

**CSO PARTNERSHIP FOR DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVENESS (CPDE)**  
**Statement ahead of the 10<sup>th</sup> GPEDC Steering Committee meeting**  
**New York, 14-15 July 2016**

**TOP RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE STEERING COMMITTEE**

On meeting objective 1: Agreement on critical elements and next steps for a draft renewed mandate and a revised monitoring framework

- a) **Preserve** the integrity of GPEDC's mandate, in particular its **accountability** function. An enhanced GPEDC knowledge sharing role should not be supported at the expense of its ultimate purpose: accountability for the commitments made over the years to improve development co-operation.
- b) Revise GPEDC's governance structure to **include a non-executive Co-Chair**.
- c) **Support the advice and recommendations from the Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG)**. CPDE wishes to highlight the essential role of external evaluations in understanding why change happens or does not.
- d) Agree on **clear a political roadmap to build on the MAG's technical work**, both in the lead up to the second High-Level Meeting (HLM2) and afterwards. CPDE is interested in being part of the proposed working group that would develop an agreed Theory of Change, with support from MAG members.
- e) Ensure the preliminary findings from the second monitoring round and the second Progress Report are shared **well ahead of time** to allow for adequate preparations.
- f) **Strengthen GPIs' linkages and contribution** to specific GPEDC commitments. GPI champions should lead efforts in showing how their GPIs can accelerate the implementation of core aid and development effectiveness commitments. Criteria for assessing GPI performance should also be refined.

On meeting objective 2: Provide inputs to the first draft of the HLM2 outcome document and advice on the way forward for its finalisation

*Note: these are preliminary recommendations only. CPDE will follow up with a detailed reaction to the first draft after the Steering Committee meeting.*

- g) Reaffirm the role of CSOs as **independent development actors in their own right**.
- h) Ensure the final outcome document **builds on previously agreed commitments**, not just development effectiveness principles, including commitments from the unfinished business agenda (Paris and Accra), which are part and parcel of GPEDC's core business and a universal pillar of Agenda 2030 The outcome document must also promote concrete new action **focusing on the quality** of development co-operation.
- i) Outline a detailed and transparent process that reaffirms the **central role of the Steering Committee** in negotiating the HLM2 outcome document, with clear stakeholder engagement mechanisms.
- j) Set up a **transparent and inclusive governance renewal** process in the lead up to HLM2.

On meeting objective 3: Provide guidance on HLM2 preparations, including the finalisation of the agenda and budget.

- k) Aim for an ambitious conference that re-affirms the **importance of effective development co-operation**; fosters **learning for higher accountability**; recalls our **mutual responsibility** and provides guidance for implementing unmet commitments; and calls for more commitments, particularly on **inclusive development** and **CSO enabling environment**.
- l) Ensure that preparations for each HLM2 segment reflect the **inclusive, multi-stakeholder** nature of GPEDC.

The CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the agenda and documentation prepared for the 10<sup>th</sup> GPEDC Steering Committee meeting. We take note of the three meeting objectives and find the agenda to address the most important issues in the lead up to HLM2. CPDE has already provided extensive comments on the main topics under discussion as our contribution to the consultations on GPEDC's Theory of Change, and revisions to its global monitoring framework and mandate. Please refer to those submissions for details and find below additional comments by agenda item.

#### *SPECIFIC COMMENTS BY STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA ITEM*

##### *Session 1. REVISING THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP MONITORING FRAMEWORK*

**CPDE supports the advice and recommendations from the Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG).** In particular, we agree with the four main recommendations and related processes – advancing a GPEDC Theory of Change; exploring synergies with SDG country reviews; approving principles and parameters for a revised monitoring framework; and considering emerging areas for a revised framework – as well as with more specific suggestions, e.g. the need for the Steering Committee to follow up on this work to actually own it; the need to carry out periodical external evaluations to ask the big question of why change is happening, or isn't; the suggestion to re-design, if not replace, Indicator Three on the private sector; etc.

We believe there is a lot of work to continue so we also agree with MAG's proposed process of delegating the follow up to a **designated working group, of which CPDE would like to be a member.** Indeed, we believe it is of utmost importance to outline a clear political roadmap that will build on the MAG's technical work, before and after HLM2. CPDE hopes the MAG will continue in its role and that at least some of its members will support the delegated working group in defining an explicit Theory of Change. Once again, we strongly believe that **only after** this Theory of Change has been defined and agreed by the Steering Committee, can GPEDC renew its mandate. This is therefore not something that should happen before or at HLM2.

On a related issue, we would like to suggest that the designated working group discuss the recommendations made on the global monitoring framework in the document *Elements and options for a draft renewed mandate.* Indeed, **some of these recommendations do not seem to follow the same conceptual framework** as the MAG's, so we suggest delegating the technical discussion to the dedicated working group and convening a Steering Committee-level discussion afterwards.

##### *Session 2. UPDATE ON GPI RESULTS AND THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO THE GPEDC*

CPDE attended the GPI Acceleration Workshop in Barcelona last month and proactively participated in the discussions. While we appreciated the frank conversations, we would have liked to see **stronger linkages between GPI activities and results against GPEDC commitments** – something that can also be drawn from the workshop summary. As a practical way forward, we suggest that proactive GPI leads champion related GPEDC commitments as well to ensure higher consistency. For its part, CPDE is going to continue its campaigning work on development effectiveness and CSO enabling environment, which is a key Busan commitment. We also agree with the proposal to streamline several GPIs based on commonly agreed criteria.

### Session 3. RENEWING THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP MANDATE

CPDE once again wishes to recall the *raison d'être* for GPEDC envisioned in the Busan Partnership Agreement, which is primarily 'to support and ensure accountability for the implementation of commitments at the political level' (para. 36a). While we support current calls for enhancing GPEDC's knowledge sharing role, we also believe **it is paramount to preserve the integrity of GPEDC's overall mandate**. An enhanced GPEDC knowledge sharing role should therefore not come at the expense of its ultimate accountability purpose. Shrinking accountability for commitments would not only be detrimental to the effective development co-operation agenda; it would also lead to unnecessary duplication of efforts with what the UN Development Co-operation Forum already does as a knowledge exchange broker.

Concerning revisions to GPEDC's governance structure, CPDE is happy to see that feedback from the GPEDC mandate survey supports its long-time request for a **non-executive Co-Chair**. We believe it is high time that this request were met to reflect the multi-stakeholder nature of GPEDC at its core. We also welcome the proposal to strengthen ways to engage non-executive actors like civil society in the proposed mandate document. Similarly, we ask that GPEDC's **governance renewal process be also openly discussed** within the Steering Committee in the lead up to HLM2 to ensure higher transparency and inclusiveness.

### Session 4. HLM2 OUTCOME DOCUMENT: THE WAY FORWARD

CPDE would first like to recall our request for clarification on the process that is being put in place to negotiate the HLM2 outcome document. We originally made this request at the Malawi Steering Committee meeting, when we raised our concerns that having a small 'first-tier' negotiating body, followed by the Steering Committee and the GPEDC membership at large, did not fully reflect the multi-stakeholder nature of GPEDC. Despite assurances that an alternative proposal would be worked out we have not received any updates. We reiterated our concerns in a letter to GPEDC's Co-Chairs in May but have yet to receive a reply.

CPDE once again strongly **reaffirms the central role of the Steering Committee** in negotiating the HLM2 outcome document. We would like this meeting to deliberate on the next steps forward once and for all, by putting the Steering Committee at the heart of a transparent, inclusive and multi-stakeholder negotiation process that is clear to everyone involved. CPDE recommends the adoption of the **negotiation framework that was used in the lead up to and in Busan** with the Steering Committee taking up what used to be the role of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness. Stakeholder engagement mechanisms must be clarified so that each Steering Committee member brings genuinely representative positions to the negotiating table and shows what actions its constituency is promoting to drive progress.

We also wish to seek further clarity on the involvement of non-state stakeholders, like civil society, in regional consultations. As we noted in Malawi, in the past these consultations were held exclusively with governments, which goes counter to GPEDC's multi-stakeholder nature. We therefore ask you to **include non-state stakeholders in the regional consultations** on the HLM2 outcome document in a way that will allow CPDE to identify its own representatives ahead of time.

In terms of content, CPDE reserves the right to send more detailed feedback after the Steering Committee meeting, once we have had the time to consult within our large constituency. At this stage we wish to highlight the following:

- i. The document needs to **build on previously agreed commitments, not just the principles** endorsed in previous effective development co-operation conferences, as currently stated, including commitments from the so-called unfinished business of Paris and Accra. In fact, CPDE takes this opportunity to recall that **unfinished business is part and parcel of GPEDC's core business**. It is the foundation of effective development co-operation in its broadest sense. It is at the heart of that universal effective development co-operation that can make a meaningful difference to the success of the SDGs, but especially to people and planet, because development co-operation is the only mechanism that is primarily focused on leaving no-one behind. A negotiated outcome document should **avoid re-opening discussions** on previously made commitments, but rather build on them and strengthen their implementation. This should be clarified once and for all.
- ii. While we support stronger linkages between GPEDC, Agenda 2030 and AAAA, these should **not come at the expense of diluting the focus on the quality of development co-operation**. We should not duplicate other agendas for which there are already processes in place within the UN (e.g. development finance).
- iii. We support the first draft's **renewed focus on the global monitoring framework** (in addition to the MAG's recommendations, please see above). We also call for the outcome document to revisit GPEDC's **working arrangements** to make it more impactful.

## Session 5. Budget and organisational preparations of HLM2

CPDE has been actively involved in the preparations of all HLM2 plenaries, in leading the plenary on Leaving No-one Behind, as well as in the planning of pre-HLM fora, such as on CSOs, women and youth. However, the **session on the private sector remains a mystery** to us, despite our repeated efforts to reach out to the organisers. To date, we do not know how or at what stage to get involved. One of our members and a Steering Committee representative at this table, the trade unions, has also written a letter to GPEDC's Co-Chairs in this regard. We ask that all HLM2 plenaries fully **reflect GPEDC's inclusiveness** in their preparations.

Preliminary findings from the second monitoring round and the second Progress Report must be shared **well ahead of time** to allow for adequate preparations and positioning ahead of HLM2. In line with our call for reaffirming the unfinished business since Paris, we would like to see a full-day pre-HLM2 workshop dedicated to an in-depth discussion of the Progress Report. We see the workshop as an important milestone that will inform a broader discussion on accountability for commitments taken at HLM2.

Overall, CPDE would like to see a conference that **reaffirms the importance of effective development co-operation**, its unique and universal role; fosters **learning for higher accountability**; recalls our **mutual responsibility** and provides guidance for implementing unmet commitments; and calls for more commitments, particularly on **inclusive development** and **CSO enabling environment**.