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Background information for new Steering Committee members and Global Partnership stakeholders

The Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (the “Global Partnership”) was established in 2011 at the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan. Through its multi-stakeholder platform, the Global Partnership sustains political commitment and upholds accountability for improving the effectiveness of development co-operation. It also provides practical support to boost development impact, with a strong focus on implementing internationally agreed upon effectiveness principles – country ownership, a focus on results, inclusive partnerships and transparency and mutual accountability – at the country, regional and global levels.

The Global Partnership does this by regularly monitoring progress on the implementation of development effectiveness principles at the country level, and by facilitating dialogue and encouraging the sharing of experiences among governments, multilateral organisations, civil society, parliamentarians, local governments, trade unions, foundations and the business sector. In this context, the Global Partnership monitoring framework is recognised as one of the main instruments to drive change in the way development co-operation is provided, managed and harnessed. The evidence and data generated from this monitoring also contributes to the global follow-up and review of the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

The Global Partnership monitoring framework is comprised of 10 indicators, focusing on strengthening developing country institutions, increasing transparency and predictability of development co-operation, enhancing gender equality, and supporting greater involvement of civil society, trade unions, parliaments, and private sector in development efforts (see Annex 1). This set of indicators include indicators from the Paris Declaration that were identified as particularly important by developing countries, together with indicators introduced in 2012 that aim to capture the broader effectiveness dimensions of the Busan Partnership agreement.

The contribution of the Global Partnership monitoring framework to SDG follow up and review is explicitly reflected in, and will inform the measurement of SDG Indicators assessing the quality of partnerships and policies needed to effectively deliver the 2030 Agenda. Specifically, the Global Partnership monitoring framework assists countries in reporting on the following SDG targets:

17.16: “Enhance the global partnership for sustainable development, complemented by multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of the sustainable development goals in all countries, in particular developing countries”,

17.15: “Respect each country’s policy space and leadership to establish and implement policies for poverty eradication and sustainable development”; and

5c: “Adopt and strengthen sound policies and enforceable legislation for the promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls at all levels”.

The primary focus of monitoring the effectiveness of development co-operation is at the country level, where governments, development partners and non-state actors can use the monitoring exercise to ensure that development co-operation observes the shared principles of development effectiveness and supports realisation of respective commitments. Therefore, data is collected through multi-stakeholder participation under the leadership of partner countries receiving support. The OECD/UNDP Joint Support Team has been mandated to develop strengthened methodologies, to coordinate the monitoring process, provide support to stakeholders, and carry the data aggregation, global analysis and progress report preparation.

The last Global partnership monitoring exercise was formally launched in September 2015 and the resulting global progress report, “Making Development Co-operation More Effective”, was published in October 2016.
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Background and rationale for updating the Global Partnership’s monitoring framework

1. The Global Partnership’s monitoring framework tracks development stakeholders’ progress towards more effective development co-operation. The current monitoring framework was established in 2012, as a result of the Busan Partnership agreement. The framework was developed by the Post-Busan Interim Group, and is comprised of 10 indicators. This set of indicators includes indicators from the Paris Declaration that were identified as particularly important by developing countries, together with indicators introduced in 2012 that aimed to capture the broader dimensions of the Busan Partnership Agreement. Post Busan, the monitoring process also evolved from a global survey to a country-led, multi-stakeholder process. Data reported by countries to the Global Partnership is used as a source of evidence to monitor progress on three SDG targets (i.e. 5c, 17.15, 17.16).

2. The framework needs to be updated to remain relevant and useful for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. The Nairobi Outcome document (NOD) reflected the breadth of effectiveness commitments across diverse actors needed to support the successful implementation of the 2030 Agenda, and recognised the “need to refine the existing Monitoring Framework, taking into account emerging issues and new methods of development co-operation” (NOD §102). The NOD spelled out a renewed mandate for the Global Partnership, calling to “update the Monitoring Framework to reflect the challenges of the 2030 Agenda, including the pledge to leave no-one behind”¹. This includes adapting the monitoring framework to ensure that it is relevant for southern partners, to assess the effectiveness of partnerships between public actors and business and philanthropy, to reflect adapted modalities of development co-operation to advance the universal goal of leaving no-one behind and to strengthen country-level monitoring processes.

Taking stock: Updating the monitoring framework and process, building on evidence and feedback

3. With the adoption of the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA), the Steering Committee (SC) had foreseen in 2015 the need to refine the Global Partnership monitoring framework to reflect the new agenda and retain its relevance for follow-up of the SDGs. The following preparatory work was carried out in 2015-2016 to provide overall parameters and direction for the updating of the Global Partnership monitoring framework:

   1. The Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG), established by the Steering Committee in 2015, performed a review of the current indicator framework;

   2. Lessons learned from the 2016 Monitoring exercise were identified through feedback collected from participating countries and stakeholders;

   3. Specific areas of refinement emerged within the context of the NOD preparation process.

## Key orientations

| 1. Monitoring Advisory Group recommendations | ○ Proposed parameters to **expand the monitoring framework** to better capture implementation challenges of Agenda 2030\(^2\), covering a broader range of development co-operation actors, modalities and finance; ○ Technical advice to **strengthen the current monitoring framework**, with specific recommendations to refine the ten indicators and monitoring process\(^3\). |
| 2. Feedback from participants in the 2016 Monitoring round | ○ A call for **strengthened country-level multi-stakeholder processes and whole-of-government engagement** in monitoring\(^4\). |
| 3. Nairobi Outcome Document | ○ Update the framework to reflect the challenges of the 2030 Agenda, including the pledge to leave no-one behind and contributions to effective development co-operation from emerging partners and non-sovereign flows of capital; strengthening the Framework’s utility in various country and regional contexts; strengthening the country-level monitoring process to ensure the integrity and relevance of data, ensuring practicality and cost effectiveness. |

### Parameters for updating the monitoring framework

4. Building on the preparatory work and consultations undertaken in 2015-2016, the following parameters were identified to guide the updating of the monitoring framework:

- a. Principles of effective development co-operation remain **relevant**.
- b. Global Partnership’s holistic approach, with an inter-related set of indicators to monitoring effective development co-operation, adds value to efforts to **strengthen the means of implementation and review processes at country level of the 2030 Agenda**.
- c. The unique value of the Global Partnership monitoring is its **country-driven, inclusive, multi-stakeholder process**.
- d. The purpose of monitoring remains to be that of **incentivising and guiding changes in practices and behaviour in development co-operation** and partnerships.
- e. The current set of indicators remains relevant to the behaviour and institutional changes required to implement the principles for effective co-operation and to contribute to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. However, **the scope of monitoring and the indicators will need to be adjusted to be relevant to today’s development co-operation challenges**, and meet collective expectations in assessing effectiveness.

The review process will be guided by five principles: demand-driven; relevant; technically sound; inclusive and transparent; and feasible.

**A three-track approach**

5. It is envisaged that the updating of the framework will take place in a three-track approach progressively:

**Track 1. Strengthening existing indicators**, taking stock of the technical and practical suggestions made to date to ensure relevance, ensuring continuity and comparability in monitoring progress of the ‘unfinished business’.

**Track 2. Adapting the scope of monitoring** to track essential elements of effective development co-operation in today’s landscape. This includes improving effectiveness in key areas such as conflict and fragility, gender equality and climate change. It also addresses...
effectiveness of different approaches and modalities of development co-operation; making it relevant for the diverse set of development actors, including southern partners, foundations, and public-private partnerships leveraged through development co-operation.

**Track 3. Making the country-level monitoring process more inclusive and action-oriented,** including by ensuring the integrity and relevance of data, balancing practicality and cost effectiveness and integrating the process with national SDG follow-up and review where possible.

6. Timing: Sequencing for success. The revisions to the current ten-indicator framework require different degrees of methodological updating, some of which can be ready for the 2018 monitoring round. Parallel work and pilots on areas that are premature to incorporate in the 2018 monitoring round (particularly new areas described in “track 2”) will continue through 2018 and 2019. These revisions and new indicators will be incorporated in subsequent monitoring exercises.

The OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team (JST) will work with relevant technical working groups to develop sound methodological approaches for existing and new indicators, in an iterative exchange with Global Partnership stakeholders and extensive consultation with relevant constituencies. A broad consultation process to revise the final proposal for the refined monitoring framework will also be carried out in February-March 2018. The Steering Committee will then review and endorse a revised framework for the third monitoring round in April 2018. The work on Track 1 will continue in parallel and new indicators will be gradually incorporated in future monitoring rounds.

The timeline to review the monitoring framework has been accommodated to allow for a rigorous, collaborative review process. The extended timeline will also allow incorporating most changes before the next monitoring round. This timeframe will allow key findings from the third monitoring round to feed into the main UN reporting processes, in particular the 2019 High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development.

---

5 E.g. through online consultation processes, regional meetings organised by the relevant regional platforms, relevant thematic dialogue led by the Global Partnership stakeholders and GPs, as well as in-depth interviews with stakeholders leading or participating in the monitoring process.
This concept note provides a rationale and approach to refine the Global Partnership monitoring framework, following the parameters agreed by the Steering Committee in July 2016 and reconfirmed in April 2017. The note is structured in three parts:

- **Part 1** provides a rationale and mandate guiding the revisions of the monitoring framework.
- **Part 2** provides a summary of feedback from the Monitoring Advisory Group, participating stakeholders, and implications of the Nairobi Outcome document;
- **Part 3** defines the strategic areas for refinement, mapping out the process and sequencing to ensure an inclusive, thorough review process that is both technically sound and politically relevant.
- **Part 4** expands on the process for the review of the framework and the role of the Steering Committee.

Five technical notes, listed in the table of contents, provide in-depth information on assessments guiding this proposal, as well as specific orientations to revise the indicators of the monitoring framework.

**Part 1. Rationale and Mandate Guiding the Revisions of the Monitoring Framework**

The Nairobi Outcome document (NOD) provides a clear direction for the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (henceforth, the “Global Partnership”). The renewed mandate establishes that the Global Partnership shall continue being a recognised source of data, evidence and analysis to track progress in implementing commitments for more effective development cooperation. To that end, the biennial monitoring rounds at country level are considered the main Global Partnership instrument to generate reliable and timely data and evidence. The renewed mandate establishes that monitoring should continue to be a country-led and country-based process; supported by regional and global platforms; and resorting to an agreed framework that monitors the relevant effectiveness challenges in implementing the 2030 Agenda; and cognisant of the AAAA and the evolving development co-operation landscape, characterised by an increasing number of development partners and modalities.

The ultimate purpose of Global Partnership monitoring is to achieve greater development impact, in support of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. This is accomplished by promoting mutual accountability among development partners, highlighting areas of progress and challenges requiring further work; informing with data and evidence the country level and UN-led follow-up and review processes, including the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) follow-and-review at the High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development, the Development Co-operation Forum, and the Financing for Development Forum. Producing the behaviour change needed to make development co-operation more effective depends on political leadership and decision-making (at
country, regional and global levels) responding to relevant, effective and timely evidence and policy recommendations.

To accomplish this mission, the renewed mandate of the Global Partnership calls for adapting its framework to ensure that it is relevant for diverse country contexts, development partners, as well as diverse resources for sustainable development, assess the effectiveness of partnerships between public actors, including local governments, and businesses and philanthropy, reflect complementary modalities of development co-operation and advance the goal of leaving no-one behind. The renewed mandate also calls for strengthening the country-level monitoring process to ensure the integrity and relevance of data, and to make the process practical, cost-effective, and action-oriented.

Foreseen the adoption of the 2030 Agenda as well as the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA), the Steering Committee of the Global Partnership had already planned in January 2015 the need to refine the Global Partnership monitoring framework, to reflect the challenges of implementing the 2030 Agenda. For example, the large and growing number of development partners and modalities means more choice but also more complexity in aligning and managing a broad set of resources available for sustainable development. Building greater coherence and alignment in support of national priorities, and providing support in an inclusive manner becomes more urgent.

On the basis of the advice provided by the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team (JST) and the Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG), the Steering Committee at the 7th, 10th and 13th meetings proposed ways to refine the monitoring framework, with three complementary objectives. The first objective is to ensure continued usefulness to participating countries, development partners and other stakeholders, particularly in promoting mutual accountability in development co-operation. The second objective is to strengthen the relevance of the framework to the broadened set of actors and modalities of development co-operation. Finally, given the uncertainties of the changing development co-operation landscape, the monitoring evidence should also support mutual learning among all development stakeholders. This latter point also includes ensuring that the indicators linked to the “unfinished business” generate additional evidence in the future that can help boost progress in those areas.

The revised monitoring framework and process will enhance the contribution of the Global Partnership to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It will allow countries and a broader range of development partners and funding modalities to assess the extent to which they align with the four principles for effective development co-operation, the degree of uptake of the SDGs, and the effectiveness of the joint work towards development.

### Part 2. Taking Stock: Summary of Feedback from the Monitoring Advisory Group, Participating Stakeholders, and Implications of the Nairobi Outcome document

Based on the Steering Committee’s endorsed approach to refinement in January 2015, the following stock taking was carried out during 2015-2016, which provided the overall parameters to refine the Global Partnership monitoring framework:

1. A Monitoring Advisory Group performed a full assessment of the monitoring framework, from mid-2015 to late 2016. The scope of the assessment included the review of the current 10 indicators, as well as the monitoring process itself. The assessment provided

---

7 The contours of the “unfinished business” are defined in detail in the Nairobi Outcome document: Annex 2.
recommendations on how to strengthen the current framework, as well as suggestions on ways to expand the framework scope in line with the 2030 Agenda.

2. The 2016 Monitoring exercise and feedback received from participating countries and stakeholders generated lessons on how to strengthen the relevance and usefulness of the monitoring framework, as well as on the efficiency and quality of the monitoring process itself. The feedback process included an exit survey to participating governments, as well as regional workshops and online consultations around the monitoring framework and process.

3. The Nairobi Outcome document also set specific ambitions and directions to guide the review of the monitoring framework. As seen in Part 1, the renewed mandate for the Global Partnership also provides the authorizing environment to carry out these revisions, in close consultation with the community of Global Partnership stakeholders.

2.1. Monitoring Advisory Group Recommendations

Twelve high-level experts from developing country governments, development partners, think-tanks and civil society organisations were nominated by the Steering Committee and appointed by the Co-Chairs of the Global Partnership in mid-2015 to form the GPEDC Monitoring Advisory Group. Throughout 2015-2016, this group carried out research and consultations on the indicators that form the current monitoring framework –including in identifying its limitations– and on other aspects that contribute to the implementation of effective co-operation principles. This review was shaped by a set of questions that examined the indicators’ relevance, methodological efficiency in gathering data, and usefulness to inform multi-stakeholder dialogue and decision-making.

The MAG delivered a final report to the Steering Committee in September 2016. This section summarises key recommendations:

**General guidance**

- Maintain the Global Partnership monitoring framework as a distinct and unique process, in its own right, that complements the SDG follow-up and review process.
- Continue strengthening linkages with SDG indicators.\(^8\)
- Strengthen the current set of indicators in the monitoring framework, provide a deeper analysis on drivers of change, and encourage the use of monitoring findings to incentivise the behavioural and institutional change needed to implement the effective development co-operation commitments.
- Facilitate greater coordination between the SDGs follow up and review process and monitoring of effective development co-operation at country level. For example, explore ways to integrate the Global Partnership monitoring process as part of national review and reporting processes that inform upcoming UN High-Level Political Fora.

**Guidance to strengthen the current set of indicators**

The MAG found that all existing indicators remain highly relevant for the implementation of effective co-operation principles and the 2030 Agenda. In strengthening the current framework, the MAG made the following general suggestions:

- Confirm the core focus of Global Partnership monitoring on official development co-operation (i.e. all forms of international development finance and activities coming from

---

\(^8\) At present, evidence generated by the global partnership monitoring is already informing the global review of SDG targets 5c, 17.15 and 17.16.
official sources).

- Give greater prominence to mutual accountability and reflect the broader diversity of development actors that need to engage with and be accountable to each other.
- Assess the framework to determine the extent of multi-stakeholder engagement in the process.
- Add depth to the analysis of monitoring results by complementing quantitative findings with qualitative analysis, tapping on ongoing work brought forth by different platforms and policy networks.
- Consider restructuring the monitoring framework with modular layers, to reflect the differentiated needs of participants in the monitoring process (e.g. fragile states).
- Balance changes to the framework, improving the relevance but respecting continuity.

The extent of revisions required varies across individual indicators, with some requiring more substantive revisions than others. The MAG’s Final Report provides overarching recommendations in revising the framework and monitoring process, while the Compendium of MAG advice on the ten indicators provides very detailed indicator-specific advice. The operationalization of the advice is described in Part 3 and detailed in Technical Note 1.

Guidance to expand the scope of the framework

The MAG also recognised the need to improve the relevance of the Global Partnership monitoring framework, by expanding the coverage of actors and modalities of development co-operation, and by including new issues that have become more prominent for the effective implementation of the 2030 Agenda. The MAG made the following proposals on areas to which expand the scope of the monitoring framework:

- Enhance the framework to cover issues related to institutional and policy coherence (e.g. whole-of-government approach).
- Adapt the framework to accommodate the evolving realities of middle income countries (e.g. access to non-concessional development finance, technical co-operation, South-South co-operation, meaning of mutual accountability in a MIC context).
- Explore approaches to assess the effectiveness of inclusive, pro-poor private sector engagement through official development co-operation.
- Clarify the role of the monitoring framework to measure effectiveness of development co-operation in addressing systemic issues that are critical to achieve the SDGs, such as conflict and fragility, gender equality, climate change, or governance issues.
- Consider ways to reflect other emerging non-state development partners.
- Integrate an assessment on the quality of multi-stakeholder engagement in the process.

2.2. Feedback from Participants in the 2016 Monitoring Round

The regional workshops held after the monitoring round (i.e. late 2016) in Africa, Asia, the Pacific as well as Latin America provided an opportunity to reflect upon the 2016 monitoring process. In addition, an exit survey was carried out in participating countries, inquiring on the performance and usefulness of the monitoring process. Feedback was also collected from governments, development partners and non-state actors during and after the monitoring round. Moreover, the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team carried out in-depth interviews with participants in the months following the round. All these sources of feedback provide critical guidance to refine the monitoring process, and align the framework with the demands of the Global Partnership community. Technical Notes 3 and 4 provide a detailed summary of the received feedback, lessons learned and responses to the exit survey to participants.
On the positive side, participating stakeholders valued the results of the monitoring exercise, noting that the evidence helped them define future priorities in their respective countries. Participants also indicated the usefulness of the evidence to inform regional and global dialogues on development co-operation effectiveness.

Some of the areas for improvement include:

- The country-level monitoring process requires significant investments to lead a meaningful country-level multi-stakeholder exercise. A monitoring exercise more grounded in countries’ own regular practices, systems and institutional processes would reduce the transaction costs and ease the data collection and dialogue. Greater co-ordination with other national data collection exercises would reduce overlaps, provide a more complete picture and create important synergies (e.g. SDG follow-up and review processes).

- The country-led monitoring process and the support provided by the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team were very appreciated, but some countries experienced difficulty in securing adequate resources at country level to fully lead the labour-intensive multi-stakeholder process for data collection, validation and review. These constraints notably affected least developed countries (LDCs), fragile states and small island developing states (SIDS) whose participation was not supported by development partners (see Technical Note 4 for details).

- Participating countries identified timeliness and responsiveness of development partners as the most critical elements in support of data collection, followed by in-country capacity and availability of resources to lead the exercise.

- Participating governments appreciated the flexibility in deadlines, while recognising the need for timely data submission for subsequent analysis and report. On-demand remote support in managing implementation constraints in the monitoring process was appreciated, but there was a call for better in-country support and more targeted training opportunities that could allow implementing teams to understand the indicators and the process better.

- Adopting a whole-of-government and whole of society approach to country-level monitoring also seems critical for success. When inputs from other ministries within the government were required, national co-ordinators in the leading ministry also experienced delays in gathering specific information due to limited awareness and responsiveness in those ministries.

- Finally, middle-income countries (MICs) noted that, while the current monitoring process was useful, the relevance of the monitoring framework could be strengthened by reflecting effectiveness issues linked to the diversity of development finance and instruments these countries have access to, as well as the extent to which development co-operation addresses the “leaving no one behind” agenda. In addition, some MICs underlined their dual role as development partners and partner countries receiving development co-operation, highlighting the need to be flexible on the role(s) they choose to report on, and to reflect in the Global Partnership monitoring some development co-operation instruments that characterize their south-south and triangular co-operation, such as non-financial technical assistance.

---

9 The Global Partnership surveyed governments from the 81 participating countries that had engaged in the 2016 monitoring process. Government teams were asked to reflect on the relevance, efficiency and usefulness of the monitoring process. In total, 73 responses (90%) were submitted to the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team. Technical Note 4 summarises the survey results.
2.3. Ambitions of the Nairobi Outcome document and the renewed mandate

The 2nd High Level Meeting of the Global Partnership in Nairobi offered an opportunity for a wide variety of development stakeholders to take stock on progress implementing the development effectiveness principles and commitments, and to learn from each other.¹⁰

The monitoring findings also played a crucial role in informing the development of the Nairobi Outcome document (NOD). This ambitious document is unique in several ways. First, the NOD confirmed the role of the Global Partnership monitoring framework as its key instrument to inform global follow-up and review processes on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the Financing for Development commitments. Second, the full range of development partners made differentiated and specific commitments to align their efforts with the Global Partnership principles for effective development co-operation. This includes traditional and emerging development partners, parliaments, non-state actors and local governments. Third, the level of ambition was raised, with more than 100 specific commitments to be implemented in the road to 2030. A refined Global Partnership monitoring will build upon those commitments, in a careful balance between heightened relevance, continuity, and feasibility of the monitoring process.

The priorities outlined in the NOD, and reflected in the renewed mandate for the Global Partnership, have some cross-cutting implications in the development of a refined framework:

- The refined monitoring framework and process should reflect the type of mutual accountability that can potentially boost and sustain the impact of development co-operation. For example, the NOD calls for the creation of mechanisms allowing all relevant stakeholders at country level to engage in development planning, implementation and follow up, i.e. along the full cycle of development strategies.
- Governments and development partners are called to help attract inclusive, sustainable private investment. For example, the NOD calls for increased engagement with the business sector, by establishing mechanisms and instruments that allow for meaningful dialogue and collaboration with the business sector. Effective dialogue would result in the joint definition of a business case for development-oriented investments, in a mutually beneficial manner.
- The NOD acknowledges the importance of South-South and Triangular Co-operation and calls for ways to foster mutual learning and strengthen the measurement of effectiveness for these increasingly significant contributions to development processes.
- Finally, the NOD is built around two other cross-cutting themes. First, across principles and commitments, development partners pledged themselves to publish and share disaggregated data for development in ways that can be used by all relevant stakeholders. In addition, and related to that point, the Leaving No One Behind agenda was placed forefront as a cross-cutting challenge, with implications for the revision of the monitoring framework indicators, and how the monitoring is flexible enough to customise approaches for countries in special situations, MICs, women and youth.

Box 1. Key parameters to refine the monitoring framework

The following parameters build on the preparatory work undertaken in 2015-2016 and reflect the ambitions set out in the Nairobi Outcome Document:

- The four principles for effective development co-operation remain relevant for all development stakeholders.
- The Global Partnership’s comprehensive approach to monitor effectiveness adds value to collective efforts to strengthen the means of implementation of 2030 Agenda, and it complements SDG follow-up and review processes at country level.
- The country-driven, inclusive, multi-stakeholder process is one of the unique values of the Global Partnership monitoring that serves as a basis to generate the evidence and inform policy dialogue at all levels.
- The purpose of monitoring remains to incentivise and guide change in development co-operation practices and country-level partnerships.
- The current set of indicators remains relevant to capture the behaviour change and institutional reform required to implement the EDC principles and to contribute to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. However, given evolving landscape of co-operation modalities and actors, and the diversity of resources available for sustainable development, the scope of the monitoring framework needs to be refined to examine the effective delivery of all relevant types of official co-operation.

1 i.e. Country ownership, focus on results, inclusive partnerships for development, transparency and mutual accountability.
Part 3. Next steps for the refinement of the Global Partnership’s Monitoring Framework

Guided by the broader parameters illustrated in Box 1, and building on the preparatory work undertaken to date, the refinement of the monitoring framework will follow three parallel tracks: **Track 1** will refine and strengthen the current set of indicators; **Track 2** will work on adapting the scope of monitoring in light of the 2030 Agenda; and **Track 3** will ensure that the country-level monitoring process becomes more inclusive and action oriented.

**Track 1. Strengthening existing indicators**

*Rationale and benefits.* While the current ten indicators are considered very relevant to assess critical areas for effective development co-operation, lessons from the previous monitoring round and the work of the Monitoring Advisory Group suggest ways to increase the quality and usefulness of the information collected through the Global Partnership monitoring process.

Highlights of the proposed changes are summarized below both in bullet points and in table format, and detailed in the Technical Note 1:

- **Focus on results** (indicators 1a and 1b): Indicator 1a will be complemented with an assessment of alignment and use of country-led results frameworks to define development partners’ country level strategies. Indicator 1b will be improved to better assess the quality of country planning tools and the level of uptake and domestication of the SDGs.

- **CSO enabling environment and development effectiveness** (indicator 2): The multi-stakeholder dialogue process associated to data collection will be strengthened. The questionnaire design will be improved and simplified.

- **Quality of public-private dialogue** (indicator 3): The short questionnaire will be expanded to deepen the assessment of the quality of public-private partnerships, to capture critical issues for private sector engagement in development. The optional module will be removed.

- **Transparency of development co-operation** (indicator 4): Reporting on global transparency assessments will be made more user-friendly. The global indicator will be complemented with an assessment of access to and use of the information at country level (demand-side).

- **Predictability** (indicators 5a and 5b): The indicators will be complemented to identify current bottlenecks preventing progress in increasing the availability of development co-operation information accessible to partner governments for planning and budgeting purposes.

- **Development co-operation recorded on budget** (indicator 6): The indicator will be complemented with additional qualitative information on the quality of parliamentary scrutiny and the openness of the budget (e.g. relying on existing sources and indexes).

- **Mutual accountability** (indicator 7): Given the transformation of the development co-operation landscape, the indicator will evolve from traditional ‘mutual accountability’ to the ‘collective accountability’ at country level necessary to implement the 2030 Agenda. This requires a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach to development co-operation.

- **Gender equality and women’s empowerment** (indicator 8). The indicator is being refined to meet the requirements of the Inter-Agency Expert Group (IAEG) on SDGs, in partnership with UN Women. The refined methodology is being piloted in 13 countries, and will be endorsed by the IAEG in September 2017 as SDG indicator 5.c.1.

- **Quality and use of public financial management and procurement systems** (indicators 9a and 9b): Building on prior work by the Effective Institutions Platform and the Collaborative
Africa Budget Reform Initiative, the JST is working in close collaboration with the PEFA Secretariat and other stakeholders. Inclusive work will be taken forth to explore the extent to which, and ways in which, PEFA assessments can be used as a basis for measuring indicator 9a on the quality of country systems, instead of the World Bank CPIA scores. Better guidance will be provided to ensure higher accuracy and reporting rates regarding indicator 9b on use of country systems.

- **Untied aid (indicator 10).** Given the ambitious role attributed to the private sector going forward, recent assessments by the OECD DAC Secretariat point out to the need to observe both de jure and de facto provisions to untie ODA, and to strengthen transparency safeguards on untying. The Global Partnership will stand ready to facilitate mechanisms for broad consultation as technical work on this area moves forward.

### Table 1. Global Partnership Monitoring Framework: Current indicators, gaps and proposed revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Current Indicators</th>
<th>Current gap(s)</th>
<th>Proposed revision(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle 1 – Focus on Development Results</strong></td>
<td>Governments have set national results framework(s) to define their development priorities and results (1b)</td>
<td>Indicator only assesses existence of national result framework(s); No reflection of SDGs yet</td>
<td>Assess the quality of national result framework(s); Measure SDG uptake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development partners use those national results frameworks to align, design and monitor the results of their development co-operation activities (1a)</td>
<td>Assessment of alignment and use of country results frameworks only at project level</td>
<td>Assess partners’ alignment at country strategy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle 2 – Country Ownership of Development Co-operation</strong></td>
<td>Governments strengthen their public financial management and procurement systems (9a)</td>
<td>Current indicator (World Bank CPIA-13) offers limited country coverage and no disaggregated information</td>
<td>Use selected PEFA indicators to provide an objective, recognised measure of quality of country systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development partners use countries’ own public financial management systems to implement their co-operation programmes with partner governments (9b)</td>
<td>Reporting quality can improve (interpretation, reporting gaps); No information about actual donor policy</td>
<td>Improve guidance and validation process; Include a qualitative question about donor policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development co-operation is predictable (annual and medium term predictability) (5)</td>
<td>No information about donor policy driving predictability, thus no actionable findings</td>
<td>Include a qualitative question about donor practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aid is untied (10)</td>
<td>Current focus on formal tied aid (i.e. explicit restrictions)</td>
<td>Complement data with de facto tied aid levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle 3 – Inclusive Partnerships for Effective Development</strong></td>
<td>Civil society organisations operate within an environment that maximises their engagement in and contribution to development (2)</td>
<td>Capacity constraints for good multi-stakeholder dialogue; Complex questionnaire</td>
<td>Strengthen the multi-stakeholder dialogue process; Streamline the questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The monitoring process will also be used to map the policies and practices that drive change. Greater emphasis on qualitative information will add depth to analysis of monitoring outcomes, by providing the type of contextual information needed to link policy options and institutional arrangements to observed results (i.e. the “why” question). This objective will be accomplished in two ways. First, development partners at headquarters level will be engaged in an HQ survey, aimed at collecting qualitative information on policies and practices that could be relevant to complement country-level monitoring and results. Second, country-level indicators are being refined to capture contextual and qualitative variables as well. These complementary sources of evidence will be particularly critical to identify ways to boost the potential of effectiveness areas that have not experienced as much progress in recent years.

**Expected outputs:**
- Steering Committee status update and available indicator drafts (October 2017)
- Revised methodological note(s) for existing indicators (March 2018)

**Expected strategic results:**
- **Relevant data** allow countries and a broader range of development partners to assess the extent to which they align with the four principles for effective development co-operation, the uptake of the SDGs, and the overall effectiveness of joint work towards development.
  - The revised framework will be rolled out in the 2018 global monitoring round;
  - Because of the relevance of the revised framework, the monitoring process will attract high level of attention and engagement.
Rationale and benefits. The successful implementation of the 2030 Agenda will require tackling emerging and systemic issues which are beyond the current scope of Global Partnership monitoring. These include improving effectiveness in a number of key areas, such as conflict and fragility, gender equality and climate change. It also requires reflecting diverse country contexts (e.g. middle income countries), the increased number of development partners and the different modalities of development co-operation.

Approach. Tracking the effectiveness of development co-operation in relation to these new issues is a complex undertaking, especially where no agreement on a standard definition of effective co-operation exists. Adapting the monitoring framework to stay relevant and useful for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda while being able to deliver results that will feed into the 2019 HLPF requires a sequencing approach based on a sound prioritisation. Such a prioritisation is needed given the time needed to develop rigorous methodological approaches and reach a consensus on how to monitor effectiveness in these emerging areas. Meanwhile, the Global Partnership will explore whether relevant complementary sources of data are immediately ready to use.

New areas under consideration

Emerging areas of monitoring ready by April 2018 will be integrated in the upcoming monitoring round, while other areas requiring further work will be piloted and fully incorporated in subsequent rounds. The following prioritisation is proposed.

1. Providing a deeper understanding of effectiveness challenges to address crosscutting or systemic issues that are crucial for the 2030 Agenda. The objective for the next round will be to complement the monitoring findings with more specific analysis on the effectiveness of development co-operation to address systemic challenges, tapping into the work of existing initiatives and policy networks. Based on their importance and available expertise, we suggest prioritizing the three following areas:
   - **Addressing fragile and conflict-affected situations.** Some two thirds of the world’s extreme poor live in situations of fragility and are affected by violence, conflict, and population displacement. Substantial and effective support is critical to sustaining peace and bolstering countries’ resilience to fragility in its many forms, thereby addressing an important dimension of the “leaving no one behind” commitment. Over 60 percent of ODA goes to fragile and conflict-affected countries, but it is unevenly distributed and the Global Monitoring shows that progress on effectiveness has been particularly slow in those countries. The combined efforts of the g7+, the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, and the Global Partnership will contribute to develop a robust, visible and country led approach to monitoring effectiveness in fragile and conflict-affected countries. A module will be developed to more explicitly identify and monitor specific effectiveness issues affecting those particular contexts.
   - **Achieving gender equality and women’s empowerment.** The promises of the 2030 Agenda cannot be realised without bringing gender equality to the centre of development. Investing in gender equality and women’s empowerment is one of the most effective paths to sustainable development and peace. Currently, the monitoring framework reflects countries’ efforts to introduce gender-responsive public financial management. It is proposed to complement the current measure with an assessment of the effectiveness of development co-operation efforts to empower women economically. An analysis of the interlinkages between gender, conflict and fragility could also usefully inform the analysis in the
Monitoring report, complementing the monitoring approach proposed above on conflict and fragility.

- **Adapting to and mitigating climate change**: Climate change has emerged as the most significant environmental issue in the international development agenda. Its impacts threaten to undo decades of development progress as well as amplify biodiversity loss and desertification. While there is a simple metric to assess effectiveness in mitigation (i.e. tons of CO₂ reduced or avoided), the complexity of measuring effectiveness in adaptation to climate change requires developing a common agreement on which indicators countries and development partners can use. The related policy community is looking at how to measure development co-operation effectiveness and impact on activities related to climate change adaptation. Findings from this work could inform the broader proposal on how to measure effectiveness in the context of the 2030 Agenda that the Global Partnership will develop to inform the 2019 High-Level Political Forum.

2. **Progressively expanding the scope of development co-operation being monitored.**

- **Looking beyond ODA.** A crosscutting exercise will involve clarifying the relevance of the current set of indicators to measure additional forms of development finance. In a first phase (2018), non-concessional official development co-operation (e.g. IBRD lending to MICs) will be monitored against the four effectiveness principles, with expansion to other forms of co-operation in subsequent years. Meanwhile the development or refinement of specific indicators will be subjected to inclusive and extensive consultation with relevant experts, countries, development partners, and non-state actors.

- **Reflecting the effectiveness of South-South co-operation.** Southern partners and networks are currently exploring ways to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of their South-South partnerships. The objective for the next round will be to engage on a specialised policy dialogue with the relevant communities, to explore how to reflect effectiveness dimensions and evidence on South-South co-operation – as identified by Southern providers, partner countries and other stakeholders. Conducting a pilot exercise and using secondary data will be considered.

- **Measuring the effectiveness of private sector engagement mobilised through development co-operation.** Achieving the SDGs and leaving no one behind requires an enhanced role of the private sector in support of development strategies – development co-operation is expected to act as a catalyst towards that end. However, no agreed standards exist in this area at present, and as a result no monitoring can be included in the next round. This will be considered only when precise guidance on effective private sector engagement through development co-operation will have been agreed. This is one of the objectives of the GPEDC work programme 2017-18.

With the proposed adaptations, the monitoring framework will become more relevant for all. MICs have a greater reliance on non-concessional modalities of development co-operation, play a dual role as providers and beneficiaries of south-south co-operation, and the effectiveness of their sizeable private sector is paramount to address many development challenges.  

---

12 Among others, the Network of Southern Think-tanks (NEST) is currently consulting and testing an indicator framework that reflects agreed principles for effective South-South co-operation. See NEST (2017), *A Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for South-South Co-operation*, Johannesburg: Network of Southern Think-tanks.

13 The JST will seek to adapt the framework and process to allow for a participation of countries as both development partners and/or partner countries, as they choose to participate; progressively expanding the scope of development finance modalities under monitoring.
Expected outputs:
- Roadmap on the assessment of additional monitoring areas (November 2017)
- Concept papers including methodology for new indicators and emerging areas (June – October 2017)
- Proposal including methodology for new indicators and emerging areas (November 2017 – March 2018)

Expected strategic results:
- The monitoring offers relevant data on key systemic issues that affect the delivery of the 2030 agenda, and better meets the needs of all participating actors and countries, including middle-income countries.
  - A methodology for the emerging areas that will be incorporated in the third monitoring round will be shared at the first SC meeting in 2018;
  - Because of the broader scope and relevance of the revised monitoring, the coverage of development finance will be higher.
- A proposal on how to measure effectiveness in the context of the 2030 Agenda informs the 2019 High-Level Political Forum and policy discussions.

Track 3. Making the country-level monitoring process more effective, inclusive and action-oriented

Rationale and benefits. The 2015-2016 Global Partnership monitoring round was implemented in 81 countries with different institutional needs, levels of capacity and resources. The exercise involved a record level of stakeholders and a broad coverage of development co-operation. While recognising the benefits of the country-led process, analysis from the last round suggests that the monitoring process can be made more user-friendly, adapted to each country’s needs, and more relevant for all participants at country level. A revised process will aim to simplify and facilitate the participation of Global Partnership stakeholders, while increasing the engagement and action resulting from the process.

Approach. Lessons learned from the past monitoring round are detailed in Technical Note 3 and are being considered in the planning for the upcoming round. The main proposals to strengthen the country-level process include:

- **Simplifying the communications and increasing the demand for the monitoring process**, making explicit the benefits and value added of the exercise for each stakeholder, and connecting the Global Partnership monitoring to SDG follow up and review processes more explicitly.
- **Supporting national coordinators and other participants during the exercise.** This includes strengthening the country-led approach by providing additional guiding materials to better ground the monitoring process in national systems and processes; providing detailed, yet user-friendly technical guidance, in-person training opportunities and video tutorials\(^\text{14}\), and streamlining data gathering wherever possible. This also includes customising the country monitoring approach and support to account for countries’ particular circumstances and capacities.
- **Strengthening the process and guidance to enhance development partner engagement** at

\(^{14}\) Upon availability, communications, guidance, questionnaires and support materials will be provided in other local languages besides English, French, and Spanish, in order to facilitate broad multi-stakeholder engagement (including non-state actors). In the 2016 monitoring round, countries and development partners supported translations into Arabic and Portuguese, which were very welcomed by other governmental and non-governmental participants.
HQ as well as country level in the multi-stakeholder monitoring processes. This involves better communications, targeted trainings, and a strengthened role for development partners’ focal points at country level, who can support the national coordinator in the multi-stakeholder dialogue, data collection and validation.

- Deepening the assessment of the monitoring results by bringing together complementary analysis, to be taken forth proactively by Global Partnership stakeholders and platforms.

- **Improving support for use of findings.** The monitoring process is just a means to provide evidence for action, not an end in itself. Better guidance and materials on how to analyse, communicate and use the monitoring findings at country and agency levels, complemented with on-demand support to targeted events, can help close the implementation gap and transform evidence-based dialogue into joint action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected outputs:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Refined data collection tools (February 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>Monitoring Guide 2018</em>, Terms of References and other materials to support country-led monitoring exercise in the 2018 monitoring round (March 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strengthened monitoring process that ensures meaningful multi-stakeholder engagement in all participating countries (rolled out from May thru December 2018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected strategic results:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► Participating countries better enabled to carry out effective national multi-stakeholder monitoring processes and take action on the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Streamlined process and adequate support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Reliable and more comprehensive data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Global Partnership monitoring embedded into emerging SDG follow-up and review processes, where those processes already exist.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 4. Envisaged review process: Stakeholder engagement and role of the Steering Committee

The review process will be guided by five principles:

a. demand-driven, building on the feedback received and addressing the monitoring needs of country-level actors, as well as capturing global commitments;

b. relevant, addressing key elements for the effectiveness of development cooperation in the rapidly evolving landscape;

c. technically sound, proposing a sequence that creates time for rigorous technical review, drawing on available expertise and expert groups for the diverse policy area being monitored;

d. inclusive and transparent, making working drafts publicly available for feedback and consulting all relevant Global Partnership stakeholders, including Steering Committee members, during the review process; and

e. feasible, ensuring a balance between simplicity, meaningfulness and continuity of the monitoring framework.

The revisions to the current ten-indicator framework require different degrees of methodological updating, some of which can be ready for the 2018 monitoring round (refer to Technical Note 5 for more details on the activities and their sequencing). Parallel work and pilots on areas that are premature to incorporate in the 2018 monitoring round (particularly new areas described in “track 2”) will continue through 2018 and 2019. These revisions and new indicators will be incorporated in subsequent monitoring exercises.

The JST proposes to carry out the updating as follows:

- **Indicator updating and development (May 2017 – February 2018).** The JST will draw on technical assistance in the form of informal expert groups related to the thematic areas to develop indicator proposals, paired with iterative consultations with relevant stakeholders and light country-level testing. A dedicated section in the Global Partnership website will facilitate ongoing stakeholder feedback and transparency.

- **Open consultation on the proposed updates (March 2018).** The broad public consultation will gather feedback on the proposed updates and monitoring process.

- **Steering Committee consideration and endorsement (April 2018).** SC members will review and endorse a revised framework for the third round. The third-round is expected to be launched in May 2018. Work around ongoing revisions that are premature to incorporate in the third round will continue, to inform subsequent monitoring efforts.

The timeline to review the monitoring framework has been accommodated to allow for a rigorous, collaborative review process. The extended timeline will also allow incorporating most changes before the next monitoring round.

---

15 The 2015-2016 stock-take referred before indicates that most indicators in the current framework will require only moderate updates to make them more useful and accurate, while some others might need substantive updates (e.g. mutual accountability indicator; private sector indicator).

16 Experience from previous indicator development during 2012-2015 suggests that developing and agreeing on new indicator methodologies require varying timeframes, consistent with the complexity of the specific policy areas being measured. More complex indicators would be piloted as part of 2018 monitoring, before being fully integrated in the monitoring framework during 2019.
The **Steering Committee**, as the main oversight and decision-making body of the Global Partnership, led by the co-chairs of the Global Partnership, is expected to review and endorse the final refined framework proposal. In addition, Steering Committee members will be invited to contribute with substantive feedback during the consultation processes, to take place in the first quarter of 2018.

This timeframe will allow key findings from the third monitoring round to feed into the main UN reporting processes, in particular the 2019 High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development.

**Figure 1. Proposed sequencing of the review process**

[Diagram showing proposed sequencing of the review process with timelines and activities for each track from April 2017 to May 2019.]
ANNEXES
The Global Partnership monitoring framework comprises a set of indicators tracking international commitments to enhance country ownership of development efforts, a focus on results, inclusiveness in development partnerships, and transparency and accountability. The current framework was established in 2012, and rolled out during the 2014 and 2016 monitoring rounds.

### Table 1. The Global Partnership monitoring framework: Measuring the implementation of commitments for more effective development co-operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Busan Commitment</th>
<th>Current Global Partnership Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOCUS ON RESULTS</strong></td>
<td>Governments agreed to focus on development results by establishing transparent, country-led results frameworks that can support results-oriented planning and strategic policy making.</td>
<td>1b looks at whether a country has results frameworks in place, and whether there are key strategic planning documents containing its national development priorities, targets and results indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development partners committed to: using country-led results frameworks to plan and design new development co-operation programmes and projects; using countries’ monitoring and evaluation systems to track progress on and achievement of results; minimising the use of other frameworks.</td>
<td>1a measures the alignment of development partners’ new interventions with the objectives and results defined by countries themselves; it also looks at development partners’ reliance on countries’ own statistics and monitoring and evaluation processes to track progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNTRY OWNERSHIP</strong></td>
<td>Governments agreed to improve the quality of their national public financial management and procurement systems in order to enhance their effectiveness and improve governance.</td>
<td>9a measures the quality of country systems using the World Bank’s Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) scores, rating the quality of budgetary and financial management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development partners agreed to use country systems as the default approach to deliver development co-operation in support of activities managed by the public sector.</td>
<td>9b measures the proportion of development co-operation disbursed for the public sector using the country’s own public financial management and procurement systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Busan, development partners agreed to further untie development co-operation. Development co-operation is untied when bilateral partners do not impose geographical constraints on the use of the funds.</td>
<td>10 measures the percentage of bilateral development co-operation provided by OECD-DAC members that is fully untied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development partners committed to disbursing funds in a timely and predictable fashion, according to agreed schedules, so as to enable countries to plan and manage their development policies and programmes with greater effectiveness.</td>
<td>5a measures the proportion of development co-operation funding that is disbursed to a country’s government within the fiscal year in which development partners schedule it. It captures both the reliability of development partners in delivering the resources, and how accurately they forecast and disburse this funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development partners committed to providing forward-looking information on upcoming funding in a timely and predictable fashion, according to agreed schedules, so as to enable countries to plan and manage their development programmes with greater effectiveness.</td>
<td>5b measures the estimated share of development co-operation funding covered by indicative forward expenditure or implementation plans that are shared with the country government (for one, two and...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refining the Global Partnership Monitoring Framework</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusive Partnerships for Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governments committed to creating an enabling environment for civil society organisations (CSOs) so as to maximise their contribution to development. CSOs agreed to make their operations more effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnerships and programs with greater effectiveness.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governments committed to engaging with the private sector: to improve the legal, regulatory and administrative environment for private investment; and to ensuring a sound policy and regulatory environment for public-private partnerships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development partners agreed to improve the availability and public accessibility of information on development co-operation and other development resources in a timely, comprehensive and forward-looking manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transparency and Mutual Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governments and development partners committed to including development co-operation funds in national budgets subject to parliamentary oversight.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governments committed to creating an enabling environment for civil society organisations (CSOs) so as to maximise their contribution to development. CSOs agreed to make their operations more effective.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 looks at: government support for multi-stakeholder dialogue around national development policies; CSO accountability and transparency; official development co-operation with CSOs; and the legal and regulatory environment where CSOs operate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 measures the quality of public-private dialogue by looking at the legal and regulatory environment for private sector activities, a country’s readiness to conduct public-private dialogue and the effectiveness of selected dialogue platforms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 assesses the extent to which development partners are making information on development co-operation publicly accessible, and in line with the Busan transparency requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 measures the share of development co-operation funding for the public sector recorded in annual budgets that are approved by the national legislatures of partner countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 measures the percentage of countries with systems in place to track public allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment, and that make this information publically available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 measures whether a country has four out of five criteria in place: 1) an aid or partnership policy; 2) country-level targets; 3) regular joint assessment of progress against targets; 4) local governments and non-executive stakeholders included in the assessments; and 5) public availability of the results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries agreed to put in place inclusive mutual assessment reviews to respond to the needs and priorities of domestic institutions and citizens.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governments committed to creating an enabling environment for civil society organisations (CSOs) so as to maximise their contribution to development. CSOs agreed to make their operations more effective.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 looks at: government support for multi-stakeholder dialogue around national development policies; CSO accountability and transparency; official development co-operation with CSOs; and the legal and regulatory environment where CSOs operate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 measures the quality of public-private dialogue by looking at the legal and regulatory environment for private sector activities, a country’s readiness to conduct public-private dialogue and the effectiveness of selected dialogue platforms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 assesses the extent to which development partners are making information on development co-operation publicly accessible, and in line with the Busan transparency requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 measures the share of development co-operation funding for the public sector recorded in annual budgets that are approved by the national legislatures of partner countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 measures the percentage of countries with systems in place to track public allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment, and that make this information publically available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 measures whether a country has four out of five criteria in place: 1) an aid or partnership policy; 2) country-level targets; 3) regular joint assessment of progress against targets; 4) local governments and non-executive stakeholders included in the assessments; and 5) public availability of the results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 2. EXPANDING THE SCOPE OF GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP MONITORING: DIRECTIONS AND SEQUENCE

The Global Partnership’s monitoring framework was developed after the Busan High-Level Meeting in 2011, building upon the experience and indicators developed to track the Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness. The scope of monitoring has traditionally focused on Official Development Assistance (ODA), with more limited coverage of other forms of development co-operation finance.

However, to stay relevant for countries at all levels of development, the coverage of the diverse set of funding modalities and actors need to expand progressively (see Figure 1).

The expansion strategy does not involve to directly apply ODA-focused indicators to alternative forms of development finance. Rather, in order to gauge whether they are aligned with the four principles for effective development co-operation, the revisions need to ensure that the particular effectiveness issues related to these alternative funding modalities are well defined and captured. It is proposed to develop parallel approaches to define what “effectiveness” means for development co-operation beyond traditional government-to-government ODA, as discussed in Part 3 of this concept note and visualised in Figure 2, below.