



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

OUTCOME DOCUMENT

**Advisory Group on the Monitoring of the Global Partnership for Effective
Development Co-operation – Summary of the 2nd Meeting**

28-29 September 2015, Paris

This document presents the outcomes and decision points from the second meeting of the GPEDC Monitoring Advisory Group

Contacts:

Ms. Yuko Suzuki, Tel: + 1 212 906 6509, e-mail: yuko.suzuki@undp.org

Mr. Alejandro Guerrero, Tel: + 33 1 45 24 83 63, email: alejandro.guerrero-ruiz@oecd.org

Ms. Julie Seghers, Tel: + 33 1 45 24 90 36, e-mail: julie.seghers@oecd.org

Summary of Sessions

Session 1 – Introductory remarks.....	3
Session 2 – Briefing and update	3
2.1. General update on the preparation of the second monitoring round (JST)	3
2.2. Outcomes of Mexico Steering Committee meeting (JST and Brian Tomlinson)	3
2.3. Outcomes of the AAAA and UN Summit on SDGs (JST)	3
Session 3. Conceptual and practical relevance of the GPEDC monitoring framework.....	4
3.1. Theories of Change implied in the GPEDC monitoring framework	4
3.2. The relevance of GPEDC ten indicators: Finalizing stress-testing questions (testing feasibility and credibility).....	5
3.3. “Country-focused, global light: ”Developing advice on implications of country-heaving monitoring methodologies.....	6
Session 4. The GPEDC monitoring framework and the SDG’s Targets and Indicators.....	6
Session 5. Working Arrangements for the Monitoring Advisory Group	8
Session 6. Work Plan.....	8
Table 1. Monitoring Advisory Group: 2015-2016 Work Plan	9
Session 7. MAG’s Internal and External Communications.....	10

Session 1 – Introductory remarks

Simona Marinescu (UNDP)

- The GPEDC framework is relevant for the implementation of AAAA and Post-2015: sustainable development will not be achieved without quality partnerships and effective processes for development cooperation.
- We however need to further discuss and understand how to bridge these processes. The JST is preparing a position paper that will be shared by the UNDP to the IEG-SDGs in October.

Arjan Schuthof (Netherlands)

- At the GPEDC Steering Committee meeting in Mexico, SC members welcomed the monitoring work, including the MAG's position. The MAG's work is well appreciated, and should play a strong role in track 2 and track 3.

Bernadette Vega (Mexico)

- Need to further define how to communicate on the MAG's work: what channels, to whom (Steering Committee members, participants in the monitoring exercise?), what balance between technical and policy messaging?

Betty Ngoma (Malawi)

- Reiterated the importance of the strong monitoring framework to support country implementation efforts and accountability.

Session 2 – Briefing and update

2.1. General update on the preparation of the second monitoring round (JST)

Since the first MAG meeting in May, the JST:

- Finalised the methodologies for 3 pilot indicators (use of country results frameworks, CSO Enabling environment, quality of public-private dialogue) and refined the methodology for the pilot indicator on transparency. This work took into account the recommendations for the MAG (a paper summarising how the recommendations were taken into account is available [here](#))
- Increased sensitisation and communication efforts to participants in the monitoring (developing country governments, providers, representatives from CSOs (CPDE), trade Unions (ITUC), parliamentarians (IPU) and the private sector (BIAC and P4P). As a result of these efforts, over 60 developing countries have expressed their interest in participating so far (which is great news, compared to the 46 participating countries in the 2013-14 monitoring round)

2.2. Outcomes of Mexico Steering Committee meeting (JST and Brian)

- Intense discussions on the purpose of the GPEDC (should the focus be more on learning or accountability?), and on how can the mix of accountability/learning lead to change?
- Multi-stakeholder nature of the monitoring exercise: SC members welcomed the efforts to increase multi-stakeholder engagement in the monitoring process, and particularly appreciated the multi-stakeholder nature of indicators 2 and 3. Parliamentarians and local governments however called to be more strongly engaged in the process.
- Discussions also focused on the applicability of the current monitoring framework to all development actors.

2.3. Outcomes of the AAAA and UN Summit on SDGs (JST)

- FfD: the effective development co-operation principles and the GPEDC explicitly mentioned in several paragraphs (see JST's framing paper, [available here](#))

- Brief description of the preliminary characteristics of the follow-up and review of SDGs and AAAAA (see JST's framing paper, [available here](#))
- Two main approaches in linking the GPEDC framework and the SDG framework were considered:
 - 1) Incorporating selected GPEDC indicators in the SDG global indicator framework (consideration could be given to incorporating 3 indicators: indicator 7 on mutual accountability for SDG 16, and indicators 2 (CSO enabling environment) and 3 (quality of public private dialogue) for SDG 17).
 - 2) Positioning the GPEDC framework as a whole, as a complementary inclusive country-based effort monitoring the effectiveness of development cooperation
- The UN-DG has established a working group on Sustainable Development, to define "Maps, mainstreaming, accelerating and policy support", in order to localise the implementation of the SDGs. Discussions are currently on-going as to the possibility incorporating the GPEDC framework in this work.

Key points raised in the discussion with the MAG:

- **Opportunities and challenges identified in Link between the GPEDC and the SDGs:**
 - Implications of nomenclature differences: "follow-up and review" (SDG) / "M&E" (GPEDC)
 - Frequency of each exercise (aligning them?)
 - The issue of governance. How will the SDG mechanism work? At the global, regional, national levels?
 - Indicators: UN-Stat framework hardly overlaps with what the GPEDC is doing.
 - If option (1) is retained (see above), the entry points should not be limited to SDG 16 and 17: effectiveness should apply to all SDGs. Consideration also needs to be given to the global politics of determining the final set of SDG indicators in relation to important dimensions of the GPEDC framework.
 - Option (2) seems like the way to go: in order to build the GPEDC monitoring framework as a complementary framework, it will be crucial to make it "politically irresistible".
 - In positioning the GPEDC in the review and follow-up, the focus should be on the global AND national levels. Important to look into the translation of SDGs and effectiveness principles at the national level (in national strategies, plans, monitoring frameworks)
 - How can the GPEDC's framework take into account the universal nature of the SDGs?
 - Need to think about incentives for countries to incorporate the effectiveness indicators within their own national SDG frameworks
 - Need to better linking process behaviour to outcomes

Action points:

- JST to prepare a positioning paper (ahead of IEG-SDFs Bangkok meeting late October). MAG members will have an opportunity to offer comments in the context of short timeframes.

Session 3. Conceptual and practical relevance of the GPEDC monitoring framework

3.1. Theories of Change implied in the GPEDC monitoring framework

- The MAG's initial conversation on the underlying theory of change (ToC) behind the Monitoring Framework acknowledged the need for a deeper exploration of the Global Partnership's establishment documents, complemented with further collective thinking within the group. A paper prepared by the MAG will summarise their thinking on this matter.
- The discussions highlighted the **need to understand the theories of change for the individual indicators and how these come together into an overarching theory of change for the monitoring framework as a whole**. If these are not explicit in the documents originating the Global Partnership, the MAG could then flesh out the implicit theory/ies of change.
- Notwithstanding this planned work stream, the Session 3 discussion already highlighted some key elements which might be included in carrying out the assessment work:

- The MAG suggested that **the ToC assessment requires a good initial understanding of the objectives being sought by the initiative**. That would drive the assessment of the current Monitoring Framework and the potential relevance questions and/or focus groups¹.
- ToC assessment should focus on:
 - making explicit the **implicit assumptions** posed by the ToC,
 - describe the **actors targeted by the monitoring effort** and the **structures of incentives** expected to modify, and
 - specify the **casual chains** that the Monitoring Framework is expected to trigger throughout the evidence-gathering and dissemination process associated with each monitoring round.
- A caveat was made to emphasize that, while behavioral change is expected to come from disclosing the information generated by the Monitoring Framework (the “evidence”), some MAG members saw **additional value in the multi-stakeholder dialogue process sparked by some indicators** (e.g. indicators 2 and 3), given that these are essentially processes of political engagement.
- The discussion also highlighted other areas for further discussion, including:
 - the implications of global focus vs country focus for the ToC;
 - the applicability of the same ToC to **different aid modalities and development actors**;
 - **risks related to the process**, such as just engaging aid coordinators and similar peers in the monitoring process and subsequent discussions;
 - and, more generally, the **impact of Post-2015 transformations** on the current ToC.
- MAG members concluded that the Monitoring Framework has **both a political and technical nature**, and the ToC should help understand how these two areas are expected to retrofit and interact throughout the monitoring process.
- The ToC assessment should also **help understand existing gaps** in the indicators framework and the proposed monitoring process in order **to help generate the incentives to promote behavior change among the relevant stakeholders**.

Action points:

- MAG to work on developing a paper on the Theory of Change (by end of November);
- MAG to provide suggestions on the report structure, based on the ToC (by 7 December).

3.2. The relevance of GPEDC ten indicators: Finalizing questions testing relevance, feasibility and credibility of indicators

- The MAG agreed to engage in an **indicator-by-indicator assessment of relevance, efficiency and effectiveness (usefulness, use)** for the ten monitoring framework. Smaller working groups were defined to carry out this work, based on background expertise and interests.
- The assessment of the indicators will be informed by (and inform) the definition of an explicit ToC, including the same considerations discussed in the session 3.1 (above).
- The proposed **testing questions** (drafted by the JST), to be included in the survey tool submitted to national coordinators participating in the 2nd Round, were considered satisfactory but a number of improvements in wording were suggested. However, the MAG highlighted the risk of asking relevance questions on the indicators simultaneously with the data collection for these indicators, with MAG members suggesting delaying the timing of the implementation of the testing questions with country focal points.

¹ In reflecting on the substantive objectives of the Monitoring Framework, some MAG members indicated that the four principles pursued since Busan could be seen as a good starting point in understanding what the GPEDC Monitoring Framework emerging from the [Post-Busan Interim Working Group](#) was trying to accomplish. An alternative line of discussion proposed two different (and, for some, complementary) *functional* objectives associated to the Monitoring Framework: accountability vs learning vs building political constituencies.

- In addition to potential testing questions, MAG members also suggested **other alternative mechanisms to gather qualitative feedback from stakeholders** regarding the relevance of the current monitoring indicators (e.g. focus groups, interviews with key informants). Also, the regional workshops provide excellent opportunities for this.
- The MAG work will **review the ToC and relevance of the different indicators in small groups, then collectively by the end of February**, in order to inform the overall review of the Monitoring Framework.

Action points:

- JST to fine-tune the wording in the testing questions with MAG guidance (by mid-January);
- MAG to produce papers on the review of individual indicators by late February to feed into the SC meeting in end Feb/early March 2016.

3.3. “Country-focused, global light: ”Developing advice on implications of country-heavy monitoring methodologies

- The **MAG is fully supportive of the “country-focused” approach**, for inclusive country ownership and to make it useful and meaningful to the countries. However, it is important to clarify that “country-heavy” also means that **providers at the country level need to engage** (i.e. to provide data to government), and to limit the disconnect between their country offices and their HQs.
- A call to **review the “global-light” part** of the equation:
 - How can adequate support to countries be provided with a “global-light” set-up?
 - How to make sure that “global-light” is not perceived as a way for providers to shy away from their responsibilities and engagement in the GPEDC processes?
 - How can this approach encourage providers to change behaviour? Need to reconcile a “country- focused” approach with a focus on providers’ behaviour.
 - Further engaging the DAC?
 - Making some indicators more “provider-heavy”? Indicators 1, 5b, 7, 8, 10 were mentioned.
- How can a **knowledge and learning hub** be developed within this “global-light country-focused approach? The MAG acknowledges the importance of learning, but emphasises that this should not happen at the expense of **accountability**, and should be informed by systematic monitoring. Need to better link learning and accountability. In addition, it is important that the learning provide concrete lessons from the ground (e.g. comparing how a provider behaves in different countries)
- How can the GPEDC create or enhance existing **spaces for debate** between developing countries and developed countries?
- **Regional level:** What is the role of the regional context in a country focused approach. The framework may need to reveal differences across regions (differentiated responsibility). Should the focus be on the differences across regions or across levels of aid dependency?
- How to **include other actors** (i.e. emerging providers)? How can the monitoring framework be adapted to take account their particular roles and approaches in South-South development cooperation?
- It will be important to **document the improvements and remaining challenges in data collection during the second round.**

Session 4. The GPEDC monitoring framework and the SDG’s Targets and Indicators

The Monitoring Advisory Group reflected on the current state of play of the work of the Inter-Governmental Expert Group’s on the post-2015 indicator framework (IEG-SDGs), with views to consider

a strategic approach for positioning the GPEDC's monitoring work in the post-2015 context. The discussion centered on the following issues:

- The strength of the GPEDC framework and of the effective development cooperation principles lies in the **effective use of resources, finance, and partnerships**. This issue is likely to remain key regardless of the SDGs targets and goals, as **national capacity for effectively managing all sources** of finance, resources and partnership is a critical enabler for implementing the SDGs.
- Linking the GPEDC monitoring with the SDGs at the country level was considered important. SDGs are promoted at the **national level** – through an institutional framework beyond the Ministry of Finance or Planning. Other Ministries such as sector ministries will play an ever more important role, and attempt to link the GPEDC monitoring (monitoring of effective development cooperation) into the SDGs will support systematic reporting at the country level.
- While taking note of the post-2015 review mechanism's shift from accountability to learning, **accountability still matters** for the GPEDC. In this context, the revised monitoring framework of the GPEDC may look at distilling the most important changes needed to support effective use of cooperation, finance, knowledge, innovation and partnerships to enable learning among countries and accountability held towards the commitments made.
- The SDGs' implementation will require actions and activities by governments and non-state actors. The GPEDC being an **inclusive and multi-stakeholder** platform, it may wish to further consider how to capture multi-stakeholder actions and dialogue to support the implementation of the SDGs. Some of the successful examples noted during the meeting include tri-partner compact used in the EITI.
- **Several approaches were considered as a way in which to strengthen and position the GPEDC monitoring in the post-2015 framework**; including, informing indicator work of the post-2015 across SDGs based on the GPEDC monitoring experience; identifying gaps and possible SDG indicators where GPEDC monitoring can complement and contribute; further positioning the GPEDC monitoring as a whole as an addendum to the SDGs global indicator framework; exploring specific interfaces within the SDG indicators (i.e. SDG 16, SDG 17) where the GPEDC can contribute.
- To this end, while there may be strengths and weakness in these approaches in relation to the integrity of a framework monitoring effective development cooperation, the MAG noted that **these approaches are not mutually exclusive, and the work of the group is to focus on its technical soundness of the GPEDC monitoring framework** with views to strengthen the framework and to also advice how the monitoring can support multi-stakeholder dialogue at the country level.
- To further strengthen and position the GPEDC monitoring and its linkages to the SDGs, it was also suggested to review the SDGs targets and analyze where the GPEDC monitoring might **contribute to implementing specific targets**. However, the MAG members recommended that the GPEDC monitoring framework should **remain as a distinct process, preserving the value of the monitoring of effective development cooperation**. Strengthening the framework should help present a solid case to the SDGs review and follow-up process. The MAG also noted that their direct engagement in the post-2015 indicator work is beyond their role, and that they will concentrate in strengthening the technical soundness of the framework in light of the Busan commitments and the post-2015 framework. Politically positioning and offering the GPEDC monitoring framework as complementary process requires action from the GPEDC Co-Chairs, SC and members (with support from the JST).

Action points:

- The JST will prepare a position paper on the GPEDC monitoring framework in light of the SDG 2015, which will be submitted to the Co-Chairs/SC for their endorsement, to be tabled out in the Inter-Governmental Expert Group on Post 2015 Indicator Framework in late October (Bangkok).

- The MAG work will concentrate on reviewing technical soundness of the GPEDC monitoring framework (the current, and possible additional indicators) to strengthen its relevance to complement the SDG 2015 review and follow-up framework.

Session 5. Working Arrangements for the Monitoring Advisory Group

The MAG decided to replace session 5 with a discussion among members to clarify the MAG's mission and working arrangements. Below are the key points from the report back made by the MAG to the Co-Chairs and JST:

- The MAG acknowledged that the **group is making progress, and thank the JST for its support.**
- The MAG agreed to appoint Brian Tomlinson as a Chair, and Lydia Fromm agreed to work with the Chair in an advisory capacity.
- The MAG asks for more **clarity on the deliverables, improved communications** (clarifying sharing and disclosure), and asks the JST to set up an “**audit mechanism**” recording the specific responses to MAG recommendations.
- The possibility of **hiring consultants** to support the MAG's work plan should be explored.
- The core expertise of the MAG is around the **credibility of the indicators**, rather than on political positioning of the GPEDC.
- The MAG acknowledged the need for the Group to increase the **preparations of meetings** (skype discussions) and the exchanges among MAG members between MAG meetings.
- Finally, in carrying out its meetings, the MAG suggested the possibility to carry out some closed-door sessions to further refine their thinking before including the JST and the Co-Chairs in the discussions.

Session 6. Work Plan

The following work plan is based on discussions held at the MAG over the two days of this Paris meeting.

In order to support the MAG's work, the UNDP-OECD Joint Support Team (JST) will make available relevant background documentation on the Monitoring Advisory Group Teamwork Space. The space will be user-friendly and password protected to allow free exchange of MAG internal document and comments, and will include an “audit trail” document in which the JST summarises how the MAG's recommendations are being taken into consideration on a rolling basis.

Table 1. Monitoring Advisory Group: 2015-2016 Work Plan

Deliverable	Lead*	Deadline
Track One		
<p>Indicator 4</p> <p>(Deliverable #1) Recommendations on the finalisation of the methodology for Indicator 4 <i>Note: The JST will provide a summary of the feedback collected through consultations around indicator 4 (incl. consultations with IATI and WP-Stat Secretariats, and an online consultation with GPEDC stakeholders) with a proposed revised methodology by 18 December 2015</i></p>	<p><i>To be appointed</i></p> <p>(Dan led the pre-Mexico advice on Indicator 4 and perhaps could continue to lead on indicator 4?)</p>	29 January 2016
Track Two		
<p>Theory of Change and the Structure of the 2016 Progress Report (including theory of change)</p> <p>This small group will initiate a short discussion paper on a theories of change that will inform both our approach to the Progress Report and to the revisions of indicators. This paper will inform a MAG webinar on this subject.</p> <p>(Deliverable #2) Overall think piece on the underlying/implicit TOC that informed the current monitoring framework and proposing an approach for the subsequent review. <i>Note: Refer to the Busan Partnership agreement, the subsequent work of the Post-Busan Interim Working Group, and the JST's September 2015 framing paper</i></p> <p>(Deliverable #3) Response to the JST's concept note on the 2016 Progress Report's structure, informed from the overall Theory of Change <i>Note: The JST provided an initial draft concept note on the 2016 Progress Report's structure on 21 Sept 2015</i></p>	<p>Dan, Lidia, Peter Discussion paper for webinar and final think piece on theory of change</p> <p>Advise to the JST on 2016 Progress Report</p> <p>Scott to lead the webinar to assist us in finalizing our theory of change</p>	<p>November 2 2015 circulation of ideas for a theory of change to inform a MAG webinar</p> <p>Mid November 2015 for theory of change webinar</p> <p>30 November 2015 for advice finalized theory of change (summary of webinar)</p> <p>December 7 2015 for advice on 2016 Progress Report</p>
<p>Review/testing questions</p> <p>(Deliverable #4) Finalisation of the review/testing questions initially proposed by the JST <i>Note: the JST will provide a revised set of testing questions by mid-January (the revision will take into account discussions from the MAG meeting in Paris, and the MAG's overall think piece on TOC as well as specific ToC/Deliverable #5-7))</i></p>	<p><i>To be appointed</i></p> <p>(Facilitated by the MAG Chairperson?)</p>	15 February 2016 for MAG input on the testing questions
Track Three		

<p>Reviewing the current set of indicators: analysis of strengths and weaknesses of the current indicators, application of the TOC to each indicator, identification of missing elements, and recommendations on how to strengthen/revise the existing monitoring framework in the light of the 2030 Agenda.</p> <p>(Deliverable #5) Paper on indicators of ownership and results (Indicators 1, 6, 9, 10)</p> <p>(Deliverable #6) Paper on indicators of inclusive development (Indicators 2, 3, 8)</p> <p>(Deliverable #7) Paper in indicators of transparency and accountability (Indicators 4, 5, 7)</p> <p><i>JST will provide support by gathering and placing relevant background documentation on the MAG web site.</i></p>	<p>Scott (lead), Lisandro, Gonzalo, Khwaga</p> <p>Peter (lead), Brian, Lidia</p> <p>Rob (lead), Dan, Deb</p>	<p>Groups develop their best thinking on indicators before our February MAG meeting²</p> <p>Papers circulated 2 weeks before February meeting.</p> <p>Finalized by groups at the February meeting and then discussed by all MAG members.</p> <p>The consolidated MAG paper as outcome of the Feb MAG meeting will inform the GPEDC SC meeting in late Feb/early March</p>
--	--	--

* Following the meeting, several MAG members who were not present have volunteered their participation in several of the deliverable working groups listed above.

Session 7. MAG's Internal and External Communications

- The MAG raised the need to reach the different constituencies within the GPEDC in order to consider their feedback in the Track 3 review work;
- The JST fully agreed with the approach, indicating that while the MAG can and should reach out to all the stakeholders, the MAG's primary audience in providing guidance to carry out policy discussions and proposing policy recommendations should be the GPEDC Steering Committee, co-Chairs, and the Joint Support Team;
- The MAG requested the JST to step up communications with the MAG, but also with other stakeholders (i.e. providers at headquarters and at country level, co-Chairs) in order to ensure full engagement and understanding by all the parties. Concerns about the packaging of pre-meeting documents were raised, suggesting online availability.

Action points:

- JST to prepare a table with roles and responsibilities of different GPEDC stakeholders;
- JST to facilitate an online MAG workspace for document sharing;
- JST to step up the communications with the MAG and other stakeholders.

Endnotes

ⁱ Link: <https://www.unteamworks.org/node/508574>

ⁱⁱ Link: <https://www.unteamworks.org/node/508574>

² The first day of the MAG meeting will include various sessions of the small groups to discuss and finalise their thinking on their respective set of indicators. The work of these groups will be presented to the MAG during the Feb MAG meeting. The work-to-date of these groups will be circulated prior to the MAG meeting.