



**Global  
Partnership**  
for Effective Development  
Co-operation

# 18<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee Meeting

## Summary

5-6 December 2019  
Seoul, Republic of Korea

### Objectives

- Welcome new co-chairs and members
- Discuss and agree on a new vision and objectives of the next work programme; areas of action and desired level of ambition, building on ongoing work
- Exchange on members' interests and intention to participate in and lead areas of action
- Agree on next steps to finalise an ambitious and realistic work programme within an agreed timeline



## CONTACTS

### Joint Support Team

Thomas Boehler, Tel: +33 1 45 24 87 75, e-mail: [Thomas.Boehler@oecd.org](mailto:Thomas.Boehler@oecd.org)

Rod Mamudi, Tel: +1 212 906 5742, e-mail: [Rod.Mamudi@undp.org](mailto:Rod.Mamudi@undp.org)

For background documents and presentations from this meeting, please visit:

<http://effectivecooperation.org/event/18th-steering-committee-meeting-of-the-global-partnership-for-effective-development-co-operation/>



*Participants of the 18<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee of the Global Partnership in Seoul, Republic of Korea*

### **Introduction**

**H.E. Mme. Elysée Munembwe Tamukumwe**, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Planning of the Democratic Republic of Congo, and **H.E. Mr. Thomas Gass**, Assistant Director General, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, joined **Mr. Bashar Siddique**, representing H.E. Mr. Mustafa Kamal, Minister of Finance, Bangladesh and **Mr. Vitalice Meja**, the Co-Chair representing the non-executive groups, to chair the Steering Committee for the first time as the new Co-chairs' team. In their opening and closing remarks, the Co-chairs pledged their leadership and ambition to deepen and expand the reach of the partnership at country level, ensuring their respective constituencies are firmly engaged in the implementation of the forthcoming work programme. They also underscored the importance of a refresh of the partnership, with effectiveness principles at the centre, to respond to changing development co-operation realities.

The Co-chairs also introduced new members, including: **Republic of Korea**, replacing Japan; **Ivory Coast**, representing recipients/Francophone African countries; **Colombia**, replacing Mexico; **IADB**, represented by ADB, for the MDB Group, replacing the World Bank; **WINGS**, a member of the foundations constituency; and **Germany** remaining on the Committee as an ex-officio member.

### **Key outcomes, and summary of deliberations**

Members **welcomed the Co-chairs' proposal** for the GPEDC's 2020-2022 work programme as a balanced document that builds on the first work programme and made suggestions to sharpen some aspects. They discussed the proposed vision, strategic priorities, action areas, foundational elements as well as a proposed review of the Global Partnership and agreed on next steps to finalise and re-source the work programme. The Committee also discussed political and constituency engagement.

### ***A new vision of the Global Partnership***

Steering Committee members **welcomed the new vision, linking effectiveness to the 2030 Agenda and building on the momentum of the Senior Level Meeting (SLM) to make the case for greater quality and impact of partnerships**, while noting that **the level of ambition needs to be matched by resources**. Members stressed that a strong focus should remain on the implementation of the development effectiveness principles and agenda, and proposed to capture the specific situation of

fragile and conflict-affected situations, including those vulnerable to climate change. The proposal of a timeframe up to 2022 – reaching half-point of the SDG implementation phase – as well as the idea of a review and evaluation in the run-up to HLM3 to build political traction were widely supported.

**Members discussed how to match expectations with real actions** – through leadership, a clear articulation of specific expected accomplishments in different action areas, and appropriate resourcing to deliver. In this context, it was suggested to avoid being overambitious and rather only pursue action areas that have leadership, multi-stakeholder engagement and convening power and are fully resourced, and reserve a second tier of action areas for when resources have been mobilised and inclusive leadership is guaranteed.

### ***Strategic Priority 1: Accelerating implementation of the 2030 Agenda***

**Members welcomed stronger linkages to the 2030 Agenda, but also agreed to articulate this priority in a way that it demonstrates how development effectiveness helps deliver the SDGs in specific contexts.** Members saw this priority as the continuation of the country-level implementation work stream and a critical link to the Nairobi Commitments, providing an important impetus for all stakeholder groups to be engaged. Some members saw the sectoral approach and the ambition to demonstrate impact as vital for ‘making the case’ for effectiveness in the 2030 context, a pre-condition to ensure political leaders continue engaging in the Partnership. They also perceived this priority as a long-term effort, running up to 2030, with interim results envisaged for HLM3. Others suggested to explore more holistic approaches beyond focusing on sectors.

The successful implementation of this priority hinges upon clear deliverables driven by and with partner country actors and the effective use of the knowledge sharing platform and other learning and capacity-building efforts.

The **European Commission** proposed to lead action area 1.1. (Demonstrating the impact of effectiveness) and **Switzerland** action area 1.3. (Strengthening effective support to statistical capacity and data). Leadership for action area 1.2. (Addressing systemic effectiveness challenges) is yet to be confirmed. Many members expressed interest in participating in the design and implementation of these action areas.

### ***Strategic Priority 2: Building better partnerships***

**Members highlighted the relevance of this priority to engage different actors and help improve the partnerships and modalities they engage in in different contexts, while cautioning against the large number of action areas.** While members voiced robust support for all action areas, some proposed to tighten them around a smaller number of common outputs, themes or strategic plans or policies, as a way of streamlining activities and avoiding any duplication. It will be important to also reflect on how the various action areas respond to the respective commitments in the Nairobi Outcome Document. Members highlighted the Kampala Principles as a model for work under this priority, and welcomed proposed efforts to focus on their implementation at country level. Members also highlighted the need to ensure that all action areas are led and owned by different stakeholder groups.

Germany proposed to lead action area 2.1. (Private sector partnerships), Canada to lead 2.2. (Triangular Co-operation), Colombia to lead 2.3. (South-South Co-operation). In development: 2.4. (CSO partnerships), 2.5. (Reinforcing foundations’ engagement), 2.6. (Development effectiveness at the local level) and 2.7. (Effective multilateral support). Many members also expressed interest in participating in the design and implementation of the seven action areas.

### ***Strategic Priority 3: Leveraging monitoring for action***

**Members shared a wide range of views and broad support for the three action areas. They reaffirmed the monitoring exercise as core function of the Global Partnership, providing evidence for policy dialogue and change in different contexts, but also highlighting the lack of progress in implementing agreed effectiveness commitments. In adapting the monitoring exercise further, it should not be seen as an end in itself, but as a driver for action.** The action area proposing to use the monitoring results more diligently was welcomed by all members to drive policy and behaviour change, in particular to follow-up on the Global Action Plan on unfinished business from the first work programme. Members discussed how to ensure a balanced approach in adapting the framework to new realities – with the aim of ensuring that it remains simple, while addressing critical questions about focus and scope, as well as challenges related to data collection and quality at the same time.

They proposed the need for a roadmap for consultation and decision-making on the monitoring in 2020. This should map out the process for considering prospective changes to the monitoring process that would implicate the periodicity of the monitoring round or changes to the roll out at country level to better support alignment with national systems and processes, such as VNRs or national policy reviews. The review of the monitoring framework itself would also have implications on the timing of future monitoring rounds.

Members expressed appreciation for the fact that undertaking a review and reform of the monitoring would preclude going ahead with a next round as it has been done in the past. Some members expressed concern around this, based on the value they place in the monitoring as an accountability tool, but broadly agreed that the proposed review was worth the delay. It was agreed to facilitate exchanges among all relevant stakeholders to consider these questions as part of advancing the work programme formulation, beginning in the New Year in the run-up to the EC workshop in March 2020.

**Co-chairs** will lead the work of the three action areas. Many members expressed interest in participating in their design and implementation.

### ***Next steps***

Co-chairs and JST will share all **expressions of interest** with respective leads to coordinate. Members are encouraged to **identify experts** within their offices to engage in the design and implementation of the respective action areas, being prepared to meet about once a month virtually and to attend the EC workshop in March 2020 to accelerate work on the draft work programme.

Members agreed that **ongoing work in action areas should continue**, taking into consideration any proposals to refine the direction and scope of the substantive work.

**Leads are invited to consult with participants and more broadly**, with GPIs and other stakeholders, preferably also beyond ‘usual suspects’, and in particular with partner countries, **and develop contribution proposals, by following the template (separate document) by Friday, 21 February 2020.**

The Co-chairs, the European Commission and the JST will revert with more information on a **workshop in Brussels on 18-19 March 2020 to accelerate the work programme**. A draft work programme will be prepared after the workshop, ahead of the next Steering Committee meeting.

The **19<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee meeting** will be held on 12 and 13 May 2020 in New York, back-to-back with the UN Development Co-operation Forum. It will endorse the work programme and discuss the proposed review and evaluation. The **20<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee meeting** will be held on 22 and 23 October 2020 in Berne, Switzerland, back-to-back with the World Data Forum.

Members also agreed to set up a **financing committee** to mobilise resources for the work programme.

### ***The effectiveness narrative and GPEDC review***

Reflecting on the challenge of maintaining political momentum, and building on the success of the SLM, **members underscored the need to emphasize the value the Partnership has among its vast**



**membership not least among the countries participating in the monitoring exercise.** Members encouraged each other to better pair technical work with political opportunities, in particular by linking the work of the Global Partnership more directly with the United Nations, such as FFD and DCF, as well as UN Permanent Representatives in New York, while at the same time keeping its distinct, multi-stakeholder identity. Action area 1.1. (Demonstrating the impact of effectiveness) was seen as a key driver to raise the profile of effectiveness in provider and partner countries alike. Some also encouraged the Global Partnership to be more engaged in wider political debates, for example around the fight against climate change.

**Members shared the ambition to improve communication efforts for greater momentum.** There was a discussion around the distinct value proposition of the Global Partnership, and the need to make clear how it differs from other forums – drawing on its principle-based, voluntary and multi-stakeholder identity. They encouraged each other to reinvigorate communications efforts, making them more strategic and political, reaching out to the right target audiences, in different languages. Some encouraged the Committee to invest in an updated communications strategy in order to be able to articulate, more clearly and in the right contexts and arenas, how the Global Partnership contributes to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. Members also agreed with the timeline to host the next High-Level Meeting during 2022, at the mid-point of the SDGs, although it will come six years after Nairobi.

**The proposal of a review and evaluation to build up political momentum in the run-up to HLM3 was also welcomed.** Members reflected on the nature of the review, and reiterated the need to link it to expected accomplishments, building on what has worked well. Members also hoped the review would focus on the political incentives needed to make greater progress on effectiveness, strengthening the Partnership as a driver of development effectiveness and, by extension, the 2030 Agenda. Co-chairs invited members to express their interest to join a small group of members to elaborate a more detailed concept for the review or evaluation in time for a more detailed discussion at the next Steering Committee meeting.

### ***Constituency engagement***

**Members underscored the necessity of effective constituency engagement as part of the Global Partnership's identity, and pledged to address challenges as part of the review.** While some members showed how coordinated engagement with their respective members works, others highlighted challenges, in particular engagement at the country level/domestically, among individual non-executive constituents (given their diversity and lack of representativeness) and in the absence of a structured partner country caucus. There was a call from members for the UNSDG and MDB group to play a special role in helping convene and coordinate different partners at country level, in line with the effectiveness principles.

The new Co-Chair from the DR Congo, representing recipients of development co-operation, offered to re-energise regional and sub-regional engagement platforms, building on good examples, such as the Asia-Pacific group.



*The Steering Committee meeting in progress*

**Table of action points emerging from meeting**

<b>Session</b>	<b>Action points</b>	<b>For whom</b>
Vision	Reflect on proposals to the vision as chapeau text for the draft work programme.	Co-chairs & JST
SP1	Revise framing of Priority 1 and action area 1.1. and update narrative Make a proposal to lead 1.2.	Co-chairs & JST SC Members
SP2	Consider clustering action areas and update narrative Make proposals to lead 2.4., 2.5, 2.6. and 2.7	Co-chairs & JST SC members
SP3	Organise a virtual consultation on improving the monitoring ahead of EC workshop	Co-chairs & JST
Next Steps	Mobilise constituencies to express interest in joining action areas Share expressions of interest with leads to kick-off preparations of 'project proposals' before Christmas (see Annex 1) Share expressions of interest to join financing committee Design proposed contributions for each action area as input to the work programme (by 21 February 2020) EC-hosted workshop on work programme (18-19 March 2020) Next Steering Committee meetings: During 12 and 13 May 2020 in NY (back-to-back with UNDCF) and 22 and 23 October 2020 in Berne, Switzerland (back-to-back with World Data Forum).	SC members Co-chairs & JST SC members Lead and groups CC, SC, JST, action area groups CC, SC, JST
GPEDC narrative and review	Develop a communications action plan Make proposals for HLM3 venue/host (in addition to Geneva)	CC, JST SC
Constituency engagement	Re-energise constituency engagement (with a view to informing the review process)	CC, SC