BACKGROUND DOCUMENT
26TH STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

Session 3: Long-Term Resourcing of the Global Partnership
Introduction: Putting steps in place towards a new resourcing model

In follow up to the decision taken at the 25th Steering Committee meeting, GPEDC Co-Chairs set up a resourcing committee with the two-fold objective of adequately resourcing all aspects of the 2023-26 work programme and developing a new resourcing model that broadens the base of supporters in line with the member-led approach of the new work programme.

This background note provides an overview of the type of financial and in-kind support needed to support the implementation of the work programme and put the ‘new delivery model’ to action at country, regional and global level. It discusses how members can resource the work programme adequately and focus on political outreach and advocacy by engaging with relevant partners in line with existing processes, to streamline resourcing and embed the GPEDC’s work programme into existing efforts, including at country level. The guiding questions at the end aim to stimulate discussion on how to carry this forward through members’ actions and the work of the resourcing committee.

Visual 1: Resourcing the GPEDC Delivery Model

Country and Local Level Action: building on new evidence to drive behaviour change

There is a renewed focus on country action. The Geneva Declaration and the 2023-2026 work programme prioritize country-level action to improve (and better anchor) development effectiveness at country level alongside global accountability and learning. The new monitoring exercise is the vehicle for this. It generates data and evidence to inform multi-stakeholder dialogue and drive learning and behaviour change with all stakeholders involved. It is therefore essential to understand and support the requirements at country level to deliver on this ambition through resourcing and strategic engagement at all levels.
Each stakeholder has its role to play at the country level:

- **Governments** undertaking the monitoring prepare and invest in the exercise and lead the in-country process.
- **Many stakeholders** have a role in contributing to data collection, while all of them are encouraged to use the findings for their own reflections, multi-stakeholder dialogue and concrete actions to make improvements. This active engagement is a key investment to ensure shared ownership of the findings, raise awareness of effectiveness as an enabler for delivering on national priorities and to put pressure on recommended follow-up action.
- **Steering Committee members** have an important role to follow the country-level monitoring closely and encourage their constituencies to actively contribute to the exercise, from inception and (in most cases) data collection up to the reflection, dialogue and action phase at country-level, and to scale up the results and findings from country-level dialogue to inform global learning and accountability.
- **Steering Committee members** can also support the organization of global monitoring training to create an opportunity for peer-learning amongst an emerging monitoring community.
- **Steering Committee Members** are invited to reflect on the resourcing of an additional (and final, for the 2023-2026 round) global in-person monitoring training in mid-2024, in addition to the two in-person training activities sponsored by the Republic of Korea and Indonesia that took place in 2023.
- **Development partners** can mobilise financial and in-kind support for inclusive follow-up action embedded in national processes, depending on country context and identified issues, building on in-country support by the UN development system.
- **The JST** provides extensive support to country-level action, particularly in support of the monitoring exercise. In particular, the JST supports each National Coordinator to lead the monitoring exercise in country, including through inception calls, support to the development of roadmaps, data collection and review and the preparation of country results briefs. The funding requirements for this essential work are highlighted in annex 1.

**Anchoring action for greater development effectiveness at country level depends on the specific context and political economy of each country.** This requires targeted and flexible support, including advocacy at political level to ensure buy-in and addressing resourcing needs in particular for Phase 5 (Reflection, Dialogue and Action) of the monitoring. The approach will be informed by the level of ambition and political opportunities or constraints in each context. Different actors are often already well placed to incorporate this in their ongoing work.

**Regional Action: towards greater systematic learning, accountability and policy influence**

Regional partnerships are critical to generate awareness, facilitate dialogue and learning, and influence policy and partnerships. Regional action is, vital for political momentum, and often overlooked. Regional actors can, through existing processes, leverage their reach and influence and build on existing events and (intra-)regional dialogues\(^2\) to foster peer learning on shared challenges and approaches. They play a key role in anchoring effectiveness and engaging more countries in their region to commit to undertaking the monitoring exercise and learning. They can also enrich global debates with regional perspectives that are informed by shared country-level evidence and best practices.

---

\(^1\) For more information on the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders, see the [guidance documents on the GPEDC monitoring website](http://www.gpedsmonitoring.org).  
\(^2\) Indonesia hosting a high-level Summit on partnerships in 2024, AUDA-NEPAD proposal to host Africa Development Days, MDBs’ annual conferences, and by engaging across regions (e.g., OECD-AUDA-NEPAD etc.).
The GPEDC Steering Committee has a strong regional dimension, with regional development banks (represented by IDB), AUDA-NEPAD, the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, the Arab Donors, the European Union all representing regional ambitions around development effectiveness. Some government members also represent important regional dimensions (e.g., Indonesia in Asia-Pacific and G20, Colombia in the LAC region etc.).

A range of planned regional actions require more attention. The Action Plan agreed by the Committee includes regional caucuses (Africa in 2023, Asia-Pacific and LAC region in 2024). These are not meant to be set up as ‘stand-alone’ activities (see also background document for session 2 on ‘strategic partnerships’). While Africa had a group on development effectiveness in the past (which met irregularly, usually ahead of HLMs), looking ahead AUDA-NEPAD has raised capacity constraints and submitted a resourcing proposal for this work to be intensified. Asia-Pacific and LAC region members are similarly encouraged to consider how to set up a light caucus structure that helps support country action and linkages to the global level.

Global Action: development effectiveness driving sustainable development

Global action requires adequate resources. This includes for Steering Committee members to continue to invest in constituency-specific, global coordination and engagement. As per updated Terms of references, this role remains vital to drive accountability and inform ongoing debate, also related to the future global development agenda, and at regional and country level. The ‘constituency-based’ model is essential to move from evidence to policy and behaviour change across stakeholders. This also requires adequate resources for the 4th Co-Chair role, and support for some constituencies to carry out internal coordination.

Global advocacy is key to drive action around the monitoring and its follow-up. For this, existing events hosted by members, such as the Busan Forum and global monitoring trainings, are very helpful. Members are also using global events, mostly at the United Nations, and work towards its own High-Level Meeting based on a global report in 2026. It is foreseen that, in principle, a Senior Level Meeting would take place at mid-way of the 2023-2026 Work Programme. The idea of a Senior Level Meeting would be to raise political momentum for the effectiveness agenda and promote accountability and learning. With the Indonesia Summit and potential other regional events planned for 2024, the Committee may consider that parts of these events can be used for this purpose, and replace a separate, stand-alone Senior Level Meeting. (The first-ever Senior Level Meeting was held back-to-back with the UN HLPF in 2019, which proved useful in terms of saving travel costs, but it required considerable investment from all actors as it was a stand-alone event).

Member-Led Thematic Initiatives

Thematic Initiatives are an important driver of policy action in specific areas. They complement core activities, especially by some stakeholders and communities that want to pursue policy work in a multi-stakeholder setting around specific topics, in some cases linked to the monitoring evidence that will be generated. Thematic initiatives are fully member-led and -financed, with ‘light JST support’ to ensure synergies with core activities of the work programme. Members are invited to contribute to and participate in Thematic Initiatives, and/or initiate new ones within the GPEDC multi-stakeholder set-up if specific opportunities arise.

Member leadership is key for their success. Though not all Thematic Initiatives need funding to initiate planning and prepare for the work, several of them presented funding proposals at the Resourcing Committee on 14 September 2023, indicating e.g., the need for seed money to initiate multi-stakeholder processes, coordinate members or prepare work plans. The JST has set up a dedicated
space in the Knowledge Management Platform where members can post and exchange on funding proposals. Members of the Thematic Initiatives are invited to fully take advantage of the dedicated space in the knowledge sharing platform, and bring resourcing or partnerships needs to the attention of the resourcing committee.

The Joint Support Team

The JST has dedicated and defined roles to support the core areas of the work programme at country, regional and global level as set out in Annex 3 of the Geneva Outcome Document. This is pursued in line with a division of labour between OECD & UNDP building on the comparative advantage and the complementary strengths of both host organizations, focusing on: (1) support to the Monitoring exercise; (2) Secretariat, Advisory and Partnerships services; and (3) Advocacy, Strategic communication, Learning and Knowledge management.

The JST’s ability to fulfil these functions is subject to adequate, balanced and predictable resources of both OECD and UNDP. Table (Annex 1) below describes the minimum financial resource needs of the JST to support the core functions of the work programme. For more information on ways to resource the JST (including through secondments) as part of a predictable long-term financing strategy, please see documents of the resourcing committee and the 25th Steering Committee. Deliberations concluded that given the nature of the GPEDC as an inclusive, multi-stakeholder platform, a broadened, diversified donor base requires a funding model that does not instate membership fees or recommendations for levels of contributions. This requires ongoing and intensified fundraising efforts and follow-up by GPEDC co-chairs and members, also to mobilize resources from non-Steering Committee members.

Conclusion

Financial resources are critical to the continuation of GPEDC’s work. Implementation of the 2023-2026 Work Programme will not be possible without the JST being adequately resourced. In light of this, we need the commitment of all Steering Committee members to engage in more intensified fundraising efforts with the objective of securing resources for the JST, as a prerequisite to be able to support members to deliver on their commitments made at the Geneva Summit.

In addition, implementing the new ‘delivery model’ depends on dedicated stakeholders that understand how they can support in-kind. Resourcing gaps need to be indicated early on in the knowledge sharing space, which serves as a marketplace for resourcing proposals and members’ pledges. Steering Committee members can also explore other pathways to contribute substantively, including through advocacy and outreach that can generate ownership. The more effort they dedicate to this, the more likely it is that the resourcing base for the GPEDC will broaden and bring different stakeholders more at eye level with each other.

The monitoring and its follow-up actions requires ‘all hands-on deck’. This approach of bringing together financial and in-kind support is particularly important at country level, where the monitoring will be undertaken by the government with stakeholders. Development partners, the UN development system and other actors can support the government in its effort to collect data and engage in inclusive dialogue on its findings and follow-up. Special emphasis should be focused on how to set up light processes at country level that are streamlined and well-integrated in existing processes to drive and follow-up on the monitoring. In line with every member’s specific responsibilities (see Action Plan), this requires political will and clear instructions for constituencies to prioritise and focus (e.g., in monitoring countries where they are present, in regional caucuses they belong to etc.).
Resourcing shortcomings must be addressed, including:

- **At country level**: (centralized) support to the JST to enable support to countries leading the monitoring, and (decentralized) support for inclusive follow-up action embedded in national processes, depending on country context and identified issues, building on in-country support by the UN development system;
- **At regional level**: regional organisations supporting dialogue, learning and accountability;
- **At global level**: political advocacy and outreach at highest political level, organization of global monitoring training (2024), support for some co-chairs and SC members, SLMs/HLMs;
- **For Thematic Initiatives**: seed money for work plans, as well as country level action;
- **For the JST**: predictable, long-term resourcing that allows forward planning and covers the core areas of support.

**Questions for Discussion and Action**

- What financial and in-kind resources will you contribute to make the 2023-2026 GPEDC work program and monitoring exercise a success?
- What actions can be undertaken to sustainably resource the Joint Support Team to support the backbone of the GPEDC work programme?
- Which priorities would you like the resourcing committee and co-chairs to focus on?
Annex 1: JST Resource Needs\(^3\) (can also be met through in-kind contributions such as secondments).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core function</th>
<th>OECD (EUR)</th>
<th>UNDP (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2023(^4)</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1: Monitoring</td>
<td>884,705</td>
<td>884,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3: Targeted Advocacy and Outreach</td>
<td>88,470</td>
<td>88,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,523,000</td>
<td>1,523,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current resourcing gap(^6)</td>
<td>0(^7)</td>
<td>677000(^8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 All figures as of August 2023. Numbers are inclusive of GMS. All figures are indicative and subject to change.
4 All figures are indicative as per the funding ceiling set under the OECD/DAC 2023-2024 Programme of Work and Budget (PWB), and consist of a mix of assessed contributions, non-earmarked voluntary contributions and voluntary contributions earmarked for GPEDC. These amounts do not include contributions from non-DAC members that may be availed in addition to the funding envelope set out for DAC contributions to OECD/JST and would allow to cover additional resource needs. The agreed funding envelope under the 2023-2024 OECD/DAC is significantly below the resources under the previous PWB (- 6.5 staff) and represents the absolute minimum amounts for the core aspects of the methodological work on the monitoring and basic secretariat support functions to be performed. Below this threshold, critical functions will not all be performed (such as the support to the substantive organization of Steering Committee meetings, validation of monitoring data validation to ensure quality of the monitoring exercise, production of country results briefs and other analytical products on the basis of the raw data).
5 On the basis of a 2025-2026 budget that sets a budget ceiling that is at the same level of the current PWB 2023-2024 level. Negotiations on the PWB 2025-2026 will start within the OECD/DAC towards the end of 2023. The continuation of any outputs beyond 2024 is subject to the inclusion of such outputs in the OECD’s future Programme(s) of Work and Budget (“PWB”). Estimated budget figures are subject to approval by the DAC.
6 The OECD/JST funding gap is calculated taking into account a portion of OECD’s assessed contributions to GPEDC, voluntary contributions carried forward from 2021-2022 and new voluntary contributions received for 2023-2024.
7 Indicative funding gap as of 13 November 2023.
8 The 2024 funding gap includes an estimated rollover amount required to ensure business continuity into the 2025-2026 OECD/DAC PWB.