

d·i·e

Deutsches Institut für  
Entwicklungspolitik



German Development  
Institute

Deutsches Institut für  
Entwicklungspolitik

German Development  
Institute

d·i·e



**Future of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation**

Concept Note for a Think Tank Exchange

Johannesburg, 02 February 2017, 6 -10pm

Venue:

“Boardroom” at the Crowne Plaza Rosebank Hotel

Johannesburg, South Africa

## Impulse and Rationale

Against the background of a record year for multilateralism with the adoption of the 2030 Agenda, the Paris Climate Agreement and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, expectations for the Second High-level Meeting (HLM2) of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (GPEDC) in Nairobi in December 2016 were high. Considering the expectations, reception of the *Nairobi Outcome Document*<sup>1</sup> and the state of affairs of the GPEDC more broadly have been rather mixed.<sup>2</sup> The GPEDC and in particular the three newly elected co-chairs of the Steering Committee<sup>3</sup> are called upon to give the partnership new direction and impetus.

The Nairobi high-level meeting broadly reaffirmed previous commitments around the four partnership principles - ownership, focus on results, inclusiveness, transparency and accountability. It also set the GPEDC on the path of (re-)defining its mandate and role in the context of the 2030 Agenda together with a number of structural reforms (mandate revision, theory of change etc.).

However, the Nairobi meeting yielded little progress in convincing important stakeholders – in particular emerging economies such as Brazil, China, India and South Africa, but also the private sector - to participate and take an active interest and role in the proceedings. That key stakeholders of the new development landscape continue to stand on the sideline poses a serious challenge to GPEDC's claim as a multi-stakeholder forum. The fact that high-level (ministerial) representation of recipients/providers of development cooperation has decreased since the Mexico high-level meeting is cause for further concern.

An open, serious dialogue with abstaining stakeholders about their perceptions and positions vis-à-vis the GPEDC is therefore long overdue. This exchange aims to address this need through an informal meeting of high-level representatives of think tanks from among the group of emerging economies. Think tanks representatives are in a suitable position to debate pending matters by taking into account, but not being restrained by, the burden of official political considerations. In line with the mission of the German Development Institute to "build bridges between policy and practice", think tank exchanges can be an important "breeding ground" for ideas and impulses for the political process.

---

<sup>1</sup> See [here](#) (01 Dec 2016)

<sup>2</sup> See some exemplary reactions [here](#) (DIE/NeST), [here](#) (ODI), [here](#) (CPDE) and [here](#) (CCIC), [here](#) (Oxfam), [here](#) (DevEx), [here](#) (Reality of Aid / CSOs) and [here](#) (Trade Unions).

<sup>3</sup> Germany, Bangladesh and Uganda

## Guiding Questions for the Exchange

The aim for the exchange is an informal, frank and open – in terms of process and outcome - exchange of views, and to gather opinions, on the “future of the GPEDC”. Taking past discussions<sup>4</sup> as a starting point, the exchange will be forward-looking and open-ended. Participants will be asked to explore commonalities and differences of views based on their different country backgrounds, and to explore common ground in the perspectives on the current state of affairs and potential future trajectories of the GPEDC.

Specifically, discussions will be structured around three sets of future-oriented issues:

- **Current state of affairs:** What are the perspectives among stakeholders on the state of affairs of the GPEDC following the Nairobi HLM2? Have views concerning its legitimacy and usefulness changed, and if so, how? To what extent is a common “narrative” and reference framework for the effectiveness of development cooperation in the 2030 context (still) useful and needed? (40min)
- **Commonalities and differences:** What are the reasons for emerging economies and other stakeholders to abstain from taking an active role in the GPEDC? What are stumbling blocks, what are stepping stones? (40min)
- **Future trajectories:** What could make the partnership more attractive for those stakeholders not currently engaged or rather inactive? Are emerging economies and the GPEDC on a course of rapprochement or drifting further apart? What are trajectories for the future development of the GPEDC in the short, medium and long-term under different scenarios? (40min)

Throughout the discussions, we aim to identify room for concurrence and difference concerning the nature and shape of the main issues and questions.

## Going Forward

The exchange is fundamentally meant as an opportunity for frank exchanges and therefore open both in terms of process and outcome. DIE will prepare a short note to summarize key takeaways from the proceedings which will be shared with all participants and, if agreed, with key external stakeholders. At the meeting, DIE will also request participant’s feedback concerning the need and value-added of such an informal communication platform and, if applicable, will solicit proposals how to take the exchange forward in the future (20min).

---

<sup>4</sup> Past DIE events on the GPEDC and the global development architecture are [here](#), [here](#) and [here](#).

## GPEDC Monitoring Framework

### INDICATORS AND TARGETS

The set of global indicators (see table below) includes some indicators which are based on the previous indicators from the Paris Declaration that developing countries have identified as particularly important. Other indicators capture some of the broader dimensions of the Busan Partnership agreement.

INDICATORS	TARGETS FOR 2015
<b>1. Development co-operation is focused on results that meet developing countries' priorities</b>	
Extent of use of country results frameworks by co-operation providers	<i>All providers</i> of development co-operation use country results frameworks
<b>2. Civil society operates within an environment which maximises its engagement in and contribution to development</b>	
A preliminary assessment of CSO Enabling Environment building on qualitative, multi-stakeholder information	<i>Continued progress over time</i>
<b>3. Engagement and contribution of the private sector to development</b>	
A three-dimension index providing a measure of the quality of public-private dialogue	<i>Continued progress over time</i>
<b>4. Transparency: information on development co-operation is publicly available</b>	
Measure of state of implementation of the common standard by co-operation providers	<i>Implement the common standard</i> – All development co-operation providers are on track to implement a common, open standard for electronic publication of timely, comprehensive and forward-looking information on development co-operation
<b>5. Development co-operation is more predictable</b>	
(a) annual: proportion of development cooperation funding disbursed within the fiscal year within which it was scheduled by co-operation providers; and	<i>Halve the gap</i> – halve the proportion of aid not disbursed within the fiscal year for which it was scheduled (Baseline year 2010)
(b) medium-term: proportion of development cooperation funding covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at country level	<i>Halve the gap</i> – halve the proportion of development cooperation funding not covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at country level.
<b>6. Aid is on budgets which are subject to parliamentary scrutiny</b>	
% of development cooperation funding scheduled for disbursement that is recorded in the annual budgets approved by the legislatures of developing countries	<i>Halve the gap</i> – halve the proportion of development cooperation flows to the government sector not reported on government's budget(s) (with at least 85% reported on budget) (Baseline year 2010)
<b>7. Mutual accountability among development co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews</b>	
% of countries that undertake inclusive mutual assessments of progress in implementing agreed commitments	<i>All developing countries</i> have inclusive mutual assessment reviews in place (Baseline year 2010)
<b>8. Gender equality and women's empowerment</b>	
% of countries with systems that track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment	<i>All developing countries</i> have systems that track and make public resource allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment
<b>9. Effective institutions: developing countries' systems are strengthened and used</b>	
(a) Quality of developing country PFM systems; and	<i>Half of developing countries move up at least one measure (i.e. 0.5 points) on the PFM/CPIA scale of performance</i> (Baseline year 2010)
(b) Use of country PFM and procurement systems	<i>Reduce the gap.</i> [use the same logic as in Paris – close the gap by two-thirds where CPIA score is $\geq 5$ ; or by one-third where between 3.5 and 4.5] (Baseline year 2010)
<b>10. Aid is untied</b>	
% of aid that is fully untied	<i>Continued progress over time</i> (Baseline year 2010)

## **Background Resources (selected)**

### ***High-level Meeting in Nairobi, November-December 2016***

CSO communiqué prior to the HLM2 ([here](#))

Oxfam Policy Brief ([here](#))

CSO Asks ([here](#))

EU Study on its delivery of effective development cooperation ([here](#))

EU common position on the GPEDC ([link](#))

### ***GPEDC Fundamentals***

2016 Monitoring Report ([link](#))

2016 Monitoring Profiles of 81 countries ([link](#))

GPEDC Principles ([link](#))

Busan High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness Outcome Document ([link](#))

## Contact Details of the Organizers

### **Dr. Stephan Klingebiel**

Head of Department "Bi- and Multilateral Development Cooperation"  
German Development Institute | Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE)  
Regular Visiting Professor at Stanford University  
Tulpenfeld 6, D-53113 Bonn, Germany  
Phone: +49/(0)228/94927-0 (ext. 299)  
stephan.klingebiel@die-gdi.de Twitter: @St\_Klingebiel  
<http://www.die-gdi.de/en/stephan-klingebiel/>

### **Timo Mahn Jones**

Researcher German Development Institute | Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE)  
Tulpenfeld 6, D-53113, Bonn, Germany  
Phone: +49/(0)228/94927-0 (ext. 273)  
timo.mahn@die-gdi.de Twitter: @timomahn  
<https://www.die-gdi.de/timo-casjen-mahn/>

**Logistics**

The meeting will take place in the "Boardroom" at the Crowne Plaza Rosebank Hotel starting at 18.00hrs (directly succeeding the official T-20 conference programme).

Participation is by invitation only.