

Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation Parameters for a strengthened and refined monitoring framework

Background

With the adoption of the 2030 Agenda, the Global Partnership is at a crossroad. Development co-operation is recognised as an important means of implementation to developing countries for poverty reduction and sustainable development, but it is part of a mix of resources and assets available for development. Added together these may be able to deliver the trillions of dollars required to implement the 2030 Agenda. As Addis Ababa Action Agenda reiterated its importance, effective development co-operation is a prerequisite for sustainable progress in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

It also recognises that the Global Partnership is a solid foundation for the multi-stakeholder partnership needed for effective development co-operation, with its focuses on country-led/focused approach and its ability to generate important source of data and evidence on effective development co-operation. Specially, the Global Partnership through its monitoring framework is positioned to inform the UN-led follow-up of the SDG 17 (SDG Indicator 17.15.1 on respect policy space and SDG Indicator 17.16.1 on enhancing global partnerships for sustainable development, in addition to SDG Indicator 5.c.1 on strengthen sound policies for gender equality).

The current Global Partnership monitoring framework is based on a set of principles that recognize the indispensability of national ownership by developing countries; inclusive development partnerships; recognition of the different and complementary roles of all actors; partnerships aligned to priority results set by developing countries; and increased transparency and mutual accountability. While these principles remain relevant, these principles reflect circumstances pre-dating the 2030 Agenda.

Further refinement of monitoring framework is needed in the pursuit of the SDGs, in particular to promote mutual accountability in development co-operation and to support mutual learning among all development stakeholders in changing global and country co-operation landscape. For example, the large and growing number of development finance providers and their modalities means more choice but also more complexity of managing resources and assets available for sustainable development aligned to national priorities. Building greater coherence, harmonization and alignment in support of national priorities, and providing support to those at risk being left behind, becomes more urgent.

The Monitoring Advisory Group, a team of 12 experts, was established in 2015 to provide technical expertise and advice to the Co-Chairs and the Steering Committee on the implementation efforts and complement the work of the Joint Support Team to review and refine the monitoring framework of the Global Partnership in the context of post-2015. The MAG advice in reviewing the monitoring framework has highlighted the importance of the following aspects:

- Maintain the GPEDC Monitoring framework as a distinct and unique process in its own right that complements the SDG review process;
- Build on the linkages with SDGs Indicators (in particular, SDG Indicator 5.c.1; 17.15.1; and 17.16.1)
- Strengthen the Framework to improve its relevance to the 2030 Agenda;
- Explore options for convergence of GPEDC monitoring and SDG review at country level and in global progress reporting.

The Co-Chairs and the Steering Committee of the Global Partnership has tasked the Joint Support Team to develop a proposed parameter for refined monitoring framework, taking into account of recommendations made by the Monitoring Advisory Group and lessons learned from the two rounds of the monitoring exercise. This note outlines a set of guiding principles and parameters for refined monitoring framework. Further

technical measurement work will follow the adoption of the guiding principles and parameters after HLM 2 and prior to the next round of the monitoring.

Guiding Principles for refining the Monitoring Framework

1. Principles of effective development co-operation remain relevant, and the Global Partnership monitoring framework is considered as the Partnership's core resource and a significant comparative advantage.
2. The monitoring framework and its indicators are derived from actual commitments made by stakeholders in the Global Partnership.
3. The GPEDC takes a holistic approach with inter-related set of indicators to monitoring effective development cooperation. This approach adds value on the means of implementation and complements SDG review at country level.
4. While achieving effective development outcomes is the goal, the focus of the GPEDC monitoring framework is changing practices and stakeholder behaviour in development partnerships, linking the "how" or "means of implementation" (GPEDC) to the "what" (the specific SDGs) through development cooperation.
5. The unique value of the framework is that it is driven and coordinated in implementation and content by partner countries, lead by a National Coordinator, but includes country level focal points for all Global Partnership actors.
6. The purpose of monitoring is the collection of relevant data and assessments of progress, not for its own sake, but to contribute directly to incentives and ongoing processes of dialogue at all levels to influence behaviour and institutional change. Creating incentives for change and dialogue on core issues of development cooperation is the benchmark for the usefulness of the evidence developed by any given indicator.
7. Given the inclusive multi-stakeholder character of the Global Partnership in which all stakeholders have a meaningful voice, the monitoring framework must reflect the principle of inclusivity, and balance in contributions, in both the scope of the indicators and in their methodology.
8. Recognizing the distinctive ways in which different actors in the Global Partnership engage in development cooperation, the framework must include indicators that are seen to be relevant, efficient and useful by each type of actor (partner country, provider, CSOs, trade unions, private sector, foundations, parliamentarians, middle-income providers).
9. The quality of the outcomes from monitoring will reflect the quality of participation and contributions at the country level by all stakeholders.
10. Global provider-related indicators will remain relevant measures of progress, but may need to be aligned better with country-level implications.
11. There are trade-offs between simplicity in indicators and contributing meaningful data/assessment. Given the purposes for the monitoring framework in relation to behaviour and institutional change, and its linkages with SDG reviews, the monitoring framework emphasizes on inclusion and meaningful information.

Parameters for Refined Monitoring Framework

The current set of indicators remain relevant, but suitable for assessing effectiveness of public concessional finance, especially bilateral and multilateral development co-operation. Such focus is not found to be fully

suitable for changing landscape both at global, regional, and country. In strengthening the relevance of the monitoring framework for all development stakeholders and countries, the following elements are proposed for refinement of the monitoring framework.

1. Adapting the Framework to reflect approaches by middle income countries

While the principles and the set of indicators remain relevant for bilateral and multilateral development co-operation (mostly grants), middle-income countries are seeking more policy-oriented, knowledge-based technical co-operation and technology transfer that support technologically oriented and private sector-driven development. In addition, middle income countries mostly receive concessional and non-concessional loans.

Closer examination of the role of technical co-operation, technology transfer and other modalities of co-operation is needed to explore practical ways to measure effectiveness of these co-operation in supporting countries attaining sustainable development and leaving no one behind. Experience of middle-income countries in the second round monitoring can inform determination of relevant areas in the Framework that recognises their dual roles in development co-operation.

2. Strengthening the indicator on public-private dialogue

The Global Partnership's established focus on public-private dialogue has proved useful to solidify engagement with CSOs and private sector as partners in development. However, to further strengthen the usefulness and relevance of this indicator, it is proposed exploring more in-depth "PPD to do what?" to ensure that a PPD is focused on assessing and improving the different roles of the private sector in development.

3. Assessing effectiveness of development co-operation policies and instruments in leveraging private investment for SDGs attainment.

With business providing 60% of GDP and 80% of capital flows and 90% of jobs in developing countries, the achievement of SDGs is influenced by the capacity of the development community to mobilize private investment and ingenuity towards this agenda. Through development co-operation, governments, development partners and foundations can play a catalytic role in helping companies articulate a business case, remove barriers, and de-risk innovation and investments in sectors that are crucial for SDGs attainment. To this end, it is proposed to explore an additional indicator that assess effectiveness of development co-operation policies and instruments in leveraging private investment for SDGs attainment. To this end, a focus on blended finance is considered as a relevant entry point for applying the principles for effective development co-operation to the private sector. Providers of development co-operation have been working with a number of financial instruments that bring together public sector finance and private finance for development projects. Further work is needed to determine an appropriate monitoring methodology, consistent with the principles and purpose of the Global Partnership, through engagement of key Global Partnership stakeholders, external research and documentation initiatives and technical expertise.

4. Philanthropic organisation effectiveness

Philanthropy has an equally important role to play in achievements of the SDGs. The Addis Ababa Action Agenda advocates for closer co-operation between philanthropic partners, governments and other stakeholders and also encourages foundations to align with national policies and priorities, and manage their endowments through impact investment. To this end, philanthropic partners have developed Guidelines on Effective Philanthropic Engagement around three pillars: dialogue, data and knowledge sharing, and partnerships. These elements can be considered in a refined monitoring framework as an additional indicator.

5. Climate Finance

The December 2015 Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change emphasizes the importance of effectiveness in measures to support adaptation through international cooperation. While the definition of climate finance is an unresolved global debate, one area of climate finance that is clear is climate-related ODA, as determined by the DAC Rio Marker. Climate finance that is public financial resources profiled by the providers and recipient can be considered in integrated into the monitoring framework. Further technical work is needed to clarify an approach and the relevance of the monitoring framework to climate finance in international cooperation. Collaboration with the OECD DAC ENVIRONET Policy Working Group should be considered for this technical work.

6. A holistic, ‘whole of government’ policy approach to implementing effective development co-operation for the SDGs.

The 2030 Agenda that requires higher level of integration of economic, social and environment policies and programmes will require a holistic framework for sustainable development. In order to ensure that such a holistic approach is part and parcel of national mutual accountability processes, it is proposed to include a sub-indicator that measures the breadth of the agenda in mechanisms for mutual accountability at the country level, and its inclusivity of inter-ministerial and development partners engagement in development planning, monitoring and accountability mechanisms.

7. Enhancing provider level engagement

Any refined monitoring framework should ensure that there is a balanced framework that calls upon all development partners committed to the Global Partnership, including national and global providers to fully participate in the monitoring process, and identifies critical areas where provider institutional policy and practices are seen to be critical for effective development co-operation. Some of the “externality” that affect the space for behavioural change in development co-operation are driven by provider institutional arrangements and culture. Therefore, the refined monitoring framework should explore ways in which to strengthen engagement of these stakeholders at HQs level. The Monitoring Advisory Group proposed the several areas of data that can be collected at HQ level in order to develop a comprehensive assessment of progress. This includes applicability of mutual accountability and gender equality indicators to providers of development co-operation. Provider profiles/dashboard could be considered to draw attention the critical areas (See MAG report – Page 22).

8. Strengthening multi-stakeholder engagements in monitoring and dialogue.

A process indicator is to accompany the degree in which the Global Partnership monitoring process itself have been characterised by full multi-stakeholder engagement.

9. Restructuring the Monitoring Framework according to the four principles for effective development co-operation, with modular layers for different development actors involved in the Global Partnership.

A more logical organization of the indicators in the Framework will be considered to improve understandability for end users, with greater prominence to mutual accountability as an overarching area for making progress in effective development co-operation. Consideration will also be given to a ‘stakeholder modular format’ for several indicators.

10. Adding depth to analysis of monitoring outcomes with greater emphasis on evaluation.

Greater emphasis on evaluation is considered as an important ingredient for a more nuanced understanding of the “why” question in assessing monitoring outcomes. Given the complexity of behaviour and institutional change in development co-operation as well as the emphasis on mutual accountability and country ownership, such nuanced understanding will be essential to making progress.

