



2015

# Busan Global Partnership Forum

November 23 – 24, 2015 | The-K hotel, Seoul, Republic of Korea



## Plenary session 1

### The Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation's Contribution to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

#### Contacts

**Dan Coppard**, Director of Research, Analysis and Evidence, Development Initiatives

T: +44 (0)1179 272505 E: [Daniel.Coppard@devinit.org](mailto:Daniel.Coppard@devinit.org)

**Carolyn Culey**, Senior Policy Adviser, Development Initiatives

T: +44 (0)1179 272505 E: [Carolyn.Culey@devinit.org](mailto:Carolyn.Culey@devinit.org)

*Developed by **Development Initiatives** in consultation with the **Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea***



## Contents

<b>Executive summary</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<i>GPEDC as an inclusive, multi-stakeholder initiative</i> .....	3
<i>The GPEDC's global monitoring framework</i> .....	3
<i>Conclusions</i> .....	4
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>1. Agreements made at Busan</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Progress since Busan</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<i>The first round of monitoring</i> .....	6
<i>The first High-Level Meeting</i> .....	7
<i>The second round of monitoring</i> .....	7
<i>Preparations for the second HLM</i> .....	7
<i>The role of the Global Partnership Initiatives</i> .....	7
<b>3. Outcomes of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development and the UN Sustainable Development Summit 2015</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<i>The Addis Ababa Action Agenda</i> .....	8
<i>The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable development</i> .....	9
<b>4. Overview of the GPEDC's contribution to the 2030 Agenda</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<i>How can the GPEDC's inclusive, multi-stakeholder nature contribute to achieving the universal goals and targets in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development?</i> .....	11
<i>What are the key opportunities and challenges in promoting effective development cooperation in the post-2015 era to achieve greater results at country level?</i> .....	14
<i>What behavioural changes will be required among development cooperation providers and developing countries in order to achieve the SDGs?</i> .....	15
<i>What action is required to strengthen coherence at all levels?</i> .....	16
<i>What changes need to be made to the scope and priorities of the GPEDC to maximise its contribution to the post-2015 development framework?</i> .....	17
<b>5. Proposals for making the GPEDC's monitoring framework more relevant to the 2030 Agenda</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<i>In which areas could the current GPEDC monitoring framework contribute to the monitoring of SDG indicators?</i> .....	19
<i>What additional aspects could be included in the GPEDC monitoring framework in order to improve the quality, impact and effectiveness of development cooperation?</i> .....	19
<i>What are the key lessons from the GPEDC's experience of country-level monitoring, and how can these be shared with those working on the post-2015 development monitoring framework?</i> .....	20
<i>How can examples of successful practice at country level be better disseminated within the development community more generally?</i> .....	21
<i>How can the conclusions of the current and future rounds of GPEDC monitoring be incorporated into the SDG review process?</i> .....	21
<b>6. Conclusions</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>Notes</b> .....	<b>23</b>

---

## Executive summary

The Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation, which led to the creation of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (GPEDC), was a visionary agreement that represented a paradigm shift in how to ‘do’ development, moving from a North–South, donor–recipient model to one that embraced partnership, and from aid effectiveness to development effectiveness. It was prescient in forging “a new global development partnership that embraces diversity and recognises the distinct roles that all stakeholders in co-operation can play to support development.” Four years later, similar language is echoed in *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*,<sup>1</sup> which seeks to “Enhance the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development, complemented by multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilise and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in all countries, in particular developing countries”. The congruence between these two statements confirms that GPEDC’s vision is central to the achievement of the SDGs, and provides the basis for it to make a unique contribution to the 2030 Agenda. This paper explores the GPEDC’s potential role in relation to the 2030 Agenda and offers some preliminary conclusions to stimulate discussion at the 2nd Busan Global Partnership Forum.

### *GPEDC as an inclusive, multi-stakeholder initiative*

The inclusive, multi-stakeholder nature of the GPEDC is identified by many as one of its key attributes, and a firm foundation for its contribution to the 2030 Agenda. As confirmed at the Mexico Steering Committee meeting in September 2015, given the widespread recognition of the need to mobilise not just development cooperation but all available financial resources to meet the ambition of the SDGs, the GPEDC’s inclusion of emerging economies, the private sector and civil society organisations are potential strengths. But to capitalise on that potential, and to make an irresistible case for the GPEDC’s role in achieving the SDGs, it is not enough for the GPEDC to bring these actors to the table. It needs to increase dialogue with them and encourage them to embed the shared principles of development effectiveness in their own ways of working, at global, regional and country levels.

At present, while some emerging economies have made a significant investment in the GPEDC, others are less engaged, and the same is true of civil society actors. The situation is even more complex with regard to the private sector, given the plethora of individual initiatives focused on enhancing its contribution to development, and there is a need for the GPEDC to clarify its comparative advantage and determine its specific role in this area. Comparison between the shared principles agreed at Busan and the effectiveness principles developed by each of these stakeholder groups within their own forums highlights considerable scope for enhanced collaboration.

Implementation of the SDGs is likely to be through a complex network of partnerships using national experience to build and share best practice across regions, and then using regional platforms to drive global change. It is by encouraging inclusive partnerships of all kinds at country and regional level, and by providing a forum in which members can share their experience and identify common lessons learned, that the GPEDC will maximise its contribution to the 2030 Agenda.

### *The GPEDC’s global monitoring framework*

The GPEDC’s global monitoring framework is also identified by many stakeholders as a unique and valuable asset that could contribute to the monitoring of the SDGs. For this to happen, the monitoring framework needs to be technically sound, based on an agreed theory of change, and presented in a way that provides an unstoppable logic between improving the quality of development and achieving the SDGs.

The current monitoring framework has ten indicators, all of which have targets for 2015, so the first challenge in increasing its relevance to the 2030 Agenda is to revise the targets and the political commitments on which they are based. A second challenge identified in this paper is that aggregate progress on several of the long-established indicators imported from the Paris Declaration has been slow, and if this persists it risks undermining the credibility of the monitoring exercise. Publication of disaggregated data in the next Global Monitoring Report would help to address the presentational aspect of this problem, but the GPEDC also needs to create space for an open dialogue about why progress has been so slow, what can be done to tackle this, and whether certain principles need to be reassessed.

While the monitoring framework should be expanded to include a wider range of actors over time, the GPEDC should focus on dialogue rather than data in the first instance and provide space for capturing this in narrative form. This could be included either in the Global Monitoring Report or in complementary materials, and captured in updates from regional and national workshops.

With a more robust monitoring framework in place, the GPEDC would be well placed to offer its expertise to the SDG monitoring exercise and contribute to the broader follow-up and review mechanisms established by the 2030 Agenda. In terms of approach, the GPEDC could contribute to the global SDG monitoring framework in two different ways – it could seek to become a qualitative data source for a number of individual means of implementation (MOI) indicators; it could offer a complementary report that considers development effectiveness in the context of the SDGs more broadly; or it could pursue both approaches. The GPEDC's experience of running a complex global monitoring exercise, and of establishing successful regional platforms, could provide valuable lessons for those involved in monitoring the SDGs, and the GPEDC should explore the best ways of sharing these.

## Conclusions

While the SDGs focus on development outcomes (such as ending extreme poverty), the GPEDC focuses on the quality of development inputs: the effectiveness of development. The two are inextricably linked because more effective inputs and behaviours will contribute to sustained improved outcomes. By maximising its assets, and demonstrating its value in improving development effectiveness, the GPEDC can make a unique contribution to achieving the ambitions of 2030 Agenda. For this to happen, the GPEDC needs to play to its strengths and address its weaknesses as follows:

1. While the multi-stakeholder nature of the GPEDC is a potential strength, to capitalise on this in the post-2015 era, the GPEDC needs to collaborate more with other stakeholder forums at global and regional levels, and promote more dialogue and lesson learning between all of its stakeholders at country level to maximise its impact. The 2nd Busan Global Partnership Forum provides a good opportunity for exploring this with many of its key stakeholders.
2. The monitoring framework needs to be strengthened, its theory of change validated and its continuing relevance tested if it is to be presented as a key component of the GPEDC's 'offer' to the 2030 Agenda. In particular, the GPEDC needs to update existing targets, consider new indicators based on new commitments, and examine why progress on several of its long-established indicators has stalled and what can be done to address this (if the indicators in question are still judged to be relevant and important).
3. Much of the GPEDC's added value derives from the activities undertaken by participants at country level. Consideration should be given to creating a new, openly accessible online platform for sharing best practice and lessons learned from this and other GPEDC forums and workshops. A global repository of lessons learned under the GPEDC, including on the Global Partnership Initiatives and other cross-cutting efforts, could show the value added of the GPEDC and motivate new initiatives among stakeholders to support SDG implementation through effective development cooperation.

---

## Introduction

2015 has been an especially important year for international development, with the Third International Conference on Financing for Development (FFD3) taking place in Addis Ababa in July, and world leaders agreeing a new 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development at the United Nations (UN) Summit in September. Taken together, the outcome of these two events sets the framework for development over the next 15 years, so within the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (GPEDC), thoughts have turned to the role that it could play in supporting this new agenda.

While final decisions will be taken within GPEDC's governance structures and endorsed by its High-Level Meeting, this year's Busan Global Partnership Forum provides an opportunity to discuss the GPEDC's role in the 2030 Agenda with a wide range of stakeholders, crucially including those who have direct experience of monitoring and implementation at country level. The purpose of this paper is to facilitate this discussion by providing background information, sharing existing analysis and posing some guiding questions for consideration, as well as some potential answers. The paper is structured as follows:

1. Agreements made at Busan
2. Progress since Busan
3. Outcomes of FFD3 and the UN Sustainable Development Summit 2015, noting points of convergence with the GPEDC
4. Overview of the GPEDC's contribution to the 2030 Agenda
5. Proposals for increasing the relevance of the GPEDC's monitoring framework to the 2030 Agenda
6. Conclusions

## 1. Agreements made at Busan

The Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation, which led to the creation of the GPEDC, was agreed four years ago at the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Korea. It was a visionary agreement that represented a significant departure from the previous international architecture in a number of ways:

- It moved the agenda from aid effectiveness to development effectiveness, and represented a paradigm shift on how to 'do' development, moving from a North–South, donor–recipient model to one that embraced aid and non-aid financing models.
- It broadened the range of actors, creating a multi-stakeholder forum that brings together governments, bilateral and multilateral organisations, civil society and representatives from parliaments and the private sector.
- All stakeholders endorsed a common set of principles on effective development cooperation, while recognising that the ways in which these principles are applied will vary across countries at different levels of development, and between different types of public and private stakeholders; in particular, it was noted that the principles, commitments and actions agreed at Busan would be the reference point for South–South partners on a voluntary basis.
- It created a new partnership that was designed to be 'global light', with flexibility to tackle specific issues, and working arrangements that were designed to be inclusive of all stakeholders, and supported jointly by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

---

The shared principles agreed at Busan were: (a) ownership of development priorities by developing countries; (b) focus on results; (c) inclusive development partnerships; and (d) transparency and accountability to each other.

As well as agreeing these core principles, countries that endorsed the Busan Partnership Agreement made a number of commitments in terms of: improving quality and effectiveness of development cooperation; ownership, results and accountability; transparent and responsible cooperation; promoting sustainable development in situations of conflict and fragility; and partnerships to strengthen resilience and reduce vulnerability to crises. The outcome document included paragraphs on strengthening South–South cooperation and recognising the roles of the private sector and civil society in development. While the outcome document was widely endorsed<sup>2</sup> it was not negotiated on an inter-governmental basis, which is why not all UN Member States have chosen to associate with it. A further outcome of the Busan High Level Forum was the launch of ten ‘Building Blocks’<sup>3</sup> with members agreeing to work together on a voluntary basis to make further progress on key issues.

The GPEDC is an inclusive political forum committed to strengthening the effectiveness of development co-operation to produce maximum impact. Through its multi-stakeholder platform, the GPEDC provides support and guidance, with a strong country focus. It also shares knowledge to ensure coherence and collaboration among all development stakeholders on development cooperation flows and policies. It offers a global mechanism to ensure that cooperation is based on the Busan principles of ownership, results, inclusiveness, transparency and accountability, to deliver tangible results.

## 2. Progress since Busan

Members seek to monitor progress and hold each other to account for implementation of their Busan commitments via the Global Monitoring Framework, and at a political level through the GPEDC’s High-Level Meetings. Regional platforms (for Asia-Pacific and Africa, for example) also hold workshops that bring stakeholders together to focus on progress and lessons emerging at the regional level.

### *The first round of monitoring*

In 2012, the Post-Busan Interim Group developed a monitoring framework of ten indicators, each of which had targets for 2015. Some of these indicators were retained from the aid effectiveness framework developed under the Paris Declaration, reflecting areas that were regarded as especially important by developing countries. In addition, pilot indicators were developed to reflect new priorities including the use of country results frameworks, an enabling environment for civil society organisations (CSOs), the quality of public–private partnerships, and transparency.

The first round of monitoring took place in 2013 and included 46 developing countries, with data from a total of 77 countries and organisations providing development cooperation. Developing countries are responsible for collecting data for those indicators that are monitored at the country level, and national infrastructure has been developed to support this process. The results of the first round of monitoring were published in the GPEDC’s report, *Making Development Co-operation More Effective*,<sup>4</sup> prior to the first High-Level Meeting in Mexico in April 2014. The report concluded that it was too early to assess progress on the first three indicators (use of country results frameworks, enabling environment for CSOs, public–private dialogue); some progress had been made but more was required to meet targets on indicators 4–7 (transparency, predictability, aid on budget, and mutual accountability); a good start had been made on indicator 8 (gender empowerment); there was no change on indicator 9 (strengthening and use of country systems); and there was only a small increase on indicator 10 (aid untying).

---

## ***The first High-Level Meeting***

The first High-Level Meeting (HLM) took place in Mexico in April 2014, and was preceded by a series of regional workshops. The HLM assessed overall progress since Busan and reaffirmed the commitments made there, encouraging accelerated efforts to implement them in a number of key areas. The themes of the Mexico HLM – progress on implementing development effectiveness principles, domestic resource mobilisation, delivering development effectively in middle-income countries, knowledge sharing, South–South and triangular cooperation, and the role of the private sector – reflected the breadth of the GPEDC’s agenda and the inclusive nature of its partnerships. Just as at Busan, the Mexico HLM encouraged additional voluntary action, with informal coalitions developing their own proposals for going further and faster in a number of areas. A total of 39 Voluntary Initiatives were annexed to the Mexico Communiqué.

## ***The second round of monitoring***

The second round of monitoring was launched in September 2015, and by then 68 developing countries had expressed their interest in participating in this exercise. Monitoring will be based on the same ten indicators and targets, but with revised methodologies for the four pilot indicators based on feedback from the previous round of monitoring, and recommendations for strengthened infrastructure to support monitoring at country level.

## ***Preparations for the second HLM***

The second HLM is scheduled to take place in Nairobi in November 2016. It is expected to focus on reviewing progress in implementing the aid and development effectiveness agenda, identifying new areas of work, and enhancing the quality and impact of the Global Partnership for the implementation of the SDGs and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. It will also include plenaries on South–South and triangular cooperation, the economic empowerment of women and young people, ‘leaving no one behind’, and innovative multi-stakeholder partnerships and inclusive development.

## ***The role of the Global Partnership Initiatives***

The Busan Building Blocks and Mexico Voluntary Initiatives are now referred to collectively as Global Partnership Initiatives. While they play an important role in mobilising the energy and enthusiasm of GPEDC members, they have a mixed record in terms of performance. These initiatives are all voluntary, with different objectives and different set-ups. Some have already achieved their objectives; others have made good progress in their specific areas, and a few have become inactive. Progress is reflected in regular updates to the Global Partnership Steering Committee. In addition, the European Commission co-hosted a workshop with the GPEDC co-chairs and the Africa and Asia Pacific regional platforms that brought together participants from the broader GPEDC constituency, including representatives of many countries participating in the Global Partnership Initiatives in January 2015. The next workshop (scheduled for June 2016) will assess the work of the Global Partnership Initiatives and enhance the link between what they do and what the GPEDC does.

---

### 3. Outcomes of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development and the UN Sustainable Development Summit 2015

To frame the discussion on the GPEDC's contribution to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, it is worth noting the potential points of convergence between its own agenda and those agreed in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA) and the 2030 Agenda.

#### *The Addis Ababa Action Agenda*

The AAAA seeks to follow up on previous financing for development (FFD) commitments made at Monterrey (2002) and Doha (2008) to strengthen the framework to finance sustainable development and the means of implementation for the 2030 Agenda, and to reinvigorate the FFD follow-up process to ensure implementation of the commitments made. It emphasises many of the same priorities as the GPEDC – for example, putting “cohesive nationally owned sustainable development strategies” at the heart of its efforts (para 9), emphasising the importance of multi-stakeholder partnerships (paras 10, 76, 117), highlighting the critical role of gender empowerment (paras 21 and 53), and recognising the importance of transparency in relation to many different resource flows (paras 23, 42, 127).

With reference to development effectiveness, paragraph 50 states that: “We recognize that we share common goals and common ambitions to strengthen international development cooperation and maximize its effectiveness, transparency, impact and results. In this regard, we welcome the progress achieved in elaborating the principles that apply to our respective efforts to increase the impact of our cooperation.” Paragraph 58 goes on to welcome “continued efforts to improve the quality, impact and effectiveness of development cooperation and other international efforts in public finance, including adherence to agreed development cooperation effectiveness principles”.

The subsequent list mirrors many of the GPEDC's priorities, including accelerating aid untying, country ownership and results orientation, strengthened country systems, alignment with national priorities, strengthened partnerships for development, increased transparency and mutual accountability, and making development cooperation more predictable through providing regular and timely indicative information on planned support. The AAAA states that it will pursue these goals through the UN Development Cooperation Forum (DCF), while also taking into account “efforts in other relevant forums such as Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation”. The AAAA's emphasis on development effectiveness principles is significant, and offers a platform for the GPEDC to consolidate its niche in this area.

In common with the Mexico HLM agenda, the AAAA notes the central importance of domestic resource mobilisation (section II A) and the role of the private sector (section II B). Development cooperation is covered in section III C, where the AAAA welcomes the increase in official development assistance (ODA) since Monterrey while regretting that many countries have failed to meet the 0.7% target, which it reaffirms. The complementary role of South–South cooperation is recognised, with providers urged to further strengthen their cooperation and improve its development effectiveness, in line with the agreements made at the Nairobi Conference on South–South cooperation (para 57).

With regard to follow-up, the AAAA will “assess progress, identify obstacles and challenges to the implementation of the financing for development outcomes, and the delivery of the means of implementation, promote the sharing of lessons learned from experiences at the national and regional levels, address new and emerging topics of relevance to the implementation of this agenda as the need arises, and provide policy recommendations for action by the international community” (para 131). It establishes an FFD Forum within the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), which will meet



annually for up to five days, alongside the High-Level Political Forum (HLPF) established under the auspices of the General Assembly and ECOSOC. Every four years, a High-Level Dialogue (HLD) on financing for development will be convened. In addition, the UN Secretary-General will convene an inter-agency Task Force, which will “report annually on progress in implementing the financing for development outcomes and the means of implementation of the post-2015 development agenda and advise the intergovernmental follow-up thereto on progress, implementation gaps and recommendations for corrective action” as an input to the FFD Forum (para 133).

## ***The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable development***

The framework that was agreed by world leaders at the UN Summit in September 2015 sets out an ambitious agenda of action for “people, planet and prosperity”. The 2030 Agenda represents a paradigm shift in much the same way that the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation did four years earlier. Like Busan, the 2030 Agenda promotes development as a shared endeavour rather than a North–South dichotomy, and emphasises the importance of partnerships between all stakeholders – public and private, domestic and international – to achieve its universal goals. Realising the ambitions of the 2030 Agenda will require all actors to do things differently, and at all levels – national, regional and global. The GPEDC is well placed to contribute to this on the basis of its own vision and its experience as a multi-stakeholder initiative with a specific focus on development effectiveness.

The 2030 Agenda includes 17 SDGs and 169 associated targets with the aim of ending poverty, protecting the planet, and ensuring prosperity for all by 2030. Goals 1–16 focus on specific sustainable development **outcomes**, such as eradicating extreme poverty, ending hunger, and ensuring that all girls and boys complete primary and secondary education. Goal 17 – to strengthen the means of implementation and revitalise the global partnership for sustainable development – is different in that it focuses on the **inputs** required to achieve the other goals, including financial resource mobilisation, technology transfer, capacity building, and trade reform; it also identifies a number of systemic issues including policy and institutional coherence, multi-stakeholder partnerships, and data, monitoring and accountability. Goal 17 focuses on **how** the overall agenda will be delivered. This is about more than just finance; it is about partnerships, behaviours, governance and principles – issues on which the GPEDC is well placed to make a contribution.

Indicators being developed by the Inter-agency and Expert Group will be agreed by the UN Statistical Commission by March 2016. Consultation on a draft set of proposals containing more than 300 indicators is already underway. A brief comparison between the GPEDC’s current Global Monitoring Framework and the draft SDG global indicator framework suggests that the most obvious areas of convergence fall under Goal 17, where indicators are being developed to monitor the following targets:

- 17.1** Strengthen domestic resource mobilization, including through international support to developing countries, to improve domestic capacity for tax and other revenue collection
- 17.2** Developed countries to implement fully their official development assistance commitments
- 17.3** Mobilize additional financial resources for developing countries from multiple sources
- 17.15** Respect each country's policy space and leadership to establish and implement policies for poverty eradication and sustainable development
- 17.16** Enhance the global partnership for sustainable development complemented by multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources to support the achievement of the sustainable development goals in all countries, in particular developing countries
- 17.17** Encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships

It is worth noting that the indicators currently proposed for targets 17.1 to 17.3 focus on **what** resources need to be mobilised (quantity of inputs), whereas the GPEDC monitoring framework focuses on **how** development cooperation should be provided (the quality of those inputs), based on the understanding that quality of development is a precursor for sustainable outcomes. GPEDC indicator 7 on mutual accountability is specifically proposed as a potential data source for measuring SDG target 17.16 – the only reference to the GPEDC contained in the proposal released for consultation with civil society, academics and the public sector in August 2015.

A comparison between the GPEDC's current monitoring framework and the emerging SDG indicator framework reveals many other potential points of convergence, particularly with regard to 'means of implementation' indicators being developed under SDGs 1–16. The following targets appear to be relevant to the GPEDC's work:

**Target 1.a under SDG 1 (End poverty in all of its forms everywhere):** Ensure significant mobilisation of resources from a variety of sources, including through *enhanced development cooperation, in order to provide adequate and predictable means for developing countries*, in particular least developed countries, to implement programmes and policies to end poverty in all its dimensions

**Target 5.c under SDG 5 (Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls):** Adopt and strengthen sound policies and enforceable legislation for the promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls at all levels

**Target 8.3 under SDG 8 (Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all):** Promote development-oriented policies that support productive activities, decent job creation, entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, and encourage the formalization and growth of micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises, including through access to financial services

**Target 10.b under SDG 10 (Reduce inequality within and among countries):** Encourage official development assistance and financial flows, including foreign direct investment, to States where the need is greatest, in particular least developed countries, African countries, small island developing States and landlocked developing countries, *in accordance with their national plans and programmes*

**Target 16.7 under SDG 16 (Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels):** Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels

**Target 16a:** Strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacity at all levels, in particular in developing countries, to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime

Primary responsibility for follow-up and review of the SDGs rests with national governments, with all Member States encouraged "to develop as soon as practicable ambitious national responses to the overall implementation of this Agenda" (para 78, *Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*) and follow-up and review is welcomed as a means of fostering peer-learning. The HLPF will have the central role in overseeing follow-up and review at the global level. Its discussions "will be informed by an annual progress report on the SDGs prepared by the UN Secretary-General in cooperation with the United Nations system, based on the global indicator framework and data produced by national statistical systems and information collected at the regional level" (para 83). The Addis Ababa Action Agenda's dedicated follow-up mechanism on financing for development will also feed in to follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda.

---

## 4. Overview of the GPEDC's contribution to the 2030 Agenda

The next section of this paper considers the GPEDC's potential contribution to the 2030 Agenda. This is examined by posing a series of guiding questions that will be put forward for discussion after the opening plenary of the 2015 Busan Global Partnership Forum. A number of key GPEDC stakeholders have already put forward their suggestions on its potential contribution to the post-2015 framework, including the co-chairs, members of the Steering Committee, and the Joint Support Team. To further aid discussion at the Forum, this paper draws on their contributions as well as offering new analysis on how the GPEDC can best support the 2030 Agenda.

### ***How can the GPEDC's inclusive, multi-stakeholder nature contribute to achieving the universal goals and targets in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development?***

In 2011, the Busan Partnership was prescient in forging "a new global development partnership that embraces diversity and recognises the distinct roles that all stakeholders in co-operation can play to support development". Four years later, similar language is echoed in *Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, which seeks to "enhance the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development, complemented by multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilise and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of the SDGs in all countries, in particular developing countries" (Target 16, SDG 17).

Many actors regard the inclusive, multi-stakeholder nature of the GPEDC as one of its key attributes, and the basis for its contribution to the 2030 Agenda. As confirmed at the Mexico Steering Committee meeting in September 2015, given widespread recognition of the need to mobilise not just development cooperation but all financial resources to meet the ambition of the SDGs, the Global Partnership's inclusion of emerging economies, the private sector and CSOs are all potential strengths. But to capitalise on that potential, and to make an irresistible case for the GPEDC's role in achieving the SDGs, it is not enough simply to bring these actors to the table; the GPEDC needs to increase dialogue with them and encourage them to embed the common principles of development effectiveness in their own ways of working, at global, regional and country levels. Increasing dialogue and collaboration with all of its stakeholder groups, especially at country level, is essential if the GPEDC is to maximise its contribution to the 2030 Agenda.

Table 1 summarises the Busan principles alongside the effectiveness principles adopted by key stakeholders within their own forums. The similarities highlight the scope for increased collaboration.

**Table 1: Similarities between the Busan principles and those agreed in other forums**

Busan shared principles <sup>5</sup>	Nairobi outcome document of the High-Level UN Conference on South–South cooperation <sup>6</sup>	Istanbul CSO Development Effectiveness Principles <sup>7</sup> (8 principles)	Joint statement from representatives of the public and private sectors on ‘Expanding and Enhancing Public and Private Co-operation for Broad-Based, Inclusive and Sustainable Growth’ <sup>8</sup> (5 principles)
<b>1. Ownership of development priorities by developing countries</b>	“Respect for national sovereignty, national ownership and independence, equality, non-conditionality, non-interference in domestic affairs and mutual benefit”	3. Focus on people’s empowerment, democratic ownership and participation	
<b>2. Focus on results</b>	“We also recognize that the impact of South-South cooperation should be assessed with a view to improving, as appropriate, its quality in a results-oriented manner”	8. Commit to realizing positive sustainable change	
<b>3. Inclusive development partnerships</b>	“South–South cooperation embraces a multi-stakeholder approach, including non-governmental organizations, the private sector, civil society, academia and other actors that contribute to meeting development challenges”	6. Pursue equitable partnerships and solidarity	Inclusive dialogue
<b>4. Transparency and accountability to each other</b>	“We acknowledge the need to enhance the development effectiveness of South–South cooperation by continuing to increase its mutual accountability and transparency”	5. Practise transparency and accountability	Transparency and accountability for results

The Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation was ground-breaking in shifting the paradigm from aid as a North–South transfer, to development cooperation as a shared endeavour. Some emerging economies have invested heavily in the GPEDC, particularly Mexico as a co-chair, and host to the first HLM. But others are less engaged, and continue to regard the UN as the only legitimate forum for discussion, preferring to participate in the UN Development Cooperation Forum (DCF) rather than the GPEDC, and using as their reference point the outcomes of the 2009 Nairobi UN Conference on South–South Cooperation rather than the development effectiveness principles adopted at Busan. The table above nevertheless highlights considerable overlap between these two agendas. Going forward, stepping up collaboration with the DCF – for example, by building on the existing informal roadmap for strengthening synergies and reducing duplication between the DCF and the GPEDC – may represent a practical solution for establishing a dialogue with those actors who have so far chosen not to engage with the Global Partnership.

CSOs are represented within the GPEDC via the CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE), and one of the indicators in the Global Monitoring Framework focuses on providing an enabling environment for CSOs. But while CPDE endorsed the Busan Partnership Agreement, CSOs look to their own forum and framework – the Istanbul Principles for CSO Development Effectiveness – in terms of legitimacy. The overlap between the Istanbul principles and the Busan principles suggests that here, too, there is significant scope for greater collaboration in taking forward a shared agenda on increasing development effectiveness, and one in which all actors share the same rights and responsibilities.

---

As noted in *The Role of the Private Sector in Development Effectiveness: Common Components for Success in Future Partnerships*, a background paper prepared for the 2015 Busan Global Partnership Forum, one of the main outputs from the 2011 Busan High Level Forum was a joint statement from representatives of the public and private sectors on “Expanding and Enhancing Public and Private Co-operation for Broad-Based, Inclusive and Sustainable Growth”.<sup>9</sup> This recognises five shared principles to maximise the benefit of coordination and collaboration to support development, namely: inclusive dialogue; consultation and collective action; sustainability; transparency; and accountability for results.

While the private sector is represented on the GPEDC Steering Committee, and public–private dialogue is the subject of one of the indicators in the monitoring framework, there is no ‘one-stop shop’ for engagement with the private sector; rather, there are many different forums for collaboration on development effectiveness. These include: Global Partnership Initiatives such as Partnerships for Prosperity (which emerged from the Busan Building Block on the Private Sector) and the Roadmap developed by The Partnering Initiative and supported by UK Aid;<sup>10</sup> the UN Global Compact; a large number of sector-specific initiatives such as the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) and the Open Contracting Partnership; and many other innovative partnerships led by providers of development cooperation such as the United States Agency for International Development (USAID)’s Global Development Alliances.

The background paper on the role of the private sector emphasises the heterogeneous nature of the sector, and the multiple roles that business can play as a partner in development. These multiple roles bring multiple opportunities, and a number of initiatives are already underway working directly with private sector partners. In light of this, there is a need for the GPEDC to clarify its comparative advantage and determine its specific role in this area. It should not aim to focus on all the ways in which the private sector contributes to development. Rather, it may find added value through identifying and analysing what works based on development effectiveness principles, translating this into guidance alongside Indicator 3 of the monitoring framework (engagement of the private sector), and using its convening power to help spread good practice. The background paper provides options for an actionable agenda to this end.

While more sustained collaboration at the global level between the different constituencies represented in the GPEDC could increase its relevance to the 2030 Agenda, it is at country level where this kind of dialogue is likely to have the greatest impact. For example, the country case studies referenced in the background paper on the role of the private sector provide many examples of successful partnerships between the public and private sectors. While some of these are context specific, the paper identifies some common components that can be identified to ensure that future partnerships are focused on mutually beneficial outcomes and designed to achieve positive social and economic outcomes for poor people. These common components include:

- establishing in-country institutional platforms for inclusive cross-sector dialogue and partnerships; identifying areas of common interest between public and private sector actors;
- engaging the private sector “upstream” in the development of national and sectoral plans;
- aligning national and local plans for future private sector engagement with the new global SDGs; establishing a national database of companies willing to engage in development-related programmes and activities;
- and building pre-commitment mechanisms into partnerships as a way of ensuring that dialogue is transformed into effective action.

In addition, many countries have embarked on reviewing the partnership architecture and institutional frameworks in-country in the context of implementation of the SDGs in order to manage diverse cooperation and partnerships effectively and link them to development results. The GPEDC’s regional platforms could play a useful role in sharing lessons learnt more widely.

The GPEDC's emphasis on inclusive partnerships is central to its potential contribution to the SDGs. Implementation of the SDGs is likely to be through a complex network of partnerships using national experience to build and share best practice across regions, and then using regional platforms to drive global change. It is by encouraging inclusive partnerships of all kinds at country and regional levels, and by providing a forum in which GPEDC members can share their experiences and identify common lessons, that the GPEDC will maximise its contribution to the 2030 Agenda. The Busan Global Partnership Forum provides a space for just these kinds of exchanges at country level, and could easily be supplemented by the development, within the auspices of the GPEDC, of a new, openly accessible online platform for peer learning and knowledge exchange.

### ***What are the key opportunities and challenges in promoting effective development cooperation in the post-2015 era to achieve greater results at country level?***

It is clear that in terms of development cooperation, 'business as usual' will not deliver the SDGs. The GPEDC therefore has a real opportunity to lead the debate on what good development cooperation looks like in the post-2015 era – *where* it should be targeted, *what* it should be spent on and *how* it should be delivered to maximise its contribution to the 2030 Agenda.

The multi-stakeholder nature of its partnership should help the GPEDC to focus on the comparative advantages of different resource flows, and ensure that development cooperation plays to its strengths. As noted earlier, the GPEDC is also well placed to promote dialogue with non-state actors on how they can embed the same development effectiveness principles in their own work, and elicit new opportunities and ways of working from different actors at country level in support of the 2030 Agenda. A further strength is that the GPEDC provides a forum for knowledge exchange and sharing best practice at country, regional and global levels, giving it the opportunity to contribute its learning to the 2030 Agenda at each of these levels.

The Addis Ababa Action Agenda reaffirms that countries who have already committed to the 0.7% ODA/GNI target, and the target of devoting 0.15%–0.2% ODA/GNI to least developed countries (LDCs) should fulfil these commitments. While the task of measuring progress on the quantity of ODA falls to the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC), there is an obvious opportunity for the GPEDC to complement this by focusing on the quality and impact of ODA.

One of the challenges of 'getting to zero' (SDG1) is that extreme poverty is increasingly concentrated in a group of countries that need to see a significant shift in their current trajectories if they are to end poverty by 2030.<sup>11</sup> Many of these countries are either politically fragile, environmentally vulnerable or both. Through the New Deal for Fragile States, also endorsed at Busan in 2011, the GPEDC has relevant experience to offer. A review of progress, with key lessons learnt, is provided in the background paper *Progress in Delivering the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation in Fragile States* prepared for the 2015 Busan Global Partnership Forum. In summary, there has been notable progress in increasing national leadership; mixed progress in using country systems (with more progress on alignment of priorities in theory than in practice); slow progress on predictability; encouraging progress on inclusive partnerships; slow progress on use of country results frameworks; and varied progress on transparency.

## ***What behavioural changes will be required among development cooperation providers and developing countries in order to achieve the SDGs?***

Achieving the universal 2030 Agenda in developing countries will be hard, and the primary responsibility rests with the governments of those countries, for whom increasing domestic resource mobilisation is the top priority. In countries where national government institutions are functioning, they are best placed to diagnose, prioritise and design investments to achieve the SDGs. For developing countries to set and drive the 2030 Agenda, domestic resources must become the 'spine' around which other development finance flows are coordinated. A good example of this from the GPEDC's work is the Development Finance Assessments piloted in a number of countries in the Asia Pacific region. These aim to support the capacity of governments to formulate Integrated National Financing Frameworks designed to mobilise the resources needed to achieve the SDGs and to develop targeted, evidence-based policies and sound institutional solutions to implement them.<sup>12</sup>

Although domestic public revenues are the largest resource available to developing countries in aggregate, the volume of resources mobilised varies widely from country to country. Many developing country governments raise low volumes of revenue that are not currently enough to implement the SDGs at the national level, and revenues are typically lowest in countries where poverty is deepest (that is, where large numbers of people are living significantly below the World Bank poverty line). Many countries aim to mobilise resources equivalent to 20% of gross domestic product (GDP) as a minimum. However, 20 countries mobilise resources equivalent to less than 15% of GDP and a further 32 countries mobilise resources equivalent to 15%–20% of GDP.<sup>13</sup>

The ways in which governments raise and spend revenues have a significant impact on poverty. An over-reliance on indirect taxation (which tends to be regressive) rather than a focus on more progressive, direct taxation is one factor that needs to be taken into consideration in designing future tax regimes in a way that is sensitive to the needs of the poorest.

While there has been a general trend towards increased government spending on key sectors, in a number of countries, a significant proportion of that funding still comes from development cooperation providers. In sectors central to efforts to end poverty, low levels of total spending combined with a reliance on external funding highlight the scale of the challenge ahead.

But while the governments of developing countries must remain in the driving seat, other stakeholders need to change how they do things. As emphasised in the AAAA, providers of development cooperation need to do better – in terms of increasing the quantity and improving the quality of their contributions – in order to fill the financing gaps and support developing countries to meet the SDGs. Few development cooperation providers have met their longstanding commitment to the 0.7% ODA/GNI target. The most recent (and the only G8 member to do so) is the United Kingdom (UK), so it is worth reflecting on the reasons why the UK has succeeded where so many others have failed.

In the UK, delivering on its 0.7% commitment was driven by a high-profile campaign that brought together development NGOs, churches, trade unions and celebrity endorsers in the run-up to the Gleneagles G8 Summit in 2005. The campaign was successful in securing cross-party support for reaching the 0.7% ODA/GNI target, so it has survived changes in government and is now enshrined in UK law. This example illustrates the critical role of civil society and parliament in driving the necessary changes in donor country attitudes and behaviour. The GPEDC's discussions on domestic resource mobilisation show that the same model applies – dialogue with citizens and business, plus transparency around how taxes are used, helps drive up compliance and revenue.<sup>14</sup>

Behavioural change is also required to improve the quality of development cooperation, but previous experience suggests that this will be difficult: only one of the 13 targets set under the Paris Declaration<sup>15</sup> was met, and on some indicators (such as improving predictability, increasing use of country systems and putting more aid on budget), overall progress by providers has been disappointing.

Why has there been only limited change in some areas? Understanding the answer to this question is key. One step towards this might be articulating a theory of change for the monitoring framework and the GPEDC more widely. Such an exercise identifies how and why a desired change is expected to happen in a particular context and specifically identifies the assumptions on which the monitoring framework is based – assumptions that can subsequently be tested. At present, the GPEDC does not have a formally agreed theory of change,<sup>16</sup> and developing one will require a clear understanding of the origins, drivers and principles of the Global Partnership. However, a starting point may be to consider a more general accountability-based model (see Figure 1) where agreed principles are operationalised in the form of specific commitments, where progress in implementing these commitments is monitored against a series of time-bound indicators, where the monitoring exercise promotes dialogue and accountability, and where this leads to changes in behaviour that ultimately result in increased impact on poverty.

**Figure 1: A simple accountability-based theory of change model**



Getting from principles to impact involves a long chain of causation that could break down at any point if the underlying assumptions turn out to be incorrect. The extent to which such a generalised model applies to the monitoring framework and the GPEDC more widely needs to be explored in greater detail. As part of the current review, it would also be useful to analyse with key stakeholders whether the current indicators remain valid, and if so, why progress has been so intractable and what can be done to address this.

Finally, the SDGs will require a fundamental change in the way that progress is made and measured, and this too will require things to be done differently. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) focused on the proportion of people living below the poverty line, the proportion of women dying in childbirth, and the proportion of children dying before their fifth birthday. The SDGs have set the much more ambitious goal of ensuring that no one is 'left behind'. Turning this vision into a reality will require decision-makers at all levels to take evidence-based decisions on resource allocation on the basis of data disaggregated by age, gender, geographical location and other relevant characteristics. Investing in reliable civil registration schemes is a vital first step towards making this possible. Much of the data used to monitor the MDGs was based on extrapolations from survey data, but to ensure that no one is left behind, the SDGs will need to move to a system of monitoring based on data collected about individual people. This change may also have implications for future GPEDC monitoring exercises.

### ***What action is required to strengthen coherence at all levels?***

As the Addis Ababa Action Agenda makes clear, coherence between domestic and international resource mobilisation, between private and public resource mobilisation, and between resource mobilisation and many other areas of policy (debt, trade, tax) will be essential to deliver the ambitions of the 2030 Agenda, and systemic issues such as global economic governance and migration must also be addressed. Pilot projects undertaken by the Dutch government on Policy Coherence for Development concluded that impact is context and country-specific, and, like other interventions, must start with the



developing country perspective.<sup>17</sup> The GPEDC's niche in promoting coherence should reflect its mandate on development effectiveness by maximising the comparative advantage of development cooperation in relation to other resource flows that will contribute to achieving the SDGs. The GPEDC can also help to strengthen coherence by promoting the same principles of development effectiveness with all of its stakeholders, including those responsible for private flows as well as public flows (as noted earlier).

### ***What changes need to be made to the scope and priorities of the GPEDC to maximise its contribution to the post-2015 development framework?***

The GPEDC is not the only forum with a mandate on development cooperation; as already noted, one way for it to maximise its contribution is to increase collaboration with other forums such as the UN DCF in order to maximise synergies and minimise duplication. The GPEDC does have particular strengths as a politically mandated, action-oriented, multi-stakeholder forum with focus on development effectiveness. To capitalise on this in the post-2015 era, it needs to turn rhetoric into reality by promoting dialogue between its stakeholders, especially at country level, and by providing a dedicated space for sharing experiences, learning lessons and developing a common understanding of what constitutes best practice.

While the SDGs focus on quantitative development outcomes (**what** needs to change), the GPEDC and others are well-placed to complement this by focusing on qualitative inputs (**how** these changes can be implemented). The two are inextricably linked – one cannot achieve outcomes without inputs, and the quality of those inputs and how they are delivered will substantially affect the outcomes and how sustainable they are. By maximising the effectiveness of development cooperation, and by encouraging other stakeholders to apply the same principles of effectiveness to their own interventions, the GPEDC could make a significant contribution to achieving the SDGs.

But again, if the GPEDC wants to institutionalise this thinking, changes to its scope and priorities will need to be considered – for example, in order to make an explicit link between the GPEDC's role and the achievement of the SDGs, or on the GPEDC's specific role in engaging with the private sector for development outcomes. If there is support for this, it could be considered at the forthcoming 2<sup>nd</sup> High Level Meeting with a view to strengthening the rationale for the GPEDC contributing to the various 2030 Agenda follow-up and review mechanisms, such as the UN Secretary-General's annual progress report and the High-Level Political Forum meetings. At the same time, the GPEDC should avoid subsuming its mandate to the 2030 Agenda entirely, and should continue to focus on its role in promoting the core principles and behaviours that make development more effective across all of its stakeholders.

## **5. Proposals for making the GPEDC's monitoring framework more relevant to the 2030 Agenda**

The GPEDC's Global Monitoring Framework is identified by many stakeholders as a unique and valuable asset that could contribute to the monitoring of the SDGs. For this to happen, the monitoring framework needs to be technically sound, based on an agreed theory of change, and presented in a way that provides an unstoppable logic between improving the quality of development and achieving the SDGs. These issues are examined in more depth in this section of this report, which also considers what changes may be necessary to the scope and priorities of the Global Monitoring Framework in order to maximise its contribution to the 2030 Agenda.

The current Global Monitoring Framework is based on ten indicators,<sup>18</sup> all of which have targets for 2015, as do some of the key commitments made at Busan, such as the commitment to implement a common, open standard for the publication of information on development cooperation by December 2015. The first challenge in increasing the relevance of the Global Monitoring Framework to the 2030 Agenda is to update not only the current targets but also the political commitments on which they are

---

based, and indeed to consider new commitments and targets where necessary. The next HLM appears to be the most appropriate forum in which to address this.

The first four indicators in the current framework are new since Busan. They focus on results at country level, an enabling environment for CSOs, the contribution of the private sector, and transparency, reflecting Busan principles 2–4. Pilot assessments were undertaken during the first round of monitoring, but in most cases (with the exception of transparency) it was judged too early to draw any conclusions. Of the six remaining indicators, one focuses on gender empowerment while five were imported from the Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey, covering predictability, aid on budget, mutual accountability, effective institutions (strengthening and use of country systems) and aid untying. Since they pre-dated Busan, the links to the Busan principles are less clear, although four of these indicators arguably support country ownership, while the other relates to the principle of transparency and accountability. The other problem with these indicators is that aggregate progress has been slow (and even non-existent in some cases), which is unsurprising since all five are based on Paris Declaration targets that were themselves missed – in some cases by a wide margin, as the final *Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration* in 2011 confirmed.

The purpose of a revised, more relevant monitoring framework should be:

- to turn shared principles and commitments into measurable targets and indicators
- to monitor progress on these among developing country partners and development cooperation providers
- to enable stakeholders to hold each other accountable for their individual performance
- to enable lessons to be learnt and best practice shared in a way that incentivises progress and drives behavioural change, ultimately leading to greater development impact.

Repeatedly monitoring the same targets and concluding that little has changed risks undermining the credibility of the exercise (and, indeed, of the GPEDC more broadly) unless action is taken to address the reasons behind this lack of progress. Part of the problem is the way in which data from the monitoring exercise was presented in the first Global Monitoring Report. A focus on aggregate results disguises progress by individual providers of development cooperation and developing countries. Countries need to be able to recognise themselves in the data that relates to them. Data that is not understood by stakeholders and fails to generate buy-in and dialogue about how to improve is of little value. Publishing data that is disaggregated by country and by individual provider would reveal examples of best practice, encourage sharing of lessons learnt, and incentivise progress. It would also paint a much richer, more diverse and more interesting picture of progress.

But the issue is not simply one of presentation – the fact remains that in some cases (predictability, putting aid on budget, and use of country systems), the changes identified by developing countries and development cooperation providers as being vital to improving effectiveness have not been fully realised. If these indicators are judged to have continuing relevance to the Busan principles and to the 2030 Agenda, the GPEDC needs to create space for an open dialogue about why progress has been so slow, what can be done to tackle this, and whether certain principles need to be reassessed. The new working groups being established by the GPEDC Steering Committee on country implementation and on a knowledge hub could contribute to this. While the Busan Global Partnership Forum could also provide an opportunity for sharing initial thoughts on this, this is likely to require a dedicated forum and a safe space. The GPEDC needs to get this right – how to gather, report, and then use data to drive dialogue and reform – before it can offer anything to monitoring the SDGs. Putting its own house in order is an essential first step before considering how the GPEDC can contribute to monitoring of the 2030 Agenda.

## ***In which areas could the current GPEDC monitoring framework contribute to the monitoring of SDG indicators?***

As identified earlier, the clearest convergence between the current GPEDC monitoring framework and the emerging global SDG indicator framework is around means of implementation, especially in relation to the targets set under SDG 17, but also the means of implementation (MOI) targets included in some of the other goals. In seeking to make a contribution, the GPEDC could adopt two different approaches that are not mutually exclusive.

First, it could formally integrate into the global SDG indicator framework. This could be achieved either by mainstreaming development effectiveness across all indicators (and managing the risk of this defaulting to a 'tick-box' exercise, as evidenced by previous mainstreaming efforts around gender, for instance). Alternatively, the GPEDC monitoring framework could align to, and serve as specific data sources for, specific relevant MOI indicators, in the same way that it was name-checked under target 17.16 in the draft proposal circulated for consultation in August 2015. It should be noted, however, that the complex task of agreeing the global indicator framework for SDG monitoring is not yet complete, so it would be unwise for the GPEDC to plan on this basis alone before these negotiations have been successfully concluded.

Second, the GPEDC could position itself as offering a complementary approach to the SDG monitoring framework – one that focuses on the quality of inputs more broadly. If the logic of the need for development effectiveness to ensure sustained development outcomes across the SDGs can be unarguably demonstrated, then the need for a parallel, but closely connected framework monitoring quality can be equally demonstrated. If the GPEDC chooses this option, its input could take the form of a regular progress report on the quality of development cooperation that feeds into the UN Secretary-General's progress report on the SDGs and the High-Level Political Forum, as well as the Thematic Reviews proposed under the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. It should be noted that both the HLPF and ECOSOC FFD Forum are mandated to take the work of the UN DCF into account, so further collaboration would be required to ensure that the Global Partnership's contribution to these processes complements but does not duplicate UN DCF's role.

The Busan Global Partnership Forum provides an opportunity for stakeholders at the country level to consider which of the above options makes most sense from their perspective, or whether – especially at this stage of the process when the global indicator framework has yet to be agreed – the GPEDC should keep its options open by actively pursuing both.

## ***What additional aspects could be included in the GPEDC monitoring framework in order to improve the quality, impact and effectiveness of development cooperation?***

At present, those participating in the monitoring exercise are largely developing countries and traditional providers of development cooperation, although two of the indicators focus on the role of CSOs and of the private sector in development. As the only global multi-stakeholder initiative with a specific mandate on effective development, the GPEDC could, over time, play a valuable role in drawing a wider range of modalities and stakeholders into the monitoring process, such as official financing beyond ODA, and providers of development assistance beyond the DAC group and the private sector. This needs to be handled sensitively though – any attempts to do this too early, and to monitor and measure new actors on the same basis as traditional providers, is likely to be counter-productive.

In the first instance, engagement should be about dialogue, not data. Future Global Monitoring Reports could, for example, include more space for narrative, allowing developing countries to describe what

engagement with South-South Cooperation providers, CSOs and the private sector looks like at country level, or this information could be published in complementary materials. In time, and in consultation with the appropriate global forums where they exist, the GPEDC could slowly introduce more quantitative measures of progress by these actors. It may be useful to discuss this approach to monitoring in more detail though, perhaps with an initial focus on voluntary self-assessments based on a selection of criteria proposed by relevant stakeholders.

## ***What are the key lessons from the GPEDC's experience of country-level monitoring, and how can these be shared with those working on the post-2015 development monitoring framework?***

A brief review by the OECD/UNDP Joint Support Team of the previous round of monitoring identified the following strengths and areas for further improvement.

### **Strengths**

- Value of a country-driven exercise
- Combination of government leadership and inclusiveness
- Overall relevance of the process and usefulness of the monitoring tools

### **Room for improvement**

- Stronger political support and increased number of participating countries
- More investment in the preparation phase (sensitisation and communications)
- More timely and inclusive consultation with relevant stakeholders
- A more structured process for data collection and validation to ensure accuracy of data
- Efforts to limit the burden on developing country governments
- Increased synergies with other monitoring exercises and Global Partnership Initiatives
- Better use and dissemination of findings to further incentivise behaviour change, including through facilitated dialogue on key areas of concern and of success

The GPEDC's experience of running a country-level data collection and monitoring exercise could provide valuable lessons for those tasked with establishing a similar framework for global monitoring of the SDGs. The Busan Global Partnership Forum provides an excellent opportunity for those involved in the GPEDC Global Monitoring Framework to share their experiences in more depth, and identify some key lessons for the SDG process to take on board. Regional monitoring workshops organised by the Joint Support Team – which are hosted by regional platforms and institutions in Africa, Asia-Pacific and Latin American and the Caribbean – also provide opportunities for this kind of learning.

It would also be useful to explore practical ways of bringing the GPEDC and SDG monitoring processes together at country level in order to maximise synergies, minimise the burden on developing countries and reinforce political buy-in for both processes. For example, the regional pre-monitoring workshop held in Bangkok for Asia-Pacific regions underscored the importance of integrating the GPEDC monitoring framework and its process into a country's institutional framework for implementing the SDGs.

The GPEDC should consider sharing the outcome of discussions at the Busan Global Partnership Forum in the form of a note on lessons learnt to date, which could be shared with the Inter-agency and Expert Group and the UN Statistical Commission. In addition, the regional platforms established under the GPEDC could contribute their experience to SDG monitoring at regional level.

## ***How can examples of successful practice at country level be better disseminated within the development community more generally?***

While the Busan Global Partnership Forum provides a good opportunity for disseminating best practice at country level, this is currently limited to participants at the annual gatherings. There could be real merit in the GPEDC establishing a new online platform for knowledge sharing so that these exchanges can take place continually, at the same time as creating a bank of good examples and sharing lessons learnt in order to underpin the GPEDC's work and its contribution to the 2030 Agenda. This could be considered and presented to the GPEDC Steering Committee for discussion and decision. The Global Partnership Initiatives and the regional platforms also provide many examples of innovation and best practice. They too could be encouraged to share their knowledge and experiences through the proposed online platform.

One of the strengths of the GPEDC model is that it operates at national, regional and global levels. By developing clear mechanisms for sharing experiences vertically as well as horizontally, the GPEDC could maximise its own impact and provide a model that could inform the SDG monitoring exercise.

## ***How can the conclusions of the current and future rounds of GPEDC monitoring be incorporated into the SDG review process?***

The conclusions from the GPEDC's monitoring process should be fed into the relevant FFD and SDG review and follow-up mechanisms, including the proposed Financing for Development Forum and High-Level Dialogue, the inter-agency Task Force established by the UN Secretary-General, the annual progress report and the High-Level Political Forum. This can be done through the co-chairs and the Joint Support Team, as well as by sharing directly the outcomes of the GPEDC High-Level Meetings and the Busan Global Partnership Forum. In addition, the GPEDC could share case studies of where increased development effectiveness has led to improved development outcomes, in order to build the case for the GPEDC to play a key role in achieving the SDGs.

## **6. Conclusions**

Some interim conclusions are shared here to provoke discussion at the 2015 Busan Global Partnership Forum.

While the SDGs focus on development outcomes (such as ending extreme poverty), the GPEDC focuses on the quality of development inputs (that is, the effectiveness of development). The two are inextricably linked, because more effective inputs will contribute to improved outcomes. By maximising its assets, and demonstrating its value in improving development effectiveness, the Global Partnership can make a unique contribution to achieving the ambitions of the 2030 Agenda. For this to happen, the GPEDC needs to play to its strengths and address its weaknesses.

First, while the Global Partnership's multi-stakeholder nature is a strength, if it is to capitalise on this in the post-2015 era it will need to collaborate more with other stakeholder forums at global and regional levels, and promote more dialogue and sharing of lessons between all its stakeholders at country level. The Busan Global Partnership Forum provides a good opportunity in which to explore how to do this with many of its key stakeholders.

Second, the monitoring framework needs to be strengthened, its theory of change validated and its continuing relevance tested if it is to be presented as a key component of the GPEDCs "offer" to the 2030 Agenda. In particular, it needs to update existing targets, consider new indicators based on new commitments, and examine why progress on several of its long-established indicators has stalled, as well as taking action to address this (if the indicators in question are still judged to be relevant and

---

important). While the monitoring framework should be expanded to include a wider range of actors over time, the GPEDC should focus on dialogue rather than data in the first instance, and provide space for capturing this in narrative form. This could either be included in the Global Monitoring Report or in complementary materials, as well as being captured in updates from regional and national workshops.

With a more robust monitoring framework in place, the GPEDC would be well placed to offer its expertise to the SDG monitoring exercise, as well as contributing to the broader follow-up and review mechanisms established by the 2030 Agenda. In terms of approach, the GPEDC could contribute to the global SDG monitoring framework in one or both of the following ways: it could seek to become a qualitative data source for a number of individual MOI indicators, or offer a complementary report that considers development effectiveness in the context of the SDGs more broadly. The GPEDC's experience of running a complex global monitoring exercise, and of establishing successful regional platforms, could provide valuable lessons for those involved in monitoring the SDGs, and the Global Partnership should explore the best ways of sharing these.

Finally, much of the GPEDC's added value derives from the activities undertaken by participants at country level. Consideration should be given to creating a new, openly accessible online platform through which participants could share best practice and lessons learnt from this and other GPEDC Forums and workshops. A global repository of lessons learnt – including on the Global Partnership Initiatives and on cross-cutting efforts – could showcase its value added and motivate new initiatives among stakeholders to support implementation of the SDGs through effective development cooperation.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworlds>

<sup>2</sup> OECD website, 'Countries, Territories and Organisations Adhering to the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation' <http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/busanadherents.htm>

<sup>3</sup> <http://effectivecooperation.org/wordpress/related-initiatives-2/>

<sup>4</sup> [http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/making-development-co-operation-more-effective\\_9789264209305-en](http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/making-development-co-operation-more-effective_9789264209305-en)

<sup>5</sup> Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation, 2011  
<http://www.oecd.org/development/effectiveness/busanpartnership.htm>

<sup>6</sup> Nairobi outcome document of the High-Level United Nations Conference on South-South Cooperation, 2009  
<http://southsouthconference.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/GA-resolution-endorsed-Nairobi-Outcome-21-Dec-09.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> Istanbul CSO Development Effectiveness Principles, 2010 [http://cso-effectiveness.org/IMG/pdf/final\\_istanbul\\_cso\\_development\\_effectiveness\\_principles\\_footnote\\_december\\_2010-2.pdf](http://cso-effectiveness.org/IMG/pdf/final_istanbul_cso_development_effectiveness_principles_footnote_december_2010-2.pdf)

<sup>8</sup> As noted in the accompanying paper on the role of the private sector in development, there is no single forum for addressing development effectiveness by the private sector. Based on the analysis in this paper, the table uses the Joint statement from representatives of the public and private sectors on "Expanding and Enhancing Public and Private Co-operation for Broad-Based, Inclusive and Sustainable Growth" agreed at the Busan High-Level Forum as the basis for comparison.

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/49211825.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> <http://thepartneringinitiative.org/research-and-learning/the-tpi-partnering-roadmap/>

<sup>11</sup> *Investments to End Poverty*, Development Initiatives, 2015 [http://devinit.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Investments-to-End-Poverty-Report-2015\\_online.pdf](http://devinit.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Investments-to-End-Poverty-Report-2015_online.pdf)

<sup>12</sup> Methodological guidelines, Development Finance Assessments, 2015

<sup>13</sup> *Investments to End Poverty*, Development Initiatives, 2015

<sup>14</sup> GPEDC Issue Paper for Plenary II, *Partnering for Effective Taxation and Domestic Resource Mobilisation for Development*, 15 April 2014, <http://effectivecooperation.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/PlenarySession2-Summary-PartneringforEffectiveTaxationandDomesticResourceMobilisationforDevelopment.pdf>

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/2011surveyonmonitoringtheparisdeclaration.htm>

<sup>16</sup> This is an area the GPEDC Monitoring and Advisory Group is expected to explore.

<sup>17</sup> Report of Wilton Park Conference, "Beyond aid: innovative governance, financing and partnerships for the post-2015 agenda", 25–27 February 2015

<sup>18</sup> The Monitoring Framework of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation: Indicators and Targets  
<http://effectivecooperation.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/GPEDC-Monitoring-Framework-10-Indicators.pdf>