



GPEDC Virtual Workshop

March 17th to 20th, 2020

Advancing together towards a 2020-2022 Global Partnership Work Programme

Background

The success of the 2020-22 GPEDC Work Programme will depend on a concerted effort by all development actors to apply the effectiveness principles across their activities to visibly help deliver the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs. To this effect, and as part of the design process of the new GPEDC Work Programme, the GPEDC Co-chairs convened over 90 participants from all regions and stakeholder groups in a virtual meeting from 17-20 March 2020 to inform and help shape a common ambition and set of action areas for change at country level. Discussions addressed in particular the bottlenecks and gaps and harnessing emerging opportunities around three pillars, related to the strategic priorities outlined in the Co-chairs' [Strategy Paper](#): (1) delivering better impact and data; (2) assessing, improving and scaling up new and better partnership approaches; and (3) leveraging the Global Partnership monitoring for action.

All political and substantive efforts to implement the new Work Programme will culminate in a GPEDC High-Level Meeting in 2022 (HLM3). To bring Ministers from all regions together for a high-level political dialogue on effectiveness in the 2030 era, the new Work Programme must embrace a strategic, appealing and simple narrative around how effective development co-operation helps deliver sustainable results for more people, especially in times when hard-won gains around sustainable development are at risk of being minimised.

With this in mind, participants of the GPEDC Virtual Workshop worked together on the ten proposed action areas¹, including through the established 'action area working groups', to test their appeal to partner country governments and non-state actors, and discussed how to support actors at country level and develop a collective narrative to mobilise political support in the run up to HLM3. The meeting also dedicated one session to discuss expectations of the GPEDC monitoring reform and synergies of the monitoring with other action areas.

Advancing effectiveness in action areas

Action area working groups acknowledged the importance of anchoring all activities at the country level to promote behaviour change and localise efforts for greater effectiveness to achieve the SDGs.

During the pitches, break-out sessions and interactive discussions, the groups reflected on the need

¹ STRATEGIC PRIORITY 1 (Development effectiveness for accelerating progress toward the 2030 Agenda): Demonstrating the impact of effectiveness; Support to statistical capacity and data; STRATEGIC PRIORITY 2 (Building Better Partnerships): Private sector partnerships; Triangular development co-operation; South-South co-operation; Civil society partnerships; Reinforcing foundations' engagement; Development effectiveness at subnational level; Effective multilateral support; and STRATEGIC PRIORITY 3 (Leveraging monitoring for action).

to work with relevant local actors as well as through existing structures and platforms. Partner countries raised concerns related to the capacity constraints some of them may face in supporting the implementation of certain activities. Group members also agreed that there is need for a systematic approach for country engagement to ensure coherence across action areas and avoid fragmentation and extra burden to partner countries.

There is considerable potential for aligning activities and using synergies across action areas. Most proposals include activities in three main areas: (i) Analysis and Research (literature reviews, case and country studies, mappings, surveys); (ii) Support to in-country operations (country pilots, development of guidance and toolkits, methodologies, support to data collection); and (iii) (Peer-)Learning, knowledge products and outreach at country and global level (global reports and events, local consultations, communication products). To ensure a coherent implementation of the future work programme and leverage available resources, there is scope to organise certain activities jointly across different action areas in some cases.

Results from the last GPEDC monitoring round will inform activities in a number of action areas proposals. Action areas such as 1.1. on the impact of effectiveness and 2.4. on civil society engagement will look at how the results of the 2018 round can support their proposed activities together with other sources of information and analysis.

Action area groups are still open for new expressions of interest. Participants agreed to continue identifying relevant actors that could potentially join groups to contribute to and support planning and implementation, especially partner countries and non-state actors. Participants interested in joining specific groups are encouraged to contact the respective leads (see box).

Some headlines from breakout sessions

Discussions informed presentations in subsequent plenary discussions, and guided group work after the virtual workshop in order to finalise proposals for all action areas (AAs).

AA 1.1: Impact [draft proposal](#) | [contact the lead](#)

Participants discussed the timeframe for implementing proposed activities, how to measure and evaluate progress, effectiveness and impact and the contributions from constituencies such as CSOs and sectoral-level efforts/initiatives.

AA 1.3: Data [draft proposal](#) | [contact the lead](#)

Participants concluded that there is a need to clarify the GPEDC's role and niche in this area and avoid duplication with existing initiatives. It was agreed to develop a scoping paper to address this issue. Participants will also reflect on a coherent approach for undertaking case studies and compile lessons learned.

AA 2.1: Private Sector Engagement [draft proposal](#) | [contact lead](#)

The group reflected on the ambition and timeline of the proposed objectives and activities taking into consideration the broader 2030 horizon and global context. Identification and mobilisation of relevant private sector actors at the country level will be fundamental in taking this work forward.

AA 2.2: Triangular Co-operation [draft proposal](#) | [contact the lead](#)

It was suggested to give more emphasis to linkages with the effectiveness principles and elaborate on how the activities will be anchored at the country level. Stronger participation from partner countries would help to broaden the scope of the group. The proposal could be more

detailed on how this action area can find synergies with other areas such as 2.1.

Short takeaways from breakout sessions (cont.)

Action Area 2.3: South-South Co-operation [draft proposal](#) | [contact the lead](#)

Participants raised the challenge of measuring South-South co-operation as its contribution relies on non-financial support and knowledge sharing. The proposal could further include activities for peer-learning and sharing experiences. There is a need for real exchange among actors in different regions working with different mechanisms of South-South Co-operation.

Action Area 2.4: Civil Society Partnerships [draft proposal](#) | [contact the lead](#)

The group had a constructive discussion on the potential focus and scope of the action area work. Participants agreed that the results from the last monitoring round would inform the proposed activities. A concept note and proposal will be developed based on the discussion.

Action Area 2.5: Foundation engagement [draft proposal](#) | [contact the lead](#)

The need to further link the proposed outputs to the effectiveness principles and to clarify how the activities respond to the foundational elements in the strategy paper were discussed. The exchanges focused on how the proposal takes into account other existing initiatives and the incentives needed to attract further partner countries to the group.

Action Area 2.6: Sub-national Development Effectiveness [draft proposal](#) | [contact the lead](#)

Participants mentioned the importance of harmonisation and co-ordination between local, regional and national governments, and with development partners when they work at the sub-national level. A space for dialogue and knowledge sharing on effectiveness at subnational level involving stakeholders from different spheres could be fostered through the GPEDC. The proposal will be revised based on the discussions and inputs provided .

Action Area 2.7: Effective Multilateral Support [draft proposal](#) | [contact the lead](#)

The group noted that the proposal should have two dimensions: how multilateral organisations can deliver more effectively on the ground and how the support provided by bilateral actors can be more effective. The scope of the work should also leave room to bring other stakeholders to the conversation. The action area is still looking for a lead to co-ordinate the work in going forward.

Strategic Priority 3 [draft proposal](#) | [contact the lead](#)

The transitional nature of the current monitoring reform process was noted. While there will not be a global monitoring round/report ahead of HLM3, evidence will be generated through the deep dives under the use of results and from piloting the new process/framework. Support to the use of results from the 2018 Round should be elevated to political level to generate accountability, without focusing only on the technical level.

Towards a Work Programme that delivers at the country level

Anchoring at the country level will be a foundational element of the Global Partnership Work Programme. This means ensuring the Work Programme will aim to respond to effectiveness challenges faced by partner countries in different contexts and ensuring that country-level activities are implemented in a way builds on ongoing efforts and provide value to country-level stakeholders.

Feedback from participants was received on the need to **converge with existing local efforts**. This means that – rather than Global Partnership stakeholders developing new areas of work in a country – they should support activities that are in line with national priorities and ongoing country-level work/initiatives, as well as drawing on existing country-level systems and processes.

To do this, Global Partnership stakeholders need to **invest in engagement and coordination**. It was suggested that Global Partnership actors develop an ‘offer’ to partner countries, outlining different ways and types of engagement and support. Partner countries can then indicate their level of interest in different engagement areas also ensuring there is a in-country demand for it. It was also noted that effort is needed to consistently share information with all partner countries, including those not engaged in any particular Action Area.

With regards to the types of support, there was significant demand for the Global Partnership to **increase support for knowledge exchange and peer learning** to build capacity of partner countries and pass on gains from one country to another. **Technical assistance**, including from the Joint Support Team in the design of country-level initiatives was requested, as well as increased availability of **knowledge products**.

It was also noted that country-level work needs to include both **technical and political considerations**. The Global Partnership could provide a space for country-level dialogue to build political buy-in to the effectiveness agenda. In this vein, the Global Partnership can help to ensure that its global multi-stakeholder nature is equally reflected at the country level.

Following, regarding Action Areas, it was specifically noted that support to efforts to engage various stakeholders at country level, including civil society, private sector, parliamentarians and foundations, is valuable. Additionally, work in the area of innovative financing and South-South Co-operation were also flagged among needs.

The Global Partnership monitoring exercise

Session participants agreed that the monitoring exercise is a core, flagship and global offering of the Global Partnership; hence, **it should continue producing comparable data and country profiles that partner countries have found useful for country-level action plans and dialogue**. Partner countries also mentioned the monitoring as a fundamental tool to engage their partners and assess strengths and obstacles to improve quality of co-operation. They also emphasized the importance of conducting regional workshops to ease and improve data collection efforts at partner-country level. For some countries, the Global Partnership monitoring is the only tool to assess progress, challenges and best practices for effective development co-operation. Participants also appreciated the multi-stakeholder aspect of the monitoring, which helps bringing together different development actors operating in the

country. The importance of the global monitoring progress report was also mentioned, especially to inform strategic decisions at High Level Meetings.

Throughout the session, participants highlighted the **challenges faced in undertaking the last monitoring exercise**: the short and rigid timeframe for data collection making it difficult to link the monitoring with existing processes, development partners' poor responsiveness and co-ordination as well as funding issues stood out as the main difficulties. Some concerns were raised about the comparability of the data produced in the previous round and the different understanding by participants of what needs to be reported and it was suggested simplifying the process with fewer countries' involvement at once as a way to enable bettering of data quality. Furthermore, some participants raised that the current monitoring framework is unfit to capture the full complexity or nuances of certain co-operation realities (e.g. development co-operation delivered through the multilateral system or South-South Cooperation).

Hence, session participants identified **key aspects for reforming the monitoring exercise**. Some participants suggested an increased flexibility in the timing and frequency of the exercise that could allow the global process to align and support existing country processes. Additionally, they recognise the vital need to strengthen the multi-stakeholder nature of the monitoring exercise currently captured through the process for reporting on Indicator 2 (on civil society organizations) and Indicator 3 (on the quality of public-private dialogue) which require engagement and dialogue among various development actors.

Overall, session participants emphasized the **need to streamline and simplify the process** by avoiding duplication in data collection and making use of existing data as much as possible (e.g. SDG indicators); any possible additional indicator should be justified by a clear benefit and should not overcomplicate the framework. In terms of encouraging **synergies with other action areas**, stakeholders referred to Kampala Principles as an interesting entry point to explore how to measure aspects of effective private sector engagement, linked to work in Action Area 2.1. As Action Area 1.1 is set to evaluate how effectiveness generates better impact, the research produced under that action area can support the work to refine the monitoring framework.

GPEDC narrative and finalisation of the Work Programme

In rallying political support around the effectiveness agenda ahead of the next High-Level Meeting in 2022, Global Partnership stakeholders will need to invest in building a narrative more closely around the SDGs. In doing so, messaging should be aligned to activities related to the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs as the overarching and well-known framework and thus avoid duplication or the sense of misalignment. This could potentially increase the uptake of the effectiveness agenda at global and national levels and help ensure authorities will realise its added-value in view of their SDG ambitions.

The multi-stakeholder nature of the Global Partnership constitutes a major incentive for increased engagement with a broad set of actors. It speaks to one of the core principles of the 2030 Agenda as a whole-of-society effort to deliver sustainable development. Activities tailored to the needs of non-state actors will facilitate their participation and, paired with the increased scope of work to other modalities of co-operation will diversify and challenge efforts to build a robust storyline. It will be

important to portray that the Global Partnership is a true multi-stakeholder – and not a government to government – platform, reflecting interests and ambitions of a broad range of actors.

The relevance of the effectiveness agenda relies on its ability to demonstrate a positive impact of the principles on the implementation of the SDGs at the country level. While difficult, this can generate political buy-in, promote behaviour change and help localise the SDGs. Global Partnership stakeholders should also consider the sustainability of the activities proposed at the country level to increase the incentives for local actors to engage. Partner countries may need support to engage in the different initiatives in terms of capacity building and knowledge sharing.

Following the fruitful discussions of the virtual meeting, the leads of the action areas were invited to review and submit final action area proposals, taking on board any final suggestions from members of their respective groups. The refined proposals present a critical pillar for crowding in countries and partners to forge collective and concrete actions to deliver the vision of the Global Partnership. .

The Co-Chairs will reflect on the submissions and liaise with the leads of the action areas to ensure the coherence of the different proposals and alignment with the foundational elements of the Work Programme and overall narrative. A draft Work Programme, reflecting and linking to the action areas proposals and introducing how to frame and build a new narrative over the next two years will be shared with the Steering Committee ahead of its next meeting.

In case you cannot access the relevant information through the links included in this document, please contact info@effectivecooperation.org.