



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

Global Online Survey: Illustrative selection of feedback

Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation Steering Committee Meeting
14 – 15 July 2016
New York

This document presents an illustrative selection of feedback from the Tier 1 Online Survey of the broader development community. The online survey was hosted via the external Global Partnership website from 10-24 May. The consultation garnered nearly 700 responses from multi-stakeholder audience of development stakeholders and interested parties, who shared feedback and ideas on how to grow an inclusive, multi-stakeholder partnership for development co-operation in support of sustainable development (building on the existing Global Partnership).

This document is shared with Steering Committee members for information and discussion.

Contacts

Yuko Suzuki Naab, Tel: +1-212-906-6509, e-mail: yuko.suzuki@undp.org
A. Hannan Ismail, Tel. + 1 212 906 5471, e-mail: abdul.hannan@undp.org

DOCUMENT 6

PART I: **What can make development co-operation effective for the 2030 Agenda?**

National governments

- Country leadership, mutual accountability and transparency and integrated and harmonized approach by all stakeholders
- More cooperation and respect of the principles of Busan by each stakeholder, the use of national country results frameworks
- Willingness to open all the elements of the process including administrative process to identify bottlenecks
- Information platform to show who [is] doing what where
- Commitment, Leadership, Accountability, Ownership, Partnership, Trust and a clear Division of Labor without Silos
- At the [n]ational level, improve the communication and involvement between donors, government and civil society
- Private company support, inclusiveness of LGBTI and other marginalized populations, women and youth empowerment
- Communication and openness, rather than stove piping and power-hoarding
- Continuous evaluation innovation and research in those particular fields that are in the 2030 agenda for sustainable development and.
- More global awareness to drive pressure for national action
- Coordination and integrated actions, capacity building and coordination within countries
- Improve dialogue among stakeholders
- Financing (domestic and external/private), data for monitoring (timely and comprehensive), use of country systems, transparency & Accountability, alignment and results

- National action plans should be the subject of national consultation from affected stakeholders.
- Mutual accountability and a strong M&E system
- LGBTI because the SDGs have watered down the tone on LGBTI

Parliamentarians

- Country ownership in strengthening their Institutions and support from development partners on providing experts where needed
- Mutual respect and partnering to development

Local governments

- Address extremism, terrorism and youth
- Much more direct engagement of the poor in the definition of priorities
- Transparency of institutions

Civil society organizations

- Inclusive institutionalized dialogue between Government, Civil Society, Development Partners and the Private Sector
- Solidarity, complementarity and communication between the state, the civil society and the private sphere
- A common understanding of what a multi-stakeholder partnership is
- A common accountability standard for partnerships. Partnerships need more guidance by example ("best-practice" examples)
- Participation of independent CSOs. Partnerships should always follow a bottom-up, country focused approach and be inclusive to local stakeholders
- Much more resources. Global taxation. Recognition that not all partners are equal. Partnerships that are not dominated by donors. Recognition that effectiveness is more a political issue than a technical one.
- Transparency; robust monitoring and reporting system; strong engagement with CSOs and local community

- Access to information supported by Freedom of Information Legislation
- A multi-stakeholder approach at all stages of the process: not just in implementing the SDGs, but also in policy dialogue on designing the implementation plans at national, regional and global level, defining indicators, monitoring the work as well as evaluating and holding each other accountable for achieving the SDGs and fulfilling the commitments. Each stakeholder has its own role and they should be considered complimentary to each other. Different forums under the UN, OECD, regional organization etc. should be provided for continuous policy discussion. Transparency and inclusiveness from the preparation to the evaluation and feedback are vital
- Structural stakeholder meetings/consultation, organized by national governments to facilitate the process - Creation of a national platform on the SDG's for M&E purposes
- Meaningful involvement of young people and youth-led organisations and networks. Commitment from national governments to work together with civil society. A transparent and joint roadmap
- Involvement of women and women's groups who usually are left out of the picture as men debate and make decisions
- CONVERT focus from already wealthy multi nationals and stakeholders that have received so much hand-holding they ought by now to stand on THEIR OWN FEET - and start focusing on the people that are actually FOOTING THE BILL - the civilians - the individuals paying taxes and forced WITHOUT THEIR CONSENT - without being asked - without any democratic influence whatsoever - to carry on footing the bill to fund special rebates and terms and services and benefits for those that are sucking the life blood out of society ! The Stake holders - the so-called CIVILIANS - the so-called PERSONS that are not even LIVING HUMAN BEINGS but merely legally defined ENTITIES.
- 1° Ensure a gender equality approach in all phases (from analysis, planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, adaptation) 2° A participatory bottom-up approach 3° Structural measures so that all stakeholders, including women/girls/women's organisations are equally involved in the process, including with regard to means and budgets
- Less jargon, more creative and open invitations to different stakeholder involvement beyond the 'usual suspects' who know how this space works and so nothing different happens
- Address transnational Organized Crime, Refugee Crisis and Migration, Climate Change Adaptability, Fair Trade

- Strategies to build local capacities Good Governance Youth engagement and empowerment
- Partnerships to address climate change, health, agriculture including eradicating extreme poverty and hunger and conflict resolution
- All 17 SDGs are important, but the highest priority in my opinion are: peace and security; education; the fight against climate change and partnership
- Mapping activity from the perspective of a human-being rather than from stakeholder perspectives and agendas
- Reinforce regional integration; Harmonize International cooperation & Foreign Affairs; streamline, update and police formulation for economic development orientation; -Strengthening capacity building; -Intercontinental Coordination. - Communication
- Harmonizing Policies at global and national level so that the follow up of the issues are integrated for development priorities and with intent to achieve outcomes. Financing development and Service Delivery for poor people, marginalized and voiceless be monitored and programmes evaluated at country level to inform global policies
- Risk management, is an important topic as social and institutional change will no doubt result in both intended and unintended consequences. Global resources need to be available to help institutions and communities to take risks with confidence of being able to have access to support during loss periods due to making changes in housing or education development projects for example

Private sector

- Less bureaucracy, more straight forward commercial process for providing solutions to requirements
- Platforms for multi-stakeholders to meet and have discussions about possible collaboration (global as well as local platforms are needed. Global to set strategies and local to make sure that we operationally reach an improvement) 2. Minimum bureaucracy 3. Sense of urgency mindset from all parts 4. Common KPI's
- Grant Risk Capital with management support (e.g. Managerohnegrenzen), all financed by the risk capital giver
- Trust. And that requires courage, because trust entails risk. Listening to understand the other sector's needs

- Greater involvement of private sector specifically local and multinational corporations Bring in partners that take a rights based approach and have a long term view of international development, i.e., those that seek to bridge the quality of life gap rather than ensuring basic access
- A small number of goals to focus on. And having stakeholders who actually care about them
- Use of systemic methods with a proven track of involving multiple stakeholders. Two come to mind: - Team Syntegrity (from Stafford Beer) to efficiently organize a multi stakeholder perspective on an issue - Viable System Model to let local coordination work as much as possible (using Team syntegrity possibly) and let untackled issue move up the hierarchy so as to benefit from a broader perspective. At a minimum, facilitation techniques to ease collaboration and cooperation among groups are necessary skills. Some of them are available freely (Liberating Structures, Game storming...) Also, an approach that value proven solutions to common problems is also a must (instead of people fighting to decide what IS the problem and what might the root causes be). Positive Deviance might be useful in the context of UNDP for instance, but Appreciative Inquiry and Solution Focus sound promising to me as well to 1) liberate positive energy to move forward and 2) identify simple and quick action steps as well, and let people support one another
- Better coordination, open and permanent dialogue, formal meeting spaces where all stakeholders must meet
- Infrastructure for small businesses and projects
- Empirical evidence of effective vs ineffective measures. Intimate relationship between partners
- Incentives (also hard ones) and success stories (and dark scenarios)
- Stand closer to the public in order to advocate a result, this can be done by a more down to earth approach to all levels of civilizations and on all continents
- Developing country leadership over administration and planning
- Private investment in developing countries is a vital component in generating the \$1.4trillion required to achieve the SDGs. The UN has estimated that 39%-45% of this investment must come from private investment, totaling up to \$630billion. Additional effort in encouraging capacity building, ownership of tax policies, and commitment to the implementation of international standards and bilateral double taxation and investment treaties is vital in developing in-

vestment climates in developing countries that provide the certainty and predictability that businesses need in order to commit to investment. The UNCTAD 2015 World Investment report (http://unctad.org/en/PublicationsLibrary/wir2015_en.pdf) highlights tax policy as a key determinant of FDI. UNCTAD estimates the contribution of MNE foreign affiliates to government budgets in developing countries at c.\$725bn per annum. UNCTAD notes that: caution is required in implementing anti-avoidance to ensure investment is not hindered, a holistic approach by governments is required; partnering with MNEs and their home countries, fiscal incentives are a key tool in encouraging investment, and providing tax certainty and eliminating double taxation encourages investment

- Informality, rule of law, corruption, mobilizing domestic resources, leveraging aid and private sector (philanthropic and impact investing) flows to capacity-build in truly transformative ways
- Seeing refugees/migrants not as a burden but a potentially beneficial customer segment - Transparency in costing/pricing - Cutting the red tape
- Employment, providing of jobs in order to get the long-term benefit required to make sure to focus on the long-term good for people in poverty situation. Avoid prestige
- Implementation through the private sector, monitoring and project definition by the public, IO sector. Demand defined in collaboration of giver and receiving country
- Each sector must declare their high-level goals. If we take a long-term view (50, 100 years), thereby forcing us to think about our grandchildren, the goals will be very similar. The SDGs, which are only 15 years, presumably target our collective 100-year vision
- I respectfully doubt an organization (such as the UN) can identify all stakeholders' concerns. And in the case it does well, until these stakeholders have thought them through by themselves, they'll doubt the rationale behind any proposal. As a consequence, tools should be used to elicit the topics to work on from the very stakeholders involved, possible in multiple rounds (1: ask about what topics to tackle 2: ask about who else should be part of the team, 3: repeat at 1. Once the list of topics is settled, reduce it to make it more manageable, and then launch a Team Syntegrity
- Private Sector - must implement Environmental Indicators Trade Unions – [articulate] Environmental Indicators to stock valuation Governments - financing or facilitating innovation

International or regional organizations

- Increase support to facilitate participants from developing countries so as to increase the participants -provide a platform for group presentation accordingly -Identify and invite various bodies from developed countries to join the multi-stakeholder partnership meeting
- Multi-stakeholder partnerships do not address the disparity in the power structure of the varying stakeholders in the partnership. So if there is a partnership of government, business and civil society often times the civil society stakeholder is under capacitated to represent and 'meaningfully' engage. There needs to be an equalization effort to ensure that the less resourced stakeholder can still meaningfully contribute. While capacity development has been the approach to this equalization effort to empower the civil society groups to meaningfully participate what would also be important is for the civil society position to be more actively/meaningfully accepted. The position/voice/interest of the weakest stakeholder should be given greater weight/importance in the partnership as it relates to decisions being made, commitments and priorities being set
- An open and transparent platform that allows every stakeholder to be able to participate in an appropriate way. Not every stakeholder has the ability to spend time into long debates, especially not the NGOs in under-served regions
- Greater youth participation (not young individuals, but youth organisations and networks)
- Funding to meet the scale of the needs/challenges (all sources - donor, domestic, innovative financing); (2) investment in meaningful civil society participation, and capacity as advocates and service providers; (3) Open data and strong accountability platforms, tracking progress and highlighting gaps
- a. Universal recognition by the Membership of the United Nations. b. Substantial extension of stakeholders beyond traditional aid community (esp. in form of business community and regulatory bodies such as central banks) c. Coherence at global, regional and country levels between different forms of finance (e.g. between finance for development and finance for humanitarian assistance)
- Not all cultures or people have a desire to "advance" in the manner set down by SDGs, or the United Nations. In point of fact many nations and people would prefer that all outside organizations stay out of their business and cultural growth system until or unless their input is specifically requested
- Quality: systematic M+E, joint with beneficiaries Effectiveness: balanced qualitative/ quantitative baseline indicators/targets agreed upon with beneficiaries

- Transparency in fund management and stronger result based management. Less Donor political influence
- Honest brokers, knowledgeable/experts in the subject matter, involvement of communities/governments, financial resources
- A system that: a) is recipient country driven, b) is long term (3-5 year projects are not enough to install processes, c) creates local/territorial governance to guarantee sustainability, d) is problem solving, e) guarantees that most of the resources reach the local people, f) creates capacities instead of filling all positions with international consultants (very expensive), instead of using national capacities
- Global related issues and challenges like climate change & Environment, food insecurity, corruption, Accountability, poor leadership & governance, trade and taxes, peace & violence. Education & Health and community development programs
- Gender equality, urban environments, resilient infrastructure, peace & security and sustainable management of natural resources
- Massive aid cannot guarantee peace and stability
- A more direct approach towards communication with the citizens
- Stakeholder equality in decision making and resource allocations
- Clear and common mechanisms for sharing information
- Advocate for transparency in resource allocations, taxation and commitments
- Humanitarian aspects, e.g. protection of human dignity, human rights of all citizens (the marginalized, poor, disabled, women, children, etc.)
- Adopt competence in cooperation as a principle
- So far we haven't been directly involved in the Busan Partnership but we would like to.
- More mutual accountability between a growing number of actors in the 'development cooperation space'
- Put emphasis on the role that national governments and grassroots organization must play in a harmonious way.

Multilateral development banks

- Focus on financing. include the private sector, climate change
- [Main value of Global Partnership in steering effective development cooperation] Not much unfortunately
- Move away from ODA focus
- Move away from ODA focus - giver and receiver - to partnership
- Not much impact

Foundations

- More entry points at national level
- Strong focus on results rather than coordination processes
- A competent coordinator
- Social enterprises, building an alternative structure
- How do we bring the faith based organizations to the table?

PART II: What can the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation do?

National governments

- Demonstrate how the Global Partnership can complement and add value to the review and follow-up mechanism of the SDGs. We need to actively reach out to those countries that are not so enthusiastic about the development effective agenda and try to get them onboard through proactive engagement in various occasions
- Main value of the Global Partnership is its monitoring exercises that can actually review how the Busan commitments are implemented on the ground
- [Focusing on] development for results, its multi-stakeholder nature can ensure harmonized way of working, through programmatic approach for results. Multi-stakeholder nature can also ensure mobilization of different sources of finance for results
- N/A - since i am not familiar with the Global Partnership
- Guide bilateral[s], multilateral[s] and CSOs to work on aid effectiveness
- Renewed commitment to the principles, renewed Global Partnership, and more actionable commitments for the implementation of the AAAA and 2030 Agenda
- A clear commitment for strengthening the partnership framework to implement and track the SDGs
- Can analyze the alignment of development partners with national priorities/SDGs to make ODA more effective for developing countries
- Encourages the utilization of country framework for both sides of the development cooperation, which can enhance mutual accountability
- Due to its voluntary nature, poses a number of challenges to effective cooperation as non-performance cannot be punished
- A key actor, to promote and identify new opportunities of private financing of co-operation to achieve Goals and targets on sustainability

- Using the platform for a discussion around the means of implementation and the quality of development co-operation
- Use of national platforms to share information to strengthen mutual accountability
- Full commitment by all stakeholders to the [Busan] principles is still lacking. Transparency and accountability and ownership is still weak. We see a lot of resources channeled through "off budget" financing and this undermines Government ownership. Ensuring alignment of such resources becomes challenging and therefore monitoring for results is also a challenge as there cannot be joint monitoring of such programmes. This in turn affects transparency and accountability. Need for stronger commitment from all stakeholders
- [The Busan principles] have not been applied directly with the SDGs in mind but they are implied
- Results-based, inclusive partnerships and transparency and accountability have enhanced the quality of development cooperation however, ownership of local government is still a challenge in terms of local government's lack of understanding on what is the ownership and lack of capacity to fully practice the central role in coordination. The support to the national government on the coordination should be addressed
- As a donor country, the [principles] have made us think about how we will implement our ODA programme to be less onerous on other nations
- Our government is focusing on being more joined up in the provision of its assistance across agencies involved in delivering the SDGs in-country and how we provide assistance to other countries, particularly in the Pacific
- New principles: Inclusiveness of weaker sections, Geographical-cultural aspects, Democratic Reforms, External Economics
- New principles: Equality, solidarity, mutual respect and consideration, honesty and sincerity
- Global Partnership has enabled us to interact with diverse development cooperation stakeholders. Korea has been hosting the Busan Global Partnership Forum and the associated Learning and Accelerating Program, and while doing so, we have interacted with representatives from partner countries and was able to listen to their perspectives
- Important platform for knowledge Exchange. Monitoring mechanism helpful (but still to improve!)

- [Supportive of] political coherence on foreign affairs, cooperation and regional development
- Needs clearer mandate. further expansion. Avoidance of duplications with other partnership Frameworks. Strengthening of Monitoring mechanism
- Policy incoherence may negatively impact development cooperation
- The Global Partnership should actively reach out to the UN development fora
- The role of the co-chairs and steering committee members as active 'ambassadors' of the Global Partnership
- More policy dialogue, new stakeholders, perhaps an on-line public consultation
- Restrict itself and learn from examples (more failures! less success stories!!!)
- It may be useful to have a regular regional meeting /workshops among diverse stakeholders to support the work of the Steering committee
- The Global Partnership should promote the concept of Global Partnership Champions among the Multi-Stakeholder Partners

Parliamentarians

- [The Global Partnership can] Fight against corruption by strengthening implementation of laws and human rights principles
- It has been simply ignored: there has not been any Busan implementation.
- Policy coherence: Regional Economic Commissions are not directly involved in Global Partnership Dialogues and Agreements
- Make sure that everyone knows about SDGs, starting by sensitizing MPs, and then citizens... Then support and align to Countries Plans in implementing SDGs
- Give our Region platform to express plans and expected support from development partners

Local governments

- [The Global Partnership can promote] Monitoring and evaluation

- [The Global Partnership can promote] Youth participation in the development and sustainability goals and all vital sectors

Civil society organizations

- Holding governments to account and pushing forward the agenda/debate of effective development cooperation
- Multi-stakeholder dialogue, participation of the Global South, focus on quality and effectiveness
- Sharing of experiences and ideas; provision of learning opportunities; mentorships
- The main value is the same alliance of the diversity of actors recognized, they have a role and responsibility in achieving effective development, which recognizes rights including participation and development. It has a framework of principles and provides for the monitoring and evaluation of countries.
- Until now there is no fair partnership, the developed countries use the global cooperation as a tool of enforcement of their policies and benefit, the pure human aspect still weak
- It seems to me the agenda and decisions have already been determined - therefore one wonders what can be accomplished from the meeting, aside from communicating results
- Revision and improvement of the Global Partnership monitoring framework and indicators and particularly how they can be applicable to the Sustainable Development Goals or the 2030 Agenda
- It can insist on the principles of the Paris Declaration and the complementary role of different stakeholders, instead of reinventing principles at each summit.
- It can Improve linkages between national and global activities and development of a six monthly timetable of action over the next three years
- [The Global Partnership can] ensure symmetrical relationship of all partners: power is not equal today for all partners
- [It can] increase representation of stakeholders and local constituency groups in the formulation and implementation of frameworks, policies and plans at national, regional and global levels with a citizen report card peer review mechanism

- Convert the Global Partnership monitoring process into a 2030 SDGs evaluation tool
- Create a "code of conduct", 2) Create a reporting and adjudication system, 3) Conduct in-depth reviews of individual efforts and publish the results 4) provide best-practice examples of effective development cooperation
- [The Busan Principles] are built into our Code of Conduct, having them as part of the Action Agenda helps to motivate our partner organisations to take the Code of Conduct seriously
- These Principles are the pillars of improving the quality and effectiveness of development cooperation: the national ownership gave a feeling of security and belonging to the development process, which, in turn led to focus on the results, the more the results are positive, the more the ownership principle is enhanced, while the inclusive partnerships plays a vital role in the feeling that the project is a joint venture which aimed at benefiting the interest of the public. Off course mutual transparency and accountability are the monitors which reflect the effective management of the project
- [The principles] are useful but quite general. A focus on results is good provided the desired results can be clearly stated. However, a focus on results does not necessarily achieve results. Results are often dependent on factors outside the control of the development organization
- We can't use global statements to hold aid actors accountable. They do what they want and only respond to political/economic pressure
- Much as there is recognition of civil society being a development actor in its own right and the importance of rights-based approaches, the environment the last few years has given more emphasis to civil society as a service provider. The drive towards results is in itself a good thing, but it tends to emphasize quantifiable deliverables rather than more qualitative changes that are harder to measure, but more important for sustainable social transformation sought by the SDGs. This has led to a watering out and weakening of some of the role civil society organisations ought to play
- The agenda is not owned by civil society as the national CSOs see it, Government is dictating the agenda, but within its terms. Partnership is temporarily enhanced because of the agenda, but there is no long term discussion to see how partnerships can work more effectively; in terms of transparency and accountability, there is much to be desired- Government cannot let go and allow for free discussion and arriving at country reports that is acceptable and relevant

- The principles helped a lot but the last principle, transparency and accountability is the most difficult to practice among the stakeholders
- [The Global Partnership can] take the university to the people, promotion of research uptake through stakeholder forums, development of training materials translated into languages the community understand
- If politically feasible it would be good to more explicitly embrace rights-based approaches or dignity. This also links to inequality, which is at the heart of many of the other challenges the SDGs seek to address.
- More collaboration and coordination as opposed to everyone doing their own thing
- The Principle of Harmonizing did not achieve its original intent because development partners did not recognize existing models of communication, management, coordination and other areas; instead they duplicated programmes and concepts that were also totally new to the local people. The principle of harmonizing (Paris Principle) can be possible in the current arrangement
- Strategic alliances with philanthropists who can help bring about change on a global level, then scale solutions on a local level.
- Democratic country ownership - fostering a 'whole of society' approach rather than solely on 'whole of government' approach to development planning, implementation, monitoring & evaluation
- We view the term "Global Partnership" as an anachronism.... which still views the world as a patchwork of "Nation States" when in fact the world has changed and become a "Global Community". Unfortunately, this community still has no united democratic voice upon which to defend itself (its rights) from the relentless onslaught of "Global Conglomerates" (some larger than countries) who have taken advantage of the chaos and played one country off against the other for their own selfish ends
- New to the Global Partnership: we foresee numerous benefits not only for our organization but for the various communities with are present there and for their community members as well
- Political engagement, accountability and country focus
- The current country focus needs refinement to focus on multiple local needs
- Setting some binding measures on transparency and accountability to both sides of development cooperation

- The Global Partnership has been least useful in "strengthening the political momentum for more effective development co-operation"
- Measuring South-South cooperation
- We have deprioritized our participation in the process since Busan and fear that many CSOs have done the same thing. The participation of civil society has not been as wide and useful as before
- This is the first time I have ever heard of the Global Partnership and the Busan commitments
- [The Global Partnership] is NOT a policy space. It's just about the SC meetings
- Distant and bombastic promises with no actual financial support
- I've heard very little about it. Stronger engagement with civil society networks
- The Global Partnership should concentrate on its core business: making development cooperation more effective, improving ways of working
- Who will police who? The international framework needs teeth as well to ensure effective implementation of the ideals
- Policy coherence: for example, in my country, change of laws and formulating policy are done with little or no participation from the affected or concerned audience and groups. Laws in many cases are in conflict with set policies
- I'm particularly passionate about seeing the private sector's particularly big Corporations truly join hands with governments in implementing the Global Development Agenda 2030. Private Corporations are in business for profit but I do believe that governments should be encouraged to apply incentives extended to newly established businesses like Tax Holidays to private sector companies that dare to veer away from their "comfort zones" and dare to invest in ventures that would enhance the political economic movements in the attainment of the goals of Agenda 2030. I believe they would thereby become effective and influential partners in the implementation of the Busan Principles also
- Regional benchmarking and peer review are critical to achieving 2030 goals
- The Global Partnership can promote the adoption of the 2030 goals on regional and the G20 agendas

- The Global Partnership should be more open to new debates on what constitutes effective development cooperation
- [The Global Partnership can] promote robust, transparent and accountable tri-lateral partnership
- JST should actively support SC constituencies
- Please also stop using the term "the Global Partnership" as it is misleading and easily confused with other organizations using the term "Global Partnership"

Private sector

- The comprehensive range of countries and International Organisations that committed to the Busan Partnership gives it unique authority in steering effective development cooperation
- [The value of the Global Partnership] remains to be seen
- Coordination of efforts, although coordination with some countries still needs improvement, in particular with China
- It can create greater awareness of the concept of enlightened self-interest among all stakeholders around the world
- [HLM2 should produce an] Overview on how the international development cooperation architecture will facilitate the implementation of the 2030 Agenda
- [HLM2 should produce] firm commitments from multiple stakeholders to re-double their support and contribution to the development goals
- Support to get the different stakeholders to find ways as well as to understand the benefit of working close together. Highlight the benefit of governments, civil society and private sector to collaborate
- By promoting country leadership and building of local/national capacities not as part of projects, but as independent projects - beyond budget cycles
- We welcome in particular the focus on capacity building in both the Global Partnership ([a] ownership of development priorities by developing countries and [c] inclusive development partnerships), and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. Capacity building and international cooperation amongst tax administrations are vital in ensuring consistent implementation of the OECD's BEPS Action Plan and creating attractive environments for investment in developing countries

- Great principle[s], little effect in practice
- The private sector is moving toward ever greater transparency, along with an accountability to broader society, rather than just shareholders
- We are doing a lot of evaluations, so there is nothing Busan can improve for us but what I can see in the field is that ownership and results show the biggest progress, partnership without strong changes and transparency and accountability had not been bad after all from donor side for quite some time
- Results focus has allowed us to be a uniquely profitable model, partnerships have allowed us to create systemic change combining unique expertise and transparency, apart from reinforcing ownership, allows for a constant discussion on growth
- Partnership is key - long term relationships, mutual understanding and shared development process
- Ownership has led to improved outcomes - but not ownership by government; rather, ownership by community. A low-income community my team has worked with in Singapore, in partnership with the South Central Community Family Service Centre, has seen really good impact in terms of social cohesion and community bonding within the neighborhood. Results orientation is generally good but has seen some instances of negative unintended consequences when the success metrics (or KPIs) have not been well constructed. Partnerships are good, but inclusiveness is more powerful in process than simply in partnerships - sometimes, I think. That's because the real work of partnership is still ultimately manifested in the work, the process, how it's done. Whereas often what you see is that the more partners there are beyond a certain number, the harder it is to have all partners be meaningfully engaged, and it ends up being a logo splash of who's who / who's listed. So I think it's more useful to focus on inclusive process rather than inclusive partnerships. Mutual transparency and accountability has been difficult to achieve in Singapore, where government agencies tend to hold on to info and data with an inflated view of perceived risk of sharing data. Progressive forces within the government (such as the team behind data.gov.sg) are trying to turn this around but there is much resistance
- Little has been changed to my business organisation since the Busan congress as the business world is hardly aware of the existence of the Global Partnership and their goals
- A greater and explicit focus on the importance of private investment in achieving the SDGs, and consequently the necessity for business and business

groups to be included at all stages, from target planning to partnerships, would be welcomed

- Rethink of the citizen-centric formulations - we need to not (inadvertently) become exclusionary of transnational poor
- Greater transparency, less bureaucracy, industry involvement
- The answer to [implementing principles] is political, not technocratic. With political capital behind a project backed by a high level politician/minister, it would help align other partners easily. However, the incentives for such actors to put their weight behind something isn't always aligned with what the project could offer. All I can say for the purposes of this survey is, maybe it would help to create nudges for governments to try newer methods / alternative approaches in ways that contain risk. Essentially help make it easier to make the approvals for folks like me to run policy experiments to improve things for citizens. So we can use the empirical data and be truly "evidence based" in creating innovations to better the human development outcomes for people
- Continued 'bottom up' direction, consideration of other global principles e.g. circular economy, frugal innovation, female empowerment as cross-cutting factors in all programmes
- Not familiar enough with the agenda, I'm afraid. If there's a 3-5min video explaining it, please share!
- We welcome in particular the focus on capacity building in both the Global Partnership ([a] ownership of development priorities by developing countries and [c] inclusive development partnerships), and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. Capacity building and international cooperation amongst tax administrations are vital in ensuring consistent implementation of the OECD's BEPS Action Plan and creating attractive environments for investment in developing countries
- We have seen the Global Partnership as a forum for inter-sector discussion. That is good. We have seen, via various fora, the public sector and private sector move toward each other quickly over the last three years. This increasing acknowledgement of one another's goals is heartening, and promises good potential for achieving the 2030 agenda
- [The Global Partnership] has not directly impacted my organisation
- Development organizations are closed up, self-projecting, self-staffing institutions. Their funding is project based. They have no interest to cooperate with private sector. Necessary is a new role definition: development organizations

are to freely assist the private sector of their home country in company or investment projects. And not staff the projects themselves. They have to function as support service and facilitation and not as direct service providers.

- We need more Blended Finance to catalyze more private capital
- Do a public scoring/ranking of key players by transparency, speed of response and inclusiveness, for example
- We welcome all four of the shared principles of the Global Partnership
- The agenda around aid distribution without connecting it to a long-term plan of how to increase education and job creation. We know that these 2 areas are the major keys to development and then it should be natural to bring them up in all areas. Aid without long-term benefits or anchoring has a very low benefit
- Cooperation on tax matters to deliver competitive tax systems that provide investors with certainty and eliminate double taxation will be vital in delivering the required levels of investment
- It must be possible to provide better knowledge transfer and improved infrastructure through better incentives
- It sounds like incentive structures need to be better understood for anything promoting multi stakeholder partnership to work. If there could be ways better understand the incentives from the position of different partners, that could help in fostering partnerships that are tighter in bringing various parties' incentives together. Can't think of an example though!
- The Global Partnership should demonstrate the benefits of capacity building (through increased cross border trade and investment) for all stakeholders
- [The Global Partnership should] be placed on the agenda at G7 and G20. Create liaisons with main DAC assistance agencies, multilateral institutions, etc.
- Get agreement on published bi-annual scoring/rankings of all key players
- Create business cases of best practice achievements and find suitable forums in which to share them. Involve civil society and private sector in the process
- Elicit genuine reasons to go forward from the very participants (i.e., have them work out their own reasons instead of asking they just accept those arrived at from the GP). Or have participants facilitated through designing the

ways they will implement the action plans or goals decided. Coaching seems key to me, otherwise momentum is often lost

- Document success stories, and when you do, especially try to include the view of unusual suspects, e.g. experimental teams trying out different approaches to development
- Embrace digital marketing
- [Promote] Greater speed of project definition and execution. Bite-sizing activities to reduce size of stakeholder groups involved in definition and execution and speed up process.
- I really think global level policy dialogue should focus on how to understand problems better. So much money, time and other resources are wasted by shooting straight to some pre-supposed solution that ended up chasing the wrong problem. Some ways of framing this: investing in understanding context; more robust problem definition; evidence-based problem analysis, etc.
- We welcome explicit recognition on the importance of including all stakeholders (including in particular businesses and business groups) in the engagement/consultation process, to ensure that the policies developed appropriately take into account their impact on investment, and, where possible, are actively tailored to encourage investment
- We are constantly being asked our views but this does not feel like meaningful engagement! Offers of feeding back on consultations make a start but would like to see more give in terms of support and knowledge in return for engagement
- Businesses and business groups would welcome the opportunity to provide input and technical expertise in such engagements
- this is a strategic decision you would have to take but I would not see too much usefulness since already a huge set of players is out there. you would be just one more
- We are committed to the SDGs and supportive of partnerships with the UN, the Global Partnership, Developing Countries, our own National Governments, and any other stakeholders in developing ways in which they can be achieved. We reiterate that policies must be holistic (taking into account the views of all stakeholders, including business) and consider that a focus on developing policies that encourage sustainable FDI is key to the SDGs being met. The IMF notes that the annual proceeds of corruption exceed the \$1.4 trillion required to deliver the SDGs (<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/sdn/2016/sdn1605.pdf>). Tackling corruption is also beneficial to

competition and stability, and accordingly to cross border trade and investment, and we would encourage the Global Partnership to promote tackling corruption in all its forms

International or regional organizations

- Funding to meet the scale of the needs/challenges (all sources - donor, domestic, innovative financing); (2) investment in meaningful civil society participation, and capacity as advocates and service providers; (3) Open data and strong accountability platforms, tracking progress and highlighting gaps
- A sound METHODOLOGY to guide both research and analysis, that allows you to really understand what stakeholders think, feel and want. I suggest something like Cynefin (please Google if needed) or another method that can work with complex adaptive systems
- The four principles [have] aided with guiding frameworks for our environmental, governance and social (ESG) research which is a growing factor for investment decisions in the equity market
- The principles have done well to streamline our organization especially when it comes to transparency and accountability it has helped us to build trust to the donor community and the beneficiaries in the local communities
- Although not a principle per se, the 1995 Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action (BDPfA) calls for the recognition of women's equality and empowerment. A call reiterated and upheld during the 20th anniversary review and commemoration of the BDPfA in 2015. The BDPfA serves as a foundation document for the 2030 Agenda which pledges that "no one will be left behind" on our collective journey to the realization of the Agenda and notes that "gender inequality remains a key challenge." The contributions of women and girls are seen as crucial to progress across all goals and targets of the 17 SDGs and "the achievement of full human potential and of sustainable development is not possible if one half of humanity continues to be denied its full human rights and opportunities." Gender equality needs to be taken into account in any development co-operation initiatives.
- What is needed is putting aside individual partner interested and focus on the objectives of the SDGs. The recognition that no one single partner can achieve these goals alone and the fact that every partner can add to the quality of the results should be the preamble for a good partnership
- Interagency coordination and cooperation are key, and they are mostly absent

- Focus on the beneficiaries: ownership by, results for, partnerships with and for, transparency and accountability to the beneficiaries
- The four principles are sufficient and we only need to cultivate the will to realize them. So it is best not to cause distractions by adding more principles
- The Global Partnership could be a strong tool for strengthening the implementation mechanisms, follow-up and monitoring required to mark progress and hold stakeholders accountable

Multilateral development banks

- Focus on transparency and results
- Benefit focus - so move from development results to real benefit for people - less capacity development and institution building as results, but look at difference such enabling actions have on people. Measure more as jobs, CO2 reductions, number of marginalized, etc.

Foundations

- These four principles are appropriate, but my organisations was not aware of the Addis Ababa Agenda
- [Encourage/promote] Pay-on-delivery, combine climate and poverty streams, towards basic loan for the poor and a parallel soft money system