

**Civil Society
Continuing Campaign for
Development Effectiveness**
January 2014 – March 2017

Program Completion Report

Project Information

Name of financial management CSO and implementing CSO(s)

Financial Management Host:

IBON International

Implementing Organisations

OECD Liaison: International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)

Reality of Aid Africa Network

Reality of Aid Network – Asia-Pacific

CONCORD Europe (2014)

FOND Romania (2015-2016)

Asociacion LatinoAmericana de Organizaciones de Promocion al Desarrollo (2014-2015)

Fundacion SES (2016)

Arab NGO Network for Development

Canadian Council for International Co-operation

Pacific Islands Association of NGO

ACT Alliance

International Trade Union Confederation

Association of Women's Rights in Development (2014)

Coordinadora dela Mujer (2015-2016)

People's Coalition on Food Sovereignty

ActionAid Italia

Indigenous People's Movement for Self-Determination and Liberation (2015-2016)

National Association of Youth Organisations (2015-2016)

Asia-Pacific Mission for Migrants (2016)

Asia-Pacific Research Network

Reality of Aid Network

Period under review

January 2014 – March 2017

Date of report submission

31 May 2017

Bilateral contract number and Associated Donor Names

Sida Contribution No. 54030480

DFATD Canada Purchase Order: 7060342

Initiative Number: D-000 368

IrishAid Contract Number: PG23-2016

ADA Contract Number: 252401/2014

Finland Contract Number:

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	3
List of Acronyms	4
1.0 Introduction and Overview	5
1.1 Overview of Achievements	5
1.2 Context of Implementation	8
2.0 Results and Impact Achieved	9
A. Ultimate Outcome	10
B. Intermediate Outcomes	10
Policy and Advocacy Engagement	13
Outreach and Capacity Development	31
Programme and Platform Consolidation and Management	40
2.1 Planned Results Not Achieved	44
2.2 Unplanned Results	45
3.0 Concluding Remarks	46
List of Annex	48
List of Appendix	49

List of Acronyms

BA	BetterAid
BB	Building Block
BPd	Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation
CC	Coordination Committee of the CPDE
CPDE	CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
CSO DE	Civil Society Organization Development Effectiveness
CSO EE	Civil Society Organization Enabling Environment
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DCF	Development Cooperation Forum
DPs	Development Partnerships
DRM	Domestic Resource Mobilization
EU	European Commission
FfD	Financing for Development
GC	Global Council of the CPDE
GPEDC	Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation
GPIs	Global Partnership Initiatives
HLF	High Level Forum
HLM	High Level Meeting
HLPF	High Level Political Forum
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approach to Development
INGO	International Non-Government Organisations
ID	Inclusive Development
IP	Istanbul Principles
ITUC	International Trade Union Confederation
MAG	Monitoring Advisory Group
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MIC	Middle Income Countries
MOI	Means of Implementation
MR	Monitoring Round
OCA	Organizational Capacity Assessment
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OF	Open Forum
PFD	Policy Forum for Development
SC	Steering Committee of the GPEDC
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SSC	South-South Cooperation
TT	Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment
UN	United Nations

1.0 Introduction and Overview

1.1 Overview of Achievements

- **General introduction to the Programme and Overview of achievements from 2014-2016**

BetterAid (BA) and Open Forum for CSO Development Effectiveness (OF) successfully moved the policy discourse from aid effectiveness to development effectiveness in 2011. These two platforms merged in 2012 to form the CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) to continue the CSO campaign for effective development. Shortly thereafter, the multi-year programme entitled *Civil Society Continuing Campaign for Effective Development (2014-2016)* was conceptualised. This programme aimed to contribute to national and global development by promoting development effectiveness in all areas of work, among civil society organisations (CSOs) and with key development actors. The two-pronged approach was through (1) active engagement with the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) among other relevant fora, guided by the human rights based approach (HRBA) and (2) encouragement of CSOs to work on their own effectiveness. In carrying out this approach, the programme was divided in two work areas: (1) Policy Engagement and Advocacy and (2) Capacity Building and Outreach.

During the implementation of this *Continuing Campaign*, three development policy milestones helped fuel the drive for a more effective, inclusive, and transformative development partnerships and initiatives at the global, regional, sectoral, and national levels. These milestones included two (2) High Level Ministerial Meetings (HLMs) of the GPEDC in 2014 and 2016 and the review of the Millennium Development Goals and subsequent adoption of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UN SDGs) in 2015. Much of the efforts of the constituency responded to these important policy milestones and ensured that CSOs and CSO positions were heard and, when possible, brought to the negotiating table. Each year, the CSO Partnership had a specific focus in terms of its annual programme planning and implementation in order to tailor fit its activities to these milestones.

Alongside these milestones, the trend of closing and shrinking civic spaces continue to undermine operation and organisation of CSO activities in at least 16 countries across the globe. This trend ran counter to efforts of promoting CSO effectiveness and the maximisation of contribution of civil society to development. This context called for a strengthened advocacy for CSO Enabling Environment (EE).

In order to demonstrate the important accomplishments of CPDE in implementing its programme, this Completion Report provides a brief description of results of programme implementation at the global, regional, sectoral, and country levels. This will also highlight the activities organised and outputs developed for the achievement of the outcomes across the three (3) years of programme implementation. While this Completion Report will highly elaborate activities and outputs of 2016, Annual Reports (ARs) from 2014-2015 are annexed to this Completion Report for a more detailed articulation of progress in outcomes and outputs in the first two years. Specifically, this

report aims to demonstrate progress made against the following programme objectives:

1. Contributing to favourable outcomes in development cooperation policy, and enabling environment for CSOs, from national to global levels where we can influence and advance our agenda; and
2. Contributing to the development of capacity and effectiveness of CSOs, particularly at the national level and amongst the most marginalized groups, to practice and advocate for development effectiveness through the Istanbul Principles.

Table 1 below presents a summary of results. A more detailed discussion of these results will be presented in the succeeding parts of this Completion Report.

Table 1. Summary of Results per Area of Work

Contribute to national and global development by promoting development effectiveness in all areas of work, among CSOs and with key development actors, through active engagement with the GPEDC among other relevant fora, guided by HRBA.	
<p>Intermediate Outcome: Contribute to favourable outcomes in development cooperation policy, and enabling environment for CSOs, from national to global levels where we can influence and advance our agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensured CSO engagement at various levels in key development cooperation policy milestones and multi-stakeholder forums to advance civil society positions, most especially in the GPEDC and the SDG processes • Three (3) of the six (6) CSO Key Asks/ Policy Priorities in Nairobi HLM were fully achieved while the other three (3) were either significantly or partially achieved. • Advocated and was able to contribute towards the following favourable policy outcomes in the Nairobi Outcome Document (NOD):¹ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Renewal of commitments to implement agreements made in Rome, Paris, Accra, Busan, and Mexico o Upholding integrity of GPEDC's mandate as an inclusive multi-stakeholder platform to ensure effectiveness of development cooperation o Recognition of the role of women, youth, migrants, and other peoples' groups o Recognition and responding to shrinking and closing spaces for civil society 	<p>Intermediate Outcome: Contribute to the development of capacity and effectiveness of CSOs, particularly at the national level and amongst the most marginalized groups, to practice and advocate for development effectiveness through the Istanbul Principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organised CSO work on development effectiveness principles through thematic and ad hoc working groups and with volunteers from different regions and sectors • Increased CSO capacity in practicing and advocating DE through the Istanbul Principles with significant increase in capacity for research and communications and policy development. Improvement is apparent in North America and LAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Based on the comparative analysis of the 2014 and 2016 OCA, overall evaluation indicator on the IP (72 in 2014 to 79 in 2016). In particular, CSOs improved on the following areas: (1) Capacity to share information/knowledge (69 in 2014 to 89 in 2016) and (2) Implementation of the IP (66 in 2014 to 87.8 in 2016) • Increased practice of transparency and accountability principles among CSOs at

¹ See *Civil Society Assessment of the Nairobi Outcome Document*, attached as Annex A for detailed analysis. Also available online at <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0ByZczWk8axJSNnVxLVFiZ1FyYIE/view>

Contribute to national and global development by promoting development effectiveness in all areas of work, among CSOs and with key development actors, through active engagement with the GPEDC among other relevant fora, guided by HRBA.	
<p>Intermediate Outcome: Contribute to favourable outcomes in development cooperation policy, and enabling environment for CSOs, from national to global levels where we can influence and advance our agenda</p>	<p>Intermediate Outcome: Contribute to the development of capacity and effectiveness of CSOs, particularly at the national level and amongst the most marginalized groups, to practice and advocate for development effectiveness through the Istanbul Principles</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ensuring the private sector exercise accountability in its development interventions o Protection of the integrity of the effective development cooperation agenda • Advocated and was able to contribute towards the following favourable policy outcomes in the Mexico Communique: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Respect the commitments made in Busan o Promote Inclusive development and democratic ownership of development agenda o Support CSOs as independent development actors • Most recent study showed some progress in CSO Enabling Environment notably in multi-stakeholder dialogue opportunities, initiatives in CSO accountability and high level of trust on CSOs as development actors, among others. Progress is overshadowed by the closing and shrinking civic spaces and widespread restrictions on CSOs² • Promoted accountable multi-stakeholder framework for development and development cooperation in its engagement of the PostMDG/A2030 process • CSOs were able to engage in policy at the country level through the conduct of multi-stakeholder dialogues and consultations for the GPEDC monitoring and the UN negotiations in 2015. 	<p>different levels of work. Over-all, there is a strong position on the practice of transparency and accountability according to the OCA (42.1 in 2014 to 52.5 in 2016). Improvement is apparent in North America and Africa.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successfully diversified platform membership through outreach to and inclusion of the Indigenous Peoples (IPs), Youth, and Migrants/Diaspora sectors in 2014, 2015, and 2016 respectively • Efforts in continuous outreach and membership expansion and consolidation of all sectors and regions, as well as through working groups • Sustained platform/network development and adjustment to changing development landscape through regular governance meetings and a Strategic Planning exercise • Involved CSOs in 62 countries in activities ranging from policy development, advocacy engagement, and capacity development on key CPDE priority themes. Twenty-eight of which directly engaged the GPEDC Second Monitoring Round at the country level. • Sustained participation and engagement in multi-stakeholder and intergovernmental dialogues with national authorities

² For detailed presentation of evidence, see *GPEDC Indicator Two: Civil Society Operates within an environment that maximizes its engagement in and contribution to development, An Assessment to Evidence*, attached as Annex B. Also available online at <http://csopartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/GPEDC-Indicator-Two.pdf>

1.2 Context of Implementation

- **General discussion of implementing context including any key factors affecting or having the potential to affect implementation**

The implementation of the programme can be contextualised in the key policy milestones of the period. At the beginning of the programme, the CSO Partnership operated on the context of sustaining the policy discourse on the shift from aid to development effectiveness and later on to effective development cooperation (EDC). This included important review and assessment of the implementation of the commitments made in previous High Level Forums (HLF) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). As preparation for a new development framework replacing the MDGs unfolded, the CSO Partnership operated to ensure that the development actors in the GPEDC and other relevant development policy forums would fulfill EDC commitments as a concrete step towards the SDGs.

Donor governments committed to allocate at least 0.7% of their Gross National Income (GNI) as contribution to the Official Development Assistance (ODA) of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in previous HLFs. Donor governments' ODA contributions, however, practically stagnated (if not, declined). At the end of 2016 – the culmination of CPDE's *Continuing Campaign* – the average contribution of all Development Assistance Committee (DAC) member countries only amounted to 0.3% of GNI, 0.4% lower than the original commitment.

Donor governments also continue to include their humanitarian, student scholarships, military-aid, and disaster-relief spending as ODA contributions while the value of ODA has largely been unchanged. ODA is also being used to attract private and blended finance in development. This has gained prominence as the major sources of financing for development in the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, and the Nairobi Outcome Document.

Aside from the slow progress on meeting commitments on ODA quantity and quality, the continuing shrinking of civic spaces proved to be detrimental for CSOs to implement their mandate and organise activities. Social movements and civil society activities had been critical of governments and other bilateral and multilateral organisations in line with their “watchdog” role. In response, many national laws regulated CSO capacities to organise assemblies and mobilise constituencies to counter such critical positions. Some governments even used its monopoly of coercive power to suppress civil society action. These conditions were clear departures from commitments of providing an enabling environment for civil society and social movements, as reinforced in Busan and Mexico on 2011 and 2014 respectively.

As world leaders adopted the 2030 Agenda, development forums were defining their roles in ensuring that these SDGs would be more fruitful compared to its predecessor MDGs. CPDE has been most actively engaged on the issue of 2030 Agenda's Means of Implementation (MOI) as this is most relevant to EDC. The 3rd Financing for Development (FfD) conference in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia reinforced governments'

preference for greater intervention of the Private Sector (PS) in development partnerships and initiatives. This strengthened the need to push for the principles of transparency and accountability not only of governments, but also of the PS as gaps in HR-aligned mechanisms to regulate PS activities continue to exist.

Across three years, the GPEDC took time in finding its niche in the development landscapes – i.e., adjusting to the political roadmap of the 2030 Agenda. In 2014, GPEDC attempted to maintain its mandate of pushing for a more effective development cooperation between and among state and non-state actors at all levels. Identified focus areas to work on are: (1) Aid in Conflict-Afflicted and Under-aided States, (2) Middle Income Countries (MICs), (3) Private Sector in Development, and (4) South-South Cooperation among other important initiatives. As it defined its guiding principles, CPDE championed the work stream on Inclusive Development. This shifted to defining the “how” of the UN SDGs 2030 Agenda in 2015 when the attention of the development world shifted to the Goals and its indicators. Despite slow progress in defining its niche in the 2030 Agenda, CPDE saw the need for a more active engagement with the GPEDC. Early in 2016, there were attempts of some actors within GPEDC to reduce its mandate as a “knowledge hub” of EDC. CPDE deemed it important to effectively engage this issue in the High Level Ministerial Meeting in Nairobi, Kenya on November 30 – December 1, 2016. This proved to be pivotal for the GPEDC, as it needed to clarify its role in the overall development picture.

Amid these institutional engagements, the current development landscape is worsening. development cooperation processes the promotion of free trade, liberalisation, and privatisation as a solution to poverty has increased. The role of the private sector in development had been highly emphasised in all policy discussions without enough safeguards for human rights and environmental sustainability. The rise of far-right populism, especially in the North, and economic crises in the developed countries negatively impact on the current geopolitical and development landscape. Violations of human rights, forced migration, terrorism, and war are escalating. The current global crisis has also been used to justify expanding the roles of the private sector in solving the world’s most challenging problems.

These and the diverse national contexts through which CPDE members operated influenced the conduct of activities of CSOs and the positions that the Platform made in the course of policy development processes. The CSO Partnership helped ensure that its members were resilient to these conditions at the local level and be able to bring forth such concerns at the global level. In response to this dynamic contexts, the platform underwent a number of consolidation meetings to strategise and reorganise its ranks.

2.0 Results and Impact Achieved

- **Results and impact achieved during reporting period in relation to the performance framework**

The following results and impact were achieved in the course of the three-year programme implementation have been noted:

A. Ultimate Outcome

The CSO Partnership aimed to contribute to national and global development by promoting development effectiveness in all areas of work, among CSOs and with key development actors, through active engagement with the GPEDC among other relevant forums, guided by the HRBA.

B. Intermediate Outcomes

Intermediate Outcome 1: Contribute to favourable outcomes in development cooperation policy, and enabling environment for CSOs, from national to global levels where we can influence and advance our agenda.

Immediate Outcomes	Results Achieved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Favourable outcomes in development cooperation policy are achieved in defending Paris/Accra commitments and towards realisation of human rights, social justice, equality (especially gender equality and sustainability in development, specifically in areas of democratic ownership and enabling environment from national to global levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Specific policy outcomes in NOD influenced by CPDE positions including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Effective development cooperation</i> - renewed full commitment to achieve this unfinished business with time-bound action plans (§35); Recognition of previous commitments and its importance in moving ahead and in contributing to A2030 (§8, §12, §18, §30). ○ <i>Accountability</i> - Mutual accountability is referenced sufficiently throughout the document (§7, §12, §31, §68). ○ <i>Enabling environment</i> - Recognition and the commitment to reverse the trend of closing spaces for civil society (§18); Commitment to accelerate progress in providing an enabling environment for civil society in line with internationally agreed rights (§18); Promotion of civil society space to “<i>evaluate development progress by the government and other stakeholders</i>” is commendable (§42f) ● Specific policy outcomes in Mexico Communique influenced by CPDE positions including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Respect the commitments made in Busan and the acknowledgment that many more efforts and behavioral changes are required to fully implement these commitments (§7) ○ Promote Inclusive development and democratic ownership of development agenda with an emphasis on openness, trust, and mutual respect and learning

Immediate Outcomes	Results Achieved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accountable multi-stakeholder framework for development and development cooperation and enabling environment for CSOs are promoted with evidence of improved impact on the policy dialogues for development national to global level. 	<p>from the different and complementary roles of all development partners (§12)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Support CSOs as independent development actors that maximizes the contributions of CSOs to development. And the acknowledgement of CSOs' role in enabling people to claim their rights (§15) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement in the 2030 Agenda process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Highlighting peoples' issues from the ground to the global level. Representatives from civil society, peoples and grassroots organisations contributed and intervened at the UN ○ Consolidated peoples' issues at the regional level, specifically Asia. Representatives engaged the Asia Pacific Regional CSO Engagement Mechanism at UNESCAP and showcased an update on an Enabling Environment for CSOs through a side-event. ○ Contributions to interactive dialogues at the UNGA during the adoption of the Post-2015 agenda ○ Elevated Development Effectiveness in the discussions of the 9 Major Groups, specifically the Farmers Major Group, NGO Major group, and the Women's Major group ○ Contributions to position papers of the NGO Major Group • Sustained engagement in the GPEDC and Global Partnership Initiatives (GPIs) highlighted by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Leadership in the work strand of post Busan core business, inclusive development, and transparency and accountability ○ Sustained CSO-championed advocacies within the GPEDC frame through the Task Team (TT) for CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment and active participation in activities of relevant GPIs 6 (CPDE), 12 (TT), 7 (SSC), 11 (Fragile States), and 31 (Climate Finance)

Immediate Outcomes	Results Achieved
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSOs at the country level were able to influence key development initiatives through the conduct of multi-stakeholder dialogues and consultations for the GPEDC monitoring work and the UN negotiations in 2015.

Planned Outputs	Outputs Produced and Activities Organised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence-based policy recommendations and submissions, particularly reflecting country level data are used. • Key development cooperation actors are aware of and understand CSO policy positions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPDE produced key documents like the CSO Asks, Global Advocacy Strategy, and Strategic Plan to guide the advocacy engagements and inform policy positions of constituencies and representatives at the global, regional, sectoral, and national levels. • CPDE statements to the GPEDC activities and position papers and policy recommendations on activities of key development policy forums were released in order to forward CSO positions. • Global researches with country data on the state of democratic ownership, DE, EE, development cooperation, and CSO capacities for advocacy, research, and promotion of Istanbul Principles • Raised awareness and acquired support of key development cooperation actors on CSO positions, most especially on important DE principles of transparency and accountability, HRBA, CSO EE, and Inclusive Development • The conduct of the Perception Survey evidenced that key development cooperation actors were aware and supportive of CSO positions espousing DE principles. • Side events were organised, and meaningful participation in negotiations of the GPEDC and its mandate and the UN and the shaping of the new UN SDGs 2030 Agenda were ensured. • Publication on CPDE priority themes – CSO DE, CSO EE, HRBA, SSC, EDC, and 2030 Agenda – were developed and disseminated to influence various stakeholders.

Planned Outputs	Outputs Produced and Activities Organised
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CSO Partnership ensured civil society representation in the GPEDC activities (e.g., Mexico and Nairobi HLM, Planning Workshops, Busan monitoring) and its key working structures (e.g., Steering Committee, Monitoring Advisory Group, and GPs), the UN bodies (e.g., Development Cooperation Forum, General Assembly, and High Level Panel), the TT on CSO DE and EE, and the OECD-DAC in order to lobby CSO key demands and positions in the formulation of outcome documents. • Country reports were developed to inform the GPEDC Progress Report on Monitoring Indicators (especially Indicator 2 on Enabling Environment) and the UN SDGs 2030 Agenda.

Further detailing of the results and impact achieved and outputs produced summarised above, the succeeding portion describes briefly the activities that have become instrumental to the aforementioned accomplishments in three years. However, a more detailed discussion of the activities for 2014 and 2015 are found in the Annual Reports for those years (See Annex C and Annex D, respectively) annexed in this Completion Report.

Policy and Advocacy Engagement

a. Ensuring Meaningful Policy and Advocacy Engagements

The Policy-Advocacy Working Group of the CSO Partnership is responsible for steering discussions on positions to be forwarded to the Platform's policy and advocacy engagements to the GPEDC, the TT on CSO DE and EE, the UN SDGs 2030 Agenda through the UN Development Cooperation Forum (UN DCF), Financing for Development (FfD), and other relevant policy arenas like the European Union Policy Forum for Development (EU PFD) and the OECD-DAC. Since 2014, positions were developed on issues relevant to the intended outcomes of the meetings and workshops organised by these institutions. Some of these issues include the (1) shrinking civic space for CSO participation in multi-stakeholder forums, (2) declining volumes of ODA due to changes in inflation rates and re-orientation of development policies, (3) rising inequalities at all levels, and (4) increasing human rights violations due to forced migration, terrorism, and war. These positions remained consistent with the over-all CPDE positions on HRBA, CSO DE, CSO EE, SSC, and EDC. The engagement to these global policy arenas was anchored on the CPDE Global Advocacy Strategy (See Annex E).

A key factor in understanding the policy and advocacy engagement of CPDE is the

influence of development policy milestones from 2014-2016 on policy development processes. Two (2) High Level Ministerial Meetings (HLMs) were organised in 2014 and 2016 respectively, and the adoption of the new UN SDGs 2030 Agenda was formalised in New York in 2015.

Engaging the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation.

The CPDE engagement to the GPEDC could be described in five (5) important aspects of work, namely: (1) GPEDC Steering Committee (SC) membership; (2) influencing GPEDC mandate and its link to the 2030 Agenda; (3) contributing to the Global Monitoring Framework and Progress Report; (4) engaging the Building Blocks/Global Partnership Initiatives (GPIs); and (5) influencing outcomes of the High Level Ministerial Meetings in Mexico and Nairobi respectively. CPDE remained to be the broadest and only voice of CSOs in advancing development effectiveness principles in the discussions of effective development cooperation in the GPEDC. While the engagement had been institutionalised for a time, CPDE continues to be vigilant in helping ensure that previous commitments made in Rome, Paris, Accra, and Busan were upheld and respected by all development policy forums, most especially the GPEDC as the successor platform of the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (BPEDC) and its Working Party for Aid Effectiveness (WP-Eff).

The GPEDC SC is the main policy guidance and coordination body of the partnership; therefore, the CPDE policy advocacy work focused on its work streams and meetings. From 2014-2016, the GPEDC convened twelve (12) SC Meetings³ which focused on agenda items specific to the (1) organisational structure and (2) the GPEDC link to the 2030 Agenda. CPDE ensured that CSOs were represented in these meetings to influence its outcomes and discussions⁴.

At the beginning of 2014, the GPEDC was restructuring to expand the membership of the SC. CPDE asserted a second CSO seat in the SC structure.. This second CSO seat went to the Trade Unions (TUs) who are members of the CPDE. Such restructuring somewhat increased the negotiating capacity of the CSOs in terms of numbers within the SC. It was also in 2014 when the discussion on the 4th Non-Executive Co-chair was raised. However, this discussion was stalled until the Second High Level Ministerial Meeting (HLM2) in Nairobi, Kenya in 2016. It was rationalised that CSOs, being the major non-executive stakeholder to the SC, should be properly represented in its leadership, most especially that the co-chairs were composed of major stakeholders like the DAC, non-DAC, and recipient countries. However, the HLM2 in 2016 was more focused on ensuring that principles of development cooperation were covered and discussed carefully, and the decision on the 4th Non-Executive Co-chair was yet again stalled to

³ For an accurate number and listing of venues where these SC Meetings were held, see the GPEDC website: www.effectivecooperation.org/events.

⁴ The 2014 Annual Report details the specific intervention of CPDE in the GPEDC SC Meetings of the year.

2017.

Aside from ensuring CSO representation in the GPEDC SC membership and leadership, the CSO Partnership also intervened in the discussions of the possible linkage between the GPEDC and the 2030 Agenda. Across the three years, the context of developing and formalising the UN SDGs 2030 Agenda and its ambitious indicators influenced the directions of the Global Partnership meetings and other activities. The entire global development community had been heavily invested on ensuring that the new Goals would *Leave No One Behind* – i.e., ensuring that the basic principles and MOIs would suffice to alleviate poverty and curb socio-economic inequalities and discrimination at all levels - not sufficiently addressed by the MDGs.

In 2014, a year before the implementation of the MDGs would formally conclude, the GPEDC SC prepared to define its niche in the Post 2015 SDGs processes. The GPEDC was poised to define the “how” of the SDGs and advancing implementation of effective development cooperation based on the core business of Paris, Accra, and Busan. In the development of this mandate, the GPEDC defined its work streams to clarify the overarching principle that should guide the GPEDC and other development actors in the fulfillment of their work on development cooperation, most especially in light of the Post 2015. These work streams had been established during the GPEDC Planning Workshop held in Brussels, Belgium in the first quarter of 2015. It included Domestic Resource Mobilisation (DRM), SSC, MICs, Aid in Fragility and Under-aided Countries, and the Private Sector. However, the CSO Partnership continued to advance Inclusive Partnerships and urged that this principle should be mainstreamed in the overall work of the GPEDC, its work streams, and the Post 2015 process. In further linking its work and contributions to the post 2015 development agenda, the GPEDC highlighted its multi-stakeholder nature and its ability to cover both the financial and non-financial means of development cooperation. Among these capacities, included its (1) leadership role in global partnerships; (2) capacity to integrate effectiveness agenda into other development agenda; (3) capacity to support and monitor accountability of stakeholders previous development commitment; (4) capacity to support knowledge sharing and generation of best practices on key development issues; and (5) capacity to organise side events and policy forums for policy exchanges. With these capacities, the GPEDC linked with the UN-DCF, the facilitators of the FfD, and the UNSG’s partnership facility. Aside from this, the GPEDC envisioned its Global Monitoring work to serve as evidence-base for ensuring that country level implementation of the SDGs were in line with the indicators of this Monitoring Framework.

In the run up to the HLMs of 2014 and 2016, CPDE actively engaged in the Global Monitoring of indicators for development cooperation. This initiative of the GPEDC was considered to be the entry point for its linkage to the 2030 Agenda. In 2014, the first Monitoring Round was conducted. The consultation process was global in nature – i.e., conducting global level meetings and workshops in Seoul, Abidjan, and Berlin. The CSO Partnership developed

briefing materials and key messages in order to influence the discussions. The representatives used these reference materials, and behavioural change was emphasised as a key outcome of development initiatives. The results of the pilot monitoring exercise were presented during the HLM in Mexico, and CPDE participated actively in the pre-workshop on monitoring and post Busan implementation. Side meetings with the GPEDC monitoring team were also organised to discuss ways forward for the Second Monitoring Round (2MR) in 2015-2016. Early in 2015, the GPEDC established the Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG), which is the experts group that the GPEDC Joint Support Team (JST) would consult in the preparation of the 2MR Progress Report. CPDE fielded a representative to this experts group to ensure that CSO positions were taken on board. The same representative was selected as a co-chair of the MAG. Compared to the first round, the 2MR was more consultative – i.e., countries were heavily involved in the process of data gathering and validation. The GPEDC released a list of 80 countries where the 2MR would be held. Out of the 80 countries included in the 2MR, CPDE was able to identify 55 countries where CPDE country structures were present and possessed the fundamental capacity to fulfill the Terms of Reference (TOR) of the 2MR country focal point. Out of the 55 countries, only 28 were provided with financial and technical support to fulfill the 2MR work. These 28 countries were convened in a Global Workshop of Country Focal Points for 2MR in Nairobi, Kenya on March 31, 2016 through the leadership of the CPDE Working Group (WG) on CSO EE. The Global Workshop aimed to reorient and clarify the TOR and the Global Monitoring Framework to the country focal points, and this was even supplemented with webinars in three languages (i.e., English, Spanish, and French) to clarify the process and timeline of the 2MR. Further to this technical support, the CSO Partnership was also able to provide financial support of USD 2,000 to each country for data gathering and organisation of/participation to multi-stakeholder national validation. The 2MR concluded with the presentation of results during the HLM2 in Nairobi, Kenya. CPDE also complemented the 2MR Progress Report with a Global Synthesis Research which provided alternative qualitative evidence on the current state of CSO DE, EE, and EDC in select 24 countries.

Owing its predecessor platform, the GPEDC annually organised a Global Workshop on the Implementation of Busan commitments since 2015. This Workshop took stock of the progress in implementing the Busan commitments and devised ways forward in addressing the perceived gaps. CPDE actively engaged in these Workshops for 2015 and 2016 as it formed the bulk of CPDE's advocacy on the core business. In 2015, the first annual workshop focused on discussing the results of the First Monitoring Round where buzz groups and reflection sessions planned for the 2MR and other relevant thematic issues on PS and CF, among other issues. CSO messages of accountability, inclusivity, and HRBA were forwarded, and it was during this Forum that Kenya announced the hosting of the HLM2. In 2016, the second annual workshop focused on refining the findings of the 2MR before presentation and launch of the Progress Report on the HLM2 in November 2016. CPDE ensured participation of key members who had been following the work on this area, and the representatives also ensured that findings on

Indicator 2 were consistent with the findings of the country cases included.

Aside from the contribution to the Global Monitoring Framework, another related work of the GPEDC that the CSO Partnership engaged actively was the development of GPIs. CPDE, together with the TT on CSO DE and EE, championed Inclusive Development (ID) as a fundamental principle of effective development cooperation. In 2014, this served as the CSO rallying call in the HLM1 alongside implementation of commitments post Busan. Aside from the TT, United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Government of Korea supported CPDE's work on ID. It, however, remained to be one of CPDE's principles mainstreamed in its advocacy on CSO EE. In 2015, the GPEDC consolidated its work on the post Busan Building Blocks (BBs) and its Voluntary Initiatives (VIs) – an output of the HLM1. These were collectively called as the GPIs. CPDE actively engaged some of the relevant GPIs like SSC (GPI 7), Fragile States (GPI 11), and Climate Finance (GPI 31). CPDE even spearheaded a GPI which was the *Continuing Campaign on Effective Development* (GPI 6) and co-chaired GPI 12 (TT on CSO DE and EE).

Finally, the engagement to the GPEDC HLM in 2014 and 2016 served as the main bulk of work for each year. In 2014, the GPEDC held its First HLM in Mexico City, Mexico, and preparations went on full speed at the beginning of the year. The CSO Partnership engaged the preparations as soon as multi-stakeholder cooperative work streams were opened up. As a result, CPDE was able to take a co-lead role in organising the Session I on Inclusive Partnerships. Weekly conference calls were organised to discuss and review policy papers that served as relevant inputs to the Session.

CPDE also mobilised its members to influence the direction of the other focus sessions of the HLM1 (e.g., DRM, SSC, MICs, PS, and progress since Busan). CPDE Task Forces were established for each focus session in order to effectively conduct the work required. Not only did CPDE establish these Task Forces on focus sessions, but the platform also mobilised its members to develop the Key Asks that would guide the advocacy of all CSO delegates in the HLM1. The main advocacy of CPDE in the HLM1 was ID. However, in the run up to HLM1, the United Kingdom released a proposal mainstreaming ID as overarching theme of HLM1, and this featured a commitment to the multi-stakeholder nature of the meeting, including its sessions and panels.

In order to consolidate the CSO delegation, the CSO Partnership organised a CSO Forum on Development Effectiveness. Days before the HLM1 in Mexico, CSOs gathered in a one-day CSO event to discuss and clarify the CSO positions to be forwarded in the negotiation table and focus sessions. The CSO Forum was highlighted by parallel sessions on CPDE's priority advocacy themes – i.e., CSO DE, CSO EE, HRBA, SSC, and Post 2015. Closed-door sessions of CSOs were also organised in order to discuss more thoroughly the CSO key demands. The outcomes of the parallel sessions informed the CSO Statement released in response to the HLM1 Communique (See Annex F CSO Statement and Annex G HLM Communique).

In 2016, the advocacy expanded to universalising effective development cooperation (uEDC), a product of the platform's Strategic Planning exercise early in the year. The members thought it best to offer an extension of the development effectiveness principles, which would cut across specific thematic priorities of the platform. In the conceptualisation of this advocacy, the CPDE Coordination Committee (CC) deemed it necessary to renew existing commitments on aid and development effectiveness to universalise EDC. This meant that the core business of CPDE and effective development cooperation should be the implementation of Paris, Accra, and Busan. Furthermore, the CC identified five other important themes that would supplement the core business – i.e., (1) CSO Development Effectiveness; (2) CSO Enabling Environment; (3) Private Sector Accountability; (4) South-South Cooperation; and (5) Conflict and Fragility. In strategising the platform's engagement in the HLM2, it heavily focused on introducing this new concept to the development community. Preparations for this engagement involved the organisation of specific structures and the mobilisation of members who had been heavily involved in the policy discussions of the GPEDC and its work streams.

In terms of structures, the CSO Partnership organised the following: (1) a Negotiation Team, responsible for developing the key CSO positions that would be forwarded to the negotiation of the Nairobi Outcome Document (NOD); (2) an International Organising Committee (IOC), responsible for fundraising and oversight of the CSO selection process; (3) a Local Organising Committee (LOC), responsible for the mobilisation of Kenyan CSO delegates and logistics preparations for the Nairobi Civil Society Forum (NCSF) and the CSO engagement to the HLM2; and (4) the Preparatory Forum Committee (PFC), responsible for the preparations of the NCSF. All these structures coordinated all preparations with the CPDE CC, to whom they were all accountable, and the Global Secretariat (GS), which provided the necessary staff support to carry out the work. Aside from these structures, the CC also organised a core group, which led the work required to influence the content of key plenary sessions of the HLM2 – i.e., Plenary 1 (on stock-taking progress of implementing Busan commitments), Plenary 2 (on SDGs), Plenary 3 (on SSC), Plenary 4 (on Private Sector), Plenary 5 (on Women and Youth empowerment), Plenary 6 (on Leaving No One Behind), and Plenary 7 (on Partnerships).

The work of these structures resulted in some incremental gains for the advocacy of uEDC (See Annex H Nairobi Outcome Document). CPDE organised an amphitheater session on uEDC, highlighting the core business and its important elements. The session emphasised the need for ensuring the continuous implementation of previous commitments – i.e., also stressing the development effectiveness principles and transparency and accountability in development cooperation. The core group was also able to field CSO speakers in the different plenary sessions of the HLM2 – i.e., providing CPDE a space to advance its agenda on the specific thematic priority discussed in the plenary session. Aside from this, CPDE also set up a booth at the

Marketplace where platform merchandise, reference materials and constituency policy products were exhibited. The advocacy campaign, nonetheless, made an impact as the outcomes of the negotiations had been significant in terms of ensuring that an enabling environment for CSOs could be provided. Without overstepping the CSO redlines, the negotiation of the NOD had been fruitful as it provided acceptable language on CSO EE and core business, albeit a watered down position on accountability of PS in its development initiatives/activities. Weeks after the HLM2, CPDE released an analysis of the NOD (See Annex A).

Similar to 2014, CPDE consolidated the CSO delegation through a CSO Forum, which aimed to discuss the advocacy on universalising EDC and informing CSO positions with constituency specific issues that needed to be addressed. The consolidation effort presented the CPDE Advocacy Toolkit (Annex I) and the Communications Toolkit (Annex J) for a meaningful engagement to the HLM2. The 2016 Nairobi Civil Society Forum was entitled *Universal Effective Development Cooperation Towards a People's Agenda*. The focus was universalising EDC guided by HRBA and democratic ownership. This reiterated the need to renew and raise the bar of commitments on the core business of quantity and quality of ODA as per Rome, Paris, Accra, Busan, and Mexico. The sessions clarified the CSO Key Asks to all the delegates and provide updates on the on-going negotiation of the NOD. Aside from this, the NCSF also provided a space for constituencies to consolidate their respective delegates, discuss the issues relevant to their context, and inform the CSO Statement with their context-specific positions and language. The NCSF Documentation Report and CSO Statement are provided in this Completion Report as Annex K and L respectively. Unlike in 2014, the HLM2 provided a separate space for major sectors of the Women and Youth to discuss their important role in realising effective development cooperation. A Women's and Youth's Forum on Development Effectiveness were held simultaneously on 28 November.

Engaging the TT on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment. CPDE's engagement to the TT focused on planning the work that needs to be done in order to advance the implementation of development effectiveness and enabling environment at all levels. From 2014-2016, CPDE participated in five (5) meetings of the multi-stakeholder platform. In 2014, the TT convened in Dublin, Ireland following HLM1 in Mexico. As an output of the HLM1, the TT signed up as one of the GPEDC's Voluntary Initiatives (later referred to as GPI 12). This GPI focused on developing an EE framework and guidelines for its engagement with the OECD monitoring team and the UN SDGs 16 (on governance) and 17 (on partnerships). CPDE assessed its capacities to contribute to the TT's work, particularly utilising its contributions to the GPEDC Global Monitoring Framework and providing evidence-based policy recommendations that were country-specific.

In 2015, the work focused on planning its engagement in the HLM2. As it attempted to influence the outcomes of the HLM2 in 2016, the TT planned to produce outputs specific to (1) developing a guideline for monitoring Indicator

2 (EE), (2) assessing Indicator 2 monitoring, and (3) conducting studies on multi-stakeholder initiatives. These outputs were envisioned to inform and complement the 2MR Progress Report. Despite persistent calls to work closely with the CSO Partnership, the TT refused to privilege CPDE in this initiative as it argued that the TT is diverse in terms of its membership. The meetings in 2015 held in Paris (April) and Stockholm (October) also discussed the possibilities of holding a separate amphitheater session during the HLM2.

In 2016, follow-up preparations were conducted in its meetings in May and October in London and The Hague respectively. The meetings focused on preparations for the TT engagement to the HLM2 in Nairobi. Bulk of the discussions was related to the TT's monitoring work on Indicator 2 (EE). The TT gathered eleven (11) country case studies to influence the outcomes of the GPEDC 2MR, and it was also planned that a stocktaking exercise of the GPEDC Monitoring work would be conducted in order to inform the multi-stakeholder initiative (MSI) studies of the TT as part of GPI 12. Aside from this, the TT also started the discussion on developing a strategy of engagement to the UN SDGs 2030 Agenda. An initial mapping of constituency activities related to the 2030 Agenda was done during the meetings, and the TT Secretariat was tasked to monitor other opportunities where engagement of the TT and its stakeholders would be relevant.

The TT and CPDE advanced the principle of Inclusive Development during the Mexico HLM1. However, little follow up work had been done since 2014, and the engagement of CPDE to the TT focused more closely on the GPI 12 and Indicator 2 (EE).

Special Issues and Emerging Themes: UN SDGs 2030 Agenda. Since 2014, the global policy discourse started shifting to the new Goals that would replace the MDGs. As the implementation of the MDGs would culminate in 2015, much of the efforts of multi-stakeholder platforms, the GPEDC, and the CSO Partnership focused on influencing the processes that developed the principles and indicators of the SDGs and its MOI. Being new to the policy discourse of the SDGs, the CSO Partnership needed to reorganise its structures and mobilise its members who followed the discussions in order to more effectively influence the outcomes of the meetings. It would be important to note; however, that the UN SDGs 2030 Agenda processes did not have a mechanism to facilitate CSO representation and that civil society participation was highly organisational. Recognising that this would be an important arena to influence and lobby CSO key positions, CPDE organised a Post MDG Working Group to steer all members who had work related to this thematic priority.

In 2014, CPDE planned to strengthen its positions, especially on the important role of global partnerships in the formation and realisation of the new Goals, through the conduct of country-level consultations and multi-stakeholder dialogues. The national consultations aimed to develop HR-aligned national SDGs, targets, and indicators. Through the leadership of the Post MDG WG, the said consultations took place in sixteen (16) countries, namely: Asia and

the Pacific (India, Pakistan, Fiji, Philippines), Africa (Uganda, Cameroon, Kenya, Nigeria), Middle East and North Africa (Tunisia, Jordan, Egypt), and Latin America and the Caribbean (Colombia, Guatemala, St. Lucia, Argentina, Bolivia). Results of the discussions were used to establish more solid evidence for positions which the platform would take in its global engagements. It also became an opportunity for the platform to update its members in these countries about the global level engagements of the CSO Partnership and identify points of entry where CSOs in these countries could readily influence discussions relevant to their contexts. Aside from this, the results of the national consultations also informed the development of CPDE Policy Papers on Post MDG, namely: (1) *Enhancing the Development Effectiveness of the Post 2015 Global Partnership for Sustainable Development* (Annex M) and (2) *Development Cooperation in the Post 2015 Development Framework* (Annex N).

The work on the Post 2015 processes also involved providing inputs to key documents and influencing outcomes of relevant meetings by advancing CSO positions. Some of these included an input to the UNPGA MOI High Level Thematic Debate, the Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing (ICESDF) Report, and a statement for the 69th UN General Assembly (UNGA). The WG also developed positions on the linkage of the GPEDC and the 2030 Agenda.

On the year of the SDG adoption, CPDE and its constituencies focused its resources in influencing the final wave of negotiations concerning the SDGs, its targets, indicators, and MOI. In 2015, CPDE strengthened its policy advocacy work in all policy arenas available that would influence the outcomes of the 2030 Agenda (See Annex O for the Implementation Strategy). Aside from influencing policy discussions in the GPEDC which attempted to link its work – i.e., through the Global Monitoring process and its partnership with the UNDCF – in the post 2015 development agenda, CPDE ensured that development effectiveness principles would be integrated in the negotiations on the MOIs of the Goals.

In influencing the outcomes of discussions, CPDE ensured its representation in the intergovernmental negotiations (IGNs) in New York UN Headquarters. Additionally, CPDE was able to pose its positions in the interactive dialogues on six (6) thematic sessions of the UNGA namely: (1) ending poverty and hunger, (2) tackling inequalities, (3) fostering sustainable economic growth, (4) climate change, (5) building accountable, effective institutions, and (6) strengthening global partnerships for development. CPDE representatives pushed for a transformative development agenda ensuring the integration of a rights-based framework for development, enabling environment for CSOs in light of the shrinking spaces in multi-stakeholder dialogues for development policy formulation, common but differentiated responsibilities in the important discussions on climate, sustainable economic growth, accountability and legally binding policies for the regulation of private sector actions, and inclusive nature of partnerships for development. In so doing, CPDE sought to address issues of inequality, marginalization, and exclusive forms of

partnerships that were detrimental to the people. Assessing that there had been some weak formulation in the outcome documents of the 3rd Financing for Development Conference in Addis Ababa, the IGN sessions in New York, and the UN General Assembly Summit in New York where the formal adoption of the 17 Goals and 169 targets was announced to the public – CPDE released statements (See Annex O for CPDE Statement on Agenda 2030) highlighting the lack of a reinforcing language on a rights-based framework for development and undermining the need for a multi-stakeholder body ensuring the effectiveness in financing development. While there seemed to be a strong civil society representation in the processes, it remained to be a struggle to push for an acceptable deal that would address the key demands of CSOs, most especially in the outcome documents (See Annex P & Q for Comments on the Post 2015 Outcome Document zero and final drafts respectively).

Aside from representation in the post 2015 processes, CPDE also organised a number of side events alongside the activities of the UN. There was a side event co-organised with Canada, UN-NGLS, and the People’s Coalition on Food Sovereignty focusing on the potential for institutionalising CSO participation at all relevant levels of governance in the post 2015 agenda at–global, regional, and national levels. Another side event was organised during the 3rd IGN session, and this focused on strengthening CSO engagement in the High Level Political Forum and beyond. It facilitated an informal exchange of best practices and lessons learned in institutionalised participation of CSOs in development policy making among key development actors to the post 2015 agenda. This opened the discussions for the need to institutionalise CSO participation in the monitoring and review of the SDGs and its MOIs. Another side event was held during the HLPF itself (alongside the 7th IGN session). This focused on the need for integrating right to development in the post 2015 agenda. This opened the discussions around the need for mechanisms in addressing issues of inequality and accountability of all development actors in effective development. Finally, during the UNGA Adoption Meeting, CPDE also co-organised a side event entitled “Dialogues for Justice, Public Interest, and the Common Good”. This side event opened the discussions of just wages, environmental degradation, international trade, state repression and militarisation, privatisation, and land and resource grabbing. It focused on highlighting the perspective from the sidelines and the frontlines – i.e., people that were most affected by the unjust conditions of development interventions.

In 2016, priorities shifted to influencing policy discussions of the HLM2 in Nairobi. The work on the 2030 Agenda had initially been mandated to the Post MDG WG until the first quarter of the year. Due to the shift in priority themes, the CPDE CC mandated that the 2030 Agenda be mainstreamed in all of the Platform members’ work. The Post MDG WG was tasked to develop an engagement strategy that constituencies could adopt in their specific contexts. Nonetheless, CPDE still engaged key activities related to the 2030 Agenda. The most important engagement of the year was during the High Level Political Forum (HLPF) in New York where CPDE influenced the outcomes of the HLPF Resolution and endorsed the Open Letter of the NGO Major Group (See Annex R and S respectively).

The 2030 Agenda engagement was also hinged on influencing the outcomes of the Financing for Development (FfD) Forum. CPDE organised a structure and developed a position paper on influencing this area of work, particularly the FfD3 Addis Ababa Conference (See Annex T). This facilitated the discussions and solicited inputs from key members following the process in establishing CSO positions and key demands in the engagement in the FfD3 Conference. Furthermore, CPDE ensured that CSO participation would be present and pushed for development effectiveness principles, particularly rights based approaches to financing development and just financial systems for effective development. Despite these interventions, the outcome remained unfavourable for CSOs as the process leaned to the views of a few experts that were part of a decision-making body and that which excluded non-state actors; thus, priming the role of private sector in development without legally binding agreements to regulate its actions.

Other Global Policy and Advocacy Arenas. Aside from the major policy and advocacy engagement in the GPEDC and 2030 Agenda, CPDE also sustained its engagement in major global policy and advocacy platforms like the UN DCF, EU PFD, and the OECD DAC.

The UN-DCF engagement had been a key area of work with the organisation of a working structure that would facilitate the discussions in this thematic priority. In 2014, the GPEDC linked with the DCF and created the GPEDC-DCF Advisory Group. This proposed benchmarks for collaboration between the two (2) platforms and organised consultative meetings to draft a joint work plan. The work rolled out in 2015 when a CPDE DCF Engagement Strategy (Annex U) was developed. Key CPDE members participated in the UN DCF Symposium in Korea and advanced the following positions to: (1) play a greater role in the monitoring of the commitments that would be taken this year by the international community; (2) uphold the principles of a just and fair development cooperation where all development actors could play their part on equal footing in the light of different responsibilities and capacities; (3) promote development cooperation that can match the needs of the people and the planet, grounded in effectiveness principles implemented as a single set of mutually reinforcing elements for all forms of development finance and interventions based on inclusive, multi-stakeholder ways of working; (4) ensure that the final outcome document of the FfD3 conference in Addis Ababa is grounded in the effectiveness principles and is inline with agreed international commitments on human rights, decent work, gender equality, environmental sustainability, and disability; and (5) redouble efforts to live up to what was agreed in Monterrey, Paris, Accra, Busan, and Mexico City, and highlight the unfinished business of the effectiveness agenda in the FfD outcome with agreed follow up action.

In 2016, the advocacy in the DCF Symposium in New York on July 21-22 was already anchored on the outcomes of the CPDE Strategic Planning exercise. Universalising EDC became the rallying call of engagement, and CPDE representatives called for effective development cooperation actors not to

backtrack on existing commitments while targeting areas such as the (1) accountability of the private sector in development; (2) south-south cooperation principles; (3) security, peace and development; (4) CSO enabling environment and development effectiveness. CPDE saw that the 2016 UN DCF Symposium could be an opportune time and appropriate platform to gather evidence and generate a multi-stakeholder discussion. The DCF could aid in “framing the priorities for the next two (2) years in order for the DCF to play pivotal role (through thematic Symposium and research briefings) regarding 1) how to universalize the effective development cooperation principles to better implement the 2030 Agenda, 2) what it would take to make sure that the effectiveness principles can apply to different kinds of financing for development tools, including the role of the private sector, and 3) how to make sure it is relevant to the right holders at all levels”⁵.

On the other hand, CPDE remains engaged in the EU-PFD through the PFD Global Assembly in 2015 and the PFD Task Team meeting in 2016. The EU-PFD is focused more on the sticky issues of the private sector and the enabling environment for CSOs. Despite the EU-PFD’s incapability to effectively influence policies, it still remains an important platform for CPDE to lobby a balance of representation and positions in the policy outcomes of the EU.

Finally, CPDE continues to endeavour for closer ties with the OECD-DAC. Although observer seats were available at the Senior High Level Meeting, CPDE request for an observer seat had not been seriously considered. The OECD-DAC is vital to CPDE engagement as it often takes into account issues related to the GPEDC and the FfD. It is also becoming even more important as critical discussions regarding the role of the private sector in development cooperation will take-place here. Currently CPDE engages this platform through its members, specifically the Trade Union Advisory Committee (TUAC).

Engaging Stakeholders across Regions and Sectors. Representatives from different regional and sectoral units and country level focal persons also sustained their participation in intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder dialogues, synergised with other regional initiatives, and engaged with national authorities.

The Platform’s European constituency had the most sustained engagement with European Union. Their engagement was hinged on influencing the outcomes of policy discussions concerning Financing for Development and commitments to the HLMs. In 2014, the European constituency released a position paper to influence EU common position for Mexico HLM. The region also advanced principles of development effectiveness, which would underpin the post 2015 framework. In 2015, the EU had been keen at engaging the FfD3 Conference in Addis Ababa. The European region ensured that civil

⁵ See Annex V CSO Messages to the 2016 UN DCF Symposium in New York.

society call for donor governments' recommitment to uphold the 0.7 GNI contributions to ODA were included in the EU position paper forwarded to the FfD3 Conference. In 2016, the region ensured that positions on CSO EE were advanced in the EU delegation to the HLM2.

North America also had a sustained engagement to the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade, and Development (DFATD). The engagement of the North American constituency, through the leadership of the Canadian Council for International Co-operation (CCIC), was on ensuring that the CSO Partnership policy of DFATD were anchored on development effectiveness principles, particularly enabling environment for CSOs and HRBA. Meetings with government officials fostered positive relationships with a range of policy staff at both bureaucratic and political levels. This engagement also resulted to the development of a policy paper entitled *Milestones to Measure Progress*. From this, the inclusion of the Canadian government to the GPEDC SC reinforced the need for the North American constituency to further strengthen its engagement with the Canadian government. This engagement would secure that civil society positions on EE and HRBA would be considered in the GPEDC SC.

The African regional constituency also engaged their respective country governments to influence the positions in the run up to the FfD3 Conference in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. This effort was espoused in the Entebbe Declaration which posed the proposals for the African governments to establish follow up mechanisms to the outcomes of the FfD3 Conference and CSO commitments to such follow up actions. Aside from this, CSOs in Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of Congo were able to document multi-stakeholder engagements in development effectiveness. This engagement revived and revitalised the discussions on the need for a multi-stakeholder dialogue framework in the region as well as an operational plan for implementation of Busan commitments at the national and provincial levels.

The Asia region also engaged key development partnerships such as the Asia-Pacific Development Effectiveness Facility (AP-DEF) and the UN Economic and Social Commission in Asia-Pacific (UN ESCAP). CPDE Asia critically engaged with various governments and stakeholders during the APDEF Regional Consultation Workshops in Manila (2015) and Bangkok (2016), which explored on new, more integrated, and adaptive approaches to planning, budgeting, financing, and 'acceleration' of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Further, CPDE members in Asia participated in an informal exchange/consultation with the UN Development Group Asia-Pacific Human Rights Network to discuss concerns and identify good practices and lessons learned where collaboration between various actors has supported civil society space. This consultation meeting explored the issue of diminishing civil society space and how the UNDG and UN Country Teams in Asia-Pacific should support inclusive participation, stakeholder engagement and an enabling environment for CSOs.

The Latin American constituency also exerted efforts to influence the post

2015 agenda through meetings with a multi-stakeholder forum MESA de Articulacion. There was a discussion on the alarming decline of international cooperation in the region, and such posed serious challenges for CSOs to fulfill their functions and roles as development actors.

b. *Establishing Basis for Policy and Advocacy Engagement*

The policy development work of the platform had been lodged through the CPDE WGs. The WGs are expected to steer the discussion on the thematic priorities of the Platform and propose language on civil society positions relevant to the themes. At the start of programme implementation, there were originally five (5) thematic working groups, namely: (1) CSO Development Effectiveness, (2) CSO Enabling Environment, (3) Human Rights Based Approaches, (4) South-South Cooperation, and (5) Post MDG. These thematic priorities were considered to be the core policy themes that CPDE would focus on, as initially conceived in 2013. The policy development/research work of the platform focused on establishing hard evidences on these thematic priorities. Across three (3) years of programme implementation, CPDE was able to produce eleven (11) policy outputs that provided baseline information for the Platform's engagement t in various relevant policy areas

In 2014, the policy development work focused on establishing baseline information and influencing policy discussions in time for the Mexico HLM of the GPEDC. Two publications were released for this purpose: (1) *Journey from Istanbul* (See Annex W), a case booklet recounting stories of CSOs experiences in implementing the Istanbul Principles from the CSO DE WG and (2) *An Enabling Environment for CSOs: A Synthesis of Evidence of Progress since Busan* (See Annex X), a contribution to the GPEDC which started in 2013 as input for the GPEDC monitoring work. The EE publication was also used as an advocacy tool in engaging with multi-stakeholder TT on CSO DE and EE. Country case studies from the following countries were developed in line with this: Asia and the Pacific (Mongolia, Laos), Africa (Ivory Coast, Mozambique), Latin America and the Caribbean (Jamaica, Colombia, Brazil), and Middle East and North Africa (Morocco).

The HRBA WG also developed a reference paper entitled *Private Sector's Accountability for Development: Mapping Business Liability Mechanisms and Donor Engagement with Private Sector and Development* (See Annex Y), mapping out accountability mechanisms of business and donor approaches on private sector support in development. The research put forward some conclusions and recommendations delineating the criteria for private sector engagement in development.

The SSC WG also released a research entitled *Issues on South-South Cooperation* (See Annex Z), which mapped out important elements of SSC including available mechanisms, policies, practices, and actors within the different regions. Research was conducted in the following ten (10) countries: Africa (Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa), Asia and the Pacific (India, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan), and Latin America and Caribbean (Argentina, Brazil, Cuba). The

development of this research aimed to contribute to an enhanced evidence-based policy engagement on SSC by CSOs and strengthen country level monitoring on the thematic issue.

As mentioned earlier, country level consultations on the Post 2015 processes resulted to the development of two (2) policy papers entitled (1) *Enhancing the Development Effectiveness of the Post 2015 Global Partnership for Sustainable Development* and (2) *Development Cooperation in the Post 2015 Development Framework*.

As a final output for 2014, the CC also ensured that the policy product entitled *A Synthesis Report: The State of Development Cooperation, Development Effectiveness, and Enabling Environment* (See Annex AA) was published in time for the Mexico HLM. This was considered to be an important undertaking after the last similar initiative prior to the 4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan in 2011. The research provided baseline information that contributed to Post 2015 discussions, particularly on global partnerships and its translation and reflection at the country and in preparation for the HLM2. It also informed programme implementation. . This Synthesis Research featured the following countries: Asia and the Pacific (India, Mongolia, Kyrgyzstan, Vietnam, Cambodia, Fiji), Africa (Mozambique, Burundi, Kenya, Nigeria, Cameroon, Zimbabwe), Europe (Czech Republic, Albania, Spain), Latin America and the Caribbean (Nicaragua, Guatemala, Paraguay, Peru, Ecuador), and Middle East and North Africa (Palestine, Tunisia, Lebanon).

In 2015, the WGs on CSO EE and HRBA continued their evidence-based policy engagement work. These WGs developed policy researches on key themes of social dialogues in CSO EE and effectiveness in development finance institutions. The CSO EE WG conducted country case studies on the implementation of social dialogues. Hinged on the framework of political spaces for decent work, the country case studies looked into the political and social conditions in the country that enabled social dialogues to take place. It looked into existing mechanisms through which the idea of social dialogues could be compared. This study focused on three countries from Africa (Ghana), Asia (Indonesia), and Latin America and the Caribbean (Uruguay).

On the other hand, the HRBA WG conducted a mapping of effectiveness of development finance institutions (DFIs) (See Annex AB). This report primarily explored the extent to which development effectiveness criteria had been transposed and integrated by DFIs using aid to leverage additional finance for development. Concluding that DFIs in the sample were ill equipped to manage aid flows in line with existing best practices, it forwarded policy recommendations focusing on the importance of ownership, results, and accountability.

In 2016, the CSO Partnership conducted researches in order to provide evidence in its engagement to the HLM2 in Nairobi. One of the global policy researches developed was an endline research on its Synthesis Research conducted in 2014. The *2016 Global Synthesis Report, State of Development*

Cooperation: Checking the Core of Effectiveness (See Annex AC) provided a follow up stock-taking effort of the status of implementing the Unfinished or Core Business. The core business would refer to the commitments made from the previous High Level Forums in Rome (HLF-1), Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (HLF-2), the Accra Agenda for Action (HLF-3), and the Busan Partnership for Effective Development (HLF-4). This synthesis research featured eighteen (18) country case studies that assessed the progress of implementation framed on the four (4) Busan principles of effective development cooperation, namely: (1) Democratic Ownership, (2) Results Focus, (3) Inclusive Partnerships, and (4) Transparency and Accountability. The results showed that development actors, most especially national governments, would need to recommit to these principles if genuine effective development cooperation would remain to be the goal.

The International NGO (INGO) constituency also developed a global policy research on their effectiveness entitled *How Effective Are International Non-Governmental Organisations: A Study of INGO Support of the Development Effectiveness Agenda* (See Annex AD). In time for the HLM2 engagement, the INGO study was timely to provide information on the commitments of CSOs, most especially INGOs, to implement the development effectiveness principles. The study provided a snapshot of the level of support INGOs have for the DE agenda. It formed part of a self-assessment exercise and was based on surveys and interviews with experts of nine (9) member organisations of the constituency who were exposed on the issues of DE.

Aside from these, CPDE also commissioned the CSO DE WG to conduct an endline research of the stocktaking of CSO implementation of Istanbul Principles. This year, the WG developed *Istanbul Five Years After: Evidencing Civil Society Development Effectiveness and Accountability* (See Annex AE), which provided a valuable source of evidence that showcased how CSOs were committed in implementing the Istanbul Principles and developed their own accountability. This research was commissioned under CPDE's European Commission (EC) Action entitled *Enhancing Civil Society Role in Development Partnerships Post 2015* and featured eleven (11) reports from seven (7) regions and four (4) sectors. This banked on the findings of the *Journey from Istanbul* casebook and the 2014 Global Synthesis Report. The results showed that CSOs continued to take initiatives to strengthen their development effectiveness. They are doing so in a political context where the space to work as effective development cooperation actors is shrinking and closing in a growing number of countries. There has been a deeply troubling proliferation in the number of restrictive laws and regulations since 2012.

Intermediate Outcome 2: Contribute to the development of capacity and effectiveness of CSOs, particularly at the national level and amongst the most marginalised groups, to practice and advocate for development effectiveness through the Istanbul Principles.

Immediate Outcomes	Results Achieved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All CPDE members will be implementing or can show evidence of implementing the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organised CSO work on development effectiveness principles through thematic

Immediate Outcomes	Results Achieved
<p>CSO Development Effectiveness Principles (CSO DE).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad inclusive participation of a range of CSOs from around the world • CSOs in the CPDE will be critically engaging with all key stakeholders of the Busan agenda at all levels. 	<p>and ad hoc working groups and with volunteers from different regions and sectors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased CSO capacity in practicing and advocating DE through the Istanbul Principles with significant increase in capacity for research and communications and policy development. Improvement is apparent in North America and LAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Based on the comparative analysis of the 2014 and 2016 OCA, overall evaluation indicator on the IP (72 in 2014 to 79 in 2016). In particular, CSOs improved on the following areas: (1) Capacity to share information/knowledge (69 in 2014 to 89 in 2016) and (2) Implementation of the IP (66 in 2014 to 87.8 in 2016) • Increased practice of transparency and accountability principles among CSOs at different levels of work. Over-all, there is a strong position on the practice of transparency and accountability according to the OCA (42.1 in 2014 to 52.5 in 2016). Improvement is apparent in North America and Africa. • Successfully diversified platform membership through outreach to and inclusion of the Indigenous Peoples (IPs), Youth, and Migrants/Diaspora sectors in 2014, 2015, and 2016 respectively • Efforts in continuous outreach and membership expansion and consolidation of all sectors and regions, as well as through working groups • Sustained platform/network development and adjustment to changing development landscape through regular governance meetings and a Strategic Planning exercise • Involved CSOs in 62 countries in activities ranging from policy development, advocacy engagement, and capacity development on key CPDE priority themes. Twenty-eight of which directly

Immediate Outcomes	Results Achieved
	<p>engaged the GPEDC Second Monitoring Round at the country level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustained participation and engagement in multi-stakeholder and intergovernmental dialogues with national authorities

Planned Outputs	Outputs Produced and Activities Organised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSOs are aware of and are effectively implementing the Istanbul Principles and International Framework for CSO DE. • CSOs at the regional, sub-regional, country levels and sectoral formations are doing relevant research, advocacy and mobilisation efforts. • CSOs in at least 50 countries in all global regions and sectoral formations are participating in the CPDE. • CSOs are using and sharing knowledge and information in engaging the development effectiveness agenda. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSO experiences across regions and sectors illustrating the implementation of Istanbul Principles were documented. • Members from different regions (country level) and sectors consolidated in strategy meetings to define ways forward in improving their own effectiveness. • Three (3) CPDE Global Council (GC) and eleven (11) CC meetings were convened from 2014-2016. • Capacity building initiatives on CSO DE, Accountability, HRBA, and monitoring implementation of EE were organised globally, across regions (sub-regions and countries), and sectors. • Research and capacity building activities were organised in at least 62 countries, focusing on the platform's thematic priorities. • Regular platform updates were disseminated through the e-bulletin. • Improvements on the CSO Partnership website were made. • The interface of the intranet facility was installed and ready for use. • Documents and correspondences were done in English, Spanish, and French.

Outreach and Capacity Development

c. Continuing Work on the International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness and Istanbul Principles

The work on the advancement and implementation of CSO development effectiveness was central to the Istanbul Principles and the International Framework. Since 2010, CSOs have committed to ensure that these principles would guide CSO development efforts. From 2014-2016, the capacity development efforts of the CSO Partnership focused on educating CSOs on the Istanbul Principles and documenting practices (good or bad) for replication or lesson learning. Constituencies from the regions and sectors were heavily involved in the process and activities of capacitating other CSOs while documenting not only successes but also the challenges that CSOs face.

Continuous Promotion of Istanbul Principles across Regions and Sectors. The CSO DE WG had been the lead working structure of the CSO Partnership that promoted the Istanbul Principles through the conduct of outreach and capacity building activities. Activities on raising awareness and sharing information on the Istanbul Principles were done in different regions and sectors in close coordination with responsible structures.

Aside from the global efforts to promote the IP, regions and sectors also worked hard to also improve work at the regional and national levels. In Europe, platform members held peer-learning sessions on the Istanbul Principles, a tradition the region started since hosting the Open Forum Secretariat. A peer-learning mechanism was developed for Istanbul Principle 7 (Mutual Learning) which CONCORD hosted. This mechanism allowed for sharing of experiences on the implementation of Istanbul Principles and clarifying how other CSOs, most especially from the non-EU sub-region, could follow such efforts to practice their own development effectiveness. The region also produced a briefing paper sharing experiences on the use of the Istanbul Principles.

In MENA, the region focused on developing a Guidebook on Mutual Accountability and Enabling Environment (See Annex AF), including a regional code of conduct based on the Istanbul Principles. This document was developed as a resource tool for civil society and development practitioners on the implementation of MA principles for different stakeholders in the post 2015 development framework. Aside from this guidebook, the region, through the leadership of the Arab NGO Network for Development (ANND) developed national papers on the implementation of the Istanbul Principles in three (3) countries: Jordan, Sudan, and Bahrain. These country papers on IPs stressed the challenges and gaps in the implementation of IPs and eventually led to the organisation of national workshops for lesson learning and devising mechanisms to improve such implementation.

In Asia, the regional secretariat coordinated with the CSO DE WG in

conducting the country outreach work in the region. Country level trainings were conducted in Bangladesh, India, Mongolia, Kazakhstan, Vietnam, Sri Lanka, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, and the Philippines based on the country framework paper developed by the WG.

CPDE North America, through the CCIC, supported the CSO DE work in the region. The constituency was able to finalise a narrative toolkit in French and English, for Canadian civil society, which sought to further develop the InterAction Aid Map, and establish a basic online directory of the international development sector in Canada, learning from InterAction's experience in development NGO Aid Map⁶. Aside from this, workshops and trainings on implementing HRBA to achieve equitable partnerships were also held based on the publication *Integrating HRBA and Equitable Partnerships into Development Programming: Operationalising the Istanbul Principles – A Practical Guide to Help Facilitators Run Participatory Workshops and Resource Manual for Participants*. The region also produced a publication on Enabling Environment in order to inform development actors about this principle and the policies it would develop.

The Pacific region, despite being a newly established region of CPDE, worked on the promotion of Istanbul Principles among its constituents since 2014. The national workshops in Fiji and Vanuatu resulted to a Civil Society Code of Minimum Standards in based on the principles of CSO DE, CSO Accountability, and HRBA in the countries⁷. This effort also contributed to an increased awareness of civil society organisations on the Istanbul Principles and how they can further the implementation of their own effectiveness and accountability.

Sectors had their fair share of promoting the Istanbul Principles. Faith- Based Organisations (FBOs) conducted trainings of religious leaders and their youth members on the Istanbul Principles. These regional trainings in Latin America and the Caribbean (2015) and Asia (2016) focused on the meaning of these principles to the FBOs. The most important outcome was the recognition of FBOs it gained as a legitimate development actor, from among CSOs and governments to promote development initiatives and the Principles itself. A more important outcome was a way forward for developing a mechanism to integrate such principles in the diaconical work of churches.

The Trade Unions (TU) also contributed in further promoting the development effectiveness principles. They developed the Trade Union Development Effectiveness Profile (TUDEP) which basically espoused the principles that would allow for labour unions and similar organisations to implement their own effectiveness.

⁶ See NGO Aid Map in this link: www.ngoaidmap.org

⁷ See Annex AG for Fiji Civil Society Code of Minimum Standards and Annex AH for Civil Society Code on the Bislama language.

The Feminist Group (FG) constituency also promoted the Istanbul Principles among its member organisations through the development of a Feminist Guidebook on Development Effectiveness. This guidebook was released before the HLM2 in Nairobi, and this informed the engagement of the constituency and their key positions negotiated during the Women's Forum in Nairobi, Kenya prior to the HLM2.

The Youth sector, despite being one of the newly integrated sector in the Platform, mobilised its resources to further inform other Youth CSOs about the Istanbul Principles. Furthermore, these trainings at the national (Zambia and Zimbabwe) and regional (Asia and the Pacific) levels allowed for the Youth CSOs to identify issues within their constituency that would resonate with the development effectiveness principles.

In the fifth year of the inauguration of the Istanbul Principles, the CSO DE WG conducted a learning exchange session among CSO DE practitioners and CSO facilitators in Nairobi, Kenya in December (See Annex BA for Documentation Report). Plans on how to increase CSO participation to the 2MR, specifically around Indicator 2, of the GPEDC were also discussed. The WG also agreed that the Istanbul Principles Checklist, an assessment tool for gauging the implementation of IP for individual organisations, should be launched.

d. Implementing Capacity Building Activities on Research, Advocacy, and Mobilisation

Another thrust of the CSO Partnership's work is to strengthen capacities of its members and other CSOs in terms of doing research, advocacy, and mobilisation in order to advance civil society issues and demands. In strengthening such capacities, CPDE also conducted assessments to monitor the impact of the programme intervention in increasing CSO capacities in research, advocacy, mobilisation, and promotion of the Istanbul Principles.

Capacity Building Activities across Regions. In 2014, sub-regional meetings were organised in order to update constituencies of the existing development discussions and platform advocacies and engagements. In addition to this, country level capacity building activities were also conducted. In Asia, the regional unit established a formal institution to monitor aid, and this was called the Asia Regional Observatorio. This aid watch mechanism was piloted in Myanmar, Indonesia, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan, and these observatorios were expected to become the center of country-level research and advocacy training on aid and development effectiveness monitoring. Aside from this, the region, through the Reality of Aid – Asia-Pacific (ROA-AP), also conducted a regional Stocktaking of Progress on CSO Accountability and Enabling Environment by bringing together CSO partners, government, media, donor and international institutions to discuss the situation of CSOs in the Asia Pacific.

The Africa region also conducted national consultations on aid and Busan

monitoring, particularly on the implementation of development effectiveness and enabling environment in 2014. Activities were organised in Zambia, Uganda, Congo, Gabon, Burundi, and Ghana in relation to this. In 2015 and 2016, a number of country mapping exercises were launched. These country mapping exercises were conducted in Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of Congo to strengthen CSO commitment to work together to overcome capacity constraints and advocate for EE. Findings of these studies, alongside CSO recommendations, were presented at national validation workshops.

In 2014, the Latin America and Caribbean region organised national workshops on international cooperation and development effectiveness prior to the Mexico HLM. Challenges that were most apparent included gaps in prioritisation of work and development of roadmap for development effectiveness. Advocacy for SSC was forwarded in the national consultations in Uruguay and Argentina among other forms of financing for development. In 2015 and 2016, the region focused on developing policy researches that would inform their advocacy engagements. Sub-regional policy researches and validation workshops were conducted in Andean, South Cone, Central America and Mexico, and Caribbean.

Capacity Building Activities across Sectors. The sectors also had a share of capacity building activities to strengthen their members in terms of research, mobilisation, and advocacy for development effectiveness and effective development cooperation. In 2014, the agriculture and rural development sector organised a CSO conference on the ineffectiveness of aid on agricultural development presenting the negative impact of ODA-sponsored projects to the lives of small-scale producers in agriculture. It aimed to raise awareness of CSOs and deepen their understanding of current policy discourse on aid and investments in agriculture. These trainings resulted to more evidence-based research in 2015 and 2016 to further support the advocacy for a more effective development cooperation and financing for development, most especially in the agriculture industry.

The Labour sector also conducted seminars in 2014 relating to development partnerships and development effectiveness. In this seminar with Central America and Caribbean labour CSOs and unions, the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) introduced the TUDEP tool to raise the awareness of CSOs on the Istanbul Principles and DE agenda.

The FG constituency also organised training in 2014 focusing on Feminist Engagement and Advocacy in Development Effectiveness. The aim was to pilot test and validate the Advocacy Guide entitled *Learning and Strategising around Development Effectiveness Post Busan*, specifically framed on women's perspective. It promoted gender responsiveness at all levels within the platform, the GPEDC, UN, and other policy spaces. The tool was also used to share knowledge within the feminist and women's rights organisations in the CPDE, particularly on ways of engaging in different spaces and work of the CPDE.

The Indigenous Peoples sector also conducted a series of discussions on aid and development effectiveness in 2014 to 2015 in order to clarify the sector's entry points in engaging the ADE agenda. These activities were also utilised to reach out to new members and have a good traction on the DE issues. Aside from that, it developed solidarity among the IPs constituency to address aid and development concerns and strengthen their positions during engagements in the UN World Conference on Indigenous Peoples and other relevant development policy arenas.

The Youth sector also conducted a series of trainings and workshops on CSO DE since their formal inclusion into the platform in 2015. The coordinating unit of the sector exerted much effort in ensuring that its constituency would be introduced deeply into the development effectiveness agenda and principles. The sector was able to organise two (2) regional trainings on DE and three (3) country trainings, which produced youth action plans on implementing CSO DE.

The Migrants sector, only integrated into the platform in 2016, also conducted a global conference to discuss migrants issues in the frame of development effectiveness. The Migrants Conference on Development Effectiveness resulted to the identification of issues that would serve as entry points of the sector in engaging the DE and EDC agenda.

The CPDE WG on SSC also brought together policy makers from the South, development partners, and civil society to discuss a framework for SSC monitoring and identify ways of implementation. The two-day Technical Workshop was held in the Philippines in 2015.

Conduct of Organisational Capacity Assessment. In an effort to monitor the impact of programme intervention among its members and constituencies, the CSO Partnership commissioned the consultancy services of UBORA to conduct the baseline and endline research of the OCA. In 2014, the OCA was conducted in order to develop the baseline information on the existing capacities of members in relation to research, advocacy, mobilisation, networking, and promotion of the Istanbul Principles. This established information that CSOs have a certain level of capacity in conducting advocacy and research, mobilising members, networking with other CSOs, and promoting the Istanbul⁸. However, it also showed the levels of priorities that CSOs have in terms of conducting these works. In 2016, the OCA showed the same trend, albeit some steady trend in specific areas of work⁹. CSOs demonstrated an increased capacity in conducting research for Enabling Environment and Development Cooperation. Development of policy researches remained to be the most important work of CSOs despite stable efforts for advocacy engagement. Constituencies' priorities remained to be developing technical capacities on policy engagement and research. Aside

⁸ See 2014 Organisational Capacity Assessment (Annex AJ).

⁹ See 2016 Organisational Capacity Assessment (Annex AK).

from this, CSOs demonstrated increased capacities for doing policy and communications work with steady engagements with respective country governments. The endline study also showed that key development actors were more aware of CSO positions despite challenges in generating engagement from other CSOs, media, and governments – a similar finding of the Perception Survey. In terms of implementing the Istanbul Principles, transparency and accountability of CSOs increased and was given more importance. On the other hand, knowledge management and organisational learning remained steady with perceived room for improvement.

e. ***Expanding Membership and Strengthening Internal Participation***

A More Diverse CSO Partnership. One of the main thrusts of the platform's work is its expansion to new sectors. In the three years of programme implementation, the platform was able to organise CSOs working with and for the Indigenous Peoples, Youth, and Migrants. The inclusion of each sector was formalised in each programme year.

In 2014, the CSO Partnership, through the CC and the support from the GS, organised global activities to convene CSOs from the Indigenous Peoples sector. The first meeting in September 2014 signaled the consolidation of the IPs sector to start its engagement in the ADE agenda through the CPDE. Their inclusion into the platform diversified positions of the CSO Partnership to include call of indigenous peoples for self-determination, liberation, and claims making for ancestral lands/domain. They also advocated against the apparent militarisation of ODA and plunder of, which brought serious threats to the lives of many IPs communities around the world.

In the same year, initial efforts to consolidate the youth sector already started. However, their formal inclusion was only concluded in 2015. In the course of their consolidation, the Youth Sector identified their entry points to the policy discourse on aid and development effectiveness. They noted that one of the priority themes of the Platform is inclusive development partnerships, most especially in the GPEDC and the 2030 Agenda where youth participation has been stressed. They banked on this civil society demand in order to ensure that the voice of the youth will be heard in important development initiatives that bear impact on their future. At the end of 2016 during the HLM2, the importance of the youth sector was further stressed with the GPEDC developing a set of youth indicators in the discussion of effective development cooperation which will commence in 2017.

The expansion to the migrants sector started mid-2015 when the first global meeting of migrants and diaspora organisations was held in October 2015 in Istanbul, Turkey. Similar to the Youth Sector, the formal inclusion of the Migrants sector came a year later during the 3rd Global Council Meeting in Nairobi, Kenya in November 2016. With the inclusion of the Migrants sector in the CSO Partnership, positions on the great impact of remittances to Overseas and Migrants Workers had been explored. Aside from this, the issue of migration and diaspora were also integrated in the discussion. This is in

light of donors reporting humanitarian aid and military expenditures as part of ODA. This is contrary to Real ODA performance which is meant to address poverty in recipient countries, which happen to be countries of migrant origin. CPDE has stressed that humanitarian aid does not count as ODA which were committed by developed countries to developing countries to aid in progress and development.

Aside from the inclusion of these sectors into the CSO Partnership, the Platform's membership also expanded in terms of its geographic scope. With petitions for recognised regions and sub-regions of the Platform, a number of reorganisation was done in relation to the geographic regional units. In 2015, the Pacific was formally recognised as a separate region from Asia after years of lobbying. This brought in an added element on the issues of climate change and financing for development, as the waters in the Pacific would soon inundate the islands comprising the region. Aside from this, the development effectiveness principles espoused in the Istanbul Principles were further promoted as the Pacific region had been one of its strong supporters since the OF days.

Sub-regions also expanded, more particularly in the Latin America and Caribbean region, as well as North America. Noting that there should be more space for the issues of the Caribbean countries to be forwarded to the platform, the Latin American regional constituency sought for a separate sub-region from Central America and Mexico. Now, the LAC region would expand its GC membership to four (4) sub-regions from an original three (3). Meanwhile, the North American constituency also lobbied for an additional seat in the GC structure noting that one representative would be insufficient to support the work of the region. This would field in a CSO representative from the United States. Finally, at the end of the 2016 GC Meeting, a new call for a separate sub-region of the Balkan area in Europe was raised. This expansion would be discussed in the 4th GC Meeting later in 2017.

The current list of CPDE Global Council members and country focal points is found in Annex AL. This database was developed to monitor the diversity and number of members per constituency.

Strengthened and Organised Internal Participation. The continuous expansion of the platform to sectors and more sub-regional formations necessitated the clarification on ways of working, membership requirements and criteria, and global institutional representation. Aside from this, the Platform needed to organise systematically the participation of its members in important discussions of the different areas of work of CPDE.

In 2014, the first effort at systematising the mobilisation of members was done with the formation of the Outreach Committee (OC). This strengthened mechanisms for members to collaborate more effectively in working on outreach and in-reach demands of the platform. The Committee included representatives from all constituencies and working groups to realise a coordinated effort of achieving the Platform's outreach objectives. In 2015, the

OC deemed it necessary to develop a protocol on ways of working (See Annex AM). This clarified how synergies could be made more effective between and among all units of CPDE to achieve both the individual organisational mandates and the collective goals of the Platform. Aside from the OC, the CPDE also established the Communications Committee in order to devise means for resolving gaps in communications work.

Alongside the development of the Protocol on Ways of Working, the OC also developed a Protocol on Criteria, Process, and Mechanisms for new constituencies (See Annex AN). Noting that the Platform could hardly accommodate all members who would fulfill the criteria of the Membership Guidelines the OC developed this protocol in order to outline the steps and prerequisites for recognizing new constituencies within the platform.

Owing to the global work of the Platform in various development policy arenas, a protocol for selecting institutional representatives (See Annex AO) was also developed. This aimed to set forth a good governance practice in ensuring a democratic process for selecting official representatives to carry the agenda of the CPDE in its engagement to a number of global policy arenas like the TT on CSO DE and EE, the International Aid Transparency (IATI) SC, the EU PFD TT, and the GPEDC Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG).

Complementing the global work of the Platform is the CPDE's continuous work on the social realities on the ground. In order to be effective in carrying out its country work, the OC also developed the Protocol on Implementing Country Focus Work (See Annex AP). This served as CPDE's guidelines in ensuring platform's relevance at the country level. The document clarified and set the guidelines for realising the platform's country focus mandate, the need to link this mandate to the operating CPDE programmes and the political imperatives of the units, the need to ensure relevance of country work to the different work streams of the platform, and the accountability of country work.

An Information Policy (See Annex AQ) was also developed in order to outline the guidelines for external and internal communications within the platform.

Additionally, as more functions were becoming more emphasised in carrying out the programme and political work of the platform, Terms of Reference of different units were also developed. Among these included the (1) Independent Accountability Committee, (2) Programme and Finance Committee, (3) Constituency Secretariats, and (4) CPDE Co-chairs.

Finally, in attempting to make the CPDE membership process aligned with the open platform mandate as well as the advocacy priorities of the platform, the CPDE underwent a review process of the Membership Guidelines. In particular, the review resolved confusion about the open platform mandate while also clarifying roles of the different units in continuously promoting and reaching out to prospective members.

f. ***Establishing Internal Communications and Knowledge Sharing Mechanisms***

Recognising the importance of effective internal communications in successfully fulfilling the objectives of an open platform and as diverse as CPDE, the platform explored different means to overcome challenges and resolve gaps in communications. The Communications Committee spearheaded the work on ensuring the effectiveness of communications channels. The work involved redesigning the website, strategising for mainstream and social media work during events, developing the intranet facility, and setting up of mailing lists.

In redesigning the website, the Communications unit of the platform made it more robust in order to front the website as a channel for showcasing the latest news on the progress of the CPDE work – i.e., including its campaigns, advocacies, statements, and press releases. The unit also prioritised the population of the website with up-to-date content – e.g., policy, communications, and programme references and materials which could be useful for constituencies in promoting CPDE to the wider public.

The Global Secretariat, through the Communications unit, also banked on past initiatives to ensure synergy of activities within the Platform. This was done through the regular release of the e-bulletin¹⁰ which mainly informed its members and the wider public on the progress of work among CPDE units. This fostered synergies between and among all units to solicit support for planned initiatives and actions. Alongside this, a communications protocol was developed to guide internal communications and information exchange within the Platform.

An ongoing undertaking of the Communications Unit is the development of an intranet facility. The intranet was envisioned to be of prime importance to resolve issues on volume of emails and real time coordination among different platform structures to fulfill the functions of the structures to which members belong to. The pilot test of the intranet facility will commence in 2017, and an instructional manual will be developed to guide members in using the facility. This will be prioritised in the next programme period.

At the global level, social media has been making waves in terms of increasing the visibility of the Platform to the wider public. In the three years of programme implementation, social media has only been used basically to promote events and advance key CSO positions on thematic priorities and issues. This proved to be useful in the CPDE engagement to the HLM2 in Nairobi, the European Development Days (EDD), and the UN 2030 Agenda. A more strategic use of social media channels, however, was only planned later in 2016, and this should be carried out starting 2017. This should further spark and sustain interest of members in following aid and development effectiveness and effective development cooperation issues. At the end of programme implementation, CPDE was able to set up a Facebook, Twitter, and Youtube accounts with 3828, 3190, and 24 subscribers respectively.

The mailing lists had been the most utilised form of internal communication within the Platform for the entire three years of programme implementation. Despite issues in the volume of emails being received, members saw the value of setting up various mailing

¹⁰ See <http://csopartnership.org/ebulletins/> for the periodic releases of the e-bulletins.

lists to ensure focus on discussion and systematic exchange of feedback on the work being done. It was expected that lesser dependence on the mailing lists would be realised once the intranet facility is fully operational. Mailing lists were established for all thematic working groups, operational committees, and ad hoc reference groups.

Programme and Platform Consolidation and Management

a. *Planning, Fundraising, and Programme Management*

CSO Partnership's complex and all-encompassing character necessitates clarity of processes and mechanisms that clearly spell out outputs and deliverables expected from constituencies to contribute to the programme objectives. The CSO Partnership developed a Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation Guide (See Annex AR) to inform constituencies and implementing units about the detailed processes that each undertake. This helped ensure accountability and transparency between and among units at the global, regional, sectoral, and country levels. Despite efforts at clarity, issues in terms of delay and time-bound processes persisted. Since 2014, the Platform has been attempting to address delays in reporting, planning, and programme implementation.

In order to address the programme issues, the CC mandated the GS to organise an All Secretariats Meeting (ASM) in The Hague, Netherlands in June 2016. In this meeting, it was agreed that the ASM stand as a regular mechanism to pursue further efforts at improving programme implementation.

In terms of fundraising, the platform successfully negotiated a project with the European Commission (EC) in end 2015 entitled *Enhancing Civil Society Role in Development Partnerships Post 2015* (See Annex AS). The Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) co-financed this programme. This ran concurrently with the *Continuing Campaign* starting 2016. It complemented the multi-year/multi-donor programme by providing additional support to global and regional processes.

The Programme and Finance Committee (ProFincom) provided the guidance required for the GS to carry out the work of programme management and fundraising. The ProFincom held regular monthly meetings that primarily discussed issues on programme and finance management. Aside from these conference calls, the ProFincom also convened face-to-face meetings to discuss more extensively these issues and take necessary actions for the Platform to operate its programmes. At the end of programme implementation, the ProFincom improved their TOR (See Annex AT) in order to clarify accountabilities of the GS and Fiscal Sponsor. This also addressed the issue that programme matters would now be discussed solely by the ProFincom, while political discussions would be the focus of the CPDE CC.

The Platform also noted the importance of checking its own accountability. It was for this reason that the Independent Accountability Committee (IAC) was included in the conceptualisation of the organisational structure of the CSO

Partnership. The IAC that was initially established in 2014 had its TOR reviewed due to competing priorities in carrying out the work of the Committee.. A consultant was contracted to review the mechanism and propose ways forward (See consultant's report attached as Annex AU). After the review, a functional committee was installed in late 2015. The IAC prepared an Accountability Review (See Annex AV) in 2016, and the recommendations of this review would be considered in planning the Platform's new multi-year programme.

The check and balances function of CC, ProFinCom and IAC ensured that the members, constituencies, and structures of the CSO Partnership practiced the principles of development effectiveness, particularly transparency and accountability at all levels (i.e., global, regional, sectoral, and country) and types (i.e., vertical and horizontal).

b. *External Communications and Platform Brand Development*

The communications work of CPDE aimed to increase profile of the Platform to support its outreach. Efforts in this front had some success in garnering support for the CSO key policy positions from other key development actors. In undertaking this work, the CSO Partnership established the Communications Committee, composed of communications practitioners of member organisations to spearhead the communications work of the Platform – i.e., ensuring that key CSO policy positions were translated into easily understandable language to attract a wider public. The Platform developed a number of products that promoted the CSO Partnership and its key demands – e.g., merchandise and other printed products that contained CSO demands. Videos and publication of the Annual Reports informed the wider public of the activities of the platform, and it contributed in developing traction and following among other CSOs who were yet to be members of CPDE.

Aside from producing these communications products, CPDE also improved its website – i.e., providing more up-to-date information on the composition, activities, and engagements in various global policy arenas it related to. The GS continued to improve its contents to inform its constituencies and other stakeholders of the latest undertakings and policy positions of the Platform.

Complementing the website was the Platform's use of social media channels. These communication channels were used in order to influence online discussions that involved effective development cooperation and development effectiveness. Participation in twitter chats during the EDD and the FfD3 Conference proved important as stakeholders gained awareness of CSO positions on issues concerning financing for development and development cooperation. CPDE's social media platforms were also utilised in advancing CSO positions during the two (2) HLMs organised by GPEDC. An internal assessment of CPDE's social media communications, however, showed that efforts had been primarily promotional rather than strategic and political. This would be a focus for improving the communications work of the platform in the

future.

While there are gaps in the communications work, the Perception Survey (Annex AW) showed that development actors were aware and supportive of CSO positions – i.e., most especially on ensuring that commitments from previous HLFs, HRBA, and CSO DE and EE with donor and recipient countries' and other CSOs' advocacies. There was less support on CPDE's position on private sector accountability. It was clear that CPDE was successful in conveying its positions to other stakeholders.

CPDE faced challenges in raising awareness of member CSOs on the available communication channels where information could be gathered and in engaging mainstream media. Typically, media coverage was during its engagements in the GPEDC HLMs. In 2014, CPDE press releases and articles landed in a number of local (Mexico) and international news websites. In 2016, key CPDE members were invited for press conferences and national television interviews in Nairobi, Kenya. These opportunities provided spaces for CSOs to advance their key positions and inform the general public about the issues that they usually face on the ground.

Overall, the communications work was successful in terms of ensuring that messaging was clear and intelligible to policy makers and influencers. However, more targeted approaches would need to be done in order for the Platform members to be more engaged in this area of work.

c. *Coordination and Platform Consolidation*

Throughout the three (3) years of programme implementation, the CSO Partnership governance structures were able to convene eleven (11) CC meetings and three (3) GC meetings since rolling out the implementation of the *Civil Society Continuing Campaign for Effective Development*. Aside from this, the platform also convened to define its ways forward in the context of the changing development landscape. Towards 2016, meetings had become more strategic in terms of convening the governance and other ad hoc structures to devise plans of engaging the different global policy arenas CPDE intended to influence. This resulted to organising a policy conference, a Nairobi HLM2 negotiation team meeting, and a number of Co-chairs meetings.

In order to ensure that consolidation meetings such as the CC and GC were properly handled, the CPDE Co-chairs deemed it necessary to meet a few days prior to scheduled governance meetings in order to discuss the meeting agenda more thoroughly and devise strategies in effectively ensuring optimum participation of participants.

For the first few years of programme implementation, CPDE governance meetings had been heavily dealing with organising its structures and clarifying the ways of working between and among implementing units. The administrative discussions had been limiting the CC and GC discussions on the more important policy directions of the platform. It was for this reason that the CC mandated the

ProFincom to discuss programme matters for CC approval and the OC to discuss ways forward on the issue of membership engagement. This way, the CC focused on policy and advocacy discussions that would provide guidance and directions for CPDE engagements in the different global policy arenas.

The first governance meeting where the policy issues were emphatically discussed was during the Policy Conference in Brussels, Belgium on January 2016. This meeting focused on strategising for the upcoming platform engagement in the GPEDC HLM2 in Nairobi, Kenya in 2016. The CC members identified the main advocacy agenda that CPDE would carry in its HLM2 engagement – i.e., universalising Effective Development Cooperation with a specific focus on the core business of Rome, Paris, Accra, and Busan. This focused on ensuring that a renewed commitment in upholding the agreements of previous high level forums would be achieved in the end. Such undertaking proved to be fruitful as CC members zeroed in on defining clearly what policy positions should be prioritised in terms of its negotiation of the Nairobi Outcome Document.

In Rome, Italy in September 2016, the CPDE Core Group for HLM 2 continued the in-depth advocacy and policy discussion guided by the outcomes of the CC meeting in January. This meeting was instrumental in identifying and crafting the CSO Lay Asks on the road to Nairobi.

Noting the dynamism of the development landscape in which CPDE operates, the CC deemed it necessary to conduct a strategic planning exercise. After the development of a Power Map where a scoping of all available development actors and policy arenas was made, the CC formed a Core Group that would be responsible for drafting a Strategic Plan that would be finalised by the Co-chairs (See Annex AX *Account, Build, Commit: Towards Effective People-Centered Development*) of the platform. The document set out medium and long term goals which CPDE would aim to achieve until 2020. This should also guide the planning sessions of the platform in the next few years, as it would attempt to operationalise the Strategic Plan coupled with overall policy objectives anchored on the core business and five (5) other thematic issues of Development Effectiveness, Enabling Environment, South-South Cooperation, Private Sector Accountability, and Conflict and Fragility.

Finally, in line with continued efforts to delineate policy and programme work of the platform, CPDE also organised consolidation meetings of the GS with other regional and sectoral Secretariats. This allowed for the Secretariats to clarify implementation strategies on the different areas of work of the Platform. At the end of 2016, the CC also clarified that regional and sectoral secretariats should be different from its appointed CC representative to remain true to the delineation of programme and advocacy work of the platform. This effort was realised in the organisation of the ASM, and the second installment of similar nature will be organised in 2017.

Overall, governance meetings adapted to the needs of the Platform – i.e., may it be policy or programme. These meetings were critical in ensuring that the

Platform members were updated on the current undertakings of the CSO Partnership; that a space for learning and knowledge exchange was available for CSOs; and that strategies for engagement were adequately planned. All these governance meetings successfully consolidated the platform members to zero-in on the important issues not only internal to the platform, but also to the global policy discourse and context-specific social realities of the regions, sectors, and countries.

2.1 Planned Results Not Achieved

- **Planned results not achieved. Describe why they were not achieved and how the challenges encountered were addressed.**

The Performance Measurement Framework (See Annex AY) sets out clear indicators and targets that spell the success of the programme. Despite clear progress on all these targets and indicators, some of it were not fully achieved.

Firstly, institutionalised multi-stakeholder character of development and development cooperation policy is yet to be realised in a number of countries. In its engagement to the GPEDC 2MR and its own initiative of coming up with its own Global Synthesis Research, the continuous shrinking of civic spaces for CSO participation, most especially at the country level, limited the capacities of CSOs to engage their respective governments meaningfully. Substantial progress in enabling environment for CSOs could not be demonstrated as governments regulated CSO participation in policy and decision-making, despite efforts of CSOs to engage and assert such. After CPDE's policy success in the GPEDC HLM2 where recognition of CSOs as key development actors was reiterated, these incremental policy gains on ensuring an enabling environment for CSOs is largely limited at the global level. In order to address these shrinking civic spaces, CSOs should continue to engage governments at country level to ensure civil society participation in key development policy processes. This trend of largely global progress in policy outcomes with minimum country level impacts, is likewise applicable to the commitments made by governments in past high-level forums in Rome, Paris, Accra, and Busan.

Secondly, in terms of its outreach work, what was originally planned was the inclusion of indigenous peoples, youth, and persons with disability (PWDs). The Platform was able to reach out to the IPs and youth sectors which were formally integrated to the Platform membership's and structures in 2014 and 2015, respectively. Identifying key organisations of and working on the issue of PWDs that has some interest in the EDC agenda, however, had been difficult. Some communications with PWDs organisations were initiated, but these were not as fruitful as the other sectors. On the other hand, some sectors like the cooperatives, CSOs in health and education have expressed some interest to be involved in CPDE. The CSO Partnership would assess its outreach strategy as there is a concern in the GC that more sectors and the geographic regions in CPDE would require more resources in order for the Platform to implement its work on effective development cooperation.

Finally, as part of its annual plan in 2015 and 2016, the CSO Partnership committed to

establish country structures working particularly on issues relevant to the platform thematic priorities. This was not established in countries in the period due to the ongoing process of clarifying the platform's vision of a country-focused work. In late 2016, the platform was able to agree on a country-focus framework. Among other things, this framework clarifies that 'establishing country structures' does not mean creating new country structures. As much as possible, CPDE would identify and work with existing CSO structures. This framework would be integrated into the planning sessions of each region and (when applicable) sector in order to include country work in their plans of action every year. The time it took to develop and create consensus on such framework impacted on the objective of developing country structures. This was, however, integrated in the bridge fund programme of the platform to sustain policy gains from HLM2 at country level. Country structures working on universalising effective development cooperation would be the goal in a year prior to the development of a new multi-year programme. After setting up such country structures, new country plans would be integrated into the work plans of regions and sectors wherever relevant.

2.2 Unplanned Results

The unplanned results had been specific to each year of programme implementation. As the programme implementation went on, adjustments had to be made in terms of strategy to ensure that activities were conducted on schedule even with the limited resources and that objectives would be met after the end of the programme. Given this reality, there are programme results that surfaced, which were not planned.

Global Monitoring Framework. Continuous active engagement with the GPEDC opened opportunities for participation in other similar policy processes and space. The contribution of the WG on EE on the Global Monitoring Framework and as well as the GPEDC MAG brought them closer with the Joint Support Team and the TT who was working on GPI12. Aside from this, the work of the WG on SSC initiated discussions about undertaking a consultative online dialogue with the groups working on CSO-SSC Network.[r1]

Further to the CPDE engagement in the 2MR, initiatives and interest in engaging work on development effectiveness from among the country CSO members of the platform. Likewise, such interest from members of the country resulted to a webinar and global training to enhance capacities of these CSOs in conducting the research work for the monitoring of progress in indicators included in the Global Monitoring Framework of the GPEDC. Due to this, efforts in early 2016 was focused on supporting the country work for the 2MR and ensuring that country reports were available to reflect the data required to showcase the realities from the ground.

The CPDE was also able to establish closer ties with the OECD-DAC where it was even exceptionally granted an informal observer seat at the DAC Senior High Level Meeting. Since the DAC frequently discusses GPEDC related issues and would take major decisions on FfD, CPDE pursued strengthened monitoring and engagement. At the same time, CPDE facilitated member-led meetings with the DAC (ITUC-DAC, Reality of Aid, Concord) that proved to be useful and opened possibilities for increased CSO

participation and collaboration with DAC.

The conduct of the Organisational Capacity Assessment also surfaced areas of strength and areas for development in the capacities of members. It also confirmed the unique and rather special character and manner of working of the platform.

CPDE was also able to respond to two (2) critical issues – i.e., heightened migration crisis brought by the conflicts and economic issues in Syria (See Annex BG for the CPDE Statement on the Syrian Crisis) and the much anticipated climate talks in Paris during the COP21 (See Annex BH for the CPDE Statement on the Paris Agreement/COP21). The platform, being a champion of development effectiveness with human rights at its core, forwarded its call for a human rights approach for development and denounced attacks and violations of people's rights. The platform stressed development cooperation should redound to peoples development rather than financing wars of aggression

Another unplanned result was the effectiveness of the regular publication of the e-bulletin. This not only posed considerable increase in membership mobilisation in terms of informing the GS and the platform with the initiatives of a geographic region or sectoral formation, but also revitalised the membership to provide inputs to prime themselves as achieving concrete results for addressing programme objectives.[r3]

Finally, the successful negotiation of the EC Action was not planned all along. As the CSO Partnership continuously engaged the Commission in terms of its positions on development cooperation and the 2030 Agenda, the outreach resulted to this new partnership.

3.0 Concluding Remarks

In three years, the *Civil Society Continuing Campaign for Development Effectiveness* programme has largely achieved its objectives.

Its most significant achievement is the civil society engagement at various levels in key development cooperation policy milestones and multi-stakeholder forums thereby promoting an accountable multi-stakeholder framework in development cooperation. This is focused on the GPEDC and, to a lesser extent the SDG processes, among other relevant policy arenas. Engagement, in this case, meant initiating or supporting activities and mobilisation across 7 geographical global regions and sector formations, advancing clear policy positions developed through consensus.

In terms of favourable outcomes in development cooperation policy, the most important achievements are captured in GPEDC's Nairobi Outcome Document in HLM2 and Mexico Communiqué in HLM1. These outcomes are products of global CSO processes of producing evidence, developing and negotiating consensus positions and engaging decision makers and influencers. CPDE can claim clear attributions to these outcomes given its role in the Global Partnership and its rootedness in the diversity of its constituents.

The key programme result in CSO enabling environment is possibly enveloped within the favourable policy outcome in the Nairobi NOD where parties to the GPDEC recognised the closing and shrinking civic spaces and committed to reverse this trend. On a lower level of attribution, there are some indications that show CPDE has contributed to multi-stakeholder dialogue opportunities, initiatives in CSO accountability and high level of trust on CSOs as development actors.

CPDE was also able to support the enhancement of capacities of its members. As per the Organisational Capacity Assessment (OCA) CPDE's member capacities show improvement in doing research, advocacy, mobilization and overall effectiveness to conduct their work measured against the standards of the Istanbul Principles. Capacity development was fulfilled through supporting regional, sector and country constituents in their work on EDC.

With these important gains in the implementation of this programme, the need for CSOs to advocate for effective development cooperation remains salient. Efforts to follow-through policy gains in the GPEDC are needed to ensure such policies translate at country level. The implementation of the 2030 Agenda will also need to be engaged to universalise the effective development cooperation principles in the pursuit of the SDGs. CSOs need to work internally and engage all actors to ensure that the commitment to reverse the negative trend on civic spaces is realised. To do all this, CSOs need continuous learning and improvement of capacity.

In terms of resourcing the work ahead, the partnership with the European Commission is concretely translated into the EC Action co-funded by Sida. For a year, the plan is for CPDE to implement a Bridge Fund programme entitled *Sustaining Civil Society Advocacy on Universalising Effective Development Cooperation* (See Annex AZ) together with the EC-Sida Action while still developing and fundraising for a new multi-year programme.

In the face of a challenging global development context, the direction of the platform is clear with the Strategic Plan in place, policy objectives are set and the structures invigorated. CPDE celebrates its achievements and is ready to tackle the challenges ahead.

List of Annex

Link: <https://drive.google.com/open?id=0ByZczWk8axJSYmIPa0RBZmp5RFU>

Annex	Title of Document
A	Civil Society Assessment of the Nairobi Outcome Document
B	GPEDC Indicator Two: Civil Society Operates within an enabling environment that maximises its engagement in and contribution to development, An Assessment to Evidence
C	2014 CPDE Annual Report
D	2015 CPDE Annual Report
E	CPDE Global Advocacy Strategy
F	CSO Statement on the HLM1
G	HLM Mexico Communique
H	Nairobi Outcome Document
I	CPDE Advocacy Toolkit
J	CPDE Communications Toolkit
K	Nairobi Civil Society Forum Documentation Report
L	CSO Statement on the HLM2
M	Enhancing the Development Effectiveness of the Post 2015 Global Partnership for Sustainable Development
N	Development Cooperation in the Post 2015 Development Framework
O	CPDE Statement on 2030 Agenda
P	Post 2015 Implementation Strategy
Q	CPDE Comments on the Post 2015 Outcome Document zero draft
R	2016 HLPF Resolution
S	Open Letter of the NGO Major Group
T	Position Paper on FfD3 Addis Ababa Conference
U	CPDE DCF Engagement Strategy
V	CSO Messages to the 2016 UN DCF Symposium
W	Journey from Istanbul
X	An Enabling Environment for CSOs: A Synthesis of Evidence of Progress since Busan
Y	Private Sector's Accountability for Development: Mapping Business Liability Mechanisms and Donor Engagement with Private Sector and Development
Z	Issues on South-South Cooperation
AA	A Synthesis Report: The State of Development Cooperation, Development Effectiveness, and Enabling Environment
AB	The Development Effectiveness of Development Finance Institutions' Support to the Private Sector with Official Development Assistance (ODA) Funds
AC	2016 Global Synthesis Report, State of Development Cooperation: Checking the Core of Effectiveness
AD	How Effective are International Non-Governmental Organisations?: A Study of INGO Support of the Development Effectiveness Agenda
AE	Istanbul Five Years After: Evidencing Civil Society Development Effectiveness and Accountability
AF	MENA Guidebook on Mutual Accountability Manual
AG	Fiji Civil Society Code of Minimum Standards
AH	Civil Society Code on the Bislama Language
AI	Documentation Report on CSO Development Effectiveness Learning Exchange

Annex	Title of Document
	Workshop
AJ	2014 Organisational Capacity Assessment
AK	2016 Organisational Capacity Assessment
AL	CPDE Global Council Members and Country Focal Points
AM	CPDE Protocol on Ways of Working
AN	Protocol on Criteria, Process, and Mechanisms for New Constituencies
AO	CPDE Membership Guidelines
AP	CPDE Protocol for Selecting Institutional Representatives
AQ	CPDE Information Policy
AR	CPDE Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation Guide
AS	Enhancing Civil Society Role in Development Partnerships Post 2015, European Commission Action
AT	CPDE Programme and Finance Committee Terms of Reference
AU	Report on Review of CPDE Internal Accountability Structure
AV	CPDE Internal Accountability Review
AW	CPDE Perception Survey
AX	Account, Build, Commit: Towards Effective People-Centred Development, CPDE Strategic Plan
AY	CPDE Programme Performance Measurement Framework
AZ	CPDE Statement on the Syrian Crisis
BA	CPDE Statement on the Paris Agreement/COP21
BB	Sustaining Civil Society Advocacy on Universalising Effective Development Cooperation, CPDE Bridge Fund Programme

List of Appendix

Link: <https://drive.google.com/open?id=0ByZczWk8axJSYjZzeElyVG9FSGM>

Unit	Link to Report
Regions	
Sectors	
Working Groups	