Goal 17: Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development
Target 17.15: Respect each country's policy space and leadership to establish and implement policies for poverty eradication and sustainable development
Indicator 17.15.1: Extent of use of country-owned results frameworks and planning tools by providers of development cooperation

Institutional information

Organization(s):

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Concepts and definitions

Definition:

This indicator measures the extent to which, and the ways in which, all concerned development partners use country-led results frameworks (CRFs) to plan development cooperation efforts and assess their performance.

The indicator assesses the degree to which providers of development cooperation (i.e. development partners) design their interventions by relying on objectives and results indicators that are drawn from country government-led results frameworks reflecting the country's development priorities and goals.

Rationale:

Measuring the alignment of development partners' support to country priorities in terms of intervention design and type of results-reporting mechanisms provides a relevant assessment regarding the degree of "respect for each country's policy space and leadership to establish and implement country-owned policies for poverty eradication and sustainable development".

In particular, for interventions approved in the year of reference (i.e. most recent behaviour), the assessment measures the extent to which support from other countries and international organizations set exogenous priorities and conditions to partner countries receiving development co-operation that are not reflected in existing country-led priority-setting mechanisms or planning tools.

The information collected throughout the indicator provides a "two-way mirror", providing both a country-level estimate on a country's existing policy space, and a development partner-level estimate on

its degree of alignment with existing results frameworks and priority- setting mechanisms in partner countries where it operates.

Concepts:

Country results frameworks (CRFs) define a country's approach to results and its associated monitoring and evaluation systems focusing on performance and achievement of development results. Using a minimal definition, these results frameworks include agreed objectives and results indicators (i.e. output, outcome, and/or impact). They also set targets to measure progress in achieving the objectives defined in the government's planning documents.

The definition of country-led results framework used for this indicator allows the possibility to use equivalent priority-setting mechanisms at the country level since not all countries articulate their priorities through consistent, integrated CRFs.

In practice, government-led results frameworks defined at the country level are often broadly stated (e.g. long-term vision plans, national development strategies) and operationalised in more detail at the sector level (e.g. sector strategies), where specific targets and indicators are set for a given timeframe.

Some examples of CRFs are long-term vision plans; national development strategies; joint government-multi-donor plans; government's sector strategies, policies and plans; subnational planning instruments, as well as other frameworks (e.g. budget support performance matrices, sector-wide approaches). In contrast, planning and priority setting documents produced outside the government, such as country strategies prepared by development partners, are not considered CRFs.

Comments and limitations:

Data collection covered about 80 low and middle-income countries for the 2015-2016 period. The number of countries covered is expected to increase for the period 2018 and beyond. The estimates for high-income countries are generated taking as a reference their role as development cooperation providers.

The monitoring exercise collects data beyond the scope of the proposed indicator, including additional aspects such as government of development partners' engagement in planning project/programme evaluations.

Methodology

Computation Method:

To provide a comprehensive measure on the extent of use of country-owned results frameworks and other government-led planning tools, the indicator calculates the degree to which objectives, results indicators and monitoring frameworks associated with new development interventions are drawn from government sources –including national, sector and subnational planning tools.

For each development intervention of significant size (US$ 100,000 and above) approved during the year of reference, the following dimensions are assessed:

- Q1. Whether objectives are drawn from government-led results frameworks, plans and strategies 0/1

- Q2. Share of results (outcome) indicators that are drawn from government-led results frameworks, plans and strategies %

- Q3. Share of results (outcome) indicators that will rely on sources of data provided by existing country-led monitoring systems or national statistical services to track project progress %

Aggregated averages per partner country will provide an assessment of the country's available policy space and leadership.
All formulas are available at: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-17.pdf

Aggregated averages per development partner will indicate the percentage of alignment with country-led priority setting mechanisms. Formulas are available at: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-17.pdf

Note that data to weight the results by development partner's actual contributions in terms of development finance is available, if requested by the IAEG SDG / UN Statistical Commission.

A global aggregate for the indicator is obtained by averaging the three dimensions of alignment with country's priorities and goals across all new interventions for the reporting year. Formulas are available at: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-17.pdf

When aggregating, the size of the project/ intervention is not considered as weight in order to give the same level of importance to the extent of use of country-owned results frameworks and planning tools in medium-sized vs. larger projects, as the indicator tries to capture the overall behaviour of development partners in designing new interventions in a given country. Weighting by project size would otherwise over represent infrastructure projects and underrepresent interventions focused on influencing policies and institutional arrangements. Nevertheless, data on project size is available.

Disaggregation:

Given the bottom-up approach in generating the indicator, disaggregation will be possible at the country level, at the development partner level, at the sector level, and at the development project level.

While data collection is led at the country level, in a bottom-up approach, global and regional aggregates can be used for monitoring internationally-agreed commitments related to strengthening country ownership and better partner alignment with nationally-set development goals.

Treatment of missing values:

- At country level

  There is no treatment of missing values. However, a validation process involving representatives of country governments and country offices as well as headquarters offices of development partners takes place. Missing values are highlighted during this validation process, and attempts are made to fill in these gaps.

- At regional and global levels

  There is no imputation of missing values. Attempts are made to minimize gaps in data submissions during the data validation process including triangulation with headquarters offices of development partners.

Regional aggregates:

Global and regional estimates are constructed by making a simple average across all projects reported. It was decided not to use a weighted average to give equal consideration to small and large projects (although project amounts and type are captured in the data to allow for more advanced tabulations).

Sources of discrepancies:

National figures are directly aggregated to come up with global figures.

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 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.

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 collects inputs from development partners. The data is submitted to the OECD and UNDP monitoring team and subsequently undergoes a review round with the headquarters offices of development partners.
(iii) No adjustments are made to the data after they have undergone the validation process.

Data Availability

Eighty-one low and middle-income countries led the data collection process to set a baseline value for the year 2015. New measurements for the indicator are collected every two years in a number of countries, which is expected to increase for the period 2018 and beyond.

Data collected for the year 2015 set a baseline for those 81 low and middle-income countries and for at least 100 development partners –including the 29 countries that are members of the OECD's Development Assistance Committee and the six major multilateral organizations in terms of development finance (i.e. the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations Development Programme, African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank).

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 has been 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 - 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 development partners.

Data compilers

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

References

URL:

http://effectivecooperation.org/

Internationally   agreed   methodology   and   guideline   URL:
http://effectivecooperation.org/pdf/2018_Monitoring_Guide_National_Coordinator.pdf

References:

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

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.

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.

GPEDC (2018). 2018 *Monitoring Guide*. /Paris/New York. Available at:
http://effectivecooperation.org/pdf/2018_Monitoring_Guide_National_Coordinator.pdf

Related indicators

17.16.1. and 5c: