

Quick Overview

Indicator 1a. Development partners use country-led results frameworks

What does it measure?

(1) alignment of development partners' new interventions (projects and programmes) with country-defined development objectives and results; (2) development partners' progressive reliance on countries' own statistics and monitoring and evaluation systems to track progress of development interventions.

Relevance to Effective Development Co-operation

The extent to which development partners guide their development efforts in line with country-defined priorities and development results is a fundamental aspect of country ownership and results focus. As such, this indicator is selected to report **SDG 17.15**; that is, measuring the degree of policy space accorded to a country's leadership in establishing its own development path.

ORIGINAL METHODOLOGY	REFINED METHODOLOGY
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignment of (up to 10) new interventions within the country in a given year. Focus limited to project-level. <p><i>Shortcomings</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Burdensome project-level reporting. Focus on project level alone missed that country-provider alignment happens mainly at strategic level (including on SDGs). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignment of (up to 6) new interventions within the country in a given year. Alignment of development partners' country strategy or partnership frameworks, if any. <p><i>Key improvements</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce maximum number of reported projects while maintaining sufficient representativeness. Alignment and use of country-led results frameworks at strategic level will allow parties to understand and act upon project-level results.

<div>Improves relevance and use</div> <div>Yes</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic alignment of development partners with partner countries helps interpret project-level results and guide policy action. Better linkage with related country commitment to lead towards development results (ind. 1b). Reference to extent of SDG uptake in development partners' strategies can inform mutual accountability indicator and SDG 17. 	<div>Reduces reporting burden</div> <div>Yes</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less burdensome process, i.e. estimated 41 percent reduction in required project reporting. Clearer guidance and reduced sample should produce overall efficiencies in data reporting and validation. 	<div>Maintains comparability</div> <div>Yes</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The core of the indicator, project-level alignment, remains unchanged, allowing for consistent reporting on SDG 17.15. Additional information [at strategy level] provides comparative context that can inform action on the indicator results.
--	---	---

Quick Overview

Indicator 1b. Countries strengthen their national results frameworks

What does it measure?

Whether a country has results frameworks in place, and whether these define the country's development priorities, targets, and results indicators.

Relevance for effective development co-operation

National, country-led results frameworks define a country-specific approach to setting development priorities and results. Country leadership in establishing and defining their own results frameworks, including monitoring & evaluation systems, is a key aspect of country ownership & results orientation.

ORIGINAL METHODOLOGY	REFINED METHODOLOGY
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maps whether the country has strategic results framework(s) in place. Countries self-describe their current arrangements to prioritise and manage for development results, through an open-ended question and a checklist of potential government strategic plans. <p><i>Shortcomings</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maps the existence of country planning tools, but not their quality or real use as a reference results framework. Does not refer to SDGs or the 2030 Agenda. Adequate answer to the open-ended question assumes in-depth understanding of national planning processes, leading to uneven quality of responses and lower response rate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assesses four building blocks towards transparent country-led strategic frameworks that could strengthen country ownership, results-based decision-making & accountability. A short questionnaire, with simple, multiple-choice questions, which replaces the open-ended question(s) and checklists. <p><i>Key improvements</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures the existence of transparent, country-led frameworks; and whether: a) development results are prioritised (including SDGs); b) there are systems and data in place for monitoring; and c) results information is used for managing domestic and external resources. Allows for cross-country and over time comparability.

<p>Improves relevance and use</p> <p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Light diagnostics of country's readiness to focus on results & implement the 2030 Agenda. Helps identify country capacity needs in strengthening inclusive results frameworks, statistical and M&E systems, and use for budgeting & decision-making. 	<p>Reduces reporting burden</p> <p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised questions are simpler and do not assume in-depth knowledge of national planning architecture. Straightforward reporting method (multiple choice). Answers can be drawn from DCF's 2018 <i>Global Accountability Survey</i>. 	<p>Maintains comparability</p> <p>Reconstructed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refined indicator allows for cross-country and over time comparability. Two indicators from the Paris Declaration survey allow for reconstructing a 2011 baseline for 77 countries.
---	---	--

Quick Overview

Indicator 2. Civil Society Organisations operate within an environment that maximises their engagement in and contribution to development

What does it measure?

(1) the extent to which governments and development partners contribute to an enabling environment for civil society organisations (CSOs); and (2) the extent to which CSOs are implementing the development effectiveness principles in their own operations.

Relevance to effective development co-operation

The political, financial, legal and policy context in which CSOs work, as well as the ways in which these development actors organise themselves and work with governments and development partners deeply affects their development effectiveness and contributions to achieve results.

ORIGINAL METHODOLOGY	REFINED METHODOLOGY
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measured four key dimensions for CSO enabling environment and development effectiveness. Questionnaire based on binary questions (yes/no), each with open-ended fields guided by sub-questions. Required multi-stakeholder dialogue to agree on response (via focal points for government, CSOs and donors). <p>Shortcomings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parties indicated that binary questions (yes/no) forced non-nuanced answers, not accurately reflecting countries' realities. Did not allow reflection of incremental progress, nor comparability. Uneven response rate to open-ended fields, and with varied quality or level of detail. Limited multi-stakeholder dialogue and actionable results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retains same four broad dimensions. Drops binary approach and guiding sub-questions; instead, uses simpler questionnaire with scales describing possible scenarios. Multi-stakeholder dialogue approach still used to agree on responses. Strengthens the guidance and support to report on this indicator. <p>Key improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presenting scenarios (<i>scales</i>) allows for more nuanced responses and reflection of incremental progress. Predefined answers allow for cross-country and over time comparability. Multi-stakeholder dialogue and negotiation of responses facilitated by questionnaire's approach, relevance & improved guidance.

<p>Improves relevance and use</p> <p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicator provides better picture of strengths and opportunities. Data can be analysed, compared to best practices, and used to guide country-level action. A potential basis for SDG 17.17 (currently a critical gap in SDG framework). 	<p>Reduces reporting burden</p> <p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scaled approach makes reporting simpler, faster, and helps form consensus. Improved guidance and support throughout the exercise allow for smoother multi-stakeholder dialogue. 	<p>Maintains comparability</p> <p>At dimension level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on same four modules allows high-level comparability with 2016 round, at qualitative level. Most elements of previous questionnaire are captured in proposed questionnaire.
---	---	---

Quick Overview

Indicator 3. Quality of Public-Private Dialogue

What does it measure?

The quality of public-private dialogue in the country, by looking at the enablers for public-private dialogue, the inclusiveness and relevance of these processes, and their effectiveness towards achieving results. Global indicators on the regulatory environment for private sector engagement are used to contextualise the responses.

Relevance to Effective Development Co-operation

Maximising private sector contributions to development requires effective engagement between the public and private sectors. Good public-private dialogue is recognised as a precondition for enhanced collaboration between the two actors.

ORIGINAL METHODOLOGY	REFINED METHODOLOGY
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structured in three modules, covering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country context, as reflected in global indicators on the legal environment. Enablers for quality dialogue, captured by a multi-stakeholder response to score and describe the country situation through open-ended questions. In-depth assessment of the public-private dialogue platform, which was optional & required a consultant report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reorganisation of modules to address both enablers and quality of public-private dialogue. Simplified questionnaire, with pre-defined responses (i.e. four typical scenarios). Costly module 3 dropped, but key elements remain in the questionnaire. Multi-stakeholder dialogue process relying on focal points to agree on responses is kept.
<p>Shortcomings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modules 1 & 2 focused on enablers for dialogue, but not quality, inclusiveness, or outcomes of public-private dialogue. Module 3 was complex and costly: no country undertook it. Low response rate and uneven quality of open-ended responses. As a result, ambiguous interpretation of isolated scores with no attached narrative. 	<p>Key improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More complete, actionable assessment of the strength, characteristics and results of public-private dialogue(s). Streamlined questionnaire with predefined responses, which allows for reflection of incremental progress and more rigorous comparability across countries and over time.

<p>Improves relevance and use</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Reduces reporting burden</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Maintains comparability</p> <p>Some elements</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised questionnaire and approach helps stakeholders jointly diagnose gaps and opportunities for strengthened public-private sector dialogue and collaboration, which can lead to taking specific actions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reporting method (pre-defined scales) increases understanding and standardised reporting, while also reducing the burden of negotiating wording in a multistakeholder setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Global indicators (context) kept for continuity. Issues reviewed in former module 2 are kept in the updated questionnaire, as well as elements of module 3.

Quick Overview

Indicator 7. Mutual accountability is strengthened through inclusive reviews

What does it measure?

Whether countries have established inclusive mutual assessment reviews, characterised by five criteria: a policy framework that defines the country's development co-operation priorities; targets for the country and its development partners; regular joint assessment against those targets; active involvement of local governments and non-state stakeholders; and public availability of the results of these reviews.

Relevance to effective development co-operation

The principle of mutual accountability recognises that development impact improves when all parties take responsibility for their contributions. As such, countries commit to establish and conduct "inclusive mutual assessment reviews," which respond to the needs of domestic institutions and citizens.

ORIGINAL METHODOLOGY	REFINED METHODOLOGY
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessed whether joint assessments around development cooperation were conducted at country level. Countries needed to meet 4 out of 5 above criteria. Short questionnaire, relying on binary responses (yes/no). <p>Shortcomings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflected traditional provider-recipient relations, failing to capture the more diverse reality of current development co-operation landscape (e.g. more development actors, collective accountability). Binary responses alone did not help interpret or take action on the results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintains the five criteria and binary answers. Countries are then asked to select the scenario that matches best their country situation, out of four levels. This provides sufficient granularity on the scope of implementation of each criteria, such as the type of participants in these inclusive reviews. <p>Key improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Countries able to provide more nuanced responses by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selecting one of the pre-defined scenarios that best match their country situation, and Easily providing specifics, such as coverage or inclusiveness, via checkboxes.

<p>Improves relevance and use</p> <p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better reflects current development co-operation landscape and type of partnerships and arrangements needed for sustainable development. Relevant now for all types of countries and actors. Best practices are explicit and can drive dialogue and action. 	<p>Reduces reporting burden</p> <p>Slightly increased</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced reporting burden by now selecting a scenario (out of 4) that best matches the country's situation, and checking boxes for details. Countries reporting to DCF's <i>Global Accountability survey</i> already have the elements to respond to this indicator efficiently. 	<p>Maintains comparability</p> <p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questionnaire and binary responses approach maintained, allowing for consistent comparability. Additional information on 'levels' will allow for more nuance reflection of incremental change.
--	--	---

Quick Overview

Indicator 8. Countries have transparent systems in place tracking public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment [SDG 5c]

What does it measure?

The extent to which countries are tracking budget allocations for gender equality and making them publicly available, thus promoting greater transparency and accountability.

Relevance to effective development co-operation

Adequate and effective financing is essential to achieve SDG 5 as well as the gender related targets across the SDG framework. By tracking and making public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment, governments promote greater transparency and drive accountability.

ORIGINAL METHODOLOGY	REFINED METHODOLOGY
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four criteria measuring extent to which countries are tracking budget allocations for gender equality (criteria 1-3) and making them publicly available (crit. 4). • A country has a system in place if meets 1 of the first 3 criteria, as well as criterion 4 (the information is public). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A country is considered to have a transparent tracking system in place if meets 3 criteria. • Improved specificity of criteria (sub-questions) captures the variability in countries' policies and public financial management systems to support gender equality in transparent manners.
<p><i>Shortcomings</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria were too general and uninformative, only describing basic elements with no sense of quality or use of these tracking systems. • Lack of specificity biased reporting towards positive responses. • Many participating countries deemed the indicator approach as not useful to inform dialogue or action. 	<p><i>Key improvements</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stronger methodology and more rigorous self-assessment on the quality of tracking systems (in terms of processes, instruments, transparency), and actual use in budgeting. • Methodology has been upgraded as SDG indicator (SDG 5.c) by the Inter-Agency Expert Group on SDGs. • The indicator scoring method incentivises improvements over time.

<p>Improves relevance and use</p> <p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The indicator is now universal (all countries) and will be a critical contribution to the UN HLPF 2019 & beyond. • Currently the only indicator within the SDG framework linking national systems with the implementation of legislation and policies for gender equality. 	<p>Reduces reporting burden</p> <p>No</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The indicator now contains more [binary] questions, in order to be acceptable for reporting on SDG 5.c target. • To compensate for that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ UNWOMEN/GPEDC will provide focal point support for data collection. ○ 15 country pilots already confirmed relevance, clarity and easiness of reporting. 	<p>Maintains comparability</p> <p>Limited</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While some dimensions of the original methodology are present in the revised indicator, these are only comparable at the individual level (i.e. by criterion).
--	---	--

Quick Overview

Indicator 9a. Quality of Countries' Public Financial Management Systems

What does it measure?

The quality of country systems, by looking at public financial management and procurement systems

Relevance to effective development co-operation

Measurement of the quality and use of country systems is critical in assessing the principle of country ownership. Government systems able to manage resources effectively help ensure country leadership in implementation, an efficient and proper use of funds, and greater development effectiveness.

ORIGINAL METHODOLOGY	REFINED METHODOLOGY
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on criterion 13 ('quality of budgetary and public financial management) of the World Bank's Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA). A country improves the strength of PFM systems when the CPIA score increases (+0.5) compared to the previous year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Globally-sourced: based on 9 dimensions of PEFA methodology for assessing public financial management performance. A country improves the strength of PFM systems when 5 or more of 9 PEFA dimensions have higher scores compared to the baseline. <i>Optionally:</i> Countries with no recent PEFA assessment (few) can estimate the selected dimensions.
<p>Shortcomings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CPIA scores are difficult to interpret and to unpack (e.g. no disaggregated info on budgeting process, auditing, financial reporting and procurement systems). Limited sensitivity to incremental change. Partner countries requested a more objective, broadly-owned measure. 	<p>Key improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear interpretation by reflecting separately quality of the budgeting process, auditing, financial reporting and procurement. Provides great granularity on quality of countries' systems and reflects progress in different dimensions. Assessments are independent, credible, owned by all parties (signed off by partner governments and development partners).

<p>Improves relevance and use</p> <p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide disaggregated data on multiple aspects of PFM systems, highlighting trends in those areas and driving informed discussions and action related to the use of country systems (indicator 9b). Can guide capacity building efforts supporting PFM reforms. 	<p>Reduces reporting burden</p> <p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The indicator is drawn from existing assessments (globally sourced). By relying on a recognised, agreed metric, it avoids duplication of efforts and reporting burden for participating countries. 	<p>Maintains comparability</p> <p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior PEFA assessment(s) since 2005 provide the baseline and track countries' efforts over time.
---	--	--