

Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation  
Monitoring Framework

**OVERVIEW**

**ADDITIONAL REFINEMENTS TO THE  
GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP MONITORING FRAMEWORK**

Document for consultation

**Summary:**

This document provides a brief synthesis of proposed revisions to the Global Partnership monitoring framework, a discussion of refinements to indicators that will largely maintain their original methodologies, and a summary of complementary efforts to strengthen the interpretation and usefulness of the monitoring process.

## Background

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda recognise the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (Global Partnership or GPEDC) as a solid foundation to drive more effective development co-operation. To meet the ambitions of the 2030 Agenda, the Global Partnership must deliver evidence and data that address the needs of countries in better monitoring the effectiveness of their development efforts. In the [Nairobi Outcome Document](#), the international development community stressed the need to “update the existing monitoring framework to reflect the challenges of the 2030 Agenda, including the pledge to leave no-one behind”.

To address these challenges, the Steering Committee of the Global Partnership outlined an inclusive strategy to refine the monitoring framework, following a three-track approach:

1. Strengthening the current 10 indicators to ensure their relevance for the 2030 Agenda context;
2. Adapting the scope of monitoring to address major systemic issues critical to the 2030 Agenda, such as climate change, gender equality, conflict and fragility as well as progressively reflecting all the modalities and development cooperation actors;
3. Enhancing the impact of the monitoring process by improving the quality and inclusiveness of country-level monitoring and facilitating follow-up and action on the results.

The refinement of the Global Partnership monitoring framework is guided by the Nairobi Outcome Document, the [technical advice](#) of the Monitoring Advisory Group and the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team, and lessons learned in the 2016 monitoring round, including feedback from participating countries. The refinement began in April 2017 and is drawing on the technical assistance of expert groups, related to specific thematic areas, paired with iterative consultations with relevant stakeholders and country-level testing.

The refined indicators will be used in the third Global Partnership monitoring round, scheduled to be launched in May 2018. Further revisions will be incorporated in subsequent monitoring exercises. Findings from the third monitoring round will feed into high-level political processes, in particular the 2019 High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development.

## OVERVIEW

### ADDITIONAL REFINEMENTS TO THE MONITORING FRAMEWORK

#### 1. Introduction

This document provides a brief synthesis of proposed revisions to the Global Partnership monitoring framework, a discussion of refinements to indicators that will largely maintain their original methodologies (i.e. 4, 5a/b, 6, 9b, 10), and a summary of complementary efforts to strengthen the implementation, interpretation and usefulness of the monitoring process.

Comments on this document are welcomed.

#### 2. Scope of revisions to the Global Partnership monitoring framework

As the international community adopted a new set of universal Sustainable Development Goals in 2015, and aimed to mobilise all available resources and capacities to achieve them, it called for “all countries and all stakeholders, acting in collaborative partnership, [to] implement this plan”.<sup>1</sup>

Echoing the need to strengthen the means of implementation of that ambitious agenda, the Global Partnership recognised the need to refine and adapt the way the principles for effective development co-operation are monitored in its latest High-Level Meeting in Nairobi.<sup>2</sup>

Based on the initial full revision<sup>3</sup> carried out by a Monitoring Advisory Group,<sup>4</sup> the lessons and feedback from recent monitoring rounds, and consultations with expert reference groups, the monitoring framework has been revised at two levels of depth:

| Indicators           | Level of refinement  | Where can you review the proposed changes  |
|----------------------|--|--|
| 1a/b, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9a | The indicator methodologies required certain level of refinement to produce robust, relevant data in the context of the 2030 Agenda. | Individual methodological papers can be found and reviewed at <a href="http://www.effectivecooperation.org/monitoring-country-progress/openconsultation/">www.effectivecooperation.org/monitoring-country-progress/openconsultation/</a> |
| 4, 5a, 5b, 6, 9b, 10 | The methodologies for indicators 4, 5a, 5b, 6, 9b and 10 was deemed robust and relevant.   | This document.   |

Note: Annex 1 presents the list of indicators in the current monitoring framework.

This document focuses on the **second group of indicators** –which require minor revisions related to the data collection process or contextualising the results with secondary information.

Specific proposals for the **first set of indicators** –where proposed changes are substantive – are found in the consultation platform at [effectivecooperation.org](http://effectivecooperation.org). Annex 2 presents a brief summary of these changes, per indicator.

<sup>1</sup> UN General Assembly (2015). *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. Resolution A/RES/70/1. New York: United Nations.

<sup>2</sup> GPEDC (2017). “Nairobi Outcome Document”, 2<sup>nd</sup> High-Level Meeting. Nairobi: GPEDC : ¶ 102

<sup>3</sup> See GPEDC (2016). “A GPEDC monitoring framework fit for purpose: delivering effective development cooperation in support of Agenda 2030. The final report of the Monitoring Advisory Group”. Available [here](#). And GPEDC (2017). “Directions to refine the current indicators” *Technical Note: 14<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee Meeting*. Dhaka: GPEDC. Available [here](#).

<sup>4</sup> The Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG) was established in 2015 to provide technical expertise and advice to strengthen the Global Partnership monitoring framework and ensure its relevance in the evolving post-2015 landscape. The group is composed of 12 high-level experts from developing country governments, development co-operation providers, think tanks and civil society organisations. From mid-2015 to late 2016, the MAG performed a full assessment of the ten-indicator monitoring framework and the monitoring process.

### 3. Proposed approach for indicators that do not require substantive methodological changes

#### Indicator 4. Information on development co-operation is publicly available

This indicator was refined in 2015 in the context of a broad consultation.<sup>5</sup> Subsequent feedback from the Monitoring Advisory Group and country-level stakeholders indicated that, while the methodology was sound and agreeable, two areas required attention:

1. The indicator provides up to three assessments on how transparent development co-operation providers are in publishing information in 'global' platforms or standards (supply-side of information). However, country-level stakeholders indicated that the picture should be complemented with a measure of how well the information is captured and disclosed at country level (demand side of information). Availability and use of development co-operation information at country level is essential in localising and achieving the 2030 Agenda, and for effectiveness on the ground. Recognising this, development partners had committed to strengthen the capacities of country-level stakeholders to make better use of this information for decision-making and accountability<sup>6</sup>. Furthermore, countries and development partners have both agreed to work together to improve the availability, accuracy and use of information on development co-operation in country, meeting the needs of partner countries, citizens and other stakeholders.<sup>7</sup> The Global Partnership Monitoring Advisory Group recognised the importance of these commitments, suggesting that the indicator would gain relevance if the assessment of transparency was also complemented with a 'country level' perspective.
  - To address this limitation, and using a very light approach, partner countries' governments will be invited to describe the extent to which development co-operation data from development partners is present in their information management systems; and whether those governments are in turn making it available to their citizens. Details on the proposed approach can be found [here](#).
2. The current indicator provides up to three different assessments of global transparency, reflecting the different needs and uses of information, but the interpretability of these parallel results could be strengthened:
  - Reporting on the results of this indicator in the Global Partnership monitoring report and other platforms can be improved by (a) providing detailed information on the relevant sub-dimensions (e.g. timeliness, comprehensiveness of the disclosed information) to help identify where the strengths and weaknesses of each development partner are; and (b) enhancing the visualisation and interpretability of the results.

---

<sup>5</sup> GPEDC (2016). "Indicator 4 on Transparency: Revisions to the Methodology". *9<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee meeting*. Lilongwe: GPEDC. Available [here](#).

<sup>6</sup> Busan Partnership Agreement highlights the importance of availability and public accessibility of information on development co-operation at the country level specifically. It also emphasises the need for partners to strengthen systems for transparency as well as the capacity of all stakeholder to use information to inform decision making and hold each other accountable. (§23)

<sup>7</sup> In the Nairobi Outcome Document, development partners committed to work together to improve the availability, accuracy and use of open data on development co-operation at the country level (§77c), while partner countries committed to apply the principle of transparency by strengthening national systems, policies and process to further the transparency agenda (§76a).

### **Indicators 5a and 5b. Development co-operation is predictable: annual and medium-term predictability**

While the methodologies for these two indicators on predictability were deemed as robust, a particular challenge prevented fruitful dialogue and country-level action around this commitment: the lack of comparative information on the policies and corporate practices established at development partners' headquarters that are driving the results. A second issue relates to the relevance of 'annual predictability' in the context of other forms of development finance beyond ODA, as for example on-demand non-concessional lending provided by multilateral development banks to partner countries. The following approach is proposed to address these two issues:

- ▶ Technical advice from the Monitoring Advisory Group suggested to submit a complementary questionnaire to headquarters level, including a qualitative question mapping current policies and practices related to making development co-operation more predictable.
- ▶ Relevance of indicator 5a for non-concessional lending will be explored in carrying out the pilot exercises in two upper-middle income countries whose development finance mix is more dependent on that modality of development co-operation.

### **Indicator 6. Development co-operation is included in budgets subjected to parliamentary oversight**

The methodology for the indicator was deemed as technically sound. However, the implementation of the 2016 monitoring round revealed that the guidance provided to participating governments was not explicit enough on how to report on this indicator<sup>8</sup>. In addition, observed inconsistencies in the final review by the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team required multiple iterations with the national co-ordinators from participating countries.

The Monitoring Advisory Group had also highlighted that, even if information on development co-operation is recorded on the national budget submitted for parliamentary review and approval, the oversight capacities of parliaments around the world are uneven. Parliaments can play a crucial role as steering body and as an institutional instrument for accountability around development co-operation efforts. Thus, the proposal was to contextualise the findings from the monitoring with other secondary data or indexes describing the quality of parliamentary oversight. This would provide a more accurate picture of the extent to which the legislative branch is exerting its important role. To address these issues, it is suggested to:

- ▶ Provide improved step-by-step guidance to ease and strengthen the role of national co-ordinators in reporting on this indicator, and to streamline the validation process;
- ▶ Include one or several indicators drawn from recognised databases on the quality of parliamentary oversight as complementary information for the national co-ordinator, to help in the contextualisation and dialogue on the results.

---

<sup>8</sup> i.e. It was not obvious to some national coordinators that, to complete this indicator, they just needed to review the annual budget submitted to parliament in the reference year, and verify whether contributions from different development partners had been reflected in the budget, either in the main budget report or in the annexed documentation.

### **Indicator 9b. Development partners use countries' own public financial management systems to implement their co-operation programmes with partner governments**

The methodology for this indicator had been tested since 2006 in successive Paris Declaration surveys and Global Partnership monitoring rounds. The Monitoring Advisory Group deemed it relevant and technically sound. Nevertheless, further analysis on reporting practices reveals the importance of strengthening the data collection process around the methodology.

Two types of issues seem to underpin the current data collection method. First, some partner countries and development partners erroneously interpret the use of country systems in the restricted sense of 'budget support',<sup>9</sup> leading to over- and under-reporting that it is only corrected during the final validation phase. The second issue relates to data gaps and availability. For some providers, particularly for new and emerging providers that were not engaged in the Paris Declaration effectiveness surveys and the Busan process, the immediate availability of data on their relative use of country systems is comparatively lower. To compound that issue, often providers' own corporate policies are not specific enough on the conditions and criteria to identify partner country systems as 'eligible' for us, or do not address the issue, creating uncertainty in the reporting process. This leads to more reporting gaps or delays.

To address these issues, it is suggested that:

- ▶ Guidance on how to generate reliable data on these indicators –including short videos – will be facilitated to development partners participating in this exercise.
- ▶ Better step-by-step guidance and checklists will help empower national co-ordinators in the validation process.
- ▶ A qualitative question about the development partner's corporate policy regarding the use of country systems will be included in the complementary survey to be submitted to their headquarters. This can help provide internal guidance to their country-level officers, as well as help interpret the data and identify the internal constraints for better results.

In addition to improved guidance and better data collection process, indicator 9a on "quality of country systems" is being substantially revised as to provide a more objective, disaggregated picture of the quality of these different government systems.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> In reality, the indicator measures the share of development co-operation disbursed to the government in the country [within a given year] that is governed by the country's specific normative, processes and systems for (a) budget execution; (b) financial reporting; (c) auditing; and/or (d) procurement. This is in contrast with requiring using the provider's own policies and systems to manage the disbursed funding. The extent of use in each of these four systems is expressed as a percentage of the total disbursed to the government in the country. The overall score for indicator 9 is an average of the results for these four systems.

<sup>10</sup> A note with the revised indicator proposal is available at [www.effectivecooperation.org/monitoring-country-progress/openconsultation/](http://www.effectivecooperation.org/monitoring-country-progress/openconsultation/)

## Indicator 10. Aid is untied

The methodology for the indicator on untied aid<sup>11</sup> was originally developed by the OECD's Working Party on Development Finance Statistics (WP-STAT), who collects this information on a yearly basis for each individual bilateral member sitting at the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC). The commitments on aid untying stem from the 2001 OECD DAC recommendation to untie aid, later revised in scope and coverage, and tracked by the OECD DAC Secretariat on a regular basis.<sup>12</sup>

The Global Partnership indicator relies on the methodological approaches defined at the WP-STAT, and on the global data collection carried out by the DAC Secretariat. The indicator reports on the share of official development assistance that DAC bilateral donors disburse in partner countries without formally establishing restrictions on the use of the funds. As complementary information, and following the advice of the Monitoring Advisory Group, estimates of *de facto* untied aid<sup>13</sup> were also presented in the latest Global Partnership monitoring report (OECD/UNDP, 2016). While not part of the formal indicator, these complementary estimates were deemed as useful to feed into the policy dialogue at country level, due to expressed concerns that the growing role and instruments to foster private sector engagement through development co-operation may trigger an increase in the degree of tied aid in the near future.

While there are no immediate plans in the relevant bodies to refine the methodology on this indicator, it is proposed that:

- ▶ Disaggregated data at country level is facilitated to national co-ordinators of participating governments to inform the post-monitoring discussion on the Paris/Busan commitments for development co-operation effectiveness;
- ▶ Complementary information is collected from the country-level process, and/or analysis is prepared during the course of the 2018 monitoring round, to better interpret the evolution of aid untying levels in light of recent evolutions in instruments and modalities of development co-operation.

## 4. Other changes to strengthen the process and action on the monitoring results

In addition to the review of the Global Partnership monitoring framework, the Monitoring Advisory Group and successive consultations with participants and reference groups suggested three main actions to strengthen the efficiency and impact of Global Partnership monitoring:

- 1. Surveying development partners at headquarters level on policies and practices related to development co-operation effectiveness.** To meet the commitments for effective development co-operation agreed by the international community, development partners not only require changing behaviours and practices at country level, but also refining

---

<sup>11</sup> A basic definition of tied aid is official development assistance from bilateral donor countries that can only be used to buy goods or services from the country providing the assistance. Different estimates indicate a loss in value-for-money of 15%-30%.

<sup>12</sup> See OECD (2014). [Aid Untying: 2014 Report](#). Review of the Implementation of the 2001 Recommendation and the Accra and Busan Untying Commitments. OECD DAC: Paris. Accessible [here](#); and OECD (2017). *2017 Report on DAC Untying Recommendation*. OECD DAC: Paris. Accessible [here](#).

<sup>13</sup> De facto tied aid levels refer to official development assistance from bilateral donor countries that is spent back in providers of goods and services in that donor country, despite the lack of formal restrictions on the use of the funds by the donor. This is often due to the procurement practices of the donor agency (e.g. publishing bidding processes only in the donor country language, visibility of procurement platforms to international or developing countries' firms, well-established informal social networks with consulting firms, etc.)

institutional policies [at headquarters level] that constraint the degree of agency of their officials and implementers at country level. A survey to development partners at headquarters level will help complement and interpret the country level results, understand the linkages between corporate policies and actual practices, and make the exercise better prepared to provide actionable policy advice.

2. **Providing space to participant to provide context to the results.** Given the intense data exchange between development actors that the monitoring process triggers, facilitating space for the different actors to qualify their responses and data can help parties better interpret the results – and make the data validation process at country level more efficient and informative.<sup>14</sup>
3. **Strengthening the capacities of all stakeholders to engage fully in the monitoring process.** Feedback from participants, post-monitoring workshops with stakeholders, and analysis of the inclusiveness and performance of the monitoring process in different country contexts<sup>15</sup> helped prepare a roadmap to strengthen the capacities of all stakeholders for efficient, useful, action-oriented process:

**a. Providing outreach materials to all stakeholders for broad engagement.** Stakeholders have highlighted the challenge to raise awareness about the purpose, usefulness and other details of the Global Partnership monitoring once it is officially launched in a country. This includes participating governments –some which experience challenges in engaging other government ministries beyond the leading department– and development partners’ agencies –some of which also experience difficulties in mobilizing their country-level colleagues in an effective manner.

- The OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team will step up the preparation of outreach packages and materials that will help all stakeholders disseminate the purpose and usefulness of the monitoring, while helping each individual participant in understanding their role in the process.

**b. Facilitating training and capacity-building tools to all participants.** In previous rounds, capacity-building activities have focused on face-to-face pre-monitoring training of national co-ordinators from participating governments. While that was considered very useful by participants, understanding of the indicators and the monitoring process beyond those participants in trainings was weak. This includes the national co-ordinators’ technical teams in charge of operationalising the monitoring exercise in the country, as well as the rest of stakeholders whose effective action is needed for an inclusive, credible monitoring process. This includes development partners at country level, and the focal points for civil society organisations, private sector, or trade unions.

---

<sup>14</sup> Particular examples include the possibility for stakeholders participating in the dialogue on civil society and private sector engagement (indicators 2 and 3) to provide individual observations to some responses, or allowing development partners identify the existence of technical cooperation activities to strengthen the countries’ capacities in strategic planning, budgeting, public financial management, monitoring and evaluation, statistical capacity –thus reflecting their commitments to increase the support in these areas in the Nairobi Outcome document

<sup>15</sup> See GPEDC (2017). “2016 Monitoring Round: Engagement and Comprehensiveness of reported information”, available [here](#); GPEDC (2017). “2016 Monitoring Round: Lessons learned”, available [here](#); and GPEDC (2017), “2016 Monitoring Round: Exit Survey – Partner countries’ feedback”, available [here](#).



In addition to the detailed monitoring guide, regional workshops and continuous Help Desk, several actions will be taken forward to empower the participation of all stakeholders:

- ▶ Guidance will be more customised to each stakeholder, adopting a step-by-step approach and an accessible, visual presentation of the process.
- ▶ The data reporting tools will become more user-friendly and self-explanatory.
- ▶ On-demand online trainings, including short videos on each indicator, will help stakeholders grasp the technical aspect of the exercise in an accessible, non-time consuming manner.
- ▶ Frequent webinars will serve as an open forum to solve technical and process questions along the monitoring round.
- ▶ Early identification of participating countries and focal points for development partners, civil society, private sector and other actors will ensure that all the awareness-raising and capacity-building efforts reach out to the full body of participants.
- ▶ Guidance will be provided on how to better link the monitoring process to existing in-country processes for development planning, SDG follow-up and review and/or efforts to strengthen multi-stakeholder engagement. This will help mainstream the Global Partnership monitoring process as a complementary exercise to existing processes prioritised at senior level within government.

**c. Facilitating guidance on how to interpret and act upon the monitoring findings.** While the participation in the 2016 monitoring round included 81 countries leading the monitoring exercise and 125 development partners and organisations contributing with data and dialogue, the degree of uptake across the different countries and institutions greatly varied. While examples of action on the monitoring results are abundant,<sup>16</sup> and several of these actors are adapting their development co-operation policies to implement the effectiveness agenda in full, stakeholders also report difficulties in interpreting the results, in setting up multi-stakeholder processes to follow up on possible actions, as well as in agreeing on the direction of these actions.

While institutional and other constraints are important, the lack of guidance on how to interpret the results and the lack of illustrative examples on how to design and implement follow-up mechanisms around the results hinder the potential impact and usefulness of the monitoring process:

- ▶ To enable the transformative potential of the Global Partnership monitoring process in achieving effective partnerships for development, guidance will be provided on how to turn the monitoring results into action at country- and development organisation- levels. This guidance will build on 15 experiences of implementation observed or supported during 2017, as well as 8 country-level pilots being carried out by the Global Partnership during 2018.

---

<sup>16</sup> Some illustrative examples include corporate events and national workshops on development co-operation to review, analyse and/or report on the findings in Honduras, Dominican Republic, Philippines, Samoa, Costa Rica, Liberia, Germany, Sweden, Switzerland, the European Union, the African community of practice on Development Effectiveness, as well as close to half of the voluntary national reviews submitted to the 2017 High-level Political Forum discussing the uptake of the effectiveness principles.

## 5. Conclusions

In preparing for the 2018 monitoring round, the revisions of the Global Partnership monitoring framework will allow participating countries and organisations obtain a fresh snapshot on the effectiveness of their partnerships in the context of the SDGs.

To that end, eight indicators have been substantially revised, with individual methodological proposals open for consultation in a dedicated Global Partnership website.<sup>17</sup>

This note discussed the approach to make the information produced by the rest of indicators more credible, contextualised, and useful. It also described other complementary measures that will be adopted to make the monitoring process at country level more efficient, inclusive and action oriented.

With this consultation, feedback from stakeholders is more than welcome, as to ensure that the revised monitoring framework and process are as useful and effective as they can be.

---

<sup>17</sup> The consultation platform, open until 1<sup>st</sup> April 2018, can be found here: [www.effectivecooperation.org/monitoring-country-progress/openconsultation/](http://www.effectivecooperation.org/monitoring-country-progress/openconsultation/)

## Annex 1. List of current indicators in the Global Partnership monitoring framework

|  |
|--|
|  |
| <b>PRINCIPLE 1 – FOCUS ON DEVELOPMENT RESULTS</b>  |
| Governments have set <b>national results framework(s)</b> to define their development priorities and results (1b)  |
| Development partners <b>use those national results frameworks</b> to align, design and monitor the results of their development co-operation activities (1a) |
| <b>PRINCIPLE 2 – COUNTRY OWNERSHIP OF DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION</b>   |
| <b>Governments strengthen their</b> public financial management and procurement systems (9a)   |
| Development partners <b>use countries’ own public financial management systems</b> to implement their co-operation programmes with partner governments (9b)  |
| Development co-operation is <b>predictable</b> (annual and medium term predictability) (5)   |
| Aid is <b>untied</b> (10)  |
| <b>PRINCIPLE 3 – INCLUSIVE PARTNERSHIPS FOR EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT</b>  |
| <b>Civil society organisations</b> operate within an environment that maximises their engagement in and contribution to development (2)                      |
| Quality public-private dialogue promotes <b>private sector engagement (PSE)</b> and its contribution to development (3)                                      |
| <b>PRINCIPLE 4 - TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT</b>   |
| <b>Transparent information on development co-operation</b> is publicly available (4)   |
| Development co-operation is <b>included in budgets subjected to parliamentary oversight</b> (6)  |
| Governments have systems to track public expenditure for <b>gender equality and women’s empowerment</b> (8)  |
| <b>Mutual accountability</b> among development partners is strengthened through inclusive and transparent reviews at country level (7)                       |

## Annex 2. Overview of Global Partnership indicators experiencing major revisions

*Detailed methodological notes are available in the consultation platform at [www.effectivecooperation.org](http://www.effectivecooperation.org)*

| Global Partnership indicators  | Summary of proposed major revisions to the indicator  |
|--|---|
| <b>Indicator 1a. Development partners use country-led results frameworks to deliver development co-operation</b>                                 | <p><i>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. This indicator corresponds to SDG 17.15.</i></p> <p>The <b>original indicator 1a</b> reviewed whether new development programmes and projects were aligned with country-defined objectives and results, and whether progress was monitored relying on countries' own statistics and monitoring and evaluation systems. The indicator only focused on project-level alignment. However, most development partners articulate their overall alignment to partner country priorities through country strategies or partnership frameworks, which then guide the focus of the projects to be approved in the country.</p> <p>In the <b>revised indicator</b>, project-level estimates are complemented with an assessment of development partners' country strategies or partnership frameworks. The additional module provides a basic assessment of the results-orientation and country ownership of these strategic frameworks.</p> |
| <b>Indicator 1b. Countries strengthen their national results frameworks</b>  | <p><i>Development efforts are more likely to succeed and be sustained when countries take the lead in determining the goals and priorities of its own development, and sets a shared strategic agenda for how they are to be achieved.</i></p> <p>The <b>original indicator 1b</b> mapped whether countries had one or more strategic planning tools in place, and a short narrative describing the country's planning process. However, the methodology only provided indication of existence of these strategic plans, without assessing their quality or use. The indicator did not refer to the SDGs either.</p> <p>The <b>revised indicator</b> addresses these shortcomings throughout a simple questionnaire that identifies whether: there are transparent, country-led frameworks in place; development results are prioritised (including SDGs); there are systems and data in place for monitoring; and whether results information is used for managing domestic and external resources.</p>  |
| <b>Indicator 2. Civil Society organisations operate within an environment that maximises their engagement in and contribution to development</b> | <p><i>Civil society organisations maximise their development impact when the legal framework, the practices of governments, and the behaviour of development partners foster a greater role for CSOs; and when CSOs' own work is carried out in line with the effectiveness principles.</i></p> <p>The <b>original indicator 2</b> measured these multiple dimensions through a multi-stakeholder dialogue process organised around a common questionnaire. However, the previous methodology did not allow properly reflecting incremental progress, or capturing the specific characteristics of each country context, limiting the chances for a substantive country-level policy dialogue and action.</p> <p>The <b>revised indicator</b> improves the questionnaire and eases the multi-stakeholder reporting process, while addressing the two issues described above.</p>  |
| <b>Indicator 3. Quality of public-private dialogue</b>   | <p><i>Maximising private sector contributions to development requires an effective engagement between the public and private sectors. Good public-private dialogue is recognised as a precondition for enhanced collaboration between the two actors.</i></p> <p>The <b>original indicator 3</b> measured the quality of public-private dialogue through a multi-stakeholder process, which produced an agreed assessment of the country's situation. However, the original methodology focused on identifying whether the basic conditions for dialogue were in place, without delving into the quality and results of the dialogue.</p> <p>The <b>revised indicator</b> addresses these shortcomings, by providing a more complete, actionable picture of the quality of public-private dialogue in the country (in terms of relevant content, inclusive and transparent processes, and actual results and joint action).</p>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   |   |
| <b>Indicator 7. Inclusive, transparent mutual assessment reviews are in place</b>                               | <p><i>Mutual assessment reviews– when regular, results-oriented, transparent, and inclusive of all relevant development actors – can help enhance mutual accountability at country level. This in turn creates incentives for all actors to meet their commitments and improve on their performance.</i></p> <p>The <b>original indicator 7</b> assessed whether five criteria reflecting these parameters were in place, with an emphasis on traditional, government-donor arrangements. The shifting development co-operation landscape, with an increase in the number development actors and engagement modalities, calls for broadening the scope of mutual accountability, to reflect the extent to which all actors and development efforts are part of these processes.</p> <p>The <b>revised indicator</b> updates the interpretation of the five criteria under that light. The indicator provides more granularity on the quality of these five elements, as well as on the extent of inclusiveness, transparency and scope of these mutual assessment review processes.</p> |
| <b>Indicator 8. Countries have transparent systems in place tracking public allocations for gender equality</b> | <p><i>Adequate and effective financing is essential to achieve the goal of achieving gender equality and empower all women and girls (SDG 5), as well as other gender related SDG targets.</i></p> <p>The <b>original indicator 8</b> measured the extent to which countries are tracking budget allocations for gender equality and making them publicly available, thus promoting greater transparency and accountability. The original methodological approach – organised around four criteria that described basic elements– did not provide a sense of the quality, relevance, or use of these tracking systems.</p> <p>The <b>revised indicator</b> provides a broader assessment on whether these systems are in place, in terms of adequate processes and instruments, transparency, and actual use in budgeting processes. This revised indicator has been selected as SDG 5c.</p>  |
| <b>Indicator 9a. Quality of Countries' Public Financial Management Systems</b>                                  | <p><i>Government systems able to manage resources effectively help ensure greater development effectiveness. Indicator 9a measures the quality of countries' public financial management systems.</i></p> <p>The <b>original indicator</b> relied on World Bank staff estimates. Specifically, a specific measure in their Country Policy and Institutional Assessments, called CPIA 13). CPIA scores were difficult to unpack or interpret, and less sensitive to small changes. Countries also asked for a more objective measure.</p> <p>The <b>revised indicator</b> is constructed based on the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) Framework. PEFA assessments are the most common type of joint government-donor assessments of a country's public financial management system. The sub-set of PEFA dimensions selected for indicator 9a reflects the quality of the budgeting process, auditing, financial reporting and procurement systems and practices. The indicator will monitor whether countries make progress in these various dimensions.</p>      |

## REFERENCES

- GPEDC (2011), *Busan Partnership Agreement*. Busan: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation; Busan: OECD. Available [here](#).
- GPEDC (2015). *Monitoring Guide 2015-2016. Technical Note*. Paris/New York: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. Available [here](#).
- GPEDC (2016a). “A GPEDC monitoring framework fit for purpose: delivering effective development cooperation in support of Agenda 2030. The final report of the Monitoring Advisory Group”. New York: GPEDC. Available [here](#).
- GPEDC (2016b). “Indicator 4 on Transparency: Revisions to the Methodology”. *9th Steering Committee meeting*. Lilongwe: GPEDC.
- GPEDC (2016c). *A GPEDC monitoring framework fit for purpose: Delivering effective development cooperation in support of Agenda 2030*. Paris/New York: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. Available [here](#).
- GPEDC (2016d). *Assessing the Current Indicator Framework: A compendium of MAG advice on the ten indicators*. Paris/New York: GPEDC. Available [here](#).
- GPEDC (2016e). *Nairobi Outcome Document*. Nairobi: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation: Paris/New York. Available [here](#).
- GPEDC (2017a). “2016 Monitoring Round: Engagement and Comprehensiveness of reported information”, Paris/New York: OECD/UNDP.
- GPEDC (2017b). “Directions to refine the current indicators” *Technical Note: 14th Steering Committee Meeting*. Dhaka: GPEDC. Available [here](#).
- GPEDC (2017c). “Nairobi Outcome Document”, *2nd High-Level Meeting*. Nairobi: GPEDC : ¶ 102
- GPEDC (2017d). *2016 Monitoring Round: Multi-stakeholder Engagement and Comprehensiveness of Reported Information*. Dhaka: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. Available [here](#).
- GPEDC (2017e). “2016 Monitoring Round: Lessons learned”, Paris/New York: OECD/UNDP.
- GPEDC (2017f), “2016 Monitoring Round: Exit Survey – Partner countries’ feedback”, Paris/New York: OECD/UNDP.
- OECD (2014). *Aid Untying: 2014 Report. Review of the Implementation of the 2001 Recommendation and the Accra and Busan Untying Commitments*. Paris: OECD DAC.
- OECD (2017). *2017 Report on DAC Untying Recommendation*. Paris: OECD DAC.
- OECD-UNDP (2016). *Making Development Co-operation More Effective: 2016 Progress Report*. Paris: OECD/UNDP Publishing. Available [here](#).
- Publish What You Fund. 2016. *Aid Transparency Index 2016*. London
- Renzio, P. & Simson, R. (2013). *Transparency for what? The usefulness of publicly available budget information in African countries*. London: ODI
- UN General Assembly (2015). *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. Resolution A/RES/70/1. New York: United Nations.