

Strengthening the Global Partnership Monitoring Framework

Global Partnership Steering Committee
The Hague, 19-20 January 2015

This document provides an update on work related to the Global Partnership monitoring framework and steps envisaged to strengthen the framework focusing on three distinct work streams.

This document is shared with Steering Committee members *for discussion*. Steering Committee members are invited to consult with their constituencies and to provide feedback particularly on the guiding questions set out at the beginning of the document.

Contacts:

Ms. Hanna-Mari Kilpeläinen, tel. +33 1 45 24 98 32, email: hanna-mari.kilpelainen@oecd.org
Ms. Yuko Suzuki, tel. +1 212 906 6509, email: yuko.suzuki@undp.org
Ms. Julie Seghers, tel. +33 1 45 24 90 36, email: julie.seghers@oecd.org

INTRODUCTION

1. This paper provides an update to Steering Committee members on the process for strengthening the Global Partnership monitoring framework. It includes recommendations for strengthening the Global Partnership monitoring process, progress and envisaged next steps on refining the four global pilot indicators. The paper also proposes an approach to reviewing and ensuring the relevance of the monitoring framework for post-2015 implementation and accountability efforts.

2. In addition to providing any general feedback, Steering Committee members are invited to endorse the:

- Recommendations to strengthen the process of the second Global Partnership monitoring round;
- Proposed next steps to refine the methodologies for the four global pilot indicators;
- Proposed approach to reviewing and ensuring the relevance of the monitoring framework for post-2015 implementation and accountability efforts; and
- Role and membership of the Independent Advisory Group for monitoring efforts (please refer to the Concept note for the Independent Advisory Group).

RATIONALE AND PURPOSE OF THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP MONITORING FRAMEWORK

3. At the Busan High-Level Forum in 2011, development stakeholders agreed to “hold each other accountable for making progress against the commitments and actions agreed in Busan, alongside those set out in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and Accra Agenda for Action” through i) agreeing on country-led frameworks based on national needs and priorities for monitoring progress and promoting mutual accountability; and ii) monitoring progress through a selective and relevant set of indicators at global level (BPd §35). The monitoring framework of the Global Partnership was agreed to by consensus through the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness in 2012, in conjunction with agreeing to the mandate of, and establishing, the Partnership. It is composed of ten indicators and targets set for 2015, which are a result of political negotiations led by the Post-Busan Interim Group.

4. The ten global indicators are grounded in the four principles of country ownership, results focus, inclusive partnerships, and transparency and accountability. Each indicator currently includes a target for 2015, providing a foundation to measure progress in making development co-operation practices more effective. Periodic monitoring of progress on the indicators – complemented by other qualitative evidence – serves as the basis for discussions at the ministerial level. The Global Partnership mandated the Joint Support Team to develop, refine and implement a global methodology for monitoring.

5. The purpose of the framework is to encourage all stakeholders to improve the effectiveness of their development co-operation in order to maximise its impact. It provides an evidence-based approach to accountability, geared towards multi-stakeholder learning and sharing of lessons on promoting behavioural changes. Its country-led approach grounds the monitoring efforts in countries’ own accountability mechanisms and information systems and aims to stimulate actions on the ground by supporting countries’ own monitoring and accountability processes.

6. The first monitoring round of the Global Partnership culminated in the report *Making Development Co-operation more Effective: 2014 Progress Report*. This first progress report was

released in April 2014 ahead of the first High-Level Meeting of the Global Partnership in Mexico. Drawing on the lessons learned from implementing the first monitoring round, there is broad agreement among the Co-Chairs, Joint Support Team (JST) and Steering Committee on the importance of building on and further strengthening the Global Partnership monitoring framework to offer a credible and appealing model of mutual accountability, both for the upcoming second Global Partnership monitoring round as well as in the context of the post-2015 implementation and accountability efforts.

STRENGTHENING THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP MONITORING FRAMEWORK AND IMPLEMENTING THE SECOND MONITORING ROUND

7. Drawing on consultations following the first monitoring round, discussions at the July Steering Committee meeting and the Global Partnership annual workshop held in Seoul, the efforts to ensure continued improvement of the monitoring framework will follow three tracks:

8. **Preparations to implement a stronger second monitoring round in 2015-2016.** The first Global Partnership monitoring round successfully demonstrated that a country-led approach to global accountability is possible. The first round engaged 46 developing countries and over 70 providers of development co-operation and provided a global snapshot of the state of implementation on the six indicators that were established already during earlier global monitoring processes. The report also incorporated a preliminary pilot analysis of approaches developed for the four global pilot indicators.

9. The second monitoring round will build on the success and lessons of the first round and particularly its six established indicators and, where feasible, incorporate the global pilot indicators. Drawing on lessons learned in the first monitoring round, the following recommendations for improvement will be incorporated into the second monitoring round:

- a. investing in communications and consultations to better sensitise all stakeholders to the monitoring effort, through organisation of a series of pre-monitoring workshops as well as effective utilisation of an online helpdesk and information updates to facilitate stronger involvement of the constituencies involved in the monitoring process for stronger awareness and engagement;
- b. further structuring the approach to data validation, including a clear process mapping of stakeholder responsibilities and timeline to ensure quality and comprehensiveness of data reported at country level; and
- c. ensuring strong engagement of the Steering Committee and Co-Chairs to ensure broad consultation and support for the monitoring approach and active stakeholder participation in the process.

Expected outputs of this process:

- Refined process and agreed final timeline for the second monitoring round;
- Refined Monitoring Guide document to facilitate stakeholders' engagement in the second monitoring round; and
- Data and analysis compiled into a second Progress Report.

10. **Further work to refine the remaining four global pilot indicators.** The 2012 agreement foresaw the inclusion of four new indicators to the Global Partnership monitoring framework. During the first GPEDC biennium, extensive work took place to develop measurement

approaches for each. At the same time, different challenges were encountered, including identifying technically sound measurement approaches to political commitments that encompass complex substantive topics, limited data availability, and limited time frame for broad stakeholder consultation and engagement. While all these indicators have evolved considerably since their inception, much further work remains to translate them into fully operational monitoring approaches.

11. There is a specific technical work stream and consultation process to refine the assessment methodology for each pilot indicator. The JST is resourcing the technical work necessary to strengthen and refine the four global pilot indicators' methodology and processes. This work will engage GPEDC constituencies through collaboration with relevant stakeholder bodies, Building Blocks and Voluntary Initiatives and will entail piloting revised methodologies in developing countries. Annex A outlines the background, rationale, and updates on the work and planned activities for the four global pilot indicators.

Expected outputs of this process:

- Refined assessment methodology (methodological note) for each of the four global pilot indicators;
- Results from the piloting of revised methodologies;
- Based on piloting results, incorporation of pilot indicators into the second monitoring round as feasible.

12. **Reviewing the monitoring framework to ensure its relevance to future accountability efforts.** Building on the existing monitoring framework as a model for mutual accountability on quality of co-operation and partnerships, this work will include:

- A review of strengths and weaknesses of the current indicators. As one form of 'stress testing' the indicators, this work would aim to identify what works in the current indicators and what aspects may need to be further improved in view of future monitoring efforts. Any desk reviews of strengths and weaknesses would then be complemented during the second monitoring round, which would offer the opportunity to 'stress test' the indicators in action;
- The identification of relevant existing indicators (with possible elements of refinement) and/or additional indicators; and
- The preparation of a refined monitoring framework (indicators and associated multi-stakeholder process) through a consultative process engaging GP constituencies. If feasible, piloting refined indicators may be embedded in the second monitoring round.

Guiding principles for this review:

- Future Global Partnership monitoring efforts should build on previously agreed principles (Busan) and parameters (selectivity, global-light and country-focused framework, building on existing developing country data, systems and accountability processes).
- The review and associated refinements to the monitoring framework will seek to inform the preparation process for financing for development and inter-governmental dialogue on the SDGs, their means of implementation and accountability in the Post-2015 context, so

as to position the GPEDC monitoring framework effectively in subsequent global accountability efforts.

- The next High-Level Meeting of the Global Partnership would endorse the refined monitoring framework, its process, indicators and associated targets.

ENVISAGED ROLE OF AN INDEPENDENT ADVISORY GROUP

13. To support these three tracks respectively, an **Independent Advisory Group** will provide a sounding board and advice to refine the monitoring framework (indicators and associated multi-stakeholder process) and help ensure its relevance also for post-2015 accountability efforts. The envisaged specific roles of the Independent Advisory Group in relation to the three work streams are set out below.

- **Track 1 on implementing a strengthened second monitoring round:** The Group would contribute expertise particularly to quality assurance of the Second Progress Report, supporting the translation of the results and key findings into actionable and policy relevant recommendations.
- **Track 2 on refining the four global pilot indicators:** The Group would provide expertise for technical review of the measurement approaches and recommendations on the refinement of the overall monitoring approach.
- **Track 3 on reviewing the Global Partnership monitoring framework to ensure its relevance:** The Group would provide recommendations for all the envisaged components of the review process, playing a particular role in defining and reviewing the “stress-test” process for individual indicators to assess their strengths, weaknesses, room for improvement and overall relevance to post-2015 efforts.

14. The proposed Terms of Reference note for this Independent Advisory Group has been submitted for endorsement by the Steering Committee ahead of the January Steering Committee meeting.

DETAILED TIMELINE OF UPCOMING MONITORING EFFORTS

Three Tracks of Strengthening Robustness and Relevance of the Monitoring Framework			
	Compliance to the 2012 Agreement – Implementation of a stronger second round		Relevance to Post-2015 efforts
DATE	(1) Strengthening the multi-stakeholder process for conducting the second monitoring round, building on the six established indicators complemented with the four global pilot indicators as progress allows	(2) Refining four global pilot indicators	(3) Relevance to post-2015 efforts –reviewing the monitoring framework to ensure its relevance to future accountability efforts
July 2014- Jan 2015	JST: Light stock-take of the first monitoring round process <u>Output:</u> Proposed recommendations to strengthen the second monitoring round process.	JST: Refinement of four global pilot indicators Consultation and technical work to refine and finalise the pilot indicators: transparency, results, private sector engagement, enabling environment for civil society. <u>Output:</u> Methodological and process updates for each pilot indicator.	JST: Preparation of proposal for the review process, and practical work to prepare the establishment of an Independent Advisory Group, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation of Concept note, • Proposed memberships • Preliminary work plan. <u>Output:</u> Concept note with proposed memberships and preliminary work plan.
Jan 15-June 15	JST: Preparation of the second monitoring round Revised guidance note with particular focus on engagement of stakeholders in the monitoring process; more structured approach to data validation; and organisation of pre-monitoring workshops.	JST: Refinement of methodologies and assessment/piloting process for the four global pilot indicators. Each of the four pilot indicators will have its technical work and consultation with relevant stakeholders and Building Blocks. More detail on work envisaged for each pilot indicator is included in the Annex A. Independent Advisory Group: expertise for technical review of the measurement approaches and recommendations on the refinement of the overall monitoring approach.	Independent Advisory Group supported by JST: Convening the Group and initiating work. The Group will play a key role in reviewing the GP monitoring framework to ensure its relevance to post-2015 accountability efforts. The Group will prepare its work plan to provide recommendations for all the envisaged components of the review process, playing a particular role in defining and reviewing the “stress-test” process for individual indicators to assess their strengths, weaknesses, room for improvement and overall relevance to post-2015 efforts.

Mid-2015 [Month to be confirmed]	Steering Committee meeting <i>Update from Co-chairs and JST on:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed refined methodology and assessment process for the four global pilot indicators. <i>SC endorsement on:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The strengthened framework, process and timeline for the second monitoring round. The process for strengthening the relevance of the GPEDC monitoring framework. 		
June 2015	JST: Second monitoring round and report <i>(the timeline will ultimately be guided by the timing of the second HLM)</i> <p>The round will consist of guidance, stakeholder outreach and technical support to roll-out the monitoring process at country level, country-level data collection and validation, data review and analysis, Progress Report production.</p> <p>This round will build on the six established indicators, and will include an assessment of the state of implementation of the four global pilot indicators, as feasible depending on the refinement of the methodologies. The second round will be the opportunity to 'stress-test' all 10 indicators with a view of ensuring their relevance for post-2015 efforts.</p> <p>Independent Advisory Group: contribute expertise particularly to quality assurance of the Second Progress Report, supporting the translation of the results and key findings into actionable and policy relevant recommendations.</p>	JST: Refinement of methodologies and assessment/piloting process for the four global pilot indicators. <p>Each of the four pilot indicators will have its technical work and consultation with relevant stakeholders and Building Blocks. Some of the indicators might be ready for quantitative assessment based on the progress on consultation and refinement of technical methodology, whereas others may still provide global snapshots on the state of play on these commitments without necessarily providing quantitative assessments of progress.</p> <p>The objective is nevertheless to include all pilot indicators in their particular iterative phase into the second monitoring round to ensure sustained political focus and dialogue on these key commitments – which is, alongside quantitative analysis, a key purpose of the global monitoring reports.</p>	Independent Advisory Group supported by JST: A review of the relevance of the GPEDC monitoring framework for the Post-2015/FfD <p>Consideration of best working arrangements to support a consultative process and country-led accountability and monitoring.</p> <p>Proposed areas of refinement in the context of post-2015 and setting out necessary technical work on methodology, indicators, etc.</p> <p>Preparation of SC proposal for the refined monitoring framework for the HLM 2016.</p> <p><i>SC endorsement on:</i></p> <p>The refined GP monitoring framework.</p>
2016 HLM	<i>Presentation by Co-chairs and JST on:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The <i>Progress Report</i> from the Second Monitoring Round to inform the HLM discussions. The proposal for a refined GP monitoring framework. 		<i>High-Level Meeting endorses:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The refined GP monitoring framework.

Stakeholder consultation: to ensure inputs and support from all GPEDC constituencies, the JST will use a range of channels of consultation, such as online questionnaires, e-discussions, Steering Committee meetings, meetings of the Independent Advisory Group, events such as regional workshops and a series of pre-monitoring workshops. The JST will make sure outreach efforts are timely and well-targeted.

Annex A: Updates and Planned Activities for the Four Global Pilot Indicators

INDICATOR 1 “Development co-operation is focused on results that meet developing countries’ priorities”

INDICATOR 2 “Civil society operates within an environment which maximises its engagement in and contribution to development”

INDICATOR 3 “Engagement and contribution of the private sector to development”

INDICATOR 4 “Transparency indicator: information on development co-operation is publicly available”

Note: The work on the pilot indicators is underway – any updates on progress made between the issuing of this paper and the Steering Committee meeting will be provided as relevant in the form of room documents.

INDICATOR 1 “DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION IS FOCUSED ON RESULTS THAT MEET DEVELOPING COUNTRIES’ PRIORITIES”

BACKGROUND

The Paris Declaration (2005) and the Accra Agenda for Action (2008) provide key milestones to improve the quality of ODA and its impact on development results. In both agreements providers of development co-operation commit to rely on developing countries’ own results frameworks and monitoring and evaluation systems. This was reaffirmed in Busan (2011):

“Where initiated by the developing country, transparent, country-led and country-level results frameworks and platforms will be adopted 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. Providers of development co-operation will minimise their use of additional frameworks, refraining from requesting the introduction of performance indicators that are not consistent with countries’ national development strategies (§18 b).”

In this context, the Global Partnership indicator on the use of country results frameworks aims to assess the extent to which providers of development co-operation use developing country results frameworks as a basis for their development co-operation. Use of these frameworks is considered from two perspectives: (1) use of objectives and targets from the national development strategy as a reference for project and programme delivery and performance assessment; and (2) use of the country’s own indicators, national statistics and monitoring and evaluation systems to monitor progress.

INDICATOR DEVELOPMENT AND APPROACH

The methodology developed for this indicator in 2013 assessed the successful utilisation of country results frameworks. It built on the assumption that providers’ funding disbursed through modalities that are closely tied to country results frameworks (for example budget support), would provide an indication of the overall level of providers’ funding channelled in support of national priorities/expenditure programmes. Providers’ use of results frameworks was measured based on a combination of quantitative and qualitative information to assess;

- a. Providers’ ability to deliver development co-operation through modalities closely associated with country results frameworks; and
- b. Developing country governments’ perception of the degree to which providers do so in an effective manner.

By taking into account both the providers’ use of delivery modalities that are typically associated with the use of country results frameworks and stakeholders’ perceptions of provider behaviour, the assessment sought to capture a better understanding of progress in this area.

Challenges identified in the piloting of the Use of Country Results Indicator

The piloting of the indicator was undertaken in eight countries. Although the limited sample size of countries did not enable establishing a comprehensive assessment of the state of play in the first monitoring report, the pilot exercise did indicate variation in co-operation providers’ development partners’ ability to use country results frameworks.

The pilot exercise, discussions during the Global Partnership post-monitoring workshop in Abidjan (February 2014) as well as follow-up discussions with some of the pilot countries noted that the pilot process of gathering necessary quantitative information and defining the country results framework were complex and time consuming.

The Global Partnership Busan annual workshop held in Seoul (November 2014) provided an opportunity to discuss this indicator with stakeholders and helped to identify important challenges for refining the methodology:

- **No consistent definition of country results frameworks.** Country results frameworks define a country's nationally owned approach to results and the associated M&E systems for measuring and reporting on performance towards the achievement of these results. Such frameworks are structured by strategic objectives derived from nationally-developed priorities. These priorities are drawn from national development strategies, sector plans, and other frameworks such as budget support performance matrices as agreed through appropriate consultative processes with relevant stakeholders. These strategic objectives are to be achieved through results-based outcomes and outputs associated to each objective. Given this breadth and sometimes complex structure of national results frameworks, the indicator piloting pointed out that there is no single definition or common understanding of what constitutes a country results framework. Each of the pilot countries had a different interpretation of country results frameworks, and the scope of the framework also varied – from overarching national frameworks to sector, programme, and project level frameworks.
- **Inherently different standards and approaches in the design of country results frameworks as well as in the nature of their use** (Country results frameworks can be used both as a planning and management tool as well as an accountability tool). At national level, there are many cases where development co-operation providers are engaged in consultative processes in the design of a country results framework (i.e. national development strategy and associated results framework) as well as in the review of development achievements and performance. Using national results frameworks as a planning and management tool is not uncommon; there are cases where development co-operation providers are informed by these frameworks to design their own development co-operation strategies and programmes. However, the use of national results frameworks as an accountability tool is less common: limitations to the quality and robustness of the country results framework, in particular, their M&E systems for measuring and reporting on performance and the achievement of development results, were often cited by co-operation providers as bottlenecks to the use of these frameworks as an accountability tool.
- **Quantifying the level of providers' alignment and use of country results frameworks is complex.** The piloting approach used providers' disbursements through certain co-operation modalities as a proxy for the use of country results frameworks. However, the piloting process revealed challenges related to this proxy, and raised questions about whether this simplified approach could sufficiently capture the dynamics related to provider behaviour in this area. To this end, a quantitative proxy approach is confirmed to be a challenge, pointing to the need to consider qualitative measurement approaches focusing more on perceptions of provider behaviour. However, some participants in the Seoul workshop noted the need to maintain a quantifiable

measurement focusing on providers' disbursements aligned to support country priorities as identified in the results framework.

PROPOSED WAY FORWARD FOR DEVELOPING THE INDICATOR

There is a need to further explore both qualitative and quantitative approaches to measuring providers' level of alignment and their use of country results framework. Discussions on the use of country results frameworks commonly evoke discussions on the concerns about the quality of the frameworks. Considerations on the quality of country results frameworks relate particularly to providers' deliberations on this topic. While the quality of frameworks is essentially linked to the topic of using these systems, for the purposes of constructing an indicator approach it would be important to seek to draw a distinction between these two aspects and facilitate stakeholder discussions on how a structured approach to assessing the use of country results frameworks might be developed. This may take into account also quality aspects, but should avoid circular deliberations where quality considerations prevent discussing the use of these frameworks.

The following areas will need further consideration to refine the methodology:

- Simplified country-monitoring process drawing on easy-to-gather information with common definitions of a results framework;
- Further exploring the availability of quantitative proxies that reflect providers' use of country results frameworks;
- Exploring qualitative assessment options, where perception-based approaches may be complemented by more in-depth country analysis on institutional, policy and operational factors. In this context, the following aspects may be considered:
 - Perception of the degree to which providers directly use country results frameworks, with further consideration to include analysis of incentives for use of these frameworks.
 - Perception of the degree to which providers' use of these frameworks serve to strengthen them, including providers' active involvement in developing and strengthening these frameworks.
- Considering assessment of the quality of country results framework, focusing on core elements such as linkages to overall strategic development objectives; collaboration and consultation in designing the results framework; its linkages to M&E framework; reporting and its linkages to the subsequent planning and implementation cycles.

If quantifying the level of providers' alignment proves to be too complex, the assessment of progress in this area may require a more qualitative questionnaire/survey type process at country level. In this case a questionnaire would be developed to capture stakeholders' perceptions on providers' use of country results frameworks. Further consultation with stakeholders, including the Building Block on Results and Accountability, will aim to identify simplified questions for a qualitative perception-based assessment on the use of country results frameworks. Further consideration and consultation is however needed to ensure the objectivity of the assessment and avoid an anecdotal assessment.

Next steps envisaged: The Joint Support Team plans to facilitate further collaboration with the Building Block on Results and Accountability as well as results based management specialists both from providers as well as developing countries to identify ways to further structure an indicator approach in this area.

INDICATOR 2 “CIVIL SOCIETY OPERATES WITHIN AN ENVIRONMENT WHICH MAXIMISES ITS ENGAGEMENT IN AND CONTRIBUTION TO DEVELOPMENT”

BACKGROUND

The Busan Partnership agreement called on stakeholders to “implement fully [their] respective commitments to enable CSOs to exercise their roles as independent development actors, with a particular focus on an enabling environment, consistent with agreed international rights, that maximises the contributions of CSOs to development” (§22a). While there is broad consensus on the importance of an enabling environment for CSOs to operate and engage in development, a range of views exist on what an enabling environment entails.

Upon agreeing on the Global Partnership monitoring framework in 2012, it was decided that the indicator related to the above commitment would draw on a new Enabling Environment Index (EEI), which at the time was under development by CIVICUS, the World Alliance for Citizen Participation. The CIVICUS EEI, a global composite index using secondary data to understand the propensity of citizens to participate in civil society, was developed and piloted in 2013.

INDICATOR DEVELOPMENT AND APPROACH

It had been initially envisaged that the Global Partnership indicator on the enabling environment for CSOs would focus on sub-dimensions of the CIVICUS-EEI relating to the Busan commitment, which is to enable CSOs to exercise their role as independent development actors and to maximise their contribution to development. These EEI sub-dimensions relate to the legal and regulatory framework for civil society organisations. However, CIVICUS encountered challenges related to availability of primary data from the country level, and eventually both these EEI sub-dimensions were based on a single source (USAID CSO Sustainability Index) with limited country coverage. This development made it difficult to rely on the CIVICUS EEI alone to build a Global Partnership indicator to assess progress on a country-by-country basis that would provide a robust basis for meaningful dialogue on the state of enabling environment for CSOs within the Global Partnership.

Alongside pointing to the lack of country-level primary data on CSO enabling environment, the experience from the first Global Partnership monitoring round highlighted the keen interest from countries to root the assessment at the country level, including by engaging developing country governments in the design and implementation of any assessment, and finding means to facilitate country-level multi-stakeholder dialogue on enabling environment. Furthermore, the process around the first monitoring round highlighted a clear need to ensure an inclusive and multi-stakeholder process for developing the indicator to ensure credibility and support for the assessment approach.

Many of these challenges and lessons were highlighted in the first Progress Report and in discussions around the Mexico High-Level Meeting. As immediate follow-up to the first monitoring round, the Joint Support Team undertook a stock-take exercise of the full monitoring effort to identify the challenges and consider ways forward, including on individual indicators. Related to this indicator, the Joint Support Team engaged in discussions with the Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment (including CPDE) to identify options forward and possible synergies between ongoing work, including the Task Team’s Voluntary Initiative launched in Mexico on ‘CSO enabling environment and guidelines’.

PROPOSED WAY FORWARD FOR DEVELOPING THE INDICATOR

Building on this work, the proposed way forward is to complement the work of CIVICUS with additional qualitative evidence to identify some trends and challenges on the path towards an enabling environment for CSOs. Given the complexity of this topic, an iterative process is proposed, where a first phase would take the form of a simple approach of undertaking a preliminary assessment through a country-level questionnaire and, in parallel, conducting a desk study to complement the questionnaire approach.

Key elements of a questionnaire approach

The purpose of a questionnaire would be to convene dialogue between the developing country government, CSOs and co-operation providers at country level. By facilitating a joint exercise to fill in the questionnaire, it would serve as a tool for sparking dialogue – not as an indicator per se at this stage.

The questionnaire would be structured around key elements of enabling environment, with the aim that a) this structure helps forge multi-stakeholder agreement on what these key elements are; b) those elements are refined based on feedback and provide a basis for an indicator approach for the second Global Partnership monitoring round, and a basis for further developments in subsequent monitoring efforts.

It is proposed that the questionnaire would consist of three core modules, and be accompanied by a desk review as a complementary element. The three core modules would focus on questions targeted at national government, CSOs and co-operation providers respectively to allow a participatory and mutual engaging approach:

- a) **Space for multi-stakeholder dialogue – democratic ownership**, including process for multi-stakeholder dialogue, access to information and CSO capacity building and funding.
- b) **CSO effectiveness**, including development effectiveness of CSO operations and organisational effectiveness of CSO participation/representation in-country.
- c) **Official development co-operation with CSOs**, including co-operation providers' processes for CSO engagement and their actions to promote CSO enabling environment.

Alongside the questionnaire, it is envisaged that a desk study would provide complementary information on legal and regulatory environment where available. Any information from the desk-review would feed into the country dialogue around the questionnaire.

Stakeholder consultation and engagement

The development of the questionnaire would be done in close collaboration with the Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment and the CPDE (also a member of the Task Team), to ensure multi-stakeholder engagement and also that other work on CSO enabling environment maximally feeds into the development of the indicator, including the Task Team's Voluntary Initiative and country pilots planned within this initiative.

The Busan Global Partnership annual workshop held in Seoul (November 2014) provided an opportunity to discuss the proposed approach with stakeholders and to define next steps for

future work in refining the pilot indicator. Participants were supportive of the proposed iterative approach and of the envisaged inclusive process bringing together the Joint Support Team, the CPDE and the Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment to further discuss and refine the questionnaire approach and the accompanying desk study as well as to ensure stakeholder consultation.

Next steps envisaged

- The Joint Support Team will identify opportunities for convening discussions to refine the approach with the CPDE and the Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment.
- The approach would be piloted in 1-3 countries (February - May 2015), with the objective of agreeing on a finalised assessment process (questionnaire + country-level multi-stakeholder dialogue) to use for the Global Partnership second monitoring round envisaged for 2015-16.

MORE INFORMATION ON PRELIMINARY IDEAS FOR THE CONTENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND DESK STUDY

Questionnaire: Three core modules

A. Space for multi-stakeholder dialogue – democratic ownership [incorporates approaches from CPDE Working Group on Enabling Environment and Task Team on Enabling Environment and Development Effectiveness]


- i. Are there inclusive and accessible processes for multi-stakeholder dialogue / engagement on development policy and programming? Are these institutionalised? Are there feedback mechanisms?
- ii. Access to information – do CSOs have the right to access relevant government information, by law and in practice? *[This question could alternatively feature in the desk study research module under legal and regulatory environment]*
- iii. Are there means for addressing capacity building of all stakeholders to engage meaningfully in multi-stakeholder dialogue, including CSO access to funding? *[This question could alternatively feature in the desk study research module under legal and regulatory environment]*

B. CSO effectiveness *[Note: For a questionnaire approach there would be a technical aggregation challenge to consolidate feedback from a multitude of CSOs at country level]*

- i. Development effectiveness – what progress are CSOs making on key elements of Istanbul Principles?
- ii. Organisational effectiveness – do co-ordination structures exist to facilitate consolidated CSO representation in policy dialogue (e.g. umbrella organisation, consultation practices), and to facilitate coordination on programming among CSOs and with others?

C. Official development co-operation with CSOs *[Note: For a questionnaire approach there would be a technical aggregation challenge to consolidate feedback from a multitude of co-operation providers for one developing country]*

- a) Inclusive processes for CSO engagement – are providers creating inclusive processes for CSO policy engagement on donor strategies at all levels (HQ, partner countries)?
- b) Based on the OECD/DAC approved 12 lessons for partnering with CSOs, how are providers promoting CSO enabling environment through a CSO policy, through financing



mechanisms and in their administrative requirements? *[Note that providers within the Task Team are also developing a code of conduct for CSO engagement, which could provide further elements for this question]*

Desk study: Fourth complementary research module to shed light on legal and regulatory environment

The research community could provide evidence on legal and regulatory frameworks for CSOs where such evidence exists/is available. Issues covered could relate for example to CSO formation and registration, and access to information and funding (see above – if not included directly in the questionnaire).

It is important to note that this information should also feed into the country-level dialogue around the questionnaire, in order to secure buy-in for the analysis and to spark relevant dialogue. This means the desk study could not be detached from the country-level process, but should be sequenced to feed maximally into the questionnaire and dialogue process at country level.

INDICATOR 3 ON “ENGAGEMENT AND CONTRIBUTION OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR TO DEVELOPMENT”

BACKGROUND

The Busan Partnership agreement (BPa) paragraph 32 recognises “the central role of the private sector in advancing innovation, creating wealth, income and jobs, mobilising domestic resources and in turn contributing to poverty reduction”. Upon agreeing on the Global Partnership monitoring framework in 2012, the political negotiation led by the Post-Busan Interim Group resulted in a decision that the indicator related to private sector engagement would focus specifically on the Busan commitment to: “Enable the participation of the private sector in the design and implementation of development policies and strategies to foster sustainable growth and poverty reduction” (BPa paragraph 32 b).

This international agreement to focus on this specific paragraph stems from the fact the Busan High-Level Forum saw a broad recognition of the for-profit private sector as a central driver of development, and placed great emphasis on the importance of inclusive dialogue for building a policy environment conducive to sustainable development, where consultation with the private sector in the elaboration of national and sector plans is seen as a prerequisite to broadening country ownership of the development process and ensuring inclusive growth. This recognition was confirmed in the Joint Statement on “Expanding and Enhancing Public Private Partnership for Broad-based, Inclusive and Sustainable Growth”, endorsed in Busan by over 40 representatives from the public and private sector and multilateral organisations – representing a significant step forward in defining how the private sector can best contribute to development co-operation.

The decision of the Post Busan Interim Group (PBIG) to focus the Global Partnership monitoring indicator on the engagement of the private sector in the development planning process meant that the indicator would not capture other elements, such as assessing the enabling environment for private sector or capturing the development impact of private sector operations. While generating development impact is the ultimate aim of all stakeholders endorsing the Busan Partnership agreement, the Busan spirit focuses on effective development partnerships, which are the prerequisite for ensuring development impact. Focusing on the engagement of private sector in public sector dialogue and policy making aims to reveal strengths and room for improvement in public-private engagement, which is essential to increase participation of the private sector in promoting an enabling environment and, ultimately, to maximise the private sector’s contribution to sustainable growth and poverty reduction.

INDICATOR DEVELOPMENT AND APPROACH

Following the agreement of the monitoring framework in 2012 the Joint Support Team, partnering with the World Bank Open Private Sector programme and others, launched a stock-taking exercise of existing tools and indicators in this domain, and drafted a preliminary methodology for this indicator approach. The proposed methodology was discussed and revised after a series of consultations over 2013-14 (workshops and online consultation through the Global Partnership Team Works community). Dialogue among interested stakeholders, including discussions within the Busan Building Block on Public-Private Co-operation, have confirmed that the monitoring and evaluation framework provided in the Public-Private Dialogue Handbook (B. Herzberg and Wright

A., 2006)¹ provides a useful basis for further work on the indicator. These existing tools provided a basis to focus this indicator approach on measuring the **quality of public-private dialogue (PPD)** in all participating countries.²

15. Consultations and collaboration with the World Bank yielded the recommendation to create a **Public-Private Dialogue Country Profile** composed of three elements. For a given country, the review focuses on a specific agreed upon dialogue platform and looks at the country-level context for public-private dialogue following a standard methodology using three existing tools:

- a. Legal and regulatory context for PPD (a series of existing governance-related indicators)
- b. Country's readiness to host, create or sustain a dialogue process (PPD Diamond)
- c. Organisational effectiveness of a given platform (PPD evaluation wheel)

The PPD Country Profiles are seen as strategic for the development effectiveness agenda as they will provide a systematic overview of the conditions in which public-private dialogue takes place, the potential for dialogue, and the efficiency of the dialogue process. The Profiles would help countries improve their development impact by strengthening the country-level context for public-private dialogue, either directly or through follow-up operational support or technical assistance.

During the first Global Partnership monitoring round, the assessment tool was still being tested. The Global Partnership's Progress Report (April 2014) highlighted how challenging the development of an indicator on private sector had been. Challenges included: i) the need to identify proxies for private sector engagement, drawing on existing methodology in such a complex area, while facilitating a relative scarcity of comparative data for creating this tool, and ii) involving a wide range of public and private actors (such as domestic and foreign companies, large companies and SMEs, and professional associations). As indicated in the Progress Report, further thinking and consultation are needed to ensure that the indicator provides incentives for developing sustainable forms of structured public-private dialogue.

In light of these lessons and challenges, the methodology is currently being reviewed by the Overseas Development Institute, and tested through four pilots which are being run in parallel. Columbia, Ethiopia, Tajikistan, and the Philippines were selected for these pilots. While the Joint Support Team covers the related costs, the World Bank team helps overseeing the quality of the pilots and participates to their implementation.

PROPOSED WAY FORWARD FOR REFINING THE INDICATOR

The Busan Global Partnership annual workshop held in Seoul (November 2014) provided an opportunity to discuss with stakeholders emerging challenges and considerations for future work in refining the pilot indicator. While participants acknowledged the soundness of the PPD methodology and its utility to help governments champion the development agenda through public-private dialogue in their respective countries, questions were raised on the scope of the

1. The Public-Private Dialogue Handbook is an initiative aimed at building knowledge and capacity for public-private dialogue. It is hosted in the World Bank Institute and has been sponsored by DFID, the World Bank, IFC, and the OECD Development Centre.

2. <http://effectivecooperation.org/files/about-trackingprogress/INDICATORS.pdf>

measurement (making sure it is feasible, reflects the GPEDC's mission and is clearly linked to the Busan Principles) as well as on the consultation process and operationalisation strategy.

Next steps envisaged

- The methodology for the indicator will be updated to 1) further clarify and reflect the rationale for the scope and type of indicator, especially how it relates to the Busan Principles; and 2) to incorporate the feedback from country pilots and the peer review process with the Overseas Development Institute.
- The Joint Support Team will organise a specific round of consultation with relevant stakeholders and work to amend the methodology accordingly. The Joint Support Team will particularly seek stronger consultation and support from the private sector at global and country level.
- Results of the four pilots, assembled into country profiles, will be widely shared to collect feedback.

The Joint Support Team, in consultation with stakeholders, will explore options to 1) operationalise the indicator through an implementation and resource plan to roll out the indicator in additional countries and 2) seek to ensure the utility of the tool to contribute to private sector engagement in public policies and to strengthening public-private dialogue platforms at country level to facilitate better development impact of private sector operations.

MORE INFORMATION ON THE PUBLIC PRIVATE DIALOGUE (PPD) TOOL

At the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan, Korea (2011), a Joint Statement on “Expanding and Enhancing Public Private Partnership for Broad-based, Inclusive and Sustainable Growth” was endorsed by governments and representatives from the public and private sector and civil society organisations.

The statement recognises that the for-profit private sector is a central driver of development and emphasises the importance of inclusive dialogue for building a policy environment conducive to sustainable development, where consultation with the private sector in the elaboration of national and sector plans is seen as a prerequisite to broadening country ownership of the development process and ensuring inclusive growth, and expanding economic opportunity for all segments of the population.

For the purpose of monitoring the implementation of aid effectiveness commitments, the Post-Busan Interim Group decided to include an indicator to assess private sector engagement. This global indicator is to measure specifically the implementation of paragraph (32b) of the Joint statement: “Enable the participation of the private sector in the design and implementation of development policies and strategies to foster sustainable growth and poverty reduction”.

Implementing development-oriented reforms requires the private sector, the government and development partners to reach high levels of co-operation. Dialogue and advocacy initiatives can serve as the umbrella public-private process and outlet under which existing energies can be better channelled, leveraged and organised.

Structured dialogue between the government and private sector aimed at improving development and sustainable growth takes many forms. They can involve informal input from a few leading corporations or wide-ranging consultations with SMEs, business groups, the financial sector,

labour unions and civil society. The dialogue mechanisms can be initiated by governments, lobbied for by business people or driven by donors. They can be local, national or regional, structured along industry lines or organised according to cross-cutting topics. What they all have in common is giving formal structure and expression to the common desire of businesses and governments to create conditions in which the private sector can flourish and where development can happen.

Their core value is twofold: governments that listen to the private sector are more likely to design credible and workable reforms, while entrepreneurs who understand what a government is trying to achieve with a reform program are more likely to be constructive and supportive. Dialogue helps to reveal to governments the likely micro-economic foundations for growth, but it also creates a sense of ownership of reform programs among the business community which makes policies more likely to succeed in practice.

For these reasons, recent years have seen an upsurge in interest in reform advocacy, public-private dialogue (PPD), and comprehensive reform platforms as a means for promoting collaborative development. Business forums, investor advisory councils, competitiveness coalitions and other types of comprehensive and systematised partnerships have become an important part of the development reform process.

Development partners over time have sponsored a number of these initiatives. They were not conceived an end in themselves, but were created as umbrella processes to carry forward specific policy reform programmes from diagnosis and prioritisation to the implementation stage. Findings support that such advocacy mechanisms, when applied on specific substantive issues, and when organised in an efficient and fair manner, have served as a quite efficient implementation interface between the private sector, the government and the development partners. They also often help create coalitions for reform that help generate political will. But findings also demonstrate that there is a high level of risk inherent to such initiatives.

However, public-private dialogue platforms are not a panacea. When done badly, not only can they can waste the time and resources of participants, they can also worsen the problems they were intended to solve. A number of risks have been identified in previous studies. 1) If not sufficiently transparent and broad-based, PPDs can reinforce vested interests and create opportunities for rent-seeking behaviour. 2) If PPD initiatives do not make special efforts to include small and medium enterprises and those based in provinces, they can be dominated by big businesses or businesses based in a capital city. 3) If poorly planned and unfocused, a PPD can degenerate into a talking shop, which leads to disillusionment, disengagement and loss of credibility, giving strength to opponents of reform and slowing down the reform process. 4) If built too closely around a particular individual, a PPD can risk becoming a one-man show, which collapses when the key person loses interest or moves on. 5) If not accompanied by sufficient efforts to build a broad base of support, PPD can become politicised by being closely associated with a particular party. 6) If not sufficiently well coordinated with existing institutions or other dialogue mechanisms, duplication of efforts can overburden and confuse participants. These risk factors are raised not to suggest that PPDs are fraught with danger, but to show how awareness and careful planning can help participants to avoid potential pitfalls.

The contexts in which PPDs operate influence them greatly. Four key contextual factors are necessary to consider when appraising the potential for PPD in a given country:

- a) The readiness and willingness of the private sector to engage and interact.

- b) The readiness and willingness of the government to engage and interact.
- c) The presence of a potential champion who can facilitate the dialogue process, activate political will and reduce the trust gap between public and private sector stakeholders.
- d) The availability of logistical, financing, and capacity building instruments which can help implement and monitor the dialogue process.

PPDs also do not take place in a legal and regulatory vacuum. A country would be more or less prone to dialogue if some pre-requisite are in place, such as the right for the private sector to organise in associations and express its voice, the right for the private sector to access public policy information or the legal deterrence of collusion between the private sector and the government.

Taking these factors into account and with a view of providing strategic overview of the condition in which dialogue take place, the potential for dialogue, and the quality of the dialogue process, the Joint Support Team intends to produce, in collaboration with the World Bank, a series of PPD Country Profiles.

Scope and objectives of the PPD profile

The review will focus on a specific agreed upon dialogue platform and look also at the country-level context for public-private dialogue following a strict methodology using three tools:

- Country's readiness to host, create or sustain a dialogue process (PPD Diamond)
- Organisational effectiveness of a given platform (shortened PPD evaluation wheel)
- Legal and regulatory context for PPD (a series of existing governance-related indicators)

INDICATOR 4 “TRANSPARENCY INDICATOR: INFORMATION ON DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION IS PUBLICLY AVAILABLE”

BACKGROUND

The Busan Partnership agreement commits providers of development co-operation to implement a “common, open standard for electronic publication of timely, comprehensive, and forward-looking information on resources provided through development co-operation, taking into account the statistical reporting of OECD and complementary efforts of International Aid Transparency Initiative and others” (BPA §23c). The common standard was endorsed by the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness in July 2012. It is built on three existing systems – the OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS)/Forward-Spending Survey (FSS) and International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI). The Global Partnership monitoring framework, endorsed at the same meeting in July 2012, defined the indicator on transparency to “measure the state of implementation of the common standard by co-operation providers”. The deadline set out in BPA §23c was “to aim to fully implement” the common standard by December 2015.

INDICATOR DEVELOPMENT AND APPROACH

The pilot indicator was developed through a process of consultations and technical deliberations. The principles underpinning the indicator approach reflected the Busan commitment to electronically publish timely, comprehensive and forward-looking information, and were informed by feedback received in February 2013 from the Ad Hoc Group on the common standard, which brokered the standard itself. The Joint Support Team led further consultations with the secretariats supporting the common standard systems – namely the OECD-DAC and IATI secretariats – and subsequently led the work of a core group of experts to finalise a proposal. The Joint Support Team issued its indicator proposal for online consultation in October–November 2013. Based on feedback received, the team finalised the methodology and piloted the revised indicator to produce a preliminary assessment and lessons learnt for the first High-Level Meeting of the Global Partnership. In practice, the data was provided by the IATI and OECD/DAC secretariats, with the Joint Support Team leading the overall assessment.

After the piloting exercise, the WP-STAT as well as the IATI Steering Committee reflected separately on the indicator in September and October 2014, based on inputs from their respective secretariats on the lessons learned from the pilot assessment of the transparency indicator. There was broad acknowledgement that an insufficient time frame for consultation on the final methodology, and its application to individual Busan endorsers, led to a lack of political engagement and support for the pilot indicator assessment. While both IATI and WP-STAT discussions reconfirmed the importance of having a transparency indicator within the Global Partnership monitoring framework, they acknowledged the need to strengthen and refine the indicator methodology to better reflect the differences between the OECD and IATI reporting systems, and to allow sufficient time for consultation, in order to secure support for the second monitoring round.

CHALLENGES IDENTIFIED IN THE PILOTING OF THE TRANSPARENCY INDICATOR

A. Interpretation of Busan Partnership Agreement paragraph 23c. The commitment refers specifically to ‘electronic publication of information’ and the common standard is defined as three systems with electronic reporting and publication. There is also a Busan commitment to prepare implementation plans for the common standard. The Post-Busan Interim Group (PBIG), in

agreeing the Global Partnership monitoring framework, agreed on an indicator labelled as “Transparency: Information on development co-operation is publicly available” to measure “implementation of a common, open standard for electronic publication of timely, comprehensive and forward-looking information on development co-operation”. Furthermore, the PBIG indicated that the assessment should not involve the collection of new data at the country level.

Based on this agreement, the indicator methodology focused on assessing electronic reporting to the three systems of the common standard. The Ad Hoc Group on the common standard also concluded that as a guiding principle the indicator should measure actual reporting rather than plans. There are varying views on how to interpret para 23c to translate it into an indicator. While there remains broad support for the 2012 agreement to assess the timeliness, comprehensiveness and forward-looking nature of co-operation providers’ reporting to the systems of the common standard, some stakeholders question this approach, calling for more focus on common standard implementation plans. At the same time, some stakeholders do not support returning back to reopen debate about the basis for the assessment. Therefore, guidance would be needed on whether there is sufficient interest and support to change the PBIG agreement.

One clear limitation of the current approach lies in its stakeholder coverage: since the current indicator assesses reporting to the common standard, any providers of co-operation publishing online but not reporting to these three systems are not covered under the current indicator approach.

Also labelling of the indicator has sparked debate. In issuing the piloting methodology, the Joint Support Team assigned a more detailed indicator label to reflect the assessment approach: “Indicator methodology to measure transparency: publishing timely, comprehensive and forward-looking information on development co-operation resources”. Despite this, the indicator is commonly referred to as a transparency indicator. Some stakeholders have expressed the need to revise the name of the indicator, and concrete proposals on this would be useful as part of the indicator refinement process.

B. Interpretation of the common standard. Some stakeholders consider implementation of the common standard as reporting to all three of its systems, while others consider that the standard can be implemented even if not reporting to all three. The methodology for an indicator depends on how stakeholders wish to interpret the nature of the standard: whether reporting to the three systems is considered complementary or mandatory. This has implications for assessing and scoring providers’ reporting efforts. In 2012 the PBIG specified that the indicator should take the form of a scale which reflects efforts and recognises that compliance with the standard is not “all or nothing”. In response to this, the pilot methodology built on a complementary measurement approach. This means that providers’ reporting to both the OECD and IATI systems was assessed, and the best score out of the two used. This approach ensured that all providers reporting to any of the common standard systems were scored. If stakeholders decided to adopt the mandatory approach to interpreting the common standard, providers would receive recognition for their reporting to both OECD and IATI systems separately/cumulatively, building on the expectation that only by reporting to all systems is the standard fully implemented and therefore the maximum score attained.

C. Inherently different characteristics of data collected by each system. The OECD Creditor Reporting System provides statistical information, while the IATI publishes management information. They have different purposes, and the piloting approach already sought to reflect this

by applying a differentiated approach to scoring reporting in these systems. The inherent differences between the two systems and the type of data have implications for assessing the timeliness, comprehensiveness and forward-looking nature of information, and further ideas and solutions would be needed to further differentiate the indicator approach to these systems. This, together with interpretation of the common standard (see previous point) will together determine the desirability/feasibility of one indicator. The PBIG agreement clearly mandated the development of one global indicator. In the event that stakeholders see a need for significant differentiation within the common standard and its three systems, there may be a need to move from one indicator to a composite indicator that disaggregates performance against all three components. Whilst this approach may enable further differentiation, it should be noted that it will limit the scope for global aggregated snapshots to inform political dialogue on progress, which is the rationale for the selected indicators if the Global Partnership monitoring framework.

D. The issue of reporting quality is not adequately addressed in the current methodology.


While stakeholder consultations around the piloting indicated a strong ambition to include an assessment of quality of reporting into the indicator, no feasible technical solutions were available to incorporate this element in the piloting phase. Significant technical work and member-led proposals would be vital to help overcome this challenge and achieve this ambition, and it is important that this does not create an additional burden for developing countries.

E. Need to further clarify how the methodology is applied. The pilot indicator was comprised of assessing the three dimensions (1) timeliness (frequency and freshness/time lags); (2) comprehensiveness (level of detail and coverage of reporting); and (3) forward-looking reporting (how many years ahead information provided and how detailed the data is). Because the nature of the common standard systems is different, the application of the assessment approach was tailored to the systems separately. Efforts were made to explain the methodology to various stakeholders in the form of methodological documents as well as technical support to members around understanding and interpreting their piloting results. However, as the methodology is refined, it will be important to also intensify efforts to ensure technical understanding of the approach among all stakeholders, and its implications for measuring provider performance.

Alongside strengthening understanding of how the methodology will be applied, it is also important to clarify when any future assessment may take place. Going forward, it will be vital to ensure that all stakeholders are aware of the timing and approach of any following technical assessment, whilst also supporting Busan endorsers to meet their December 2015 implementation deadline.

PROPOSED WAY FORWARD

The Busan Global Partnership annual workshop held in Seoul (Nov 2014) provided an opportunity to discuss with stakeholders emerging challenges and consideration for future work in refining the pilot indicator. There was broad support for the indicator to measure actual reporting to the systems of the common standard (rather than plans) as a guiding principle. Taking note of the inherently different characteristics of data collected by each system that constitute the common standard, there was also broad recognition that all types of information (statistical, management and planning information) are important to advance transparency of development co-operation. While the end goal of the drive for transparency in development co-operation may eventually look at a mandatory approach whereby improved transparency aims to strengthen transparency of statistical information as well as management information, this approach may be politically premature, particularly given that currently different providers report



to different systems of the common standard and no common obligation exists for providers to report to all these systems.

Therefore, the current complementary approach was noted as appropriate. However, given the inherent difference in characteristics of the three systems, there is support for a composite indicator that disaggregates performance in all three reporting systems of the common standard and across all components of the Busan commitment. This could offer a pragmatic and flexible approach to capturing information on the current state of play of transparency in the context of the specific Busan commitment. Further efforts are however needed to ensure that such global drive for transparency is geared towards countries' needs.

Next steps envisaged

- Further consultation on a possible composite approach with relevant stakeholders and endorsement of this approach by the Steering Committee;
- Further technical work led by the secretariats and members of the common standard systems to identify feasible solutions to further differentiate the measurement approach to reporting in different systems, based on the different nature of information in each system respectively.
- A revised methodological note to set out a proposed approach in consultation with the DAC and IATI Secretariats, which will facilitate broader stakeholder consultations on a revised methodology; revision of this methodology based on feedback, and preparations of the next transparency assessment.