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I. Introduction

1. The first meeting of the Post-Busan Interim Group took place in Paris on 13 and 14 February 2012. The meeting was chaired by WP-EFF Chair Mr. Talaat Abdel-Malek. The list of participants for the meeting is available as annex to this document.

2. Following a round of introductions and the adoption of the agenda, the chair outlined the objectives of the meeting: i) to agree on an interim WP-EFF work process that will deliver agreement on the post-Busan governance and monitoring framework by June 2012; ii) to identify key characteristics of the future Global Partnership that will guide further work to define the functions, nature and support needs of the Partnership; and iii) to provide guidance on the key questions related to developing indicators and targets to monitor implementation of Busan commitments.

II. Interim work process of the WP-EFF January-June 2012

3. The first substantive agenda item focused on the process through which working arrangements for the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation and the post-Busan monitoring framework will be finalised by June 2012. The Chair referred to the related meeting document [DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)1], which proposed a framework for the interim work process.

4. The Chair emphasised the importance of continuity in the work of the PBIG. The Chair asked that participants should aim to attend all PBIG meetings in person, but that at the same time some flexibility may be necessary. It was agreed that for future meetings, personal attendance by PBIG members is the first preference but, recognising possible limitations and constraints, members may designate a representative to speak on their behalf. However, to ensure continuity of the process, each member shall have one designated observer who will participate in meetings and who may represent the member in case of absence. In the case that both are present in meetings, this accompanying colleague will have observer status.

5. Brazil, India and China informed the group that they were attending the meeting as observers. In response, the Chair emphasised the inclusive nature of the Global Partnership initiated in Busan and invited these countries to participate in discussions to the extent that they desired, suggesting a ‘participant observer’ status.

6. Moving on to the WP-EFF interim work process in broader terms, the Chair pointed out that while the PBIG represents – directly or indirectly – various stakeholders, there remain actors that are not represented in the group but that could have potential multiplier effects in the interim work process. In this context, the Chair proposed setting up a reference group that would include (but not be limited to) regional actors and would be actively solicited throughout the process. Some participants highlighted that various regional and other actors are already represented in the PBIG, and that duplication in structures should be avoided. The importance of including the private sector in such a group was emphasised. It was agreed that a reference group be set up and that relevant actors be invited to join. The group will be kept informed of the WP-EFF interim work process and offered opportunities to feed inputs to the PBIG work process.

7. In terms of the broad WP-EFF interim work process, the Chair emphasised that the final agreement on the working arrangements and monitoring framework will be taken by the WP-EFF. While some members proposed organisng a WP-EFF plenary meeting earlier than June, the majority supported organising only one WP-EFF plenary meeting to deliver the final agreement. It was emphasised that consultations within the WP-EFF will play an important role throughout the coming months. To this end, the WP-EFF Community Site [link], which is accessible to all participants of the WP-EFF, will provide a
practical tool for seeking inputs and for sharing views. Alongside this, the official HLF4 website continues to provide a source of general information to all interested stakeholders.

8. As to structuring the interim work process, the group had a first round of exchanges related to the timing, sequencing and venues of forthcoming meetings. Initial reactions emphasised the need to take account of travel time and costs in setting up meetings. There was broad support for utilising opportunities to link meetings back-to-back with other key events and for keeping the process lean and practical. At the same time, several participants felt that more information on the substantive objectives and desired deliverables of the interim work process were needed before making decisions on the structure of the work process. Therefore, it was agreed that the meetings schedule would be revisited the following day in connection to discussions on next steps.

9. In relation to future meetings, the group acknowledged the importance of engaging a broad range of stakeholders in the WP-EFF interim work process, as mandated by the Busan Partnership document. The Chair concluded that all stakeholders that are committed to strengthening the effectiveness of development cooperation and to implementing the commitments of the Busan Partnership document are welcome to actively engage in the process.

III. Working arrangements for the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation

Core functions of the Global Partnership

10. To structure the discussions, the Chair invited participants to focus first on what the core functions of the Global Partnership should be [DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)2 paragraphs 12-14]. The group identified four core functions for the Global Partnership:

   i. Maintain and strengthen political momentum for more effective development cooperation;

   ii. Ensure accountability for implementing Busan commitments;

   iii. Facilitate knowledge exchange and sharing of lessons learnt; and

   iv. Support implementation of Busan commitments at the country level.

11. Regarding the scope of the Global Partnership, particularly whether it should take on a broader development effectiveness role beyond solely reviewing progress in implementing HLF4 commitments, the majority advocated for a focused approach, whereby the Partnership should primarily focus on enhancing the effectiveness of development cooperation as foreseen by the Busan Partnership document.

12. At the same time, a certain degree of flexibility was called for to ensure that there is sufficient space for policy dialogue. Ministers should be able to address key issues arising from country level evidence and provide the political guidance needed to resolve arising challenges for development cooperation. The group did not foresee that the Global Partnership would assume the role of setting global standards; rather, it should facilitate the political level exchanges and dialogue necessary to ensure implementation of commitments and actions agreed in Busan.

13. There were diverging views within the group on the extent to which policy coherence for development should feature in the Global Partnership. The Chair raised the question of whether taking this issue on board might overstretch the capacity of the Partnership.

How the Global Partnership will deliver its core functions
14. Having discussed core functions of the Global Partnership, the group moved on to consider how the Partnership would deliver these functions [DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)2 paragraphs 15-19]. Regarding the membership of the Partnership, there was broad consensus that it should be inclusive and open to all interested stakeholders, with the sole criterion that they endorse the Busan Partnership document and are committed to implementing the actions agreed to therein. Ministerial level meetings including heads of agencies and of non-governmental organisations were identified as the key working structure of the Partnership.

15. To support this ministerial level platform, there was broad support for the idea of a Steering Committee, which would convene below ministerial level and would guide the substantive agenda of the Partnership. Several participants envision this body to be limited in size and membership. Balanced representation arose as one important criterion for the composition, with some participants proposing a rotating membership to the Committee.

16. While the general framework of ministerial level political engagement and a Steering Committee operating at a lower level received strong support, participants agreed that there is a need for more detailed elaboration on how this governance set-up would operate in practice. Particularly, concrete suggestions would be needed on i) how to maintain political momentum and provide incentives for ministers to engage; ii) what frequency and organisational aspects of ministerial meetings would best support political momentum; iii) what would be the tasks and membership of the Steering Committee to ensure a functional and efficient structure. The United Kingdom expressed its willingness to develop a proposal to this end. It was agreed that the United Kingdom would work together with interested parties to submit a proposal by 29 February.

17. As set out in the Busan Partnership document, the group was unanimous that Secretariat services provided jointly by the OECD and UNDP will support the functioning of the Partnership. The OECD and UNDP informed participants that they are discussing their respective comparative advantages and beginning to consider how they can together respond to the call from Busan to provide support to the Global Partnership. This concept will need to be articulated in parallel to the development of the Global Partnership concept, and the organisations will share this with the WP-EFF once it is developed further.

18. Regional organisations were identified by some participants as important actors in supporting implementation of Busan commitments. Potential roles for regional organisations included collecting country level experiences and lessons (including possible engagement in country level monitoring efforts), facilitating intra- and inter-regional learning and building links between country and global level efforts to implement Busan commitments. The group identified the need for further elaboration on what different kinds of regional organisations are relevant in this context, what are their competences and mandates to engage in this agenda, and – based on this – what could be their specific role to support the Global Partnership. The NEPAD Agency representing the African Union expressed its willingness to develop a proposal to this end. It was agreed that the NEPAD Agency would work together with interested parties to submit a proposal by 29 February.

19. In the context of operationalising the Global Partnership, the group discussed the role of Building Blocks and other voluntary alliances that arose from HLF4. While the group considered that these can play a potentially significant role in implementing Busan commitments, there was consensus that these should continue to exist as self standing alliances and that there is no need to formally institutionalise them or envision any accountability relationship between them and the Global Partnership. At the same time several participants pointed to the fact that these alliances include champions around various substantive themes and could therefore offer important inputs to the work of the Global Partnership. It was
agreed that the Chair will send out a letter, providing actors associated with various Building Blocks information on the current interim work process and welcoming inputs to the work process at hand.

20. In structuring the work of the Partnership, there was widespread support for building on existing knowledge and structures. Comparative advantages and potential value added of existing actors and fora should be carefully analysed and tapped into. Working arrangements should ensure that strategic links are made to other political fora that are relevant for enhancing the effectiveness of development cooperation.

21. There was agreement on the need to resist creating new layers and heavy bureaucracies. The paradigm of ‘global light’ was conceptualised mainly as arranging meetings back-to-back with other international high level meetings, focusing on issues at the political level rather than working level and creating synergies and ensuring cost-effectiveness wherever possible. Ministerial meetings were not envisioned to necessarily take place on a yearly basis, with several participants advocating a less frequent meeting cycle of every two or three years.

22. As regards to institutional anchoring of the partnership, several participants envisioned organising the ministerial meetings of the Global Partnership back-to-back with the UNDCF and DAC High Level meetings, alternating between the two. The Chair invited partner countries to consider, whether they would be interested to take on a role in hosting and organising events of the Global Partnership, with a view to strengthening ownership and country level linkages of the Partnership.

IV. Monitoring Framework post Busan

23. The group’s discussions on the post-Busan monitoring framework included an exchange of initial views on the “what”, “who” and “how” of future monitoring [see DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)3]. In considering general criteria for the scope of global monitoring efforts, the following issues arose as key elements to guide further work:

i. Country-level monitoring provides the foundation for reviewing progress. Building capacity and strengthening systems for monitoring is essentially linked to developing country level monitoring frameworks.

ii. Country level monitoring must include flexibility to reflect specific country contexts and development co-operation priorities and could benefit from a menu of options provided at global level.

iii. Monitoring progress in implementing Busan commitments requires both qualitative and quantitative analysis. Existing information and analysis should be used to the maximum extent possible, combining quantitative and qualitative inputs from various sources.

iv. A distinction should be made between assessing behavioural change and assessing outcomes. While efforts to monitor the results of development co-operation are important, the commitment contained in paragraph 35 of the Busan Partnership document focuses on monitoring effectiveness of development cooperation.

v. In keeping with the nature of the BPd, participation in monitoring efforts is voluntary. At the same time, exchange of knowledge between all actors in development cooperation is strongly encouraged to facilitate sharing of lessons and mutual learning.

24. While country level monitoring was agreed to provide the basis for reviewing implementation of Busan commitments, the question of how to link country level to global level monitoring requires further elaboration. Particularly the question of whether country level information should be directly aggregated
to global level will need to be addressed. Some participants envisioned a role for regional organisations in gathering country level evidence and feeding it to the global level. The Chair invited AUC to include this aspect into its forthcoming proposal (see above para 18).

25. Regarding indicators at the global level, several participants advocated for a certain degree of continuity and comparability to enhance coherence in reviewing progress. It was noted that certain themes and commitments may be more appropriate to monitor at global level than others and that careful consideration should be given to the global or country specific nature of different commitments.

26. While there was broad consensus that future monitoring should build maximally on existing information, there were varying views in the group of the extent to which the post-Busan monitoring framework should introduce new indicators and methodology in the run-up to 2015. There was general consensus that not all Paris Declaration Survey indicators merit continuation, but that some indicators would nonetheless maintain their relevance post Busan. Several participants brought up the need for a certain degree of flexibility in the indicators to allow for possible revisions post-2015.

27. The group emphasised the difference between monitoring behavioural change and monitoring development outcomes. Some participants pointed out that there already exist monitoring mechanisms for development results (e.g. MDG monitoring) and that duplication in approaches should be avoided. While the majority supported a general shift of focus from input-output-analysis to examining results and outcomes, participants emphasised the importance of behavioural change to support strengthened results. Several partner countries underlined the value of monitoring behavioural change for informing dialogue between government and development partners.

28. Brazil and Mexico indicated that, as providers of south-south cooperation, they are not at this stage in a position to be associated with the future monitoring framework. They emphasised the need to take into account the differential and voluntary nature of commitments as stated in the Busan Partnership document and the longer time frame necessary for providers of south-south cooperation to adapt to the post-Busan framework. At the same time, several participants emphasised that increased information on all forms of development cooperation would be desirable to facilitate knowledge exchange and mutual learning, and to this end voluntary reporting by providers of south-south cooperation was seen as a viable means to make relevant information available.

29. Regarding the process for agreeing on a monitoring framework, there was broad recognition of the urgent need for more detailed elaboration on key questions. The option of setting up task teams was explored, but did not receive broad support. To structure the consultation and ensure coherence of inputs, it was agreed that the Secretariat will issue a simple questionnaire that sets out a uniform set of questions. Inputs are invited from PIG members by the end of February.

Agenda item II revisited: Meetings schedule and key deliverables of the interim work process

30. Based on the discussions of previous agenda items, the group revisited the work plan for the interim period leading to June 2012. The Chair emphasised the importance of avoiding clashes with other major meetings while at the same time utilising possibilities for back-to-back arrangements and expressed the willingness to organise meetings outside of Paris. Participants voiced varying preferences regarding meeting dates and venues, but overall there was broad support for prioritising practicality and feasibility in meeting arrangements. It was agreed that, based on the discussions, the Secretariat would produce an updated proposal for the work process, including meeting dates as well as key deliverables and decision points.
31. To make progress on developing the working arrangements of the Global Partnership and the monitoring framework, the Chair invited inputs by 29 February 2012. (See Key decisions and follow-up below).

**Key decisions and follow-up**

- *Working arrangements of the PBIG*: Personal participation of each PBIG member in subsequent meetings is the first preference. In the event that this is not possible, the member may designate a representative to speak on their behalf. Each member shall have only one designated observer, who may represent him/her.

- *Ensuring consultation with relevant actors*: The Chair plans to consult a reference group representing key regional and functional entities that are not included in the PBIG but that can provide an important reference for the interim work process.

- *Broad engagement of stakeholders in the WP-EFF interim work process*: All stakeholders committed to implementing the Busan Partnership document are welcome to engage in this interim process to agree the post-Busan governance and monitoring framework. Such stakeholders are encouraged to contact the Secretariat for any additional information on participation in WP-EFF consultation.

- *Further elaboration on working arrangements for the Global Partnership*: The general framework of ministerial level political engagement and a steering committee operating at a lower level received strong support. At the same time participants agreed on the need for more detailed elaboration on how to put this into practice. The Chair invited the United Kingdom and the NEPAD Agency to develop, in collaboration with interested stakeholders, proposals on the governance structure and on the role of regional organisations respectively. PBIG members are invited to contribute inputs to these themes either i) through the United Kingdom and/or the African Union Commission; or ii) directly to the Secretariat by 29 February.

- *Further elaboration on the post-Busan monitoring framework*: Inputs are invited through a simple questionnaire, which should be submitted to the Secretariat by 29 February.

- *Finalising agreement on the WP-EFF interim work process*: Based on the PBIG discussions, the Secretariat has produced an updated and revised version of the document *Interim Work Process of the WP-EFF January-June 2012* [DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)1/REV1] to propose a more detailed plan of work, including dates for future meetings of the Post-Busan Interim Group and their expected deliverables as well as timing of opportunities for consultation and inputs from the broad membership of the WP-EFF and other interested stakeholders. Further comments and feedback on the proposed timing of PBIG meetings are welcome.
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