

Unclassified

DCD/DAC/EFF/M(2012)3

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

08-Jun-2012

English - Or. English

DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE
Development Assistance Committee

Working Party on Aid Effectiveness

DRAFT SUMMARY RECORD

Third Meeting of the Post-Busan Interim Group

21-22 May 2012

This document presents the draft summary of the third meeting of the Post-Busan Interim Group organised in Paris 21-22 May 2012.

It is circulated to PBIG members for their review. Comments should be forwarded to the secretariat no later than Friday 15 June 2012.

Ms. Hanna-Mari Kilpeläinen, tel: +33 (0)1 45 24 90 36 email: hanna-mari.kilpelainen@oecd.org
Mr. Robin Ogilvy, tel: +33 (0)1 45 24 94 48, email: robin.ogilvy@oecd.org

JT03323422

Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

DCD/DAC/EFF/M(2012)3
Unclassified

English - Or. English

I. Introduction

1. The Chair welcomed participants to the third and final meeting, also acknowledging and welcoming those following the meeting over the internet webcast. The Chair welcomed Director General Muller, representing Germany, as participating in the group for the first time. Furthermore the Chair expressed his thanks to the various task teams of PBIG members that had contributed important inputs over the course of the PBIG work process.

2. In introducing the agenda items of the meeting, the Chair emphasised that the work had been shaped by an extensive process for consultation, both within the PBIG and among constituencies, and that this consultation has not only enabled transparency but also the active engagement of a broad range of stakeholders to this work.

3. The Chair acknowledged that within the agenda items for the meeting, there remained issues over which agreement had not yet been reached, but at the same time emphasised the important role of the mutual trust accumulated in the process for forging compromises and enabling the group to reach agreement and deliver final proposals as tasked.

4. Regarding the draft agenda of the meeting, the Chair proposed to reverse the first two items on the agenda, so as to start the meeting by reviewing the mandate of the Global Partnership and then move on to discuss membership of the Steering Committee. The group approved these changes to the draft agenda as well as the revised summary record of the second PBIG meeting.

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

5. The Chair introduced the agenda item on working arrangements for the Global Partnership, emphasising that the text in the proposed mandate [DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)7] was based on agreement reached in the previous two meetings of the PBIG. The Chair reminded members that now was the time for final review and agreement over the mandate, and proposed to review the document section and paragraph at a time, inviting members to propose concrete formulations in the event that they disagree on existing text.

6. Before initiating discussions on the mandate, the question arose as to whether private sector representatives had been consulted in preparations of the mandate (Nordics). The Chair clarified that, in the context of the Chair's Reference Group, private sector representatives had received the PBIG meeting documents in advance of the meeting and had been invited to provide comments.

7. In discussing the overall objectives and core functions of the Global Partnership (paragraphs 1-7), it was proposed that the mandate text state more explicitly the need for linkages between the Global Partnership and the UNDCF (UNDP). There was agreement on the need for complementarity, and BetterAid called for coordination between the Global Partnership and the UNDCF to ensure complementarity. Several participants called for a reference to the Building Blocks (BetterAid, EU, Korea) recognising their central role in the HLF4, while at the same time stating clearly that there are no institutional linkages between the Building Blocks and the Global Partnership but that these alliances maintain their voluntary nature as agreed in previous meetings.

8. Moving on to the working arrangements of the Global Partnership, specifically of ministerial level meetings (paragraphs 8-10), the question arose as to whether it is appropriate for ministerial level meetings to endorse the Steering Committee membership (CANZ). The Chair clarified that while the ministers will not approve the membership – since the nominations will come from the constituencies themselves – there is a need for an agreed mechanism for endorsing the membership of the Steering Committee. Members requested clarifications as to how decision making will take place in the Global

Partnership (EU, AU). It was agreed that the key decision making body would be the ministerial level meeting, but that also the Steering Committee could take decisions as directed by the ministerial level. Regarding the venues and timing of meetings, the importance of utilising back-to-back arrangements when possible was emphasised (UNDP).

9. In introducing the discussion on chairing arrangements and Steering Committee composition (paragraphs 11-13), the Chair emphasised that agreement had previously been reached on three co-chairs and on a nimble committee of 12-14 members. The Chair informed the group that he had received comments and requests from PBIG members ahead of the meeting regarding the composition of the Steering Committee. In light of those consultations and in order to accommodate and balance the interests of various stakeholders, the Chair proposed to add two seats to the Steering Committee composition: one for recipients and one for providers of development cooperation. The Chair emphasised that these additions would maintain the balance of the composition and that 16 members including the co-chairs should be maintained as the size limit of the committee.

10. The Chair's proposal for additional seats received broad support, while at the same time several members requested further additional seats for their own constituencies. Members representing providers of development cooperation (US, Korea, EU, Nordics, Germany, Japan) called for three seats for providers on the committee (excluding co-chairs), highlighting that the ambitious work programme of the committee calls for sufficient resources and burden sharing among the members, that co-chairs could not be expected to strictly represent their constituency in the work of the committee and that a strong representation of providers of cooperation on the committee is crucial to ensuring their commitment and buy-in with regards to the agenda of 'unfinished business'. Representatives of recipients of development co-operation emphasised the challenges that committee members will be faced with in consulting the large group of recipient countries and, in addition to calling for an increase in the number of recipient country seats on the committee, emphasised the important role of the Partner Country Caucus to facilitate consultations within this group of countries.

11. Some members advocated for allocating additional seats in the committee for stakeholders that did not configure in the proposed composition (including regional organisations, trade unions and representatives of local governments). BetterAid called for adding a fourth co-chair position to represent non-executive stakeholders. In response to members' differing requests for inclusiveness on the one hand and functionality on the other, the Chair reminded the group that agreement had been reached in previous meetings on the constituencies to be represented on the committee, and that these could be roughly categorised into four key entities of i) recipients of development cooperation; ii) providers of development co-operation; iii) recipient-providers of development co-operation; and iv) non-executive stakeholders including all other constituencies represented on the committee that play different but supportive roles in enhancing the effectiveness of development co-operation. The Chair emphasised that accommodating all legitimate requests of stakeholders for committee membership was not a viable option in light of the aspirations for a nimble and functional Steering Committee as had been agreed. Regarding the request for a fourth co-chair, the Chair reminded that chairing arrangements had already been agreed in the second PBIG meeting and was therefore unwilling to re-open this discussion in the group.

12. In the general remarks there was broad support for maintaining a balanced composition in the committee (in terms of both constituencies and regions) and ensuring a strong representation of recipients of development cooperation on the committee. Discussions led to an agreement to add four additional seats to the committee, granting two additional seats to recipients and two additional seats to providers of development co-operation. The group discussed the possibility of allocating one of the additional recipient country seats to countries that are both recipients and providers of development co-operation, and concluded that it would be for the constituency of recipients of development co-operation to decide on the nomination for this seat. The final agreement confirmed a Steering Committee composition of 18 members including the three co-chairs. Subsequently the following amendments were made to the initial Chair's

proposal [DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)6]: adding two seats for recipients of development co-operation (from 3 members seats to 5 seats) and adding two seats for providers of development co-operation (from 1 member seat to 3 seats).

13. In the context of discussing Steering Committee membership, the nature of OECD and UNDP representation on the committee was raised, with some members calling for clarification on the role of these organisations on the committee in light of their role in supporting the functioning of the Global Partnership (Nordics, Germany, Japan). Both organisations respectively clarified that their participation in the committee will be distinct from their function of providing joint support to the Partnership, and that their representatives in the committee will fully contribute, in the capacity of their convening role of members, to the policy dialogue taking place in the committee. The Chair emphasised that no distinction shall be drawn between so called institutional members and other members, as the objective is that all members engage actively in the policy dialogue and work of the Steering Committee.

14. Continuing to discuss the text of the proposed mandate (paragraphs 14-16), some members (BetterAid, Japan) called for a strengthened emphasis on the need for Steering Committee members to work in a consultative manner with regards to both their own constituencies and to the broad stakeholders within the Global Partnership. In relation to this, PBIG members representing recipient countries (Rwanda, Honduras) stressed the important role of the 'Partner Country Caucus' in facilitating consultations and consolidating views and called for a reference in the mandate text to the Caucus, in a similar manner as the reference to the HLF4 Building Blocks. It was also agreed that there should be a clearer reference in the text to the rotational nature of representation in the committee to support ownership and inclusiveness. Some members (EU, UNDP) emphasised that rotational representation may not necessarily apply to all committee seats and requested that this be reflected in the text.

15. Moving on to discuss the level of representation in the Steering Committee, the Chair invited comments to his proposal, suggesting that all members of the Steering Committee should be of ministerial level. While the group agreed on the importance of political leadership over the work of the Steering Committee, the majority supported membership of senior level officials (or the equivalent) to ensure personal engagement and active contributions. As to the level of representation regarding the co-chair positions, there was broad agreement on the need for ministerial level co-chairs and for their strong personal engagement in leading the work of the Steering Committee.

16. On the process for nominating the co-chairs and members of the Steering Committee, the PBIG endorsed the Chair's proposal [DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)6] for arriving at nominations ahead of the June WP-EFF meeting. In line with this proposal, the Chair emphasised that it was the responsibility and privilege of each constituency to decide on its own nominations. The Chair underlined the importance of consultation and, while acknowledging the challenges related to this process, pointed out that there was no viable alternative for delivering nominations according to the agreed constituency based approach by June. The Chair emphasised that it will be crucial to endorse nominations for the new leadership structure at the June WP-EFF meeting to ensure continued momentum and commitment for implementing the Busan partnership. It was agreed that PBIG members will lead consultations among constituencies to arrive at final nominations for representatives as set out by the agreed Steering Committee composition, providing one name per seat (be it co-chair or committee member) to the Chair by 10 June 2012.

17. BetterAid informed the group of the ongoing reorganisation of civil society organisations into one CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness, which is envisioned to have four co-chairs, and pointed out that this reorganisation may result in revisiting the nomination for the representative of Civil Society on the Steering Committee. The Chair thanked BetterAid for this information, inviting it them to nominate a representative to the initial Steering Committee set-up but also emphasising that this would not exclude a change in representation later on as decided by the new CSO platform.

18. On the basis of the discussion on 21 May, a revised text of the proposed mandate was distributed to the group on 22 May for final review. Further discussion took place on paragraph 7 regarding the linkages between the Global Partnership and UNDCF. BetterAid called for co-ordination between the two bodies while UNDP/UNDG, US and Korea opposed. The compromised text presented in the revised proposal entailed an emphasis on consultative dialogue to build synergies and complementarity.

III. Global monitoring of Busan Partnership commitments and actions

19. The Chair introduced the agenda item on monitoring the Busan Partnership agreement, stressing that monitoring initiatives are only one element of the Global Partnership, and that stakeholders should give consideration to the role of monitoring in supporting the exchange of experiences and as an entry point for a broader dialogue. The Chair emphasised the voluntary nature of the monitoring efforts foreseen in the Busan Partnership agreement, consistent with the text of the agreement itself, which recognises the different nature of South-South co-operation. The Chair drew participants' attention to a discussion note circulated by Korea on the participation of South-South co-operation providers in the Busan global monitoring framework (reproduced in Annex B).

20. In the discussion that followed, participants expressed their broad support for the text proposed by Korea. It was agreed that the term "development assistance" featuring in Korea's proposal should be replaced with "development co-operation" (as proposed by Brazil and Mexico). Edits were introduced to ensure that the evolutionary nature of the partnership is better captured by the text, in recognition of the fact that while South-South partners may not participate in monitoring activities at the outset, this should not exclude voluntary participation at a later stage (comments by the US, Mexico and Brazil). India confirmed its support for the addition of the paragraph proposed by Korea, and informed participants that it is in the process of reviewing its engagement in this area and that it does not rule out the possibility of participating in monitoring efforts at a later stage. Mexico proposed making reference to the "specific characteristics" of South-South partners. Participants noted the voluntary nature of participation in global monitoring efforts by all stakeholders, noting that this is not limited to south-south partners.

21. In framing the discussion on global indicators and targets, the Chair reminded participants of the need to reach consensus on a selective and relevant set of global indicators, and emphasised that these indicators – which are by definition quantitative – would be complemented by qualitative approaches to monitoring and reporting on progress in the implementation of commitments. He pointed to the importance of focusing indicators on those aspects of behaviour change that matter most for development outcomes, and expressed the view that existing data sources should be drawn on wherever possible. In introducing the proposed indicators and targets [DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)8], the Chair pointed to the need for compromise, and urged participants to avoid enlarging the list of global indicators further. He explained that the indicators set out in DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)8 had been developed by a group led by the UK and Rwanda, building on a shortlist of themes agreed by the PBIG in its previous meeting (4-5 April).

22. In the general remarks that followed, participants reflected on the need for an appropriate balance between quantitative and qualitative approaches to gathering evidence which would in turn be a relevant input for political dialogue. Honduras and Mali stressed the need for consensus on specific indicators and targets of a quantitative nature, highlighting the demand from partner countries for a clear agreement on these.

23. At the invitation of the Chair, Rwanda (Ronald Nkusi) and the UK (Richard Calvert) provided an overview of their deliberations and consultations which underpinned the development of the list of global indicators and targets. They emphasised the view that indicators and targets are one of several inputs which will shape dialogue at the ministerial level, and that the evidence generated through them is intended to offer an entry point for discussion and action. They noted the importance that developing countries attached to the development of global indicators and targets during the negotiation of the HLF-4 outcome

document, and the groundwork done by countries in this area prior to HLF-4. They noted that the length of the list of indicators presented reflects the diverse priorities of stakeholders, and that compromise would be essential to any further streamlining of the list.

24. The discussion on the specific indicators highlighted in DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)8 is summarised by theme:

- *Gender equality and women's empowerment*: while some members questioned the extent to which this should feature as an indicator in a framework focused on efforts for effective co-operation, several members confirmed the importance that they attach to retaining an indicator in this area (Korea, BetterAid, IPU, World Bank, UNDP/UNDG). UNDP/UNDG confirmed UN Women's willingness to invest in the development of this indicator and in sourcing and reporting data.
- *Programme-based approaches*: there were diverse views on the extent to which this was a priority candidate for a global indicator, with some proposing that this could be removed or monitored only at the country level (Korea, Canada, Japan, EU, US, World Bank), and others stressing its importance to a range of partner countries (Rwanda).
- *Private sector*: several participants confirmed the importance that they attach to an indicator on the private sector (Sweden, United States, Germany) while others suggested that this might be addressed through other approaches to monitoring (BetterAid, EU, UNDP/UNDG). A range of views on the exact focus of such an indicator were articulated (efforts to improve the environment for the private sector; private sector involvement in such efforts; contribution of the private sector to development...).
- *Domestic accountability*: the IPU expressed its support for the indicator on aid on budget in view of its emphasis on the role of parliaments. It suggested that an additional indicator specific to parliaments should be added.
- *Enabling environment for civil society*: the EU and Sweden expressed their support for an indicator on the environment within which civil society operates.
- *Fragmentation*: participants expressed a range of views on the proposed indicator on aid fragmentation, with some proposing that it be omitted from the global framework (Sweden) while others proposed that it should be retained (Germany, Rwanda).
- *Transparency*: some participants noted the relevance of the agreement on a common standard to the definition of an indicator (Canada, EU), while Japan suggested the indicator should focus on efforts to use country-level aid information management systems rather than on the common standard.
- *Country systems*: there was broad recognition of the importance that partner countries attach to the indicators relating to the strengthening and use of country systems. The EU questioned the extent to which use of procurement systems should feature in the global framework given the limited availability of data on the quality of these systems.

25. On the basis of the discussion on 21 May, a revised list of global indicators and targets was prepared by Rwanda and the UK in collaboration with the secretariat as a basis for further discussion on 22 May [DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)8/ADD1].

26. The discussion of the revised list of indicators pointed to broad consensus on the scope and coverage of the global indicators proposed [DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)8/ADD1]. The Chair proposed that, on the basis of the discussions that followed, the proposal would be finalised within a ten day period and shared with the full membership of the WP-EFF for its consideration in advance of its final plenary meeting.

27. The discussions of specific *indicators* and *targets* that followed is summarised by indicator:

- *Indicator 1 – Results frameworks*: participants noted the need for further work to operationalise this indicator, on the basis of approach set out in option 1 of Annex B [DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)8]. Some participants suggested that reference to “inclusive” results frameworks should be made, while others suggested this was not necessary given that inclusiveness in this context refers to the participatory and multi-stakeholder process through which country-led results frameworks are developed. Some participants questioned whether a link with the quality of results frameworks should be made here.
- *Indicator 2 – Civil society environment*: the discussion confirmed that the focus of this indicator should be on measuring the environment within which civil society operates (rather than its contribution to development, which is diffuse and difficult to measure meaningfully). The link between an enabling environment for civil society and its impact on civil society’s contribution to development was noted.
- *Indicator 3 – Improving the environment for private sector development*: participants noted the need for further technical work to clarify what would be measured, and in turn to operationalise this indicator.
- *Indicator 4 – Information on development co-operation is publicly available*: participants agreed on the need for explicit reference to the word “transparency” in the title of this indicator.
- *Indicator 5 – Predictability (annual and medium-term)*: participants agreed that the title of the indicator should read “Development co-operation is *more* predictable”. Participants noted the potential synergies to be had from implementation of a transparency standard (which could improve the availability of forward-looking information), while noting that this is not a prerequisite for improved predictability.
- *Indicator 6 – Aid is on budgets which are subject to parliamentary scrutiny*: participants agreed on the need to define more clearly key concepts used in this indicator. One participant questioned to what extent this indicator could be used to attribute performance to any given donor’s efforts. The Chair explained that the purpose of this indicator was not to assess the performance of a donor, but rather to offer an entry point for a broader discussion on domestic accountability.
- *Indicator 7 – Mutual accountability*: while noting the important linkages between domestic and mutual accountability, participants agreed that this indicator should remain focused on assessing the existence of reviews that strengthen mutual accountability.
- *Indicator 8 – Gender equality / efforts to target expenditures to benefit both men and women*: while noting that the proposal drew from language contained in the Busan Partnership agreement, participants agreed that the title of this indicator should be simplified to read “Gender equality and women’s empowerment”. They also agreed that the words “aid information management and PFM” should be removed from the indicator, recognising that different countries may use different systems to achieve the same objectives.

- *Indicator 9 – Strengthening and use of countries’ systems and institutions:* participants agreed on the need for dialogue on the strengthening and use of systems to go beyond PFM and procurement, and noted that additional qualitative methods for measuring progress in this area may be drawn on where available, while the (quantitative) indicator itself remains focused on measuring PFM and procurement systems as defined in the proposal. Some participants expressed their concern that the quality of country PFM systems should be measured through more participatory processes than that underpinning the CPIA (Rwanda, Mali, Honduras) while others noted the difficulty of drawing on PEFA assessments as a data source for such a global indicator (World Bank). The World Bank noted that it has concerns with the way in which use of procurement systems is measured.
- *Indicator 10 – Aid is untied:* no concerns were raised in relation to the proposed indicator and target.

28. In addition to the indicator-specific points summarised above, participants discussed the rationale and logic underpinning the targets proposed, noting that many of the proposed targets were based on Paris Declaration targets or modified versions of these. The discussion also considered the merits of relative (e.g. “halve the gap”) targets rather than absolute targets, noting that this approach recognises different starting points and does not assume a common starting point to all stakeholders – important features in the current approach. The discussion also considered the merits and shortcomings of setting targets based on 2010 baselines (rather than 2005) for those indicators that are taken from the Paris Declaration monitoring framework. While this approach would lead to slight increases in the original 2010 targets (where progress was made since 2005), a new target date of 2015 allows more time for targets to be achieved. It was also noted that the use of a 2010 baseline to establish those targets would allow for the use of data from a much larger sample of countries (78 countries, rather than 33 if a 2005 baseline is used).

29. In his concluding remarks on this agenda item, the Chair congratulated participants for reaching a compromise on the set of global indicators and targets, thanking the UK and Rwanda for their leadership in developing the proposal. The Chair confirmed that, on the basis of the elements agreed over the course of the discussion, the secretariat and Chair would proceed to make final revisions to the paper [DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)8] which would then be shared with the PBIG prior to distribution to the full membership of the WP-EFF.

IV. Update on joint OECD and UNDP support to the Global Partnership

30. UNDP and the OECD drew participants’ attention to the revised draft concept note “Arrangements for Joint OECD-UNDP Support to the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation” which was circulated in advance of the meeting. In their introductory remarks, they noted that this version builds on a previous version shared with participants in advance of the PBIG meeting on 4-5 April 2012, and that the OECD and UNDP have sought to address the comments and suggestions received from PBIG members.

31. In particular, they noted that the draft presented includes greater detail on the sorts of support activities and division of labour foreseen across the two organisations, and that efforts had been made to clarify the relationship between the Steering Committee and the joint support team. Both emphasised the desire to avoid institutionalising a secretariat, and that the joint team would work flexibly to respond to the evolving needs of the Global Partnership. The OECD noted that its activities in support of the Global Partnership would depend on the ongoing discussions on the DAC Programme of Work and Budget for 2013-14 and that the outcomes of these discussions might lead to further refinements and modifications. UNDP drew participants’ attention to the important distinction between its role in supporting the functioning of the Global Partnership through the “secretariat”-type activities undertaken by the joint

support team, and its role as a Steering Committee member in its own right ensuring, among others, the political link with the work of the UN system.

32. In the discussion that followed, participants raised a number of questions and provided feedback on the draft concept note. Some participants sought clarification on the roles and responsibilities of the OECD and UNDP in the context of the joint support team, and the distinction between these activities and other activities that they each undertake in respect of their own mandates and constituents (Germany, BetterAid). Some countries (Honduras, Rwanda) stressed the importance of ensuring that the joint team is sufficiently resourced to bridge the gap with implementation at the country level, and to support initiatives that developing countries may wish to lead under the auspices of the Global Partnership (*e.g.* a Partner Country Caucus).

33. It was proposed that future drafts could better explain how communication and broader outreach activities will be supported (Germany, BetterAid), and that further information on staffing and financial needs would be useful to support members in their decision-making (Sweden). The DAC Chair confirmed that the DAC would provide resources in support of the joint team, and that the DAC sees itself as an equal partner alongside others in the context of the Global Partnership. The World Bank noted the importance of appropriate analytic and advisory work, stressing that this should be demand-driven and that the Steering Committee and joint support team should draw on the support of stakeholders going beyond the membership of the Steering Committee as appropriate.

34. The OECD and UNDP confirmed that more detailed information on overall resource needs would be made available, with planning and costing evolving in tandem with the PBIG's deliberations on the Global Partnership and its governance so that the joint support concept continues to be grounded in emerging needs. The OECD informed participants that the latest proposal for the DAC's Programme of Work and Budget would see the OECD/DCD implementing activities costed at approximately EUR 3 million over the next two years (2013-14) in the context of the joint programme.

V. Final plenary meeting of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness

35. The Chair began by outlining the three main elements of the draft agenda for the WP-EFF meeting [DCD/DAC/EFF/A(2012)4/PROV]. There was broad agreement on the importance of reaching final agreement in the WP-EFF meeting on the post-Busan governance and monitoring framework as foreseen by the Busan Partnership agreement. There was interest in the group to also include in the agenda some country level perspectives on implementation efforts and progress since Busan (CANZ, US, BetterAid).

36. Regarding the agenda item on looking ahead post June 2012, there was agreement that while it would not be for the WP-EFF to define the priorities of the post June agenda, the meeting can be used as an opportunity to share views and ideas on the road ahead that may inform the early stages of the Global Partnership.

37. In regards to participation at the WP-EFF, there was general consensus (supported particularly by Korea, Rwanda, United States, EU and Mexico) that the meeting should be open beyond the WP-EFF membership to a wider set of stakeholders endorsing the Busan Partnership agreement. At the same time the group recognized the need to ensure broad buy-in and support for the proposals to be presented to the WP-EFF, as these stem from an extensive and transparent consultation process and it would not be desirable to reopen discussions on issues that have already been discussed and agreed in the course of the six-month work process.

As a more general contribution to the meeting discussions, India confirmed to the group that it will participate in the Global Partnership on a voluntary basis and expressed its willingness to work more closely with the Busan follow-up agenda over the next months.

VI. Conclusions and next steps

38. In his concluding remarks the Chair thanked PBIG members for the successful meeting in which the group made a great deal of progress, reaching agreement on the following deliverables for the WP-EFF:

- Mandate for the Global Partnership;
- Governance structure of the Global Partnership, including core functions, the composition of the Steering Committee and the process whereby nominations for Co-Chairs and Committee members will be endorsed by the WP-EFF in June;
- On the post-Busan global monitoring framework, a list of 10 indicator headlines for assessing progress, tentative agreement on several indicators and on the basis through which targets will be finalised; and
- Agreement on the basis of which providers of south-south cooperation will engage in monitoring efforts.

39. While recognising these achievements, the Chair emphasised that in order to deliver agreement on the post-Busan governance and monitoring framework in the June WP-EFF meeting PBIG members must ensure ownership and support for the final proposals. To this end, the Chair called on PBIG members to actively engage with their constituents over the coming weeks, communicating the results of the PBIG work process as well as mobilizing support and securing political consensus to deliver final agreement in June 2012.

40. As next steps in preparation of the WP-EFF plenary meeting 28-29 June 2012, the Chair requested PBIG members to lead consultations among constituencies to arrive at final nominations for the positions of Co-Chairs of the Global Partnership and Steering Committee members as set out by the agreed Steering Committee composition, providing one name per position to the Chair by 10 June 2012 (Email: malek00@gmail.com; cc: hanna-mari.kilpelainen@oecd.org). The Chair emphasised that PBIG members are expected to lead the process in a transparent manner, consulting broadly within their constituencies. He reminded the group that setting up the initial leadership structure is a test for the credibility of the Global Partnership, and that the in-built rotation of membership every two years will ensure that different actors have their turn. The Chair informed members that he would consult with representatives of the private sector to facilitate and support a process for agreeing on a private sector representative as member of the Steering Committee.

41. The Chair informed members that they would receive revised proposals for the mandate and monitoring framework for final review by 1st June, with the opportunity to provide any final comments by 6th June, and that final PBIG proposals would be released to the WP-EFF by 8th June, allowing for a consultation period of 2,5 weeks ahead of the plenary meeting.

* * *

ANNEX A
Participants List for Post-Busan Interim Group Meeting

21-22 May 2012

Chair

Talaat ABDEL-MALEK

Economic Advisor to the Minister and Chair of the
Working Party on Aid Effectiveness
Ministry of International Co-operation
9, Mohamed Fahmy El-Said Str.
Garden City
Cairo
Egypt

Tel: +20 2 27 927 158
Fax: +20 2 27 923 944
Email: malek00@gmail.com

Bureau

DAC Chair

Brian ATWOOD

DAC Chair
DCD
OECD

Tel: +(33-1) 45 24 90 70
Fax: +(33-1) 44 30 61 41
Email: Brian.ATWOOD@oecd.org

Korea

Enna PARK

Director-General
Development Cooperation
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
Seoul
Korea

Tel: +02 2100 0170
Fax: +02 2100 0110
Email: epark85@mofat.go.kr

UN Development Programme (UNDP)

Sigrid KAAG

Assistant Secretary-General
Bureau for External Relations and Advocacy
UNDP
One United Nations Plaza
First Avenue
10017 New York
United States

Tel: 1-212-906-5512
Fax: 1-212-906-5307
Email: Sigrid.kaag@undp.org

Daša SILOVIC

Senior Policy Advisor
Bureau for External Relations and Advocacy
United Nations - Development Programme (UNDP)
One UN Plaza, 19th Floor
NY 10017 New York
United States

Tel: +1 646.346-3204
Fax: +1 212 906 -5307
Email: dasa.silovic@undp.org

World Bank

Barbara LEE

Manager, Aid Effectiveness Unit
1818 H Street NW
Washington D.C.
20433

Tel: +1 202 473 7084
Email: blee@worldbank.org

Participants

African Union Commission

Florence NAZARE

Head, Capacity Development
NEPAD Agency
Block B, Gateway Park,
Midridge Office Park
P.O. Box 1234, Halfway House, 1685
Midrand
South Africa

Tel: +27 11 256 3632
Email: florenceN@nepad.org

Victoria EGBETAYO

Policy Officer
African Union Commission
Economic Affairs Department
P.O. Box 3243
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia

Tel: +251 11 551 7700
Email: egbetayov@africa-union.org

Better Aid-Civil Society Organisations

Antonio TUJAN

International Director IBON; Co-chair BetterAid
Better Aid (IBON Foundation)
3rd Floor IBON Center
114 Timog Avenue
1103 Quezon City
Philippines

Tel: +63 2 927 6974
Fax: +63 2 927 6981
Email: atujan@iboninternational.org

Ms. Mayra MORO-COCO

Development Policy and Advocacy Manager
Policy and Advocacy Manager
Association for Women's Rights in Development
(AWID)

Tel: +34 646 974 431
Email: mmoro-coco@awid.org

Bangladesh

Monowar AHMED

Joint Secretary, JCS Coordination Officer
Aid Effectiveness Unit, Economic Relations Division
Ministry of Finance
Economic Relations Division
Sher-e-Bangla Nagar
1207 Dhaka
Bangladesh

Tel: +8801711522543
Fax: +8802 8113088
Email: ahmedmonowar@hotmail.com

Canada

Caroline LECLERC

Director General
Strategic Planning and Performance Reporting
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)
Strategic policy and performance Branch (SPPB)
200 Promenade du Portage,
Place du Centre, Floor 12, Room 1237
K1A 0G4 Gatineau
Canada

Tel: +1 (819) 994 6742
Fax: +1 (819) 997 9049
Email: caroline.leclerc@acdi-cida.gc.ca

Jennifer LALONDE

Team Leader Aid Effectiveness Division
Direction générale des politiques stratégiques et du
rendement / Strategic Policy and Performance Branch
CIDA
200 Promenade du Portage
K1A 0G4 Gatineau
Canada

Tel: +1 819-953-2775
Fax: +1 819-953-6356
Email: JENNIFER.LALONDE@acdi-cida.gc.ca

EU

Vincent GRIMAUD

Head of Unit
Aid and Development Effectiveness and Financing
European Commission

Tel: +322 296 33 20
Email: Vincent.GRIMAUD@ec.europa.eu

Ms. Kristiina KUVAJA

National Seconded Expert in the EU Commission
Aid Effectiveness Team
European Commission
Brussels, Belgium

Email: kristiina.kuvaja@ec.europa.eu

g7+

Francesca BOMBOKO

Coordonnatrice de l'Observatoire Congolais de la
Pauvreté et des Inégalités
Ministère du Plan
480 avenue Kasai
Kinshasa
Democratic Republic of the Congo

Tel: +243814048086
Email: Berci65@yahoo.fr

Lisa DENNEY

ODI

Email: l.denney@odi.org.uk

Germany

Ursula MÜLLER

Director General, Policy Issues and Bilateral
Development Cooperation; Sectoral Affairs
Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and
Development (BMZ)
Dahlmannstrasse 4
53113 Bonn
Germany

Tel: +49 228 99 535 3400
Email: ursula.mueller@bmz.bund.de

Martina METZ

Head of Division
Effectiveness of Development Cooperation
Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and
Development (BMZ)
Adenauerallee 139-141
53113 Bonn
Germany

Tel: +49-1888-535-880
Email: Martina.Metz@bmz.bund.de

Honduras

Lidia FROMM CEA

Director General for Co-operation
Secretaría Técnica de Planificación y Cooperación
Externa
Ministry of Planning and Co-operation
Centro Cívico Gubernamental-Contiguo a Chiminike
Boulevard Fuerzas Armadas, Tegucigalpa
Honduras

Tel: +504 2230 7000
Fax: +504 2230 5268
Email: lfromm@seplan.gob.hn

Inter-Parliamentary Union

Martin CHUNGONG

Director of Division of Programs
Co-Chair of Aid and Accountability Management
Group
Inter-Parliamentary Union
Chemin du Pommier 5
Switzerland
1218 Grand Saconnex
Geneva
Switzerland

Tel: +41 22 919 4130
Fax: +41 22 919 4160
Email: mch@mail.ipu.org

Japan

Tatsuhiko MITAMURA

First Secretary
Development
Permanent Delegation
11, avenue Hoche
75008 Paris
France

Tel: +33 1 53 76 61 33
Fax: +33 1 45 63 05 44
Email: tatsuhiko.mitamura@mofa.go.jp

Yukiko OKANO

Counsellor
Permanent Delegation
11, avenue Hoche
75008 Paris
France

Tel: +33 1 53 76 61 60
Fax: +33 1 53 76 61 54
Email: yukiko.okano@mofa.go.jp

Korea

Seung Woo CHIN

Deputy Director
International Economic Affairs
Ministry of Strategy and Finance
Korea

Email: swchin@mosf.go.kr

Mali

Modibo M. MAKALOU

Coordinateur/Mission de Développement et
Coopération
Development and Cooperation Initiative (DACI)
Présidence de la République
B.P.10
Koulouba
Mali

Tel: +223 763 747 00
Fax: +223 2023 0009
Email: mmakalou@mdc.pr.ml

Mexico

Gerardo BRACHO

Deputy Director General of Cooperation Policy
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Plaza Juárez 20, Piso 7
Colonia Centro
Delegación Cuauhtémoc
06010 Mexico City
Mexico

Tel: +52 (55) 36 86 51 00
Email: gbracho@sre.gob.mx

Aldo ALDAMA

Mexican Delegate to the DAC
Development, Employment, Health and Social Affairs
Permanent Delegation
8, Rue de Berri
75008 Paris
France

Tel: +33 1 56 59 29 21
Fax: +33 1 45 63 03 63
Email: aaldama@delegamexocde.org

Pacific Islands

Roger CORNFORTH

Development Counsellor
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
New Zealand

Tel: +33 1 45 01 43 17
Email: roger.cornforth@mfat.govt.nz

Rwanda

Ronald NKUSI

Director
External Finance Unit
Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning

Tel: +250.252596130
Email: ronald.nkusi@minecofin.gov.rw

Yuko SUZUKI NAAB

Aid Effectiveness Specialist
Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
Kigali
Rwanda

Tel: +250782220008
Email: yuko.suzuki@minecofin.gov.rw

South Africa

Linda SHONGWE

Minister Plenipotentiary
59 quai d'Orsay
75345 Cedex 07 Paris
France

Email: shongwel@dirco.gov.za

Peter MAHAFHA

Third Secretary
Multilateral
Embassy of South Africa
59 quai d'Orsay
75007 Paris
France

Tel: +33 1 53 59 23 46
Email: MahafhaP@dirco.gov.za

Sweden

Johan BORGSTAM

Director General for International Development Co-
operation
Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Gustav Adolfs torg 1
S-103 39 Stockholm
Sweden

Tel: +46 8 405 51 15
Email: johan.borgstam@foreign.ministry.se

Johanna TEAGUE

Department for Management and Methods in
Development Cooperation
Ministry for Foreign Affairs
S-103 39 Stockholm
Sweden

Tel: +46 70 618 84 83
Email: johanna.teague@foreign.ministry.se

United Kingdom

Richard CALVERT

Director General
Finance and Corporate Performance Division
Department for International Development
1 Palace Street
SW1E 5HE London
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 207 023 0417
Email: r-calvert@dfid.gov.uk

Carol Ann MUNN

Statistics Adviser
Aid Impact, Finance Performance & Impact
Department for International Development (DFID)
Abercrombie House

Tel: +44 (0) 1355 843819
Email: ca-munn@dfid.gov.uk

United States

Steven PIERCE

US Representative to the DAC
USOEDC
Permanent Delegation
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
20523-4801 Washington
United States

Tel: +33.1.4312-7434
Fax: +33.1.4312-7489
Email: spierce@usaid.gov

World Bank

Melanie MARLETT

Operations Policy and Country Services
World Bank - USA
1818, H ST NW
20433 Washington
United States

Tel: +1 202 458 4312

Email: Mmarlett@worldbank.org

Participant Observers

Brazil

Ricardo GUERRA DE ARAÚJO

Minister Counsellor
Head of OECD Liaison Office
Embassy of Brazil in France
34, Cours Albert 1er, 75008 Paris, France

+33 1 45 61 63 54

+33 1 42 89 03 45

ocde@brazil.org

India

Rakesh SHARMA

Second Secretary
Embassy of India
15 rue Alfred Dehodencq
75016 Paris
France

Tel: +33 1 40 50 50 38

Email: ss.paris@india.com

OECD

Mr. Jon LOMOY

Director
DCD
OECD

Tel: +(33-1) 45 24 90 00

Email: Jon.LOMOY@oecd.org

Brenda KILLEN

Head of Division
DCD/AQuA
OECD

Tel: +(33-1) 45 24 83 72

Email: Brenda.KILLEN@oecd.org

Marjolaine NICOD

Senior Policy Advisor on Aid Effectiveness
DCD/AQuA
OECD

Tel: +(33-1) 45 24 87 67

Email: Marjolaine.NICOD@oecd.org

Hanna-Mari KILPELAINEN
Policy Analyst, Aid Architecture et Financing
DCD/AQuA
OECD

Tel: +(33-1) 45 24 90 36
Email: Hanna-Mari.KILPELAINEN@oecd.org

Robin OGILVY
Policy Analyst
DCD/AQuA
OECD

Tel: +(33-1) 45 24 94 48
Email: Robin.OGILVY@oecd.org

**ANNEX B – NOTE PREPARED BY KOREA ON GLOBAL MONITORING
(CIRCULATED AS A ROOM DOCUMENT ON 21 MAY)**

**PARTICIPATION OF SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION PROVIDERS
IN THE BUSAN GLOBAL MONITORING FRAMEWORK**

Draft Discussion Note – 21 May 2012 ¹

Background

1. The Busan Forum made a significant step forward by bringing together the broadest range of stakeholders in development. Most notably, emerging economies such as China, India, and Brazil participated in Busan and rendered their support to the Busan outcome document, which has been lauded as a major achievement.

2. Among others, the paragraph 2 was finalized by the sherpas after the intense negotiation. It states “The principles, commitments and actions agreed in the outcome document in Busan shall be the reference for South-South partners on a voluntary basis.” Also, the paragraph 14 makes a specific reference to the complementary roles of South-South providers and recognizes the “common goals, shared principles and differential commitments.”

3. The promise of Busan will be met when the political momentum is maintained and the participation by all development stakeholders is encouraged. In particular, the participation of South-South partners is essential in order to materialize the new Global Partnership. Otherwise, there will be little political progress since Busan and possibly we will move backward to the old paradigm. In this context, the PBIG members are invited to discuss how to provide an appropriate space for South-South providers in the global monitoring system and deliver a specific proposal for the approval of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness in June.

Diverging Views

4. Within the PBIG members, there are diverging views on the nature and level of participation of South-South providers in the global monitoring framework. On one hand, there is a call to engage them in the global monitoring framework in the same way as “traditional” donors. On the other side of the spectrum, there are more realistic views in which the focus is on the voluntary nature of participation and the promotion of policy dialogue and trust building.

5. Some South-South partners have shown greater interest than others in global monitoring by expressing the view that they will engage in the global monitoring in a progressive manner, taking into account their relatively limited capacity as providers of assistance. Some other South-South partners have not expressed their positions on these issues, and have yet to indicate whether or how they intend to participate in the Global Partnership.

Proposal

5. The paragraphs 2 and 14 are an expression of today’s changing realities of the global development landscape. And this is the agreement that over 160 countries including emerging economies themselves have accepted. Thus, they should be the starting point of any deliberations in regards to the participation of South-South partners in the post-Busan system.

¹ This note is prepared by the Republic of Korea in consultation with the Chair and WP-EFF bureau members and is intended to provide an input for discussion at the 3rd PBIG meeting.

6. In regards to the global monitoring, it is important to ensure that language is provided to retain an open door for South-South partners without undermining the expectations and quality of the Busan spirit. Equally important is to reaffirm that South-South providers are not treated in the same way as Northern providers, unless they choose to be. It is welcome for them to provide input to the global monitoring efforts in a range of ways, for example through self reporting on their efforts in areas of interest. Their engagement to share experience and tackle common challenges jointly is key.

7. The following paragraph is proposed to be included in the final proposal for the Busan global monitoring framework. The PBIG members are invited to comment and revise the text, as appropriate.

Given the different nature of South-South cooperation, it is expected that the experience and achievements of South-South cooperation partners in implementing the Busan principles, commitments and actions will be shared on a voluntary basis (for example, through self-reporting on their efforts in areas of interest to them). These new providers of assistance are not expected to participate in the global system proposed in this initial Partnership arrangement. Their future participation in aspects of the global system is a decision left to evolving and sovereign processes, and this will in no way inhibit their full participation in the Partnership as South-South partners.

* * * * *