

**DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE
Development Assistance Committee****Working Party on Aid Effectiveness****MONITORING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BUSAN PARTNERSHIP FOR EFFECTIVE
DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION****Objectives, scope and process for defining a global monitoring framework****Meeting of the Post-Busan Interim Group
13-14 February 2012, OECD, Paris**

This consultation paper is presented FOR DISCUSSION. It sets out (i) key considerations relating to the process through which the WP-EFF will agree on indicators and targets for monitoring the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation, and (ii) a brief overview of substantive and policy issues that may be helpful in stimulating initial discussion on the scope and nature of the future monitoring framework itself.

The post-Busan Interim Group may wish to draw on these elements as it agrees on the process through which the future monitoring framework will be developed and finalised.

This paper is shared with all WP-EFF participants, who are invited to share their views with members of the Interim Group, either directly or by means of the discussion facility on the WP-EFF community space (<https://community.oecd.org/community/aideffectiveness>).

Mr. Robin Ogilvy, tel. +33 (0)1 45 24 94 48, email: robin.ogilvy@oecd.org
Ms. Marjolaine Nicod, tel. +33 (0)1 45 24 87 67, email: marjolaine.nicod@oecd.org

JT03315159

MONITORING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BUSAN PARTNERSHIP FOR EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION: OBJECTIVES, SCOPE AND PROCESS FOR DEFINING A GLOBAL MONITORING FRAMEWORK

1. This paper provides a brief overview of issues for consideration as stakeholders endorsing the *Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation* work to define a framework for monitoring its implementation. The paper is structured in three parts so as to facilitate consultations within the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF), and in turn discussions at the first meeting of the Post-Busan Interim Group (PBIG):

- i) Section I offers background information on the agreement reached at the Fourth High Level Forum and in particular provisions for monitoring implementation of the *Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation*.
- ii) Section II sets out a number of issues relating to the *process* through which a global monitoring framework will be developed. The PBIG is invited to consider these elements and agree at its first meeting on broad deliverables, roles, responsibilities, timing and means of consultation.
- iii) Section III offers an initial overview of some of the *substantive issues* that may need to be addressed in the development of a global post-Busan monitoring framework. These elements are intended to provide a starting point for discussion within the WP-EFF. The first meeting of the PBIG offers an opportunity for an initial exchange of ideas around some of these issues.

2. While the focus of this paper is on the *international* monitoring arrangements that the WP-EFF has been tasked with agreeing, stakeholders should be mindful that these efforts are intended to complement and build on efforts at the level of individual developing countries to agree on frameworks for monitoring progress and supporting mutual accountability. The WP-EFF may, through the PBIG, wish to reflect on the degree to which these country-level efforts are underway, and where additional efforts may be needed to initiate or support these activities at the country level.

I. Background and context

3. The Busan Partnership document (BPd) is the result of an inclusive process of consultation and negotiation in preparation for the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (HLF4). Finalised during HLF4 itself, the BPd sets out a number of principles, goals and commitments that aim to improve the effectiveness – and in turn the results – of development co-operation. It is informed by the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and Accra Agenda for Action, and sees the endorsers of these agreements reaffirming their respective commitments alongside the new commitments agreed by a much broader set of stakeholders in Busan.

4. The BPd is neither an international treaty nor a legally binding agreement. Rather, it takes the form of a joint declaration of a political nature. In associating themselves with the agreement, governments and organisations have recognised the urgency with which the actions set out in it must be implemented.

The BPd places strong emphasis on country-level implementation and the monitoring of efforts in ways that meet the needs of developing countries and are appropriate to country context. Countries and organisations lending their support to the BPd have also agreed to “hold each other accountable for implementing [their] respective actions in developing countries and at the international level” (BPd §13). More specifically, the agreement foresees:

- Country-led efforts to put in place frameworks to monitor progress and strengthen mutual accountability for the effectiveness of development co-operation, and in turn development results.
- A global-level agreement, by June 2012, on a framework – including a selective and relevant set of international indicators and targets – that will be used to monitor progress towards more effective development co-operation. (See BPd §35-36.)

5. Recent experiences highlight the important role that global and country-level efforts to monitor the effectiveness of development co-operation can play in strengthening both domestic and mutual accountability, and in generating and helping to disseminate evidence of challenges and good practices in development co-operation. Evidence from periodic surveys on the implementation of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness played a key role in shaping dialogue at HLF4 as well as its outcomes, and it will be important that discussions on future monitoring are informed by the successes and challenges of existing efforts at the country, regional, sectoral and global levels.

II. Proposed process for agreeing on global post-Busan monitoring arrangements

6. The Post-Busan Interim Group (PBIG) is invited to consult WP-EFF members with a view to agreeing on the arrangements through which a monitoring process, indicators and targets will be defined over the period February to June 2012. The points below offer suggestions for consideration by the group.

Scope of the work

7. In order to deliver on the mandate given to it at HLF4, the WP-EFF would need to agree a number of elements by the end of June 2012:

- *Scope of monitoring at the global level* – agreeing on the commitments, actions, outputs or results to be monitored on a rolling basis at the global level, drawn from the BPd.
- *Specific indicators* through which progress will be measured, accompanied by *time-bound targets*.
- *Means of measurement*, to include:
 - definition of indicators and key concepts;
 - choice of appropriate data types and sources;
 - data availability, periodicity and – where new data needs are identified – means of collection;
- *Arrangements for global analysis, aggregation and dissemination*, to include:
 - linkages between country-level monitoring initiatives and the global monitoring process;
 - global monitoring secretariat and analytical functions;

- arrangements for the provision of support to key stakeholders and end users (e.g. “helpdesk” functions);
- possible outputs and analytic products, including their timing and periodicity, and opportunities for international dialogue and review;
- quality assurance processes and arrangements to ensure continued global learning.

8. A review of existing and relevant internationally agreed indicators and targets could provide a useful starting point for this work, avoiding unnecessary duplication and proliferation of approaches to global monitoring where existing tools could be drawn on to feed a “light” global monitoring framework associated with the BPD and the activities of the Global Partnership.

Roles, responsibilities and consultation arrangements

9. Finalising a monitoring framework by June 2012 will require extensive consultation and substantial technical work to ensure that a realistic proposal is presented to the WP-EFF for discussion and endorsement at the end of the interim period. As it clarifies working arrangements for this period, the PBIG should agree on roles and responsibilities for delivering this work.

10. While the PBIG acts as a senior-level forum for consultation and makes recommendations for approval by the WP-EFF, its members may be less inclined to play a direct role in detailed discussions and consultations of a technical nature. Possible options for carrying forward this work include:

- i) A **secretariat-led** process at the working level, with the OECD working in close collaboration with UNDP to consult relevant stakeholders, developing proposals and reporting to the WP-EFF via the **PBIG**, which provides oversight and acts as the principal forum for consultation/negotiation.
- ii) Extending the mandate of the **WP-EFF Task Team on Monitoring the Paris Declaration** to play a role in the development of future monitoring arrangements and advise the secretariat in developing proposals. This group brings together specialists from donor organisations, developing country governments and civil society, and has an established track record (it oversaw the 2011 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration – a key source of evidence for HLF4). Limited adjustments to its membership could ensure fuller ownership of the process by low- and middle-income countries.
- iii) The establishment of a **new working-level interim group** to lead the development of a proposal for post-Busan monitoring, represent and consult with key stakeholders, and agree on final arrangements. This approach could support broader representation in the process and might see workload being shared across organisations. Agreeing on the composition of a group of a manageable size and possessing the necessary expertise may however lead to further delays.

11. In agreeing on roles and responsibilities, effective use should be made of existing expertise and experience in this area at both the international and country levels. In addition, the group may wish to identify ways of drawing on additional, independent perspectives and advice throughout the process. The **OECD** and **UNDP** could be well placed to lead consultations with a wide range of countries and organisations on the future monitoring framework in view of their close collaboration on the Paris Declaration monitoring process, in-house expertise and access to key stakeholders based in developing countries. Consideration could be also given to identifying a limited number of experts from academia, think-tanks and research institutions that would act as an **advisory panel**, supporting the secretariat and/or any agreed working group, and playing a quality assurance role.

12. Particular efforts should be made to identify relevant existing initiatives led by developing countries so that the global framework is developed in a way that makes it relevant to country-level monitoring and mutual accountability efforts. Proposals for global indicators and targets presented by representatives of the Africa and Latin America regions and civil society stakeholders during the negotiation of the BPD may offer helpful starting points for consultations.

13. Online consultation tools such as the WP-EFF Community Space offer cost-effective opportunities to solicit inputs from a range of stakeholders, and in particular those involved in monitoring efforts at the country level.¹

Timing of work

14. A degree of prioritisation will be important if the elements outlined above (“scope of the work”) are to be delivered within the timeline foreseen by the BPD. Delivering on their mandate would require that stakeholders are in a position to operationalise the agreed monitoring framework in the second half of 2012. At the same time, the WP-EFF may wish to consider ways in which further additions or refinements to the global monitoring framework might be made over the medium term. This may be a desirable feature if the existing body of knowledge and norms relating to specific BPD topics is not sufficiently developed to allow for the design of meaningful indicators and targets at this point in time, but there is an interest in monitoring such topics when evidence becomes available to support the development of sound indicators at a later date. Such topics might include, for example, methods for assessing effectiveness in the areas of South-South and triangular co-operation, the role of the private sector in development, and commitments relating to climate finance.

III. Key issues for consideration in the development of a framework for monitoring Busan commitments

15. The paragraphs that follow are intended to provide some initial questions and themes for consideration by the PBIG in its discussion. They are by no means an exhaustive set of issues that will need to be explored by the group, though initial orientations from the PBIG on some of these themes could act as a helpful starting point for more detailed technical work.

Monitoring what?

16. The PBIG may, in its initial consultations, wish to identify **criteria for the scope of global monitoring efforts** that would act as a starting point for further consultations on process-related issues, as well as specific indicators, targets and methods. Such criteria could include, for example:

- *Relevance at the country level* – ensuring that any global indicators and targets are relevant to challenges faced by stakeholders at the level of individual developing countries.
- *Measuring behaviour change that matters for development* – the efforts, outputs and any intermediate outcomes being measured are closely related to issues that matter for the achievement of development goals.

1. This platform replaces the WP-EFF portal and provides an electronic discussion and knowledge-sharing platform accessible to all participants. See <https://community.oecd.org/community/aideffectiveness>.

- *Supporting global accountability* – approaches that allow a degree of global aggregation and comparison, and are relatively simple to communicate, are important as inputs to political dialogue and the strengthening of accountability at the international level.
- *Cost-effectiveness* – careful consideration should be given to the costs and benefits associated with monitoring different issues or commitments, drawing on existing approaches and country-level processes wherever feasible.

17. An initial identification of **thematic priorities** for monitoring – based on needs articulated by a range of stakeholders, and in particular developing countries – could help to focus the work of the group over the coming months. Selected themes would need to be relevant to the challenges faced by a broad range of developing countries, and in turn to the achievement of results at the country level. As outlined in section II of this paper, it may be realistic to adopt a phased approach to monitoring, recognising that some themes or commitments addressed in the BPd would require more detailed research on norms and needs to render them monitorable in a meaningful way.

18. Within discussions on the scope of indicators and targets, consideration should be given to the **commitments set out in the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action** in view of their reaffirmation in the BPd. Consideration should also be given to the means through which the **differential nature** of some commitments – *i.e.* where commitments apply to a narrowly defined set of actors – are reflected in global indicators and targets, and to what extent some of the more detailed actions set out in initiatives such as the **Busan “building blocks”** should feature in the global monitoring framework. The latter are voluntary, and are endorsed by a subset of the countries and organisations endorsing the BPd.

How should progress be monitored?

19. Detailed discussion on the means through which progress should be monitored at the international level will in large part depend on the agreed scope of monitoring efforts (*i.e.* the “what” of global monitoring, as outlined above). The criteria of relevance and cost effectiveness remain important in discussions on the nature of the global process, roles and responsibilities, and linkages with other processes.

20. Careful consideration will need to be given to the **timing and periodicity** of global monitoring efforts. The BPd commits stakeholders to monitoring progress on a rolling basis, and to periodic publication of results (BPd §35b). A range of approaches could be considered. For example, several existing international monitoring processes relating to development co-operation have organised data collection in the form of periodic global surveys in which data is collected from a panel of countries at the same time to offer global snapshots of progress at key dates (*e.g.* global surveys on monitoring the Paris Declaration; UNDESA surveys on mutual accountability; sector initiatives such as the IHP+Results and EFA-FTI surveys). Alternative approaches could see data collected at the country level at different intervals, institutionalised within country-specific monitoring processes, and then reported, aggregated and analysed at the international level at periodic intervals to offer global progress reports (in a similar manner to the periodic progress reports on the MDGs, or the Human Development Report, for example). The means, timing and periodicity of data collection will again depend in large part on the scope of monitoring (*i.e.* the “what” of monitoring efforts), existing efforts, and the costs and benefits of developing new means for data collection and reporting.

21. A balance between **country-specificity** and the need for **international standards** will need to be given careful consideration in the design of the future monitoring framework. The objectives set by different countries in the area of development co-operation are likely to vary depending on local context and stakeholders’ priorities – a given indicator and target may be meaningful in one country, but of less use in another country facing different development challenges. One approach to balancing these needs could

be to keep global efforts focused on the **development of a monitoring “toolkit”** – *i.e.* developing and agreeing at the international level to a set of norms, indicators and methodologies that can be used to assess progress in a range of areas, with stakeholders at the country level then agreeing to use only those that are relevant to a given country. Global monitoring efforts could equally be structured around a limited set of “core” indicators monitored in all countries, with “optional” indicators bringing depth and additional insight to analysis in smaller sets of countries with shared challenges.

22. HLF4 generated agreements in a wide range of thematic areas. Several **complementary initiatives and “building blocks”** (voluntary, thematic partnerships emerging to address implementation issues) currently propose to monitor progress in addressing a range of challenges. The WP-EFF and PBIG may wish to consider whether a single global framework for monitoring the various outcomes and differential commitments from HLF4 is desirable, or whether other approaches could be adopted to avoid a burdensome proliferation of monitoring initiatives linked to Busan commitments.

23. Detailed **methodological work** would need to be initiated once broad consensus is reached on some of the higher-level questions outlined above. Within this, agreement would need to be reached on appropriate means of measurement, data sources, quality assurance processes, and the degree to which it may be desirable to supplement the specific targets and indicators agreed in the context of the BPd with more detailed narrative reporting (previous initiatives such as the surveys on monitoring the Paris Declaration and the UNDESA surveys on mutual accountability have, for example, drawn on both qualitative and quantitative approaches, situating work on indicators of progress within a richer multi-stakeholder dialogue on progress and challenges at the country level).

24. It would be important to identify the **means of disseminating global findings** at the outset of efforts to develop a post-HLF4 monitoring framework. This should involve, for example, agreeing on key international meetings or processes into which reports on progress at the global level should be fed, and the broad scope and format of such reports.

Who is involved?

25. Once the broad objectives and scope of the global monitoring framework have been defined, the roles and responsibilities of a range of stakeholders should be clarified further. The inclusive nature of the BPd and the commitments to monitor and support international accountability suggest that efforts should be made to involve **a broad range of actors** (*e.g.* governments of developed and developing countries, multilateral organisations, civil society, parliamentary, local and regional organisations). The **leadership of developing countries** throughout the process will be particularly important in view of the emphasis placed by the BPd on country-level monitoring and mutual accountability efforts and the commitment to build, at the global level, on initiatives led by developing countries.

26. While section II of this paper presents some broad options for interim working arrangements for the first half of 2012, it would be appropriate to explore options for the **governance and oversight** of global monitoring efforts. The Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation would present an obvious forum or group that could fulfil this function. Depending on the form and membership/participation arrangements agreed for the Global Partnership, there may also be a need for a dedicated working group, advisory panel or similar light structure to play a specific role in supporting monitoring efforts.²

2. The WP-EFF is currently consulting on the functions, form and working arrangements of the Global Partnership. The first meeting of the PBIG offers an initial opportunity for discussion of these issues (13-14 February 2012), alongside the issues relating more specifically to global monitoring set out in this paper.

27. Further work is needed to identify the specific **secretariat, analytical, support and outreach functions** that would be needed to support global monitoring efforts, and the organisations that would fulfil these roles. The BpD invites the **OECD** and **UNDP** to support the effective functioning of the Global Partnership. Both organisations have partnered in the implementation of previous global monitoring initiatives in the area of development co-operation, and would be well placed to lead activities in support of a global monitoring process going forward.

IV. Next steps

28. WP-EFF participants are invited to provide initial views and comments on the options and ideas presented in this note, with a view to informing discussions in the first meeting of the PBIG (13-14 February 2012). During its meeting, the PBIG may wish to:

- agree on roles and responsibilities for consulting on and developing more detailed proposals for the post-HLF4 monitoring framework (section II of this paper presents some options for discussion);
- exchange initial views on the “what”, “who” and “how” of future monitoring, considering guiding principles and criteria for the future monitoring framework, and priority themes/issues to be monitored (the points contained in section III may be helpful in guiding the discussion). The outcomes of this discussion would help to guide subsequent working-level / technical consultations.