

Fragility poses a significant threat to global aspirations of achieving the 2030 Agenda

Recognising the reciprocal nature of sustainable development and peace, SDG 16 aims to promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions. Around 1.6 billion people currently live in fragile contexts¹. It is estimated that by 2030, fragile contexts will account for 80% of the world's poorest¹. Official development assistance (ODA) to fragile contexts has increased 26% in real terms from 2009 to 2016¹. To secure long-lasting development gains, it is critical to ensure that all resources spent in fragile contexts are used effectively.

Participation in the 2018 Global Partnership Monitoring Round

- ▶ 45 of 86 partner countries that participated in the 2018 Monitoring Round are considered to be affected by fragility according to the 2018 OECD States of Fragility report;
- ▶ 33 of these 45 are also least developed countries, and 5 are small island developing states;
- ▶ 12 of 15 partner countries considered to be 'extremely fragile' by the 2018 OECD States of Fragility report participated; and,
- ▶ All 20 G7+ countries participated.

Headline results of the 2018 Global Partnership Monitoring Round for fragile contexts

Alignment with national priorities

- Almost all (98%) fragile contexts have a **national development strategy** in place and 89% have a **country-owned results framework**. However, only 22% of fragile contexts report that they have timely, regular and accurate government data available to report on all or most indicators in their results framework.
- Development partner alignment with country-defined priorities is lower in extremely fragile contexts, where a smaller proportion of projects align their **objectives** to country development priorities (extremely fragile contexts 80%; other contexts 84%). Reliance on **government-defined results indicators** is higher in extremely fragile contexts (64% versus 58% in other contexts), while reliance on **statistics** (extremely fragile contexts 51%; other contexts 50%), and involvement of partner country governments in final **project evaluations** is similar for extremely fragile and other contexts (extremely fragile contexts 58%; other contexts 59%).

Use of country systems

- Fewer fragile contexts (42%) than the global average (65%) of partner countries have strengthened their **public financial management (PFM) systems**. Furthermore, 12% of fragile contexts saw no change, and 46% (global average 26%) saw a decline in the quality of their budget, procurement, audit, and financial reporting systems.
- Development partners' use of PFM systems is lower in fragile contexts. In extremely fragile contexts, 34% of development partners' funds that are disbursed to the public sector use PFM systems. In other contexts, 55% of development partners' funds use these systems.
- More broadly, while there has been a sharp global decline in the proportion of **development co-operation funding that went to the public sector** (80% in 2016, 65% in 2018) this is even more pronounced in extremely fragile contexts, from 77% in 2016 to 31% in 2018. At the same time, data from the OECD Creditor Reporting System show that there has been a slight increase, from 1.4% in 2015 to 1.5% in 2017, in the proportion of **core support to CSOs** in extremely fragile contexts as a share of total ODA disbursed in these contexts.

¹ Statistics from OECD (2016) and OECD (2018) States of Fragility reports, OECD Publishing Paris.

Inclusive country ownership

- In the development of their national strategy, all fragile contexts reported that they consulted at least one of the following: parliament, civil society, private sector, subnational governments, and/or development partners. However, while 75% of fragile contexts with a national development strategy stated that they consulted **civil society**, only 9% reported that they engaged civil society in a participatory process.
- Reporting on the quality of public-private dialogue, the views of government and **private sector stakeholders** regarding the relevance of such dialogue diverge sharply in extremely fragile contexts.

Predictability and national oversight

- Despite commitments to increase predictability in fragile contexts, **annual predictability** is lower in extremely fragile contexts (73%) than in non-fragile contexts (89%). On the other hand, the share of funds disbursed beyond what was originally scheduled is also much higher in extremely fragile contexts. This over disbursement is likely due to the unplanned and volatile nature of crisis that are prone to occur in extremely fragile contexts.
- Moreover, **medium-term predictability** - the availability of forward expenditure plans one, two, and three years in advance - is much lower in extremely fragile contexts (58% versus 67% in fragile or non-fragile contexts).
- Globally, less than two thirds (61%) of development co-operation were recorded on national budgets and subject to parliamentary scrutiny in 2018; this is lower in extremely fragile contexts (57%).

Mutual accountability

- Extremely fragile contexts are less likely (45%) than other fragile and non-fragile contexts combined (68%) to have a policy framework for development co-operation in place. When they do, however, a higher proportion (90%) include relevant development actors in mutual assessments than other contexts (77%) and make the results of these assessments publicly available (70% extremely fragile; 51% other contexts). Many development partners that were engaged in reporting on the 2018 Monitoring Round in extremely fragile contexts reported that while these assessments exist, their effectiveness is limited due to country context.

→ More information can be found in [Part I](#) and [Part II](#) of the Global Partnership's 2019 Progress Report, accessible at <http://effectivecooperation.org/monitoring-country-progress/making-development-co-operation-more-effective/>

How the Global Partnership is tailoring its monitoring to fragile contexts

Recognising the complex and pressing needs of these contexts, **the Global Partnership has developed a tailored approach to monitoring effective development co-operation in fragile contexts**, which will be rolled out in the next monitoring round. This tailored approach, developed through an open working group of partner countries, development partners and civil society representatives, will track progress at a more incremental level on a selection of priority effectiveness issues. Data from this tailored approach seeks to inform ongoing efforts, highlighting key areas where progress is achieved and bottlenecks remain, reinforce mutual accountability of all partners, and enable the right decisions at the right time. This tailored approach can be accessed at effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/FCAS-monitoring-approach.pdf.