

## Global Action Plan - Outline/Draft Concept Note

In this brief note/outline we offer some initial thinking on the conceptualisation and implementation of the Global Action Plan.

### **Introduction: The Context for a Global Action Plan**

The political origin of the Global Action Plan is paragraph 36 of the Nairobi Outcome Document, which recognizes that there is much left to be done to fulfil effectiveness commitments and that in an effort to do so the GPEDC will establish time bound action plans. While the Global Action Plan comes under Strategic Output 2 of the 2017-2018 Work Programme and the idea emerged from discussions in GPEDC Workstream 2 on Unlocking the Potential of Effectiveness, it has the potential to bring together the outcomes of related initiatives in the four Workstreams. In effect, by bringing together the various strands of evidence and country experiences, the GPEDC should be able to develop and tailor a Global Action Plan to support the realisation of effectiveness commitments.

Workstream 2 has been tasked to conceptualise the Global Action Plan and potentially animate and support its implementation. For the Global Action Plan to be effective in its own right it will need to be both political and technical in character and will need to extend to, and become the responsibility of, the GPEDC as whole.

The Steering Committee agreed to conceptualise the Global Action Plan as a way to address the unfinished business of the development effectiveness agenda. It was agreed that the Global Action Plan would be presented as a menu of actions, solutions and approaches that can be used to address specific effectiveness commitments, by stakeholder, which have not been met.

It was agreed that the Global Action Plan would serve to take forward action based on the most recent assessment of development effectiveness progress (i.e. the results of the 2018 GPEDC Monitoring Round), ensuring that both data and evidence, as well as proposed solutions to effectiveness challenges, would be available together to inform country-level action and global policy debates, notably the 2019 High-Level Political Forum (HLPF) for Sustainable Development. It will also draw upon the outcomes of the country pilots on enhancing development effectiveness at country level and the Global Compendium of Good Practices under Workstream 1.

The Global Action Plan should set out a number of strategic and achievable objectives, towards an end goal of Unlocking the Potential of Development Effectiveness, or in other words, meeting the commitments set out since Paris and Busan. These objectives can give form and function to a Global Action Plan.

The conceptualisation and elaboration of the Global Action Plan should itself be through a phased approach, with each phase having its own objectives, deliverables and outcomes. The final phase will be the establishment of the Global Action Plan, which will solidify the objectives, targets to be achieved, and an established a timeline for the plan to be rolled out by GPEDC and its stakeholders.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> From the WS 2 Concept note: "The Global Action Plan could draw on prior and new evidence (point 1), as well as complementary research commissioned for this purpose (point 2), the outcomes of the regional dialogues (point 3), as well as the findings and conclusions of the Working Group 1 "Enhanced Support to Effective Development Co-operation at the Country Level") and the Global Needs Assessment Survey undertaken as part of Working Group 3,

## *Strategic Objective*

**Establish a Global Action Plan with time bound targets for the "unfinished business," which can be monitored regularly**

The Global Action Plan will need to move on three fronts:

1. Clearly identify and seek multi-stakeholder agreement on the commitments relating to "unfinished business."
2. Garner political support to ensure these long standing objectives can be achieved through necessary action at political level
3. Provide the technical expertise and support down to country level to ensure changes in policy can be reflected in action

### Objectives

Identify existing commitments for "unfinished business" and establish time bound targets for these commitments, with a menu of actions, solutions and approaches, which can be monitored regularly

### Deliverables

A Global Action Plan

### Outcomes

Political and technical support to the GAP Implementation and Monitoring

## *Phase 1- Stock take of commitments*

The first step in designing a Global Action Plan requires a comprehensive understanding of what commitments remains to be achieved and assessment of progress, or lack of it, to date.

### Objective

Identify what has been committed under the effectiveness agenda and what remains to be done

### Deliverables

Proposed commitments, in the context of progress achieved to be included in the GAP

### Outcomes

Consensus on GAP areas of commitment and the level of progress achieved

## *Phase 2 - Technical review of a number of commitments/indicators especially those which have multiplier effects*

---

*"Knowledge-Sharing for Increased Development Effectiveness."* Each of these mentioned products can be worked into the various phases of the GAP where they are most valuable.

Based on the Phase 1 assessment, a technical review of those commitments that have shown to be the most difficult to achieve, and where further work is needed to better understand where bottlenecks lie and whether they can be unlocked.

### Objectives

1. Review the agreed areas of commitment, assess bottlenecks in making progress;
2. Develop a menu of actions, solutions and approaches to overcome these bottlenecks for agreed areas of commitment;
3. Develop relevant measures and indicators to monitor fast-tracking progress in these areas, if and as appropriate.

### Deliverables

Evaluation and review monitoring data and assessments frameworks;  
Proposed action areas, a menu of actions, solutions and approaches, with appropriate indicators and methodologies for assessing fast-track progress for the GAP commitments.

### *Resources*

This work will take advantage of the outcomes of the Third Monitoring Round, qualitative country level inputs from WS1 country pilots and the Global Compendium of Good Practice, and other complementary work on bottlenecks and issues in achieving progress in commitments relating to development effectiveness.

### Outcomes

Information and feedback from a mostly technical perspective, which can allow a Global Action Plan to establish feasible timelines and ultimate agreement with all GPEDC stakeholders.

---

## ANNEX: COMMENTS SO FAR RECEIVED

### Points from Teleconference on 3 April 2018

- Need to create broad ownership and responsibility for the GAP among GPEDC stakeholders;
- Important to have a holistic approach with ongoing engagement of the other Workstreams to build the Action Plan;
- Need to link very directly to the third monitoring round and especially in the follow-up of the results, in particular its follow-up at the country level;
- Need to establish broad political buy-in and determine at what level such buy-in needs to be sought;
- Need to seek leadership from the SC Co-Chairs in framing the GAP as an essential component of moving the agenda on effective development cooperation.

### Written comments from BMZ

1) Discuss if the GAP will catch enough political interest, as we think that without high political involvement it might end up as a paper tiger

2) Discuss that GAP draft ideas have synergies with other WS which we have to further identify

- *(Political and Technical aspects)* We agree that both dimensions are relevant in order to achieve the goal of boosting the implementation of the unfinished business. A “menu of actions, solutions and approaches”, as described in the paragraph below, could then represent one technical aspect of the GAP. It could inform and provide guidance for the implementation at country level. Yet in our view, the menu of action alone would not provide the political dynamic required to push towards the necessary momentum and boost implementation. In this sense, we support the idea of adding a more political facet to the GAP.
- We strongly support the approach to create ownership and responsibility for the GAP among the GPEDC as a whole. Its mandate touches upon all the different Workstreams and its implementation will represent a holistic task requiring joint efforts.
- Concerning the gathering of significant data and information in the “Menu of actions, solutions, approaches”, we see clear interfaces with the Global Compendium of Good Practices that will be drafted in Workstream 1. We may want to think about a common concept - or even consider a fusion- of both documents in order to avoid parallel processes. Moreover, we would highlight the potential synergies with Workstream3 which develops a knowledge sharing platform enabling the exchange on results and lessons learnt in the implementation of effectiveness commitments. We also think it would also be valuable to include the GPI into the drafting process of such a “Menu”. They represent important knowledge carriers and will thus be useful to identify lessons, solutions and approaches. Finally, it seems reasonable to also consider the processes in Workstream 4. The case studies on private sector engagement as well as the final technical note will represent valuable input.
- We would suggest adding an informative timeline to this concept
- *(Monitoring associated with GAP)* We will need to clarify the mandate and scope of such a monitoring exercise. The Global Monitoring captures the implementation of the effectiveness principles and we would strongly suggest to rely on these results as much as possible.

#### Written Comments from AidWatch Canada

- At some point we need to be clear about how monitoring of the GAP relates to the existing monitoring processes in GPEDC.
- What is missing for this plan is a strategy for socializing and building support among the various stakeholders, even just those of the SC, related to the GAP and its core areas. We cannot just present a finished product and expect agreement. We need to hold workshops and other activities to build political support for this work, particularly across many developing countries who are part of the GPEDC. In my view this political work is as important as the technical work in developing the GAP.

- Like all such GPEDC documents this one is also voluntary. The presumed “theory of change” is that if this unfinished business is highlighted at the global level and reinvigorates political pressure from developing countries, behaviour change will happen. It needs to be reinforced by inclusive mechanisms at the country level that create this pressure locally. It links very strongly in my view with the vital importance of strengthening **effective** mutual accountability mechanisms among other measures with local actors. There is no way that a global document, however specific for time commitments and actions will be effective without this political dimension, hence the importance of linking it concretely to a further revision of the GPEDC monitoring framework for future monitoring.

#### Written Comments from Joint Support Team

- WG members may wish to consider how to ensure the ‘actionability’ of the GAP. The Paris/Accra/Busan/Nairobi continuum offers a framework of commitments and global targets, result of intense negotiation at the highest levels. Based on lessons from the monitoring, the main hurdle for the GPEDC stakeholders has been translating the commitments actions, as acknowledged in the Nairobi Outcome document. Whilst it will be helpful that the Global Action Plan explores ways in which to promote political leadership to drive change, the GAP may generate most impact by providing an instrument to help individual stakeholders take specific actions to implement commitments into practice.
- This could be achieved by framing the GAP not only to identify the key pending commitments, but also offer a menu of possible actions and practical solutions that have worked for those that perform best. This could be achieved through peer learning and proactive contributions from GPEDC stakeholders. The emerging concepts of the Global Compendium of Good Practices as well as the knowledge sharing platform may bring important complementarities to advance such mutual learning.
- In terms of timelines, data for the 2018 monitoring round will be collected until end-year and full analysis will be available in the first part of 2019. Facilitating strong linkages between the GAP and monitoring evidence would therefore entail finalization of the GAP in early 2019.