



Workshop Summary

**Monitoring Effective Development Co-operation:  
What have we achieved? How can we do better?**

© Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation, 2016  
[www.effectivecooperation.org](http://www.effectivecooperation.org)

## Monitoring Effective Development Co-operation: What have we achieved? How can we do better?

29 November 2016 – 09:00 to 18:00 – Amphitheatre, Kenyatta International Conference Centre (Nairobi, Kenya)

A full-day workshop attended by 32 panellists and 495 participants, including representatives from governments, development agencies, civil society, the business sector, foundations, parliaments, and trade unions took place on 29 November 2016, within the context of preparations for the Second High-Level Meeting (HLM2) of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation.

The workshop took stock of progress in implementing the commitments for more effective development co-operation agreed in Busan, mapping existing bottlenecks and discussing possible solutions to move the agenda forward. The workshop also took stock of emerging challenges for development effectiveness, and reflected on how to update the existing global monitoring framework so it is fit for purpose in the context of the Addis Ababa Agenda for Action and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

### Session 1. Overview of the 2016 monitoring round

**The 2016 monitoring round saw record participation by all Global Partnership stakeholders.** Eighty-one low and middle income countries led national monitoring processes, with the participation of 125 development agencies, and hundreds of representatives from civil society organisations (CSOs), the private sector, trade unions, and others. In meeting the internationally-agreed commitments for more effective development co-operation, agreed in Busan in 2011, the findings reveal significant areas of progress, some lagging behind, and some areas that show promising start and potential for the future. The first session of this full-day workshop was an opportunity for different Global Partnership stakeholders to react these findings, from a country perspective as well as from the perspective of global consultation processes held ahead of HLM2.

The [summary video](#) and opening remarks highlighted the progress reported in the 2016 monitoring round, but also mapped the challenges ahead. The monitoring evidence, when looked at in detail, reveals individual stories of progress, even in very difficult areas. Most of these stakeholders showing progress in difficult areas (such as strengthening and using domestic systems to deliver development co-operation, in increasing predictability of their support, or in systematically engaging CSOs) can lead in this “race to the top” by helping the Global Partnership understand the drivers of change, and in promoting mutual learning and joint action. There was a call for identifying and sharing innovative approaches to solve current bottlenecks in the development effectiveness agenda.

Panellists took stock of progress to date at global and country level and consultations held prior to the Nairobi High-Level Meeting. In the run-up to Nairobi, participating countries and CSOs gathered together around the monitoring findings in senior-level meetings in four continents; development partners also met to discuss the monitoring findings in different meetings; and inputs from the broad Global Partnership community were gathered throughout online consultation processes.

Those stakeholder consultations around the monitoring findings highlighted some shared themes, captured during the workshop opening dialogue:

1. The **record levels of participation** and **diversity of participants** in the **second monitoring round** illustrate the continued relevance of the exercise, the strength of the development effectiveness agenda, and the broadened scope and complexity of the current international architecture for development co-operation;
2. Consultations with **participating countries** have shown **continued commitment** to this agenda since Paris/Accra/Busan, with progress in several commitments that reflect concerted efforts to reformulate development co-operation policies, management practices, and closer collaboration among development partners. However, partner countries highlighted **emerging challenges in transitioning out of traditional bilateral assistance** into the more diverse development co-operation landscape that currently characterises most countries – but particularly middle income countries such as Vietnam or the Dominican Republic.
3. **Development partners** praised improvements in carrying out and reporting on the second monitoring round, suggesting that this is a good time to take stock of methodologies and processes and **update the framework for the future**. In peer dialogue, partners also have called for an honest conversation and innovative solutions around the **‘unfinished business’** of the Paris/Accra/Busan agenda, including regarding the use of country systems and other commitments that have shown limited progress. In a particular note, the group of Arab donors highlighted their efforts to implement the Busan agenda, with progress reflected in the monitoring round, and renewed commitment to these effectiveness principles.
4. **Developing meaningful multi-stakeholder partnerships proved to be one of the most difficult, but necessary, endeavours**. The monitoring round showed that countries resort to diverse modalities to engage civil society and the private sector in dialogue and joint action. However, the lack of instruments or skills, as well as specific country regulations and practices, prevent the development and institutionalisation of good engagement mechanisms. The consultations highlighted the need to better measure the quality of partnerships using transparent methods and ensuring neutrality in the assessments. A key message is that *multi-stakeholder partnerships* are a *means* to achieve an enabling environment that could allow the participation of every stakeholder in their own capacity, toward the ultimate *end* of democratic ownership of development processes.

## Session 2. Increasing the focus on development results

The commitment to manage for development results formulated in Paris in 2005 was renewed in Busan five years ago. The monitoring round revealed that:

- Countries have made **very good progress in articulating the development results they wish to achieve** – most now have a single strategic plan that defines development priorities, typically including a results framework. Together, these documents set a clear path forward. However, these plans and frameworks need to be more actionable (i.e. setting realistic and measurable goals, linked to clear actions that are reflected in national budgets). Embedding the SDGs in these national development plans and frameworks is still a challenge and at early stages. Finally, results information need to be used to inform future decision-making in a more systematic way.
- **Development partners also show a good level of alignment with countries' priorities.** The objectives of 85% of all new development programmes and projects support objectives established in government-led development plans and strategies. However, while alignment to broad objectives is good, **use of country-led results frameworks and monitoring and evaluation systems is weaker.** Only 62% of results being pursued by these programmes and projects overlap with government development targets, and the reliance on government data and statistics falls to 52% on average. Social sectors, such as health and education, show both better quality government strategies and greater use of country results frameworks by *some* development partners (i.e. those with that particular sector focus).
- Finally, findings revealed that **final evaluations are being mainstreamed** across development interventions, but **partner countries are only engaged in less than half of these evaluations**, and typically only in defining the evaluation scope.

During the discussion, partner countries like Uganda indicated that the overall picture closely reflects their actual experience. National development plans are set and partners align to these broadly stated objectives, but the level of embedding of development co-operation in planning and managerial practices still could be much more substantive and systematic.

Echoing the monitoring findings, participants in the discussion raised the following key points:

1. There was a call to move towards setting up the **same development targets, joining actions to achieve these goals, and using the same follow-up mechanisms** to track development impact;
2. Governments and development partners may need to make their policy-making and implementation processes **more inclusive**, not just at the planning level as it is prioritised at the moment, but also in the implementation and monitoring of progress towards development results;
3. Governments and development partners agreed that **strengthening monitoring and evaluation systems at the country level is a prerequisite and pending challenge for most developing countries**, and much more joint support in building domestic monitoring and evaluation capabilities and in increasing availability of disaggregated data on results by geo/socio/demographic characteristics are needed going forward;

4. Development partners such as UNICEF argued that **transformations of corporate results frameworks and internal IT data generation systems should evolve to accommodate countries' own results frameworks and data needs, and not the other way around**. These internal investments should be coupled with adequate corporate policies (e.g. open data) and practices (e.g. timely data release for managerial purposes, IATI reporting) if partner governments are to be in a position to manage development co-operation with a results orientation beyond the planning phase. Understanding organisations' current programming practices and data-generation and sharing capabilities is a first step to inform change in corporate practices towards better embedding in countries' own planning and implementation processes.
5. Finally, **development co-operation planning and management practices are still largely output-driven, rather than focused towards development outcomes**. Governments and development partners still feel more comfortable focusing on outputs, because they are more immediate and often easier to measure and report on. Moving towards output-driven development co-operation will require building the capacities of all involved parties on managing for development results.

Participants acknowledged that the **transition from planning to managing for development results** ambitioned since 2005 is far from completed, and much more remains to be done by countries and development partners themselves. Achieving the results set in Agenda 2030 will require moving managerial practices in that direction, creating the right incentives and capabilities for sustained political and managerial leadership along the process.

Workshop participants voted a number of priorities going forward, from a menu of actions that could help strengthen the focus on results of development efforts:

### **Most voted priority actions to strengthen the focus on results**

#### ***Governments should:***

1. Strengthen participatory mechanisms to define national priorities, goals and targets, ensuring that no one is left behind.

#### ***Governments and Development Partners should:***

2. Support capacity building of governments and development partners to design results-based monitoring and evaluation frameworks, including establishing strong baselines, measurable indicators, and realistic targets.
3. Share the evidence and data on development results publicly with the broader development community.

#### ***Development partners should:***

4. Increase the use of countries' national statistics and monitoring systems as basis to track and report on results of development interventions.
5. Ensure that the use of country results information (targets, indicators and data) is incorporated into the design of new interventions.

### Session 3. Strengthening Country Ownership

The Busan commitments to strengthen country ownership of development processes included **strengthening countries' own institutions** to manage and channel development co-operation flows, increasing development partners' **use of country systems**, increasing the **short- and medium-term predictability** of development co-operation, and **untying aid** from procurement constraints imposed by donors. The monitoring findings revealed a mixed picture in this area:

- Countries are experiencing **challenges in improving budgetary and public financial management** (PFM) practices in a sustainable way. Only 11 countries managed to make progress since 2010, while 14 experienced declines in quality of PFM systems, and the rest did not observe major changes in quality. Peer learning and stock-taking of lessons learned in how to politically navigate these reform processes, not just as a technical exercise, is needed.
- Development partners' **reliance on countries' own PFM and procurement systems** to deliver development co-operation **has slightly improved** since 2010 – but some groups have experienced sharp increases in use of country systems, including many non-DAC bilateral agencies and some bilateral agencies from the OECD DAC. Pooling risk in common programmes supported by several development partners and experimenting with new/innovative support modalities were suggested to tackle the current bottlenecks in this area.
- Albeit not far from the targets established in Busan, there was little progress in annual and medium-term predictability of development co-operation in the past years. **Medium-term predictability** is particularly a constraint as it prevents proper government planning, medium-term perspective, and inclusion of development co-operation on national budgets scrutinised by local parliaments. PEFA assessments also systematically highlight the lack of that forward-looking information as one of countries' PFM systems more frequent weak spots.
- **Aid untying levels are hovering around the peak level** achieved in recent years. De facto aid untying is actually very low. It was suggested that further engaging donor country firms in procurement processes may increase the share of de jure/de facto tied aid, and development partners should explore practices to increase the level of untied aid.

The very candid panel discussion around country ownership highlighted the following points, as a basis to move the ownership agenda forward:

1. Development partners indicated that **there are both technical and political obstacles to advance country ownership commitments** in practice. Development partners can more easily make progress on the “results” and “transparency and accountability” agendas, due to corporate incentives and domestic pressures, than on the country ownership agenda, where they face internal headwinds, including aversion to corruption risks and increased realignment of development co-operation with trade and investment strategies. There are domestic incentives to “show results” to taxpayers and to be transparent and accountable for the impact of development co-operation budgets in providing countries.
2. Countries signalled that the **country ownership agenda** is relevant to the entire policy and development co-operation management cycle, from strategic planning, budgeting, and

implementation, to monitoring and evaluation for results. Difficult issues such as weak predictability of development co-operation affect the full policy cycle, but with continuous interaction with development partners and clear government policies around development co-operation, progress in taking ownership of development co-operation is possible.

3. Several countries emphasised the **continuous importance of “using country systems”** to ensure stronger ownership and alignment of development co-operation, and to minimise transaction costs. USAID suggested that channelling development co-operation through local civil society organisations could be considered as using local systems and helping strengthen country ownership.
4. In the face of limited progress on commitments related to country ownership, several participants highlighted some silver linings, including:
  - a. **Multilateral organisations** were commended for their better performance in delivering on the ownership commitments, including by relying more on **programme-based approaches** and **new results-driven modalities** which are associated with increased use of country systems, but also possibly because they are more distanced from taxpayers’ domestic pressures, in comparison to bilateral agencies;
  - b. Multi-donor trust funds and other **modalities that pool risk** are allowing partners to rely further on country systems;
  - c. The results show that some local systems (such as budgeting, financial reporting, or auditing) are more used than others, and several interventions suggested the possibility to **move forward sequentially, using ‘safer’ systems as they are strengthened.**
  - d. The work of some GPIs (such as the **Effective Institutions Platform**) is exploring and piloting approaches to strengthen domestic institutions and increasing the reliance on local systems to deliver development co-operation (including PFM but using a broader definition of country systems);
  - e. **Aid untying and the emerging role of ODA as a catalyst of private sector support could be in tension**, and further efforts are needed to ensure that ODA mobilises domestic firms and suppliers and helps in developing the private sector in recipient countries – which starts by revising current procurement practices on basic elements such as language used in tendering processes and other good practices for competitive, locally focused procurement.
  - f. Countries **transitioning to the upper-middle income category** – and, thus, to more demand-driven and non-concessional forms of development support – find the current ownership dimensions monitored by GPEDC as less relevant, but acknowledge that there are other ownership challenges related to their specific development landscape and country characteristics that may merit dialogue and alternative monitoring (i.e. using different indicators).
5. The **role of the Global Partnership** in advancing this difficult agenda was acknowledged. As one of the few multi-stakeholder fora that exclusively focus on these issues, it is the adequate venue for an **honest dialogue** between development partners, **mutual learning** on practices that work, and the development of focused **communities of practices** that could help advance these thorny effectiveness issues.



Workshop participants were invited to discuss and vote around a menu of proposed actions and priority commitments to make advance the country ownership agenda:

### **Most voted priority actions to strengthen country ownership of development priorities**

***Governments should:***

1. Strengthen public financial management systems incrementally, by focusing on most pressing problems and customising diagnostics tools and solutions to country context.
2. Enhance parliamentary, civil society and private sector participation in the definition and monitoring and evaluation of development policies and programs.

***Development partners should:***

3. In supporting reforms to strengthen country systems, move from 'best practice' to 'best fit', carry out joint diagnostics, adopt flexible approaches and build a stronger evidence base on what works.

***Governments and development partners should:***

4. Link concrete programs to strengthen country systems (e.g. PFM, procurement) to broader public administration reforms (such as civil service reform).

## Session 4. Creating Inclusive Partnerships for Development

The monitoring framework for effective development co-operation endorsed in 2012 gave a distinctive importance to ensuring an enabling environment that could **maximise the contributions of civil society to development** and, in parallel, increase the contributions of the private sector to development by enhancing the **quality of public-private dialogue** – with two new GPEDC indicators tracking Busan commitments in that direction.

Overall, findings from the 2016 monitoring round suggest that:

- Countries and development partners have both made efforts to **establish consultation and engagement arrangements with CSOs**. CSOs also show good coordination and mobilisation around these processes. However, for a meaningful engagement, there is a need to institutionalise these mechanisms of engagement and feedback loops, ensure systematic consultation and inclusive participation, and do so across the entire policy cycle (not just at planning stage). At a global level, there is also limited progress in improving the legal and regulatory environment that could maximise CSO contributions to development.
- Both **governments and private sector actors show good disposition and readiness to engage** with each other in productive policy dialogue, but in half of the countries there are **no champions or facilitators** that could lead the public-private dialogue (PPD) platform and, in most countries, the **instruments, logistics, and skills** to support these dialogue platforms are missing. Case studies show that establishing effective PPD platforms that could inform policy, analysis, and steer public-private collaboration is a medium-term effort, which requires sustained engagement and useful outputs.

The subsequent panel discussion and dialogue with workshop participants generated the following key messages and considerations:

1. The multi-stakeholder approach adopted by the Global Partnership is generally very appreciated, as it allows **ensuring an inclusive monitoring process**, while also taking stock of **how inclusive development partnerships at the country level** currently are. There were calls to reinforce these two elements.
2. Participants noted that parallel studies and direct country-level experience showed that governments adopt a **broad array of different mechanisms and modes of engagement with civil society and private sector actors**, and it is unclear how these different approaches compare to each other in terms of **effectiveness, inclusiveness, and usefulness** to the relevant stakeholders.
3. It was argued that **to achieve meaningful dialogue and action** with civil society and the private sector there were several missing elements. The monitoring process indicated that there is a lack of instruments available to carry out these dialogue processes, limited feedback on how the inputs from civil society and private sector are taken up in defining national development plans and development policies and, often, stakeholders lack the skills and knowledge on how to jointly develop effective multi-stakeholder partnerships. Several participants called for a better understanding the **success factors**, while also providing **capacity building and guidance** to governments and CSOs in how to engage effectively in these partnerships.

4. There was a call to focus future commitments and Global Partnership monitoring **not just on the existence of mechanisms for dialogue, but also on joint action.**
  - a. Substantively, this requires updating existing arrangements for CSO and private sector engagement being used by governments and development partners on the basis of best practices. Peer learning could be an instrumental factor to help in the process, with the facilitating role of the Global Partnership.
  - b. Future Global Partnership monitoring may require **revising the two indicators** related to inclusive partnerships, to accommodate the lessons learned throughout the 2016 monitoring as well as the commitments included in the Nairobi Outcome document. An inclusive process to revise these indicators was requested.

After the discussion, participants prioritised some actions from a menu of options to enhance inclusiveness of development partnership in the coming years:

### **Most voted priority actions to strengthen inclusive partnerships for development**

#### ***Governments and Development Partners should:***

1. Increase the number and quality of partnerships with businesses, civil society, philanthropies, parliaments, subnational governments and trade unions to achieve development goals.
2. Establish inclusive mechanisms for dialogue and engagement with civil society organisations, with clear goals, mandates and expected results.

#### ***Governments should:***

3. Improve the policy, legal and regulatory environment so civil society and business can maximize their contribution to development.

#### ***Development Partners should:***

4. Support the capacity of governments to establish and carry out multi-stakeholder partnerships.

## Session 5. Improving Transparency and Accountability

Discussions in previous sessions highlighted how different dimensions of transparency and accountability are crucial factors shaping development effectiveness (e.g. transparency and accountability around development results; inclusive arrangements to engage civil societies in implementing and monitoring development co-operation). This session reviewed progress to date on several Busan commitments for stronger transparency and accountability around development co-operation.

Overall, the monitoring findings show that **more information on development co-operation is publicly available** than ever before, and governments are increasingly making **budget allocations more transparent**, but **accountability arrangements** still need to be updated to the current development landscape:

- Development partners have made **progress in making information on development co-operation publicly available**. First, the number of development partners voluntarily reporting to the three systems and standards (hosted by IATI and OECD) more than doubled compared to 2013. Second, the information being published is **more comprehensive** than three years ago. The biggest challenges to make information available remain in releasing **forward-looking information**, and in ensuring that information is both timely and accurate. Going forward it will be essential to ensure that the information has been integrated in countries' own systems and can be used for management purposes and for accountability towards citizens. In the context of Agenda 2030, increasing the public availability and legibility of information on development co-operation results will also be critical.
- Development cooperation is **increasingly recorded on annual budgets** subjected to parliamentary scrutiny (67% compared to 54% in 2010). Key hurdles to increase the share of development co-operation on annual budgets include: scarce availability of development co-operation forecasts accessible by governments in a timely manner; weaknesses on countries' own budgetary processes; and fragmented or volatile presence of any given development partner in a country, which prevents adapting the reporting practices to country information needs.
- The number of countries **tracking gender budget allocations almost doubled** – going forward, these tracking systems need to be more organised and information need to be made public.
- The number of countries with **inclusive and transparent mutual accountability review processes slightly decreased**. Previous government-donor arrangements around traditional providers and official development assistance need updating to the new actors in the broader development landscape, and need to become more transparent and inclusive of parliaments, civil society and other relevant stakeholders.

The discussion among panellists and with workshop participants highlighted the following key messages:

1. Transparency is an important precondition, but needs to be reenergised to lead to meaningful accountability. Recent gains in terms of publishing data on inputs are good news, and now it is important to place efforts in **making information on development results**

**publicly available.** Some examples mentioned included the geo-coding and mapping of development results initiatives, and the World Bank Global Delivery initiative (i.e. a database on delivery of results where people can see the rate of success of projects, almost in real time).

2. Part of the equation, in light of the Agenda 2030 goals, is producing results data disaggregated by gender and by other socio demographics (including marginalised groups) to understand **who is being left behind in terms of results**. Data should be used to increase the visibility of all groups in the policy-making process.
3. Building trust between development partners takes time, and practices to increase transparency and mutual accountability are **incrementally adopted**. It is important to look at working relations between governments and development partners (e.g. at how line ministries access to the information provided by the development partners).
4. **Gender** is a crosscutting issue and **needs to be mainstreamed** across government sectors. It is crucial to implement gender equality policies across all sectors; invest in women to empower them politically; and also develop the capacity of civil society and other actors to engage. Cote d'Ivoire presented their approach to mainstream gender across the government, where 14 teams have been established in different ministries. Sector co-ordination mechanisms and indicators for measuring gender inequality and showing results are also critical ingredients. An actionable strategy is needed to ensure that there is progress in the measured indicators.
5. There were some calls to include **country-level transparency measures**, for both the government and development partners, in country level monitoring supported by the Global Partnership.
6. Development co-operation is no longer only official development assistance. This positive change adds complexity in **adapting mutual accountability arrangements** at country level. This is crucial to ensure transparency and accountability of all development actors to achieve the objectives of Agenda 2030.

Following the dialogue, workshop participants voted on a number of forward-looking priorities to strengthen transparency and mutual accountability, from a menu of actions:

### **Most voted priority actions to strengthen transparency and accountability**

#### ***Governments should:***

1. Link aid and partnership policies to national development strategies and national budgets.
2. Reinforce budget-planning processes to increase reporting of development co-operation on budgets submitted for parliamentary approval.
3. Publish regular, timely and detailed information on national/subnational budgets, budget execution reports and related audits, and make it accessible to the public.

#### ***Development partners should:***

4. Facilitate the use of information on development co-operation at country level making it accessible, usable and facilitating its inclusion on national planning and budget systems.

## Session 6. Updating and Refining the Global Partnership’s Monitoring Framework for the Future

The 2011 Busan Partnership agreement – and the ensuing monitoring framework to track the implementation of that agreement – already captured some elements of the fast-changing development co-operation landscape, its new actors and emerging global issues, while preserving the core aid effectiveness agenda inherited from the Paris Declaration monitoring processes.

However, the picture continues changing at a fast speed, and the **ambitions of the Post-2015 development agenda** include making a reality the goals of Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development throughout an effective use of development finance as set in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. Ensuring that we meet these ambitions creates a healthy pressure to **revise and update the Global Partnership monitoring framework, to ensure that we track the core elements for effective development co-operation**, and to expand the coverage to the broader scope of development co-operation financing and actors. Moreover, after two rounds of monitoring process, we have accumulated a precious wealth of lessons on how to conduct country-led monitoring processes effectively, inclusively, and accurately. These two elements drive current work to update this effectiveness framework.

The OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team presented **nine parameters for updating the monitoring framework**, based on the [technical work and advice](#) provided by the Global Partnership’s [Monitoring Advisory Group](#) since May 2015, as well as online and in-person consultations with the broad array of stakeholders and policy networks that participate in the Global Partnership community. In addition to [fine-tuning current indicators](#) to ensure their relevance, efficiency, and usefulness, the [nine parameters](#) for updating the framework presented by the Joint Support Team were:

1. Adapting the monitoring framework to reflect the realities and effectiveness challenges of **middle-income countries** as well (e.g. quality of technical co-operation, non-concessional financing, south-south co-operation, dual role as providers and recipients);
2. Strengthening indicator on **public-private dialogue** to move focus from dialogue to action;
3. Considering an indicator on **blended finance** effectiveness as a way to capture the quality of private sector engagement;
4. Considering an indicator reflecting the quality of engagement of **philanthropic organisations/private foundations** in development processes;
5. Clarifying the relevance of the monitoring framework for **climate finance**;
6. Considering a holistic, **“whole-of-government” approach**;
7. Enhancing **providers’ engagement** linking commitments with policies and regulations at headquarter level and practice at country level;
8. Strengthening the **multi-stakeholder engagement** in the monitoring process;
9. Ensuring balance between **simplified framework and indicators and meaningful information**.

To make the Global Partnership’s monitoring more effective and useful, panellists and participants raised the following proposals:

1. Balance **simplicity** of the monitoring framework and process, which is demanded by several stakeholders, with the need for useful, relevant information for mutual learning and accountability purposes.
2. Raise **awareness** among relevant stakeholders, **empower** them and **facilitate** their participation during **the monitoring process and beyond**. Several participants highlighted that the monitoring process still has a distinctive government flavour, both in substantive focus and in engagement, despite the multi-stakeholder approach of the Global Partnership monitoring. The quality of engagement by all the actors determines the quality of the data.
3. Make efforts to **expand the coverage of the monitoring framework** beyond ODA (e.g. non concessional public financing, blended financing) and beyond the traditional North-South development partnerships, engaging the full array of development partners and stakeholders.
4. Ensure that the **results of the monitoring are used**, widely known, and drive action and implementation. Facilitate knowledge-sharing, **peer-to-peer** exchanges and collective learning, particularly in areas where it has been difficult to make progress.
5. Understand the **incentives of actors** to participate in this voluntary exercise, in order to review the process to maximise their engagement and the impact of multi-stakeholder monitoring. Competition around rankings, lower costs of participation, and increased benefits from availability of relevant evidence are some of the suggested elements that can help strengthen the monitoring framework and process.

## Closing

During this session, facilitators of the day discussions on focus on results, country ownership, inclusive partnerships, and transparency and mutual accountability were invited to sum-up conclusions reached during the workshop, identifying key areas for improvement going forward. Alongside recapping the most voted actions of each session, facilitators highlighted the following additional key messages coming from discussions:

- National results frameworks should include sector and sub-national plans to increase the focus on results. Using sound results frameworks can have a positive effect in ensuring greater country ownership, mutual accountability and transparency.
- Monitoring and evaluation systems should be improved to inform decision making and learning across all levels.
- Country ownership is crucial for development co-operation results to be sustainable.
- This is not only a technical agenda, but a highly political one. Identifying the right incentives to ensure political buy-in, using context-sensitive approaches, breaking silos and promoting inter-regional exchanges can help increasing ownership.
- To increase transparency and accountability, aid and partnership policies should be linked to national development strategies and national budgets. Budgeting processes should in their turn be more holistic, inclusive and transparent.
- Data on development co-operation should not only be published timely but it is crucial ensuring that information is accessible at country level and responsive to the needs of the users.
- Multi-stakeholder dialogues are in place but their quality needs to improve and an enabling environment needs to be secured to ensure fully inclusive partnership.
- The Global Partnership has a clear role to play in nourishing trust among its stakeholders, which is a pre-requisite for minimising the perception of risk and ensuring inclusive partnerships for development.

Finally, participants reaffirmed the unique role of the Global Partnership in the implementation of development effectiveness principles through driving accountability, supporting governments in creating permanent dialogue systems, and strengthening mutual trust among all stakeholders.

## Related documents

2016 Monitoring Report - [Full Report](#)

Summary ([EN](#) / [ES](#) / [FR](#) )

[Summary Video](#)

[Web streaming](#) of the Monitoring Workshop

[Nairobi Outcome document](#)

[MAG final report](#)

[MAG compendium](#) of recommendations to strengthen the monitoring framework