



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

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

---

## ***Post-monitoring Workshop***

Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire, 27-28 February

*This workshop was organised by the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation, together with the government of Côte d'Ivoire, and with the financial support of the European Union. The contents of this document are the sole responsibility of the United Nations Development Programme and can under no circumstances be regarded as reflecting the position of the European Union.*

# *Objectives of the workshop*

- 1. Review progress in implementing selected Busan commitments → craft key political messages arising from the monitoring findings (day 1)**
- 2. Take stock of the monitoring process itself → lessons for strengthening the process to support accountability nationally and globally (day 1)**
- 3. Discuss ways to strengthen pilot indicators → help to inform further work to refine approaches (day 2)**

# *Monitoring approach and key findings*

- **Paris Declaration evaluation:** Ownership, alignment and harmonisation, results and accountability are relevant for all forms or co-operation. Their implementation has contributed to strengthen standards of partnerships and legitimised demand particularly from developing countries that good practice be observed
- **Busan: country-led monitoring**
- **46 countries submitted data.** Expectations for **broader future participation:** countries revising accountability processes to reflect Busan principles
- **Over 70 co-operation providers** reported data to national governments. Process reviews the quality of **almost half (46%) of global “country programmable aid”**

# *Emerging Key Messages: Glass Half Full*

- Effectiveness and accountability matter
- Core 'aid effectiveness' gains broadly sustained – a good basis for further progress by 2015?
- Reform takes time but it works – need to continue investing, also in 'younger' Busan commitments
- Inclusiveness is on the table – but not yet a full reality
- Transparency drive starting to show results – but these need to be geared towards countries' needs
- Countries increasingly own monitoring – need to support data quality and providers' country engagement

## ***Commitments → action → behaviour change***

- Monitoring spurs actions and reinforces accountability – use what we have and make it work even better...

# OWNERSHIP AND RESULTS

- Use of country results frameworks
- Aid on budget
- Quality and use of country systems
- Aid untying

# Indicator 1 – use of country results frameworks

- **Target:** all providers use country results frameworks by 2015
- **Measure:**
  - % of funds disbursed through modalities which allow for alignment with countries' programming, implementation and annual reporting cycles
  - Government perceptions: direct use; and support to developing and strengthening these systems
- **State of play:** too early to say
  - Indicator piloted in 8 countries; 17 partners
  - Preliminary conclusions: great variation among providers; but consistent provider behavior across countries
  - Multilaterals performing better than bilaterals?
- **Way forward:** what are the operational procedures and instruments that need to be put in place for further progress?

# Indicator 6 – aid on budget

- **Target:** halve the proportion of development co-operation flows not reported on government's budgets – with at least 85% reported on budget
- **Measure:**
  - % of disbursements scheduled for the government sector included in the government budget estimates for the same year
  - Change in the denominator (scheduled disbursements instead of actual disbursements)
- **State of play:**
  - 64% in 2013 (compared to 57% in 2010)
  - 7 countries have reached the target of 85%
  - Important variations across countries + interpretation
  - Notable recording of funds on budget beyond what was scheduled
  - Fund inclusion gaps also exist
- **Way forward:** need for greater transparency and regular exchange of information



# Indicator 9a – quality of PFM systems

- **Target:** half of developing countries mover up at least one measure (0.5 pts on the PFM/CPIA scale)
- **Measure:** a comprehensive and credible budget; effective financial management systems; timely and accurate accounting and fiscal reporting/audit
- **State of play:**
  - No overall change since 2010: 3 countries moving upwards, 3 countries moving downwards
  - Additional evidence: Open Budget Initiative
- **Way forward:** alternative measure – work underway from the Effective Institutions Platform

# Indicator 9b – use of PFM and procurement systems

- **Target:** reduce the gap in the use of PFM and procurement systems (2/3 for CPIA  $\geq$  5; 1/3 for CPIA between 3.5 and 4.5)
- **Measure:** % of funds through national budget execution procedures; financial reporting procedures; auditing procedures; and procurement procedures
- **State of play:**
  - 49% of funds use national systems; no change since 2010
  - 15 countries have a use above 60%
  - 14 countries saw an increase; 22 countries saw a decrease
  - Weak correlation between quality of systems and use
  - Recognition of the need for a gradual approach in fragile states (e.g. Somali ND compact)
- **Way forward:** how to promote greater use – and encourage providers to implement their operational policies (most have updated them)?

# Indicator 10 – aid is untied

- **Target:** continued progress over time
- **Measure:**
  - % of ODA that is fully untied
  - Bilateral providers only (reporting to OECD/DAC CRS)
- **State of play:**
  - 79% in 2012 (compared to 77% in 2010)
  - Progress in the coverage of the reporting status: only 3.5% not reported
- **Way forward:**
  - some reporting inconsistencies remain: is it a political or technical issue?  
Can greater value for money be achieved through international bidding for the remaining activities which are tied?



# Inclusive partnerships

- Enabling environment for CSOs
- Private sector engagement
- Gender equality

# Indicator 2 – Enabling environment for CSOs

- **Target:** continued progress over time
- **Measure:**
  - CIVICUS EEI dimensions related to NGOs legal and regulatory framework
  - 2 subdimensions
- **State of play:**
  - Too early to say – indicator not available (due to limited data availability)
  - Some examples of progress – major challenges in many countries
- **Way forward:**
  - Further thinking needed on possible measurement and collection of primary data
  - How to promote country level dialogue on the CSO enabling environment in existing accountability frameworks and provide a basis to feed into the CIVICUS EEI?

# Indicator 3 – Private sector engagement

- **Target:** continued progress over time
- **Measure:** quality of public-private dialogue as a proxy
  - Institutionalised mechanism/formalised structures to facilitate dialogue
  - Representativeness of private sector actors engaged in the process
  - Outcomes of the dialogue (e.g. reform proposals)
- **State of play:**
  - Too early to say – indicator ready to be piloted shortly
- **Way forward:**
  - Need to identify what's the best way of taking this indicator forward
  - Who does what?

# Indicator 8 – Gender equality

- **Target:** all developing countries have systems to track and make public gender equality allocations by 2015
- **Measure:**
  - % of countries with systems in place
  - 2/4 criteria: official government statement; allocation systematically tracked; leadership and oversight with ministry of finance; public availability of budget information (mandatory)
- **State of play:**
  - 12 countries have a system in place
  - 4 countries have a system in place but allocations not made public
  - Initiatives in most countries not having systems in place
- **Way forward:** what support needed to ensure that countries have such systems in place?



# TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- Transparency
- Predictability (annual and medium-term)
- Mutual accountability

## *Indicator 4: Information on development co-operation is publicly available*

- Target? Full implementation of the common, open standard by 2015
- Measure: assess providers' reporting to the OECD/DAC and IATI systems through 3 criteria: timeliness, comprehensiveness, forward looking nature
- State of play: a good start...Average provider: data once a year, data 6-9 months old. Information for 50% of data fields. 75% provide forward looking information.
- Way forward: more frequent reporting, fresher data. More systemic completion of data fields, start with country envelopes. How to translate this into support for countries' strategic planning?

## *Indicator 5a: Annual predictability*

- Measure: proportion of funding disbursed within the fiscal year for which it was scheduled
- Target? Halve (2010-2015) the proportion of funding not disbursed as planned
- State of play: some progress, 84% disbursed according to plan. 22 countries received less than scheduled (17 more). Large variations 40% << 240%, also within countries. Noteworthy absence of disbursement schedules.
- Way forward: Eliminate funding shortfalls; improving accuracy of funding schedules (also upwards); providing disbursement schedules in the first place.

## *Indicator 5b: Medium-term predictability*

- Measure: availability of forward expenditure plans from providers for 1, 2 and 3 years ahead; proportion of funding covered by forward expenditure plans
- Target? Halve the proportion of funding not covered by forward expenditure plans
- State of play: a good start, but Busan commitment not met.
- Way forward: Adjusting providers policies/procedures so that plans can be regularly updated and communicated. Address possible mismatch between information provision at global and country level

<b>2014</b>	<b>83%</b>
2015	70%
2016	57%

## *Indicator 7: Mutual reviews of progress*

- Measure: four / five criteria
- Target: All countries have in place mutual assessment reviews
- State of play: some progress 70% meet 4/5 criteria

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

- Way forward: Encouraging momentum to build on, efforts are underway. Need targeted action to make reviews more inclusive and transparent.

# *What are the important messages from your perspective?*

- 1. From your perspective, what is the key message?*
  - Is progress happening? Are we on track to meet our targets?*
- 2. What came out of the process for you?*
  - Progress, what kind? Why so?*
  - Challenges, what kind? Why so?*
- 3. What are the successes / lessons to build on? What needs to be done to overcome bottlenecks?*