2016 Summary Report
Making development co-operation more effective
Effective development co-operation is a prerequisite for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. This report is the second edition since the establishment of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation in Busan in 2011 aims to build political momentum for change, ensuring that we are able to identify remaining challenges and learn from each other the effectiveness of development co-operation at the country and global levels.

We extend our sincere thanks to all of the participating countries, institutions and individuals for their engagement in this collective effort. We would like to thank the OECD/UNDP Joint Support Team for their work in facilitating the 2016 monitoring round and preparing the progress report: designing the methodology, supporting countries in managing the process, compiling the results and conducting the analysis, drawing on inputs from a broad range of partners. Our thanks are extended also to the members of the Monitoring Advisory Group for their guidance.

The Global Partnership is committed to continuing to provide data and evidence to support country-led efforts and inform global policy dialogue on effective development co-operation, including follow-up and review of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). We urge development stakeholders everywhere to make the most of this report and the intense exercise it summarises by using the evidence to guide policy dialogue at all levels – country, regional and global – to celebrate progress and successes, address hurdles, and jointly devise a way forward.

We are confident that the analysis and information contained herein will also make an important contribution to discussions in Nairobi in November 2016 and beyond, helping us to maximise the contribution of effective development co-operation – collectively, inclusively and effectively – to realising the development ambitions we all share.
Overview

Cooperation for Effective Development Co-operation (EDC) is a political commitment and upholds the

The 2016 Global Partnership monitoring round was a key moment in demonstrating that transparency and accountability are critical for effective development co-operation. It is also an opportunity to reflect on progress made and challenges remaining.

The 2016 Global Partnership monitoring round drew record participation, both in terms of numbers and diversity: 81 low and middle-income countries and territories; 125 development partners; 74 development organisations; and hundreds of civil society organisations, private sector representatives, trade unions, foundations, parliamentarians and local governments.

The development community is adopting a decisive focus on results for more impact at the country level: 99% of countries have development strategies at the national and sector levels; 74% of countries have set out their priorities, targets and indicators in a single strategic planning document. In addition, 85% of development partners' new programmes and projects are aligned to country-led results frameworks.

Evidence reveals a promising evolution towards more inclusive partnerships among governments, civil society organisations (CSOs) and the private sector. In 70% of countries, the government and the private sector for building a common public-private agenda for sustainable development. Almost 90% of governments consult CSOs on national development policy. Amongst themselves, CSOs have also improved co-ordination for programming and alignment.

Inclusiveness is essential for ensuring that development processes and results are widely owned. Yet only 51% of countries have all the elements in place for meaningful dialogue with CSOs. In 63% of countries, the potential for more equitable and inclusive development is affected by lack of coordination and alignment of development partners. In the areas where concerted effort is required to unlock bottlenecks.

Transparency is also growing, with more publicly available information on development co-operation than ever before: 72% of development partners assessed for transparency achieved a “good” score in their reporting to at least one of the three international databases on development co-operation finance and 39% achieved “excellent” in reporting to one or more systems. In parallel, countries have taken strides to enhance the transparency of their budgeting procedures; they now record 66% of development co-operation finance in national budgets that are subject to parliamentary oversight. Furthermore, 47% of countries are tracking public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment.

To be effective, countries need to manage flows in a complementary and strategic manner. Development partners' improvements in predictability of development co-operation have only reached 74% in 2016. A major cultural shift is needed to arrive at regular publication of real-time information that meets country needs for planning and managing development co-operation.

The transparency and inclusiveness of development partners also require improved institutionalisation. Half of countries involve local governments and non-state stakeholders in these assessments or make the results public.

Moreover, these review processes continue to largely formulate around traditional development assistance models and require adapting evolving partnership approaches.

Finally, the 2016 Global Partnership monitoring evidence has shown that institutionalised partnerships at the country level can build trust and accountability.

Overall, results of the 2016 monitoring round testify to joint progress towards achieving the development effectiveness goals agreed in 2011 at the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness.
The 2016 monitoring round drew record participation, both in terms of numbers and of diversity of profiles. Eighty-one low and middle-income countries led national assessments of the effectiveness of development operation, reporting on their co-operation with 125 development partners. The broad range of stakeholders participating in the process – in total 125 countries, 74 development organisations and hundreds of civil society organisations, private sector representatives, trade unions, philanthropists and local governments – reflects the increasing diversity of the development co-operation landscape. The data and evidence they generated covers the vast majority (up to 89%) of development co-operation funding programmed for these 81 countries. This diversity and coverage confirms the increasing commitment of the international community to the development effectiveness agenda.

**Shared principles and differentiated commitments for more effective development co-operation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitments</th>
<th>Civil society</th>
<th>Development partners</th>
<th>Country governments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Development partners use country-led results frameworks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Civil society organisations operate within an environment that maximises their engagement in and contribution to development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Public-private dialogue promotes private sector engagement and its contribution to development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Transparent information on development co-operation is publicly available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05A</td>
<td>Development co-operation is predictable (annual)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05B</td>
<td>Development co-operation is predictable (medium-term)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Development co-operation is included in budgets subject to parliamentary oversight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Mutual accountability is strengthened through inclusive reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Governments track public allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09A</td>
<td>Governments strengthen country systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09B</td>
<td>Development partners use country systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Aid is untied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governments agreed to focus on development results by establishing transparent, country-led results frameworks that can support results-oriented planning and strategic policy making.

**Busan Commitment**

01

An institutional enabling environment:
- High-level leadership
- More effective implementation of legislation and policies
- Strengthened country institutions and systems

02

Many regions face similar challenges in implementing a results-based approach:
- Co-ordination and alignment of budgetary and strategic planning processes
- The need for institutional reform management with results-oriented practices
- Cross-regional learning can help in identifying solutions to these challenges.

**Indicators**

01

- **Do countries have results frameworks?**
  - **Indicator 1b**
    - Looks at whether a country has results frameworks in place, and whether there are key strategic planning documents containing its national development priorities, targets and results indicators.
  - **74% of countries have a single strategic plan that includes priorities, targets and indicators**

02

- **Countries have made progress in country-led results frameworks:**
  - Most countries have **multiple priority-setting mechanisms** at the national and sector levels.
  - In three out of four countries, priorities, targets and indicators can be found in a single strategic planning document.

- **Countries still have a way to go** in translating their strategic plans and priorities into **results-based budgeting and implementation**, they also need to strengthen their monitoring and evaluation systems so they generate useful information on results.

**Results at a glance:**

- Countries have made **very good progress** in developing country-led results frameworks:
  - Most countries have multiple priority-setting mechanisms at the national and sector levels.
  - In three out of four countries, priorities, targets and indicators can be found in a single strategic planning document.

- The way forward:

**What types of results frameworks are countries using?**

- **Number of countries**
  - National development plan: 34
  - Long-term vision: 33

**What priority-setting mechanisms do countries have in place at the national and/or sector levels?**

- **Number of countries**
  - Long-term vision: 34
  - National development plan: 33
  - Education: 80%
  - Healthcare: 79%
  - Transport: 58%
  - Public Finance: 56%

“Greater use of results information in policy-making is essential for achieving better development results.”

**What is the country’s main results framework?**

- Number of countries
  - Long-term vision: 25
  - National development plan: 30

**What priority-setting mechanisms do countries have in place at the national and/or sector levels?**

- National Level
  - National development plan: 76%
  - Long-term vision: 74%

- Sector Level
  - Education: 80%
  - Healthcare: 79%
  - Transport: 58%
  - Public Finance: 56%
**Busan Commitment**
Development partners committed to: using country-led results frameworks to plan and design new development co-operation programmes and projects; using countries’ monitoring and evaluation systems to track progress on and achievement of results; minimising the use of other frameworks.

**Indicator 1a**
Measures the alignment of development partners’ new interventions with the objectives and results defined by countries themselves; it also looks at development partners’ reliance on countries’ own statistics and monitoring and evaluation processes to track progress.

**Results at a glance:**

01 Development partners tend to align new interventions to objectives prioritised by countries, relying heavily on national development plans and sector strategies.

02 The use of country results information and reliance on domestic monitoring and evaluation systems to track project implementation and impact is significantly lower.

**What results frameworks do development partners use?**

- **UN agencies**
- **Multilateral development banks**
- **Bilateral partners (DAC)**
- **Other bilateral partners**
- **Vertical funds and initiatives**
- **Other international organisations**
- **Foundations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework</th>
<th>National development plan</th>
<th>Sector plans</th>
<th>Ministerial or institutional plans</th>
<th>Other government planning tools</th>
<th>Development strategy (or similar) agreed with the country government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN agencies</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral development banks</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral partners (DAC)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bilateral partners</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical funds and initiatives</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other international organisations</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scope of the assessment:**
2,819 new interventions approved in 2015 (valued at USD 73 billion)

**Partner support to strengthen countries’ results frameworks and domestic monitoring and evaluation capacity will be critical.**

**What is the extent do development partners use countries’ own results frameworks?**

- 85% Development partners use country-led results framework to set objectives for new interventions.
- 62% Percentage of results indicators drawn from country-led results frameworks.
- 52% Percentage of results indicators monitored using government sources and monitoring systems.
- 48% Percentage of new interventions that plan a final evaluation with government involvement.

**The next step is to increase the use of country results frameworks for implementation, monitoring and evaluation of development interventions.**

01 **Country results indicators**, local monitoring systems and national statistics need to be used more widely; government involvement in evaluations also needs to increase, which may entail expanding support to countries for strengthening national results frameworks and associated tracking systems.

02 Countries are embedding the SDG Framework; this opens up opportunities for development partners to strengthen alignment with national priorities on locally defined development goals.
approaches can help strengthen country systems

Busan Commitment
Governments agreed to improve the quality of their national public financial management and procurement systems in order to enhance their effectiveness and improve governance.

Indicator 9a
Measures the quality of country systems using the World Bank’s Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) scores, rating the quality of budgetary and financial management.

at a glance:

- **52** countries have a moderate CPIA score
- **7** countries have a strong CPIA score
- **11** countries have a weak CPIA score
- **35** countries have improved their country systems since 2010
- **14** countries have not seen any substantial change in the quality of their country systems
- **30** governments have experienced a decline in the quality of their country systems

How strong are budgetary and public financial management systems?

CPIA score = World Bank’s Country Policy and Institutional Assessment score, rating the quality of budgetary and financial management.

- **1** country has a weak CPIA score
- **52** countries have a moderate CPIA score
- **7** countries have a strong CPIA score

What progress has been made in strengthening systems?

From 2010 to 2015:

- **01** Need to continue work on joint diagnostics to identify weaknesses in domestic institutions and co-ordinate support to strengthen them.
- **02** Move from “best practice” to “best fit” approaches to improving public financial management and procurement systems.
- **03** Find ways to build political commitment to support long-term institutional change and reforms in public financial management.
- **04** Conduct broad public administration reforms in parallel to strengthening of country systems to ensure effective transformation.

Obstacles
- Lack of predictability of development co-operation
- Inclusion in budgets and effective delivery of development co-operation funding

Solutions
- Make their budgets more comprehensive and credible, and effectively link them to policy priorities
- Ensure good predictability and oversight in the management of public expenditure
- Subject their budgets to timely and accurate accounting, fiscal reporting and public auditing
- Strengthen procurement practices

The way forward

Encouragingly, progress was concentrated on fragile states and small island developing states.
Busan Commitment
Development partners agreed to use country systems as the default approach to deliver development co-operation in support of activities managed by the public sector.

Indicator 9b
Measures the proportion of development co-operation disbursed for the public sector using the country’s own public financial management and procurement systems.

at a glance:
02
Bilateral partners have driven the increase in use of country systems – particularly those beyond the OECD DAC, who increased their use from 4% to 40%.

03
Development partners are finding diverse ways to use specific systems – increasingly relying on countries’ own budget execution procedures, financial reporting and auditing mechanisms.

04
In contrast, the use of countries’ procurement systems has decreased since 2010.

Comparing partners’ use of country systems

Risk needs to be managed, not avoided
01
Development partners tend to rely more on country systems when their quality is high, although in highly aid-dependent countries they are often willing to assume certain risks.

02
Evaluation and peer learning can help to identify and scale up approaches that work, even in the most challenging country contexts.

03
Innovative approaches include risk pooling and experimenting with hybrid or novel modalities of development co-operation – beyond budget support.
Busan Commitment
Development co-operation is untied when bilateral partners do not impose geographical constraints on the use of the funds. In Busan, development partners agreed to further untie development co-operation.

Results at a glance:

Progress in untying aid is leveling off

The share of untied aid has marginally increased since 2010; the global average hovers around the peak value reached in 2013.

The increasing involvement of the private sector from development-partner countries in delivering development co-operation needs to be carefully managed to avoid further tying of aid.

On the other hand, six DAC members have not achieved the 2010 level of 74% untied development co-operation.

Belgium, Denmark, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway and the United Kingdom maintain fully or almost fully untied aid.

Untying aid further will need broad collective action

Peer pressure amongst the development partner community has helped some partners build support within development agencies to further untie their programmes.

The quality of national procurement systems can influence the share of aid that is untied; on the other hand, in fragile situations, untying aid can play a crucial role in improving these systems.
Busan Commitment
Development partners committed to disbursing funds on time, improving predictability, and enabling countries to plan and manage their development policies and programmes with greater effectiveness.

Results at a glance:
Annual predictability of development co-operation has not increased.

How does annual predictability vary by development partner?

- Developing long-term partnerships pays off.
  
A country's most significant development partners – in terms of funding volume and duration – tend to be their most predictable.

- Predictability is more challenging in difficult country contexts.
  
Annual forecasting seems to overestimate the implementation and absorption capacity of the countries with weaker institutions and public administration.

Effective partnerships to overcome barriers to annual predictability

1. Investing in partnerships with countries is essential. The following initiatives help to increase annual predictability:
   - Agency-wide, multi-year rolling plans and budgeting frameworks
   - Longer-term country partnerships, strategies and development co-operation instruments
   - Effective tracking and reporting
   In contrast, fragmented and short-term support is associated with lower predictability levels.

  A realistic approach in preparing annual forecasts is particularly important in fragile and conflict affected states.
Busan Commitment
Development partners committed to providing forward-looking information on upcoming funding in a timely and predictable fashion, according to agreed schedules, so as to enable countries to plan and manage their development policies and programmes with greater effectiveness.

How much improvement is still needed in terms of medium-term predictability?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All development partners</th>
<th>Multilateral development banks</th>
<th>Other bilateral partners</th>
<th>Bilateral partners (DAC)</th>
<th>Vertical funds and initiatives</th>
<th>UN agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>70% 71%</td>
<td>70% 79%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>69% 69%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>80% 79%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>69% 69%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which partners have made the biggest gains in terms of medium-term predictability?

- Multilateral development banks
- Bilateral partners (DAC)
- Vertical funds and initiatives
- UN agencies

Medium-term predictability enhances countries’ strategic planning and budgetary capacity.

1. Lack of medium-term predictability hinders countries’ capacity to manage development resources in a complementary and strategic manner; it also affects the credibility and comprehensiveness of their budgetary and public financial management process.

2. Providing timely and accurate forward-looking funding estimates strengthens domestic accountability, as it influences the likelihood of recording development cooperation on national budgets.

3. Close to half of participating countries or are preparing expenditure frameworks – forward-looking estimates will enhance their process.
Creating an enabling environment for civil society organisations requires further effort.

**Busan Commitment**
Governments committed to creating an enabling environment for civil society organisations (CSOs) so as to maximise their contribution to development. CSOs agreed to make their operations more effective.

*Indicators:*
- Agenda for dialogue with government includes CSO-enabling environment
- CSO-enabling environment promoted
- Information on support to CSOs shared with the government
- CSOs systematically consulted on development policy/programming
- CSOs report to government on finances and programming
- CSOs lead processes for input on policy dialogue
- CSOs have access to government information
- CSOs have transparency and accountability mechanisms
- CSOs co-ordinate among themselves and with others
- CSOs have access to resources for CSOs
- CSOs facilitate access to resources for CSOs
- CSOs enable CSO formation, registration and operation
- CSOs can increase their development effectiveness
- CSOs recognise and respect freedom of association, assembly and expression
- CSOs lead processes to ensure freedom of association, assembly and expression
- CSOs lead processes to ensure transparency and accountability
- CSOs have space for multi-stakeholder dialogue on national development policies
- CSOs have legal and regulatory environment that can support multi-stakeholder dialogue on national development policies

**The Way Forward**

1. Governments need to improve their legal, regulatory and operational policies and practices, including:
   - Ensuring freedom of expression and association
   - Engaging with CSOs in a transparent and representative way
   - Improving regulations to facilitate the operational functioning of CSOs
   - Not marginalising any social group
   - Strengthening the institutional mechanisms for engagement

2. CSOs can increase their development effectiveness by:
   - Improving co-ordination of development efforts
   - Strengthening reporting on development efforts

3. Development partners can help strengthen dialogue mechanisms with CSOs.
To be successful, public-private dialogue must address topics of mutual benefit. Instruments and logistics are less of an issue when the private sector is willing to engage. High-level political leadership helps. The emergence of champions is facilitated when both sides express trust and willingness to engage. Focusing on common interests and orienting the dialogue towards useful outputs and results helps sustain the relationship. Participation of small and medium enterprises in the dialogue ensures an inclusive process.

Lessons from experience can help build successful public-private dialogue:

01
To be successful, public-private dialogue must address topics of mutual benefit.

02
Instruments and logistics are less of an issue when the private sector is willing to engage.

03
High-level political leadership helps.

04
The emergence of champions is facilitated when both sides express trust and willingness to engage.

05
Focusing on common interests and orienting the dialogue towards useful outputs and results helps sustain the relationship.

06
Participation of small and medium enterprises in the dialogue ensures an inclusive process.

Inclusive Partnerships

Private sector willingness to engage
- 4% WEAK
- 40% FAIR
- 56% STRONG

Government willingness to engage
- 12% WEAK
- 54% FAIR
- 35% STRONG

Existence of potential facilitators
- 16% WEAK
- 47% FAIR
- 37% STRONG

Availability of instruments to facilitate and support public-private dialogue diminishes the quality of the dialogue.

In most countries, the private sector and the government are willing and ready to engage with each other.

What are the conditions and potential for public-private dialogue?

There is great potential to partner with the private sector.

Busan Commitment
Governments committed to engaging with the private sector: to improve the legal, regulatory and administrative environment for private investment; and to ensuring a policy and regulatory environment for public-private partnerships.

Indicator 3
Measures the quality of public-private dialogue by looking at the legal and regulatory environment for private sector activities, a country's readiness to conduct public-private dialogue and the effectiveness of selected dialogue platforms.

Score for the quality of public-private dialogue hides variation across countries.

Target: 10

2016 Monitoring: Summary Report
Transparency is moving in the right direction

Busan Commitment
Development partners agreed to improve the availability and public accessibility of information on development co-operation and other development resources in a timely, comprehensive and forward-looking manner.

Indicator 4
Assesses the extent to which development partners are making information on development co-operation publicly accessible, and in line with the Busan transparency requirements.

Results at a glance:

What systems and standards do development partners use to provide online data on development co-operation in an open and accessible manner?

Of the 61 partners assessed...

- 24 achieved “excellent” scores in at least one of the three assessments (40% of the assessed partners).
- 44 achieved “good” scores in one or several of them (72% of the assessed partners).

Most notable progress on the timeliness and comprehensiveness of publicly available data, while the publication of forward-looking information continues to be a challenge. Also, observed trade-offs between data timeliness and accuracy.

Improvements in transparency depend on robust policies, sound corporate processes and systems, and dedicated staff.

01
Analysis reveals that good reporting to a specific platform or standard does not automatically imply equally good reporting through other channels, evidencing the need to focus on specific institutional hurdles in terms of systems, policies or culture.

02
Investments in corporate processes and information management infrastructure help to improve the supply of publicly available data.
Development co-operation is increasingly on budget

Busan Commitment
Governments and development partners committed to including development co-operation funds in national budgets subject to parliamentary oversight.

Indicator 6
Measures the share of development co-operation funding for the public sector recorded in annual budgets that are approved by the national legislatures of partner countries.

How does the share of on-budget development co-operation vary by region?

- Most countries in Latin America and the Pacific have met the target.
- Multilateral development banks and some bilateral partners outperformed other development partners.

How does the share of on-budget development co-operation vary by partner?

There has been good progress since 2010: 15 countries and 29 development partners met the target regarding 85% of development finance in national budgets.

Further progress calls for improvements in budgeting systems and processes of countries and their partners alike.

01 Development partners may need to continue investing in corporate systems and processes to generate timely projections, in accordance with countries’ budget planning cycles.

02 Institutionalising the relationship with the country matters: larger, more focused country programmes, implemented through national systems and integrated into national budgets, enable parliamentary oversight and accountability.

03 To facilitate the inclusion of development co-operation on budget, ensure adequate oversight and effective use of funds, and increase mutual accountability, countries may need to strengthen budget planning processes and information management systems for public expenditure. Creating budgetary incentives for line ministers to report development co-operation may contribute to central oversight of public expenditure.
Busan Commitment
Countries committed to putting transparent systems in place to track public allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment, so as to ensure that public expenditure is appropriately targeted to benefit both women and men.

Do countries have the systems they need to track budget allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment?

Percentage for all 81 countries:

- **62%** Government statement establishing tracking system
- **52%** Central government units provide leadership and oversight
- **51%** Gender equality disaggregated budget information publicly available
- **47%** Countries have transparent tracking systems
- **41%** Public allocations systematically tracked

02
03

The next step is to effectively mainstream gender-responsive programming across the entire budget, beyond specific sectors and programmes.

Countries encounter challenges in moving from the formulation of gender-responsive policy, law or strategies to the systematic tracking of gender equality allocations and impacts.

Transparency in gender tracking systems is critical for effective policy formulation and for accountability.

Using gender-disaggregated data to inform policy and budgeting decisions for achieving gender equality and sustainable development.
Busan Commitment
Countries agreed to put in place inclusive mutual assessment reviews to respond to the needs and priorities of domestic institutions and citizens.

What progress have countries made in conducting and sharing inclusive mutual assessments?

Indicator 7
Measures whether a country has four out of five criteria in place: 1) an aid or partnership policy; 2) country-level targets; 3) regular joint assessment of progress against targets; 4) local governments and non-executive stakeholders included in the assessments; and 5) public availability of the results.

Results at a glance:

02
Countries with mutual assessment reviews have an increasing number of basic elements in place for effective accountability, but often these are not enough for meaningful accountability.

03
Parliamentarians and other stakeholders need to be sufficiently engaged in reviewing progress against national targets; there is also room to make the results of these reviews more transparent.

Assessments need to be more inclusive and transparent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have the required 4 out of 5 criteria for regular and inclusive mutual assessment (Indicator 7)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country has an aid/partnership policy</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country has country-level targets</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country and partners assess progress against targets regularly</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results are publicly available</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parliamentarians and other stakeholders need to be sufficiently engaged in reviewing progress against national targets; there is also room to make the results of these reviews more transparent.

Rethinking mutual accountability structures as evolving development models and partnerships

01
While established mutual accountability structures are formulated on traditional development assistance, partnerships for the SDGs increasingly encompass whole-of-government approaches, as well as a variety of development partners, including southern partners, businesses and philanthropies. These partners all need to be accountable to each other.

02
Most low- and middle-income countries need to make mutual accountability processes more relevant in the light of their development models and partnerships. Emerging approaches in some countries can provide important lessons.
The full Progress Report is published on the OECD iLibrary, it is also available on the UNDP website. Visit www.oecd-ilibrary.org or www.undp.org/library for more information.