



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

# Summary of feedback on the 2012 mandate of the Global Partnership

11<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee Meeting  
Seoul, 8 October 2016

This document presents the key points of feedback on the 2012 mandate of the Global Partnership that Steering Committee members have submitted by 30 September 2016. The full set of submissions can be found in the annexed ZIP file.

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

## **Contacts**

Mr. Thomas Boehler, Tel: +33 1 45 24 87 75, email: [thomas.boehler@oecd.org](mailto:thomas.boehler@oecd.org)

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

DOCUMENT 4

## Background

At the 10<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee meeting, Co-chairs invited the Steering Committee members to make specific language proposals on the original 2012 mandate of the Global Partnership. Feedback was received from six<sup>1</sup> Steering Committee members (Civil Society, Japan, Local and Regional Governments, Parliamentarians, Trade Unions, United States).

This feedback reaffirms that the original mandate presents a solid base for a renewed mandate. Respondents indicated areas that need updating and fine-tuning to ensure the Global Partnership contributes to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, addresses challenges in the evolving development landscape and builds on its lessons and perceived shortcomings.

Steering Committee members also referred to the feedback from the survey conducted in May/June 2016 on the renewal of the mandate (see [here](#)<sup>2</sup>). The present summary should be read in conjunction with the findings from this survey.

## Key messages

The following are common messages emerging from the six responses. Following this is a compilation of detailed inputs per stakeholder group.

## Substantive priorities

- Emphasize the role of the Global Partnership in supporting the achievement of the 2030 Agenda and SDGs
- Replace references to “Busan” commitments and the High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan with references to effective development co-operation more broadly
- Delete references of outdated aspects of the mandate, such as “Building Blocks”, and replace with already agreed new functions and tools
- Re-emphasize the accountability function of the Global Partnership and its focus on implementation of agreed commitments
- Anchor the Global Partnership Initiatives better in the mandate

## Suggestions for working arrangements

- Concretize synergies between the Global Partnership and the High-Level Political Forum, the Financing for Development Forum and the Development Cooperation Forum

---

<sup>1</sup> SDG Philanthropy Platform suggests WINGS to be a member of the Steering Committee. No other substantive comments.

<sup>2</sup> <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/5.-Mandate-consultations-with-the-SC-summary-of-responses.pdf>

- Hold High-level Meetings at Ministerial level at less regular intervals, for example every 3-4 years, with senior level meetings in between, and aligned with follow-up and review processes of the 2030 Agenda and the AAAA. However, CPDE, while welcoming the effort to maximize the contribution of the Global Partnership to global follow-up and review, argue that more spread-apart HLMs would negatively impact on the political momentum of the Global Partnership, even if interspersed with other meetings.
- Fourth non-executive co-chair (on a rotational basis), with the exception of Japan which thinks this would make the number of co-chairs too many in relation to the size and membership of the Steering Committee
- Better define the roles of Co-chairs and Steering Committee members with the help of Terms of References (that also clarify the constituency representation)
- A trend towards fewer Steering Committee meetings, with Japan suggesting to have them every 12-24 months instead of 6-12 months if the HLM periodicity shifts. Parliaments suggest having them once a year on the occasion of the FFD Forum and more often in “HLM years”.
- Call for clarity on endorsing the Steering Committee
- Adjust the SC composition by acknowledging the expansion already agreed at the fifth Steering Committee in Abuja in 2014 (6 more members), with a call for better representation of the private sector
- Develop and use a regular programme of work
- Reaffirm the roles of the Joint Support Team

## **Suggestions for process**

- Ensure continued review of functions and uphold flexibility to regularly update the mandate.
- Define the “shelf-life” of this mandate renewal, with suggestions made for 2020 and 2021.

## **II. Feedback from development partners**

(United States, Japan where indicated)

### **Substantive priorities**

- Replace references to Busan with Nairobi Outcome Document, emphasising the role of the Global Partnership in supporting the 2030 Agenda and SDGs and the Global Partnership’s objective to achieve agreed commitments, highlighting implementation, monitoring, accountability and knowledge sharing

- Stress the importance of building a knowledge base on effective development co-operation in conjunction with knowledge sharing. Japan suggests including specific proposals on outreach to engage more countries, in particular emerging economies
- Move away from a characterization that only countries can be providers of development cooperation, replacing references to different government actors with the term “countries” and better recognizing regional and local institutions
- Delete recipient country leadership in defining priorities and challenges
- Recognize contribution of GPIs to implement commitments at country level and encourage members to support their work

### **Suggestions for working arrangements**

- Hold Ministerial-level Meetings every 36-48 months, aligned with the follow-up and review processes of the 2030 Agenda and AAAA
- Ensure SC takes decisions to support successful operation of the Global Partnership and the delivery of its mandate, changing scope beyond “work of the ministerial meeting” to the entire Global Partnership including setting a programme of work, and supporting knowledge management
- US suggest fourth co-chair filled with a non-state actor involved in development co-operation. Japan think it is too much to have four co-chairs given size and composition of SC.
- Japan suggests holding SC meetings only every 12-24 months instead of 6-12 months in case the HLMs take place less often.
- SC and JST to develop and endorse TORs outlining roles and responsibilities of Co-Chairs and SC members, including expectations for consulting with the representative’s constituency
- JST to bring in some private sector expertise, supporting knowledge management, elevating issues and recording and implementing decisions taken by SC
- Japan suggests articulating Global Partnership’s funding mechanism in the revised mandate

### **Suggestions for process**

- US recommend a mandate from 2016-2020. Japan thinks it is not the right time to make thorough changes to the mandate and to stay flexible in terms of the Global Partnership’s contribution to SDG follow-up and review.
- Recommends to review mandate in preparation for or immediately after HLM3 and to regularly review and iterate the mandate to ensure objectives are met and results achieved

### **III. Feedback from non-state actors**

(Civil Society, Local and Regional Governments, Parliaments and Trade Unions)

#### **Substance/key messages**

- Describe that development co-operation is key to advance the 2030 Agenda and how Global Partnership overall objectives contribute to the 2030 Agenda, AAAA, perhaps drawing from the draft HLM2 outcome document
- Emphasise linkages to Financing for Development and High Level Political Forum and complementarity to DCF by providing data and lessons learned from country-level experience and concretise synergies.
- Replace “Busan” with “development co-operation” commitments and provide annex with detailed commitments that concern Global Partnership
- Clarify how the Global Partnership promotes universal effective development co-operation as a stand-alone agenda, while remaining relevant to broader global development processes
- Stress that maintaining political momentum is an end in itself and an essential component to achieve the 2030 Agenda and the AAAA
- List commitments from Rome, Paris and Accra as integral part of mandate
- Provide a definition of development co-operation – public/private, non/financial – and focus on effectiveness of development co-operation when leveraging public and private investment, facilitating entry into global markets, supporting an enabling environment, improving tax collection/rules, eliminating illicit financial flows and curbing corruption.
- List key areas of work of the Global Partnership at the outset
- Reiterate the ultimate purpose to support and ensure accountability for the implementation of commitments at the political level and mention monitoring framework as key pillar of mandate
- Reflect domestic accountability as pre-requisite for mutual accountability better
- Emphasize that ensuring accountability for Busan commitments requires dedicated monitoring framework that is relevant, efficient and useful at country level
- Stress that implementation of Busan commitments should be inclusive and placing this function first to indicate the new direction of the Partnership going forward
- Highlight Global Partnership’s country focused approach to support national agendas and SDGs through country-led multi-stakeholder dialogues
- For inclusive regular review of progress all stakeholders must be involved in monitoring, including local and regional governments

- Include trade unions as constituency where not mentioned
- Anchor GPIs in the mandate and refer to agreed criteria and regular interaction with the Global Partnership, their importance to champion efforts, a need for a space for them to interact, and proposal that JST can support partner countries in leading them. Delete reference to Building Blocks.

## **Suggestions for working arrangements**

### *Meetings*

- Replacing “Ministerial” with “High-level” meetings and representatives
- Adjust timing of High-level Meetings to maximize their contribution to the global follow-up and review processes
- CSOs believe that more spread-apart HLMs would negatively impact on the political momentum that is required to sustain the Global Partnership agenda, despite appreciation for suggestions to hold senior-level or technical meetings in between. Parliaments suggest a 3-4 year HLM cycle, preceding the GA-HLPF and to organize smaller, working level meetings back-to-back with the DCF.
- Lower frequency might dilute monitoring efforts. Switching monitoring cycles from two to four-year cycles would be detrimental in terms of both peer pressure and institutional memory
- Reiterate importance of lessons learned as basis for providing guidance and sharing experiences on different modalities of development cooperation
- High-level meetings to be structured around four principles and to promote human-rights based approaches
- Propose additional inclusive meetings around issues such as implementation challenges at country level at Annual Global Partnership Forum (CPDE). Senior level meeting every 18-24 months and regular technical level exchanges around communities of interest, regional dialogues and GPI workshops (ITUC)
- Propose including high level representatives of non-governmental stakeholders

### *Chairing arrangements*

- CSOs, Parliaments and local governments recommend a non-executive stakeholder co-chair to be chosen on a rotational basis from among: CSOs, trade unions, local authorities and parliaments.
- Revised composition of Steering Committee (adding six members based on Abuja Steering Committee decision) and recommend no further expansion unless there is a compelling case

- “Parliamentarians” suggest changing their title to “parliaments” since individual parliamentarians must have a mandate to act on behalf of their parliaments.
- CSOs make Steering Committee responsible for implementation of work plan based on Theory of Change and recommendations of working groups and GPIs and taking into account participatory and periodic reviews of achievements and challenges. Parliaments suggest that SC provides guidance to national coordinating structures for development co-operation, setting global standards, sharing best practices between countries and taking stock of progress.
- CSOs reiterate that the process for endorsement of SC membership, at HLMs, must be inclusive and transparent. Parliaments suggest to revisit the composition of the SC at each HLM
- Parliaments suggest holding SC meetings once a year on the occasion of the FFD Forum except in HLM years when more than one SC meeting may be needed. It would set the work programme, review progress reports from JST and WGs that work in between meetings. CSOs recommend SC meetings to be held according to highest transparency standards and participation by broadest audience of interested parties

#### *Joint Support Team*

- CSOs suggest JST to be called upon to organize technical meetings
- Parliaments suggest JST to provide a functional link with country-level development co-operation structures by collecting country-level data, assist with developing own monitoring of national commitments, sharing guidance, tracking GPI outcomes and reporting to the Steering Committee, and providing other secretariat and advisory services as needed.

#### **Suggestions for process**

- Parliaments propose a mandate from 2016-2021.
- CSOs remind that there is no specific deadline by which a revision of the mandate needs to happen