

Global Partnership Initiative 12

Stock-take of Indicator Two Monitoring

Task Team on CSO Development
Effectiveness and Enabling Environment



Jacqueline Wood
with contributions from Adinda Ceelen
November 2016

Disclaimer

This report is a consolidation of findings from eleven country reports drafted by country level researchers for the Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment. It is delivered as part of the Task Team's Global Partnership Initiative 12 (GPI-12). The research was commissioned by the Task Team through its Secretariat at the International Institute of Social Studies of Erasmus University Rotterdam (ISS-EUR), the Netherlands. The content of this report does not reflect the views of ISS-EUR, Task Team participants or their institutions.

Acknowledgements

The Task Team extends thanks to the GPI-12 researchers in the eleven Stock-take countries. Further appreciation is due to the National Coordinators in each country for their participation in the Stock-take and for their support in helping the Stock-take researchers understand the Indicator Two monitoring landscape. The CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) and CPDE-designated country level Focal Points are also thanked for their participation and support through the Stock-take, as are cooperation provider Focal Points and all interviewees who participated in this study.

This report was authored by Jacqueline Wood with contributions from Adinda Ceelen, both of the Task Team Secretariat. Support has been provided by David Wubs-Mrozewicz and Sanne Huesken, also of the Task Team Secretariat, as well as by the Task Team's Co-chairs: Richard Ssewakiryanga, Cornelius Hacking, and Modibo Makalou.

Funding for the Task Team activities and for this Stock-take is provided by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida).

This report is available on the Task Team's website at:

<https://taskteamcso.com/gpi-12-stock-take/>

Table of Contents

List of abbreviations	VI
SUMMARY	VII
Overview of recommendations	XI
1 Introduction	1
2 GPI-12 Stock-take Purpose and Approach	5
2.1 GPEDC 2015/16 Monitoring Approach	6
2.2 Origins of the Stock-take	7
2.3 Purpose of the Stock-take	7
2.4 Coverage, Methods, Principles, Limitations and Generalizability of the Stock-take	8
2.4.1 Country sample and selection	8
2.4.2 Methods used	9
2.4.3 Guiding principles	10
2.4.4 Limitations	10
2.4.5 Generalizability of the findings	10
3 Stock-take Findings	11
3.1 Multi-stakeholder Engagement	12
3.1.1 Multi-stakeholder dialogue sessions	12
3.1.2 Involvement of Focal Points and their constituencies	14
3.1.3 Challenges in multi-stakeholder engagement	17
3.1.4 Recommendations on multi-stakeholder engagement	23
3.2 Indicator Two Questionnaire and Guidelines	25
3.2.1 Questionnaire and guidelines content	25
3.2.2 Recommendations on the questionnaire and guidelines	26
3.3 Relevance of Indicator Two Monitoring	27
3.3.1 Effective development cooperation	27
3.3.2 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)	27
4 Behaviour Change, Usefulness and Next Steps	29
4.1 Opportunity for Behaviour Change	30
4.2 Usefulness and Next Steps	31
4.2.1 Recommendations on behaviour change, usefulness and next steps	33
5 Key Summary Conclusions	35
Annex A: GPI-12 Stock-take Country Rankings	40
Annex B: Multi-stakeholder Engagement in Indicator Two: Questionnaire, Focal Points and Multi-stakeholder Dialogue	41
Annex C: GPI-12 Stock-take Interviewees by Country and Stakeholder Group	44
Annex D: GPI-12 Stock-take Researchers by Country	45

List of abbreviations

CPDE	CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
FP	Focal Point
GPEDC	Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation
GPI-12	Global Partnership Initiative 12
HLM	High Level Meeting
JST	Joint Support Team
MAG	Monitoring Advisory Group
NC	National Coordinator
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
Task Team	Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment

Summary

Introduction

In 2015 the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) launched the 2015/16 (second) monitoring round of the global effective development cooperation commitments.¹

The GPEDC's monitoring provides evidence of progress and challenges in meeting the effective development cooperation commitments, which will be reflected in the 2015/16 *Progress Report*.² As such, the monitoring supports accountability across stakeholder groups, and incentivizes behaviour change. It is meant to fuel multi-stakeholder dialogue at country level and beyond, including the political dialogue that will take place at the next High Level Meeting (HLM2) scheduled for November 28th-December 1st in Nairobi. The importance of making development cooperation more effective for achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is clearly evident in Agenda 2030 and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.

The GPEDC monitoring framework covers ten indicators, one of which is Indicator Two: *civil society operates in an environment that maximizes its engagement in and contribution to development*. Indicator Two is comprised of a four module framework addressing: i) space for multi-stakeholder dialogue; ii) CSO development effectiveness; iii) official development cooperation with CSOs; and iv) the legal and regulatory environment for CSOs.

The 2015/16 monitoring round marks the first time that Indicator Two was monitored at country level, using a questionnaire addressing the four modules, and guidance that calls for a multi-stakeholder approach.

Origins of the Stock-take

At the Mexico HLM, the Task Team on Civil Society Organization (CSO) Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment (Task Team) committed to implement Global Partnership Initiative 12 (GPI-12)³: CSO Enabling Environment Framework and Guidelines. GPI-12 implementation began with Task Team participation in an informal multi-stakeholder working group, under the leadership of the GPEDC's Joint Support Team (JST), to refine Indicator Two. This effort led to the current Indicator Two framework and monitoring approach.

¹ These commitments include those made at the Monterrey, Rome, Paris, Accra, Busan and Mexico High Level events (2002, 2003, 2005, 2008, 2011, 2014). The motivation behind these key events has been to develop principles and associated commitments to enhance the effectiveness and thus impact of development cooperation, with an eye to achieving the Millennium Development Goals and the Sustainable Development Goals.

² This report will be available at: <http://effectivecooperation.org/monitoring-country-progress/explore-monitoring-data/>.

³ Global Partnership Initiatives (GPIs) are voluntary initiatives affiliated with the GPEDC's global efforts to advance effective development cooperation. GPIs are listed in the Mexico Communiqué, available at:

http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/ENG_Final-ConsensusMexicoHLMCommunique.pdf. Additional information on GPEDC-affiliated GPIs is available at: <http://effectivecooperation.org/monitoring-country-progress/global-partnership-initiatives/>.

Additional information on the Task Team's GPI-12 is available at: <https://taskteamcso.com/about-gpi-12/>.

The Stock-take arose as a means to learn from country experience of monitoring this newly devised indicator in the second monitoring round. It is a further contribution to the Task Team's GPI-12. Also under GPI-12, the Task Team is developing a Guidance on the CSO Enabling Environment as a tool to help build a common understanding of what the four Indicator Two modules entail in practice. Examples of good practice from the country level were gathered during the Stock-take research for inclusion in the Guidance.

Purpose of the Stock-take

This Stock-take has been undertaken under the auspices of the Task Team. The Stock-take's purpose is to provide a light assessment of the 2015/16 Indicator Two monitoring based on the experience and perceptions of stakeholders in eleven countries. It is intended to inform the GPEDC's reflections on the Indicator Two monitoring results and experience in its *2015/16 Progress Report*. In addition, the Stock-take findings and recommendations are intended to enhance the design and implementation of Indicator Two monitoring for future monitoring rounds. Ultimately therefore, the Stock-take's intent is to give impetus to advancing the Indicator Two commitments on enabling environments for CSOs and CSO development effectiveness.

This GPI-12 Stock-take will be disseminated ahead of the HLM2 in Nairobi at the end of 2016. Together with the Guidance (forthcoming), the Stock-take will inform design of the Task Team's post-HLM2 GPI. This GPI is likely to address further refinement of Indicator Two, and strengthening country level multi-stakeholder dialogue on its four modules. The Stock-take will also inform the Task Team's Key Messages⁴ for HLM2 and the Nairobi Outcome Document.

Multi-stakeholder Engagement

For the 2015/16 monitoring round, the Indicator Two monitoring was led by National Coordinators (NCs), representing aid recipient country governments. The GPEDC's *2015/16 Monitoring Guide*⁵ calls for two main multi-stakeholder methods for Indicator Two monitoring:

- 1)** Multi-stakeholder dialogue sessions, including to launch the monitoring; for data gathering; and for data validation.
- 2)** Coordination of stakeholder inputs via Focal Points (FPs) designated by stakeholder groups and agreed on with NCs.

The Stock-take findings point to limited multi-stakeholder dialogues having taken place combined with inconsistent use of FPs. This suggests an incomplete application of the Indicator Two monitoring guidance. Five of the eleven countries completed multi-stakeholder sessions focused on Indicator Two. Four of these multi-stakeholder sessions were led by stakeholders other than government. Where they took place,

⁴ The Task Team's Key Messages for HLM2 will be available at: <https://taskteamcso.com/the-2016-high-level-meeting-in-nairobi/>.

⁵ GPEDC (2015), *Monitoring Guide 2015-16: Monitoring the Effective Development Cooperation Commitments*, available at: http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/2015-Monitoring-Guide_final1.pdf.

Indicator Two multi-stakeholder sessions were organized in different ways and with a very varied number and relative presence of stakeholders. In the bulk of the remaining countries, NCs organized multi-stakeholder information sessions to launch the monitoring, or validation sessions, but these were not Indicator Two-specific. In the absence of NC-organized multi-stakeholder dialogues, other collaborative approaches for Indicator Two monitoring were evident however, such as bilateral contact with select CSOs.

The FP role was important for stakeholder outreach and soliciting input to Indicator Two monitoring. However, the FP role was not consistently used across stakeholders. CPDE-designated FPs played a significant role. The designation of development co-operation providers FPs varied considerably and providers were insufficiently engaged overall. Contributions from other stakeholders such as the private sector, parliamentarians, or non-NC government departments/ministries were virtually absent.

A number of challenges commonly encountered in Indicator Two monitoring include: time constraints; lack of capacity including financial resources; gaps in awareness; difficulties in stakeholder outreach, and mistrust across stakeholders. Various recommendations to help address these challenges going forward include: reducing time pressures; capacity development; clarifying FP roles, emphasizing the importance of intra-stakeholder coordination; and maintaining multi-stakeholder dialogue on Indicator Two in between monitoring rounds, amongst others.

Indicator Two Questionnaire and Guidelines

The Indicator Two questionnaire and guidelines are considered comprehensive, and an improvement on the first monitoring round's method of drawing largely from global data. However, the Stock-take findings suggest that the questionnaire could be shortened and simplified. This could in turn potentially enhance the completion of the questionnaire in a multi-stakeholder fashion going forward. At the same time, a series of specific recommendations were offered by interviewees that, if implemented, would lengthen and potentially complicate the questionnaire. There is interest in devising ways to make the questionnaire more locally relevant, including but not limited to the need for early translation. Refinements to the questionnaire and guidance will need further reflection.

Relevance

Indicator Two and its monitoring are clearly relevant to the effective development co-operation agenda, in which CSOs' varied roles – from policy dialogue to program implementation – are recognized as integral. Indicator Two also exemplifies the effective development cooperation paradigm – and more specifically the principle of inclusive partnerships - given its multi-stakeholder approach to monitoring the practices of various actors. Indicator Two is also particularly relevant to SDGs 16 and 17.⁶

⁶ See United Nations General Assembly (2015), Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development at http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1&Lang=E. SDG 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels. SDG 17: Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development.

CSOs have a role to play in advancing progress toward the peaceful, inclusive societies and accountable institutions called for by SDG 16, while these are also key elements of an enabling environment for CSOs. Meanwhile, CSOs are also significant players in the means of implementation of SDG 17.

Behaviour Change, Usefulness and Next Steps

The Indicator Two monitoring both demonstrates and provides an opportunity for behaviour change involving multi-stakeholder collaboration, increased transparency, and the building of trust and mutual understanding. Despite the mixed experience of multi-stakeholder engagement, the findings suggest that even partial steps toward a multi-stakeholder approach have whet the appetite for multi-stakeholder engagement on Indicator Two subject matter. This shows potential for escalated uptake in future monitoring rounds. Further, Indicator Two monitoring has the potential to motivate changes in the operational behaviour of the stakeholders it targets, and thus to strengthen enabling environments for CSOs and CSO development effectiveness. To increase the chances of sustained behaviour change, next steps will need to involve: access to country reports for review and cross-country comparison; opportunities for ongoing multi-stakeholder dialogue on Indicator Two; and demonstrations of political will from all stakeholders to reflect together, implement, and hold each other accountable for the behavior changes needed.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the Stock-take findings and recommendations are worthy of consideration in light of the GPEDC's 2015/16 *Progress Report*; future monitoring rounds; and the collective interest in multi-stakeholder engagement at country level toward more enabling environments for CSOs and CSO development effectiveness. The potential to build on the Indicator Two experience is worth seizing as a means of achieving greater development cooperation effectiveness.

Overview of recommendations

MULTI-STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Recommendations on the multi-stakeholder dialogue approach

- i. Extend the time frame from launch to data submission deadline, avoiding holiday periods if possible and anticipating that staff and ministerial/departmental responsibility changes often result in significant delays.
- ii. Start the monitoring process early, and invest in a preparatory phase at country-level involving awareness raising.
- iii. Invest in raising awareness of the effective development cooperation paradigm and the GPEDC monitoring across a broader swath of stakeholders and more deeply within stakeholder groups.
- iv. Use awareness raising methods to “market” the GPEDC monitoring so that all parties can see the value of Indicator Two monitoring. In particular, the benefits of building a greater understanding of each stakeholder’s contributions and constraints while setting a path of greater collaboration could be highlighted.
- v. Establish a CSO liaison position in the ministry/department responsible for the monitoring. This position would support future monitoring rounds and, in between, engage in awareness raising and champion ongoing dialogue about Indicator Two content.
- vi. With the NC in the lead, establish a multi-stakeholder organizing committee for each monitoring round and build this committee’s capacity well in advance of the monitoring. Have multi-stakeholder leadership for this committee and thus coordination of Indicator Two monitoring.
- vii. Tap into an existing multi-stakeholder dialogue forum in advance of the monitoring launch. While a forum that is specific to Indicator Two content is unlikely to exist, there may be others on related subject matter prepared to “host” Indicator Two dialogue.
- viii. Alternatively, establish and institutionalize a multi-stakeholder forum on Indicator Two subject matter and encourage meeting in between monitoring rounds.
- ix. Encourage country-level donors to fund these multi-stakeholder dialogues on an ongoing basis.
- x. Establish a means to provide capacity development for stakeholders that will build their understanding of the Indicator Two questionnaire and guidelines, and their ability to design and engage in country level multi-stakeholder dialogues.
- xi. Ensure sufficient JST resources and capacity to support the monitoring through regional workshops, web and Skype-based assistance to NCs and other stakeholders.

Recommendations on Focal Points and constituency engagement

- i. Maintain a list of key stakeholders working on development cooperation effectiveness issues and broaden information sharing and outreach with these stakeholders on an ongoing basis.

- ii. Circulate the questionnaire broadly to CSOs through contacts available in e.g. national databases or CSO umbrella databases. Follow by inviting those who responded to a dialogue to discuss questionnaire responses.
- iii. Revise the guidelines to make the role of various stakeholders in Indicator Two monitoring clearer, stressing the importance of inter-stakeholder group coordination and the FP function for intra-stakeholder coordination.
- iv. More specifically, elaborate a clearer mechanism of provider participation in the process and seek greater support from the GPEDC as well as from provider headquarters to solicit provider engagement.
- v. Maintain the FP role but encourage context-appropriate interpretation of this role and, when it comes to CSOs, consider direct engagement with other country-level CSO coordinating bodies (umbrellas and networks).
- vi. Consider ways of broadening and deepening engagement of stakeholders, including of CSOs outside of capital cities, such as through the use of focus groups.
- vii. Consider financial support to CSOs fulfilling the FP role, or at minimum, find ways to acknowledge their contribution.
- viii. Invest in capacity development for FPs on inter and intra-stakeholder group engagement.
- ix. Where relationships of mistrust between government and CSOs are particularly evident, consider delegating management of Indicator Two monitoring to a third party. In such cases it would be important to still require a multi-stakeholder process, and to ensure government, via the NC, has a role in data provision and validation of the report.

INDICATOR TWO QUESTIONNAIRE AND GUIDELINES

Recommendations

- i. Distinguish between policy/regulation and what occurs in practice, as there can be discrepancy between the two.
- ii. Distinguish between local and non-local CSOs especially in relation to modules 3 and 4. Regarding the latter, legal and regulatory frameworks increasingly distinguish between local and non-local CSOs, such as in relation to foreign funding. Regarding the former, donor funding tends to flow differently to local and non-local CSOs with the bulk reaching local CSOs only via non-local CSOs.
- iii. Distinguish between service delivery and advocacy CSOs as their experience in relation to the four Indicator Two modules may differ.
- iv. Add variables regarding CSO development effectiveness and accountability.
- v. Add variables regarding both the financing of CSOs and the financing that they bring to development cooperation at country level.
- vi. Add a variable regarding CSO and private sector cooperation which is going to be increasingly relevant as part of a collective effort to achieve the SDGs.
- vii. Use scales rather than “yes”/“no” answers to allow for greater nuance that reflects the views of multiple stakeholders.
- viii. Rethink the 300-word limit, as qualitative issues are lost in the summary.
- ix. Provide funds for translation of the questionnaire into local languages early on in the process.

BEHAVIOUR CHANGE, USEFULNESS AND NEXT STEPS

Recommendations

- i. Make country reports available for stakeholders to be able to see and analyze their own country's report on Indicator Two.
- ii. Reflection by single stakeholder groups on: country report findings; implications for their practices; what is needed to demonstrate political will toward behaviour change.
- iii. Consideration by NCs and FPs, separately and together, of how to organize multi-stakeholder dialogue to review the country report including areas needing further progress.
- iv. Organize a large multi-stakeholder event on a country's report so that the results can be used by various stakeholders.
- v. Use the Indicator Two results for ongoing multi-stakeholder dialogue on progress and bottlenecks in relation to Indicator Two's four modules.
- vi. Use the Indicator Two results to design and implement awareness raising and capacity development on Indicator Two's four modules.
- vii. Ensure an ongoing lead role for NCs, including in between monitoring rounds and with strong institutional and political backing.

1. Introduction

In 2015 the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) launched the 2015/16 (second) round of monitoring of the global effective development cooperation commitments.¹ Eighty-one countries² receiving development cooperation participated in this most recent monitoring round.

The GPEDC's monitoring provides evidence of progress, opportunities and challenges in meeting the effective development cooperation commitments, which will be reflected in the 2015/16 Progress Report.³ Through such evidence, the monitoring plays a key role in supporting accountability for meeting these commitments across stakeholder groups, and in incentivizing behaviour change. Both the evidence gathered and the monitoring process fuel multi-stakeholder dialogue at country, regional and global levels on the changes needed to make development cooperation more effective. Such dialogue, including political dialogue at the next High Level Meeting (HLM2) scheduled for November 28th-December 1st in Nairobi, stimulates stakeholder agreement on actions to address bottlenecks and foster further progress.

Notably, stakeholder commitment to the principles and actions of effective development cooperation is voluntary, as is participation in the monitoring. Yet, as is clear from the Agenda 2030 and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the quality and effectiveness of development cooperation as well as the active participation of all development stakeholders are critical to achieving the new and ambitious Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).^{4,5}

The GPEDC monitoring framework covers ten indicators clustered around the GPEDC's four key principles: ownership, results, inclusive development partnerships, and transparency and mutual accountability. Included in these ten indicators is Indicator Two: *civil society operates in an environment that maximizes its engagement in and contribution to development*.

The 2015/16 monitoring round marks the first time that Indicator Two was monitored at country level. Additionally, the newly designed Indicator Two monitoring process and questionnaire required a multi-stakeholder approach.

¹ These commitments include those made at the Monterrey, Rome, Paris, Accra, Busan and Mexico High Level events (2002, 2003, 2005, 2008, 2011, 2014). The motivation behind these key events has been to develop principles and associated commitments to enhance the effectiveness and thus impact of development cooperation, with an eye to achieving the Millennium Development Goals and the Sustainable Development Goals.

² As communicated by the GPEDC's Joint Support Team, August 26, 2016.

³ The 2015/16 Progress Report will soon be available at: <http://effectivecooperation.org/monitoring-country-progress/explore-monitoring-data/>.

⁴ This summary is largely extracted from GPEDC (2015), Monitoring Guide 2015-16: Monitoring the Effective Development Cooperation Commitments, available at: http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/2015-Monitoring-Guide_final.pdf.

⁵ See United Nations General Assembly (2015), Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, at: http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/69/L.82. See also United Nations General Assembly (2015), Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development at http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1&Lang=E.

Given the new experience of Indicator Two, the Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment (Task Team) deemed it valuable to “take stock” of how the Indicator Two monitoring rolled out in the 2015/16 round. The Task Team’s intent is that lessons from the Stock-take will inform the GPEDC’s reflections on the monitoring framework to further strengthen future monitoring rounds.

This report presents the main findings of the Stock-take. It speaks to the experience of multi-stakeholder engagement in the Indicator Two monitoring. The Stock-take findings are comprised of the challenges and recommendations for the monitoring process; the content of the Indicator Two questionnaire, including recommendations to strengthen it; the relevance of Indicator Two monitoring; and its potential to influence behavior change, and next steps.

2. GPI-12 Stock-take Purpose and Approach

2.1 GPEDC 2015/16 Monitoring Approach

2.2 Origins of the Stock-take

2.3 Purpose of the Stock-take

**2.4 Coverage, Methods, Principles,
Limitations and Generalizability of
the Stock-take**

To put the Stock-take in context of the GPEDC monitoring, this section begins with a brief overview of the GPEDC's 2015/16 monitoring approach as outlined in the *2015/16 Monitoring Guide*.

2.1 GPEDC 2015/16 Monitoring Approach

The GPEDC's 2015/16 *Monitoring Guide* calls for a multi-stakeholder approach to the overall monitoring exercise. The Guide sees this approach as not only a means to enhance data quality and credibility, but also to foster constructive dialogue among development stakeholders. Participating countries are to designate National Coordinators (NCs) to lead the monitoring, and collaboration with other stakeholders is highly encouraged. Data gathering and validation is to involve multi-stakeholder dialogue sessions inclusive of civil society organizations (CSOs), development cooperation providers, and other actors from the private sector, parliamentarians, and local/regional governments. In collaboration with NCs, these stakeholder groups are to designate Focal Points (FPs) to help coordinate stakeholder participation and inputs to the monitoring. Terms of Reference for the different stakeholder FPs outline their responsibilities.

This multi-stakeholder approach is particularly appropriate for Indicator Two given that it examines the practices of multiple stakeholders. National governments, CSOs, and development cooperation providers are all meant to report data for Indicator Two. The Indicator Two questionnaire has a four module framework addressing: i) space for multi-stakeholder dialogue; ii) CSO development effectiveness; iii) official development cooperation with CSOs; and iv) the legal and regulatory environment for CSOs. Binary yes/no responses are to be complemented by qualitative context assessments for each module. While the multi-stakeholder approach is meant to incentivize consensus on the responses, diverging views can be noted, while complementary evidence can also be submitted.

“This indicator is primarily built to provide a useful tool to spark multi-stakeholder dialogue at the country level among governments, CSOs and providers, to identify progress as well as room for improvement in CSO enabling environment and CSO development effectiveness.” (2015/16 Monitoring Guide, p. 26)

To complement the *Monitoring Guide*, the GPEDC's Joint Support Team (JST) organized regional workshops and provided web and Skype-based support to NCs and other stakeholders in implementing the monitoring.

2.2 Origins of the Stock-take

At the Mexico HLM, the Task Team committed to implement Global Partnership Initiative 12 (GPI-12)⁶: CSO Enabling Environment Framework and Guidelines. As noted in the *Mexico Communiqué*, the Task Team's intent was to develop a framework and guidance on the CSO enabling environment, consistent with agreed international human rights, to strengthen GPEDC Indicator Two, and advance democratic ownership in development processes, by the time of the next HLM.

Following the Mexico HLM, the Task Team was invited by the JST to participate in an informal multi-stakeholder working group to refine Indicator Two and its monitoring approach. The JST and the Task Team were motivated by the need for an Indicator that would be based on country experience, rather than on global data as was the case in the 2013/14 (first) monitoring round. The Task Team engaged in this endeavor as part of its GPI-12 commitment to develop a framework on the CSO enabling environment. For the Task Team, it was important that such a framework reflect the effective development cooperation commitments in relation to civil society, including democratic ownership through multi-stakeholder dialogue; official development cooperation with CSOs; legal and regulatory frameworks for CSOs; as well as CSO development effectiveness. The Task Team's efforts, with its participants from CPDE, provider and recipient governments and with leadership from the JST, led to the current Indicator Two monitoring framework and approach.

The Stock-take arose as a means to learn from the experience of monitoring this newly devised indicator in the 2015/16 monitoring round. The Task Team considers the Stock-take as a further contribution to GPI-12. Also under GPI-12, the Task Team is developing Guidance on the CSO Enabling Environment and CSO Development Effectiveness as a tool to help build a common understanding of what the four Indicator Two modules entail in practice. During the Stock-take research, examples of good practice from the country level were gathered for inclusion in the Guidance.

2.3 Purpose of the Stock-take

The purpose of the Stock-take is to provide a light assessment of the 2015/16 Indicator Two monitoring exercise in a sample of countries. The Stock-take is based on the experience and perceptions of country level stakeholders on the recommended Indicator Two monitoring process as outlined in the GPEDC 2015/16 *Monitoring Guide*, and the actual experience with the process and Indicator Two questionnaire content.

The intention of the Stock-take is to provide a useful source of information for the chapter on Indicator Two in the GPEDC's 2015/16 *Progress Report*.⁷ As the 2015/16 *Monitoring Guide* notes, the second monitoring round provides an opportunity to

⁶ Global Partnership Initiatives (GPIS) are voluntary initiatives affiliated with the GPEDC's global efforts to advance effective development cooperation. GPIS are listed in the Mexico Communiqué, available at: http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/ENG_Final-ConsensusMexicoHLMCommunique.pdf. Additional information on GPEDC-affiliated GPIS is available at: <http://effectivecooperation.org/monitoring-country-progress/global-partnership-initiatives/>. Additional information on the Task Team's GPI-12 is available at: <https://taskteamcso.com/about-gpi-12/>.

⁷ The 2015/16 *Progress Report* will be available at: <http://effectivecooperation.org/monitoring-country-progress/explore-monitoring-data/>.

learn from the new approach to Indicator Two monitoring to strengthen it as needed for future monitoring rounds.⁸ As such, it is also the Task Team’s intent for the Stock-take to inform the GPEDC, its Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG), and the JST as they review the GPEDC monitoring framework pre- and post-HLM2. This review considers the relevance and potential role of the GPEDC’s monitoring in the SDGs’ monitoring.

As noted, the results of the Stock-take will also be used by the Task Team as it develops Guidance on the four modules of Indicator Two. The Stock-take will be disseminated ahead of HLM2 in Nairobi at the end of 2016. Together with the Guidance (forthcoming), the Stock-take of these Task Team products will inform design of the Task Team’s post-HLM2 GPI. This GPI is likely to be geared both to further refinement of Indicator Two (in collaboration with the JST), and to strengthening country level multi-stakeholder dialogue on its four modules. The Stock-take will also inform the Task Team’s Key Messages⁹ for HLM2 and the Nairobi Outcome Document.

2.4 Coverage, Methods, Principles, Limitations and Generalizability of the Stock-take

2.4.1 Country sample and selection

Eighty-one countries participated in the 2015/16 monitoring round, with fifty-five of these countries having monitored Indicator Two.¹⁰

The Stock-take covers a sample of eleven countries:

Armenia	Cameroon	Costa Rica
Egypt	Honduras	Kenya
Kyrgyzstan	Mozambique	Myanmar
Sudan	Uganda	

Factors taken into consideration when selecting countries included coverage of a range of geographic regions and of environments for CSOs as reflected in two indices (see Annex A). The first, CIVICUS’s Enabling Environment Index, ranks governance, socio-cultural and socio-economic environments for civil society in 109 countries.¹¹ The majority of Stock-take countries are located around the middle of the CIVICUS Enabling Environment Index scoring, suggesting a moderate environment in which citizens are able to participate and engage in the civil society arena. The second, Freedom House’s Freedom in the World¹² index, assesses the condition of political rights and civil liberties in 195 countries and 15 territories. The majority of Stock-take countries are split almost equally between “partially free” and “not free” in the Freedom

⁸ GPEDC 2015/16 Monitoring Guide, p. 48.

⁹ The Task Team’s Key Messages for HLM2 will be available at: <https://taskteamcso.com/the-2016-high-level-meeting-in-nairobi/>.

¹⁰ As communicated by the GPEDC’s JST, August 26, 2016.

¹¹ CIVICUS (2013), The CIVICUS 2013 Enabling Environment Index, available at: http://civicus.org/eei/downloads/Civicus_EEI%20REPORT%202013_WEB_FINAL.pdf.

¹² Freedom House (2016), Freedom in the World 2016, available at: https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/FH_FITW_Report_2016.pdf. Further information also available at: <https://freedomhouse.org/report-types/freedom-world>.

House classification with one considered “free”. Noteworthy is that 74% of countries participating in the 2015/16 monitoring round are, as with the majority of Stock-take countries, categorized as either “partially free” (44%) or “not free” (30%). Similarly, of the countries that monitored Indicator Two, 78% are categorized as either “partially free” (47%) or “not free” (31%).

Practical considerations also came into play in country selection, particularly the receptivity of NCs approached by the Task Team to participate in the Stock-take. A further practical consideration was the Task Team’s ability to identify country level researchers with an understanding of the development cooperation effectiveness paradigm as well as of issues in relation to the CSO enabling environment and CSO development effectiveness as covered by Indicator Two. The Task Team also sought researchers who would as much as possible be considered neutral parties, that is, not particularly affiliated with a specific stakeholder group.

2.4.2 Methods used

The methods used by country level researchers included document review and semi-structured interviews with key informants from all stakeholder groups referred to in the GPEDC 2015/16 *Monitoring Guide*. The researchers focused primarily on interviewing representatives from national governments, CSOs and development cooperation providers. In addition, effort was made to speak to parliamentarians and the private sector. The Stock-take advised researchers to complete a maximum of 14 interviews,¹³ as much as possible balancing interviews across stakeholder groups. Researchers were further advised to conduct a small number of interviews with individuals who had not been involved in Indicator Two monitoring, with the aim of learning about both awareness and perceptions of its relevance. A breakdown of interviews by stakeholder group is available in Annex B. Over 120 interviews were completed for the Stock-take.

Where possible, researchers were encouraged to also attend, as observers, any country level multi-stakeholder dialogue sessions that took place for Indicator Two data gathering and validation purposes.

To produce this report, the Task Team Secretariat reviewed the researchers’ country reports and many of the accompanying interview summaries. Each country report was coded according to the key findings areas around which this report is organized. The Secretariat validated the findings against the various country reports submitted, and further validated the figures with the country level Stock-take researchers.

Stock-take activities on the ground began in February 2016, to benefit from the fresh perspectives of potential interviewees and to increase the likelihood that the researchers would be able to participate in Indicator Two multi-stakeholder dialogues. Timing was further motivated by the Task Team’s aim of producing this report in time for its consideration by the JST in the 2015/16 *Progress Report*, and by the JST and MAG in their review of the GPEDC monitoring framework.

¹³ As some interviews involved more than one interviewee the number of individuals interviewed surpasses 120. Note that in one country an abbreviated Stock-take resulted in only three interviews conducted for the country report.

2.4.3 Guiding principles

The Terms of Reference for country researchers emphasized the importance of ensuring that the exercise did not in any way interfere with or influence the Indicator Two monitoring process. Key principles communicated to the researchers to guide their work included: neutrality; inclusivity and stakeholder balance; respect; and confidentiality.

In order to respect the condition of confidentiality, this Stock-take report does not attribute quotes to individual interviewees, though where possible, attribution is done by stakeholder type. Equally, findings are not attributed to specific countries, with the exception of the summary tables in the annexes.

2.4.4 Limitations

The main limitation of the Stock-take is the relatively small number of countries it covers. The eleven Stock-take countries represent approximately 14% of the eighty-one countries that participated in the 2015/16 monitoring round, and 19% of the fifty-nine countries that monitored Indicator Two. The Stock-take is also limited in that it does not cover countries that did not monitor Indicator Two.

Obstacles were sometimes faced in accessing potential interviewees. For the most part this was due to busy schedules. Generally, individuals were receptive to country researchers' requests for interviews. On occasion, NCs were cautious about participating in the Stock-take. The willingness of NCs to participate in the Stock-take has been integral to the exercise, as has the collaboration of CSOs, development cooperation providers and others.

2.4.5 Generalizability of the findings

The findings from the Stock-Stake's relatively small sample of countries cannot be considered as fully representative of the experience across the fifty-nine countries that monitored Indicator Two. The participating countries are varied and unique. However, as noted, the Enabling Environment Index and Freedom in the World rankings suggest some similarity across Stock-take countries and others that participated in the 2015/16 monitoring, and thus generalizability of the Stock-take findings beyond the sample. The Stock-take gives an indication of the variety of circumstances and perspectives from the country level, while also pointing to common themes. Overall, it is the Task Team's view that the Stock-take offers rich findings and recommendations for consideration in the future design and implementation of Indicator Two monitoring.

3. Stock-take Findings

- 3.1 Multi-stakeholder Engagement**
- 3.2 Indicator Two Questionnaire and Guidelines**
- 3.3 Relevance of Indicator Two Monitoring**

3.1 Multi-stakeholder Engagement

The Indicator Two monitoring guidance calls for two main methods designed to render it a multi-stakeholder exercise, with NCs in the lead:

- 1) Multi-stakeholder dialogue sessions, including to launch the monitoring; for data gathering; and for data validation.
- 2) Coordination of stakeholder inputs via FPs designated by stakeholder groups and agreed on with NCs.

The Stock-take findings suggest incomplete application of the Indicator Two monitoring guidance, with varying degrees of uptake of these methods. This is further elaborated upon below.

The table in Annex B summarizes multi-stakeholder engagement in each country.

3.1.1 *Multi-stakeholder dialogue sessions*

The intent to implement Indicator Two monitoring in a multi-stakeholder manner was evident in all Stock-take countries and steps in that vein were taken. Nevertheless, the nature, breadth and depth of multi-stakeholder engagement varied considerably and often deviated from the *2015/16 Monitoring Guide's* recommended approach and intent.

The GPEDC *2015/16 Monitoring Guide* envisioned multi-stakeholder dialogue sessions where the content of Indicator Two would be discussed with the aim of building a common understanding and reaching a certain level of agreement on the questionnaire responses. Such multi-stakeholder dialogue sessions were infrequently used to gather or to validate Indicator Two data. In a country where no multi-stakeholder dialogue took place, a CSO interviewee expressed that the lack of dialogue undermined the monitoring process. Overall, the findings suggest that Indicator Two specific multi-stakeholder dialogues, whether for data gathering or validation, took place in five Stock-take countries. In four of these countries, dialogues were led by stakeholders other than the government NC.

Indicator Two specific multi-stakeholder dialogues took place in five Stock-take countries.

Where they took place, multi-stakeholder sessions were organized in different ways with different stakeholder groups taking the lead. An innovative approach was implemented in one country where the development cooperation provider FP organized the Indicator Two multi-stakeholder dialogue on behalf of the NC at the latter's request. At this multi-stakeholder session, participants responded to the Indicator Two questionnaire using an anonymous clicker system and then proceeded to discuss the results both in single and multi-stakeholder groups. Another country saw two small provider-led dialogues involving providers, a few CSOs, as well as government in one

dialogue. In a third country, the NC and CSO FP jointly organized a small multi-stakeholder validation session, while in a fourth country, a multi-stakeholder Indicator Two validation session was organized by the CPDE-designated CSO FP. In a fifth country, the NC appointed responsibility for data gathering to the CPDE-designated FP, which organized two provincial-level multi-stakeholder data gathering dialogues involving CSOs, local government and elected officials.

“the ultimate purpose... of stimulating multi-stakeholder dialogue on development cooperation is to strengthen mutual understanding of progress and challenges in making cooperation more effective.”

In at least four instances, multi-stakeholder meetings convened by the NC at the outset of the monitoring exercise served largely to inform participants of the exercise, as well as to solicit stakeholder engagement in the 2015/16 monitoring. Sometimes however, whether or not such a multi-stakeholder session took place was unclear, including in two of these countries. In one country the NC hosted Indicator Two specific information meetings separately with CSOs and providers.

The findings also reveal variation in how stakeholder engagement was shaped. In one instance the effort to engage stakeholders in data gathering and/or validation involved phone or in-person bilateral contact between the NC and the stakeholder, with the NC (or delegated staff) ultimately completing the questionnaire on behalf of the responding stakeholder. In another, while the NC proposed to establish a multi-stakeholder working group and made two attempts to convene such a group, the attempts were not successful in part due to time pressures felt by CSOs to complete the CSOs' parallel Indicator Two monitoring report. Ultimately in this country the NC and CSO FP met bilaterally to confer on their respective reports demonstrating strong “two-sided cooperation and exchange.” In another country the Indicator Two report was circulated to CSOs for validation, though this occurred only after submission to the GPEDC JST, and few CSOs responded.

Notably, a number of interviewees expressed the feeling that their engagement was limited to serving as information providers, with emphasis on soliciting their inputs to the Indicator Two questionnaire, perhaps at the expense of multi-stakeholder engagement. Whereas ideally “the questionnaire should be only one step not a main part of the monitoring.”

The above case examples illustrate that the Stock-take countries demonstrated intent to implement Indicator Two monitoring in a multi-stakeholder manner, however, the nature of multi-stakeholder engagement varied considerably.

3.1.2 Involvement of Focal Points and their constituencies

On the whole, the use of FPs was uneven across Stock-take countries, as was the level of participation from different stakeholder groups. CSOs had the highest level of participation and involvement of FPs, followed by providers. There was minimal to no engagement of the private sector, parliamentarians or others via FPs or otherwise.

The use of FPs to help coordinate stakeholder participation in multi-stakeholder dialogues and gather stakeholder inputs to the Indicator Two questionnaire was mixed. Where used, the FP approach facilitated stakeholder input to the Indicator Two monitoring. CSO FPs designated by CPDE played a significant role. Provider designation of FPs was less frequent, and development cooperation providers were less engaged overall. The participation of other stakeholders including the private sector, parliaments and non-NC ministries/departments or levels of government, whether involving FPs or otherwise, was virtually absent.

Overall, the number of stakeholders that participated in the 2015/16 Indicator Two monitoring was fairly small. Numbers of participating CSOs ranged from two CSOs completing the Indicator Two questionnaire in one country to forty in another.¹⁴ Provider FP participation ranged from zero to nineteen.

CSOs: Of the eleven Stock-take countries, CPDE had designated CSO FPs in ten. On the whole, these CSO FPs played an important role in Indicator Two monitoring.

Through a series of regional workshops and webinars with its FPs and wider membership, CPDE raised awareness among CSOs of the Indicator Two monitoring exercise and the multi-stakeholder intent of its design. This helped CPDE-designated FPs to take on a significant role in mobilizing CSO participation in the monitoring and coordination of CSO inputs to the Indicator Two questionnaire in at least seven Stock-take countries. CPDE-designated FPs coordinated inputs using different methods, including circulating the questionnaire to CSOs, as well as hosting meetings to develop joint CSO responses to the Indicator Two questionnaire. In three countries, the CPDE-designated FP seems to have played the role of unofficial coordinator of the Indicator Two monitoring¹⁵.

Of the eleven Stock-take countries, CPDE had designed CSO FPs in ten. This helped CPDE-designated FPs to take on a significant role in mobilizing CSO participation in at least seven Stock-take countries.

¹⁴ Note however that some of these CSOs were networks that may have consulted with their members. Thus, the total number of CSO participants may be larger than represented here.

¹⁵ In one of these countries the CSO FP was also unofficially the coordinator for Indicator Three monitoring on the private sector.

In two countries it appears that the NC did not liaise with the CPDE-designated FP. Here, and in the country with no CSO FP, outreach to CSOs was limited, though it was also limited in one country even with involvement of the CPDE-designated FP. In the eight others the CPDE-designated FP was engaged in the Indicator Two monitoring, though in one country the CPDE-designated FP simply participated alongside other CSOs. Here, it was felt that the diversity in the CSO sector would potentially be inadequately reflected via a single CSO FP. In the words of a CSO, it would have been “difficult and impractical to have a FP as it would inevitably not include or represent the variety of voices and concerns that the different CSOs themselves represent... Attempting such an endeavour [FP designation] would necessarily involve navigating a myriad of complex political and ethnic-based sensitivities which may end up distracting from the original task of trying to bring together different CSOs to present a unified voice.”

Notably, CPDE-designated FPs in five of the Stock-take countries (Cameroon, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Uganda, Myanmar) submitted “parallel” Indicator Two reports to CPDE for inclusion in *GPEDC Indicator Two: An Assessment of Evidence*¹⁶ submitted to the JST as a complement to the official country level Indicator Two monitoring.

Development cooperation providers: Involvement of development cooperation providers was varied when it came to Indicator Two. In at least six Stock-take countries there appears to have been no providers completing the Indicator Two questionnaire. However, in one of these countries, providers did participate in an Indicator Two specific multi-stakeholder validation session. In another country, a provider participated in an Indicator Two validation session organized by the CSO FP. In at least four of these Stock-take countries lack of provider involvement was due at least in part to their sense of not being explicitly invited to participate in Indicator Two monitoring.

In at least six Stock-take countries there appears to have been no providers completing the Indicator Two questionnaire. In three countries provider FPs actively facilitated provider input.

The designation of provider FPs appears to have been sporadic, and the Stock-take has not easily been able to determine whether FPs were designated specifically for Indicator Two. Nonetheless, it appears that three Stock-take countries had provider FPs who actively facilitated provider input to complete the Indicator Two questionnaire. In one such country, two provider FPs facilitated completion of the Indicator Two questionnaire by 10 providers. In another, the provider FP hosted a dialogue among providers. This was aimed at developing responses to the third and fourth modules of the Indicator Two questionnaire on providers’ support to CSOs and the legal and regulatory environment. A small selection of CSOs was present at this dialogue. In the same country, another provider hosted a small multi-stakeholder dialogue on Indicator Two.

¹⁶ CPDE (2016), GPEDC Indicator Two: Civil society operates within an environment that maximizes its engagement in and contribution to development – An Assessment of Evidence, available at: <http://csopartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/GPEDC-Indicator-Two.pdf>.

In yet another country, as noted, the provider FP became the ex-officio NC, coordinating a multi-stakeholder dialogue on Indicator Two and consolidating the results.

“Cooperation providers argued they were not aware of completing Indicator Two, neither were [they] requested to respond [to] it.”

In one country, a provider FP did not play a role in facilitating provider inputs to the questionnaire. Instead, the organisation channelled multiple providers' financial support and provided administrative assistance for the CPDE-designated FP's Indicator Two consultation. Other providers' engagement in this country was limited to the validation discussion hosted by the NC, though this was not Indicator Two specific. However, the lack of provider involvement was not due to lack of interest. Some providers stated that: “they were expecting to be more involved in the process and simply were not contacted.” In another country, while there was no provider FP, a United Nations agency responding to the questionnaire conferred with other UN agencies in the country so in effect acted as the FP for United Nations bodies.

Notable is the absence of participation in Indicator Two monitoring of non-traditional donors such as China, India, Brazil and Russia. One Stock-take country report suggests this is not surprising, as these providers' focus tends to be on economic issues and not on the type of governance issues that are implied in Indicator Two. Another report states simply that these key providers “are not part of the aid effectiveness or GPEDC process.”

Other stakeholders: the private sector, parliamentarians, other government: The 2015/16 Monitoring Guide recommends the designation of FPs from other stakeholder groups, specifically from the private sector, parliamentarians, and subnational entities, to facilitate their engagement in the monitoring.¹⁷ The Indicator Two-specific section of the Guide emphasizes involving CSO and provider FPs in completion of the Indicator Two questionnaire.¹⁸ Given the broad multi-stakeholder intent of the monitoring, the Stock-take findings on the engagement of actors beyond CSOs and providers are noted here.

There was little involvement of the private sector in Indicator Two monitoring or use of private sector FPs. In four countries effort was made to engage the private sector, such as through information or validation meetings, though these were not necessarily Indicator Two specific, and private sector actors did not complete the Indicator Two questionnaire. Only in one country it appears that four private sector actors were invited to complete the questionnaire.

The Stock-take findings suggest no involvement of parliamentarians in Indicator Two monitoring. Parliamentarians expressed that they were not aware of parliamentarians having been invited to participate in the monitoring. There was also very limited involvement of

¹⁷ GPEDC 2015/16 Monitoring Guide p. 7. Note that for the purposes of this Stock-take, the TT considers trade unions, also referred to in the Guide, as CSOs.

¹⁸ GPEDC 2015/16 Monitoring Guide, pp. 26 and 48.

government ministries/departments beyond the one responsible for effective development cooperation (where the NC resides), or of local government officials. In one country the NC did not involve any other governmental agency or parliamentarians, considering it “unnecessary”. Broader government engagement was explicit in only two Stock-take countries. However, the Stock-take has also found that some NCs consulted with other ministries or departments in completing the 2015/16 monitoring, presumably inclusive of Indicator Two.

3.1.3 Challenges in multi-stakeholder engagement

The multi-stakeholder dialogue process and the engagement of stakeholder FPs in Indicator Two monitoring both faced some challenges. The Stock-take suggests a number of reasons for these challenges including time constraints, capacity constraints, gaps in awareness, difficulties of outreach, and relations of mistrust.

Time: The 2015/16 monitoring round was launched in September-October 2015 with four regional workshops supported by the JST held in October-November. However, in all of the countries involved in this Stock-take, the monitoring exercise effectively began only in 2016 following the December-January holiday period that affected the majority of countries.¹⁹ With a March 31st deadline²⁰ for data submission, interviewees in all Stock-take countries were left feeling time pressured, which reduced the scope for multi-stakeholder engagement. Undertaking multi-stakeholder dialogue requires practical matters such as identifying the most appropriate stakeholder representatives to engage. In addition, effective multi-stakeholder dialogue requires building a common understanding of the subject matter and objective at hand, as well as mutual trust and respect necessary to exchange information and perspectives. Achieving this requires a considerable time investment.

Time constraints were exacerbated in some countries by changes in institutional responsibility for development cooperation; staff rotation; or uncertainties due to elections and Ministerial changes at the early stage of the 2015/16 monitoring round. One country report referred to a discrepancy in determining responsibility for the country-level monitoring between the designated NC and the representative invited to the GPEDC regional workshop, worsened by the government’s own “inter-institutional disputes”. This resulted in delays in the monitoring process. For four countries, coordination across government agencies was a challenge, particularly where regulation of CSOs lies outside of the responsibilities of the dedicated ministry/department responsible leading the 2015/16 monitoring.

¹⁹ An information/launch session for the 2015/16 monitoring round was held in at least one Stock-take country toward the end of 2015.

²⁰ At least two Stock-take countries were granted extensions to the submission deadline.

Capacity: In the past participating countries were already encouraged to undertake the monitoring in a multi-stakeholder manner. However, the call for a more concerted effort in the 2015/16 monitoring round left some country-level actors uncertain as to how to proceed and lacking the capacity and resources to do so. In the majority of countries, various stakeholders were affected by capacity constraints including; lack of finance, shortage of personnel, lack of experience and know how, and lack of awareness. These constraints limited the ability to undertake a more fulsome multi-stakeholder process, as “these are resource heavy processes.”

As previously noted, in one country, the government’s self-perceived capacity constraints led to a provider FP playing the lead coordinating role, though this was also partially due to the concern that a government-led process would not be deemed neutral by other stakeholders. In another country, the NC expressed that CSOs would need capacity development to be able to participate in the monitoring, but that government was not in a position to provide it due to limited state resources.

“... not many NGOs were sufficiently aware of the legal and policy issues to play a very active part.”

Conversely, in another country, the NC “spoke of difficulties in using [the questionnaire] without help and information from experts in the other sectors.” Here also, while emphasizing the importance of a lead role for government in the monitoring, CSOs noted government lacked the capacity “to undertake the task in a full sense,” such that the CSO FP provided a training workshop for staff at the NC’s ministry. Still in this country, the technical capacity in the CSO sector to address some Indicator Two subject matter was a noted constraint.

“... a capacity building program has to be developed for both civil society and government.”

As regards financial resources, in another country where CSOs essentially led the Indicator Two monitoring, they did so apparently without additional financial resources, while noting that; “having a small budget to pay for monitors’ time would have helped a lot” in undertaking this “complex technical work.” Elsewhere, CSOs were enabled to organize two multi-stakeholder dialogues outside of the capital due to financial and administrative support from the provider FP.

On the whole, participants of the 2015/16 monitoring round found themselves having to combine simultaneous processes of learning about the monitoring while implementing it. Worth noting also is that capacity challenges were a limiting factor for many of the twenty-two countries that did not include Indicator Two in their monitoring.²¹ Capacity constraints, especially of small-island developing states, were the primary observed reason for not monitoring Indicator Two in eight (36%) of these

²¹ The observable reasons in this paragraph were communicated by the JST Aug. 26, 2016.

countries. Last minute reporting/engagement in five countries (23%), and the fragile/conflict state status of six countries (27%), were also observed reasons for not monitoring Indicator Two. Taking these latter two reasons as also indicative of capacity constraints, the share of the twenty-two countries that may have faced capacity challenges rises to 86%.

Awareness: Many interviewees for the Stock-take noted a lack of awareness about the development cooperation effectiveness paradigm, including the Busan commitments, the GPEC monitoring, and Indicator Two specifically. This posed a further challenge to the multi-stakeholder aims of the monitoring.²²

In one Stock-take country where a multi-stakeholder dialogue did not take place at the outset of the monitoring, the majority of interviewees felt this was a “setback” given their lack of awareness even of the monitoring process itself prior to receiving the Indicator Two questionnaire to complete.

As a result, the response rate to the questionnaire was low in this country, with four out of twenty-seven invited CSOs completing the questionnaire.

“[CSOs] weren’t fully informed about the process from the very beginning... prior knowledge about the initiative would have made them more prepared”

In another vein, a few interviewees pointed to a lack not just of CSO awareness but of CSO interest to engage in broader issues of national development and effective development cooperation. In the words of one private sector representative there is a need “to shift the interest of NGOs from their only main interest which is (finding a big fund) or their charitable activities to participate in a real model of development process.”

Despite the fact that the Indicator Two monitoring guidance calls for the involvement of all stakeholders in completing the questionnaire, and the fact that the questionnaire contains a module specific to development cooperation providers’ practices, the findings suggest that providers did not prioritize participation in Indicator Two monitoring but left it largely to CSOs and the NC. The Stock-take findings suggest that providers in four countries did not engage in Indicator Two monitoring, while the number of provider participants in other countries tended to be low.

At times this was due to providers not being explicitly invited to engage in Indicator Two monitoring. However, it also raises the question of the level of providers’ awareness of their expected role specifically in Indicator Two monitoring. For example, in one country providers’ engagement in the 2015/16 monitoring round was fairly high with fourteen having submitted responses to the NC. However, of these, only three

²² That the Stock-take purposely pursued interviews with individuals and organizations that had not participated in the monitoring is a factor contributing to this finding of low levels of awareness. Nonetheless it is worthy of note for future rounds especially if there is intent to broaden and deepen multi-stakeholder engagement.

submitted responses to the Indicator Two questionnaire. In another country the NC assumed that after an initial contact informing select providers of the monitoring, the providers would take the initiative to coordinate among themselves to complete the Indicator Two questionnaire. This however did not play out in reality, possibly due to “weakened interest” on the part of providers. More commonly however, interviews suggest a lack of awareness of the multi-stakeholder nature of the indicator and the FP role. This is felt to be in part due to the absence of a direct liaison mechanism between providers at country level and GPEDC structures.

“... the indicator can be misleading in the sense that one might think that it only concerns civil society, and ends up overlooking other stakeholders such as development partners and government that are also supposed to provide... information.”

In most countries there was notable lack of awareness among parliamentarians of the 2015/16 monitoring. Parliamentarians interviewed expressed an interest in future engagement however, as articulated by one interviewee: “Congress must play a greater impact role on the results obtained by international cooperation in the country and it must have a clear understanding of commitments and trends in international cooperation. Then, all practices to achieve better results are welcome, as well as methodologies to link the government and civil society.” Awareness was also found to be low among government ministries/departments outside of the ones housing the NC. This in spite of the fact that responsibility for CSO regulation, or day-to-day operational experience with CSOs such as in line ministries (health, education, etc.), generally lie outside of the NC ministry.

There appeared to be higher levels of awareness among private sector interviewees, perhaps due to their engagement in monitoring Indicator Three on the private sector. The private sector’s limited engagement in Indicator Two monitoring may be a result of there being “no motivation for them to participate.” At the same time, whether there is need for their engagement was also questioned. In the words of the NC in this country, “maybe we do not need to engage them at all in this process.”

Outreach: In some countries, NCs were challenged to determine which CSOs to invite to participate in Indicator Two monitoring. According to four country reports, government lacked a database of CSOs that would potentially be interested in participating. Notably these countries did not have or did not liaise with a CPDE-designated FP. In one country, where an initial multi-stakeholder meeting was held to introduce the 2015/16 monitoring, a few international CSOs were invited, but there was no contact between the NC and CPDE-designated FP. A perception that government only involved CSOs with which it is most familiar or affiliated, despite that they may not be representative of the CSO sector nor of citizens, was heard in a few countries. Yet, even where CPDE had designated a FP, sometimes the existence of more than one CSO network created challenges for the NC with one suggesting the need for “a single CSO platform” at country level.

"The government has specific organizations that are always invited... while the majority of the local organizations were not there."

Even where CSOs and the NC collaborated on Indicator Two monitoring and the CSO FP was involved, there was a sense that greater outreach was needed. In some instances there was a perception that reliance on a CSO FP to mobilize CSO participation left many key CSOs, despite outreach efforts, “outside the consultation loop.” This was seen as being due to both “known CSOs syndrome” where invitees are those with which the FP is most familiar, as well as to limited awareness of the GPEDC monitoring among CSOs. In another country where the CPDE-designated FP was appointed responsibility for Indicator Two monitoring, the CSO FP organized two Indicator Two consultations with CSOs and other stakeholders outside of the capital. Still, various interviewees in this country, including the CPDE-designated FP, expressed the need for broader outreach.

"There is insufficient engagement with civil society – those CSOs that are engaged are engaged well, but there could be a wider front (i.e. more groups, different groups involved)."

Relations of mistrust: In virtually all of the sample countries, interviewees spoke of contexts within which the environment for CSO engagement is not ideal due to relations of mistrust between government and CSOs, and other actors. In some cases this is combined with an absent or only nascent multi-stakeholder dialogue culture.

Country reports explicitly identified these as impediments – in varying degrees – to the multi-stakeholder intent of Indicator Two monitoring. In at least five countries, context-specific relations of mistrust may have translated to low interest or willingness to engage in a multi-stakeholder way. In one case, for example, CSO disinterest in participating reflected a lack of trust in government initiated activities based on the perception that government engages CSOs simply “to provide a picture of participatory governance to the international community and donors.” This sentiment is echoed in the words of a CSO in another country: “Sometimes, we feel we are used just for show. They don’t invite the CSOs and don’t listen to the CSOs’ voice in policy making, processes and procedures.” In yet another country, circulation of the questionnaire by the CPDE-designated FP to one hundred and fifty CSOs resulted in a 7% response rate (ten CSOs). This was attributed both to the capacity and awareness factors previously mentioned, but also to CSOs’ “cautious attitude” toward the monitoring exercise, spurred by recent draft regulatory changes that have the potential to shrink the space for CSOs.

Another country report suggested NC resistance to involving CSOs due to ongoing animosity between government and the CSO sector. In this country the CSO sector is perceived as politically and religiously polarized, which is deemed to impede their inclination to engage with government constructively.

Mistrust was seen to exist not only between governments and CSOs, but also between governments and development cooperation providers, between CSOs and

cooperation providers, as well as within stakeholder groups. In one country, CSOs expressed distrust in cooperation providers due to their support for a government that has, until recently, been less than enabling of CSOs. Here and elsewhere CSOs have felt “sidelined from engaging and shaping policies from development partners... they feel used merely to address vaguely-defined stakeholder engagement exercises required by development partners.” In some countries, trust among CSOs was noted as an obstacle to intra-CSO coordination due to environments of high competition for provider funding.

“... mistrust and the absence of desire and ability to find a dialogue space among all the partners left the monitoring as a piece of cake in starving society. All are so keen to get it but it will never satisfy their basic needs!”

Elsewhere mistrust between providers and government was evident due to providers’ perceptions of lack of transparency and corruption. In a country where providers were said to have not been invited to participate in Indicator Two monitoring, one provider saw this as “no surprise” as there would have been “criticisms toward the government” in responding to the Indicator Two questionnaire. This perception may also hold true in the other two countries where providers appear to not have been invited to participate. That said, whether or not providers were invited to engage is a matter of dispute. For example in one of these countries the NC stated that providers actually did not step up to engage, maybe due to time constraints, lack of interest, or perhaps because “the questionnaire does not respond to what they want to report.”

In two instances, a changing geopolitical and development cooperation landscape was identified as a factor affecting the environment for multi-stakeholder engagement. In several countries, “unhealthy competition about aid results” among traditional providers and the so-called “emerging” ones such as China, India and Russia are seen to reduce the transparency and mutual trust required to engage in the monitoring exercise. This was exacerbated by the limited participation of non-traditional providers in the development cooperation effectiveness agenda in these countries. Further, in one of these countries the fact that government had in recent years cancelled some large-scale projects in part due to CSO objections to them has left providers – both traditional and emerging – somewhat wary of government and CSOs alike.

Regarding private sector engagement, one report notes that the traditional tendency “to stress on divergences” rather than “building synergies” between CSOs and the private sector, may be a trust factor limiting private sector engagement in Indicator Two monitoring.

3.1.4 Recommendations on multi-stakeholder engagement

The importance of multi-stakeholder dialogue to the Indicator Two approach strongly emerges from the findings. Thus, as much as interviewees identified challenges to its implementation, so too did they share ideas as to how these challenges might be addressed going forward. These recommendations are listed below.

Recommendations on multi-stakeholder dialogue approach

On the basis of the findings, the following recommendations can be made to increase the likelihood of a multi-stakeholder dialogue approach to Indicator Two monitoring:

- i. Extend the time frame from launch to data submission deadline, avoiding holiday periods if possible and anticipating that staff and ministerial/departmental responsibility changes often result in significant delays.
- ii. Start the monitoring process early, and invest in a preparatory phase at country-level involving awareness raising.
- iii. Invest in raising awareness of the effective development cooperation paradigm and the GPEDC monitoring across a broader swath of stakeholders and more deeply within stakeholder groups.
- iv. Use awareness raising methods to “market” the GPEDC monitoring so that all parties can see the value of Indicator Two monitoring. In particular, the benefits of building a greater understanding of each stakeholder’s contributions and constraints while setting a path of greater collaboration could be highlighted.
- v. Establish a CSO liaison position in the ministry/department responsible for the monitoring. This position would support future monitoring rounds and, in between, engage in awareness raising and champion ongoing dialogue about Indicator Two content.
- vi. With the NC in the lead, establish a multi-stakeholder organizing committee for each monitoring round and build this committee’s capacity well in advance of the monitoring. Have multi-stakeholder leadership for this committee and thus coordination of Indicator Two monitoring.
- vii. Tap into an existing multi-stakeholder dialogue forum in advance of the monitoring launch. While a forum that is specific to Indicator Two content is unlikely to exist, there may be others on related subject matter prepared to “host” Indicator Two dialogue.
- viii. Alternatively, establish and institutionalize a multi-stakeholder forum on Indicator Two subject matter and encourage meeting in between monitoring rounds.
- ix. Encourage country-level donors to fund these multi-stakeholder dialogues on an ongoing basis.
- x. Establish a means to provide capacity development for stakeholders that will build a) their understanding of the Indicator Two questionnaire and guidelines, and b) their ability to design and engage in country level multi-stakeholder dialogues.
- xi. Ensure sufficient JST resources and capacity to support the monitoring through regional workshops, web and Skype-based assistance to NCs and other stakeholders.

Recommendations on Focal Points and constituency engagement

A number of recommendations to enhance the engagement of multiple stakeholders through FPs and otherwise were offered including:

- i. Maintain a list of key stakeholders working on development cooperation effectiveness issues and broaden information sharing and outreach with these stakeholders on an ongoing basis.
- ii. Circulate the questionnaire broadly to CSOs through contacts available in e.g. national databases or CSO umbrella databases. Follow by inviting those who responded to a dialogue to discuss questionnaire responses.
- iii. Revise the guidelines to make the role of various stakeholders in Indicator Two monitoring clearer, stressing the importance of inter-stakeholder group coordination and the FP function for intra-stakeholder coordination.
- iv. More specifically, elaborate a clearer mechanism of provider participation in the process and seek greater support from the GPEDC as well as from provider headquarters to solicit provider engagement.
- v. Maintain the FP role but encourage context-appropriate interpretation of this role and, when it comes to CSOs, consider direct engagement with other country-level CSO coordinating bodies (umbrellas and networks).
- vi. Consider ways of broadening and deepening engagement of stakeholders, including of CSOs outside of capital cities, such as through the use of focus groups.
- vii. Consider financial support to CSOs fulfilling the FP role, or at minimum, find ways to acknowledge their contribution.
- viii. Invest in capacity development for FPs on inter and intra-stakeholder group engagement.
- ix. Where relationships of mistrust between government and CSOs are particularly evident, consider delegating management of Indicator Two monitoring to a third party. In such cases it would be important to still require a multi-stakeholder process, and to ensure government, via the NC, has a role in data provision and validation of the report.

An over-arching recommendation to increase the number of countries implementing Indicator Two monitoring would be to render the GPEDC monitoring an “all inclusive” package. In other words, the guidelines could clarify the expectation that responses for all ten indicators are required. Rendering Indicator Two non-voluntary would however only be feasible if key challenges highlighted here, particularly regarding awareness and capacity gaps, could be addressed.

While the Stock-take identifies some significant challenges faced by the Indicator Two monitoring, it also puts forward constructive recommendations that, if implemented, could go a long way to strengthening Indicator Two monitoring in future.

3.2 Indicator Two Questionnaire and Guidelines

The Stock-take findings indicate that the content of the Indicator Two questionnaire and guidelines are considered to be comprehensive and relevant. However, the general sentiment is that the questionnaire could be shortened and simplified. The issue of whether the questionnaire's length and complexity may have rendered it inappropriate for completion in a multi-stakeholder dialogue manner was raised. Also raised was the risk of the type of generalized responses that Indicator Two requires whereas the CSO sector and the issues it faces are diverse.

3.2.1 Questionnaire and guidelines content

Appreciation was expressed for the improvements in Indicator Two monitoring over the previous monitoring round's approach where no country level questionnaire was involved. The thoroughness of Indicator Two content was noted with one CSO highlighting that "with this questionnaire it is possible to present the overall picture encompassing all areas, including policy, donors and regulatory framework for CSOs."

Nonetheless, a common refrain among interviewees was that the questionnaire is long and cumbersome to complete, with too many variables. In particular where a multi-stakeholder dialogue did not take place at the outset, those invited to complete the Indicator Two questionnaire found it daunting. Notably, the sentiment was expressed that the extensiveness of the questionnaire made it more difficult to envision completing it in a multi-stakeholder manner. This echoes the point raised in the multi-stakeholder dialogue section of this report, that emphasis on completion of the questionnaire seems at times to have over-ridden the multi-stakeholder engagement aims of the monitoring.

"... the heavy content of the questionnaire require[ed] a lot of effort to absorb the material and provide feedback to each of the question together with its sub-questions... the format... was confusing."

In one country the NC called for a "reformatting" of the questionnaire guidelines to render them "easy to follow, readily understandable and where sections can be easily translated into a number of languages... given the complexity of the terms and concepts, the language should be revised... a glossary is not enough." In another, the country report noted: "It seems that the questionnaire is more designed for policy advisors, advocacy experts, and lawyers, rather than rank-and-file development CSOs."

Numerous government and CSO interviewees expressed a need for the questionnaire to be more specific to their country context, and to rely on existing national indicators where possible though this raises the challenge of country comparability. A suggestion was made to enhance the questionnaire's coverage of CSO development effectiveness and accountability, which, according to one NC, has historically not been adequately monitored in her country. CSO interviewees suggested the Indicator Two

questions reflected “the global context [while] underestimating the local character of issues CSOs normally face” in their country. Elsewhere the challenge of generalizability when it comes to civil society-related issues was noted as “this monitoring process takes an average of something that is so heterogeneous that any average would undoubtedly be inaccurate and not reflect the reality.”

Though the questionnaire was translated into key languages used by GPEDC members (English, French, Spanish, Arabic), one delayed translation, which became available only well into the monitoring exercise, presented an obstacle in one Stock-take country. In others, the questionnaire needed to be translated to locally accessible languages thereby contributing to time pressures. Having translations accessible at the outset of the monitoring would greatly enhance awareness and understanding by diverse actors, including CSOs outside of capitals.

3.2.2 Recommendations on the questionnaire and guidelines

A number of interviewees pointed to specific gaps or additional areas of the CSO environment and CSO development effectiveness that could be covered by the Indicator Two questionnaire:

- i. Distinguish between policy/regulation and what occurs in practice, as there can be discrepancy between the two.
- ii. Distinguish between local and non-local CSOs especially in relation to modules 3 and 4. Regarding the latter, legal and regulatory frameworks increasingly distinguish between local and non-local CSOs, such as in relation to foreign funding. Regarding the former, donor funding tends to flow differently to local and non-local CSOs with the bulk reaching local CSOs only via non-local CSOs.
- iii. Distinguish between service delivery and advocacy CSOs as their experience in relation to the four Indicator Two modules may differ.
- iv. Add variables regarding CSO development effectiveness and accountability.
- v. Add variables regarding both the financing of CSOs and the financing that they bring to development cooperation at country level.
- vi. Add a variable regarding CSO and private sector cooperation which is going to be increasingly relevant as part of a collective effort to achieve the SDGs.
- vii. Use scales rather than “yes”/“no” answers to allow for greater nuance that reflects the views of multiple stakeholders.
- viii. Rethink the 300-word limit, as qualitative issues are lost in the summary.
- ix. Provide funds for translation of the questionnaire into local languages early on in the process.

On the whole, the Indicator Two questionnaire is considered an appropriate tool, though one that could be simplified for future monitoring rounds, which may enhance multi-stakeholder engagement in its completion. Specific recommendations to enhance the questionnaire, including to make it more locally relevant, risk also lengthening and complicating it, and will need further reflection.

3.3 Relevance of Indicator Two Monitoring

The relevance of Indicator Two and its monitoring to effective development cooperation was expressed by some interviewees. So too was the relevance of Indicator Two to the SDGs expressed, particularly SDGs 16 and 17 on peaceful, inclusive societies and accountable institutions, and partnerships for sustainable development respectively. However, the understanding of Indicator Two's relevance may have been impeded by the aforementioned gaps in awareness of the effective development cooperation paradigm, as well as of the details of the SDGs.

3.3.1 Effective development cooperation

Indicator Two monitoring is seen to offer a building block in making development cooperation more effective, including the opportunity to discuss the role of CSOs in a transparent way. For some interviewees the starting point is that CSOs are an active partner and that their participation is key to improving development processes. It is increasingly recognized that CSOs' varied roles – such as “in implementing, advocacy, influencing and monitoring development initiatives and programs” – are integral to effective development cooperation. By extension, given its focus on CSOs, Indicator Two monitoring is also seen to be integral to effective development cooperation. Placing Indicator Two squarely in countries’ monitoring represents “an important policy making shift, because it ensures that [CSOs] are understood and appreciated as a development actor in their own right and that their conditions for operation are also appreciated and understood at all levels of global and national policy processes by government and providers of development financing.”

Indicator Two monitoring is also seen to serve as a model for the wider effective development cooperation agenda given the importance it places on inclusiveness and multi-stakeholder approaches, both as regards the monitoring process and its content.

3.3.2 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

The relevance of Indicator Two and its monitoring to the SDGs was expressed by interviewees in over half a dozen Stock-take countries, especially in relation to SDGs 16 and 17.²³ The relevance to the former is due to the link between Indicator Two's content as well as its multi-stakeholder monitoring process and the peaceful, inclusive societies and accountable institutions that are SDG 16's target. CSOs have a role to play in pushing governments, other actors, and themselves, to achieve SDG 16, while progress toward SDG 16 is also integral to enhance the enabling environment for CSOs. Regarding SDG 17, CSOs have a clear role, independently and in partnership with other stakeholders, as part of the means of implementation to achieve the SDGs.

²³ See United Nations General Assembly (2015), Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development at http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1&Lang=E. SDG 16: Goal 16. Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels. SDG 17: Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development.

According to one government interviewee however, Indicator Two would need to be “reformatted” to more broadly capture multi-stakeholder partnerships under SDG 17. What will also be needed as well is “more than one round” of GPEDC monitoring to be able to effectively contribute to the SDG framework going forward. A provider expressed the relevance of Indicator Two given that it “assists in putting the focus on CSOs and their role in the development of the country”, which is significant given that the involvement of CSOs will be necessary to achieve the ambitious SDGs.

Overall, the Stock-take findings show clear relevance of Indicator Two and its monitoring to the effective development cooperation agenda and to the SDGs, particularly SDGs 16 and 17.

4. Behaviour Change, Usefulness and Next Steps

4.1 Opportunity for Behaviour Change

4.2 Usefulness and Next Steps

4.1 Opportunity for Behaviour Change

Despite the mixed experiences of multi-stakeholder engagement in Indicator Two monitoring, the Stock-take found optimism among interviewees in the majority of countries about the opportunities that the monitoring presents for behaviour change, and the potential to build on and improve the multi-stakeholder nature of the exercise going forward. That Indicator Two monitoring has helped enhance multi-stakeholder dialogue on Indicator Two's four modules was seen as a sign of behaviour change already.

Many interviewees perceived the Indicator Two monitoring as already indicative of behaviour change, even in countries where the multi-stakeholder approach was light of touch. In its implementation, Indicator Two monitoring offered a mechanism for increasing multi-stakeholder collaboration, information sharing, transparency, and developing or consolidating relationships of trust.

Interviewees saw this round of Indicator Two monitoring as a step on which to build and generally “a good start.” According to one NC, “even if we are not doing it so well this time, we can do it better in 2017”, with closer collaboration across stakeholder groups in future. Whereas CSOs have sometimes felt their engagement with government and providers has amounted to a mere “box-checking exercise”, the experience of Indicator Two monitoring was significant as “part of a staging ground for a wider and deeper cooperation effectiveness agenda involving civil society.”

The significance of the Indicator Two monitoring was particularly noted in countries where government-CSO relations had not always been congenial. In one such country CSOs expressed the unlikelihood that these “former antagonists” would have come together without the platform Indicator Two monitoring provided.

“... any discussion between CSOs and the government would have been nearly unthinkable... years ago. [Indicator Two monitoring] provided a platform for all parties to present ideas and concerns to one another... this process also allowed for greater steps to be taken to establish further foundations of trust between all parties.”

Even in the absence of multi-stakeholder dialogue, the monitoring was considered a useful investment in knowledge and relationship building. Simply the inclusion of data collected by CSOs in the country monitoring report was seen as an indication of greater openness and trust.

The NC in one country expressed that the Indicator Two monitoring had improved “government understanding on civil society role[s], constraints and needs” and that this can improve the government-CSO relationship in addressing broader development issues. In another country the NC saw the Indicator Two monitoring as a significant step in “build[ing] bridge[s] and “breaking down... barriers.”

One country report observes that the monitoring exercise “has brought change in working relations of CSOs, government and development providers.” Significantly, where there were prospects that the Indicator Two monitoring process and results had positive repercussions on the government-CSO relationship, the findings suggest this can incentivize further collaboration toward more successful multi-stakeholder engagement in future monitoring rounds.

“If government finds that through this monitoring process they will understand better and work better with civil society, the government will then ensure that it consults civil society. For civil society if this dialogue will lead to a better appreciation of their work by government, it is also likely that civil society will be willing to be part of the process of collecting data for monitoring such processes.”

Further, interviewees suggested that Indicator Two monitoring had the potential to contribute to “technical behaviour change”, that is to change the “operational behaviour” of the stakeholders whose behaviour it targets. Providers in one country for example were called upon to “give more attention to this process” and to the results, including in their modalities of CSO support. A private sector interviewee suggested that especially if the Indicator Two process continues, it can provide information and motivation for CSOs to enhance their “effectiveness, transparency and accountability.” In another country CSOs stated a belief that the Indicator Two monitoring will “encourage and motivate CSOs to work more systematically along with other development partners and the government.”

A government interviewee expressed the potential for the Indicator Two monitoring to contribute to better provider coordination when it comes to their CSO support, as well as providing useful information for stakeholders’ strategic development and program strategies “which would underpin the democratization process of the country.” Elsewhere an NC expressed that the Indicator Two monitoring results offer a good complement to other country sources that inform for example national strategies, annual plans and budgets, and decentralization strategies.

However, the Stock-take also found that the potential for Indicator Two monitoring to contribute to behavior change depends on the steps that will follow the monitoring exercise, as discussed below.

4.2 Usefulness and Next Steps

Stock-take interviewees saw the usefulness of Indicator Two monitoring, though with some caveats. Certainly there was a high level of interest across stakeholders in seeing and discussing the monitoring results, preferably in a multi-stakeholder fashion and on an ongoing basis, both at country level or at the level of the GPEDC. There is some scepticism about the potential for Indicator Two to affect sustained behaviour change.

Resoundingly there was a sense across Stock-take countries that the usefulness of Indicator Two monitoring will be revealed when stakeholders are able to see and analyze their country's report on Indicator Two (including how it compared with other countries' reports), as well as ongoing multi-stakeholder dialogue on Indicator Two's four modules in country. Completing the questionnaire itself will not suffice, even if done in a multi-stakeholder fashion. It is only "a starting point." According to the NC in one country, "the results should be presented to civil society and international cooperation [providers] in a large event so that they will able to use the results."

"From here work begins. Because we finally have a technical instrument, which is the survey, our first baseline."

However, at the time of the Stock-take, many interviewees remained unclear about whether and what next steps would be taken. There is evidence of mistrust across stakeholders, and scepticism about whether there will be follow-up and thus the usefulness of the monitoring to affect change.

"The process faced challenges such as... negative attitudes towards any monitoring process itself and the big doubt in its ability in producing any tangible outcomes of any process aiming at activating the role of CSOs and activating the "big" values such as accountability, just society... into practice."

In this regard, the necessity of political commitment to change was stressed: "Issues like political position in different countries are the ones that influence the behaviour of donors and countries... This is a reality that cannot be ignored." Relatedly, the importance of an ongoing lead role for NCs, including in between monitoring rounds and with strong institutional and political backing, was stressed.

That said, some specific next steps were identified by the Stock-take. For example, one CSO FP intends to organize a follow-up discussion of Indicator Two based on expressions of interest from varied stakeholders. Elsewhere, the Indicator Two monitoring inspired two providers to pledge support for a new multi-stakeholder development effectiveness dialogue platform. The possibility of using the Indicator Two results not only as a source for ongoing multi-stakeholder discussion, but also to design and implement awareness raising and capacity development in Indicator Two areas was a refrain heard across Stock-take countries, though no specific plans in this regard were communicated.

CSOs interviewees stated the potential to use the monitoring results in their advocacy work, including advocating for behaviour change in relation to the Indicator Two findings as a matter of "promoting and endorsing human rights on the domestic and international level." However, as noted in one country report, the usefulness – whether for CSO advocacy or for spurring behaviour change – will depend on the content of the Indicator Two report and whether it reflects "the real picture" of CSO development effectiveness and enabling environment, or instead reflects what is "on paper but rarely applied in practice."

Overall, the Stock-take found Indicator Two monitoring as a useful but insufficient exercise. Its potential to foster behaviour change requires follow-up steps.

4.2.1 Recommendations on behaviour change, usefulness and next steps

To seize the opportunity for Indicator Two monitoring to affect behaviour change, the Stock-take findings recommend that follow-up on the 2015/16 monitoring round involve:

- i. Making country reports available for stakeholders to be able to see and analyze their own country's report on Indicator Two.
- ii. Reflection by single stakeholder groups on: country report findings; implications for their practices; what is needed to demonstrate political will toward behaviour change.
- iii. Consideration by NCs and FPs, separately and together, of how to organize multi-stakeholder dialogue to review the country report including areas needing further progress.
- iv. Organizing a large multi-stakeholder event on a country's report so that the results can be used by various stakeholders.
- v. Using the Indicator Two results for ongoing multi-stakeholder dialogue on progress and bottlenecks in relation to Indicator Two's four modules.
- vi. Using the Indicator Two results to design and implement awareness raising and capacity development on Indicator Two's four modules.
- vii. Ensuring an ongoing lead role for NCs, including in between monitoring rounds and with strong institutional and political backing.

Such steps – combined with those already recommended above to enhance multi-stakeholder engagement – can also lay the ground for a broader and deeper multi-stakeholder approach to Indicator Two monitoring in future.

5. Key Summary Conclusions

The Stock-take findings point to a mixed experience of Indicator Two monitoring in the eleven countries it has covered. From this mixed experience some key conclusions can be drawn.

Multi-stakeholder engagement: Multi-stakeholder engagement in the form of multi-stakeholder dialogues for the purposes of Indicator Two data gathering and validation (as outlined in the GPEDC 2015/16 Monitoring Guide) was rarely achieved. Equally, the involvement of FPs and their constituencies in providing or validating Indicator Two data was uneven. Reporting on Indicator Two for the GPEDC 2015/16 Progress Report needs to be viewed in light of this.

CSOs – largely facilitated by CPDE-designated FPs – had the highest level of participation followed by providers, with minimal to no engagement of the private sector, parliamentarians or government beyond the NC ministry/department. When used, the FP function worked relatively well as a means to facilitate stakeholder engagement, though whether and how FPs understood and implemented their role varied considerably. Providers could have taken on the FP role more consistently to coordinate provider contributions to Indicator Two monitoring, not least of which as their engagement with CSOs is the topic of one of the four Indicator Two modules. Outreach within and across all stakeholder groups could be enhanced.

Across the board there were demonstrations of multi-stakeholder approaches, though at times these efforts were shallow. This is not to minimize the significant accomplishments toward multi-stakeholder approaches that Indicator Two monitoring has fostered. It suggests however that there is distance still to go toward what could be considered concerted and fulsome multi-stakeholder approaches to data gathering and validation, with a breadth and depth of engagement within and across stakeholder groups.

Overall the sporadic occurrence of multi-stakeholder dialogues and engagement of stakeholders contributes to a sense that the Indicator Two monitoring fell short of its multi-stakeholder potential and its ultimate intent to stimulate multi-stakeholder dialogue on Indicator Two's four modules. Common challenges faced in Indicator Two monitoring included: time constraints, lack of capacity including financial resources, gaps in awareness, difficulties in stakeholder outreach, and mistrust across stakeholders.

A multitude of recommendations emerge from the Stock-take to help address these challenges going forward. Summarizing key recommendations suggests, for one, the need to build sufficient time into the monitoring schedule to raise awareness, secure FPs (including involving provider headquarters), reach out to their constituencies, and implement multi-stakeholder dialogue sessions for information gathering and validation. In addition, investing in capacity development for all stakeholders can help build a common understanding of the content of the Indicator Two questionnaire and guidelines and the process for multi-stakeholder engagement, including the FP role. Further, the lead NC and FP roles are important to maintain, though the role of various stakeholders in Indicator Two monitoring could be made clearer, stressing the

importance of inter-stakeholder group coordination and the FP function for intra-stakeholder group coordination. Also, the multi-stakeholder approach to Indicator Two monitoring could be consolidated, by establishing multi-stakeholder organizing committees that would endure between monitoring rounds and facilitate ongoing multi-stakeholder dialogue on Indicator Two. Finally, support to such ongoing multi-stakeholder dialogue – including financial, technical, and informational support – could help them serve as a means to address awareness and capacity challenges, while also maintaining momentum in between monitoring rounds.

Indicator Two Questionnaire Content: The content of the Indicator Two questionnaire is seen to be comprehensive and relevant to what it seeks to assess, noting however the risk of generalizing given the diversity of potential responses to Indicator Two's four modules. There is a general sense that the Indicator Two questionnaire is long and cumbersome and needs simplification, which may render it more appropriate for completion in a multi-stakeholder way. At the same time, a number of specific recommendations to improve the questionnaire content were offered, though taking these into account would potentially lengthen and further complicate the monitoring tool. There is interest in devising ways to make the Indicator Two questionnaire more locally relevant, including by making translations available early in the monitoring. However, how to do so while respecting the global-level framework of the effective development cooperation commitments that the Indicator Two questionnaire is based on, as well as the need for a tool that produces results somewhat comparable across countries, would need further reflection.

Relevance: Indicator Two monitoring is seen as relevant to the wider effective development cooperation agenda. Its multi-stakeholder aspects – including the monitoring process and examination of various stakeholder practices – represents well the development model that the effective development cooperation paradigm seeks to advance. That Indicator Two monitoring helps instil the development effectiveness commitments in relation to enabling environments for CSOs and CSO development effectiveness as made at various High Level Fora confirms its relevance. Relevance to the SDGs is also noted, in particular to SDGs 16 on peaceful, inclusive societies and accountable institutions and 17 on partnerships for sustainable development.

Opportunities for behaviour change, usefulness and next steps: Stock-take participants attest that the Indicator Two monitoring represents an important demonstration of and opportunity for behaviour change involving multi-stakeholder collaboration, increased transparency, and the building of trust and mutual understanding. This is even the case where the multi-stakeholder process was relatively light of touch. Further, Indicator Two monitoring has the potential to motivate changes in the operational behaviour of the stakeholders it targets and thus to strengthen enabling environments for CSOs and CSO development effectiveness. Where the next steps involve access to country reports and opportunities for multi-stakeholder dialogue on Indicator Two, the chance that the monitoring will have a sustained effect on behavior change will increase, as will stakeholder interest in participating in future monitoring rounds. Also required is the political will of all stakeholders to reflect together, implement, and hold each other accountable on behavior changes needed from each stakeholder.

In conclusion, the Stock-take has found a rich and diverse experience of Indicator Two monitoring in the eleven sample countries. From this diversity the Stock-take report highlights a number of common themes from the findings, including challenges, recommendations, and opportunities, that are worthy of consideration in light of the GPEDC's *2015/16 Progress Report*. The Task Team anticipates drawing from the Stock-take findings and recommendations as it designs a future Indicator Two-related GPI.

In producing this report the Task Team's intent has been to provide constructive reflections toward enhancing the design and implementation of Indicator Two monitoring going forward. By extension, the Task Team also aspires to give impetus to multi-stakeholder engagement at country level toward more enabling environments for CSOs and CSO development effectiveness. The potential to build on the Indicator Two experience to these ends is worth seizing as a means of achieving greater development cooperation effectiveness.

Annex A: **GPI-12 Stock-take Country Rankings**

Annex B: **Multi-stakeholder Engagement in Indicator Two: Questionnaire, Focal Points and Multi-stakeholder Dialogue**

Annex C: **GPI-12 Stock-take Interviewees by Country and Stakeholder Group**

Annex D: **GPI-12 Stock-take Researchers by Country**

Annex A:

GPI-12 Stock-take Country Rankings

	CIVICUS Enabling Environment Index ranking 2013 Score (rank)	Freedom House Freedom in the World 2016 Classification (freedom rating)
Armenia	0.47 (73)	Partly free (4.5)
Cameroon	n/a	Not free (6.0)
Costa Rica	0.66 (31)	Free (1.0)
Egypt	0.40 (94)	Not free (5.5)
Honduras	0.45 (77)	Partly free (4.0)
Kenya	0.43 (84)	Partly free (4.0)
Kyrgyzstan	0.43 (80)	Partly free (5.0)
Mozambique	0.43 (85)	Partly free (4.0)
Myanmar	n/a	Not free (5.5)
Sudan	n/a	Not free (7.0)
Uganda	0.42 (87)	Not free (5.5)

Notes:

CIVICUS Enabling Environment Index: This index examines the conditions in which civil society works. It uses secondary statistical data to rank governance, socio-cultural and socio-economic environments for civil society in 109 countries. Seventeen sub-dimensions are assessed including, for example: openness to policy dialogue (governance); propensity to participate (socio-cultural); and, trust (socio-economic). The score ranges from 1.0 (best) to 0 (worst). Extracted from:

http://civicus.org/eei/downloads/Civicus_EEI%20REPORT%202013_WEB_FINAL.pdf.

Freedom House Freedom in the World: This index assesses the condition of political rights and civil liberties around the world. It is composed of numerical ratings and supporting descriptive texts for 195 countries and 15 territories. Seven categories of political and civil rights are assessed: i) electoral process; ii) political pluralism and participation; iii) functioning of government; iv) freedom of expression and belief; v) associational and organizational rights; vi) rule of law; and, vii) personal autonomy and individual rights. The freedom rating ranges from 1 (most free) to 7 (least free). Extracted from: <https://freedomhouse.org/report-types/freedom-world> and <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world-2016/table-scores>.

Annex B:

Multi-stakeholder Engagement in Indicator Two: Questionnaire, Focal Points and Multi-stakeholder Dialogue

Country	Completion of questionnaire & engagement of Focal Point for Indicator Two monitoring ^{1,2}												Multi-stakeholder (MS) Process
	Government ³	NC Y/N	CSO ⁴	FP Y/N ⁵	Provider	FP Y/N	Private sector	FP Y/N	Parliament	FP Y/N	Other		
Honduras	1	Y	2 ⁶	N	o	N	o	na ⁷	o	na	o	MS information/launch session for 2015/16 monitoring organized by NC; degree of MS participation uncertain. Followed by NC invite to CSOs to complete Indicator questionnaire. No CSO or provider FP engagement.	
Costa Rica	1	Y	5	N	19	N	o	na	o	na	o	NC held separate information sessions with providers and with CSOs, not clear if these were Indicator Two specific. Followed by NC invite to providers and CSOs to complete Indicator Two questionnaire. No CSO or provider FP designated.	
Egypt	1	Y	4	N	o	N	4	na	o	na	2	MS information/launch session for 2015/16 monitoring organized by NC, followed by NC invite to CSOs, private sector, foundation to complete Indicator Two questionnaire via phone or site visits from NC/staff. No CSO or provider FP engagement.	
Armenia	1	Y	4 ⁸	Y	3 ⁹	N	o	na	o	na	o	No MS info session or dialogue. NC sent Indicator Two questionnaire to stakeholders including the CSO FP, providers, private sector via trade unions/associations. CSO FP circulated the questionnaire to other CSOs. NC's completed questionnaire shared with CSO FP for validation, though after submission to GPEDC. No provider FP designated but one provider (UN body) played somewhat of an FP role by consulting with sister bodies on questionnaire input. Private sector FP represented by trade unions but did not engage on Indicator Two.	

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE 12
STOCK-TAKE OF INDICATOR TWO MONITORING

Kyrgyzstan	1	Y	10 ¹⁰	Y	o	N	o	na	o	na	o	NC aimed to hold an MS session but this did not occur. NC informed stakeholders of the monitoring exercise bilaterally. CSO FP invited CSOs to complete Indicator Two questionnaire. NC and CSO FP drafted separate reports though conferred prior to their respective submissions. No provider FP.
Sudan	3	Y	40	Y	2	Y	2	na	o	na	o	MS information/launch session for 2015/16 monitoring organized by NC. Followed by CSO FP invitation to CSOs to complete Indicator Two questionnaire. CSO FP consulted with NC re CSO invitee list. Indicator Two MS validation session co-organized by NC and CSO FP, attended by 3 of the CSOs that completed the questionnaire (including FP), 2 providers including the FP, 2 private sector, and 2 government officials additional to the NC
Uganda	1	Y	16 ¹¹	Y	10 ¹²	Y (2)	o	na	o	na	o	No MS information/dialogue session held. CSO FP facilitated Indicator Two questionnaire completion by CSOs. 2 provider FPs facilitated questionnaire input by providers
Myanmar	15	Y	15	na	6	Y	o	na	o	na	2	MS data gathering dialogue involving the three stakeholder groups organized by provider FP. CPDE-designated FP involved but not in an FP role.

¹ The information in these columns covers stakeholders considered to have completed the Indicator Two questionnaire, whether singly, or jointly through an Indicator Two specific multi-stakeholder dialogue for information gathering or validation purposes. Stakeholder figures do not cover dialogues that may have taken place but were not Indicator Two specific.

² Occasionally, due to the need for consistency, the stakeholder categorizations applied for the purposes of this report differ from the categorizations applied by interviewees or country report researchers. We have categorized international CSOs as "CSOs"; private sector actors as "private sector"; and foundations/trusts as "other". None of these actors have been categorized as "provider". The "other" category also includes media and an independent legislated human rights commission.

³ The figure "1" is used when the sole government ministry/agency involved in completion of the Indicator Two questionnaire was the NC host. However, the NC was sometimes supported in this work by staff and may also have consulted with other ministries or departments in completing the Indicator Two questionnaire.

⁴ Some of these CSOs were networks that may have consulted with their members in completing the Indicator Two questionnaire. Thus, the total number of CSO participants may be larger than represented here.

⁵ In some instances FPs for each stakeholder group may have been designated but either were not invited or opted not to participate in completion of the Indicator Two questionnaire, in which case the "FP Y/N column" indicates "N".

⁶ There is a small discrepancy between the NC's reporting and CSOs' reporting on levels of participation.

⁷ The use of "na" (not applicable) indicates that FPs for this stakeholder group were not designated, at least for Indicator Two.

⁸ There is a small discrepancy between the NC's reporting and CSOs' reporting on levels of participation. This may be due to a partial response by a CSO to the questionnaire.

⁹ There is a small discrepancy between the NC's reporting and providers' reporting on levels of participation.

¹⁰ Ten is the number that fully completed the questionnaire though additional CSOs filled out parts of the questionnaire or provided comments to the CSO FP.

¹¹ Some CSOs partially completed the questionnaire but their numbers are not included here.

¹² This figure is estimated by the NC.

Country	Completion of questionnaire & engagement of Focal Point for Indicator Two monitoring ^{1,2}											Multi-stakeholder (MS) Process
	Government ³	NC Y/N	CSO ⁴	FP Y/N ⁵	Provider	FP Y/N	Private sector	FP Y/N	Parliament	FP Y/N	Other	
Mozam-bique	1 ¹³	Y	Un-known ¹⁴	Y	o	Y/N ¹⁵	o	na	o	na	o	MS information/launch session for 2015/16 monitoring was organized by the NC. 2 provincial level MS Indicator Two data gathering sessions organized by CSO FP with financial/admin support from provider FP. NC organized MS validation session though not Indicator Two specific.
Kenya	1	Y	28	Y (2)	8 ¹⁶	Y	o	na	o	na	o	CSO FP plus another CSO co-organized CSO data gathering session for Indicator Two. A provider hosted meeting with providers, select CSOs and a government representative to further the dialogue. Another provider (FP) hosted a provider meeting on Modules 3 and 4 with select CSO participation, and submitted the information to the NC. NC organized MS validation session though not Indicator Two specific.
Cameroon	3 ¹⁷	Y	35	Y	1	Y	3	na	o	na	4	MS information/launch session organized by NC, with representation from all stakeholder groups, using existing multi-donor/government dialogue forum. CSO FP circulated the questionnaire to other CSOs and hosted a MS validation dialogue. NC completed questionnaire, drawing from inputs provided by CSO FP based on the validation session. NC organized MS validation session, though not Indicator Two specific.

¹³ From the national government side only the NC was involved. However, the two provincial level MSDs were also attended by local government representatives and elected officials. Participant figures unfortunately could not be obtained for the provincial level dialogues.

¹⁴ Participant figures could not be obtained for the provincial level dialogues.

¹⁵ The provider FP's role was to channel financial support from multiple donors to the CSO FP-led provincial level multi-stakeholder dialogues., as well as to provide administrative support for the dialogues.

¹⁶ This figure may underrepresent the number of participating providers as exact figures could not be obtained.

¹⁷ All figures in this row represent an estimate of the number of institutions represented at the multi-stakeholder validation session organized by the CSO FP. Some institutions were represented by more than one individual.

Annex C:

GPI-12 Stock-take Interviewees by Country and Stakeholder Group

	Government	CSOs	Providers	Private sector	Parliament	Other	Total interviews
Honduras	3*	3*	4~	1	1	0	12
Costa Rica	1*	2	0	0	0	0	3
Egypt	1*	4*	0~	1	1	2	9
Armenia	1*	4*	3~	1	0	0	9
Kyrgyzstan	3*	4*	2~	1	0	0	10
Sudan	2*	5*	2*	3	0	0	12
Mozambique	3*	3*	4* ¹	1	0	0	11
Uganda	5*	3*	4*	1	1	0	14
Myanmar	5*	6~	2* ²	0	0	1	14
Cameroon	4*	4	4	0	0	0	12
Kenya	3*	9*	2*	1	0	0	15
							121

* National Coordinator/Focal Point for the constituency was interviewed.

~ Focal Point not applicable or Focal Point information unclear/unavailable.

¹ Participation of the Focal Point was limited to financial support and logistics.

² An actor in this constituency took up the practical role of National Coordinator.

Annex D:

PI-12 Stock-take Researchers by Country

Country	Consultant Name	Job title	Affiliations
Mozambique	Prof. José Jaime Macuane	Governance Consultant and Senior Partner	Map Consulting, Mozambique
Honduras	Mr. Héctor A. Caballero R.	Independent Consultant	N/A
Cameroon	Prof. Isaac Tamba	Professor at University of Yaounde II, Executive Secretary at the Center of Research of Sustainable Development	University of Yaounde II, Cameroon and Center of Research of Sustainable Development in Africa
Egypt	Prof. Amany Massoud El – Hedeny	Professor of Political sociology and comparative politics	Faculty of Economics and Political science, Cairo University
Kenya	Prof. Winnie V. Mitullah	Director and Researcher	Institute for Development Studies (IDS), University of Nairobi
Sudan	Dr. Abdul-Hameed Elias Suliman	Assistant professor, Head of Research and Consultancy unit	Development Studies and Research Institute, University of Khartoum
Myanmar	Mr. Alexander Jaggard	Country Representative	Mekong Economics Ltd.
	Ms. DD Seng Htoi Aung	Project Coordinator	Mekong Economics Ltd.
Uganda	Mr. Emmanuel Musoke Muyiiya	Institutional Development Consultant	Centre of African Strategic Innovations
Costa Rica	Mr. Alonso Ramirez Cover	Researcher-Professor	University of Costa Rica
	Ms. Ariana Araujo Resenterra	Independent researcher and consultant in development projects and studies	N/A
Kyrgyzstan	Mr. Charles Buxton	Regional Representative in Central Asia	INTRAC (International NGO Training and Research Centre, UK)
	Ms. Anara Moldosheva	Independent Consultant	N/A
	Dr. Medet Tiulegenov	Lecturer	International and Comparative Politics Department, University of Central Asia, Bishkek Kyrgyzstan
Armenia	Dr. Artak Ayunts	Independent Consultant	N/A

About the Task Team

The Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment (Task Team) is a multi-stakeholder informal network. Its work is concerned with advancing the role of civil society in development, in the context of international commitments on civil society and development as agreed at the 2011 [Busan High Level Forum](#) on aid effectiveness and more recently at the 2014 [Mexico High Level Meeting](#).

Task Team participants come from three stakeholder groups: governments that provide development cooperation; recipient governments; and civil society organizations (CSOs) in the CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE). It is led by three co-chairs, each representing a stakeholder group.

For more information

Please visit our website and follow us on Twitter.



TaskTeamCSO.com



@TaskTeamCSO

Contact

Please use the contact form on our website www.taskteamcsocom/contact/.

Address

Secretariat of the Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment
International Institute of Social Studies
of Erasmus University Rotterdam
P.O. Box 29776
2502 LT The Hague
The Netherlands

Telephone

+31 (0)70 426 0659
+31 (0)70 426 0542

Funding

The Task Team secretariat and Task Team activities are funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA).



Credits

Photography: Adobe Stock
Graphic design: MOAN



Task Team
CSO Development Effectiveness
and Enabling Environment

