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Progress since SCM16 in November 2018

✓ 3rd OWG meeting held in February 2019
✓ Consultation beyond the working group with:
  ✓ Governments
  ✓ Development partners
✓ Building on the 2 OWG papers, and 6 action areas presented at SCM16, OWG have developed a proposal for monitoring effectiveness in FCAS
Proposed monitoring approach

1. Possible improvements to the process

- Comprehensive review of the monitoring process needed in context of preparations for next monitoring round

- Preliminary thinking:
  - Greater in-kind technical assistance
  - An improved reporting tool
## Proposed monitoring approach

### 2. Tailoring the content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action area</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutual accountability</td>
<td>Mutual accountability among development actors is strengthened through inclusive dialogue</td>
<td>Adapted indicator 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political dialogue</strong></td>
<td>Foster legitimate politics through regular political dialogue</td>
<td>[Placeholder]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with national priorities/strengthening national capacity</td>
<td>Countries strengthen national development planning tools/ frameworks</td>
<td>Adapted indicator 1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development partners use existing country-led tools/ frameworks</td>
<td>Adapted indicator 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development partners strengthen national capacities</td>
<td>[Placeholder]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce redundancy and overlap of actors and activities</td>
<td>[Placeholder/could be covered under 7]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Proposed monitoring approach

## 2. Tailoring the content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action area</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of country systems</td>
<td>Partner countries strengthen the quality of their public financial management systems</td>
<td>Indicator 9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development partners use <em>and strengthen</em> country systems</td>
<td>Adapted indicator 9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humanitarian-development-peace coherence</strong></td>
<td>Foster humanitarian- development-peace coherence</td>
<td>[Placeholder]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps

1. Development of measurement approaches and indicator methodologies

2. A review of the monitoring process

3. Re-conceptualising the monitoring tool

2019

2020

Next GPEDC monitoring round
Questions

- Is there a need to be more selective or add components to adequately cover the six critical action areas? Are there key issues/stakeholders that require greater attention?

- Do you foresee benefits/limitations with revising the monitoring tool to allow for relevant questions to be asked, and others to be skipped?

- What considerations need to be accounted for in revising the monitoring process for fragile contexts?