



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

# PREPARING FOR THE SECOND MONITORING ROUND (2015-16)

Global Partnership Steering Committee meeting  
3-4 September 2015, Mexico

This document provides an update on work related to the Global Partnership's second monitoring round and steps taken on three distinct work streams: (i) strengthening GPEDC's second monitoring round; (ii) refining the four pilot indicators; and (iii) reviewing the Global Partnership monitoring framework to ensure its relevance and contribution to the broader post-2015 monitoring and follow-up efforts.

This document is shared with the members of the Steering Committee for consideration. Steering Committee members are invited to review and endorse the proposed methodologies and processes for monitoring indicators 1, 2, 3 and 4, as well as the proposed process and timeline for the second monitoring round.

## Contacts:

Mr. Alejandro Guerrero. Tel: +33 1 45 24 83 63, email: [alejandro.guerrero-ruiz@oecd.org](mailto:alejandro.guerrero-ruiz@oecd.org)

Ms. Julie Seghers, Tel: +33 1 45 24 90 36, email: [julie.seghers@oecd.org](mailto:julie.seghers@oecd.org)

Ms. Yuko Suzuki, Tel: + 1 212 906 6509, email: [yuko.suzuki@undp.org](mailto:yuko.suzuki@undp.org)

Ms. Liz J.E. Chung Tel: +1 718 483 6675, email: [liz.chung@undp.org](mailto:liz.chung@undp.org)

## Acronyms

BIAC	Business and Industry Advisory Committee [OECD]
CIPE	Center for International Private Enterprise
CPDE	CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness
CRF	Country Results Framework
CRS	Creditor Reporting System [OECD]
CSO	Civil Society Organisations
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
FfD	Financing for Development Conference
FSS	Forward Spending Survey [OECD]
GPEDC	Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation
HLM	High-Level Meeting [GPEDC]
IATI	International Aid Transparency Initiative
IDG	International Donor Group
IHP+	International Health Partnership Initiative
IPU	Inter-Parliamentary Union
ITUC	International Trade Union Confederation
JST	UNDP-OECD Joint Support Team [GPEDC]
MAG	Monitoring Advisory Group [GPEDC]
ODA	Official Development Aid
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
P4P	Partnerships for Prosperity
PFM	Public Financial Management
PPD	Public-Private Dialogue
SC	Steering Committee [GPEDC]
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
UN-DESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

## Introduction

This paper, which focuses on the monitoring work of the Global Partnership, provides Steering Committee members with an update on recent progress as well as a proposed way forward regarding the [three tracks](#) agreed upon during the last Steering Committee meeting.

The Joint Support Team's work builds on comments collected through consultations with Global Partnership stakeholders, and on preliminary recommendations provided by the Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG).

The paper is structured as follows:

- Section I provides a brief stock-take of the work undertaken by the Joint Support Team since The Hague.
- Section II focuses on key efforts to prepare a stronger second monitoring round (i.e. Track 1), including efforts to increase political engagement and participation, a proposed process and timeline, improved monitoring tools, and approaches to strengthen synergies with other monitoring exercises.
- Section III describes key features of the four pilot indicators' finalised methodologies (i.e. Track 2).
- Section IV presents an update regarding efforts to position the GPEDC monitoring framework vis-à-vis the post-2015 and FfD accountability frameworks, and envisaged work regarding the overall review of the monitoring framework to ensure its relevance to post-2015 accountability efforts (i.e. Track 3).
- Finally, Annex 1 gives more information about each pilot indicator, Annex 2 further details the proposed monitoring process for the second monitoring round, Annex 3 outlines concrete options for the Steering Committee Members to further support this process and Annex 4 contains the list of all 10 indicators of the GPEDC monitoring framework.

In addition to providing general feedback, Steering Committee members are invited to:

- Endorse the proposed methodologies and processes for monitoring indicators 1 (use of country results frameworks), 2 (CSO enabling environment), 3 (quality of public private dialogue) during the second round.
- Agree to defer the endorsement of the proposed methodology for monitoring indicator 4 (transparency indicator) to the next Steering Committee meeting (January 2016) and endorse the need for extensive consultation with relevant stakeholders on the proposed methodological revisions.
- Endorse the proposed process and timeline for the second monitoring round.

## I. BRIEF STOCK-TAKE ON ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE THE JANUARY STEERING COMMITTEE IN THE HAGUE

### Track 1 – Preparing a stronger second monitoring round

- Efforts made to increase political engagement and participation in the second monitoring round
  - Support to Co-Chairs and Steering Committee members in their efforts to strengthen political awareness about the monitoring (e.g. dissemination of key messages, [sensitisation leaflet](#)).
  - Targeted messaging to Global Partnership stakeholders to start preparing for the second round (coordinators of the monitoring round in developing countries, DAC providers and Multilateral Development Banks, UN Development Group, UN Country Teams, Resident Coordinator's Offices, and UNDP country offices and others stakeholders...).
  - Enhanced communication to Global Partnership stakeholders
- Revision of the monitoring process and timeline for the second monitoring round, on the basis of feedback collected through an online consultation.
- Efforts made to increase synergies with other monitoring exercises.
- Enhanced collaboration with regional organisations and platforms in the use of monitoring results and preparations for pre-monitoring regional workshops (to take place in October 2015).
- On-going work to improve and update the monitoring tools (Monitoring Guide, country spreadsheet for data collection and validation, FAQs)

### Track 2 – Finalising the four pilot indicators

- Intensive consultations with a range of Global Partnership stakeholders, and with the Monitoring Advisory Group to finalise the methodological approaches for the pilot indicators (see Annex 1).
- Refinement and finalisation of the methodologies for the four pilot indicators.

### Track 3 – Reviewing the Global Partnership monitoring framework to ensure its relevance to the post-2015 and FfD context

- While the JST has prioritised Tracks 1 and 2 in the past semester, further thinking about this broad review will be undertaken in parallel to the second monitoring round.
- Discussions around positioning the GPEDC monitoring framework vis-à-vis the post-2015 and FfD accountability efforts (to be raised at the Steering Committee meeting).

### Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG)

- Establishment of the MAG, and kick-off meeting on 20-21 May 2015 in New York, with representatives from the Co-Chairs' offices and the Joint Support Team to exchange initial thoughts on the agreed areas of work (which the MAG will further describe in a work plan to be shared to Steering Committee members in Mexico).
- Since its establishment, the MAG has focused its work on providing guidance to the JST on finalising the methodologies for the four pilot indicators. Key features of the methodologies presented in section 2 and Annex 1 of this paper incorporate the MAG's recommendations.

Feedback from the MAG on how to further strengthen the second monitoring round at different stages will also guide the JST in its final preparations for the second round (September) and throughout the monitoring exercise. Finally, the MAG will further define its approach to track 3 at its next meeting (28-29 September 2015).

## II. TRACK 1: PREPARING A STRONGER SECOND MONITORING ROUND

Expected decision points from Steering Committee members:

- Endorsement of the proposed process and timeline for the second monitoring round

### ***Strengthening the GPEDC Monitoring framework: key feedback from stakeholders<sup>1</sup>***

*To prepare a stronger second monitoring round, the Joint Support Team drew on feedback from Global Partnership stakeholders, which highlighted the following strengths and suggested the following improvements:*

#### ***Strengths:***

- *Value of a country-driven exercise*
- *Combination of government leadership and inclusiveness*
- *Overall relevance of the process and usefulness of the monitoring tools*

#### ***Room for improvement:***

- *Stronger political support and increased number of participating countries*
- *More investment in the preparation phase (sensitisation and communications)*
- *More timely and inclusive consultation with relevant stakeholders*
- *A more structured process for data collection and validation to ensure accuracy of data*
- *Efforts to limit the burden on developing country governments*
- *Increased synergies with other monitoring exercises and Global Partnership Initiatives*
- *Better use and dissemination of findings to further incentivise behaviour change*

## **STRONGER STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND INCREASED PARTICIPATION**

1. The Co-Chairs and Steering Committee members have been playing an instrumental role in reaching out to their constituencies to encourage stronger participation in the second monitoring round, and are invited to pursue their sensitisation efforts in the coming months (concrete ways in which members can do so are detailed in Annex 3). An official letter of invitation to participate in the second monitoring round will be sent from the GPEDC Co-Chairs to developing country Ministers and to heads of organisations following the Steering Committee meeting.
2. The support of Steering Committee members to strengthen stakeholder engagement throughout the second monitoring round will be crucial to ensure broad ownership over the monitoring exercise. The role of relevant regional organisations and platforms is also significant, based on the particular regional context of development effectiveness issues.
3. The JST will further intensify its sensitisation, communication and consultation efforts to ensure stakeholder engagement throughout the whole monitoring process. The website is

---

1 This feedback was mainly gathered through two on-line consultations (one held as an immediate follow-up to the first monitoring round, the second held in April 2015).

currently being revamped; the pages dedicated to monitoring will, in particular, be updated to provide user-friendly and timely information about the second round.

4. With a view to strengthening stakeholder engagement in the use of monitoring results, the JST will enhance its collaboration with relevant regional organisations and platforms. In particular, their role in analysing the outcomes of the monitoring and in drawing from this analysis will be enhanced to inform global and regional dialogue on development effectiveness.

### REVISED MONITORING PROCESS, TIMELINE AND TOOLS

5. While the overall approach used during the first monitoring round will be maintained, a few changes will be incorporated into the second monitoring round, based on lessons learned and on recommendations made by stakeholders. This section presents key changes to the process, as well as a detailed timeline. Further information on the process is detailed in Annex 2.

### Further structuration of the process for data collection and validation

6. A “country-led approach” means that data sourced at the country level is collected and validated under developing country government leadership. The JST proposes the following changes to further facilitate the data collection and validation process, with a view to reducing the burden on the national co-ordinator, increasing multi-stakeholder engagement, and improving data accuracy:
7. *Designation of focal points for all stakeholders at headquarters and country levels, with clear roles and responsibilities.* During the first monitoring round, a focal point for each developing country government (i.e. the “national co-ordinator”) was systematically appointed to coordinate the monitoring exercise. The national coordinator leads the monitoring efforts by sensitising relevant government institutions about the monitoring round, overseeing the data collection, and organising multi-stakeholder dialogue with partners for data consolidation and validation. In some countries, a provider focal point was designated to support the process. In order to further facilitate the national co-ordinator’s role and to strengthen multi-stakeholder engagement during the second monitoring round, the JST is encouraging stakeholders to appoint focal points at country level, in consultation with developing country governments, for: providers of development co-operation, parliamentarians, civil society organisations, trade unions and the private sector. The JST is currently reaching out to GPEDC stakeholders and networks (including the OECD’s *Development Assistance Committee*, the *CSO Partnership for Effective Development*, UN Development Group, Multilateral Development Banks, the International Donor Group, the International Parliamentary Union, the International Trade Union Confederation, Partnerships for Prosperity, and the Business and Industry Advisory Committee to the OECD, and the Center for International Private Enterprise) to seek support in identifying these focal points at head quarter and country levels. The focal points at headquarters are expected to (1) contribute to the outreach and sensitisation around the second monitoring round at country level (e.g. ensure that their representatives/constituencies at the country level are aware of the process), (2) encourage participation of country focal points in the government-led data collection and validation process, (3) liaise with country focal points to ensure that the data provided to the national coordinator is accurate and (4) contribute to policy dialogue around the findings of the monitoring exercise at the global level. The focal points at country level are expected to (1) encourage developing country governments to participate in the second monitoring round, (2) provide data to the national co-coordinator when required (liaising with headquarters to ensure data accuracy when relevant), (3) participate in dialogue around data validation, (4) contribute to policy

dialogue around the findings of the monitoring exercise at the country level. The JST will provide detailed guidance on the roles and responsibilities of each focal point to fully engage in the exercise (particularly in the Monitoring Guide, which is currently being finalised, and during the regional pre-monitoring workshops).

8. *Intensified efforts to engage providers in the process.* An important lesson learned from the first monitoring exercise is the need for stronger engagement of providers at the country level, and better internal communication and co-ordination within provider organisations to address apparent disconnects between headquarters and country offices. The JST will scale up its communication with providers, to engage them in the monitoring exercise at an early stage. While the providers' country offices will be responsible for ensuring the quality and accuracy of reporting, previous experience has demonstrated that the provision of guidance and incentives from providers' headquarters to their respective country offices is essential.

### Proposed timeline

9. The proposed timeline aims at reconciling (1) the call for additional time to collect and validate the data and (2) the importance of disseminating the 2016 Progress Report ahead of the second HLM (November 2016 TBC). Within this proposed timeline, the deadline for reporting validated data is 31 March 2016. While it was originally envisaged to collect 2015 data, in particular to measure progress against the 2015 targets, further feedback from developing country representatives indicate that 2015 data may not be fully available in March 2016 for several participating countries. However, moving the deadline for data collection further to a date when 2015 data is available for most countries (July 2016) would preclude publishing the report in time for the second HLM<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, the proposed timeline for the second round will most likely enable data from 2015 in a limited number of cases, 2014 in a majority of cases, and 2013 in certain cases.
10. The timetable below outlines the envisaged timing and detailed roles and responsibilities. The ultimate timing will be defined by the date of the second HLM (still TBC), and, based on the experience of the first monitoring round, the sequencing for data collection, validation, processing, review and final validation is likely to vary from one country to another. Holding this timeline will also depend on the timeliness of the provision of validated data by developing country governments.

<b>March - September 2015</b>	<p><b><u>Preparation and sensitisation</u></b></p> <p><u>Co-Chairs and SC</u>: outreach to developing country governments, providers, CSOs, parliaments and trade unions to raise awareness / increase participation.</p> <p><u>JST</u>: finalises the four pilot indicators in consultation with experts from stakeholders, coordinates consultation / sensitisation and outreach / preparation of tools (Monitoring Guide, country spread sheet, FAQs, etc.).</p> <p><u>Developing country governments</u>: express interest; designate a focal point (i.e. a "national co-ordinator") by 31 July. Sensitise relevant government institutions on the upcoming monitoring round.</p> <p><u>Providers, CSO, private sector, parliamentarians, trade unions</u>: designate focal points at headquarter level (by 31 July) and country level (by 15 September).</p> <p>Note: UNDP stands ready – on demand – to assume the role of provider focal point at country level.</p>
-------------------------------	---

2 For reference, among the 46 countries that submitted data in the first monitoring round (final data submitted by end of February 2014), the reporting years of reference were as follows: a) 2011 (3 countries), b) 2011-12 (2 countries), c) 2012 (32 countries) and d) 2012-13 (9 countries)



<p><b>September 2015</b></p>	<p><b><u>Endorsement of the strengthened framework, process and timeline</u></b> for the second monitoring round by the GPEDC Steering Committee.</p>
<p><b>September - October 2015</b></p>	<p><b><u>Launch of the monitoring exercise</u></b></p> <p><u>Co-Chairs</u>: send formal ministerial (or high) level invitation to developing country governments and heads of organisations to participate in the second monitoring round.</p> <p><u>JST</u>: organises pre-monitoring workshops (Oct-Nov), webinars, circulates the Monitoring Guide and country spreadsheet to the national co-ordinators in participating countries as well as to other stakeholders (and re-circulates individual country and provider results from the first monitoring round for comparison purposes). Where developing country governments chose to resort to a consultant/think tank to support the data collection and validation process for indicator 2 and/or 3, the Joint Support Team stands ready to provide technical support as detailed in Annex 1.</p> <p><u>Developing country governments</u>: send formal letter of commitment to participate in the exercise. National co-ordinators participate in the pre-monitoring workshops and organise the launch of the monitoring exercise at country level (e.g. through a kick-off meeting) in an inclusive manner with all relevant stakeholders.</p> <p><u>Providers, CSOs, private sector, parliamentarians, trade unions</u>: focal points participate in the pre-monitoring workshops and/or webinars, and engage in the kick-off meetings convened at country level.</p>
<p><b>October 2015 - March 2016</b></p>	<p><b><u>Data collection and validation</u></b></p> <p><u>JST</u>: regarding country-sourced indicators (1,2,3,5,6,7,8,9b<sup>3</sup>), the Joint Support Team provides on-going support to national co-ordinators for data gathering, validation and submission. Regarding globally sourced indicators (4, 9a, 10), the Joint Support Team coordinates the assessment and shares data with relevant stakeholders (providers, developing country governments, civil society). The Joint Support Team provides support and guidance to all stakeholders through the Helpdesk, Teamworks community space, and FAQs.</p> <p><u>Developing country governments</u>: national co-ordinators co-ordinate data collection, liaise with focal points from providers, civil society organisations, the private sector and other stakeholders to convene consultations and dialogue around data validation, and submit to the Joint Support Team <b>by 31 March 2016</b> the completed country spreadsheet based on data available at the country level for the latest government fiscal year.</p> <p><u>Providers</u>: focal points provide information for Indicators 1, 2, 5a, 6, 9b to the national co-ordinators, and participate in data validation (for all indicators)</p> <p><u>CSOs, parliamentarians, private sector, trade unions</u>: focal points provide information for Indicators 2 and 3 to the national co-ordinator, and participate in data validation (for all indicators).</p> <p><u>Consultants/Think tanks</u>: <i>[in cases where the government has decided to resort to a consultant or think tank to support the data collection and validation process for indicators 2 and 3 (see annex 1)]</i> Consultants support the implementation of the data collection and validation for indicators 2 and 3, in close collaboration with developing</p>

3 The 10 indicators of the GPEDC monitoring framework are listed in Annex 4



	<p>country governments and relevant stakeholders. Provide consolidated data on indicators 2 and 3 to the Joint Support Team by March 2016.</p> <p><b><u>Complementary evidence</u></b></p> <p><u>JST</u>: begins to compile/analyse complementary evidence (desk review), provides guidelines on the possibility for stakeholders to flag complementary analysis on specific themes (November).</p> <p><u>SC members</u>: points the Joint Support Team to relevant analysis.</p>
<b>April-May 2016</b>	<p><b><u>Data processing and final review</u></b></p> <p><u>JST</u>: consolidates and aggregates country-sourced data (indicators 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9b) and global-sourced data (indicators 4, 9a, 10). Sends full country-sourced data tables to national co-ordinators for final review (indicators 1,2,3,5,6,7,8,9b). Sends full globally-sourced data tables to providers' headquarters (indicators 4 and 10) and to developing countries' national co-ordinators (indicator 9a). Once the full data tables are finalised, make the raw data available to support country and regional analysis of the outcomes.</p> <p><u>Developing Country Governments</u>: National co-ordinators receive their full set of country-sourced data, and ensure final review of indicators 1,2,3,5,6,7,8,9b, in consultation with relevant stakeholders. In the case of any errors in the data, national co-ordinators notify the Joint Support Team.</p> <p><u>Providers</u>: Providers receive for information their full set of country-sourced data pertaining to each country in which they have reported data to the government (indicators 1,2, 5a,6,9b). Providers may communicate any final comments regarding the data they reported on at country level directly to the national co-ordinator for possible further consideration. All final country-level data are communicated to the Joint Support Team by national co-ordinators. Providers also receive their set of globally-sourced data (indicators 4 and 10) from the Joint support Team, and can communicate any final comment on the data for these indicators to the JST.</p>
<b>June-September 2016</b>	<p><b><u>Aggregation, Analysis, Report production and publication</u></b></p> <p><u>JST</u>: carries out the analysis (global aggregation), co-ordinates the preparation and finalisation of the report, in consultation with the Co-Chairs and the Monitoring Advisory Group (launch of the report in early September)</p> <p><u>Regional organisations</u>: Based on the finalised data tables, are encouraged to undertake specific regional analysis to inform the finalisation of the report as appropriate.</p>
<b>September – December 2016</b>	<p><b><u>Dialogue and dissemination</u></b></p> <p><u>JST</u>: supports dissemination of the report's findings (launch of the Report, dissemination of key highlights, on-line access to the full dataset, etc.). Supports discussion and use of findings at country, regional and global (2016 HLM) levels.</p> <p><u>Co-Chairs and SC members</u>: promote dissemination and discussion of findings at country, regional and global level.</p> <p><u>Developing country governments, regional organisations, providers, parliamentarians, CSOs, private sector, trade unions and other stakeholders</u>: organise, initiate and actively participate in discussion and dissemination of findings at country, regional and global levels.</p>

## **Improvement of the monitoring tools**

11. Overall, participants in the first round considered the monitoring tools useful and adapted to their needs. The JST is currently adjusting the process and updating the tools, and will disseminate them in September, particularly the Guide to the monitoring, the country spreadsheet (used for data collection), the FAQs, and the online helpdesk.
12. The pre-monitoring workshops (October-November 2015) will enable stakeholders to learn more about how they can use these tools.
13. Regarding the country spreadsheets used to collect data at country level, the Joint Support Team envisages two main changes. Firstly, in addition to the quantitative or yes/no questions outlined in the country spread sheet, room will be given for the national coordinator to provide qualitative comments and explanations. This information will be useful for the JST to further understand and analyse progress regarding each indicator and to strengthen the global narrative of the 2016 Progress Report. Secondly, the JST is currently working, with the Advisory Group's guidance, on questions to incorporate into the country spreadsheet to collect feedback on the relevance of the 10 GPEDC indicators. Feedback from this "stress testing" will feed into the Advisory Group's work to propose a reviewed monitoring framework for post-2015 (i.e. Track 3).

## **Strengthening Synergies between the GPEDC monitoring and other monitoring processes and tools**

14. With support from the UNDP, the UN-DESA conducts a biennial global survey on national mutual accountability for the Development Cooperation Forum, which aims to re-energize and re-engineer efforts around mutual accountability to monitor a more integrated set of development co-operation commitments and results, building on the specific enablers of mutual accountability that have been identified through previous survey rounds – ranging from national development co-operation policies to country results framework, information management and dialogue platforms. The 4<sup>th</sup> National Mutual Accountability survey is currently being rolled out in close collaboration with the UNDP. It provides an opportunity for governments to engage with their partners to initiate consultation on the monitoring framework. Results from the National Mutual Accountability Survey at the country level can be used to respond to GPEDC indicator 7 (as the five targets of indicator 7 are aligned to the questions in the more detailed DCF survey).
15. The International Health Partnership (IHP+) monitors the implementation of development effectiveness principles in the health sector. In 2014, the IHP+ used a similar monitoring approach to that of the Global Partnership (i.e. country-led data collection and validation, adjustment of GPEDC indicators to the health sector). Discussions are on-going between the IHP+ core team and the JST to further strengthen synergies between the Global Partnership's second monitoring round and the IHP+'s fifth monitoring round, particularly regarding the possibility for the IHP+ to harmonise its timeline with that of the Global Partnership, to use the methodology developed for indicator 2 on the CSO enabling environment, and to potentially collaborate on looking into a more analytical approach to understand bottlenecks to progress and reasons for these.
16. The monitoring of the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States focuses on behavioural change among national and international partners. Its framework incorporates monitoring of the five TRUST principles, which aim at building mutual trust and strong partnerships in countries affected by conflict and fragility. The five elements of TRUST principles include: (1) transparency; (2) risk-sharing; (3) use and strengthening of country systems; (4) strengthening of capacity; and (5) timely and predictable aid. While an independent review of the New Deal monitoring framework is currently being commissioned, it is envisaged that the timing of the next New Deal monitoring round will be aligned with the GPEDC's second

monitoring round. Further discussions between the JST and the Secretariat of the International Dialogue on Peace Building and State Building will be undertaken in July-August to detail how this coordination will take place.

### **INCREASED USE OF COMPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE**

17. In order to make optimal use of existing evidence, the JST has started to map out existing studies/analyses. Relevant information gathered through this desk review will feed into the JST's analysis in complementing data collected through the monitoring exercise, and enriching the second monitoring Progress Report. In late 2015, the JST will share with Steering Committee members and the Monitoring Advisory Group a preliminary list of themes for which complementary analysis could be useful, and will invite them to direct the JST to additional sources of analysis in line with those themes.
18. The JST will further reach out to UNDP Country Offices and Regional Centres to gather additional country level analysis, to inform on current progress in the Progress Report.
19. While indicator 9a (on the quality of PFM systems) will be monitored as it was in the first monitoring round, the JST will take into account - for the 2016 Progress Report - findings from the Effective Institutions Platform's consultations and piloting of an [alternative methodology](#).

### **IMPROVED DISSEMINATION AND USE OF MONITORING RESULTS**

#### **Making data and findings more easy to use and to access**

20. As was the case for the first monitoring exercise, the JST will produce a 2016 Progress Report, which will draw on evidence of progress and challenges gathered through the monitoring exercise and through complementary qualitative analysis. This Progress Report will constitute a core source of evidence to inform policy discussions at the 2016 High-Level Meeting, therefore the JST aims to release it at least one month ahead of the HLM.
21. A short document synthesising key highlights from the report will also be prepared. This product will present overall messages and recommendations in a way that makes sense for political leaders, policy-makers and general public.
22. In order to make data more visual and user-friendly, the JST plans to invest in infographics and data visualisation. The JST will explore options to develop products similar to the [video](#) prepared for the first monitoring round and to improve online data visualisation.

#### **Facilitating the use of findings at country and regional levels**

23. As agreed in 2012, the GPEDC monitoring reports were meant to provide a global snapshot of progress made in the implementation of Busan commitments, but were not expected to incorporate individual country chapters for participating countries. However, feedback received from stakeholders suggests the usefulness of country analysis to facilitate dialogue and encourage behavioural change at country level. The JST has taken note of this suggestion, but reminds that the agreed framework and associated resources available will limit its ability to produce individual country chapters. The JST is however exploring ways to produce country-pages and, in any case, the data for each country will be available to facilitate country-level stakeholders to undertake country-specific analysis – as was the case in several countries following the first monitoring round.
24. The JST has also been increasing its outreach to identify relevant partners at country and regional levels to foster dialogue and use of findings from the second monitoring exercise.

The creation of a “toolkit” is being envisaged to facilitate the interpretation and use of data and the promotion of multi-stakeholder dialogue around the findings.

25. The Monitoring Advisory Group is expected to provide further strategic guidance on actionable policy recommendations and use of findings to support effective dialogue at country level (by February 2016).

### Engaging regional platforms in the dissemination and use of findings

26. The role of regional platforms in the monitoring efforts is significant. They can (1) support stronger evidence-based policy dialogue on effective development co-operation practices drawing on country-led monitoring efforts and results, and (2) generate complementary evidence and codified knowledge on how the principles of effective development co-operation have facilitated changes in behaviour, practice, and policies. The JST plans to intensify its discussions with relevant regional platforms to strengthen synergies with their plan of work, in particular regarding regional analysis and regional-level accountability frameworks, including making the data available to inform their regional-level analysis and their engagement in the preparation for the High Level Meeting and other relevant global and regional dialogues.

## III. TRACK 2: FINALISING THE PILOT INDICATORS

Expected decision points from Steering Committee members:

- Endorsement of the proposed methodologies for the four pilot indicators

This section summarizes the key features of the proposed revised methodologies. Annex 1 provides more detailed information on the refinement process for each pilot indicator, and on the proposed methodological approaches.

### INDICATOR 1

Previous approach	Revised methodology
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focused on providers’ effective use of country results frameworks (CRF) as a basis to align development co-operation to the country’s development priorities.</li> <li>• Relied on the assumption that the actual delivery of cooperation through modalities typically associated with use of country results framework (e.g. budget support) was a simplified proxy for use of CRFs.</li> <li>• The indicator was complemented with government’s perceptions of providers’ behaviour in the use CRFs and in the support provided to strengthen national results frameworks.</li> <li>• The pilot exercise revealed that there is not a consistent definition of CRFs, with inherently different approaches in designing and using CRFs at the country level. It also revealed limitations of the proposed simplified proxy for use in capturing providers’ actual behaviour.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The indicator’s focus does not change.</li> <li>• The methodology is focused on (1) providing a descriptive monitoring on the operational status of the CRF (to better understand the existence and characteristics of CRFs), and (2) gathering data that will enable to understand the degree to which, and the way in which the CRF is being used by providers.</li> <li>• To manage complexity and feasibility, the use of CRFs by providers will be reported by focusing the indicator’s data gathering exercise on CRF use at the sector level, both in the planning and reporting phases.</li> </ul>

## INDICATOR 2

Previous approach	Revised methodology
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Narrower focus on monitoring the legal and regulatory framework to enable CSOs' independent contribution to development.</li> <li>Use of existing global reporting mechanisms (envisaged use of sub-dimensions of the CIVICUS-Enabling Environment Index).</li> <li>Challenges encountered: nature of the data (secondary data from a single source), limited data availability (limited country coverage) and limited country dialogue between the different stakeholders included in the previous methodology.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Broader focus on assessing the extent to which governments and providers contribute to an enabling environment for CSOs, and to which CSOs are implementing development effectiveness principles in their own operations.</li> <li>Collecting primary data through a qualitative country-level questionnaire structured around four modules: (1) space for multi-stakeholder dialogue on national development policies; (2) CSO development effectiveness; (3) official development co-operation with CSOs; and (4) legal and regulatory framework.</li> <li>The monitoring process will be led by developing country governments, in close consultation with focal points from CSOs and providers. Multi-stakeholder dialogue to collect, validate and discuss the data will be encouraged. On a case by case basis, developing country governments can decide to use the services of a consultant/think tank to support the process.</li> </ul>

## INDICATOR 3

Previous approach	Revised methodology
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on assessing the quality of public private dialogue at country level, as a proxy to capture private sector engagement in improving public policies.</li> <li>The data gathering builds on the <i>Public-Private Dialogue Country Profile</i> methodology developed and tested with the World Bank. The Country Profile provides evidence on (1) the legal and regulatory context for PPD, (2) the country's readiness to host, create or sustain a dialogue process, and (3) the organisational effectiveness of a given PPD platform.</li> <li>The assessment tool was still under development during the first monitoring round.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The indicator focus does not change.</li> <li>The tool has been slightly refined based on piloting in 3 countries.</li> <li>The monitoring process will be led by developing country governments, in close consultation with focal points from the private sector. Multi-stakeholder dialogue to collect, validate and discuss the data will be encouraged. On a case by case basis, developing country governments can decide to use the services of a consultant/think tank to support the process.</li> </ul>

## INDICATOR 4

Previous approach	Revised methodology
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The indicator focused on measuring the state of implementation of the common standard by co-operation providers.</li> <li>The indicator relies on two international sources of data (DAC and IATI), which assess the three components of the common standard: timeliness, comprehensiveness, and forward-looking approach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The indicator focus does not change.</li> <li>Progress measurement continues to rely on these two main sources of data (DAC and IATI).</li> <li>The methodological approach will still assess the three components, using composite scores calculated based on an agreed scoring method by the two secretariats (IATI/DAC) supporting the</li> </ul>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A single composite score derived from both data sources, reporting on the basis of the best score obtained in these datasets.</li> <li>• However, the DAC and IATI data sources diverge in methodological specificities (objectives, country coverage and reporting timeframe) creating methodological challenges related to the use of both data sources as equivalent.</li> </ul>	<p>Common Standard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are different dimensions assessed for each component by the three reporting systems. For CRS/FSS, it is also proposed to incorporate assessment of data accuracy as an additional component.</li> <li>• To avoid previous methodological challenges related to aggregation, the indicator's composite scores will be calculated for each dimension of the Common Standard separately. The Progress Report will present progress over time on the scores from each data reporting system separately, with sufficient detail on their composition.</li> <li>• The JST will strengthen the consultation process with providers at an early stage of the assessment process, to ensure a common understanding of the methodology and results.</li> </ul>
--	---

#### **IV. TRACK 3: REVIEWING THE MONITORING FRAMEWORK TO ENSURE ITS RELEVANCE TO FUTURE ACCOUNTABILITY EFFORTS**

##### **POSITIONING THE MONITORING FRAMEWORK VIS-À-VIS THE POST-2015 AND FFD ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK**

27. Making development co-operation and partnerships more effective will be crucial in the post-2015 context. Development effectiveness will be a cross-cutting theme in ensuring that the SDGs are achieved at a global level, by helping establish the linkage between the development finance agenda and the SDG targets. SDG 17 highlights the need to strengthen the means of implementation, and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (Para 58) welcomes “efforts to improve the quality, impact and effectiveness of development cooperation and other international efforts in public finance, including adherence to agreed development cooperation effectiveness principles”, and highlights the complementarity between the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation’s efforts and those of the Development Cooperation Forum.
28. Through its inclusive country-led monitoring approach and process, the GPEDC provides a complementary, ready-made platform to help support UN-led Financing-for-Development and SDG implementation and mutual accountability efforts. Indeed, the GPEDC monitoring framework seeks to capture behaviour change leading to more effective development co-operation: it focuses on “how” stakeholders engage in development. In that sense, it complements the SDG framework which monitors “what” results and outcomes stem from development co-operation. Further enhancing the relevance of the GPEDC monitoring framework vis-à-vis the post-2015 and FfD agenda will be an essential objective of the forthcoming efforts to review the monitoring framework (track 3).

##### **PREPARING FOR THE BROAD REVIEW OF THE MONITORING FRAMEWORK**

29. During the kick-off meeting of the Monitoring Advisory Group in New-York in May 2015, preliminary ideas were discussed regarding ways to approach the envisaged review of the GPEDC monitoring framework to ensure its relevance to the post-2015 and FfD accountability efforts. In particular, MAG members identified a few entry points to be explored

---

regarding the relevance of the monitoring framework vis-à-vis flows beyond ODA, and vis-à-vis non-traditional development actors.

30. The Monitoring Advisory Group will focus its next meeting (28-29 September 2015, Paris) on further discussing its approach to produce guidance and recommendations on this review.





## ANNEX 1 – FOUR PILOT INDICATORS

### INDICATOR 1: DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION IS FOCUSED ON RESULTS THAT MEET DEVELOPING COUNTRIES' PRIORITIES

#### Progress made since The Hague:

The last Steering Committee meeting (The Hague, January 2015) endorsed a proposal to revise the methodology for Indicator 1. Since January, the JST has refined the proposed approach for this indicator, with support from an informal group of technical experts from developing countries. To further refine the approach, the JST consulted with a wide range of relevant stakeholders, including the Global Partnership Initiative on *Results and Mutual Accountability* (April) and the DAC's "Results Community" (May and June). Several regional platforms were consulted on pilot indicators (May and June) and a light testing was undertaken in a selected number of countries (May and June). The GPEDC's Monitoring Advisory Group has further reviewed the draft methodology and provided recommendations on the way forward (May and June).

#### Key features of the methodology:

Indicator 1 aims at assessing the extent of the use of Country Results Frameworks<sup>4</sup> (CRF) by co-operation providers, as a proxy for measuring the progress on adopting "transparent, country-led and country-level results frameworks and platforms as a common tool among all concerned actors to assess performance based on a manageable number of output and outcome indicators drawn from the development priorities and goals of the developing country" (BP a §18a). It is designed to incentivise providers of development co-operation to use country results frameworks and monitoring systems, and to refrain from introducing performance indicators that are not consistent with countries' own development strategies. This is expected to also create incentives for supporting the strengthening of CRFs and their related monitoring systems. The results of this indicator will provide a basis to better understand the reasons for progress in the use of country-led results frameworks, as well as the challenges ahead.

The nature of this indicator includes an overview of the existence and characteristics of a country-led results-framework as well as the degree to which, and the ways in which, all development actors in the concerned country use the framework. To this end, Indicator 1 will focus on descriptive monitoring of the operational status of a CRF, and gathering data that will enable understanding of the degree to which, and the way in which, the CRF is being used.

- Understanding the existence and characteristics of a country-led results framework: Countries will be invited to provide a description of how country priorities are determined, planned, and how country results are monitored and reported. This overview will allow capturing a wide range of country-led practices in CRFs without introducing normative standards regarding CRFs.
- Understanding the degree to which, and the ways in which, the country-led results framework is used. This will focus on monitoring providers' use of the framework at sector level in (1) planning (alignment of providers' sector planning and programming with the government's sector results framework); and (2) reporting phases.

The monitoring of Indicator 1 will take place through a limited number of survey questions on both components.

---

<sup>4</sup> Country results frameworks define a country's approach to results and its associated monitoring and evaluation systems, focusing on performance and achievement of such development results.

### Complementary case studies and desk review

To better inform the existence and characteristics of a country-led results framework, a desk review of complementary sources of evidence will also be considered to validate the indicator's results. In addition, short comparative and case studies of providers' practices will also be considered to provide complementary inputs to better understand the degree of use of country-led results frameworks, and to provide evidence on the drivers and bottlenecks influencing the use of CRFs.

### **Monitoring process:**

The assessment of Indicator 1 is led by developing country governments: the national co-ordinator coordinates the overall data collection and validation process, engaging relevant sector ministries, development cooperation providers and other relevant stakeholders at sector level. While the process is led by developing country governments, all stakeholders are encouraged to engage in evidence-based policy dialogue in a multi-stakeholder framework throughout the process.

## **INDICATOR 2: CIVIL SOCIETY OPERATES WITHIN AN ENVIRONMENT THAT MAXIMISES ITS ENGAGEMENT IN AND CONTRIBUTION TO DEVELOPMENT**

### **Progress made since The Hague**

Following the Steering Committee's endorsement of the [proposed approach](#) for indicator 2 in The Hague (January 2015), the JST has refined the methodology with the support of an informal working group, including experts from developing country governments, CSOs and providers. To ensure the relevance and feasibility of the approach, the JST (1) consulted with the Task Team on *CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment*, which coordinated a broad consultation among its constituencies, including through the networks of *the CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness* (CPDE) and the *International Donor Group* (IDG); (2) light-tested the methodology in a few countries; and (3) shared the methodology with regional platforms and with the GPEDC's Monitoring Advisory Group for feedback and recommendations.

### **Key features of the methodology**

Indicator 2 aims at assessing the extent to which governments and providers of development co-operation contribute to an enabling environment for CSOs ([BPa §22a](#)), and to which CSOs are implementing development effectiveness principles in their own operations ([BPa §22b](#)). It also provides a useful tool to spark multi-stakeholder dialogue at country level between governments, CSOs and providers, to identify progress as well as room for improvement in CSO enabling environment and CSO development effectiveness. The approach consists in collecting primary data through a country-level qualitative questionnaire and, in parallel, conducting a desk review to complement the findings. The questionnaire is structured around four modules: (1) space for multi-stakeholder dialogue on national development policies; (2) CSO development effectiveness: accountability and transparency; (3) official development co-operation with CSOs; and (4) legal and regulatory environment.

### **Monitoring process:**

The national co-ordinator, in liaison with colleagues from relevant government agencies/ministries<sup>5</sup>, coordinates the overall data collection and validation process. In order to

---

5 The national co-ordinator can decide to engage colleagues from relevant central or line ministries working on relations with CSOs, and will be expected to liaise with the parliament focal point designated at country level for the whole monitoring process.

facilitate the process and to ensure an inclusive approach, the national coordinator is invited to liaise with a focal point from civil society organisations and a focal point from providers<sup>6</sup> to fill the questionnaire. The national co-ordinator is encouraged to (1) convene a multi-stakeholder dialogue to kick-off the process, (2) seek out CSOs and providers' feedback on the questionnaire (CSO and provider focal points are invited to carry out consultations with their respective constituencies, and to share this feedback with the national co-ordinator) and (3) re-convene a multi-stakeholder dialogue at the end of the process to jointly discuss and validate the findings, before sending them to the Joint Support Team. Where there is no agreement on some aspects of the questionnaire, there will be an option for "minority reports" from stakeholders (i.e. a mechanism to register divergent views in reporting). Where possible, the national co-ordinator is encouraged to use existing in-country platforms to support the process, and to coordinate with the Global Partnership Initiative 12.

Given that Indicator 2 is characterised by a relatively detailed questionnaire and that the monitoring exercise will entail active participation of multiple stakeholders in data collection, developing country governments can decide, on a case by case basis, to use the services of a consultant and/or think tank to support the process. The intervention of such a third-party entity could help avoid overburdening the national coordinator and ensure that the process allows for neutral and balanced assessment which effectively captures all stakeholders' views. In such cases, the Joint Support Team can facilitate the process through technical support (e.g. making available generic terms of reference, providing a list of possible consultants, providing technical guidance to steer consultant's work, etc).

### INDICATOR 3: ENGAGEMENT AND CONTRIBUTION OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR TO DEVELOPMENT

#### Progress made since The Hague

In January 2015, the Steering Committee members approved the [proposed draft methodology](#) – developed in close collaboration with the World Bank– and the work plan to refine indicator 3. Further to this, the JST consulted with relevant stakeholders to explore assessment options, in particular through the 8<sup>th</sup> Public-Private workshop, and at a Development Task Force meeting of the *Business and Industry Advisory Committee* (BIAC), in which the *Center for International Private Enterprise* (CIPE) was represented. The JST is also reaching out to the *Partnership for Prosperity* (P4P) and the UN Global Compact. In addition, the JST shared the methodology for feedback and recommendations with regional platforms and with the GPEDC's Monitoring Advisory Group, incorporating the received feedback.

#### Key features of the methodology:

Indicator 3 aims at assessing the quality of Public-Private Dialogue (PPD) at country level, as a proxy to capture private sector engagement in public policies ([BPa §32b](#)). The quality of PPD constitutes a useful first step in strengthening private sector engagement and its contribution to development. Good public-private dialogue leads to reforms oriented at fostering private sector development, reforms lead to a better enabling environment for business, which in turn leads to a stronger impact of the private sector on sustainable growth. The indicator is complementary to existing indexes focused on the development impact of private sector operations (e.g. the *Global Competitiveness Index*) or the business environment (e.g. the *Doing Business* index).

---

6 The Joint Support Team has invited providers and civil society organisations to appoint focal points at the country level, in consultation with developing country governments ahead of the monitoring round (the CPDE and the IDG could support developing country governments in identifying such focal points).

Indicator 3 is conceived as a tool to encourage multi-stakeholder dialogue at country level between governments, providers and private sector representatives, and to identify strengths as well as room for improvement in PPD, with the ultimate aim of maximising private sector's contribution to sustainable growth and poverty reduction. Rather than aiming for a single indicator, the methodology builds on the [Public Private Dialogue Country Profile](#), which provides, an overview of the context for PPD for a given country, and assesses one relevant dialogue platform in that specific country –relying on a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods. Specifically, the Country Profile looks into (1) the legal and regulatory context for PPD, (2) the country's readiness to host, create or sustain a dialogue process and (3) the organisational effectiveness of a given PPD platform.

### **Monitoring process:**

The national coordinator, in liaison with colleagues from relevant government agencies/ministries<sup>7</sup>, coordinates the overall data collection and validation process. In order to facilitate the process and ensure an inclusive approach, the national coordinator is invited to liaise with a focal point from the private sector and a focal point from the assessed PPD platform to fill the questionnaire<sup>8</sup>. The national co-ordinator is encouraged to (1) convene a multi-stakeholder dialogue to kick-off the process, (2) seek out feedback from the private sector (the focal points from the private sector and from the assessed PPD platform are invited to carry out consultations with their respective constituencies) and (3) re-convene a multi-stakeholder dialogue at the end of the process to jointly discuss and validate the findings, before sending them to the Joint Support Team. Where there is no agreement on some aspects of the questionnaire, there will be an option for “minority reports” from stakeholders (i.e. a mechanism to register divergent views in reporting). Where possible, the national co-ordinator is encouraged to use existing in-country platforms to support the process.

Given that Indicator 3 is characterised by a relatively detailed questionnaire and that the monitoring exercise will entail active participation of multiple stakeholders in data collection, developing country governments can decide, on a case by case basis, to use the services of a consultant and/or think tank to support the process. The intervention of such a third-party entity could help avoid overburdening the national coordinator and ensure that the process allows for neutral and balanced assessment which effectively captures all stakeholders' views. In such cases, the Joint Support Team can facilitate the process through technical support (e.g. making available generic terms of reference, providing a list of possible consultants, providing technical guidance to steer consultant's work, etc).

## **INDICATOR 4: TRANSPARENCY – INFORMATION ON DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION IS PUBLICLY AVAILABLE**

### **Progress made since The Hague**

The January Steering Committee in The Hague acknowledged challenges associated with this indicator emanating from the inherently different nature of reporting systems on the common standard and endorsed a composite approach that disaggregates performance in different

---

7 The national co-ordinator can decide to engage colleagues working on relations with the private sector from relevant central or line ministries, and will be expected to liaise with the parliament focal point designated at country level for the whole monitoring process.

8 Private sector representatives are invited to appoint, in consultation with developing country governments, focal points for the private sector at the country level ahead of the monitoring round. The JST is initiating further discussions with actors such as the Center for International Private Enterprise (CIPE), the country hubs of Partnerships for Prosperity (P4P), the UN Global Compact, with regard to possible support in identifying such focal points.

reporting systems. Since this meeting, further technical work has been undertaken in close collaboration with the secretariats that serve the two parallel systems of the common standard. As a first step, the JST mapped out the technical features of the three transparency components captured by each system<sup>9</sup>, and is reviewing the alternative measurement and scoring approaches used in the IATI and DAC reporting systems.

In addition, the Monitoring Advisory Group also reviewed the methodology used in the piloting of this indicator and provided recommendations on (i) how to build a composite approach and on (ii) how to provide a meaningful and coherent tool to assess progress made against the common open standard. The MAG noted the relevance of the indicator, reckoning that current challenges for monitoring this indicator lie less in the detailed methodology, and more in the principle and methodology to aggregate inherently different datasets; the process of consultation and limited time given to explaining the meaning of the results with development co-operation providers; and the way in which data and results are presented. Based on this, the MAG made the following recommendations:

- The composite approach is a sound one, with composite scores to be calculated for each component of the common standard, and presented separately for each system – with sufficient detail on their composition. If this approach is not feasible and there is need for a single score, an average of the two scores would be a better outcome, compared to the current methodology of a best-score approach.
- The monitoring framework needs to invest more time in an early consultation with stakeholders, in order to explain the methodology and results. In addition, bilateral verification processes with each development co-operation provider should be considered, complemented by public consultations, as well as an IATI-DAC Statistics working group meeting to discuss outcomes of the data collection process, ensuring the participation of informed representatives from GPEDC associated developing countries and the CPDE.
- The monitoring of the ten indicators are intended to generate evidence-based policy dialogue on development co-operation and its effectiveness and to facilitate mutual accountability and learning at the country and global levels. For this reason, it is recommended that the results should be presented in terms of country progress over time, incorporating profiles and country case studies that provide context and meaning to what progress has been made.

### **Key features of the methodology**

Indicator 4 aims at assessing the state of implementation of the common standard by co-operation providers ([BPa §23c](#)) and is conceived as an important tool to generate evidence-based policy dialogue on the transparency of development co-operation and to facilitate mutual accountability and learning at the country and global levels. The principles underpinning the indicator approach reflect the Busan commitment to electronically publish timely, comprehensive and forward-looking information.

The composite approach will be used to measure the state of implementation of the common standard, with scores attained for each of the three components assessed separately by two data sources (IATI and CRS reporting systems). The composite scores - taking into account several measurement dimensions - will be calculated for each component of the common standard, and will be presented separately for each system, with sufficient detail on their composition.

---

9 The three components of the transparency indicator include: (1) timeliness; (2) comprehensiveness and coverage; and (3) forward-looking approach (1-3 year perspective).



Based on the mapping of technical features of the three components by IATI and CRS reporting systems, there are different dimensions proposed to be assessed by each system as described in table below:

**Table: Dimensions proposed to be assessed for the transparency components**

Three components of the common standard	CRS/FSS	IATI
Timeliness	The timely reporting/submissions of <i>complete</i> DAC/CRS data, in accordance to the reporting cycle.	Frequency of reporting information and how fresh the reported data is/time lags
Comprehensiveness	Coherence of data products and completeness of data	Breath of data elements used by publishers in their activity reporting, assessed through the usage of data fields (core, financial and value added). Coverage measured by the percentage of total operational spend that is reported to IATI
Forward-looking (1-3 years)	Timeliness of submission of FSS survey; completeness of the information provided on overall budgetary estimates, priority countries and transparency of survey data; overall quality of the data submitted to the FSS survey; and public availability of the data.	For how many years ahead is data provided and at what level of disaggregation, measured through the number of current activities that contain budgets.

In addition to the above three components, the CRS/FSS system brings the assessment of data accuracy as a critical component of the transparency assessment.

Further consultation and endorsement is needed as to whether different dimensions should be measured for each of the transparency components, or whether there is a need to agree on common dimensions with measurement/scoring methods accounting for the specific nature of the information. A final proposal will be made for Steering Committee endorsement at the next Steering Committee meeting (January 2016).

All three components – timeliness, comprehensiveness, and forward-looking – are individually subject to a coverage ratio in calculating individual dimensional scores, as opposed to applying the coverage ratio to all dimensions.

With a view to present a business case for change and improvements in an easily understood manner, the methodology builds on the development of Provider Profiles, which provide, for a given provider, an overview of the composite scores for each dimension of the common standard, with the data generated by the two above-mentioned systems. The Providers Profiles will offer a better picture of the contextual factors and degree of progress made over time. For cases in which a provider of development co-operation is publishing its information in both CRS/FSS and IATI, the profile will include 6 composite scores. The overall presentation of the



---

result will focus on presentation of the composite scores, with an emphasis on the trend over time.

### **Monitoring process**

Indicator 4 is built on pre-existing data, and composite scores will be calculated based on an agreed scoring method by each secretariat that is supporting the common standard. The DCD Secretariat will assess the data sourced from the CRS/FSS on three dimensions, while the IATI Secretariat will do the same for the IATI data. Verification of data used to score the three dimensions will be led by the DCD Secretariat and IATI Secretariat respectively through their own processes.

## ANNEX 2

### PROPOSED PROCESS FOR DATA COLLECTION AND VALIDATION

The overall approach implemented during the first monitoring round will be maintained in the second round: most indicators will be monitored at the developing country level, while several indicators will draw on global reporting systems. In addition, the four pilot indicators have been refined in order to provide operational tools to be incorporated into the second monitoring exercise.

Throughout the monitoring process, the JST will provide on-going support to national coordinators and focal points through a variety of tools such as a helpdesk, guide, FAQs and workshops. In addition, the JST will aggregate country data at the global level to feed into the 2016 Progress report; this will constitute a key source of evidence for the 2016 HLM.

#### **Standard process [for indicators 1,2,3,5,6,7,8,9b]**

As in the first round, the data collection and validation process for these indicators will be characterised by:

- developing country government leadership and coordination;
- reporting grounded in countries' own monitoring mechanisms and tools (e.g. Aid Management Information Systems) – where they exist – or alternatively through ad hoc processes.
- In-country data validation and consultation with providers of development co-operation, parliamentarians, CSOs, the private sector and other stakeholders. In-country providers of development co-operation are strongly encouraged to consult with their headquarter focal points as they engage in the in-country data validation.
- aggregation and analysis at the global level by the JST.

To facilitate the national coordinator's role in coordinating data collection and validation, and to strengthen multi-stakeholder engagement, the JST will encourage the designation at country level of focal points for: providers of development co-operation, parliamentarians, civil society, trade unions and the private sector. The JST is reaching out to GPEDC stakeholders and networks (including DAC, CPDE, IDG, IPU, ITUC, P4P, CIPE, etc.) to seek support in identifying these focal points at country level.

Governments will provide data for certain indicators (indicator 1, 2, 3, 5b, 6, 7 and 8), and, in some cases, they will collect data from providers (indicator 1, 2, 5a, 6, 9b). For all providers, the in-country head of the organisation will be responsible for ensuring the quality and accuracy of reporting. At the same time, previous experience has demonstrated that the provision of guidance and incentives from these organisations' headquarters to their respective country offices is essential.

Governments will be expected to coordinate data validation through inclusive country level dialogue. While other stakeholders (parliamentarians, civil society organisations, the private sector, trade-unions) are not expected to report to developing country authorities for indicators 1,5,6,7,8,9b they will be encouraged to actively take part in the dialogue around data validation.

#### *Note regarding Indicator 8 (gender equality and women's empowerment):*

Following a successful piloting during the first monitoring round and further discussions with UN Women, it is proposed that reporting for this indicator no longer be optional, and that countries be invited to monitor it along with the other indicators.

*Note regarding Indicators 2 and 3:*

Indicator 2 and 3 were not monitored during the first round, given that the methodologies were still under development at the time. The second monitoring round will be an opportunity to use the finalised methodologies proposed in Annex 1. For these two indicators, the overall assessment will be co-ordinated by the government and will require direct participation of other stakeholders (providers, CSOs, private sector and others), not only in the data validation but also in the data collection process. Given that these indicators are characterised by a relatively detailed questionnaire and that the monitoring exercise will entail active participation of multiple stakeholders in data collection, developing country governments can decide, on a case by case basis, to use the services of a consultant and/or think tank to support the process. The intervention of such a third-party entity could help avoid overburdening the national coordinator and ensure that the process allows for neutral and balanced assessment which effectively captures all stakeholders' views. In such cases, the Joint Support Team can facilitate the process through technical support (e.g. making available generic terms of reference, providing a list of possible consultants, providing technical guidance to steer consultant's work, etc.).

**Specific process for indicators 4,9a,10**

As in the first monitoring round, these indicators will draw on existing global-level data sources and reporting systems (i.e. OECD-DAC, IATI, and CPIA). Each manager of the reporting system will undertake data collection, ensuring that transparent and adequate validation of data is done in accordance to their own process. The JST will source the data sets from reporting systems directly. However, drawing on lessons from the first round, the JST will strengthen consultation on the data with providers, developing country governments and civil society well ahead of the report publication.

### **ANNEX 3 - HOW CAN STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS FURTHER SUPPORT THE SECOND MONITORING ROUND?**

As the document shows, significant progress has been made during the past months to strengthen the monitoring framework and to prepare for the rollout of the second round. Nevertheless, ongoing efforts are necessary to increase the relevance and impact of this exercise. A larger number of participating countries will be crucial to maintain momentum around the development effectiveness agenda and to build evidence ahead of the second HLM.

There are several concrete ways in which Steering Committee members can support the promotion of the monitoring exercise and encourage participation in the second round. Outreach to stakeholders within Steering Committee members' individual constituencies is critical during the pre-launch stage and can be done by:

- Distributing the material, tools and information available about the monitoring throughout the various networks.
- Mentioning the monitoring exercise during meetings, presentations and any other conversation with relevant stakeholders.
- Making dedicated phone calls and sending emails to contacts from key countries to encourage their participation. Interested countries can get in contact directly with the monitoring team via email at [monitoring@effectivecooperation.org](mailto:monitoring@effectivecooperation.org)

Promoting engagement of stakeholders in data validation is also of key importance during the monitoring process. Multi-stakeholder consultations will be organised by governments to validate the data collected and Steering Committee members can encourage participation from their constituencies in these dialogues so that they are inclusive, transparent and results oriented.

At a later stage, Steering Committee members can support dissemination of the monitoring findings with a view to instigate mutual learning and dialogue on making development co-operation more effective at global, regional and country level.

## ANNEX 4 – 10 INDICATORS OF THE GPEDC MONITORING FRAMEWORK

INDICATORS	TARGETS FOR 2015
<b>1. Development co-operation is focused on results that meet developing countries' priorities</b>	
Extent of use of country results frameworks by co-operation providers	<b>All providers</b> of development co-operation use country results frameworks
<b>2. Civil society operates within an environment which maximises its engagement in and contribution to development</b>	
A preliminary assessment of CSO Enabling Environment building on qualitative, multi-stakeholder information	<b>Continued progress over time</b>
<b>3. Engagement and contribution of the private sector to development</b>	
A three-dimension index providing a measure of the quality of public-private dialogue	<b>Continued progress over time</b>
<b>4. Transparency: information on development co-operation is publicly available</b>	
Measure of state of implementation of the common standard by co-operation providers	<b>Implement the common standard</b> – All development co-operation providers are on track to implement a common, open standard for electronic publication of timely, comprehensive and forward-looking information on development co-operation
<b>5. Development co-operation is more predictable</b>	
(a) annual: proportion of development cooperation funding disbursed within the fiscal year within which it was scheduled by co-operation providers; and (b) medium-term: proportion of development cooperation funding covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at country level	<b>Halve the gap</b> – halve the proportion of aid not disbursed within the fiscal year for which it was scheduled (Baseline year 2010)  <b>Halve the gap</b> – halve the proportion of development cooperation funding not covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at country level.
<b>6. Aid is on budgets which are subject to parliamentary scrutiny</b>	
% of development cooperation funding scheduled for disbursement that is recorded in the annual budgets approved by the legislatures of developing countries	<b>Halve the gap</b> – halve the proportion of development cooperation flows to the government sector not reported on government's budget(s) (with at least 85% reported on budget) (Baseline year 2010)
<b>7. Mutual accountability among development co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews</b>	
% of countries that undertake inclusive mutual assessments of progress in implementing agreed commitments	<b>All developing countries</b> have inclusive mutual assessment reviews in place (Baseline year 2010)
<b>8. Gender equality and women's empowerment</b>	
% of countries with systems that track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment	<b>All developing countries</b> have systems that track and make public resource allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment
<b>9. Effective institutions: developing countries' systems are strengthened and used</b>	
(a) Quality of developing country PFM systems; and  (b) Use of country PFM and procurement systems	<b>Half of developing countries move up at least one measure</b> (i.e. 0.5 points) on the PFM/CPIA scale of performance (Baseline year 2010)  <b>Reduce the gap.</b> [use the same logic as in Paris – close the gap by two-thirds where CPIA score is >=5; or by one-third where between 3.5 and 4.5] (Baseline year 2010)
<b>10. Aid is untied</b>	
% of aid that is fully untied	<b>Continued progress over time</b> (Baseline year 2010)