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1. Status update

March
Data aggregation and analysis

April
FfD - global SDG data released

May
Sequenced release of Monitoring Report

June
Full dataset made publically available
1. Status update: SDG follow-up & review

- **SDG 17.16** # of countries reporting progress in development effectiveness monitoring frameworks
- **SDG 17.15** Extent of use of country-owned results frameworks and planning tools by providers of development cooperation
- **SDG 5.c** Proportion of countries with systems to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment
2. Preliminary results

- **100+ development partners** in **87 partner countries**
- More than **3,400 interventions** approved in 2017 (approx. USD 67 billion in total budgets)
- Reporting on approx. USD 64 billion in grants + loans disbursed at country-level in the fiscal years of reference

**Which countries?**

- Mostly **low (30) and lower middle (29) income** countries
- **15** countries reporting for the first time since Busan
- **71** participating in 2016 & 2018

**Fragility Status**

*OECD Frangility framework 2018*

- Extremely fragile: **14%**
- Fragile: **38%**
- Non fragile: **48%**

**Regional distribution**

- Europe
- Americas
- Oceania
- Asia
- Africa
2. Preliminary results: Partner countries

Strengthening results frameworks (ind. 1b)
➢ *Almost all* have results frameworks that *increasingly* spell out *development priorities*, contain results indicators & link to SDGs

Strengthening country systems (ind. 9a)
➢ *Overall* countries are *strengthening their financial management systems*

Gender equality (SDG 5.c / ind. 8)
➢ Only around a *fifth of countries* have systems to *track* and make public allocations for *gender equality* and women’s empowerment
2. Preliminary results: Development partners

Alignment (ind. 1a)
➢ Good alignment with national priorities at strategic level
➢ Often incorporation of SDGs (targets/indicators) in strategies
➢ Lower alignment at programme level

Predictability (ind. 5a)
➢ Annual predictability decreased but remains above 2/3
➢ Unscheduled disbursements increased compared to 2016

Use of country systems (ind. 9b)
➢ Overall modest increase in the use of country systems
2. Preliminary results: Mutual accountability

Mutual assessments (ind. 7)

- The overwhelming majority of countries have a policy framework in place to guide development co-operation
  - However, fewer are tracked through regular, inclusive and transparent mutual assessments

Transparency (ind. 4b)

- Majority of countries have aid management information systems (FMIS, AIMS or DMS)
  - Yet more than a third of development partners still need to report to these systems
2. Preliminary results: Whole of Society

**CSOs report:** (ind. 2)
- Good protection of CSOs working with marginalised populations
- Moderate legal and regulatory frameworks for enabling environment

**Private sector & trade unions report:** (ind. 3)
- Efforts from both public and private actors to increase dialogue and mutual trust
- Joint collaboration resulting from several dialogue initiatives

**CSOs report improvement needed in:**
- Space for dialogue on national development policies
- Engagement with development partners
- CSO development effectiveness

**Private sector and trade unions report improvement needed in:**
- Inclusivity and relevance of dialogue
- Capacity and resources to engage in structured dialogue
3. Emerging lessons: anticipated challenges

**Partner countries**
- Timing
- Context specific challenges
- Capacity

**Development Partners**
- Data collection and validation
- Diversified delivery channels
3. Emerging lessons: new challenges

Structural shifts for SDGs implementation
• Development co-operation structures are in flux

Mechanisms through which the monitoring exercise has been conducted are changing
• Increased demand for support to conduct the exercise
3. Emerging lessons: implications

Quality of engagement and data
• Recognition of spectrum of engaged countries, tailored support accordingly

Improving the Global Monitoring process
• How to best ensure feasibility, sustainability and relevance of the monitoring process?
4. Leveraging the monitoring results

- For the SLM and next GPEDC work plan
- For SDG follow-up and review
- At country level
Guiding questions

- **At the SLM**: How will the Steering Committee harness the monitoring results for the content and substantive direction of the Senior-Level Meeting? And the next Global Partnership work programme?

- **For SDG follow-up and review**: How will Steering Committee member maximise the visibility and impact of the monitoring results? And ensure effective development co-operation and the monitoring process and results feature in VNRs?

- **Spurring collective action at country level**: What will Steering Committee members do to ensure that the monitoring results are acted on at country level?