



## **Global Partnership Event**

**“The Global Partnership Monitoring: Fit for the Road to 2030?”**

**Bonn, 10 & 11 May 2019**

### **SUMMARY**

*50+ participants from over 12 countries met in Bonn for two days to discuss the perspectives for the Global Partnership Monitoring exercise in light of recent experiences during the monitoring round 2018. During the hands-on discussions on data collection, data quality and effective use of results, practitioners from partner country governments, donor headquarters, civil society and trade unions identified strengths as well as challenges of the current Monitoring approach. Moreover, the dialogue provided space to analyse the potentials of the Global Partnership Monitoring within the contemporary global landscape by considering international developments ever since Busan (2011) and with regard to the Sustainable Development Goals of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. This included discussing the ongoing efforts of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) to adapt the exercise to specific contexts such as monitoring effectiveness in fragile states and in South-South cooperation. The event was hosted by the Government of Germany. It took place in light of the upcoming Senior Level Meeting in July during the High Level Political Forum (HLPF) in New York.*

#### **Key Messages:**

- The Global Partnership Monitoring is a globally unique exercise to generate evidence on the quality and effectiveness of development cooperation in partner countries through an inclusive, decentralized and country owned approach.
- The exercise will continue to be the flagship of the GPEDC. Yet, its framework will require refinements and rethinking on many levels to ensure it produces meaningful data in the context of changing global landscapes.
- The monitoring is not an end in itself. Results need to be translated into action on the country level to spur change for increased effectiveness. It will be crucial to foster follow-up processes to utilize the data, widen the reflection on a way forward and increase the relevance of the results in different fora and diverse platforms.
- With fragility aspects growing in importance worldwide, the current effort to adapt the Global Partnership Monitoring to fragile situations remains key to producing meaningful data – it also holds a direct link to the SDG principle of “Leave no one behind”.
- A specific approach to monitoring effectiveness of Southern cooperation is highly relevant to account for its growing importance. Linking this effort closely to the global discourse on Southern cooperation represents the unique opportunity to further include new development partners to the effectiveness community.

- Political momentum around effectiveness needs to be revived through a clearer nexus between the effectiveness debate and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. This also includes reviewing the concept and contents of the effectiveness agenda in light of contemporary development landscapes.

### ***Session I: Setting the Scene***

The first session connected the Monitoring Dialogue to a preceding GPEDC “Country Level Implementation” workshop, which concluded on nine pilot initiatives on the implementation of effectiveness at country level. A presentation by the European Commission on the latter’s main take-aways **reiterated that the [effectiveness principles](#) continue to be indispensable prerequisites for achieving the goals mapped out in the 2030 Agenda**. Thereafter, the Joint Support Team of the GPEDC set the ground for subsequent discussions by giving an overview of the Monitoring 2018, its process and aggregated preliminary results.

Recognizing the evolving development landscape and subsequent challenges to its monitoring exercise, the Global Partnership is already taking steps to ensure that it continues to deliver cutting-edge evidence on effectiveness. One of the ways that the Global Partnership is doing this is by reviewing the monitoring process. The discussions in Bonn, together with the monitoring feedback survey and SLM discussions, will inform a comprehensive review of the monitoring exercise prior to the launch of the next monitoring round. The Global Partnership is also tailoring through the development of principles for private sector engagement through development co-operation, adapting its monitoring to fragile contexts, and supporting the development of an approach to measure the effectiveness of South-South cooperation.

### ***Session II: The Process of Data Collection***

This session reviewed the experiences of the data collection during the 2018 Monitoring and identified lessons learned on how data collection could be strengthened in upcoming monitoring rounds. The debate also shed light on how the Global Partnership Monitoring data and process can inform the review mechanisms around the 2030 Agenda. The panel was constituted by representatives of Rwanda, Georgia, Australia, the CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) and the Partners for Review initiative.

**The Global Partnership Monitoring is a globally unique exercise, which uses a multi-stakeholder approach to generate evidence on the quality and effectiveness of development cooperation in partner countries.** This was highlighted as especially important considering the rising demand for data to take evidence-based action for a focus on results and effective, results-driven development cooperation. Moreover, the GPEDC was credited with providing one of the rare and shrinking spaces for civil society representatives. **While participants agreed that the current approach remains highly valuable given its inclusive, country-heavy and decentralized approach, there was broad consensus that challenges regarding the framework and data collection call for new approaches on methodology, process and follow up.** Discussions highlighted that more needs to be done to make data collection *de facto* efficient, inclusive and country-owned, but also realistic in terms of time windows, expectations to multi stakeholder approaches (which need time), data quality as well as capacities in the partner country. Participants reported that limited responsiveness by either partner country governments or donor agencies have hindered smooth data collection. This was attributed to **capacity deficiencies as well as to the complexity of the process, time constraints and a perceived decrease in political momentum**. It was also asserted that the challenges are linked to the fact that the Global Partnership

Monitoring, being a global exercise, cannot do justice to the individuality of all participating countries. Moreover, partner countries reported difficulties concerning the participation rates from non-traditional actors. The debate pinpointed the political challenge and necessity to include these actors, highlighting that the international aid architecture is no longer characterized by the classical dichotomy between donors and recipients. Participants also stated that the growing number of non-traditional aid relationships might make it gradually less possible to apply a one-size fits all approach to monitoring, thus underlying the relevance of the current efforts of the GPEDC to adapt the framework for Southern cooperation and other contexts or areas. **Impulses to refine the approach in response to these observations were diverse and addressed how the global management of the Global Partnership Monitoring could further be aligned with country level needs and processes.** Ideas included the provision of targeted and contextual capacity support to partner governments, the conception of regional approaches e.g. for the SMIS in the Pacific or a novel timing through a more voluntary roll-out and schedule to be determined by partner countries. Finally, it was acknowledged that the **Global Partnership Monitoring and the SDG Review approach could learn from each other's experiences.** Both do have similarities, being voluntary, state-led and multi-stakeholder processes. Main differences consist in the wider scope of the 2030 Agenda as well as in the individual country choice on indicators and timing foreseen in the SDG review process. It was suggested that an exchange on best practices of the processes could be envisaged and discussed in regional and global fora and networks on monitoring the SDG.

### ***Session III: Making the Actual Difference - Using Results for Change***

The session focused on how monitoring results can be used in various contexts and by all stakeholders for driving country-level change to enhance effectiveness and accelerate the achievement of the SDGs.

Discussions also allowed participants to pinpoint opportunities and challenges of using the data and to discuss possible solutions. The panel was constituted by representatives of Kenya, Malawi, the European Commission, the Global Partnership Initiative Mutual Accountability and Results, the Non-Executive Co-Chair of CPDE and the German Co-Chair.

**The Global Partnership Monitoring is a highly relevant tool to induce evidence-based “change” for more effectiveness on country-level.** This was underlined as the main *raison d'être* of the monitoring process. The Global Partnership Monitoring is thus generally understood as far more than a tool to merely assess donor performance. The discussion demonstrated how different the perceptions of *change* are among the stakeholders of the GPEDC – e.g. referring to processes, outcomes, structures or people involved in development cooperation. Participants concluded that creating a common understanding of *change* is necessary to provide sufficient grounds for negotiations between donors and recipients and truly give a voice to those groups, such as the private sector or CSOs, which are often not included in other fora and platforms. On this basis, discussions tackled the **question on how the impact of the Global Partnership Monitoring should and could be assessed in order to capture the state of data use as well as the related outcomes. This was also linked to the question on whether the contents of the indicators still touch upon the core aspects of effectiveness in the contemporary global landscape.**

One of the recurring topics during the discussion was **the lack of follow-up processes at the country level after the monitoring.** It is considered as fundamentally important to foster such processes for increased data use in order to hold up the value and create political momentum for the Global Partnership Monitoring. Throughout the discussions both the technical know-how on how to utilize the data as well as the political will to act upon

the data were pinpointed as indispensable assets for successful follow-up processes. Furthermore, **there was a general call for guidance from the GPEDC when it comes to translating the monitoring results into change and action on country level.** Creating improved interfaces between the global management of the monitoring and its results on the one hand and the processes on national levels on the other was identified as crucial to empower ownership on the ground.

**In general, the diminishing participation at GPEDC events was discussed and interpreted as a sign of decreasing political momentum around effectiveness issues.**

#### ***Session IV: Effectiveness in Fragile Situations***

In this session, the Joint Support Team presented the approach of the GPEDC towards monitoring effectiveness in fragile situations. A presentation by an Afghan government representative on the implementation of effectiveness in the Afghanistan context displayed the specific challenges to effective cooperation in fragile contexts.

**With more than half of the participating countries in the 2018 monitoring round classified as ‘fragile’ by the OECD, it becomes clear how important it is to dedicate special consideration to fragility when monitoring effectiveness.** The GPEDC Joint Support Team presented the monitoring approach to monitor effectiveness in fragile and conflict-affected situations that is currently being developed under the auspices of the GPEDC through an inclusive Open Working Group. Based on the established monitoring framework, six effectiveness areas of specific interest in fragile situations have been identified, as to say: mutual accountability, political dialogue, alignment with national priorities, strengthening national capacities, using country systems and the nexus between humanitarian, development and peace coherence. Next steps will consist in defining indicators and methodologies as well as in redesigning data collection. A subsequent presentation of the Afghan experience underlined the specific conditions under which aid is being delivered in fragile contexts. The input highlighted the relevance of efficient aid management on the one hand and the challenges of implementing country ownership in a complex and dynamic, crisis context like in Afghanistan, especially when alignment to national priorities is not among donors’ priorities. Consensus arose that **effectiveness in fragile situations must be framed according to the specific conditions on the ground.** The Afghan implementation of the Global Partnership Monitoring has helped to identify the need for improvement when engaging CSOs and local communities.

#### ***Session V: Monitoring Effectiveness of South-South Cooperation***

The session provided space to present and discuss the approach to adapt the GPEDC monitoring to South-South cooperation that has been endorsed by the Steering Committee in April 2019 in Uganda. The panel was constituted by representatives of Mexico, Chile, South Africa, Indonesia, the BRICS Policy Centre and the German Development Institute.

**In view of the globally growing importance of South-South cooperation, the current effort of the GPEDC to develop a Monitoring approach for Southern development cooperation is crucial to generate meaningful data on effectiveness.** The BAPA+40 Conference in Buenos Aires, which took place in March 2019, highlighted the increasing importance of South-South cooperation. In this light, Mexico has developed an adapted version of the Global Partnership Monitoring to monitor the effectiveness of cooperation between Southern partners. The approach was piloted during the Monitoring round 2018 in a national multi-stakeholder data collection process. It also included an assessment of applicability for other countries, which was conducted in Chile, South

Africa, Indonesia and Malaysia. Throughout the session, Southern development partners provided first-hand experiences on challenges and best practices for monitoring progress and increasing effectiveness of their cooperation. Particularly the importance of ‘being on the ground’ to understand the potentials and challenges of effective cooperation was highlighted. Moreover, the need to further involve civil society in South-South cooperation was recognized. The multi-stakeholder approach of the Global Partnership could thus be valuable to platforms and partnerships of Southern cooperation. Participants stressed the particularities of South-South cooperation as it was discussed during the BAPA+40 conference in March 2019: it is characterized by the fact that it is demand-driven, aims to create mutual benefits and that it is a form of horizontal cooperation. It was hypothesized that **establishing a conceptual link between South-South principles and the effectiveness principles could enrich the debate on the monitoring framework and prove to be fruitful for strengthening the role of the effectiveness agenda in Southern cooperation.** In addition, it was suggested to include questions into the adapted monitoring approach on how South-South cooperation is accounted for and which contributions are classified as South-South cooperation in the particular country contexts.

### ***Session VI: Outlook and Perspectives for the Global Partnership Monitoring***

The last session was dedicated to conclude and reflect on the overall relevance of the Global Partnership Monitoring, also with regards to the role of effectiveness in light of the 2030 Agenda. The panel consisted of representatives from the International Trade Union Confederation, the incoming Co-Chair Switzerland, the non-executive Co-Chair (CSO Partnership for Effective Development) and the researcher Mr. Debapriya Bhattacharya.

Participants concluded on previous discussions by highlighting the need to re-think the processes around the Global Partnership Monitoring as well as the contents that are currently being measured. It became clear that **the Global Partnership Monitoring will continue to be the flagship of the Global Partnership. Yet, it will require fundamental reviews and – as a consequence – refinements to ensure it produces meaningful data and action triggered by the results of the exercise in the contexts of rapidly changing global landscapes.** It was emphasized that a leaner data collection, more time and an effective support mechanisms for partner countries could be helpful to enable an environment for a truly inclusive and comprehensive data collection. Moreover, participants reflected on alternative set-ups of the overall management of the Global Partnership Monitoring, e.g. foreseeing a more flexible framework leaving decisions upon timing and indicator composition up to countries or regions. There was broad consensus that follow-up processes on country-level are elementary to spur real progress towards more effectiveness. Participants remarked that there has been an increasing interconnectedness between development cooperation, humanitarian aid and economic cooperation since Busan. Furthermore, it was discussed that the profiles and demands of developing countries have been changing with new actors and modalities constantly growing. **Overall, the debate underlined that the effectiveness principles and contents might need to be reconsidered conceptually in the global vision of the 2030 Agenda and considering new realities of contemporary developments.** While it was agreed that the GPEDC is a pre-SDG construct, it was nonetheless asserted that the Global Partnership is in a unique position to contribute to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals because it brings together a true representation of society by uniting government representatives, civil society and the private sector at the same table. **At the same time, some felt that the political momentum around effectiveness had waned and that it needs to be revived. The consensus is that there needs to be a clearer nexus between the effectiveness debate and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.**

Taking a step back, the panel also reflected on the outlook for the GPEDC. Mr. Batthacharya from the Centre for Policy Dialogue highlighted that the GPEDC itself would need to change in order to meet the requirements of the changing aid landscape. He depicted three scenarios for the institutional future of the GPEDC. The first scenario refers to the status-quo, where the GPEDC continues almost as it is, trying to popularize the results of the monitoring rounds with few regional adjustments to data collection. In a second scenario, the GPEDC would be complemented by additional facilities aiming to make it more efficient, inclusive and comprehensive. This could, among other things, include a follow up process to manage effectiveness. In doing so the GPEDC would establish itself as a safe space where all traditional and emerging actors in development cooperation could meet and discuss as equal partners. Lastly and as a third option, he hypothesized that the GPEDC could reinvent itself and shift its focus from monitoring norms and principles to building structures for an institutionalization of change. This was seen as a possibility to do justice to how far the discourse has moved since Busan and Paris. **Eventually it was noted that which turn the GPEDC will take in light of the globally evolving context would depend on the dynamics, political will and engagement of the GPEDC stakeholders.**

## Closing remarks by Andrea Ries, Swiss Agency for Development and Co-operation

- **Evidence based policy is our DNA**
- **But there is a need to change the monitoring tool**
- **How?** Support to partner countries, DP mobilization, capacity of non-state actors
- **What?** Fragile contexts, multilateral instruments, bridge to humanitarian peace actions
- **Who?** South-South and triangular DP, multi-stakeholder Partnerships, non-state actors
- **Where?** Country vs global process
- **Why?** Impact on Agenda 2030 results!

**Evidence-based decision-making is at the very essence of what we are doing** and what brings us together. There is a need to change the GPEDC monitoring tool. We do not have all the answers at the moment but we discussed a number of important topics over the last three days:

We looked at the **HOW** and we saw that there is a lot of scope to support the partner countries different than we have done. For example in the area of mobilising the development partners. There is no need that partner countries explain over again why participation in the monitoring is import. And there is the issue of capacity building of non-state actors. Those issues are probably relatively simple to solve and we have enough expertise and experience to address what we need to do differently.

We also looked at the **WHAT** and we have seen that there are new contexts that are becoming more important. Fragile contexts, new multilaterals instruments that come along with fragility but also with evolving systems. A couple of instruments of which development partners feel that these are not properly represented in the monitoring. We have to bridge the humanitarian peace action and to think how to capture that.

The **WHO**. We started our journey as a club of traditional donors and then widened it, but we are now in different times. We had very stimulating discussions on South-South and triangular cooperation. It marks a very important step: it was the discussion of a very long time, since Busan. To deepen this dialogue which goes ways beyond the monitoring. A learning journey combining different experiences. Two-way road and open dialogue.

Then there is the issue of **WHERE** does the monitoring actually taking part? Increasingly we hear that the monitoring is perceived as a very global exercise. When we talk to some of our partners, even to some of our [SDC] offices on the ground their understanding is that they are 'sending some data to Paris' and do not feel that it matters so much to their business. It is important that we bring the monitoring back to a country-led process.

Then the **WHY**. One very important issue is to bring the effectiveness agenda to closer to where things are done, at the very concrete levels where we are trying to reach impact, such as in the sectors. Most of the people at the operational level do not know what development effectiveness means and we are not very good in explaining the principles in a very good way.

**GPEDC is a unique platform.** A dedicated platform to build trust. Trust between partner countries, non-state actors and development partners. We should know how to make good use of it. We need to make the extra mile to go beyond the monitoring. We need discussions and arrangements in how we build structures and spaces for action and change. We do not have that yet. We are currently racing through the monitoring exercise to deliver results at the SLM but we have not really thought 'beyond that'. It is up to us to propose a follow-up of where we have these discussions on those issues to really making a difference there where change happens.

I would imagine that not all of the issues will be solved at the SLM – rather a translation of the issues raised in a work programme. We need to sequence how we do that. We certainly talk to the JST and listen to your advice whether we need another kind of this meeting after the SLM to becoming more concrete.