

Options Note: Working arrangements of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation

Fifth meeting of the Global Partnership Steering Committee
13-14 February 2014, Abuja, Nigeria

Contacts:

Mr. Derek Kilner, tel. +1 212 906 5742, email: derek.kilner@undp.org

Mr. Gerardo Bracho, tel: +1 33 45 24 93 37, email: gerardo.bracho@oecd.org

I. Introduction

1. The document [Proposed Mandate for the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation](#), endorsed by the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF) in June 2012, sets out the current governance arrangements of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation.
2. At its October 2013 meeting, the Global Partnership's Steering Committee raised the need to revisit some of the current governance arrangements, particularly relating to: a) the constituency model of Steering Committee representation; b) composition and rotation of Steering Committee membership; and c) composition and rotation of Co-Chairs and hosting arrangements for high level meetings.
3. The Steering Committee agreed that these issues would be tabled for discussion at the next meeting (Abuja, February 2014), with the objective of providing recommendations for endorsement at the first High Level Meeting of the Global Partnership in Mexico City (April 2014).
4. For the areas described above, this note lays out the current arrangements and rationale; highlights challenges with the current approach; and presents a proposal by the Global Partnership's Co-Chairs for addressing these issues.

II. Background

5. The Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF) mandated in early 2012 a group of senior level negotiators, the Post-Busan Interim Group (PBIG), to define the working arrangements for the Global Partnership. In its three meetings, from February to May 2012, the PBIG, following the guidance set out in the [Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation](#), agreed on the objectives and functions of the Global Partnership and on the working arrangements that would best support these functions.
6. The original mandate for the Global Partnership notes that a Steering Committee will provide "the strategic leadership, coordination and oversight necessary for ensuring a coherent work programme for the Global Partnership," with the following core functions:
 - a. Steering the work of the ministerial meeting, including identifying strategic priorities and setting the agenda;
 - b. Acting as 'ambassadors' of the Global Partnership to other international and regional processes, ensuring that priorities and key messages of the Global Partnership are reflected in relevant discussions taking place in other fora;
 - c. Guiding the work of the Secretariat, including support for accountability reporting to ministerial level; and
 - d. Undertaking other tasks as may be directed during the ministerial meetings.
7. The current approach to the Steering Committee responded to demand at the Busan High Level Forum and afterwards for a model of "global light/country heavy." This aimed to replace the WP-EFF model, which was deemed to be: a) too large, bureaucratic and costly to maintain; b) too informal and fluid in its membership, which created problems of accountability in

following up discussions and decisions; and c) too technical, rather than political in its discussions.

8. The decision on structuring the Steering Committee responded to these concerns, specifically by: a) limiting the membership to make the body more manageable, cost-effective, and capable of frank and strategic discussion; b) formalising the governance structure with seats for particular individuals representing specific constituencies to foster continuity and accountability, and to encourage consultations within constituencies which would inform SC discussions; and c) positioning the level of representation at that of senior officials, chaired by three ministerial-level co-chairs, to make the body more political.

9. This decision was accompanied by an expectation that there would be greater focus on activities and implementation at the country level, which were adapted to countries' own priorities and development objectives. Consultations among constituencies would then inform the global political discussion more strategically, via the Steering Committee members.

10. The Steering Committee mandate notes that members should play a key role in facilitating policy dialogue; bringing knowledge, experience, and priorities from their constituencies into preparing the substantive agenda of the Global Partnership; conveying messages of the Global Partnership to other international and regional processes, thereby acting as ambassadors of the Global Partnership; and promoting the interests of the Global Partnership to ensure that effective development co-operation remains a key issue on the agenda for international development.

11. Steering Committee members are expected to actively consult with their constituents to ensure that their constituency's priorities are reflected in the decision making of the Steering Committee. In this regard the potential of existing, self-standing alliances and networks to facilitate consultations and consolidate views among constituencies were recognised and welcomed.

III. Challenges with the current model

12. Many stakeholders recognise that the current model of representation on the Steering Committee is not functioning adequately. Some of the main issues that have been raised include:

13. Not all constituencies are directly represented at the Steering Committee. Groups including trade unions; local governments and regional authorities; and foundations feel their views are not adequately captured in the Steering Committee deliberations. Some members of the Global Partnership that are not directly represented in the Steering Committee have requested additional seats.

14. Some constituencies, while represented, may not be heard as loudly as others due to various barriers, including staff capacity, language, etc. For example, developing countries have more seats on the Steering Committee than do provider countries, but the latter often have more staff resources to follow the agenda between meetings.

15. Many members of the Global Partnership that are not directly represented in the Steering Committee do not feel a direct stake in the process and have not been as actively engaged as they might otherwise be, suggesting the link between Steering Committee members and their constituencies is not functioning as intended. Under the WP-EFF, delegates were sent by government capitals to participate in regular discussions, creating a sense of investment and

ownership among a wider range of countries. The constituency model was intended to allow each constituency to establish its own mechanisms for regular consultation. However, while this may be happening successfully in some cases (e.g. civil society, multilateral development banks), there is considerable concern that it is not happening sufficiently in several other constituencies. The lack of clarity as to the responsibility of delegates and the precise composition of the constituencies they are expected to represent compounds this challenge.

16. The Co-Chairs have addressed some of the concerns above by inviting observers to join Steering Committee meetings. While the process for choosing which observers to invite has been relatively ad-hoc, the presence of observers has allowed for more direct involvement by a number of stakeholders, particularly emerging economy governments and non-executive actors that have expressed a clear interest in following the meetings. Inviting observers can be a useful tool for the Co-Chairs and Steering Committee meeting hosts. However, the inclusion of observers has also created challenges in terms of:

- a. Lack of clarity over their role. If an approach to using observer is kept, it may be helpful to clarify their role.
- b. Reducing the informal/strategic nature of discussions. While more inclusive, the growing size of Steering Committee meetings has made them more formal and less efficient, and may have slowed progress on reaching decisions.

17. The lack of engagement at global level described above appears to have also impacted investment by governments in activities to implement effective development co-operation commitments at the country level. There is concern that there has been a notable decline in efforts by development partners at country level to actively engage in activities to advance effective development co-operation commitments, and in overall awareness of developments in the agenda. In this respect, the “global light” approach seems to be having an unforeseen negative impact at country level. Sensing this gap previously filled by the WP-EFF, Korea convened last December in Seoul a technical meeting focused on the “unfinished business” of the aid/development effectiveness agenda. The meeting reinforced the message that this type of global workshop can energise the agenda. Korea announced its intention to host the meeting on an annual basis.

18. Similarly there are concerns that many partner country governments are also less informed and are prioritising the agenda less than they had previously. When the Global Partnership was being established (e.g. at the final meeting of the WP-EFF in June 2012), there were several calls to ensure adequate space and support for mechanisms for regular consultations and knowledge-exchange between developing countries¹. However to date there has been inadequate support for such efforts. This challenge has been compounded by the under-resourcing of the UNDP-OECD joint support team. The shift away from the WP-EFF model to a more “country-focused” approach, was accompanied by a decision to expand UNDP’s role in supporting the Global Partnership. Building on its country-level presence, this role was intended to place a particular emphasis on supporting country and regional-level efforts, including facilitating peer learning and knowledge-exchange across programme countries; support to country-level partnership and accountability frameworks; and demand-driven capacity development support, among other areas. However, given slow and insufficient financing for UNDP, the support team has been limited in the scope of its efforts in this area.

¹ For example, the proposal for a Partner Country Caucus.

19. Overall, the experience to date suggests that 1) the constituency model is not working as intended, with many members of the Partnership that are not on the Steering Committee feeling that they are not adequately involved in global discussions; and 2) technical evidence of progress and challenges at country level – intended to be the focus of the Global Partnership – has not been properly captured or reflected in global discussions, primarily through the Steering Committee. This has reinforced a sense of lost momentum.

20. The above does not necessarily imply that Steering Committee approach is incorrect. However, it does suggest that for it to function successfully there need to be working mechanisms for consultation, many of which have not been in place. Creating effective spaces for consultation takes time, but there may be options available to help establish them. The Steering Committee may wish to explore options to address these concerns.

IV. Revising the governance of the Global Partnership: a proposal by the Co-Chairs

21. Adjustments to the governance structure of the Global Partnership, including the composition of the Steering Committee, are to be endorsed by the High Level Meeting². The previous section outlines key challenges in the current governance arrangement. This section presents proposed changes in four broad areas for further consideration by the Steering Committee and for its recommendation for endorsement at the Mexico City High-Level Meeting.

A. Size and Composition of the Steering Committee

22. The composition of the Steering Committee is intended to capture the diversity and reflect the perspectives of key stakeholders in the Global Partnership, as well as to strike a balance between efficiency and representativeness. The current composition is as follows:

Co-Chairs of the Global Partnership	
1	Recipient of development co-operation
1	Recipient and provider of development co-operation
1	Provider of development co-operation
Members of the Steering Committee	
5	Representatives of recipients of development co-operation, one of which is a representative of the g7+ group of fragile and conflict-affected states
1	Representative of recipients and providers of development cooperation
3	Representative of providers of development cooperation
1	Representative of private sector stakeholders
1	Representative of parliamentarians
1	Representative of civil society stakeholders
1	Representative of multilateral development banks
1	Representative of the UNDP/UNDG
1	Representative of the OECD/DAC

² As per the Mandate of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation.

23. The Co-Chairs have received multiple requests for additional seats on the Steering Committee, including from representatives of trade unions; representatives of local governments and regional authorities; and the African Union. The Steering Committee considered these requests at its first meeting (London, December 2012), concluding that the question should be revisited at ministerial level, in conjunction with any discussion on succession/rotation arrangements and also as part of any review of the Global Partnership's mandate in the future.

24. The Co-Chairs, and Mexico as host of the first High-Level Meeting³, further discussed this issue, considering the need for broader ownership and engagement by members in the Steering Committee dialogue, as well as the challenge associated with the expanded size of the Steering Committee. **In this regard, the Co-Chairs propose to:**

a. Improve the functioning of the Steering Committee by ensuring that its members have a clear understanding of their roles, responsibilities and the constituencies they represent. In some cases, Steering Committee members will need additional support from specific organisations or platforms (to be identified). These efficiency improvements apply to all options outlined in paragraph (b).

b. Steering Committee composition

i. Maintain the original 18-member Steering Committee endorsed by the WP-EFF and reconfirmed at the first Steering Committee meeting in London. Assuming that the improvements outlined in (a) above are met this option would prioritise efficiency and continuity of Steering Committee discussions.

OR

ii. Maintain the current size of the Steering Committee at 18 members, but revise the allocation of seats between constituencies. Assuming that the improvements outlined in (a) above are met, this option would prioritise efficiency of Steering Committee discussions while allowing new groups of actors to engage⁴.

OR

iii. Expand the Steering Committee to 24 members. Additional seats could be added for: Arab providers; three regional organisations (tbd) representing Africa, Asia-Pacific, and Latin America/Caribbean; and nongovernmental actors⁵. Assuming that the improvements outlined in (a) above are met this option would prioritise greater inclusiveness and a stronger role for regional organisations to facilitate consultations among recipient and provider/recipient countries.

c. Rely on additional inputs from non-members as needed. As envisaged in the original mandate of the Global Partnership⁶, contributions from other networks and alliances or development stakeholders are welcome. It may be useful to clarify the role of observers in Steering Committee discussions.

³ In this section, references to the proposal of the Co-Chairs refers to the three Co-Chairs plus Mexico.

⁴ The UK will circulate a document with more detail on this proposal shortly.

⁵ Nongovernmental actors refer to all groups outside governments, i.e. foundations, civil society organisations, the private sector, trade unions, etc.

⁶ Working Party on Aid Effectiveness, *Proposed Mandate of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation*, DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)7/REV1, para. 15.

B. Steering Committee membership

25. The current mandate of the Global Partnership notes that the rotational feature of representation within constituencies supports ownership and inclusiveness in the work of the Steering Committee. There is an expectation that at least some of the members of the Steering Committee will rotate following the first High-Level Meeting. However, to ensure continuity and momentum, it may be preferable to rotate a portion of the seats, in a coordinated manner. Responsibility for endorsing the Steering Committee membership lies with the ministerial-level meeting. **In this regard, the Co-Chairs propose to:**

- a. **Rotate 10 out of 15 Steering Committee seats.** Most government seats can be rotated.
- b. **Request Steering Committee members to announce their intention to step down at the Abuja meeting.**
- c. **Task those members who will step down (together with any other members from their constituency) to identify replacements to be confirmed by the Mexico City High Level meeting, if possible, or by the first Steering Committee meeting following the High Level Meeting.** Regional and constituency-based consultations in the lead-up to the Mexico City **High Level Meeting** could be used to support this process.

C. Composition and Rotation of Co-Chairs, and Hosting Arrangements

26. Under current arrangements, three ministerial-level Co-Chairs represent (1) recipients of development co-operation; (2) recipients and providers of development co-operation; and (3) providers of development co-operation.

27. The CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness has requested that an additional Co-Chair represent non-government stakeholders, arguing that one of the defining characteristics of the Global Partnership is its multi-stakeholder character, and that the views of non-executive stakeholders will not be fully reflected in setting the Partnership's agenda if they are not represented at the level of Co-Chairs. On the other hand, the higher the number of Co-Chairs, the greater the challenges in ensuring their proper coordination.

28. In addition there has been some interest in tying the Chairing of the Global Partnership more directly to the hosting of High-Level Meetings. This could have the benefit of both (1) accelerating efforts to identify a host for the next High-Level Meeting, a process which has proven lengthy and has delayed substantive progress on the Partnership's agenda in this round; and (2) facilitating improving the hosting Chair's ability to mobilise support for the Partnership.

29. Concerns have also been raised about the lack of continuity that might ensue from rotating all Co-Chairs at once, along the same lines as concerns about a full Steering Committee rotation as described above.

30. The Co-Chairs propose the following:

- a. **Announce a new set of Co-Chairs at the Mexico City High-Level Meeting**
- b. **Allocate one Co-Chair seat to the host of the next High Level Meeting, if possible.** Any host of the next High-Level Meeting will be able to shape and have strong ownership of its agenda. This would have the advantage of improving efficiency and accountability mechanisms, but might lessen the sense of ownership of the High-Level Meeting agenda by other constituencies. This option will depend on the timely identification of a suitable candidate.

D. Supporting constituency discussions

31. The proposals on Steering Committee composition set out above are intended to improve its functioning. However, there is demand for additional mechanisms to support the constituency model of Steering Committee representation. **In this regard, the Co-Chairs propose to:**

- a. **Formalise the annual meeting on country-level implementation hosted by Korea**
- b. **Hold standardised regional consultations in preparation for the next High-Level Meeting.** While constituencies should have the latitude to structure consultations as they see fit, a set number of more systematic regional consultations could be organised in preparation for the next High-Level Meeting. These could be organised with regional organisations on the Steering Committee, if this option is agreed. This option would also be dependent on provision of adequate resources.

E. Resourcing the joint support team

32. To address the resource challenges described above, the Co-Chairs propose:

- a. **Following the Mexico City High-Level Meeting, the support team will prepare a list of key deliverables and budget for the period through to next High-Level Meeting.**
- b. **Pledges will be made by the first Steering Committee following the Mexico City High-Level Meeting.**
- c. **Depending on the pledges made, the deliverables will be revised accordingly.**

V. Next Steps and Key Actions/Decision Points

33. Changes to the Global Partnership's governance will need to be endorsed at the Mexico City High-Level Meeting in April 2014. Before that time, a concrete proposal with broad consensus among the Partnership's members should be agreed.

34. Steering Committee members are invited to respond to the proposals put forward by the Co-Chairs in the boxes above.

35. The below table outlines key elements of the agreement needed at the Steering Committee meeting, envisaged endorsement at the Mexico HLM, and actions expected to be taken after the meeting.

Areas for Proposed Changes	Co-Chair proposal for SC endorsement	Decision by Mexico City HLM	Actions following HLM
Steering Committee Structure			
Number and Composition of Steering Committee seats	Maintain 18 seats OR expand to 24 seats	Confirm/endorse any changes to the structure of the Steering Committee	
Role of Observers	Clarify role. Invited on ad-hoc basis		
Steering Committee Membership			
Rotation of SC membership	Rotate up to 10 of 15 members Decide which will rotate Agree on a process of identification of replacement by next SC meeting, latest	(1) Confirm new SC members OR (2) confirm time-bound process for selection	(1) None OR (2) confirm new SC members at SC meeting in July 2014
Co-Chairs and Hosting			
Rotation of Co-Chairs	Identify new Co-Chairs by Mexico City HLM	(1) Announce host for 2016 HLM AND/OR (2) announce new Co-Chairs	If necessary, identify host or Co-Chairs before SC meeting in July and/or an agreed timeframe.
Hosting	Link 1 Co-Chair to HLM Host		
Support mechanisms/ structures			
	Formalise the annual meeting on Busan implementation in Korea Agree systematic regional meetings	Announce intention to use annual Seoul meeting and/or regional preparatory meetings to enhance the country focused Global Partnership.	Prepare a plan for improving SC engagement; Work planning incorporating preparatory meetings
Revising on the joint support team			
	Support team prepares key deliverables and budget, with pledges by next SC meeting		Prepare key deliverables
			Fundraise
			Revise deliverables as necessary