mandate will also be guided by the ongoing negotiations on the Nairobi Outcome Document.

A. The Global Partnership

1. International development co-operation is a major source of funding, capacity building, knowledge, expertise and technology transfer for sustainable development. As a pivotal part of the means of implementation needed, it complements developing countries' domestic resources to fuel their own development; incentivises innovations, investments and risk-sharing; and can foster a conducive development and investment environment through support for policy reforms. Development co-operation offers financing options for least developed countries and fragile states with limited capacity to access other forms of financial flows. The past decades have witnessed a growing diversity of modalities of development co-operation. In addition to North-South co-operation, South-South and triangular forms of co-operation are expanding; a greater number of state and non-state actors are engaged in the sustainable development agenda, and public-private partnerships are blooming.

2. Increases in volumes of financing for development must be coupled with more effective action to generate sustainable and transparent results for all citizens. To this end, the international development community met in Busan, Republic of Korea, for the Fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in 2011. One hundred and sixty-one countries, heads of multilateral and bilateral institutions, representatives of public, civil society, private, parliamentary, local and regional actors committed to the Busan Partnership Agreement that contained four principles for effective development co-operation in support of sustainable development, namely:

- *Ownership of development priorities by developing countries:* Countries should lead in defining the development priorities that they want to implement;
- *A focus on results:* Sustainable impact should drive all investments and efforts in development policy making;

¹ Prepared by the Joint Support Team under the guidance of the CO-Chairs and Host Country of HLM2.

- *Inclusive partnerships*: All relevant actors must have the space to engage in development, recognizing their diversity and the complementarity of their actions;
- *Transparency and shared responsibility*: Development co-operation must be transparent and accountable to all citizens.

3. The Busan Partnership Agreement led to the establishment of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation in 2012. The Global Partnership performs four core functions, as follows:

- Ensures accountability for implementing Busan commitments;
- Facilitates knowledge exchange and sharing of lessons learned;
- Supports implementation of Busan commitments at the country level; and
- Maintains and strengthens political momentum for more effective development co-operation.

4. Every 18-24 months, the Global Partnership brings together Heads of State, Ministers and representatives of developing and developed countries, heads of multilateral and bilateral institutions, representatives of different types of public, civil society, private, parliamentary, local and regional organisations. These high-level ministerial meetings are the main political forum for reviewing evidence and data on the implementation of commitments, ensuring continued mutual accountability for effective development co-operation, knowledge sharing, learning and innovation to promote more effective cooperation. In addressing issues arising from evidence, ministerial level meetings are structured around problem solving, thematic, and/or context-driven approaches.

5. The 2030 Agenda calls for stakeholders to mobilize all relevant resources and partners for development and recognizes the importance of development co-operation to help mobilize and catalyse financing, capacity, technology and knowledge to achieve the SDGs. The new environment also implies a need for greater coordination and coherence among these actors and better tracking of the full range of development co-operation resources and their use. The demand for more systematic knowledge sharing and learning of what works and what does not, particularly given the engagement of different partners and the use of different resources, has increased. In the context of the upcoming High Level Meeting scheduled to take place in Nairobi from 30 November to 1 December 2016, this paper presents an overview of the contribution of the Global Partnership to the effective development co-operation agenda and options on the way forward.

B. Achievements

6. ***A monitoring framework to assess effective development co-operation.*** The Global Partnership has an established monitoring framework that measures the quality of partnerships for development and upholds mutual accountability between development actors. The current monitoring framework comprises 10 indicators that track the

behaviour of development actors based on the commitments they made in Busan. To date, more than 80 developing countries use the Global Partnership framework to monitor joint progress in meeting effectiveness principles. These include low- and middle-income countries from Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, as well as from Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Countries from the g7+ group of fragile and conflict affected states, and small island developing states also participate.

Global Partnership - Indicators of effective development cooperation

Indicator	Means of verification
1. Development co-operation is focused on results that meet developing countries' priorities	Extent of use of country results frameworks by providers of development co-operation
2. Civil society operates within an environment which maximises its engagement in and contribution to development	Multi-stakeholder assessment of CSO Enabling Environment
3. Engagement and contribution of the private sector to development	Multi-stakeholder assessment of the quality of public-private dialogue
4. Transparency: information on development co-operation is publicly available	Assessments of transparency of development cooperation providers
5. Development co-operation is more predictable	(a) Annual proportion of development co-operation funding disbursed within the fiscal year (b) medium-term: proportion of development co-operation funding covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at country level
6. Aid is on budgets which are subject to parliamentary scrutiny	% of development co-operation funding scheduled for disbursement that is recorded in the annual budgets approved by the legislatures of developing countries
7. Mutual accountability among development co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews	% of countries that undertake inclusive mutual assessments of progress in implementing agreed commitments
8. Gender equality and women's empowerment	% of countries with systems that track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment
9. Effective institutions: developing countries' systems are strengthened and used	Quality of developing country PFM systems; and (b) Use of country PFM and procurement systems by development partners
10. Aid is untied	% of aid that is fully untied

7. Country-level data informs on the effectiveness of development co-operation of over 80 developing countries and 90 development partners, including all OECD-DAC Members, multilateral development banks, European Union institutions, and the United Nations development system. Data reported by countries includes development co-operation programmes and finance from non-traditional partners such as the OPEC Fund for International Development, the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and China, as well as from global funds and programmes such as Bill and Melinda Gates and Ford Foundation, Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immun-

isation, Global Environment Facility and the Global Fund to Fight Aids Tuberculosis and Malaria.

8. ***The Global Partnership Initiatives translate commitments into action:*** The Global Partnership has also led to the launch of 49 initiatives to lead implementation of commitments to effective development co-operation. The Global Partnership Initiatives translate into action partnerships for effective development co-operation. Partnership initiatives include: the *New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States* that has established a formal dialogue between the g7+ group of fragile and conflict affected states and the development co-operation community; the setup of the *Tax Inspectors Without Borders* programme to better co-ordinate support to national tax administrations, coupled with increased capacity support to countries for mobilising domestic resources; *Guidelines for Effective Philanthropic Engagement* and the *gender equality tracking systems* to create more data disaggregated by sex.

9. ***The Global Partnership's monitoring and initiatives generate regular data and evidence on the effectiveness of development co-operation*** measured against the Busan principles. They produce much-needed evidence to inform policy dialogues between stakeholders on areas of progress and challenges where further work is crucial to manage development co-operation better. Data from the first Global Partnership Monitoring Round highlighted:

- Advances in country ownership, indicating that investment in strengthening national planning, and country public and financial management systems, is paying off. At the same time, stronger dialogue led by countries with their development partners is required to strengthen alignment with national priorities and systems.
- Progress on inclusive partnerships points to improving recognition and engagement of non-state actors. However, evidence reveals that the development co-operation architecture is still skewed towards a government-centred, North-South perspective. Further work is necessary to strengthen multi-stakeholder arrangements inclusive of new and emerging actors and their modalities.
- More attention is needed to enable civil society organisations, the private sector and foundations to exercise their role as development actors in their own right. This will help build mutual understanding and purpose and improve the climate necessary to grow investment.
- Monitoring transparency of development co-operation providers shows that information on development co-operation is increasingly available, but this information should be better geared to supporting national planning needs.

10. ***The Global Partnership is recognised as a pivotal driver to review and optimise development co-operation's contribution to the 2030 Agenda.*** The 2030 Agenda puts renewed emphasis on a revitalised global partnership and co-operation to improve ac-

cess to technology and knowledge, share ideas and foster innovation, promote investment for the least developed countries, and enhance North-South and South-South co-operation in support of national plans to achieve all the goals. The report of the United Nations Secretary-General on follow-up and review of the implementation of the SDGs and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda recognises the Global Partnership as an important part of the global arrangements for follow-up and review of development co-operation, engaging the full range of development co-operation actors. It highlights the contribution of the Global Partnership in: ensuring alignment of activities with national priorities; strengthening country ownership and results orientation; reducing fragmentation and transaction costs; and increasing predictability, transparency and mutual accountability in development co-operation.

c. Renewing the Global Partnership’s mandate: Delivering on existing and new effectiveness commitments

11. Evidence shows that Parties to the Global Partnership deliver the largest share of ODA. They remain committed to further effective development co-operation as a means of implementation of the 2030 agenda. Through stakeholder consultations, the Global Partnership is critically reviewing its contribution to development co-operation to be fit for purpose. In the evolving development landscape the aim is to boost a rejuvenated partnership that mobilises all actors, public and private, bilateral and multilateral, developing and developed countries to deliver on the universal SDG agenda. In moving forward, the following issues have been identified through consultations and lessons learned to strengthen the impact of the Global Partnership:

12. ***A mutual accountability framework inclusive of stakeholder commitments on effective development co-operation.*** The Busan agreement established a global partnership that recognises the distinct roles of diverse development co-operation stakeholders in promoting sustainable development. The aim is to jointly engage the diverse community of development stakeholders from the North and the South, and the public, private and civil society sectors in scaling up their development impact. To date the Global Partnership has had some success in translating the commitment of accountability for effectiveness by supporting more than 80 developing countries monitor the effectiveness of their development cooperation partnerships. While this monitoring provides the international development community with data and analysis on development co-operation with more than 90 development partners, it remains largely focused on financial flows from government to government and on the promotion of an enabling environment for non-state actors. The Busan agreement expected different stakeholders to play a proactive role in defining their respective commitments and actions, recognizing their diversity and evolving nature. Regional organizations were seen as critical to coordinate efforts within each region. Moving onward, stakeholders reaffirmed that current effectiveness principles remain relevant and that the Global Partnership will need to advance effective development co-operation across the 2030 Agenda. Parties look up

on the international development community to ensure continued attention on mutual accountability for agreed commitments. However, with the recognition of their weight in the development landscape, ***it is proposed that the Global Partnership should consider supporting non-state actors to articulate, jointly with target countries, effectiveness principles and commitments adapted to their specific efforts***. The aim would be to further promote effective philanthropic engagement and responsible business conduct as well as effective co-operation by civil society and non-governmental organisations to help realise national strategies for sustainable development. A more differentiated approach to support stakeholder engagement may also require revisions to the Global Partnership working arrangements.

13. ***Measuring the effective delivery of all sources and types of development cooperation***. Parties recognize that development co-operation comes from diverse sources and takes several forms, including the mix of financial resources, capacity-building, technology development and transfer, and policy advice. Among other Busan commitments, the current Global Partnership monitoring framework tracks the way official development co-operation is delivered. As a country-led exercise, it adopts a recipient perspective in looking at how development co-operation inflows are delivered at country level. This includes grants and concessional and non-concessional loans that bilateral and multilateral actors provide for developmental purposes. It also covers their specific flows in support of national development efforts channelled through non-state actors, such as non-governmental organisations. In addition, the monitoring exercise assesses the enabling environment and regulatory framework for the civil society and private sector's contribution to development. The renewal of the Global Partnership's mandate presents stakeholders with an opportunity to review the areas of development co-operation where it should contribute with data, evidence and policy analysis. In line with ongoing efforts to better capture the diverse forms of development assistance, its monitoring framework could expand to interested development parties engaged in effectiveness, namely:

- Public bilateral providers on ODA grants and concessional loans, as well as other officially supported resource flows and associated instruments;
- Multilateral agencies on concessional and non-concessional finance;
- Bilateral and multilateral development finance institutions on the use of financial instruments to mobilise finance from the private sector²;
- Other official providers, including South-South and triangular co-operation actors based on their principles;
- Businesses on investing more responsibly in developing countries;
- Private foundations on their support to developing countries;

² Examples include: guarantees and other forms of innovative risk management, syndicated loans and shares in collective investment vehicles (CIVs)

- Non-governmental organisations on their support to developing countries, including ODA channelled through them; and
- Local and regional governments on their development co-operation flows.

14. ***A monitoring framework suited to the 2030 Agenda.*** Through its track record in monitoring and facilitating mutual accountability for effective development co-operation, the Global Partnership is a recognized source of data and evidence for Financing for Development and the SDG follow-up processes. Its monitoring framework specifically provides the international development community data and evidence to SDG targets on respecting countries' own policy space and leadership (SDG 17.15), on multi-stakeholder partnerships for development (SDG 17.16), and on gender equality and women's empowerment (SDG 5c).³ Stakeholder feedback indicates a demand to update the Global Partnership's framework with emerging issues to strengthen the contribution to the follow-up and review process of the 2030 Agenda. While parties value the country-led, multi-stakeholder nature of the monitoring process, there is room to make it more relevant for stakeholders in their respective work. To ensure it is suited to the 2030 Agenda, the monitoring framework is currently being reviewed by an independent Monitoring Advisory Group with the aim of strengthening it and making it more inclusive and relevant to the range of development actors and resources. The objective is to propose indicators that deliver mutually beneficial information on the effectiveness of development co-operation and reflect new areas of action in the context of the 2030 Agenda. For this reason, the Global Partnership's Monitoring Advisory Group is proposing the following revisions for consideration by the Steering Committee:

- *Strengthening the current set of effectiveness indicators* to better embody the multi-stakeholder nature of development co-operation and ensure effectiveness assessments that encompass the diverse constituencies of development actors;
- *Expanding the scope of monitoring to areas that are relevant for the 2030 Agenda.* In revising the monitoring framework, the long-term objective would be to develop indicators that are relevant for the different development actors.
- *Improving data processing and relevance for country-level.*⁴ An updated monitoring framework should include a review of country-level monitoring process to ensure

³ SDG indicator 17.16.1 measures the number of countries that report progress in multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks to support the achievement of the SDGs. The Global Partnership also measures progress against SDG target 5c to adopt and strengthen sound policies and enforceable legislation for the promotion of gender equality and women's empowerment and 17.15 on to respect each country's policy space and leadership to establish and implement policies for poverty eradication and sustainable development. The 2016 Report of the Inter-Agency Task Force on Financing for Development also recognises the Global Partnership monitoring framework as an important source of evidence for future monitoring of commitments to enhance the quality and effectiveness of international development co-operation, emanating from the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.

⁴ The Monitoring Advisory Group will provide recommendations for revising and updating the monitoring framework. This advice, coupled with stakeholder feedback from the second monitoring round as well as the Global Partnership's renewed scope, principles and commitments agreed in Nairobi will provide the

high-quality data that is relevant to development actors. This would require enhanced support to country teams leading the monitoring effort in order to strengthen data collection processes towards higher quality and applicability for development practitioners and decision-makers. The monitoring should also be further grounded in national development coordination policies, institutional monitoring and accountability frameworks.

In addition the MAG will prepare a theory of change for the Global Partnership which will have implications for the revised mandate.

15. ***From data collection to political momentum.*** There is broad agreement among stakeholders that the Global Partnership should contribute to political momentum through monitoring and implementation, and sharing of knowledge on progress and shortcomings. Stakeholders emphasize that the interdependence amongst functions should be strengthened to make them mutually reinforcing and better geared towards supporting different actors in their efforts to achieve the SDGs. Knowledge generation, sharing and learning on effective development co-operation is a cross-cutting priority for the Global Partnership. The Global Partnership is expected to provide the evidence to guide policy-makers and practitioners to take informed decisions. Monitoring, implementation efforts and policy dialogue are all critical sources of learning. Knowledge generation must be demand-driven and geared to different users, making lessons relatable and inspiring for all relevant actors. The working group on Knowledge Hub provides recommendations to strengthen the Global Partnership's role in generating and disseminating knowledge on more effective cooperation for development. The Working Group on Country level implementation should make recommendations to: mainstream and implement effectiveness principles in national development strategies, partnership frameworks, and other policies; identify and promote dialogue on how to address bottlenecks and obstacles; provide technical analyses and good practice compendiums; and support multi-stakeholder dialogue at country level.

16. ***Contributing to global policy dialogues for effective development co-operation.*** The Global Partnership is expected to scale up its contribution to global policy dialogue at the High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development and the Financing for Development Forum by proposing concrete solutions to improve development co-operation partnerships. This can be achieved in part through its role as a recognized source of data for the follow up of the Financing for Development commitments and the SDGs. Its stakeholders and its Global Partnership Initiatives can inject innovative solutions and lessons learned, fostering mutual learning and knowledge sharing at global level. The Global Partnership is also expected to deepen its complementarity with the Development Cooperation Forum (DCF). With a strong focus on country-level effective-

basis for updating the monitoring framework to provide a distinct and valuable contribution to follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda.

ness and knowledge generation and dissemination, the Global Partnership can inject evidence on progress and lessons to inform discussions at the DCF. Global policy recommendations on effective development co-operation from global policy dialogue should also be fed back to relevant communities of interest to guide their work.

17. ***Global Partnership's working arrangements.*** The Global partnership currently operates through the following working arrangements:

- Regular High-level Meetings, focusing on delivery on Busan commitments and topical and emerging issues relevant for effective development co-operation;
- The Steering Committee and its composition, supporting HLM preparations; providing strategic leadership and oversight to the work programme; reflecting key messages in relevant discussions; and guiding the work of the Secretariat;
- Three Co-chairs, representing the Global Partnership externally, guiding its work, and responsible for delivering its overall objectives.

18. Adjustments to the scope and functions of the Global Partnership also imply changes to its working arrangements. The following presents some options for aligning the Global Partnership's working arrangements to a renewed mandate:

- ***Adjusting the timing of Global Partnership meetings.*** The periodicity and sequencing of meetings remain vital to strengthen political momentum, accountability and knowledge sharing. The Global Partnership meetings at highest level, i.e. ministerial level meetings (HLMs), should be better aligned to the SDG and FFD follow-up processes and thus should be held at an appropriate time ahead of the High Level Political Forum under the Economic and Social Council (at Ministerial Level) and of the General Assembly (at highest political level), starting in 2018. To ensure continued accountability in between, and linkages with the Development Cooperation Forum, Senior-level Meeting (SLM) could be held every two years at an appropriate time and annual global technical exchanges could be continued, building on existing efforts such as the Annual Busan Global Partnership Forum. Timing annual meetings at a senior technical level could be linked with regional platforms, GPI workshops, and the monitoring process. This would help advance work at the country level while also producing inputs to the annual FFD Follow-up Forum and thematic and global HLPF reviews. More specialized regional and thematic policy dialogues, at the request of stakeholders, can better cater to “communities of interest” and fill a structural gap in the meeting structure of the Global Partnership to address implementation challenges around specific principles and commitments with different actors. Partner country caucuses among national governments across regions in close collaboration with regional platforms could complement this scenario.⁵

⁵ For an illustrative overview of global level meetings described here, see Annex 1. One governmental co-chair may also only commit to one year after HLM2 to start the rotational process.

- ***Streamlining co-chairing arrangements.*** To reflect the diversity of constituencies engaged in effective development co-operation, better ways to engage non-executive actors should be considered. Terms of References for Co-chairs should be clarified, along with application and selection procedures that ensure transparency and corresponding accountability. Hand-over notes and meetings to ensure effective succession arrangements could also be recommended in this context.

- ***Strengthening representation in the Steering Committee.*** The constituency model used to represent stakeholders in the Steering Committee⁶ groups stakeholders according to distinct roles and priorities. It is currently not working as intended, with a lack of clarity of representation of some actors and varying mechanisms to consult and coordinate, making it difficult to build consensus, especially within each constituency across regions. It is suggested that a flexible compendium of which Steering Committee member represents which actor, reflecting dynamics within stakeholder groups and expanding the role for greater regional coordination, could address this challenge. It should be based on an assessment of the current constituency model. It could include agreed procedures to consult constituencies and reporting to the Committee, as well as reference to the representation of Global Partnership Initiatives. This could be regularly adjusted in view of changes to the composition of the Steering Committee. Stakeholder feedback indicates support for maintaining the current composition of the Steering Committee per stakeholder.

- ***Revisiting Secretariat and Advisory Support.*** Secretariat Support is currently provided by a Joint Support Team comprising OECD and UNDP. Its four functions are: (1) Secretariat and demand-driven advisory services to the Steering Committee and the Co-Chairs; events, including Ministerial-level Meetings of the Global Partnership, (2) communications initiatives; (3) analytical work produced and disseminated; (4) and monitoring framework developed, refined and implemented. The OECD and UNDP should continue to jointly provide secretariat functions, building and expanding on the current arrangements. The main additional functions to the current scope of support of the JST should be on supporting the implementation of the Global Partnership mandate at the country level, upon request of programme countries after being offered such support, building on the unique strengths of the UNDP as a global organization with presence in most developing countries. The role of UNDP's regional bureaus should be reviewed accordingly. This could require dedicated funding over and above the resource requirements. The JST should be asked to prepare a proposal accordingly. An external review of the Secretariat could take place after HLM2 to make sure it best supports the revitalised Global Partnership.

⁶ The original 2012 mandate recognised the following constituencies in the Steering Committee composition: recipients of development co-operation; recipients and providers of development co-operation; providers of development co-operation; private sector stakeholders; parliamentarians; civil society; and multilateral development banks. Subsequently, a constituency seat dedicated to foundations was added in 2013.

D. The way forward: Issues and Options

19. Based on the evidence presented above, this section presents an overview of issues and options for a renewed mandate of the Global Partnership for consultation and debate by the Steering Committee, capitalizing achievements, lessons learned and stakeholder feedback. Issues captured, many of them not mutually exclusive, will be further guided by deliberations on the HLM2 outcome document and also by the findings of the Working Groups on knowledge hub and country level implementation, and the Monitoring Advisory Group.

Issue	Options
Renewing the Global Partnership's mandate	
<p>1. Promoting mutual accountability, political momentum and knowledge sharing</p>	<p>a. <i>Rejuvenate</i> the Global Partnership through the proposed adjustments below to drive a common understanding of what effective development cooperation means for different development actors and the way they will use the Global Partnership for learning and mutual accountability.</p> <p>b. <i>Strengthen the interdependence between the Global Partnership's functions</i> - upholding political momentum, generating evidence, and sharing knowledge - to make them mutually reinforcing and better geared towards supporting different actors in their efforts to achieve the SDGs</p>
<p>2. Agreeing on a monitoring framework suited for the 2030 Agenda</p>	<p>a. <i>Build on and/or expand the scope of the monitoring framework.</i> Options are: (a) focusing on current effectiveness principles and indicators and accelerate progress on unmet commitments; and (b) expand to monitor common principles and commitments specific to diverse constituencies of development actors</p> <p>b. <i>Reflect new development challenges</i> in the monitoring framework of the Global Partnership based on an explicit Theory of Change</p> <p>c. <i>Strengthen country-level implementation and monitoring processes and their relevance</i> for country-level policy dialogue and action. Options include: (a) strengthening developing countries' knowledge and capabilities for strengthening devel-</p>

<p>3. Contributing to global policy dialogues for effective development co-operation</p>	<p>opment effectiveness through Global Partnership principles; (b) support to integrated national development cooperation policies, plans and monitoring frameworks; and (c) advocacy by expanded Global Partnership stakeholders to induct their respective national counterparts into nationally-led monitoring.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Adapt the modalities of its meetings</i> to focus on data and evidence that can inform global policy dialogues on effective development cooperation including the HLPF, FFD Forum and DCF. b. <i>Provide timely evidence</i> from global monitoring, implementation and policy dialogue on effective development co-operation to the follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and <i>share their recommendations to inspire mutual learning at country level</i>; c. <i>Streamline calendars of the Global partnership monitoring</i> with the DCF mutual accountability survey and other substantive work to build on respective data
<p>Reviewing the Global Partnership’s working arrangements</p>	
<p>1. Adjusting Global Partnership meetings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Ensure that the cycle of High Level Meetings is strategically aligned to the FFD and SDG follow-up and builds synergies with the DCF</i>, including by considering appropriate adjustments to the current arrangements b. <i>Support specialized regional and thematic policy dialogues</i> based on demand by stakeholders to advance on specific effectiveness principles and commitments and support “communities of interest” c. <i>Organise regular partner country caucuses</i> across regions
<p>2. Reforming co-chair arrangements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Review ways to strengthen the involvement of non-executive actors.</i> <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. <i>Instate an ambassadorial function for govern-</i>

	<p><i>mental Co-chairs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">c. <i>Engage HLM/SLM host as special Co-chair for one year prior to the meeting, if not already co-chair</i>d. <i>Prepare Terms of References and encourage hand-over notes for succession between Co-chairs</i>
<p>3. Strengthening representation through the Steering Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. <i>Prepare a compendium to describe the representation of all stakeholders in the Steering Committee including their proposed roles, depending on changes in its membership</i> <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">b. <i>Maintain the composition of the Steering Committee in terms of numbers of seats per stakeholder</i>
<p>4. Revisiting Secretariat and Advisory Support</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. <i>Revisit the role of the Joint Support Team in view of changes to the mandate (options include: (a) continue as present; (b) augment current arrangements with required capacities.</i> <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">b. <i>Consider institutionalising an expert-based advisory function, similar to the Monitoring Advisory Group</i>