

Unclassified

DCD/DAC/EFF/M(2010)1/PROV



Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Économiques
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

22-Jun-2011

English - Or. English

DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE
Development Assistance Committee

DCD/DAC/EFF/M(2010)1/PROV
Unclassified

Working Party on Aid Effectiveness

DRAFT SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 16TH MEETING

OECD Paris, 27-28 October 2010

*This is the draft summary of the last meeting of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (27-28 October 2010).
This version incorporates comments received from UK and Belgium.*

Hubert de Milly, tel: +33 (0)1 45 24 98 32, e-mail: hubert.demilly@oecd.org

JT03304432

Document complet disponible sur OLIS dans son format d'origine
Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

English - Or. English

Day 1

I. Introduction

1. The sixteenth meeting of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF) took place in Paris on 27 and 28 October 2010. It was co-chaired by Mr. Talaat Abdel Malek and Mr. Koos Richelle. The full list of participants is set out in Annex 1.

2. Following adoption of the draft summary and draft agenda, the co-chair underlined the need to reach agreement at this meeting on the purpose of HLF-4, the event format, the key themes for discussion, the preparatory and consultation process as well as the budget and communications strategy.

II. Reporting on progress since the last WP-EFF meeting

3. The co-chair made a global report on progress since the last Working Party meeting in December 2009, highlighting in particular Executive Committee (ExCom) outcomes, key developments across clusters and work-streams and the latest updates on the focus country initiative. He recalled the main actionable points from the last WP-EFF meeting which included:

- Accelerating implementation at country level
- Better coordination & linkages across clusters
- Raising partner country participation & voice
- Ensuring timely information & evidence
- Presenting a Roadmap to HLF-4 by October 2010

4. Work is well underway, including at the country level. Most groups are on track to produce high quality evidence that is useful to practitioners and coordination across clusters and at country level has improved. Challenges remain in balancing technical and political aspects in some areas. Communication around the aid effectiveness agenda more generally is a challenge - the language and content must be simplified to better explain what the WP-EFF hopes to achieve at HLF-4. The co-chairs' presentation was complimented by more detailed information provided in writing through cluster and work-stream reports, an update on WP-EFF focus countries and a compendium of summaries of ExCom meetings.

III. HLF-4: Purpose of the Event

5. The co-chair invited the WP-EFF to set out its vision on the main purpose of HLF-4, specifying possible expected outcomes. Most participants underlined that HLF-4 should be a political event, attracting high level ministerial attendance. Bureaucracy should be streamlined to ensure a cost-effective event and a leaner, lighter structure going forward focussed on implementation and results at the country level. While some cautioned against too narrow a focus on aid, several participants considered the main objective of HLF-4 to be two-fold:

- Draw conclusions from the PD/AAA process (stocktaking, results)
 - Focus on aid effectiveness
 - Draw conclusions on what has worked, what has not worked and why
 - Identify issues that need further work (change is long term)
- Maintain focus on aid while situating it in the broader development context (forward looking)
 - Take into account the changed environment and a broader range of actors and partnerships

- Take into account the impact and role of aid on the broader development agenda (ex. MDGs, PCD, global public goods, mobilisation of domestic resources, stimulation of private investment to support growth ...).

6. Building on the lessons from Accra, most participants considered it too early to pin down the detail on the process and content of the outcome document. This should be deliberated throughout 2011 as expected evidence becomes available. The preparation process should start at the July 2011 WP-EFF plenary. At this stage, there was broad agreement that any outcome document should be short, political, with a possible technical section on implementation. The majority considered the outcome should only be finalised in Busan itself, with the exception of two participants who favoured a consensus text agreed in advance.

IV. HLF-4: Event Format

7. The Secretariat presented the proposed format for the HLF-4, referring in particular to the three categories of discussions outlined in the draft Roadmap: 1) Plenary: opening and closing sessions, kept open for ad hoc reporting back throughout the 3 days; 2) Interactive sessions: lively exchanges informed by evidence; 3) Political debates: aimed at filling the blanks in the outcome document on issues where agreement has not yet been reached. Regarding the latter, 2 options are on the table: A) short, successive political debates with restricted representation and strong pressure to conclude within limited timeframe (3 hours approximately); OR B) longer, parallel political debates (up to 1.5 days) with larger participation and regular updates to the plenary. A hybrid of the two is also possible. The ultimate objective is to ensure an enabling structure for a successful conference in Busan.

8. While it is too early to agree the detail on the HLF-4 format, the WP-EFF expressed broad support for the 3 categories of discussion. There was support for forward-looking political debates, with some divergences regarding the shape and sequencing of these. While some favoured option B, most participants preferred option A. As Ministers may not be expected to attend for the full 3 days, it was proposed to undertake the stocktaking on Day 1, with political debates and decisions on the future reserved for Days 2&3. Several participants emphasised the need for clearer inter-linkages between inter-active sessions and political debates, with conflicting views on how to link the results of these to the outcome document.

V. HLF-4: Key Themes for Busan

9. In presenting the “key themes for Busan”, the Secretariat highlighted that a major breakthrough at HLF-4 will only be possible if key elements for the discussion are identified relatively early in the preparation process. Interactive sessions should focus on issues which are important for aid to have an impact on development. Typically, these issues can be advanced through knowledge sharing and making progress by discussion. Political debates, on the other hand, should address the most critical challenges where it is clear that the barriers are mainly political. The Secretariat invited the WP-EFF to revert in writing on the proposed themes before end January 2011 with a view to finalising a shortlist by March 2011.

10. Some participants underlined that decisions on key themes should respond to evidence and to the issues which emerge from the political negotiations on the outcome document as of July 2011. There were a number of comments on the proposed list of themes, suggesting changes and identifying some specific questions for debate. For example, “who governs global health” works well as a proxy or a tracer to inform other sectors and global public goods about ways to reduce transaction costs and ensure more effective aid. Capacity development could be approached from the angle of “capable states”. How to ensure inclusive country ownership, involving CSOs, Parliaments and the private sector? Accountability and transparency

should be framed in the context of mutual accountability and responsibility. Results and value for money could replace aid quality as the unifying theme, setting a lens through which should to assess which PD commitments to retain and/or modify, and where new commitments may be required. How to follow up on the AAA's call for a political dialogue on fragmentation and cross country division of labour? Is there a willingness to provide predictable aid (forward spending estimates) in times of financial crisis? While some were in favour of discarding media as a topic, others cautioned against this.

11. The partner country caucus called for prioritisation of commitments on use of country systems, division of labour, predictability and national strategies for capacity development. There was support for additional themes, including conflict and fragility, capable states, rights-based management, enabling environment for CSOs, exit from aid strategies, aid architecture, role of aid as a catalyst, diversification of financial tools, risk management, gender, policy coherence and financing for climate change. In addition, a number of participants highlighted the need to distinguish between specific contexts and constituencies. Differences in regional context must be respected. If new goals are agreed in Busan, these need to account for differences in country type and status (fragile states, MICs, LICs). It is also important to recognise differences and specificities among providers, taking into account comparative advantage of multilaterals, bilateral donors, global funds, emerging donors, South-South cooperation etc.

12. The World Bank suggested organising these issues around four main themes as follows:

- Aid works (results, what does aid deliver?)
- How aid helps strengthen domestic institutions
- How aid catalyses other development tools
- How aid can help address pressing global issues

13. Clusters, work-streams and other relevant bodies will necessarily play a major role in taking these themes forward, under the leadership of the ExCom. There was broad agreement that January 2011 was too early to close the list of themes for Busan and the identification process should be kept open to reflect availability of evidence.

14. The co-chair concluded the list had grown from 7 topics to 20+ to include most AAA points and pointed to the tension between issues narrowly focussed on aid and those relating to a wide range of related global topics. He warned against the Christmas tree syndrome and suggested that the proposed organising framework may prove useful in ensuring a sharper focus going forward.

Day 2

VI. HLF-4: Preparation process and Milestones

Evidence for HLF-4

15. The Secretariat provided an update on gathering evidence for HLF-4. Work is well underway on the 2011 Monitoring Survey with 73¹ countries participating this time around. It is essential that donors submit the survey questionnaire at country level by end February 2011 in order to allow partner countries to submit consolidated results to OECD by end March 2011. If these deadlines are respected, tentative findings should be ready by July 2011, with the full report published by September 2011, allowing stakeholders to digest the results well in advance of Busan. The Report on “Progress since Paris” will consolidate into one document evidence which was previously published in two separate reports (the *Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey* and the *Paris Declaration Progress Report*). It will present progress on the 12 indicators as well as selected PD/AAA commitments. It will draw primarily on the findings from the survey – Paris Declaration and Fragile States Principles - alongside other sources of evidence (generated from within and beyond the WP-EFF, including the optional survey modules on inclusive ownership and gender equality), and will also include country chapters and statistical annexes. The report on the Paris Declaration Evaluation Phase II remains a stand-alone document in line with the independent nature of the process. Findings from the evaluation should be available by April/May 2011. A single high-level publication will present “Key Findings and Recommendations” targeting a political audience and drawing on the Paris Declaration monitoring and evaluation processes.

16. Several participants stressed the need to balance quantitative and qualitative information. The “Key Findings and Recommendations” document should be short, jargon free and targeted at a political audience as well as policy makers. It should address 1) what has been achieved, how and why not; and 2) what is next. It is important to clarify the criteria for presenting other “evidence” for Busan in order to draw coherent input from other parts of the WP-EFF as well as from independent sources (CSO, academia...). Global progress should be reflected, as well as regional, contextual and country-specific realities. In response to several requests, the UNDG agreed to revert on the possibility of providing disaggregated data for the Paris Monitoring Survey. There were mixed views on the need for monitoring post Busan, but consensus that this requires further discussion soon.

Consultations for HLF-4

17. In response to participants requests for more information, updates on ongoing and upcoming consultation processes were provided by a number of stakeholders, including the DAC Chair, a series of (sub)regional organisations (AsDB, AfDB, Pacific Islands Forum, Colombia on behalf of OAS, Caricom, Saudi Arabia on behalf of the Arab Funds), UNDP on the Survey workshops, AWEPA and BetterAid. It is important to ensure a strong partner country voice in these processes, and to ensure good coordination between broader HLF-4 and fragility and conflict negotiations.

18. The co-chair acknowledged the key role of regional institutions, Parliamentarian and CSO platforms in casting a wide net for consultation, building confidence, peer learning and collecting information and evidence for HLF-4. He encouraged these constituencies to coordinate their own processes in tandem with the milestones for preparing HLF-4 and negotiating its outcomes. He invited participants to submit regular information in writing to the Secretariat on these different consultation processes and events and also encouraged partner countries to take advantage of the online consultation tool (available in

¹ Since the WP-EFF meeting, the number of partner countries participating in the Survey has risen to 86.

French/English at www.surveymonkey.com/s/hlf4topics, and in Spanish at www.surveymonkey.com/s/hlf4topicsES).

Negotiations for HLF-4

19. The co-chair reaffirmed that the WP-EFF and ExCom are the principal actors leading the HLF-4 negotiations. The ExCom shall lead the preparations while the WP-EFF remains the main decision making platform. The WP-EFF should only meet when meaningful discussion can take place based on availability of evidence and outcomes of consultations. In the light of the feedback on the need for a revised timeline, he proposed not to meet in full plenary in March 2011. Alternatively, an ExCom meeting could be envisaged in March 2011, and a more substantive WP-EFF plenary in July 2011 once the (tentative) PD Survey and PD Evaluation results are available to start negotiations.

20. Several participants agreed with this proposal, underlining the need to ensure legitimacy, ownership, transparency and cost-effectiveness of the process at all levels. Moreover, the structure for political level negotiations to be held in Busan itself should be clarified. There was support for the proposal to establish a high-level partner country contact group as well as for securing high level political engagement of donors and other stakeholders. The proposed timeline in the roadmap should be revised (particularly for the period Q4 2011) to ensure evidence and consultations from the country, regional, WP-EFF work-streams as well as from other processes (ex. INCAF) are coordinated and feed into the negotiation process.

VII. Call for Pledges

21. The co-chair provided information on existing and required funding for activities undertaken under the auspices of the Working Party. The estimated costs required to cover the period leading up to Busan and the HLF-4 itself amount to approximately **4.6 million Euros**. He invited pledges to (i) replenish the existing UNDP trust fund to cover partner country travel for WP-EFF meetings in 2011 (363,000 Euros required), (ii) fund a second trust fund to cover partner country travel for HLF-4 (1.6 million Euros required) and (iii) finance a third trust fund to cover the HLF-4 communications strategy (450,000 Euros required).

| | AsDB Trust Fund: 1.6 M€ | UNDP Trust Fund: 360k€ | Communication Strategy: 450k€ |
|-----------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Korea | "Will make contribution" | | |
| AsDB | 200K\$ | | "Expressed interest" |
| EC | "Wishes to participate" | 60 K€ now, 100 K€ 2011 | |
| US | 100 K\$ | | |
| Colombia | Approx. 40 K\$ | | |
| Australia | "Expressed interest" | | |
| Japan | "Expressed interest" | | |

22. Some participants underlined that the cost and investment in HLF-4 is likely to attract attention. Expenditure must be transparent and clearly demonstrate value for money. A number of participants announced contributions outside of this specific pledging round. Korea confirmed that it would cover the cost of the 3-day event in Busan as well as the full cost of the HLF-4 website managed by UNDP. Colombia and the US announced contributions of respectively approximately 30K\$ and 100 K\$ to the TT on South-South Cooperation. The US also announced 100 K\$ to the Survey workshops and 200K\$ to the DAC Programme of Work and Budget (PWB). Luxembourg and France will also contribute respectively 150K\$ and (possibly) 80K\$ to the PWB. Japan indicated interest in making a contribution to the CDDE.

VIII. HLF-4: Organisation and Logistics

23. The working hypothesis to date has been that the size and level of HLF-4 would be on a par with the HLF-3 in Accra, which gathered over 1,700 participants. The co-chair proposed setting a cap on the number of participants at HLF-4 of between 1500 and 2000 maximum. The allocation of places could be worked out by the ExCom, ensuring some degree of flexibility. Some participants underlined that the size of delegations will depend on the format and the agenda of the event. While it is important that all categories of actors are adequately represented, there was also recognition of the need to maintain a realistic and sober view on the number of participants and on the overall cost of HLF-4. The event needs to be of a manageable size in order to allow for meaningful discussion.

24. The co-chair (Mr. Abdel Malek) informed the WP-EFF of the establishment of a core group on logistics. This group will follow up on organisational and logistical aspects only and will not have any decision making powers. In response to Betteraid's offer of CSO participation, the co-chair explained the core group should be kept very small and confirmed this would be discussed further in ExCom.

25. The Secretariat presented the draft communications strategy for HLF-4, emphasising the wide consultation process which has taken place since 2009. At this point, specific feedback was requested from the WP-EFF on the communicators' proposal for the branding of the event ("Fourth HLF on Effective Development" vs. "Fourth HLF on Aid Effectiveness"), the overarching message as well as funding for the strategy. Several participants believed the communications strategy was too ambitious and that the level *and scope should be scaled down to make it more cost effective*. As regards branding, it was suggested that the word "aid" or "aid effectiveness" could appear in the title, with a sub-title reflecting the broader context. The overarching message should have an overall positive tone.

ANNEX 1

COMPENDIUM OF SUMMARIES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(29 OCTOBER 2010 AND 9-10 MARCH 2011)

WP-EFF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – 29 OCTOBER 2010 (PARIS)

I. Introduction

1. The seventh meeting of the Executive Committee (ExCom) of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF) took place in Paris on 29 October 2010. It was co-chaired by Mr. Talaat Abdel-Malek and Mr. Koos Richelle. The draft agenda and full list of participants are set out in Annex 1 and 5.
2. With reference to the draft list of conclusions from the WP-EFF plenary (Annex 4), the ExCom is expected to follow up on a number of points, including the key themes for Busan, the HLF-4 outcome document and negotiation process, a series of organisational issues and the HLF-4 communications strategy.

II. Key themes for Busan

3. As regards the preliminary list of topics for Busan (Annex 2), Mr Richelle suggested to use the four points proposed by the World Bank as a useful **organising framework** through which to address the key questions of: what worked (evidence), what did not work (why), and what is next (the “how-to”)?
 1. Aid Works (results, what does aid deliver?)
 2. How aid helps strengthen domestic institutions
 3. How aid catalyses other forms of development
 4. How aid addresses global issues
4. Members agreed with the preliminary list, with some adding the critical role of sectors as tracers for the application of the PD/AAA principles. A number of specific questions were identified to be debated at the next ExCom. For example, why are **country systems** not used and what triggers donors to pull the plug on budget support? How can low tolerance for **risk management** in the public sector be tackled? How to ensure genuinely **inclusive country ownership and leadership**, involving Parliaments, CSOs and the private sector? **Exit strategies**: how can aid be made to increase countries’ own revenue base?
5. In addition to identifying issues, several members underlined the need to differentiate between specific contexts and constituencies. Differences in **regional contexts** must be taken into account. In particular, Korea was encouraged to share its experience as an Asian “development champion”. The effectiveness of regional organisations should also be considered. Ensuring the interest and involvement of **emerging donors** and the **private sector** was highlighted as a key challenge. This will not happen of its own accord and should be taken forward first and foremost by partner countries in their coordination of donors at the country level. The specificities of **Middle Income Countries**, **South-South Cooperation** and **fragile states** were also emphasised.

6. Mr Richelle concluded that the ExCom had enriched the draft list of topics and agreed an organising framework using aid as an entry point while linking it to the wider agenda. While it is **too early** to flesh out these topics in detail (evidence is needed), the Secretariat will revert with a revised list of topics, and will make a proposal to structure the process, setting out roles and responsibilities for taking the work forward in conjunction with clusters, work-streams and other relevant bodies.
- Follow-up: **all WP-EFF and non WP-EFF groups and members to communicate possible themes** to the Secretariat by mid-January 2011.
 - Follow up: Secretariat to **revise the HLF-4 roadmap**, presenting an updated **list of topics**, and a **proposal to structure this process**, setting out roles and responsibilities for taking the topics forward. This will take into account the ongoing work of clusters, work-streams and other relevant bodies.
 - Follow-up: Secretariat to propose suggested guidance and **criteria for presenting “other” sources of evidence for Busan** (not yet included in the “Progress Since Paris” report)
 - Follow up: Clusters and work-streams to present relevant **deliverables** (e.g. evidence for the “Progress since Paris” Report) before end March 2011.

III. HLF-4 Outcome document and negotiation process

7. Mr. Abdel-Malek shared his impression that there was a broad consensus from the WP-EFF that the HLF-4 outcome document should be **short and political, with a possible technical annex** on implementation. It will be prepared by the ExCom and negotiated within the WP-EFF. No additional negotiation forums will be established. As the Working Party functions as a coalition of the willing, the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action were not signed and the Busan outcome document will **not be signed** by participants.
8. The majority of members were in favour of keeping specific sections of the outcome document **open** until the HLF-4, yet Japan and the World Bank preferred a consensus text which would be **finalised in advance** of Busan. Further clarity on the “implementation” part of the outcome document is required with unresolved questions around whether this should be an annex or indeed the core of the text, and diverging views on whether it should contain targets and a monitoring framework.
9. While there was some unease regarding the lack of clarity on timelines and content of the outcome document and negotiation process, it was generally accepted that some ambiguity was inevitable and it was **too early to pin this down** in detail. Building on the lessons from Accra, the negotiations will start to take shape as of July 2011 when preliminary evidence from the monitoring survey becomes available. The establishment of a high level **Partner Country Contact Group** was welcomed as a possible positive step to ensure a stronger voice of developing countries in this process. A **public consultation** could also be envisaged, for example through a dedicated website to follow and comment on the process.
- Follow up: Developing Countries to revert with proposal for **establishment of Partner Country Contact Group**

IV. Organisational issues

10. Mr. Richelle proposed to set a **cap on the size** of the HLF-4, suggesting a range of between 1700-2000 participants. A starting point could be as follows: 194 UN countries (5 seats each: 3

government, 1 CSO, 1 Parliament) and 100 international, regional and multilateral bodies (3 seats each), resulting in a first cut of approximately 1300 participants. Japan, Netherlands and Ghana welcomed this suggestion, underlining that HLF-4 must be cost effective and focussed.

11. Mr. Abdel-Malek informed that a **small core group on logistics** chaired by Korea has been established according to the proposal in Annex 3 to coordinate and implement the organisational and logistical aspects of the HLF-4 preparations. The US and Switzerland suggested revisiting membership of the core group to include **CSOs**. Korea emphasised the distinction between the existing UNDP partner country travel fund (for WP-EFF and other preparation meetings) and the new HLF-4 trust fund (for Busan itself) managed by the ADB, and asked for a **summary of pledges** thus far. In response to BetterAid, the DAC Secretariat confirmed that the budget of the trust fund managed by ADB, as currently estimated, includes travel and accommodation for 100 CSO representatives.

- Follow up: DAC Secretariat to follow up swiftly with a **list of pledges to date** and an overview of the **outstanding financing gaps**

V. Communications Strategy

12. Mr. Abdel-Malek requested that a revised communications strategy be prepared to reflect the discussions of the week, in particular: targeting it to the agreed key audiences; scaling down the level of ambition and scope; heightening cost-effectiveness; focusing on the particular issues of aid effectiveness and the HLF-4 in the context of global development. He indicated that this revised strategy would be considered at the next ExCom in March 2011. The ADB requested preparation of a short (2-page) note **on HLF-4 and its purpose**. UNDP drew attention to the fact that it would be implementing the HLF-4 website, welcoming collaboration with the DAC Secretariat and others to deliver the HLF4 messages.

- Follow up: DAC Secretariat to **circulate revised communications strategy**, taking account of WP-EFF and ExCom comments, by end January 2011.
- Follow up: DAC Secretariat to **prepare 2-page note with user friendly messages** on HLF-4 and its purpose (live document).

VI. Next Steps

13. The next ExCom will take place over 2 or 3 days from 9 to 10/11 March 2011, possibly under Chatham House Rules, at least for part of the meeting. The next WP-EFF plenary will be held on 6-7 July 2011 in Paris.
14. Regional meetings and thematic workshops are key opportunities to influence the negotiation and preparatory process, and participants were invited to provide details in writing on upcoming events, including specifying who should attend.
 - Follow up: Secretariat and co-chairs to prepare for **2/3-day ExCom in March 2011**: in-depth discussion with the overarching objective of presenting a succinct list of documented topics to the WP-EFF in July 2011.
 - Follow up: ExCom Members to provide Secretariat with **regular written updates on upcoming events**, including with proposals for who should attend.

WP-EFF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – 9-10 MARCH 2011 (PARIS)**VII. Introduction**

1. The eighth meeting of the Executive Committee (ExCom) of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF) took place in Paris on 9-10 March 2011. The meeting was co-chaired by Mr. Talaat Abdel-Malek and Mr. Bert Koenders. The ExCom welcomed the new Vice-Chair representing Korea Ms. Enna Park as well as the new DAC Chair, Mr. Brian Atwood. The overall objective of the ExCom meeting was to ‘Strategise for Busan’—to begin to build a consensus around the possible outcomes for HLF-4. (For the draft agenda and list of participants see Annex 1 and 5 respectively).
2. Mr. Koenders in his opening remarks highlighted the **importance of raising the political profile of HLF-4 which should aim to endorse a new consensus on aid and development**. Building on the knowledge and the evidence of progress gathered so far, including from the Paris Declaration monitoring and evaluations processes as well as from the WP-EFF clusters and task teams, it is now necessary to work towards gaining high-level political support to assure Busan’s success. He observed that HLF-4 can be a political success if (i) it is partner-led and leads to clear, actionable, monitorable recommendations based on candid assessment of the Paris and Accra agendas; (ii) it showcases building blocks on how to proceed post-Busan; and (iii) it reaches out to partners such as the private sector, parliamentarians, civil society, and the so-called “new” donors—which often hold a differing view on development.
3. The summary of the last ExCom was endorsed, with comments from BetterAid and Canada (revised version can be found on the WP-EFF Portal).

VIII. Paris Declaration Evaluation: Discussion of Draft Findings

4. Mr. Niels Dabelstein, from the Secretariat for the Independent Evaluation of the Paris Declaration, presented **preliminary findings** of the second phase of the Evaluation. He explained that the evaluation included 22 country-level evaluations, led by partner countries and managed in-country, and 18 donor/agency headquarter-level evaluations.
5. Overall findings are broadly positive, **pointing to the enduring relevance of the Paris Declaration principles**, which can be applied to different country contexts and remains valid for different sources of financing for development. There is a marked positive trend in its implementation, particularly in partner countries - stronger national strategies; increased alignment of aid; enhanced accountability to citizens and parliaments; and less corruption and more transparency. The findings noted that partner countries have generally adopted the PD and are moving faster - regardless of differing starting points - compared with donors, whose performance is highly varied. However, the findings also pointed to the challenge that the implementation of the commitments often do not extend to line ministries. Finally, the findings highlighted the need for broader engagement with new donors in the agenda.
6. Members were broadly satisfied with the preliminary findings presented. Several members mentioned that their participation in the evaluation had been useful for their own internal discussions and management processes. Several members also underlined the importance of understanding specific country contexts to facilitate successful implementation of the PD. Other members highlighted the importance of understanding the reasons for change or lack thereof, particularly the bottlenecks, challenges and lack of incentives in areas where there has been slower progress.

Members also took note of the joint analysis carried out on specific issues related to middle income countries taking part in the PD evaluation.

- Decisions and Follow-up: The draft synthesis report will be available by end April 2011 and the final synthesis report will be disseminated in June 2011.

IX. Revised Communication Strategy

7. Mr. Keith Conlon (consultant) presented the revised communication strategy which incorporates the comments from the WP-EFF and ExCom when they last met in October 2010. The revised version is more focused, practical and proportionate to the main objectives of HLF-4. It presents HLF-4 as an “opportunity for all” that provides a platform to bring new partnerships around a new consensus. There was positive overall reception of the strategy. Some members called for further clarity on the target audience as well as main messages, as well as the number of websites proposed, in addition to the official HLF-4 website (busanhlf4.org) which will be launched on 31 March. Others emphasised the importance of capturing good practice and results which can be used to communicate stories on how aid works.
8. Ms. Enna Park informed that Korea will launch its own nation-wide campaign and communication strategy, targeting its domestic audience, while assuring alignment with the global strategy. In addition, Korea will extend its communication strategy to engage its neighbouring countries and region. She also confirmed the possibility of seconding a communication expert to the DCD Secretariat.
9. Members supported Mr. Koenders’ view that the **revised strategy, which can be flexibly adapted, provides a good basis for action**. Given the urgency, he emphasised that the strategy should be immediately implemented. Each ExCom member should take the responsibility for implementing this strategy, including through their own communication divisions. Out of the 450KEUR estimated budget for communications, no pledges have been received to date. Mr. Koenders also highlighted the need to explore how the DAC Development Communicator’s Network can be engaged. ExCom members are invited to send written comments to respond to three questions on the revised strategy, which are: (i) how will you align with this strategy?; (ii) how will you support it financially?; and (iii) how will you support it through in-kind contributions?
 - Decisions and Follow-up:
 - Members should align their communication strategy to the broad global strategy to raise the profile of HLF-4
 - ExCom members to provide written feedback on the three questions (alignment, financial pledges, in-kind contributions) **by 31 March 2011** to be included where possible in the next phases of the ecommunication strategy
 - Co-chairs write the DAC Development Communicator’s Network on how they can support the HLF-4 communication strategy.

X. Break-out sessions – Possible Political Commitments at Busan

10. The break-out sessions provided an opportunity for each participant to think about possible priority political recommendations at Busan, including how they can be followed-up and operationalised post-Busan, and how consensus can be built around them. The intention was to complement the bottom-up approach of themes captured in the “Menu of Options” with the top-down approach of identifying the main political narrative for Busan. Discussions were organised in two broad areas, on “core aid effectiveness issues” and on “aid in the broader development context”. Detailed reports from the four break-out groups can be found in Annex 3.

Short consolidated feedback from the Breakout Groups

Core aid effectiveness issues:

- Results and transparency agenda for better accountability (outcome oriented; consider risks; countries' own frameworks, further work to distil areas for political commitment vs. technical work),
- Ownership and leadership (inclusive ownership);
- Human and institutional capacity development (country-led, state capacity and sustainable exit from aid, support is aligned with comprehensive CD plans)

Aid in the broader context of development:

- Ownership in a broader context - state-building and public sector institution building,
- Levering aid for other forms of development finance
- Acknowledging / capitalising on differences in:
 - Actors (incl. BRICS, private sector, CSOs...) and partnerships (SSC, PPPs, sector, GPPs, people-to-people), building on complementary strengths
 - Country context: Fragile States, MICS

11. Some participants expressed that not all views from all breakout sessions were captured fully in this consolidated feedback, especially related to aid in the broader development context. Issues raised included: state-building and public sector institution building as an area of focus by itself, not under ownership in a broader context; recognising differentiated responsibilities and complementary strengths; using aid and aid agencies as catalysts (aid for domestic resource mobilisation; aid for taxation; linked to policy coherence); the importance of making clear distinctions between different country contexts, for example fragile states should be addressed in their own right; ownership in a broader context—whole of government approach; crucial role of democratic accountability and transparency: role of CSOs and Parliaments; and importance of linking to the MDG agenda.
12. Mr. Koenders highlighted that a **convergence is emerging around an outline and a type of outcome document for Busan**. Possible components include:
- a preamble that focuses on:
 - the indispensability of working on aid and development;
 - the reaffirmation and/or refreshing of the PD principles that worked;
 - maintaining a partner-led approach; and
 - acknowledging the diversity of actors (common and differentiated responsibilities);
 - a section on concluding from the Paris/Accra process; and
 - a section on the “new” agenda on aid effectiveness as it relates to other development finance – while being aware of finding the value-added vis-à-vis Monterrey and Doha, and a concluding section on the “governance and monitoring framework” post-Busan.
13. From the discussion the WP-EFF co-chairs proposed a **“living” draft narrative for an outline of the Busan outcome document**, tabled at the closing of Day 2 (see Annex 2). This living document is not a “zero draft” of the Busan outcome document – which will only be available in July when the evidence becomes available – but an initial outline that can be used by all WP-EFF participants to engage their political masters and to debate on potential outcomes for Busan amongst their own constituencies.

- Decisions and Follow-up:
 - Living document to be used by all WP-EFF participants to engage their political constituencies to debate on potential outcomes for Busan.
 - ExCom members to provide feedback to DAC Secretariat on the “living document” by 3 April 2011.
 - Upon receiving comments, co-chairs and Secretariat will work on the first draft of the outcome document to be presented to the WP-EFF and ExCom in July 2011.

V. Strategy and Messaging for HLF 4

14. Mr. Koenders reiterated the importance of attracting the highest level of political attention and participation at Busan, which is not an easy task given the perceived “technocratic” nature of the topic. Hence the importance of engaging with “champions”: Each ExCom member must share the responsibility of engaging their politicians and constituencies to encourage a multiplying effect.
15. Mr. Abdel-Malek reported on the current status of setting up the **Partner Country Contact Group (PCCG)**. The main objective is to co-ordinate a common position amongst partner countries based on a candid assessment of progress and challenges at the country-level derived from evidence, such as the monitoring survey as well as the PD evaluation. As of early March, out of the 37 WP-EFF partner country members invited to join the PCCG, 15 have confirmed participation. The co-chair proposed 8 countries (Colombia, Egypt, Ghana, Honduras, Mali, Pacific Island Forum Secretariat, Timor-Leste and Vietnam) to comprise the “drafting team” to analyze inputs from partner countries and deliver a common Position Paper by end May 2011. Members of the PCCG—which are all drawn from within the WP-EFF—are expected to engage with their senior (ministerial) politicians. Mr. Abdel-Malek also highlighted aid for trade as an area where existing evidence needs to be taken into account.
16. The DAC Chair (Mr. Brian Atwood) was invited to share his view on how he will engage the DAC, particularly at the DAC Senior Level Meeting on 6-7 April, to raise the political profile for Busan. He identified five priorities (see Annex 4): (i) focusing on the MDGs, which is a universally accepted mandate for development and Busan represents the last and best chance to realise this global commitment; (ii) improving the quality of partnerships through embracing diversity, differential approaches and leadership from development partners, whilst also fostering mutual respect and mutual accountability; (iii) linking MDGs and global crises – food, finance, climate and health; (iv) encompassing a broader paradigm that calls for more resources, coherent policies and alignment of all actors – private, public, DAC and non-DAC; and (v) seeking convergence of interest on development through finding common ground, based on evidence.
17. Events and opportunities that should be used to raise the political momentum for Busan in different fora include the DAC, G8/G20 processes, UN processes (UN LDC IV, UN DCF), WB/IMF annual meetings, g7+ group on fragile states, as well as other stakeholder groups such as parliamentarians, global programmes learning group, private sector, non-DAC donors and others. The next key events include :
 - AU ECA Finance & Economic Ministers Meeting (24-29 March), Addis Ababa
 - DAC Senior Level Meeting (6-7 April), Paris
 - WB/IMF Spring Meetings (16-17 April), Washington DC
 - UN DCF High Level Symposium (5-6 May), Mali
 - Fourth UN LDC Conference (9-13 May), Istanbul
 - Second International Dialogue on Conflict and Fragility (14-15 June), Monrovia

18. In particular, Mr. Koenders highlighted the importance of facilitating **informal discussions at ministerial level** between developing countries and development partners in order to raise awareness and develop mutual understanding of political priorities pre-Busan. One such opportunity will be an informal ministerial event co-hosted by the World Bank Managing Director (Ms. Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala) and the DAC Chair (Mr. Brian Atwood) at the margins of the WB/IMF Spring Meeting in April. Participants supported the initiative, while calling for transparency and inclusiveness of the process. The Co-chair also emphasised that raising awareness amongst politicians—formally and informally—needs to be linked to, but separate from, the negotiation process, which will be led by the WP-EFF and its ExCom, starting in July.
- Decisions and Follow-up:
 - Each member must share the responsibility of engaging their political constituencies in the run-up to HLF-4 and engage in the process of political consensus building.
 - Partner Country Contact Group position paper to be presented in May 2011 based on outline narrative.
 - ExCom Members (and all WP-EFF participants) to provide DAC Secretariat with regular written updates on upcoming events.

VI. Organisation and Logistics

HLF-4 Revised Event Structure

19. The Secretariat (Brenda Killen) presented the revised proposal of the HLF-4 event structure which reflects feedback from the October 2010 Working Party. (For reference, please see the updated *Road to Busan* which can be found on the WP-EFF Portal).
20. Several participants expressed concerns on the difficulty of attracting ministerial participation for three days, and also keeping the sequencing of the meetings manageable, particularly in relation to on-site negotiation of the Busan outcome document. In regards to the negotiation of the Busan outcome document, most participants agreed that while the majority of the text should be “fixed” pre-Busan, “flexible” sections of the document could be finalised on-site taking into account outcome of discussions.
- Decisions and Follow-up:
 - With regard to the Busan outcome document—it is intended that the majority of the text will be prepared pre-Busan but finalised on-site taking into account outcome of discussions.
 - The WP-EFF Co-chairs will revert back by mid-April on a revised proposal for the HLF-4 event structure and process, addressing issues raised at the ExCom,
21. Clarification was also sought on the next steps for translating the themes of the “Menu of Options” into events in Busan, and the process and timeline for attributing responsibilities for organising such event. For the latter, a question of whether WP-EFF clusters and task teams are expected to play a role in organising events was raised. Concerns were raised that deciding on events in July may be too late to assure proper preparation by the organisers.
- Decisions and Follow-up: Based on the Menu of Options, the Secretariat will propose a limited number of possible sessions for Busan, as building blocks for post-Busan actions, and will propose coordinated organisation of these sessions. A more detailed e-mail regarding follow-up with proposals will be sent by the Secretariat by the end of March.

Core Group on Logistics

22. Korea (Ms. Enna Park), as chair of the core group, reported back from its first meeting which took place on 8 March. The core group is advancing on implementing its work plan and is currently focusing on finalising the invitation list. Invitations will be sent out by the end of March. Subject to sufficient financial contributions to the Trust Fund set up by the AsDB, the cost of five delegates per country could be covered: three from the executive, one from parliament or local government, and one from civil society, media, or the private sector. Financing for an additional 100 trips would also be managed centrally, for speakers and southern representatives of international networks. After consultation with BetterAid, Korea will invite a total number of 300 delegates from civil society organisations, including the ones whose travel charges will be covered by the Trust Fund. Concurrently, plans are advancing in specifying the venue facilities at Bexco Convention Center. The official logo for HLF-4 was also presented to ExCom members.
- Decisions and Follow-up: Invitations for HLF-4 will be sent out end of March 2011 by the Core Group on Logistics.

Call for Pledges

23. Mr. Abdel-Malek provided updated information on the existing and required financing under the auspices of the Working Party. Building on what has been pledged or expressed at the October 2010 Working Party, he invited pledges to contribute to the 1) Asian Development Bank Trust Fund to facilitate developing country travel to Busan (1.6 million EUR required, current pledges 504K EURO). The AsDB informed that the administrative process of setting up the Trust Fund has been completed; 2) communication efforts for Busan, which subject to agreement of the revised communication strategy is requesting 450K EUR. No funding has been pledged to date; and 3) replenishment of the UNDP-managed Trust Fund to finance travel of LIC participants to WP-EFF meetings. The funding gap is estimated at 300K USD.

| | AsDB Trust Fund 1.6M EUR | Communication Strategy 450K EUR | UNDP Trust Fund 300K USD |
|-------------|---|--|---|
| AfDB | 100K USD (77K EUR) plus "increase to Busan" | | |
| AsDB | 200K USD (154K €) | "Expressed interest" (October WP-EFF) | |
| Australia | "Expressed interest" (October WP-EFF) | | |
| Colombia | Approx. 40K USD (31K EUR) | | |
| EC** | "currently making a decision" | | 60K EUR |
| Global Fund | 60K USD (46K EUR) "particularly southern partners and parliamentarians" | | |
| Ireland | 100K EUR (135K USD) | | |
| Japan | "Expressed interest" (October WP-EFF) | | |
| Korea | "will make contribution" (October WP-EFF) | | |
| Luxembourg | 19K EUR (26K USD) | | |
| Nordic Plus | "process of considering contribution" | | Finland, Netherlands, Norway negotiating with DAC Secretariat to re-earmark surplus funds from 2010 |
| US | | | Considering additional contribution |

*At conversion rate of 1 EURO=1.3 USD **The EC has also agreed to financially support Mr. Koenders's position as co-chair.

24. Furthermore, Colombia pledged an additional 30K USD to the TT-SSC, and will confirm whether it can be used for supporting Southern participants to Busan. BetterAid also informed that it is currently seeking pledges for the CSO-managed trust fund to support CSO participation at Busan.
- Decisions and Follow-up: WP-EFF members are strongly encouraged to positively consider OECD DCD Director Jon Lomøy's letter calling for voluntary contributions (dated 24 February 2011). For those interested in contributing to the ADB Trust Fund, contact details should be forwarded to Manju Senapaty (msenapaty@adb.org). The Secretariat will follow up with interested members.

XI. Next Steps

25. The next ExCom will take place on Saturday, 9 July, 2011 back-to-back with the WP-EFF plenary on 7-8 July 2011 in Paris.
- Decision and Follow-up: ExCom and WP-EFF members to provide Secretariat **detailed proposals for evidence** to inform the "Progress since Paris" report by **31 March 2011**.