

OUTCOMES OF THE MONITORING WORKSHOP IN BENIN

Room document for Session II: “The Global Partnership
Monitoring Reform: Preparing for Endorsement and Roll-Out”

23rd Steering Committee Meeting, 6-7 July 2022

This document provides an update to the Steering Committee on key outcomes of the Global Partnership workshop “Paving the way for endorsement of the new Global Partnership monitoring” on 14-16 June 2022, held in Cotonou, Republic of Benin. It is shared with Steering Committee members as additional background for discussion on the monitoring reform, complementing the formal [background document](#) for Session II.

Contacts:

Ms. Ashley PALMER, e-mail: Ashley.PALMER@oecd.org

Mr. Paul FARRAN, e-mail: Paul.FARRAN@undp.org

Strategic Level Considerations Emerging from the Benin Workshop

Participants from Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America reviewed the monitoring proposals in depth over a 2.5-day workshop, under the leadership of the GPEDC Co-Chairs.

As a general note, **the workshop provided technical level validation of the revised monitoring framework and process proposals, paving the way for a strategic-level agreement by the Steering Committee.**

Appreciation was expressed by the Co-Chairs for the ideas shared by stakeholders of the GPEDC during the reform process, which have all served to shape the formulation of the proposals. Further, inputs received throughout the workshop sessions provide strong foundations to begin the drafting of guidance notes for the revised monitoring exercise from 2023.

It was further agreed that following the 23rd Steering Committee meeting, Members should begin mobilizing constituents on the new monitoring, aiming for commitments at the Summit. On this, the re-launch of the monitoring in 2023 could be part of the Summit outcome document, pushing for political leadership and momentum.

1. THE MONITORING FRAMEWORK

Overall agreement (no objections) on the structure of the revised framework and the evidence that will be generated, as indicated through the dimensions and the components.

In preparing guides for the revised monitoring, **additional work at the technical level will continue in the lead-up to the re-launch in 2023 to refine terminology, specific data points, and assessment questions.** This will also include more explicitly representing the EDC principles as an underlying foundation of the revised framework.

2. INCREASING THE FOCUS ON LNOB WITHIN THE GPEDC MONITORING

General positive feedback on the relevance of the LNOB assessment and the fact that it will produce useful evidence and data for partner countries and development partners to help guide the actions towards advancing on the pledge to LNOB.

Challenges raised in relation to how to ensure that the **perspectives of vulnerable and marginalized groups are taken into account**; this also needs to be addressed during the inception as well as the reflection, dialogue and action phases.

In preparing guides for the revised monitoring, **additional work at the technical level will continue in seeking to address the complexity of reporting** on specific questions. It will also explore ways to strengthen the approach to collect evidence on the behaviours of development partners without adding excessive reporting burden.

3. STATE AND USE OF COUNTRY SYSTEMS

There was a strong sentiment that the state and use of country systems is a cornerstone for effective development co-operation and partnerships and the Global Partnership monitoring framework.

There was positive feedback to the proposed approach to highlight evidence on the state and use of various country systems, in addition to PFM systems (while remaining true to the Busan Partnership Agreement in terms of mirroring the approach on the state and use of the PFM system).

The proposal to collect complementary evidence was also welcomed. In preparing guides for the revised monitoring, **additional work at the technical level will continue to ensure that the formulation of complementary questions are not biased and encourages the use of country systems.**

4. ACCOUNTABILITY AND OWNERSHIP IN THE GPEDC MONITORING

General positive feedback and appreciation for how accountability is strengthened with the revised monitoring was expressed. In the framework, accountability is now driven at different levels and between different constellations of stakeholders. In the process, while it is still led by government, there is more emphasis on generating ownership, and in turn accountability, by engaging stakeholders more systematically.

Reflection on the fact that meaningful accountability will rely not only on the evidence generated from reporting against the monitoring framework, but also through the monitoring process, by creating a shared commitment to take action on results, which requires engagement of political leaders and decision-makers.

5. KAMPALA PRINCIPLES ASSESSMENT (KPA)

The KPA's inclusion in the monitoring is welcome as it provides an important entry point for highlighting key issues of PSE in development cooperation at country-level, and for bringing actors including the private sector around the table.

Wide support was expressed for the elements in the metrics, which focus on the policy framework, accountability & transparency, existence & characteristics of dialogue mechanisms, and other institutional mechanisms. **However, the issues in the metrics and questions proposed should be further streamlined and simplified and redundancies reduced. Importantly, the success of the KPA will be dependent on whether the right PSE stakeholders, in a given country context, are identified and engaged** right from the inception phase.

Further consultation and technical work to develop the KPA will continue and be mindful of the reporting burden, aiming to streamline metrics and questions.

6. MONITORING PROCESS – GLOBAL ROLLING ROUNDS (GRR)

Overall agreement (no objections) on the structure of the revised process, including the 4-year Global Rolling Round. Consensus on the Global Partnership monitoring as a 'global' process seeking to strengthen global accountability, no longer referring to "open waves" but rather to the process as a GRR.

The need for a global push to encourage early commitment to participate in each GRR – and at what point within the global round – was highlighted, in order to mitigate the risk of countries delaying to the end of the participation window of the round. There is thus a need for **political mobilisation to encourage the engagement** of countries and partners in the monitoring.

The proposed dashboard to record partner country and development partner participation was appreciated as a tool to drive engagement.

The regional level was highlighted in terms of exploring opportunities for a group of countries to undertake the monitoring around the same time, supported by regional bodies and platforms.

7. MONITORING PROCESS – COUNTRY-LEVEL & RESUMPTION OF THE EXERCISE

Overall agreement (no objections) on the proposal for the country level monitoring process. Appreciation of the process providing a flexible timeline in catering for various country contexts and processes, also including more targeted and diversified support and engagement.

The foreseen changes to the monitoring process that **seek strong commitment in the inception phase as well as during the reflection/dialogue/action phase were welcomed,** highlighting the renewed focus on making use

of monitoring results to generate action. It was highlighted that **periodic progress reviews could be conducted as needed at country and global levels prior to engaging in subsequent rounds.**

The need for the monitoring process to be **institutionalized within national planning processes and mechanisms** from inception was highlighted. The VNR was mentioned as providing a potential anchor at country level for the monitoring to raise the profile of the exercise and systematize its occurrence. This will require **commitment at political and technical levels and securing the resources required at country level**, as well as raising awareness within the governments and partners. Furthermore, strong engagement and support of partners is key in multi-stakeholder processes, including ensuring information is consistent between partners at global and country levels.

Participants raised the role of UN development system at country level to support the monitoring process in terms of institutionalization and coordination among partners, under government leadership.

The prospect of an online reporting tool for data collection was well received, as a way to simplify the reporting process. Participants also raised the usefulness of sharing of good practices and lessons learned from how countries undertake the monitoring in a way that is part and parcel of development cooperation process at country level.

In preparing guides for the revised monitoring, additional work at the technical level will continue in the lead-up to the re-launch in 2023 to continue to unpack the process in line with the proposal.

In order to commit and sign-up for the monitoring in the next round, participants shared several needs. These included high level political commitment and collective stakeholder engagement, as well as more practical asks, such as receiving an official invitation letter and guidance material.

8. IMPROVING THE GPEDC WAYS OF WORKING

The overall approach of the Global Partnership to ‘re-focus’ its work at country level is broadly welcomed, with the Global Partnership monitoring being the central pillar of the GPEDC work and its linkages with country-level actions.

However, noting that political leadership is lacking in many countries to fully ‘institutionalise’ the monitoring as part of national planning, coordination/partnership processes, **the global level platform remains important in terms of political advocacy, accountability, and the sharing of good practice and knowledge.** Some also pointed out the usefulness of providing guidance to country-level institutional mechanisms to promote more inclusive and multi-stakeholder coordination and accountability processes.