

21st Steering Committee Meeting

Summary Report

7 & 8 July 2021
Virtual meeting

Objectives

- Session 1: Initiate preparations for the next High-Level Meeting in 2022, with a brainstorming on the political vision and strategic objectives, followed by a discussion on how members can support preparations.
- Brainstorming: Climate and development effectiveness: Explore members' interest and views on discussing the interlinkages between the climate change agenda and effective development co-operation in the run up to and beyond the next High-Level Meeting.
- Session 2: Hear from members an update on the latest progress on country-level 'Action Dialogues', explore how members are mobilising support for the Action Dialogues and agree on how to use emerging evidence for HLM3.
- Session 3: Update members on the initial stages of and ongoing work related to the GPEDC review, and discuss how to use emerging findings to foster political engagement in the run up to the next Steering Committee meeting.
- Session 4: Present and garner feedback on the Co-Chairs' consolidated proposal on the contours of a revised monitoring framework and key elements of an improved monitoring process, as well as on next steps in the monitoring reform.

For background documents and presentations from this meeting, please visit [this page](#).

For a full list of Steering Committee members, please visit [this page](#).

Joint Support Team Contacts

Thomas Boehler, e-mail: Thomas.Boehler@oecd.org, Tel: +33 1 45 24 87 75,

Rod Mamudi, e-mail: Rod.Mamudi@undp.org, Tel: +1 212 906 5742

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the 21st Steering Committee was held virtually over two days, with English-French interpretation available to members. The meeting was chaired by the Partnership's four Co-chairs and brought together participants representing committee members.

Introduction

H.E. Ambassador Thomas Gass, Assistant Director General of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (Switzerland), welcomed members and noted that the pandemic has put a spotlight on the importance of leaving no one behind, as enshrined in the 2030 Agenda. H.E. Amb. Gass asked members to reflect on the role the Partnership can play in building forward better and supporting the realisation of the SDGs.

H.E. Mr. Christian Mwando Nsimba, Minister of Planning (DR Congo), addressed the Committee for the first time as new Co-chair. Reflecting on the impact of COVID-19, the Minister highlighted the importance of effective financing for health systems in partner countries. The Minister encouraged greater coordination among development partners at country level, and collective action to support transparency and accountability. He encouraged members to work together to use the next High-Level Meeting to put the Global Partnership at the heart of efforts to achieve the SDGs.

Ms. Fatima Yasmin, Secretary of the Economic Relations Division in the Ministry of Finance (Bangladesh), representing H.E. Mr. Mustafa Kamal, Minister of Finance, reminded members that the recovery from the pandemic is still some way off, with many countries facing new 'waves' of the pandemic. Against this background, the Global Partnership should support principles-based and evidence-led action to improve partnerships on the ground and leave no one behind. Ms Yasmin invited members to consider how to mobilise political engagement in the lead up to the next High-Level Meeting, especially recipients of development co-operation.

Mr. Vitalice Meja, Executive Director of Reality of Aid Africa (Non-executive Co-chair), stressed that development effectiveness should become the norm and not a choice in the post-pandemic world. Effectiveness should be the guiding framework through which countries address the challenges of the pandemic and the future beyond the current crisis. He encouraged members to think about using the next High-Level Meeting as a milestone to improve their programmes and projects and, ultimately, people's lives.

Key outcomes

The Steering Committee has:

- **agreed on the political vision and strategic objectives for the next High-Level Meeting**, prioritizing the development of a clear narrative to attract political attention ahead of the event.
- **welcomed Switzerland's offer to host the 2022 High-Level meeting in Geneva**, which will most likely have a hybrid format to allow all constituencies to actively join discussions.
- **agreed that messages stressing the importance of effectiveness in action on climate and related financing could be relevant for discussions at COP26** and that the Co-Chairs will explore with members how these messages can be delivered.
- **welcomed members' and countries' efforts to drive inclusive multi-stakeholder 'Action Dialogues' at country level**, for strengthening effective development cooperation at country level and generating fresh insights on effectiveness issues to inform global-level accountability.
- **reiterated support for the review of the Global Partnership**, and noted the progress made so far in gauging inputs from stakeholders. Members welcomed the opportunity to contribute to the review process following the release of an initial report late-summer/early-autumn, while the Republic of Korea offered space at the next Busan Global Partnership Forum to further consider findings at the end of 2021.
- **agreed with the Co-Chairs' proposal for the contours of the new indicator framework** and appreciated the recent inclusive consultations. Members also recognised that 'trade-offs' will need to be reconciled in order to achieve the ambition of the reform, noting that much remains to be done on the reform in the relatively short period of time before the next HLM.

Session 1:

- ✓ **Members expressed a high level of support for the proposals on the political vision and strategic objectives for the 2022 High-Level Meeting made by the Co-chairs.** They emphasised the need for a **clear narrative** to build political support ahead of the meeting and link effectiveness to global efforts for building back better and greener. Members suggested that such a narrative should focus on demonstrating **how effectiveness delivers better impact**, and need for a **whole-of-society approach** to deliver the 2030 Agenda. They further agreed that a focus on how development effectiveness can contribute to the ambition of leaving no one behind in practice is key to pursue effectiveness as a genuine political agenda, while staying within the GPEDC's mandate and aligning with other processes, and expressed their willingness to support the Co-Chairs in developing this agenda and building support for it in the run up to the HLM.
- ✓ **Members welcomed Switzerland's offer to host the next High-Level Meeting in 2022** and agreed that the event will most likely have a **hybrid format**, to allow for effective participation of all constituencies at the relevant levels, in person and virtually. The **new monitoring framework and process**, the **review of the Partnership** and work and insights from the Partnership's **Action Areas** as well as country-led Action Dialogues will all inform the meeting. A **short political communiqué** was suggested as the most appropriate format for an outcome document.

Brainstorming – Climate action and development effectiveness:

- ✓ **Members underscored the importance of development effectiveness in action on climate change.** Some members, however, raised concerns about the Partnership engaging in the climate and environment sphere in view of limited resources, and other processes active in this field. There was broad agreement that impactful climate action would benefit from greater recognition and application of the four principles and that members should bring this message to the COP 26, if possible.

Session 2:

- ✓ Members showcased how they are planning for their Action Dialogues, using this opportunity to **foster dialogue and collective action on evidence related to effective development co-operation**, including from the **monitoring exercise**.
- ✓ Given the importance of inclusive participation of country-level stakeholders in the Action Dialogues, it is important for all **constituencies and stakeholders to refer to the Knowledge Sharing Platform** for relevant information on the list of confirmed countries, **to mobilise support and engagement at country-level**.

Session 3:

- ✓ Members agreed to a **roadmap for the review process** to produce concrete and workable recommendations to enhance the Global Partnership, including a sense-making workshop and the 2021 Busan Global Partnership Forum as milestones. The 22nd Steering Committee Meeting will consider recommendations in full.
- ✓ Members emphasized that this review is critical to **understanding how the Partnership can work better to provide incentives** for different stakeholders to deliver better at the country level, drive policy and promote accountability in changing global and local contexts.

Session 4:

- ✓ Members **agreed with the contours** of the revised monitoring framework proposed by the Co-Chairs, noting the inclusive process that informed their development. While expressing overall agreement with the strategic vision, they did raise **questions about how various challenges will be reconciled**, noting that **difficult choices will need to be made to this end**.

- ✓ With respect to the reform's next steps, members encouraged that the **pace of the reform be accelerated**. They requested that the broad contours be translated into more specific indicator-related proposals as soon as possible. Co-Chairs emphasised the **complexity of the forthcoming technical work**, which will require a holistic approach to integrate the contours into a coherent indicator 'system'.

Summary of Deliberations

Session 1: Delivering development better to advance progress on the SDGs – Preparing for the next GPEDC High-Level Meeting

Moderated by H.E. Mr. Thomas Gass, Switzerland. Members that took the floor: All four co-chairs as well as Canada, CIPE, Colombia, CPDE, DAC Chair, EU, Germany, IPU, ITUC, NEPAD, Nepal, PIFS, Republic of Korea, UNSDG, WINGS.

Part 1: Political vision and strategic objectives

- Members welcomed and agreed with the proposed vision and objectives for the next High-Level Meeting presented by the Co-chairs, placing a strong focus on implementing **the whole-of-society approach** to sustainable development. Members stressed the need for further investing in the localisation of the 2030 Agenda and clearly demonstrating how effectiveness can support efforts to build forward better and greener at the country level after the COVID pandemic and leaving no-one behind. Some members proposed ideas to broaden the scope of work, and to reinterpret the principles for different contexts and sectors while others recommended focusing squarely on the GPEDC niche and commitments made in Busan and Nairobi.
- In terms of deliverables, members raised the importance of presenting a **renewed monitoring process and framework** that can be more flexible and aligned with partner countries own policy and SDGs processes. Some members recalled the ambition of preparing and presenting pilots to demonstrate the strength of the new monitoring approach at the HLM. The **findings from Action Dialogues**, should demonstrate how the monitoring exercise can result in practical action at country level to improve effectiveness.
- Members suggested that the HLM should be informed by the **findings from Action Dialogues** and the **recommendations of the GPEDC review**.
- In order to generate political support in the run up to the meeting, members suggested investing in a **communication strategy** that shows concrete examples of how effective development co-operation can contribute to **better impact and support national development agendas**. In this sense, members raised that insights generated through the Action Dialogues and the expected case studies of the different action areas as sources of information and data for such an effort.

Part 2: Political engagement process, format and deliverables

- **Switzerland offered to host the next High-Level meeting**, pending agreed format (virtual or hybrid). Members welcomed the offer, highlighted benefits of having the meeting in Geneva to link to UN processes and raised the positive aspects of having at least part of the meeting face-to-face to facilitate informal and bilateral meetings. Nevertheless, the uncertainty of the pandemic was said to make it difficult for all participants to be present on site and members suggested the exact format could be decided later to ensure the decision is taken based on latest pandemic developments.
- In terms of attracting political engagement, members stressed the need **to craft and clearly communicate a narrative** that shows the value added of effective development co-operation and the GPEDC in supporting the achievement of accelerated progress on the SDGs, the delivery of

the Agenda 2030 and its commitment to leave no-one behind. They emphasised the need for a strategic approach for building and communicating this narrative before the HLM to gather the necessary political support for this agenda and to ensure ministerial-level attendance at the HLM.

- Members expressed support for the idea that the HLM outcome should be a **short political communiqué** that avoids the lengthy draft and validation process of the Nairobi Outcome Document.

Brainstorming: Climate and Development Effectiveness

Moderated by Amb. Thomas Gass, Switzerland; Members that took the floor: Bangladesh, Canada, CPDE, DAC Chair, EU, Germany, ITUC, ORU-FOGAR, PIFS, UCLG, UNSDG, Vitalice Meja, WINGS.

- Members welcomed the discussion on **interlinkages between climate action and development effectiveness in the GPEDC**. They acknowledged the importance of the topic and bringing the development and environment/climate agendas more closely together, but also raised questions about which contribution the GPEDC could make in practice. Members agreed to further explore how to ensure climate actions in the context of development co-operation are more squarely grounded in the effectiveness principles. The modalities of this support will need to be further discussed to ensure that these efforts do not compromise the implementation of the current work plan and divert resources from core activities. The Co-chairs proposed to continue this conversation with members to explore potential pathways for engagement that harness the GPEDC's added value.

Session 2: Action Dialogues – Maximising impact in light of COVID-19

Moderated by Ms. Fatima Yasmin, Bangladesh; Members that took the floor: Afghanistan, Colombia, Cote d'Ivoire, CPDE, DRC, EU, IPU, ITUC, Nepal, Republic of Korea, Switzerland, UNSDG

- With a view to strengthen the effectiveness of development cooperation in their countries, **five partner countries shared their plans to lead an Action Dialogue in 2021**. This included that:
 - DRC is organizing a national participatory dialogue to further build on ongoing SDG financing initiatives. The Dialogue will complement existing mechanisms and aim to enhance inclusive exchanges with regard to development financing, effective cooperation and development.
 - Afghanistan is finalising a concept note to embed an Action Dialogue within the national development cooperation dialogues planned to take place in late September or early October. Among other things, the Action Dialogue aims to enhance the link between development planning and budgeting in order to spur implementation of the country's strategic development plan; the Afghanistan National Peace and Development Plan II (ANPDF II).
 - Colombia plans to link its Action Dialogue with the Knowledge Hub on South-South Cooperation to promote the exchange of knowledge and information on this issue. The Dialogue will be organized with diverse stakeholders with the view to discuss how to make SSC more effective in the context of development transition.
 - Cote d'Ivoire has held several preparatory meetings in advance of their Action Dialogue, which aims to result in a memorandum on the state of effective development cooperation; related follow-up actions; a dialogue mechanism; and an analytical mechanism to assess development coordination.

- Nepal is planning for an Action Dialogue that will focus on understanding effectiveness in different sectors, as well as how to strengthen effective partnerships and disseminate related lessons across different stakeholders (e.g., sub-national, the private sector, etc.).
- Members welcomed the efforts made by partner countries to lead an Action Dialogue and flagged their interest to support and engage further in these efforts. Members were encouraged to **regularly check the [Knowledge Sharing Platform](#) for relevant information** on the list of confirmed countries, and to actively mobilise support and engagement at country-level for the countries that have confirmed they will do an Action Dialogue in 2021.

Session 3: The Review of the Global Partnership

Moderated by H.E. Mr. Christian Mwando Nsimba, DRC; Members that took the floor: Canada, CPDE, EU, Germany, IPU, Republic of Korea, UNSDG

- In terms of responding to initial findings, members were positive about the work undertaken so far, and its thoughtful and frank approach to the review; well aligned with an initiative so invested in transparency. With the review in process, members noted their expectations that it produces **concrete and workable recommendations to strengthen the work of the Partnership**, both in the shorter-term/lead up to the next HLM, but also longer-term issues, as needed.
- Members agreed that more efforts should be placed on analysing country level outcomes, rather than the global-level context, in order to help deliver local action. Members further agreed on the value of incentives amongst members to deliver better country-level performance.
- Members brought forth the idea of forming **stronger alliances and partnerships within the multilateral sphere/UN system**, by focusing on a few more topical issues, such as digitalization, climate change, post COVID-19 recovery, etc., and making relevant linkages on these issues.
- They also acknowledged the initial finding that the Partnership is mainly champion-driven; that is, it relies heavily on the extensive efforts of a select group of its membership. While this is part of the voluntary and inclusive ethos the Partnership advocates for, there is room for improvement in terms of how the Partnership can involve members to be more proactive in different areas of work.
- Members expressed their concern around a lack of recognition of the Partnership as a 'legitimate' platform in the context to the 2030 Agenda. Although the Partnership is appreciated as a less rigid/formal, low threshold space where partners can constructively convene on effective development cooperation, the absence of being perceived as a more legitimate platform could restrain the Partnership's influence on the 2030 Agenda.
- Members suggested **further examining models of other multi-stakeholder initiatives that have close connections to country level efforts**, for other examples of approaches that tackle specific local issues at the country level (though the review team also noted that many such initiatives face challenges translating global resolutions into country-level action).
- With interviews wrapping up at the end of July, consultants will analyse and present initial findings by August, to be further discussed with stakeholders over the autumn. **Members agree to use the sense making workshop (mid-September) and the Busan Global Partnership Forum (end-November) as milestones to address how the outcomes of the review can be built upon.** The 22nd Steering Committee Meeting will consider recommendations in full.
- Members stressed the need to build consensus around the proposals emerging from the review in advance of the HLM so that these can form the basis for a renewed and reinvigorated partnership to be launched at the HLM – and requested that the process for consensus building be included in the roadmap for the review process.

Session 4: The Global Partnership monitoring reform: towards new evidence, better accountability and more relevance

Moderated by Mr. Vitalice Meja, 4th Co-chair; Members that intervened: Canada, Colombia, CPDE, EU, Germany, IPU, ITUC, Republic of Korea, Switzerland, UCLG, UNSDG

Part 1: Strategic vision: contours of new indicator framework

- **Members agreed to the contours as proposed by the Co-Chairs**, and expressed appreciation for the extensive and inclusive constituency-based consultations that were convened since the Committee last met. Several specific contours were particularly welcomed by members, including on monitoring of leave no-one behind (LNOB), Kampala Principles, South-South co-operation, multilateral donorship, as well as the overall focus on making the framework more inclusive and reflective of various stakeholders' role in development co-operation.
- **Members felt that the contours represent broad issues to be reflected in the new framework, and, as soon as possible, need to be translated into more specific proposals in relation to indicators.** Members would welcome the opportunity to review a provisional outline with elements of the new indicator framework, even in a rough form, ahead of the next Committee meeting and before significant methodological work goes ahead. This could help reconcile contradictions and make choices.
- It was suggested that, as work on the new framework moves forward, consideration should be given to [previous GPEDC work to monitor effectiveness in fragile and conflict-affected situations](#). There was **overall agreement on the strategic vision for the new monitoring proposal, but also questions about how some apparent contradictions contained within it will be reconciled.** Members pointed to the challenge of producing a simplified framework while including additional and more qualitative information, as well as of having a leaner framework while maintaining a degree of data comparability over time. Members acknowledged that there will be **difficult choices as the reform advances.**
- Members emphasized that **what is measured through the monitoring framework should be informed by commitments**, and encouraged that this linkage with commitments be more explicit as work on the framework advances. The monitoring should also strengthen capacity and build on existing processes and data to avoid duplication.
- In terms of the scope and expectations for what needs to be done by HLM3, as well as to support the resumption of monitoring in 2023, **members pointed to the need for increased resources and support for the JST.**

Part 2: Issues A and B [monitoring process]: next steps of the reform

- Members welcomed the update from Co-Chairs on the further work on the monitoring process, both through consultations [Issues A] and analytical work [Issues B], since the Committee last met.
- Some members focused in particular on the challenges and **complexity of institutionalising the monitoring process** at the country level [one of the Issues A], where key considerations include how to do so in a way that promotes a multi-stakeholder approach. Regarding the analytical paper **on the occurrence of the monitoring process, members had mixed reactions to the options listed.** Some voiced a preference among the options (favouring Option 1 on open waves); there were also reservations about altering the timing of the exercise.
- There was also a suggestion to focus on developing a proposal for the revised monitoring process, to be consulted on at a technical event in advance of the next Steering Committee meeting, and that this should take precedence over methodological work on the indicators. **Co-Chairs conveyed that they view work on the framework to be a priority.**

- In response to the proposed next steps of the reform, several members pointed out that the time spent over the past year on consultations has left a relatively short time remaining, before HLM3, for technical work on indicators and any in-depth piloting on aspects of the new framework and process at the country level. **Some members agreed with the roadmap for the reform, with others highlighting the need to move more quickly. Co-Chairs emphasized the complexity of the work ahead**, including the fact that the contours need to be integrated into a coherent “system” of indicators, which requires a holistic approach. They reiterated that the reform will remain an inclusive process, with members’ views welcome throughout.
