# Revised Proposal: New Global Partnership Monitoring Framework

May 2022

# I. Introduction

An ambitious reform of the monitoring exercise of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (GPEDC) is taking place during 2020-2022. It will culminate with the endorsement of a new monitoring proposal at the Effective Development Co-operation Summit in December 2022. The scope of the reform includes changes to both the monitoring framework and the monitoring process.

This document provides a proposal for a new monitoring *framework*. It has been developed with attention to feedback received during the various consultations led by Co-Chairs over the course of the reform. It is intended as the basis for collecting reactions, with a view to reach agreement amongst stakeholders, and with the Steering Committee, so that preparations can be made for resumption of monitoring in 2023. It will also be discussed at a multi-stakeholder in-person technical workshop, taking place from 14-16 June in the Republic of Benin.

A first draft proposal of elements of a revised monitoring framework  - built on the "contours" of the revised framework that the Steering Committee endorsed at its 21st meeting - was released in October 2021 and tested with stakeholders through a virtual consultation (summary of consultation feedback) in October-November 2021. In December 2021, the Steering Committee agreed (meeting summary) on the focus areas of the revised monitoring framework, namely how the evidence collected through the monitoring exercise will be presented, as well as the key content and changes to the former framework. Technical work and further discussion with experts have taken place in the first quarter of 2022 and informed the revised framework presented in this document.

The **structure of this document** is as follows:

*Part II: The Revised Monitoring Framework – Snapshot:* a high-level overview of the structure of the new framework, and explanation of the rationale for the shift
*Part III: The Revised Monitoring Framework – In More Detail:* a more detailed presentation of the new framework, including key content (with reference to placement of previous indicators) under each component
*Part IV: Additional Information:* more detailed description and explanation of the framework
*Part V: For Reference – Previous Monitoring Framework:* overview of indicators from the 2018 monitoring round

A set of **annexes to this document**, available here, includes the following:
*Annex I: Mapping of Content of New and Old Frameworks:* mapping of the former indicators to the new framework, with information as well on the changes to the former measurements and the degree of comparability
*Annex II: Full Questionnaire of the Monitoring Framework:* all proposed questions for the new framework
*Annex III: Draft Kampala Principles (KPs) Assessment:* although this will be an integral part of the framework, as it is an entirely new assessment area and the questionnaire is in an early draft form, it is presented in a separate annex for ease of reference

# II. The Revised Monitoring Framework – Snapshot

The proposed new Global Partnership monitoring framework is presented in the following table. A more detailed version is presented in Table 2.

**Table 1. The revised Global Partnership monitoring framework: a snapshot**

| | Dimension | Component | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Collective accountability | Whole-of-society approach to development | Engagement and dialogue | SDG 17.16.1 |
| | | Parliamentary oversight | |
| | | Enabling environment for Civil Society Organisations | |
| | | Private sector engagement in development co-operation | |
| | State and use of country systems | Planning | |
| | | Respect country's policy space – **SDG 17.15.1** | |
| | | Public financial management | |
| | | National budget | |
| | | Gender budgeting – **SDG 5.c.1** | |
| | | Accountability mechanisms | |
| | | Information management | |
| | | Procurement | |
| | Transparency | Countries' action | |
| | | Development partners' action | |
| | Leaving no one behind | Consultation | |
| | | Targets and results | |
| | | Data and statistics | |
| | | Targeted focus of private sector engagement | |

Additional information on this new framework is as follows, presented in the form of answers to key questions that may arise:

► *How* **is the new framework constructed?** The framework is comprised of three elements:
   o **Dimensions.** The four dimensions are the core blocks of the framework. They are the key thematic areas around which the content of the monitoring framework can be grouped. They are expected to be a clear and important - but not exclusive - way to generate distinct storylines from the results that will emerge. These four dimensions align very closely with the four ''focus areas'' for which the Steering Committee, in December 2021, agreed that technical work on the framework should proceed. That technical work was the basis for adjusting the language of the first dimension.[1] The dimensions are conceptual groupings to facilitate the narrative around the emerging results.

---

[1] The original focus area was ''collective accountability and a whole-of-society approach to development''. This has been changed, to reflect that behaviours which underpin collective accountability are actually captured across the entirely of the framework.

- o **Components[2].** The components are conceptual sub-groupings of evidence collected within each dimension, used to facilitate the narrative around the results emerging each of the dimensions.
- o **Content** [shown in Table 2]**.** These are short descriptions of the more specific areas, within a given component, for which evidence is collected and results will be generated.

*The concept of collective accountability is shown as transversal across the framework.* This recognises that various accountability actions and behaviours, taken by different actors, are interwoven across the framework. In this sense, the monitoring framework in its entirety represents a tool for collective accountability. In addition, this presentation of the framework *highlights that the monitoring exercise will continue to provide official data for three SDG indicators.*

► *Why* **has the framework been constructed this way – what benefits does it offer?** The construct of the new framework offers several improvements over the previous version (see Part V for reference). **First**, it conveys more clearly *what* the monitoring exercise collects evidence on and *what kind of results* it will produce. A stakeholder can see this easily by glancing at the dimensions and their associated components. For any given dimension, or indeed for its underlying components, it is not claimed that the monitoring exercise will provide a comprehensive assessment of all aspects. But this framework shows *which* aspects - related to LNOB, for example – the GPEDC *does* monitor. **Second**, this new structure is consistent with the structure of other similar measurements used by academia[3], national governments[4], and international organisations[5].

► **Why are the four effectiveness principles not in the structure of the framework?** The core mandate of the Global Partnership monitoring exercise is to measure progress on stakeholders' commitments to the four principles of effective development co-operation. The new monitoring framework will continue to deliver on this mandate, by generating evidence which speaks to the four principles. The previous framework (see Part V of this document) attempted to illustrate a causal relationship between a principle and a sub-set of indicators.[6] While this approach was appealingly simple the logic was flawed: many of the underlying behaviours contribute to more than one principle.[7] It is thus proposed that, going forward, there is a more flexible approach to using the evidence that emerges from the monitoring to report on how stakeholders are meeting their commitments to the four principles, by drawing on relevant data from *across the framework*. To this end, the content listed under each component should not be interpreted as indicators in the same sense the term "indicator" was used in the past. They should rather be seen as core results generated either by data points or sub-elements of a composite assessment (many of which already collected in the past but were not visible in the simplistic version of the framework, some others which are new) or as summary measurements (equivalent to what in the past was defined as "indicator"), when these generate relevant evidence.

---

[2] Neither the components (nor the dimensions) will be used to generate an index or summary score based on the information contained therein, but rather to facilitate the narrative around the results that emerge.

[3] See for instance the structure for multidimensional poverty index (MPI), used by the Oxford Poverty and Human Initiative, and comprised of three dimensions and ten components.

[4] See for instance the Multidimensional Vulnerability Index (MVI) used by the Gross National Happiness Commission in Bhutan, composed of four dimensions and 18 indicators.

[5] See the structure used by UNICEF's Multiple Overlapping Deprivation Analysis (MODA) to describe the list of common indicators in each dimension. Similarly, the World Bank's Statistical Framework from the Statistical Performance Indicators (SPI) is comprised of five pillars and 22 components.

[6] The monitoring proposal [October 2021] also attempted to loosely correlate the four principles with the four focus areas [now dimensions], but that attempt arguably did not add value and was inconsistent (for example the LNOB focus area was linked to all four principles), and has hence been dropped.

[7] For example, as shown in the table in Part V, in the previous framework the indicators related to partner countries strengthening their national results frameworks, and development partners using country-led results frameworks, were associated with the principle of *Focus on Results*, but arguably are also strongly related to *Country Ownership.*

## III. The Revised Monitoring Framework – In More Detail

Table 2 replicates the same information as appears in Table 1, but supplements it with additional detail:

► **What does complementary data refer to and how will it be used?** Table 2 shows that the content of the revised monitoring framework will include both core and complementary data. The distinction, as well as the rationale and use is described in Box 1 as follows:

**Box 1. Overview of core and complementary evidence**

| Type of evidence | Rationale | Use | Source |
|---|---|---|---|
| CORE<br><br>[un-italicised bullet points in Table 2] | This evidence provides the essence of the GPEDC monitoring framework; it is aimed at generating headline messages to drive accountability and political momentum. | Would be used at global level to generate headline statistics for high-level engagement and communication; and at country level to highlight the overall key effectiveness trends. | Country level, through the monitoring exercise & Global level, through existing measurements [shown in blue font in Table 2] |
| COMPLEMENTARY<br><br>[*italicised and lighter grey text* in Table 2] | Provides contextual information to illuminate the bottlenecks preventing progress on the implementation of the commitments. Complementary evidence had been included for issues highlighted by stakeholders during the reform's consultations. | Would help explain and unpack the underlying reasons and nuances of the headline statistics from the core evidence; while this will be useful at both country and global level, it will be particularly useful as a substantive input for [country-level] Action Dialogues and formulation of action plans to progress on implementing the effectiveness commitments. | Country level, through the monitoring exercise |

► **Will all monitoring data be collected at country level?** No, as in the past, some data – indicated in blue font in Table 2 - will be drawn from existing global measurements but collated by the JST for inclusion in the results of the monitoring exercise. In addition it is envisioned that some secondary data from global sources, described in Part IV below, will be drawn on to enrich the interpretation of monitoring results.

► **How does the revised framework ensure continuity of reporting and data comparability?** In response to stakeholders' expectations[8], the revised framework preserves comparability and continuity of trends by keeping all past measurements in the revised framework, with the exception of the previous indicator 3 on public-private dialogue which will be replaced by the Kampala Principles assessment. For reference, Table 2 shows (between parentheses) the indicator numbers as they were defined through the 2018 monitoring round. Annex I of this document also shows in more detail the comparison between the former indicator framework and the proposed revised framework and points to where some adjustments to the existing scoring methods/intermediate approaches are needed given the addition of new elements demanded by stakeholders (e.g. to increase the focus on LNOB). Furthermore, data points (information captured from one or a few questions) contained within core measurement areas (existing indicators) were not visible in the simple representation of the previous framework, as shown in Part V[9]. These data points are given more prominence in the revised framework, as a way to more accurately reflect the scope and richness of the evidence that the monitoring generates.

---

[8] Throughout the consultations, stakeholders were explicitly invited to suggest core measurement areas (existing indicators) to drop if they wished to see a leaner framework. No proposals were forthcoming and stakeholders voiced strong expectations for continued data collection on previous measurements. Therefore, the revised framework maintains all previous core measurements.

[9] The former framework was composed of a heterogeneous mix of measurements, some of which improperly defined as "indicators" and others hidden in the simple representation of the framework (shown in Part V of this document). Some of those measurement were improperly referred to as "indicators", although they did not correspond to a summary result (e.g.

**Table 2. The Global Partnership monitoring framework: detailed version**

The following version of the table – Table 2 - provides additional details and information on the content of framework. This is described in the narrative section which follows the table. Key features of the table include:

- **Previous indicators (by number) are highlighted in bold** for easy identification and to emphasise that **all indicators have been retained**, with the **exception of indicator 3** (public-private dialogue), which will be replaced by the Kampala Principles assessment;
- As explained in the table above, in the "Content" column, core data is shown as un-italicised, complementary data is shown as *italicised/lighter grey* font, and data collected at global level through existing measurements is shown in blue font.

| | **Dimension** | **Component** | **Content** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Collective accountability** | **Whole-of-society approach to development** | Engagement and dialogue | • Countries and development partners engage a diversity of stakeholders in the preparation of their national development strategies<br>• Countries include a diversity of stakeholders in: dialogues on development priorities and results [based on national development strategies/progress reports]; joint accountability assessments towards targets for development co-operation | **17.16.1** |
| | | Parliamentary oversight | • Countries regularly provide information on development co-operation to parliaments<br>• Development co-operation is recorded on national budget (**Indicator 6**) | |
| | | CSO enabling environment | • CSOs report improvement to their enabling environment due to (**Indicator 2**):<br>  o the government<br>  o development partners<br>  o their own effectiveness<br><br>- *Partner country governments, CSOs and development partners participate in an inclusive dialogue to assess civil society enabling environment; philanthropic organisations and trade unions are consulted as part of this reporting process* | |
| | | Private sector engagement | [content to emerge from the **Kampala Principles assessment, which replaces Indicator 3**]:<br>• Countries, development partners, private sector businesses, trade unions and CSOs work together through multi-stakeholder dialogues to design more transparent, inclusive and effective partnerships through private sector engagement in development co-operation<br>• Countries have a policy framework that builds on a consultative process with relevant stakeholders and articulates the envisaged role of private sector in development co-operation<br>• Engagement of private sector in partnerships in development co-operation is facilitated by countries and development partners | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **State and use of country systems** | Planning | <ul><li>Countries have quality national development strategies and results frameworks (**Indicator 1b**)</li><li>Sector and sub-national strategies are linked to the national development strategy</li><li>Countries and development partners include SDGs in their national development strategies and country-level strategies</li></ul> - *Development partners support strengthening of country development planning capacity* | |
| | Respect country's policy space | <ul><li>Development partners use country-owned results frameworks and planning tools for developing their country-level interventions (**Indicator 1a**) **SDG 17.15.1**<ul><li>Objectives</li><li>Results indicators</li><li>Data and statistics</li></ul></li></ul> - *Main reasons for limited/no use of country-owned results frameworks and planning tools by development partners* | |
| | Public financial management | <ul><li>Countries have quality public financial management (PFM) systems (PEFA) (**Indicator 9a**)</li><li>Countries strengthen their PFM systems (**Indicator 9a**)</li><li>Development partners use PFM systems when channelling funding to the public sector (**Indicator 9b**)</li></ul> - *Development partners country's strategies include: agreements [with government] on the use of PFM systems; support to strengthen PFM systems*<br>- *Main reasons for limited/no use of PFM systems by development partners*<br>- *Funding disbursed to the public sector as proportion of total funding to the country* | |
| | National budget | <ul><li>Development co-operation is predictable (**Indicators 5a and 5b**)</li><li>Development co-operation is recorded on national budget (**Indicator 6**)</li></ul> - *Main reasons for low predictability of funding* | |
| | Gender budgeting | <ul><li>Countries have systems to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment (**Indicator 8**) – **SDG 5.c.1**</li></ul> | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Accountability mechanisms | • Countries have inclusive, regular, transparent, result-focused accountability mechanisms, captured in a policy framework (**Indicator 7**)<br><br>- *Countries' development co-operation policies indicate preferences for modality of support by development partners (e.g. budget support, public sector support)*<br>- *Countries use results of accountability assessments to inform discussion at national development co-operation/partnership fora and/or for adopting joint actions*<br>- *Development partners country's strategies include agreements [with government] on preferred co-operation modalities* | |
| | | Information management | • Countries have information management systems for development co-operation<br>• Development partners report to these information management systems<br><br>- *Development partners support strengthening country information management systems for development co-operation* | |
| | | Procurement | • Aid is untied (**Indicator 10**) | |
| | **Transparency** | Countries' action | • Countries make publicly available:<br>   o information on development co-operation, national development plans and their progress reports<br>   o results of joint assessments towards targets for development co-operation | |
| | | Development partners' action | • Development partners:<br>   o report to global systems and standards (OECD-CRS, OECD-FSS, IATI) (**Indicator 4**)<br>   o make publicly available their country-level strategies | |
| | **LNOB** | Consultation | • Countries and development partners engage representatives of vulnerable and marginalised groups in the preparation of their national development strategies and country-level strategies<br>• Countries include representatives of vulnerable and marginalised groups in: dialogue on development priorities and results [based on national development strategies/progress reports]; joint assessments towards targets for development co-operation | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Targets and results | • National development strategies and development partners country-level strategies include development priorities for vulnerable and marginalised groups<br>• National development strategies include disaggregated targets and results indicators<br>• Development partners use distributional analysis to define targets and results indicators for the beneficiaries of their interventions<br><br>- *Countries have in place systems to track and make public budget allocations for vulnerable groups of the population (e.g. for the poorest, youth and children, the elderly)*<br>- *Development partners country-level strategies include support to increase the capacity of vulnerable and marginalised groups to organise and represent themselves* | |
| | | Data and statistics | • Data-based assessments inform national development plans/ development partners country-level strategies<br>• Disaggregated data and statistics are available to monitor progress on targets and results indicators | |
| | | Targeted focus of private sector engagement | • National development co-operation strategies articulate how private sector should be engaged in development co-operation to specifically target vulnerable and marginalised groups<br>• PSE projects are designed to explicitly target groups of the population who are at risk of being left behind | |

# IV. Additional Information

► **Where can the detailed assessment questions be found?** The [draft] detailed assessment questions can be found in the annex to this document. Stakeholders who provided feedback to the virtual consultation on the draft monitoring proposal may also wish to consult this document, which responds point-by-point to the feedback received.

► **Will secondary data be used in connection with the monitoring framework?** Beyond the core and complementary evidence, other data generated by external/secondary sources may be considered to enrich interpretation of the monitoring results. This responds to calls from stakeholders to utilise secondary data. During various consultations related to the reform, stakeholders have suggested a range of potential sources. The following secondary data, at minimum, are expected to be utilised, in view of their topical relevance, and, in some cases, as a response to stakeholder expectations for additional data collection that can be met through secondary data, rather than by increasing the burden of primary data collection. The use of additional secondary data, beyond the following, will be explored on an iterative basis going forward, based on feasibility, as well as considerations of value added, quality and coverage, and stakeholder demand. Similarly, secondary data indirectly generated through the exercise will be considered. This could include information on participation in the monitoring exercise to be featured in country results briefs (which development partners reported to the exercise in the country) and in development partner profiles (in which partner countries they engaged in the exercise).

  ▪ **OECD-CRS data on share of funding provided to public sector, and across other modalities.** This information will be used [in DP profiles] to allow for a broader picture of the funding provided by [a given] DP[s] to those partner countries participating in a monitoring round. This information would complement and help contextualise those results from the monitoring exercise that are based on funding disbursed to the public sector (e.g. use of PFM systems, predictability of development co-operation).

  ▪ **[OECD] Data on *de facto* tied aid.** The OECD Contract Awards Database (not publically available) indicates the share of ODA-related procurement contracts awarded by each development partner to companies based either in the partner country, in the country of the development partner or in a third country. This information would complement the overall untied aid figures by showing the extent to which development partners working in the country are contracting partner country national companies in their ODA-related procurement process and the extent to which partner country national companies are successful in ODA-related procurement processes.

  ▪ **Paris21/Bern Network data on DP support to strengthen data and statistical systems**. The Clearinghouse for Financing Development Data (supported by the Bern Network) captures on a regular basis development partners' support to National Statistical Systems (NSS). Clearinghouse data on support to NSS can complement the evidence generated through the monitoring exercise on the extent of use of NSS (and understand for example if development partners are supporting efforts to build country-level capacities in the long term).

► **How will bilateral support to the multilateral system be reflected?** To complement the presentation of monitoring results for bilateral partners, the new monitoring will highlight [available] characteristics of how the individual development partner funds the multilateral system by including, in development partner profiles, elements such as the amount and share of funding to the multilateral system, and the share of core vs. earmarked funding. In line with stakeholder demands to not duplicate between the GPEDC and the work/mandate of others, is information will be drawn from existing data (e.g. OECD-CRS database/provider profiles of the OECD Development Co-operation Report and/or evidence from DAC Peer Reviews, the UN Global Compact, and [potentially] MOPAN).

► **What is the status of development of the assessment of implementation of the Kampala Principles (KPs)?** Tables 1 and 2 now reflect what is proposed for how the KPs assessment will be integrated into the monitoring framework, and the key results that will be generated. This is consistent with what was proposed in the technical paper that was circulated with the draft monitoring proposal in October 2021, which was in turn based on stakeholder expectations expressed through consultations, as well as on the Steering Committee guidance that the KPs should be a contour of the new framework. As the KPs assessment is a new assessment area for the monitoring exercise*, it should be emphasised that the information reflected in Tables 1 and 2, as well as the assessment questions contained in the annex to this document are a very initial draft – to a greater degree than other areas of the framework* which have been subject already to consultation and/or are adjustments to existing measurement areas. As such, the KPs assessment will be subject to additional consultations over the course of 2022.

► **How will the adaptation for fragile and conflict-affected states (FCAS) be captured as part of the revised monitoring framework?** Technical work on the FCAS adaptation is ongoing and has benefitted from inputs from experts during the first quarter of 2022. While not yet reflected in this revised proposal, the adaptation will be based on the tailored approach that was endorsed at the 17th Steering Committee in 2019, was which in turn was underpinned by the work of a multi-stakeholder open working group established in 2018.

► **How is Action Area 2.3 work on monitoring the effectiveness of South-South Co-operation (SSC) reflected?** Colombia is leading work of GPEDC Action Area 2.3 to develop and pilot a framework (and process) to monitor the effectiveness of SSC. Once rolled out, it will not be integrated into the GPEDC monitoring exercise, and is thus not referenced in the above framework. When the monitoring exercise resumes in 2023, it is anticipated that there will be a [separate] offer on SSC monitoring for those interested countries. There will be clear communication so that countries fully understand the differences and benefits of the SSC monitoring and the GPEDC monitoring. Effort will be made to ensure complementarity of both sets of monitoring, and countries can opt to participate in one or both of these two monitoring exercises. The advantage of this approach is that some dual [provider and recipient] countries do not see GPEDC monitoring as useful to their country context so participating in SSC monitoring allows them to remain engaged in effectiveness issues. It is also flexible that if a country sees value in participating in both monitoring exercises, they can do so. For those countries that are interested to undertake SSC monitoring and agree to make the results available within the GPEDC monitoring framework, the results will be included in their country results brief from the GPEDC monitoring.

**How does the monitoring generate evidence on youth and children?** In response to stakeholder feedback, the revised framework will generate a range of results relevant for youth and children. This includes information on whether: governments and development partners engage them in the definition of development strategies and country-level strategies respectively, and identify specific development priorities for them; governments define disaggregated targets, results indicators for youth and children; and disaggregated data and statistics are available to track progress on those targets and indicators. A complementary question will also be asked to reflect whether systems are in place in partner countries to track budget allocations for youth and children, as well as for other segments of the population.

## V. For Reference – Previous Monitoring Framework

The following is the framework used in the most recent (2018) round of the monitoring exercise:

| PRINCIPLES | FOCUS ON RESULTS | | COUNTRY OWNERSHIP | | INCLUSIVE DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIPS | | TRANSPARENCY AND MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **INDICATORS** | **1A** | Development partners use country-led results frameworks | **5A** | Development co-operation is predictable: Annual predictability | **2** | Civil society organisations operate within an enabling environment that maximises their engagement in and contribution to development | **4** | Transparent information on development co-operation is publicly available |
| | **1B** | Countries strengthen their national results frameworks | **5B** | Development co-operation is predictable: Medium-term predictability | **3** | Quality of public-private dialogue | **6** | Development co-operation is included in budgets and subject to parliamentary oversight |
| | | | **9A** | Quality of countries' public financial management systems | | | **7** | Mutual accountability between development actors |
| | | | **9B** | Development partners use country systems | | | **8** | Governments track public allocations for gender equality and womens' empowerment |
| | | | **10** | Aid is untied | | | | |