

SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK AND WAY FORWARD TO FINALISE THE STRENGTHENING OF CURRENT MONITORING INDICATORS

This document provides a summary of the feedback received from stakeholders on the proposed refinements to the Global Partnership’s current monitoring indicators, coupled with OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team proposals to address the suggestions received. This detailed summary information (presented by indicator, from page 4 onwards) is shared with Steering Committee members to provide a transparent account of feedback received and to shed light on the breadth and detail of inputs.

The Steering Committee is invited to provide strategic guidance for addressing this feedback in order to finalise the indicators’ review. To this end, Steering Committee members are called on to:

- Consider the proposed guidelines to address the received feedback, described below; and
- Provide strategic direction for, and endorse, agreed guidelines, which will underpin the process to address stakeholder feedback and finalise the indicators’ review.

Overall, feedback received demonstrates strong support for the proposed refinements. Appreciation was expressed for the overarching direction of the refinements – that is, ensuring that monitoring remains relevant, useful and comparable over time, while also being simpler and more streamlined.

Certain themes feature across the feedback, and are captured in five categories presented below. Within these themes, feedback often includes conflicting views and suggestions. With a view to managing and addressing feedback in a constructive and consistent manner, the JST proposes an overarching guideline for dealing with each category of inputs.

Key issues raised by GPEDC stakeholders and proposed guidelines to address feedback

Theme #1	<i>Feedback spanning all indicators emphasises the need for a shared understanding of definitions, roles and responsibilities to support data collection and validation.</i>
<i>Proposed guideline #1</i>	Clarify definitions, roles and responsibilities for integrity and comparability JST will further strengthen guidance and tools to explain definitions, as well as ensure robust validation processes as needed for different indicators, to ensure consistent reporting across participants and over time.
Theme #2	<i>Some of the feedback includes suggestions for expanding the scope of indicators, including through additional questions. Other stakeholders are concerned about adding burden or complexity to the monitoring process.</i>
<i>Proposed guideline #2</i>	Retain originally agreed scope of indicators for focus and manageability In light of the original agreement of Global Partnership monitoring indicators (2012) and of the Steering Committee’s decision to <i>strengthen</i> existing indicators as one part of the post-HLM2 framework update, the technical work and stakeholder consultations undertaken did not constitute a process to renegotiate the scope of the indicators. Therefore, in the short term, the JST proposes to preserve decisions taken in the negotiation of the original 2012 framework. This is vital to manage complexity and avoid duplication between indicators.
Theme #3	<i>Feedback highlighted the interlinked nature of the indicators and the importance of developing a more holistic narrative on the monitoring framework, its value-added and complementarity.</i>
<i>Proposed guideline #3</i>	Clarify the Global Partnership’s monitoring narrative and complementarity In the short term, the JST will develop a clearer narrative for the Global Partnership’s value added and complementarity in assessing mutual accountability. This will include highlighting explicitly the value-added of the mutual accountability indicator in facilitating country-specific reporting and action on results, exploring ways to further draw on existing data at country level, and positioning the indicator as an overarching indicator in the framework. In

	<p>the medium term, the JST recognises the need to highlight more clearly how the interlinkages between indicators provide a comprehensive picture of development co-operation effectiveness. In preparation of sharing a revised monitoring framework with the international community in 2019, the Steering Committee may wish to consider a more holistic narrative, centred on dynamic partnership reality and an evolving concept of ‘collective accountability’, to position the monitoring framework in the broader global context.</p>
Theme #4	<p><i>Feedback highlights the need for more context specific consideration across indicators to better cater to, for example, countries in fragile and conflict affected situations or to upper middle income countries that provide and benefit from development co-operation.</i></p>
<i>Proposed guideline #4</i>	<p>Better account for diverse country contexts to ensure relevance and broad participation For the 2018 monitoring round, flexibility will be provided during the monitoring process to account for different country contexts, drawing on experience and lessons from the 2016 monitoring round. In the medium-term, this feedback underscores the importance of adapting the monitoring framework to the realities of the new development landscape and the challenges of the 2030 Agenda. As such, the JST proposes to facilitate this review under the forthcoming phase 2 of the framework update.</p>
Theme #5	<p><i>Feedback across indicators includes various demands for more in-depth, complementary and contextual analyses to strengthen the evidence around indicator topics and to further facilitate interpretation of, and action on, monitoring results. Feedback also calls for inclusive and stronger engagement of relevant stakeholders in the country monitoring process, and for linking GPEDC monitoring more closely to ongoing in-country accountability processes and policy reforms.</i></p>
<i>Proposed guideline #5</i>	<p>Facilitate prioritisation between deeper analyses&engagement and biennial monitoring JST proposes that the Steering Committee consider, in the medium-term, the benefits of a synchronised, biennial monitoring approach versus a more ‘country-responsive’ approach, which allows alignment of timing with national processes. Benefits of the former include continued accountability through regular fresh evidence, more timely SDGs reporting and sustained political momentum. A more country-responsive approach, on the other hand, would allow for strengthened linkages to country context and deeper stakeholder engagement at country level. The JST emphasises that the current arrangement, reaffirmed in Nairobi, to undertake biennial monitoring rounds does not permit deeper analyses in connection, or in follow-up, to the data collection and consolidation. Further analyses geared towards interpreting and collectively acting on the monitoring evidence, as well as further efforts to mobilise broader stakeholder engagement at country level, would require significant additional resources.</p>

GATHERING BROAD STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK ON PROPOSED REVISIONS

KEY FACTS

Open consultation

- Online consultation open for **31 days**
- Over **300 suggestions** received through the consultation platform – from **48 countries, organisations and networks**, representing all GPEDC constituencies
- **70%** of comments in consultation threads received during final week (9 – 12 April)

Country testing

- Field testing in **four different country contexts** (Liberia, Laos, Mexico and Belarus)
- Focused interviews and workshops with **over 125 stakeholders**, including government officials, development partners, civil society organisations, private sector networks and others.

Complementary processes

- **3 global webinars** open to all GPEDC stakeholders, adjusted to different time zones.
- Revised indicators 1a and 1b consulted with **30 results experts** in hands-on session during latest OECD workshop on results (12 April 2018).
- Methodological proposals jointly revised with effectiveness experts from **18 development agencies** during dedicated full day workshop in Brussels (11 March 2018).
- **2 CPDE-organised three-day workshops** on indicator 2 in Nairobi and Paris, bringing CSOs from all five regions.

Final participation rates in the different processes described above

- **Countries:** 53 (provider and recipient countries)
- **Multilateral organisations:** 15
- **Networks:** Center for International Private Enterprise (CIPE), CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE), EU Effectiveness Network, European Network on Debt and Development (Eurodad), g7+, German Development Institute (DIE), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC), OECD Results Community
- **GPIs:** 5