



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

Towards a Strong Second Monitoring Round: 2015-2016

Alejandro Guerrero OECD | Yuko Suzuki UNDP

8th Steering Committee Meeting
3-4 September 2015, Mexico DF, Mexico

GPEDC Monitoring Framework: Quick Recap

- **Origin:** Agreed in 2012 (Post-Busan Interim Working Group)
- **Purpose:** Tracking progress in implementing the four principles & related Busan commitments on development effectiveness, informing policy discussions at the global (HLM-2) & country level.
- **Approach:** “*Global light, country focused*” → 10 key indicators monitored at global & country levels every 2 years.
- **1st Monitoring Round:** 2013-2014 Monitoring Round
→ **Mexico** High-Level Meeting '14
- **2nd Monitoring Round:** 2015-2016 Monitoring Round
→ **Kenya** HLM '16

Session Objectives

In addition to providing specific feedback, Steering Committee members will be invited to review and endorse the:

1. **Proposed process and timeline for a strengthened Second Monitoring Round;**
2. **Proposed methodological approach regarding the four pilot indicators, on**
 - (1) use of country results frameworks,
 - (2) enabling environment for CSOs,
 - (3) public-private dialogue, and
 - (4) transparency.
3. **Proposed approach to reviewing the Monitoring Framework** and ensuring its relevance for Post-2015 implementation and accountability efforts

1. Key Improvements to Achieve a Stronger Second Monitoring Round in 2015-16

- 1. Stronger process streamlining**
 - Clearer roles and processes
 - More time allocated for training, country-level data collection and validation (6 months), and dissemination & dialogue around findings
- 2. More inclusive process**
 - Earlier engagement and greater country participation (already +57 recipient countries confirmed interest in participating to date)
 - Also, providers of development co-operation, CSOs and other stakeholders are being engaged from early on and throughout the process.

- 3. Strengthened methodologies for the four pilot indicators**
 - Extensive consultation process for the review of each methodology + Add'l country light testing
 - Final review by the Monitoring Advisory Group
- 4. Greater support for the implementation**
 - Three regional workshops, online Helpdesk, targeted support, user-friendly tools, etc.
- 5. Broader use of monitoring findings**
 - More time allocated to pre-HLM country level dissemination and discussions.
 - Country profiles & data to inform country-level policy dialogue.
 - Engagement of regional platforms for regional assessments (e.g. NEPAD).
 - User-friendly data visualization tools and formats, policy briefs, actionable recommendations.

A Streamlined Process & Timeline



...with a focus on...

- Greater participation
- A more feasible process
- Better data quality
- Greater use of results

| | |
|----------|--|
| Jan 2015 | 7th Steering Committee Meeting |
| Mar 2015 | Methodology Refinement, Preparation & Sensitization |
| Aug 2015 | |

| | |
|----------|--|
| Sep 2015 | Launch Second Round |
| Oct 2015 | Country-led Data Collection |
| Mar 2016 | Data Validation |
| Apr 2016 | Data Processing & Final Review |
| May 2016 | |
| Jun 2016 | Aggregation, Analysis & Report Preparation |
| Aug 2016 | |
| Sep 2016 | Dissemination and dialogue (country- and global level) |
| Dec 2016 | 2nd High-level Meeting (Kenya) |

2. Refining the Four Pilot Indicators

Indicator 1: Use of Country Results Frameworks

- **What is being measured?**
 - **1a.** The degree to which (and the ways in which) providers use country-led results frameworks (CRFs);
 - **1b.** Existence and characteristics of CRFs.
- **How is it being measured?**
 - Country-sourced data (country-led process)
 - For **1a**: Bottom-up approach (project level)
 - For **1b** (complementary): Qualitative approach + evidence.
- **Highlights of the methodological approach**
 - Focus on sector (operational CRFs at sector level)
 - Broad concept of CRF allows for more accurate picture of different country- and sector-level realities
 - Data useful as entry point for **country-level dialogue on CRF use & on needs for planning/M&E strengthening.**

Indicator 2: CSO Enabling Environment

- **What is being measured?**
 - The extent to which governments and providers contribute to an enabling environment for CSOs and to which CSOs are in alignment with development effectiveness principles.
- **How is it being measured?**
 - Country-sourced data (country-led)
 - 15 qualitative questions in four thematic modules: (1) Space for multistakeholder dialogue on national policies; (2) CSO dev. effectiveness; (3) Official dev. cooperation with CSOs; and (4) Legal and regulatory framework.
 - Assessment of country context.
- **Highlights of the methodological approach**
 - Broader focus on role of different actions in enabling CSO contributions to development; Reliance on primary data.
 - Country-led, but also multi-stakeholder process for data collection & validation.

Indicator 3: Public-Private Dialogue

- **What is being measured?**
 - Focuses on assessing the quality of public private dialogue at country level, as a proxy to capture private sector engagement in improving public policies
- **How is it being measured?**
 - Globally-sourced and Country-sourced data
 - Three modules: (i) international indicators on country context for private sector development; (ii) country-sourced questionnaire on country readiness, based on a multi-stakeholder process; (iii) in-depth assessment on the quality of a selected Public-Private Dialogue Platform (optional)
- **Highlights of the methodological approach**
 - Assessment tool (originally developed by World Bank) slightly refined based on piloting in 3 countries;
 - Country-led process, embedded in multi-stakeholder dialogue.

Indicator 4: Transparency Indicator

- **What is being measured?**
 - Degree of transparency of development co-operation data
 - 3 dimensions of Busan's *common approach* (timeliness, comprehensiveness & forward-looking nature).
- **How is it being measured?**
 - Relies on data from IATI & OECD DAC (CRS & FSS).
 - Classifies providers within broad categories, depending on degree of progress in implementing the common approach.
- **What is the status/challenge?**
 - OECD & IATI methodologies are starting to diverge (type scoring, indicator composition, reporting, year).
- **Proposed approach for consultation**
 - Proposal reflects technical consensus.
 - Consultation (Sept-Dec): IATI, WP-Stats, GPEDC.
 - SC endorsement (early 2016 meeting or virtual)
 - Data becomes available in Dec 2015.

3. Reviewing the Framework to Ensure Post-2015 Relevance

Objective **Strengthening the GPEDC Monitoring Framework as a whole**

- Position as an existing strengthened package to support both FFD follow up and the post-2015 monitoring and review

Entry Points **FFD and Post-2015 entry points**

- Addis Ababa Action Agenda (OP 50) and (OP 58)
- The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its indicator framework (i.e. target 17.16, 17.17)
- Reflection of universality and inclusivity

Second Round Monitoring Country-level Feedback

- Used to obtain country-level feedback to review strengths, weakness and relevance of the current monitoring framework – testing through stress-testing questions of the MF and each individual indicator

Monitoring Advisory Group Strategic Guidance

- Starting on Sept 28th, year-long stream of work focused on stress-testing the MF, strengthening the underlying theory of change, and providing strategic advice going forward on how to strengthen the relevance of the MF in light of SDG discussions and outcomes (late 2016).

MF Review In-depth Assessment

- More detailed assessment/evaluation of the current MF and GPEDC, on the basis of technical inputs and guidance.
- (Optional, for consideration of the SC)

Session Objectives revisited

Steering Committee members are invited to provide feedback and endorse the following three :

- 1. Proposed process and timeline** for a strengthened Second Monitoring Round;
- 2. Proposed methodological approach regarding the four [new/pilot] indicators**, on
 - (1) use of country results frameworks,
 - (2) enabling environment for CSOs,
 - (3) public-private dialogue, and
 - (4) transparency.
- 3. Proposed approach to reviewing and ensuring the relevance of the monitoring framework** for post-2015 implementation and accountability efforts.

Thank you

তোমাকে ধন্যবাদ

ありがとう

Gracias

Dankjewel

Asante

Merci

Hvala

مننه

Obrigado

شكرا

Salamat



Contact

Mr. **Alejandro Guerrero**

Alejandro.GUERRERO-RUIZ@oecd.org

Ms. **Yuko Suzuki**

Yuko.SUZUKI@undp.org