

Goal 17: Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development

Target 17.16: Enhance the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development, complemented by multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals in all countries, in particular developing countries

Indicator 17.16.1: Number of countries reporting progress in multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks that support the achievement of the sustainable development goals

Institutional information

Organization(s):

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Concepts and definitions

Definition:

The indicator tracks the number of countries reporting progress in multi stakeholder monitoring frameworks that track the implementation of development effectiveness commitments supporting the achievement of sustainable development goals (SDGs).

Rationale:

Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals requires mobilizing and strengthening multi stakeholder partnerships that can bring and effectively use all the available knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources for sustainable development. The quality of the relationship between all the relevant partners defines the strength of the global partnership for sustainable development.

The indicator provides a measure of countries' efforts to enhance these multi stakeholder partnerships, and by extension the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development, by looking at progress made on a set of indicators that track how well country governments and development partners are working together towards sustainable development.

Reflecting the spirit of the global partnership for sustainable development, and the universal nature of the SDGs, the indicator monitors the contribution and behaviour of both developed and developing countries in establishing more effective, inclusive multi-stakeholder partnerships to support and sustain the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. It does so by measuring their respective but differentiated commitments to strengthen the quality of their development partnerships.

Concepts:

Using a minimal definition, “multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks” that track effective development cooperation are monitoring frameworks: whose indicators have been agreed on a voluntary basis; whose indicators measure the strength of the relationship between development actors; where data collection and review is led by the countries themselves; and where participation in data collection and review involves relevant multi-stakeholder representing, at minimum, the public sector, the private sector and civil society organizations.

The indicator takes into account the need to capture the respective roles and responsibilities of all parties involved in multi-stakeholder partnerships for development. It does so by looking at development effectiveness frameworks that are led by countries but include the participation of all relevant development partners.

The *Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation* (Global Partnership) monitoring framework is an example of existing development effectiveness monitoring frameworks. There are other complementary efforts, such as the *ECOSOC Development Cooperation Forum* (DCF) mutual accountability survey. Emerging and future monitoring frameworks that fit the above definition, such as recent efforts to track South-South Cooperation by *SEGIB*, could also be considered.

Comments and limitations:

The design of the indicator has practical benefits:

- (a) the indicator allows for relevant monitoring frameworks to be updated in line with evolving commitments and country specific context without affecting the spirit of the indicator;
- (b) the indicator does not presume a globally-set multi-stakeholder framework, acknowledging the diversity of complementary efforts supporting effective development cooperation;
- (c) the indicator allows participating countries to choose whether they would like to report as a provider of development co-operation, as a recipient, or both.

Data collection for the Global Partnership monitoring framework is led by developing countries. Progress of developed countries in implementing development effectiveness commitments is captured through their partnership behaviour in those developing countries. Depending on each case, middle income countries that currently are both recipient and providers of development cooperation opt to report in their role as recipient and/or provider of development cooperation. Other developing and/or developed countries could be included through their future participation in the OECD and UNDP data collection, or through their reporting to complementary monitoring frameworks on a regular basis.

Methodology

Computation Method:

To reflect the universal nature of target 17.16 this indicator is presented as the global aggregate number of countries reporting progress. For any country reporting towards one (or more) multi-stakeholder development effectiveness framework(s), the country is considered to be reporting progress when, for the year of reference, the number of indicators within the framework(s) that show a positive trend is greater than the number of indicators that show a negative trend.

Countries providing development co-operation funding and reporting in multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks are assessed against the following elements:

1. *Aligning to country-defined development priorities:* Percentage of new development interventions that align their objectives to country priorities set in country-led results frameworks.
2. *Using country-led results frameworks:* Percentage of results indicators in new development interventions drawn from country-led results frameworks.
3. *Using national monitoring and statistical systems:* Percentage of results indicators in new development interventions monitored using government statistics, data and monitoring systems.
4. *Using national evaluation systems:* Percentage of new interventions that plan a final evaluation with some country government involvement.
5. *Transparency of development co-operation:* Public availability of information on development co-operation according to international reporting standards.
6. *Annual predictability of development co-operation:* Proportion of development co-operation funding disbursed within the fiscal year within which it was scheduled by providers of development co-operation.
7. *Medium-term predictability of development co-operation:* Share of development cooperation plans (for the next three years) made available to recipient countries for planning purposes.
8. *Development co-operation on budgets overseen by national parliaments:* Proportion of development co-operation funding recorded in national annual budgets of partner countries and subjected to parliamentary scrutiny.
- *Development co-operation delivered through country systems:* Proportion of development co-operation delivered according to national regulations and systems for public financial management (i.e. budgeting, financial reporting, auditing) and procurement.

- *Untied Aid*: Proportion of development co-operation that is untied¹

Countries receiving development co-operation funding and reporting in multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks are assessed against the following elements:

1. *Leading in setting up national priorities*: Existence of country-led results frameworks.
2. *Creating an enabling environment for civil*: Assessment of the extent to which civil society organizations operate within an environment that maximises their contribution to development.
3. *Creating quality public-private dialogue*: Assessment of the current quality of public-private dialogue to promote private sector engagement and contribution to development.
4. *Recording development co-operation on budgets overseen by national parliaments*: Proportion of development co-operation funding recorded in national annual budget subjected to parliamentary scrutiny.
5. *Strengthening mutual accountability*: Transparent, inclusive mutual assessment reviews at country level are in place.
6. *Strengthening gender equality and women's empowerment*: Existence of transparent government systems to track public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment
7. *Strengthening domestic institutions*: Quality of the country's budgetary and public financial management.

Countries providing and receiving development co-operation funding are invited to select whether they would like to report against provider-specific commitments, against recipient-specific commitments, or against both sets of commitments.

The baseline for counting progress is the latest measurement available for each specific country, dating back to 2010¹. When no baseline exists for a country, the first measurement available for an indicator constitutes the baseline for future measurements of progress.

When a country meets and sustains all targets for the indicators it reports on (i.e. it is logically impossible to make further progress) it is considered as "making progress".

Disaggregation:

The indicator presented as a global aggregate is generated through a bottom-up approach whereby data is collected at the country level and can therefore be disaggregated back at the level of countries (for both development cooperation providers and recipients) for national analysis and mutual dialogue. The

¹ Estimates currently available for countries that are members of the OECD Development Assistance Committee.

data can also be further disaggregated according to individual indicators (i.e. specific dimensions of effective development cooperation) that are included within the multi- stakeholder frameworks.

To foster regional policy dialogue, disaggregation at the regional level is possible and encouraged. Some existing platforms are already using the evidence for regional monitoring, learning and policy discussions (e.g. NEPAD in Africa, the Asia-Pacific Development Effectiveness Facility in Asia-Pacific, the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, the UN Regional Economic Commissions).

Treatment of missing values:

- [At country level](#)

There is no treatment done for missing values. However, missing information is highlighted during data validation processes and stakeholders are asked to fill in these gaps.

An estimate of the representativeness of the sample is calculated. This estimate of coverage relies on Country Programmable Aid from the OECD Credit Reporting System.

- [At regional and global levels](#)

No imputation is done for missing values. However, missing information is highlighted during data validation processes and stakeholders are asked to fill in these gaps.

An estimate of the representativeness of the sample is calculated. This estimate of coverage relies on Country Programmable Aid from the OECD Credit Reporting System.

Regional aggregates:

Regional estimates are not provided as the indicator looks at the interface between development partners and country governments.

Global estimates are calculated as the simple sum of the number of countries in the world who have made progress in multistakeholder development effectiveness frameworks.

Sources of discrepancies:

The national figures are directly aggregated to come up with global estimates.

Data Sources

Description:

The monitoring is a voluntary and country led process. Country governments lead and coordinate data collection and validation. At country level, data are reported by relevant government entities (e.g. the Ministry of finance/budget department for national budget information) and by development partners and stakeholders. OECD and UNDP are supporting developing countries in collecting relevant data on a biennial basis through the Global Partnership monitoring framework, and these organisations lead data aggregation and quality assurance at the global level. In addition, countries are increasingly institutionalising the data collection process within their national aid management systems, public financial management systems, and are reporting on a yearly basis.

Complementarily, the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs has been conducting a regular survey for the Development Cooperation Forum, in cooperation with UNDP, to identify national progress in mutual accountability and transparency. Survey results are assessed in comprehensive studies, informing global monitoring and providing practical suggestions for improving development results. Synergies with the measurement of indicator 7 of the Global Partnership monitoring framework are being used. Other complementary sources of data (i.e. additional multi- stakeholder frameworks) may be incorporated in the future to provide a broader picture of progress made by countries towards development effectiveness in support of SDG implementation.

Collection process:

(i) For the data collection process of the Global Partnership's monitoring exercise, a national coordinator is assigned from the country government. S/he typically comes from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Finance, or the Ministry of Planning.

(ii) The national coordinator in turn consults with other stakeholders (including country offices of providers of development co-operation, Civil Society Organisations, the private sector, and trade unions) to gather and validate data.

The data is then validated by headquarters offices of providers of development co-operation.

(iii) No adjustments are made to submitted data, given that the validation process needs to stay at country level. However, inconsistencies or possible problematic values are highlighted and sent back to national co-ordinators for revision.

Data Availability

Description:

"Global aggregates are available for the 2006, 2008, and 2011 surveys on monitoring the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, as well as the 2013 2014 GPEDC monitoring exercise. The 2015-2016 Global Partnership monitoring results will be available in September 2016.

Calendar

Data collection:

Data is collected biennially, starting from the year 2014. Monitoring rounds have been planned for years 2016, 2018, 2020, 2022, 2024, 2026, 2028, and 2030. Data generated by countries for 2016 was made available to country level, regional and global reporting processes on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

Data release:

Data release at global level is scheduled for the first quarter in the year that immediately follows the national data gathering processes.

Data providers

Name:

Leading central ministry from reporting countries. Typically the ministry of finance, the ministry of planning, ministry of development, or the ministry of foreign affairs, depending on the division of labour within each government.

Description:

Representatives from the leading ministry in country governments –typically the ministry of finance, the ministry of planning, ministry of development, or the ministry of foreign affairs- are responsible for leading the national data gathering process and country-level validation. These representatives coordinate the data collection process at the national level by consolidating data and inputs from providers of development co-operation, Civil Society Organisations, the private sector, and trade unions. For global aggregation and calculation of indicator 17.16.1, country governments submit the data to the OECD/UNDP Joint Support Team.

Data compilers

OECD and UNDP jointly compile and report the data at the global level.

References

URL:

<http://effectivecooperation.org/>

References:

Coppard, D. and C. Culey (2015). The Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation's Contribution to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Plenary Session 1 Background Paper. Busan Global Partnership Forum, Korea.

Espey, Jessica; K. Walecik and M. Kühner (2015). Follow-up and Review of the SDGs: Fulfilling our Commitments. Sustainable Development Solutions Network: A Global Initiative for the United Nations. New York: SDSN.

OECD/UNDP (2015). Monitoring Guide 2015-2016 for the Global Partnership Monitoring Framework. New York/Paris: Accessed at www.effectivecooperation.org

Hazlewood, P. (2015). Global Multi-stakeholder Partnerships: Scaling Up Public-Private Collective Impact for SDGs. Independent Research Forum, Background Paper 4: IRF2015.

Ocampo, J.A. and Gómez, N. (2014). Accountable and Effective Development Cooperation in a Post-2015 era. Background Study 3: Accountability for Development Cooperation. ECOSOC: DCG Germany High-Level Symposium.

Ocampo, Jose Antonio (2015). A Post-2015 Monitoring and Accountability Framework. UNDESA: CDP Background Paper No. 27. ST/ESA/2015/CDP/27

Related indicators

17.15 and 5c.