

**Enhancing Civil Society Role in Development Partnerships Post 2015  
2016 Interim Report**

**Table of Contents**

<b>1. DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTION ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE ACTION	3
2.2 RESULTS AND ACTIVITIES	4
A. RESULTS	4
B. ACTIVITIES	17
2.3 LOGFRAME MATRIX UPDATED	31
2.4 UPDATED ACTION PLAN	35
<b>3. BENEFICIARIES/AFFILIATED ENTITIES AND OTHER COOPERATION</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>4. VISIBILITY</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>LIST OF ANNEX</b>	<b>45</b>

## 1. Description

<b>Name of Coordinator of the Grant Contract:</b>	IBON International Foundation Inc.
<b>Name and Title of the Contact Person:</b>	Ms. Amy Padilla, IBON International Deputy Director/ CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness Executive Secretary
<b>Name of beneficiaries and affiliated entities in the Action:</b>	ACT Alliance ActionAid Italia Arab NGO Network for Development Asia Pacific Mission for Migrants Asia-Pacific Research Network Coordinadora dela Mujer FOND Romania Fundacion SES International Trade Union Confederation National Association of Youth Organisations Pacific Islands Association of NGO People's Coalition on Food Sovereignty Reality of Aid Africa Network Reality of Aid Network Reality of Aid Network - Asia-Pacific Rural Missionaries of Mindanao – Northern Mindanao Region
<b>Title of the Action:</b>	Enhancing Civil Society Role in Development Partnerships Post 2015
<b>Contract Number:</b>	DCI-NSA/2015/370-426
<b>Start date and end date of the reporting period:</b>	January 2016 – March 2017 (15 months)
<b>Target countries or regions:</b>	Global and Africa, Asia, Pacific, Europe, North America, Latin America and the Caribbean, Middle East and North Africa Regions
<b>Final beneficiaries and/or Target groups (if different):</b>	
<b>Countries in which the activities take place (if different from 1.7):</b>	

## **2. Assessment of Implementation of Action Activities**

### **2.1 Executive Summary of the Action**

2016 marked a milestone year for the CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE). The 2<sup>nd</sup> High Level Ministerial Meeting (HLM2) of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) featured discussions on the future of the GPEDC and development cooperation. In response, CPDE consolidated and strengthened civil society positions through conduct of policy researches and careful deliberations to arrive at evidence and consensus-based policy recommendations.

The Action has made good progress on both specific objectives.

Under the objective of influencing favourable policy outcomes in Development Partnerships (DPs), CPDE notes progress in multi-stakeholder dialogue opportunities and commitment to reverse trend of shrinking civic spaces. Under the objective of increasing CSO capacity, an independent assessment showed increase in capacity to sharing information/ knowledge, implementation of the Istanbul Principles (IP) on CSO Development Effectiveness and increased practice of transparency and accountability principles.

The changes in development landscape impact on the the context in which the Action activities are implemented. CPDE adjusts and makes sure that the desired results of the programme resonate to the current realities of key stakeholders and beneficiaries. The logical framework of this Action will be revised according to these changes. These revision benefits from the Strategic Planning exercise that the CPDE Coordination Committee (CC) engaged in last March 2016 in Brussels, Belgium. Through a Power Mapping exercise, the development landscape was assessed, and new advocacy priorities were identified to guide the platform's work in the coming years.

The overall objective of engaging the GPEDC and other relevant processes, focusing on effective development cooperation principles in the context of development partnerships for the implementation of the SDGs, remains the same. Changes on the specific objectives, most especially as it relates to the Platform's policy and advocacy engagement work, will be in accordance to its redefined advocacy priorities. As CPDE mainstreams the advocacy in promoting human rights based approaches (HRBA) in all its work, advocacy priorities on CSO Enabling Environment (CSO EE), CSO Development Effectiveness (CSO DE), Private Sector (PS) Accountability, South-South Development Cooperation (SSDC), and Countries in Conflict and Fragility will need to be articulated in the policy influencing objectives of Action, as well as areas CSOs will monitor. There will also be some adjustment in the set indicator of operationalising CSO accountability guidelines to align with the Strategic Plan.

## 2.2 Results and Activities

### A. Results

The European Commission (EC) Action of the CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) has set out to ensure significant contribution in global and regional development policy arenas, particularly through the GPEDC and other relevant processes, with focus on the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Specifically, the platform has also set out the following objectives in order to guide its programme for (1) policy and advocacy engagement and (2) capacity development:

1. Influence favourable policy outcomes in Development Partnerships (DPs) at the global and regional levels through institutionalising CSO participation, advocating enabling environment for CSOs, and aligning development frameworks to human rights based approaches (HRBA); and
2. Increase CSO capacity to contribute and monitor DPs and Istanbul Principles implementation.

2016 marks the commencement of the implementation of this Action.

So far, positive gains can already be demonstrated in terms of the Platform's work in policy and advocacy engagement and capacity development. CPDE's years of work on development effectiveness made it possible to achieve policy gains on enabling environment for CSOs<sup>1</sup> and capacity development of CSOs in the Action's initial year. Year 1 of the EC Action coincided with the GPEDC HLM2 year. In line with this, CPDE was already able to anticipate the importance of the negotiations in developing the outcome document of the Ministerial Meetings – i.e., coming from the HLM1 in Mexico which watered down the value of the negotiations with unexpected caucuses of the GPEDC Steering Committee (SC). Learning from the HLM1 engagement, CPDE was more prepared for the HLM2. Due to this, CPDE was more focused in its advocacy with one call for universal application of effective development cooperation (EDC) principles. Furthermore, CPDE also reiterated the need to uphold and renew donor and partner countries' commitments to the Rome, Paris, Accra, and Busan High Level Forums (HLF). However, despite this success, more work needs to be done in order to ensure that the policy gains will be implemented, rather than remain as rhetoric.

**Outcome 1.** Influence favourable policy outcomes in Development Partnerships (DPs) at the global and regional levels through institutionalising CSO participation, advocating enabling environment for CSOs, and aligning development frameworks to human rights based approaches (HRBA).

The CSO Partnership had some significant progress in advancing its advocacy for and ensuring an acceptable language on CSO Enabling Environment in its engagement in the GPEDC HLM2. The Nairobi Outcome Document (NOD) Recognised and committed

---

<sup>1</sup> See **Annex A** - Nairobi Outcome Document for exact referencing of policy gains on this thematic area.

to reverse the trend of closing spaces for civil society (§18). It further committed to accelerate progress in providing an enabling environment for civil society in line with internationally agreed rights (§18). CPDE will continuously engage relevant policy spaces at all levels, most especially at the global and regional, to assert CSO role as an independent development stakeholder to ensure such success does not end up as mere rhetoric. Follow up of multi-stakeholder dialogue at all levels will be made so that specific actions would be taken by all stakeholders to advance CSO EE.

The Action seeks to contribute to institutionalised CSO spaces in development partnerships. The NOD upheld the promotion of civil society space to “*evaluate development progress by the government and other stakeholders*” (§42f). More broadly speaking, the Synthesis of Evidence<sup>2</sup> submitted by the platform notes progress in CSO Enabling Environment notably in multi-stakeholder dialogue opportunities, and high level of trust on CSOs as development actors, among others. More progress is expected once the Regional Observatorios are rolled out in Year 2. It is expected that CSOs will demand this from the regional and global development partnerships that they engage in. Noting that success on this advocacy will require sustained engagement for a longer period of time, CPDE remains committed at delivering this under the EC Action, as a vital component of the advocacy priority on CSO EE.

Success in aligning development frameworks to HRBA is most apparent in the GPEDC. The NOD upholds its vision consistent with agreed international commitments on human rights (§4). It further asserts its belief that EDC principles are consistent with our agreed international commitments on human rights (§7). Progress is minimal beyond the GPEDC. Similar to institutionalised CSO participation in DPs, progress in this area is expected to broaden upon the roll-out of the Regional Observatorios. Globally, CPDE has mainstreamed HRBA in the Platform’s advocacy for effective development cooperation – i.e., noting that HRBA and Human Rights should be at the heart of ensuring that development cooperation and initiatives at all levels are effective. Specific advocacy priorities will focus on CPDE engagements and lobbying while mainstreaming HRBA in these areas – i.e., for instance, SSDC discussions are far from institutionalising HRBA in its framework, and this will be the focus of CPDE’s work in 2017.

In realising inclusive partnerships in DPs, success can be attributed to the engagement to the GPEDC SC and the HLM2. Being one of the major stakeholders of the GPEDC, CPDE influenced the discussions of the GPEDC SC – the highest governing body of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation. Room documents were developed to articulate clearly the positions of CSOs on the important discussions concerning the platform, most especially the mandate of the GPEDC. Aside from this, the CSO Partnership participated actively in the planning of the plenary sessions – i.e., identifying CSO leads to the seven (7) plenary sessions of the ministerial meetings. This heavily contributed to ensuring that the GPEDC operated on the principle of inclusive partnerships – i.e., most especially upholding the principle of providing an enabling environment for CSOs.

In ensuring that these results are effectively achieved, a set of outputs had been developed in 2016. Most of these outputs were produced particularly for the engagement of the CPDE in the GPEDC HLM2. These outputs were instrumental in ensuring that

CSO voices were made available to the wider public, not only to those actors who are directly engaging the negotiation table of the HLM2.

### **Output 1.1 Institutionalised CSO participation and policy gains in CSO EE in global and regional development policy arenas**

The following are specific outputs that contribute to the above:

#### ***CPDE Comments on the Nairobi Outcome Document drafts***

The Zero Draft of the Nairobi Outcome Document (NOD) was released in May of 2016. CPDE submitted feedback to all official drafts until its adoption in Nairobi on December 2016. Inputs for these submissions were collected from the CPDE CC and the Advocacy Committee. The former is responsible for steering the policy and advocacy discussions in the platform and giving political direction to all of the platform's engagements. As the HLM drew closer, the Negotiation Team, an ad hoc task force organised specifically for providing inputs to the negotiation of the NOD content, was formed to take the process head-on.

Influencing the NOD became one of the avenues for advancing CSO position. The main CSO advocacy that was advanced in influencing the document was hinged on renewing commitments on the unfinished business of Rome, Paris, Accra, and Busan. Among these were making development more effective through providing an enabling environment for CSOs and institutionalising multi-stakeholder dialogues. Advancing this, however, was a rather easy negotiation because the document explicitly mentioned commitments on ensuring that these principles would guide development cooperation to make it more effective. Specifically, the NOD committed to the "creation of institutionalised space and a legally supported enabling environment for the formation and operation of civil society organisations (in particular women's organisations and marginalised groups), including access to national and international funding resources as agreed in the Busan Agreement, to ensure their full participation in development processes at all levels and their contribution to the realisation of human rights" (§ 50). As the initial drafts of the NOD explicitly stated the principle of EE, CPDE needed to reiterate the continuous shrinking of civic spaces which development stakeholders would need to recognise. In such recognition, the GPEDC calls upon governments to reverse such trend and create such conducive context for CSOs to operate and participate in development processes, most especially at the country level.

#### ***Statement on the Asia Pacific Forum for Sustainable Development***

CPDE engagement of the APFSD was through its members in the Asia-Pacific region as well as other sectors. The working group on 2030 Agenda took the lead in drafting the APFSD statement (See Annex B) with inputs from CPDE members who attended the conference. Aside from this, CPDE Asia also organised a side event in the Asia-Pacific Civil Society Forum on Sustainable Development on steered conversation on *Diminishing Democratic Spaces for CSOs in National and Regional Levels*, highlighting the need for CSO enabling environment and denouncing legal and extra-legal trends that restrict CSO participation in development processes in the region. The result of the discussions in this side

event helped CSOs unite their positions on CSO enabling environment and accountability, which projected in the Asia-Pacific Forum on Sustainable Development. The event was attended by various development actors.

CPDE reaffirmed in the statement that the APFSD is not simply a forum for follow-up and review. Its niche is derived from its capability to reflect the regional context and priorities and, more importantly, people's aspirations to the 2030 agenda. However, the decision to defer decisions regarding the regional roadmap was compromising not only to the region, but the whole 2030 agenda process.

### Output 1.2 GPSD & DPs adopting elements of HRBA and Inclusive Partnerships

The following are specific outputs that contribute to the above:

**Room Document for the 9<sup>th</sup> GPEDC SC Meeting in Malawi.** Given the multi-stakeholder nature of the GPEDC SC, its meetings were considered as the main advocacy engagement of CPDE. The GPEDC SC Meetings serve as an arena to advance policy positions. Maximising its presence in the highest governance body of the GPEDC, CPDE ensures that inclusive partnerships and development are of paramount concern to the platform. In doing so, CPDE engages meaningfully in the SC through the development of room documents which civil society will be negotiating in the meetings depending on the agenda of the meeting.

For the 9<sup>th</sup> SC Meeting in Malawi, the agenda was focused on making progress on the discussions of the GPEDC mandate and the required preparations for the HLM2 in Nairobi. The statement reflected CPDE's contributions to the meeting which provided guidance for the preparations of the HLM2. CPDE called for a conference that fosters learning for greater accountability and guidance for more effective development co-operation. CPDE also advocated for the need to place the value of the GPEDC as a multi-stakeholder platform as well as the importance of inclusive development.

The Room Document for the 9<sup>th</sup> GPEDC SC Meeting is found in Annex C.

**CPDE Statement ahead of the 10<sup>th</sup> GPEDC SC Meeting.** Ahead of the 10<sup>th</sup> GPEDC Steering Committee meeting, CPDE drafted a set of recommendations that shall guide the HLM2 engagement of the platform. The Statement (See Annex D) emphasised on the importance of preserving the integrity of GPEDC's mandate, in particular, its accountability function, the need to revisit the GPEDC's governance structure to include a non-executive Co-Chair, and the need to operationalise the recommendations from the Monitoring Advisory Group in conducting the GPEDC Second Monitoring Round (2MR). CPDE also recalled the urgency to develop a political roadmap anchored on the MAG's technical work pre and post HLM2. What is important in this engagement is the underlying implication of advancing the accountability function of the GPEDC and moving forward the discussion on the issue of the fourth non-executive Co-chair position in the SC. In moving this discussion, CPDE is also making progress in advancing HRBA and inclusive partnerships, among others, in the GPEDC – i.e.,

considering it being the most relevant development partnership for CPDE at the moment. As espoused in the Accountability piece of CPDE ahead of the HLM2 engagement, advancing accountability is holding governments and other development stakeholders into account of fulfilling previously agreed international commitments on upholding human rights and inclusiveness at all levels of development cooperation.

Being on the final stretches of planning for the HLM2, CPDE engaged meaningfully in this meeting to ensure that CSO voices are integrated in the discussion/outcomes.

**CSO plenary leads to the official HLM2 WGs.** To ensure that the planning of the plenary session for the HLM2 would be inclusive and would integrate on CSO voices, the CSO Partnership identified CSO leads to the different plenary sessions of the HLM2. In line with this, CPDE established seven (7) task forces to provide inputs to the seven (7) plenary sessions of the GPEDC HLM2. These task forces were composed of CPDE members who volunteered to take the lead on the specific Plenary Session of the GPEDC HLM2. Each task force has an assigned lead responsible for negotiating CSO positions to be integrated in the programme of the session. These leads are members of either the CPDE CC or CPDE WGs who are exposed to the policy discussions of the thematic issue presented in the plenary session. These leads are, namely: Luca de Fraia (Plenary 1: Stock-taking on progress since Busan), Jeroen Kwakkenbos (Plenary 2: On Sustainable Development Goals), Erin Palomares (Plenary 3: On South-South Cooperation), Jennifer Malonzo (Plenary 4: On Private Sector), Rey Asis (Plenary 5: On Women and Youth Empowerment), Izabella Toth (Plenary 6: On Leaving No One Behind), and Tetet Lauron (Plenary 7: On Partnerships). These CSO leads were responsible for influencing the discussions on the planning of the specific plenary session they belong to. They were successful in ensuring that the plenary sessions would discuss important issues relevant to the thematic priority and that CSO positions were factored in. They also comprised eventually the CPDE Core Group for the HLM2 engagement.

**HLM Plenary 6 Concept Note: Leaving No One Behind (LNOB).** Given its relevance in the development policy discussions globally, the plenary session on LNOB was seen to be an important avenue for advancing the principles of inclusiveness and rights based approaches to development. Predominantly government, this plenary session was an opportune time for CPDE to defend the role of development cooperation in the 2030 Agenda architecture. This is hinged on the idea of development cooperation as a unique instrument exclusively devoted to help the most vulnerable of being left behind. As one of the principles in the universal application of effective development cooperation, inclusive partnerships and HRBA are relevant advocacies to forward in the planning of this plenary session.

CPDE advocated that LNOB should be a crosscutting approach to development. In terms of planning the session, CPDE was the lead-organiser for Plenary Session 6. This plenary identified the most vulnerable sectors of society that might be left behind. The session discussed important mechanisms for ensuring that the SDGs slogan of Leaving No One Behind would be achieved by 2030. In line with this, speakers of the session highlighted the need for transparency,



trust, and risk-taking in advancing this agenda. This is most especially applicable to countries in a state of conflict and fragility. The session also strongly emphasised the value of creating innovative approaches to the issue of conflict and fragility. There was even a watered down value of inclusiveness as a principle in this session, as it only becomes a prerogative in terms of implementation on this issue.

The Concept Note of Plenary Session 6 can be found in Annex E.

**One-pager on Accountability.** Sharpening the call for a more effective development cooperation at all levels, CPDE specified Accountability as one of the main priority themes to discuss in the HLM2. Accountability was described as one of the key principles for instigating behaviour change among all development cooperation actors at all levels. Anchored on the commitments made in previous high level forums on aid effectiveness, the one-pager (See Annex F) emphasised that fulfilling these internationally agreed principles could enhance the implementation of development cooperation, most especially at the country level. This holds all stakeholders into account in ensuring that everyone undergoes a check and balance mechanism on initiatives. Specifically, this is hinged on the need for aligning development initiatives and cooperation on HRBA and inclusiveness. Such principles are germane to a more effective development cooperation, and reiterating such would be vital in the direction that the GPEDC will be going in the coming years, including its efforts to make sure that no one is left behind. Furthermore, Accountability is more than just a basic development effectiveness principle, but an approach reminding the donors about their commitments for providing an effective development co-operation. This is important especially in the context of enhancing the 2030 Agenda SDGs follow-up and review process.

This output was developed in order for CPDE to engage more meaningfully in the HLM2. The CC and the Advocacy Committee of the platform worked together in developing this document and ensure that the political direction of the CPDE engagement will be hinged on this.

**EDD16 Brainstorming Lab session.** Noting the diversity of the stakeholders participating in the European Development Days, the CSO Partnership sustained its engagement in the event to advance CSO positions and generate buy-in on the new main advocacy of the platform – i.e., focusing on the universal application of effective development cooperation at all levels. The Coordination Committee took the lead in developing the concept of the Brainstorming Lab session at the EDD16. Select members of the Coordination Committee were also chosen as resource speakers of the session to explain more carefully the advocacy on universalising Effective Development Cooperation.

The session introduced CPDE's notion of universalising Effective Development Co-operation and elaborated on how the DE principles can be cascaded from the global scale to country realities. It also reiterated the need for fulfilling the unfinished business of Rome, Paris, Accra, and Busan. It emphasised on the importance of holding all governments and non-state actors into account to uphold internationally agreed human rights and frameworks of inclusiveness in development partnerships. To exemplify this, the session also presented cases

enshrining multi-stakeholder and rights-based approaches that build accountability in partnerships, strengthening ways of moving forward to leave no one behind, and fulfilling the SDGs.

***CPDE Side Event in the HLM2.*** The Negotiation Team, Coordination Committee, and GPEDC Advocacy committee collaborated to lead the process in developing CPDE's side-event at the HLM2. The session comprised of CPDE co-chairs, members, and government officials as speakers discussing the need to uphold commitments from the unfinished business of Rome, Paris, Accra, and Busan.

The session conveyed the opportunity to reclaim lost ground on effective development cooperation, as the effectiveness agenda plays an even greater role today. It highlighted that leaving no one behind refers to the upholding and implementing of principles such as democratic ownership and accountability. The session discussed how to universalise EDC, uphold accountability at all levels, and link the overall work in the 2030 Agenda process. It also highlighted that the advocacy on accountability is anchored on upholding internationally agreed human rights principles in development. With universalising EDC, CPDE champions the advocacy for human rights aligned frameworks for development which are currently farfetched. The primacy of the private sector in development and the lack of legally binding mechanisms to regulate the activities of this development actor put more emphasis on the need for HRBA in EDC.

***CPDE Advocacy Toolkit for HLM2 Engagement.*** The Global Secretariat was tasked to develop a toolkit that CSO delegates and other participants at the HLM2 can use to have a meaningful engagement to the policy milestone. This Toolkit was submitted to the CC for review and approval before dissemination to the delegates. It highlighted the CSO positions and explained thoroughly the components relevant to each advocacy ask. It was also able to express the platform's stance on each issue/plenary-session of the GPEDC HLM2. In disseminating this engagement piece, not only did CPDE consolidate the voices of CSOs, but also it highlighted the effectiveness of CSOs in calling for inclusive partnerships. This resulted in a meaningful engagement among CSOs.

***CSO Communiqué.*** The CSO Communiqué (See Annex G) is the product of the Nairobi CSO Forum (NCSF) which took place as a preparatory forum of HLM2. It aimed to consolidate the CSO delegation and to unite all CSO delegates on the advocacy that would be advanced in the HLM2. The Forum also provided updates on the progress of the negotiations and the outcome document. It also provided space for CSO delegates to consolidate their constituencies through strategic caucuses and to develop context specific policy positions that would be integrated to the Communiqué. A CSO communiqué drafting committee was organised to consolidate the inputs from these constituency caucuses.

Basically, the Communiqué asserted that the starting points of the HLM2 should focus on the four (4) development effectiveness principles, namely: (1) democratic ownership, (2) focus on results, (3) inclusive partnerships, and (4) transparency and accountability. But, the overall call was to uphold the aid and development effectiveness commitments made in Rome, Paris, Accra, Busan, and Mexico. It also emphasised that CSOs are key partners in inclusive and

effective development co-operation and that an enabling environment should be upheld as one of the guiding principles in making development cooperation more effective. Finally, the communiqué acknowledged the critical role of the development effectiveness principles, effective development co-operation, and multi-stakeholder partnerships in the delivery of the 2030 Agenda.

***CSO Imperatives for a successful outcome document.*** The CSO Partnership identified imperatives that should be considered in developing a successful outcome document of the HLM2. The Negotiation Team in coordination with the Coordination Committee developed these imperatives, but with the need to ensure that CSO inputs are reflected in the final stages of the negotiations, the draft was continuously developed during the actual HLM2 engagement.

The document (See Annex H) demanded all stakeholders to the GPEDC to focus on ways that can effectively support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals through development cooperation. It recommended primarily the universal application of effective development co-operation principles through an inclusive monitoring framework with clear indicators that recognise the multidimensionality of development. The imperatives also demanded required measures to address the issue of shrinking spaces for CSOs as well as the increasing role of private sector in development.

***Civil Society Assessment of the Nairobi Outcome Document.*** In an effort to assess the level of achievement in the HLM2 engagement, the CPDE CC deemed it necessary to develop a Civil Society Assessment of the NOD (See Annex I). The CPDE CC worked with the Global Secretariat in developing this assessment with data gathering conducted online weeks after the engagement. The survey gauged the perceived achievements in terms of language and process in negotiating the NOD. It elaborated on all aspects of the Nairobi Outcome Document and was cross-referenced against the Key Asks of CPDE.

In the document, CPDE assessed that most of the Key Asks and CSO imperatives were achieved. The commitment to a time-bound work-plan for achieving the unfinished business in particular is the crucial take-away for the development community. It provided an anchor for civil society to monitor and ensure that the GPEDC and other development actors will uphold its ADE commitments, while still supporting the 2030 Agenda. The commitment to reverse the trend of shrinking spaces for CSOs was a hard-fought achievement from the negotiation of the NOD, and the openness to a fourth non-executive co-chair reflected the commitment of the GPEDC to uphold the inclusive character of the partnership.

However, the outcome document heavily emphasises the value of private finance, which is consistent with the global trend in development financing. This means that there remains to be an outright promotion of the intervention of big businesses in achieving development outcomes for the SDGs. Not only is this a threat to the principle of accountability in the Global Partnership, it also raises many uncertainties for the future.

**Outcome 2.** Increase CSO capacity to contribute and monitor DPs and Istanbul principles (IP) implementation

In line with the monitoring CSO capacities, CPDE had already established an Organisational Capacity Assessment in 2014 that basically presented baseline information on existing CSO capacities for research, mobilisation, and advocacy for IP. Under the project *Civil Society Continuing Campaign on Effective Development*, CPDE members showed increased capacities in the different areas of its work. The Capacity for Research and Advocacy for Development increased from 68.5% in 2014 to 70.2% in 2016. This included associated capacities for research on development cooperation policy (which increased from 58% in 2014 to 65.4% in 2016) and knowledge capacities on aid and development effectiveness issues (which increased from 39.7% in 2014 to 62.8% in 2016). Enabling Environment has been one of the main advocacy priorities of CPDE, and members are effectively showing significant increase in terms of capacities to advocate such. As reflected in the OCA Evaluation Report, the overall evaluation on the Capacity for Networking, Mobilisation, and Generation of EE received a marked increase from 69% in 2014 to 74% in 2016. Associated capacities on this included networking for EE (increasing from 63% in 2014 to 74% in 2016) and capacity for doing communications and policy work on EE (from 65% in 2014 to 71 % in 2016). Finally, CPDE members also showed marked increase in capacity to advocate and implement the Istanbul Principles (from 72% in 2014 to 79% in 2016). CSOs are able to share information with their constituencies and other stakeholders (from 69% in 2014 to 80% in 2016). Furthermore, capacity to uphold transparency principles also increased among the Organisational Board (from 72% to 81%).

Such information was hinged on the objectives of the *Continuing Campaign* project, and the capacity to monitor DPs were only integrated in the baseline report for the EC Action. This meant that CPDE had to conduct another OCA in order to define benchmarks for assessing an increased capacity on this work area. It is also for this reason that data in this project component are culled from existing CSO capacities already assessed in an existing project. Furthermore, it is in this regard that the first year of implementing CSO capacity development work under the EC Action focused on the assessment of current CSO capacities and the completion of needed inputs for the intended actions. As the CSO Partnership grapple with the basic elements of Development Partnerships (DPs), the initial phase of the capacity development work of the CPDE took off from researches that aimed to scan the current landscape of CSOs strengths and needs to help develop the framework for the CD activities of the sectors and the regions. This baseline information reported in the Organisational Capacity Assessment (OCA) will form the basis for identifying the minimum elements of the capacity development activities required to increase CSO capacities in monitoring DPs and implementing IP. Aside from this, the mapping exercise aimed to initially identify actors which regions can readily engage in the development of their respective observatorios. In line with this, the initial phase of the capacity development work had been successfully implemented already, and the implementation phase will be underway this 2017. It is primary that the findings of these researches will inform the framework of intervention in order to ensure that CSOs will benefit from this undertaking.

On the other hand, the CSO Partnership is also committed at further improving their development effectiveness. In line with this, the work on CSO Development Effectiveness continued in 2016 to document the good practices and lessons learned of CSOs in further contributing to the implementation of the Istanbul Principles. Aside from

this documentation, CPDE also created spaces for learning exchange among CSOs in order for these lessons learned and good practices to be shared with other CSOs who are grappling with how they can improve their effectiveness and contribute to the implementation of the IP. As the good practices continue to pile up, scaling up the work on CSO DE will be vital, and it is in this regard that the logical framework will be revised to scale up the implementation of the Istanbul Principles and ensure that operating mechanisms for accountability will be set up at the global, regional, and country levels. A number of researches, publications, and activities had already been organised to document these practices, and the work on CSO DE is more than just ensuring that CSOs are implementing the IP.

The outputs detailed below showcase (1) the CPDE initiative to document CSO implementation of the Istanbul Principles and (2) the scoping exercises of the CSO needs and capacities in order for the capacity development work of the platform to materialise. These outputs will be beneficial for the framework setting of such CD initiatives which are expected to roll out in 2017.

### **Output 2.1 Increased CSO capacity in monitoring DPs on effective development cooperation**

The following are specific outputs the contribute to the above:

**2016 Organisational Capacity Assessment.** Consistent with the CPDE capacity development strategy under the EC-SIDA Action, the platform employed the 2016 Organisational Capacity Assessment (OCA) (See Annex J) to establish the current capacities of CPDE members relevant to planned CD initiatives. The assessment ably covered the whole CPDE, drawing findings from eight (8) sectors and seven (7) regions. UBORA Consultancy Services based in The Netherlands was hired to render the service contract. The Global Secretariat received a total of three (3) Expressions of Interest (EoI) from several organisations and individuals, UBORA included. UBORA was eventually chosen owing to their expertise on the subject matter and their clear plan in implementing the contract.

The OCA provided baseline information on CPDE members' current capacities on: (a) research, advocacy, and monitoring cooperation policies; (b) research, advocacy, and networking on enabling environment, and (c) upholding and implementing the Istanbul Principles. Based on the findings of the baseline OCA for this project, CSOs and their networks have presented strong capacities related to CSO Enabling Environment and the implementation of the SDGs – i.e., having a global score of above 75%. Europe, Latin America, and Asia were the regions most able to conduct research on EE. Furthermore, capacity to network and communicate advocacy on CSO EE was high with regions of North America, Europe, and Latin America. The highest capacity rating was recorded for implementing the Istanbul Principles. The Transparency Principle received the highest score with most members implementing this at 77.2% rating. However, capacities on conducting research and monitoring development cooperation policies are below average. The associated capacity on this component scored fairly well with Latin America, Africa, and Asia exhibiting to have access to information on development cooperation policies. Based on these findings, recommendations were forwarded in order to strategise more effectively the

capacity development intervention of the platform in the coming years. Following these recommendations, CPDE should focus on increasing capacities that reinforce CSO Networks at the regional and national level. In doing so, CPDE is able to strengthen regional and national organisations to bring their advocacies to the international level. Given that CPDE advocates for evidence based policy making for development, CPDE should strive to strengthen linkages and partnerships with think tanks and other research organisations. Furthermore, resources should be appropriately allocated to the conduct of research and staffing complement to sustain the work.

The evaluation part of the OCA will be administered in 2018 before the end of the EC-SIDA Action Project to gauge improvements (or none) in the capacities of CPDE members after the conduct of CD activities.

**Mapping Exercise on Monitoring Development Cooperation and Partnerships.** A mapping exercise of monitoring development cooperation and partnerships (See Annex K) globally was also implemented in Year 1. Results of this mapping exercise will feed into the overall framework of regional-level initiatives on monitoring development cooperation and partnerships. The mapping exercise features eleven (11) country cases from 6 CPDE regions, and is now available at <http://csopartnership.org/mappingexercise/>.

The results of the mapping exercise point out that initiatives on monitoring development cooperation and partnerships are already in place, but more particular at the country-level. From the examples gathered, themes monitored by CSOs include development projects, commitments on development cooperation, MDGs implementation, ODA in relation to service delivery, civic engagement mechanism, and laws and regulations. Monitoring is usually done on governments (national government, particular agency), development/ donor agencies, and multi-stakeholder (MSH) mechanisms initiated by other DPs. Among the challenges posed by CSOs include ad hoc/ non-institutionalised nature of monitoring mechanisms, gaps in their capacity, problems in sustainability, and limitation of scope and engagement.

From the initially-planned regional trainings, CPDE units opened the idea of conducting research especially in regions that already have rich experience in monitoring work, as long as either initiatives will result into the intended outputs of developing a regional partnership database and setting up a regional monitoring working group.

## **Output 2.2 Renewed Commitment of CSOs in upholding CSO DE principles and operationalization of CSO Accountability mechanisms**

**Istanbul Principles Five Years After.** Five years since the adoption of the Istanbul Principles, CPDE initiated a process of gathering evidence and stories of CSOs implementing the Principles. The output *Istanbul Five Years After: Evidencing Civil Society Development Effectiveness and Accountability* (See Annex L) assessed the actual state of CSO DE and Accountability in order to scale up previous initiatives and identify action points to address challenges.

The book is composed of eleven (11) reports from seven (7) countries and four (4) sectors, building on the results of prior books, *Journey from Istanbul* and the *2015 CPDE Global Synthesis on the State of Development Cooperation, CSO Enabling Environment, and CSO Development Effectiveness*. While baseline information informs us that there is an uneven buy-in of the Istanbul Principles across regions and sectors, these were appropriately compensated with activities that advanced the DE principles. In fact, some sectors conducted workshops and developed sector-specific guidelines to further the implementation of the IP in their constituencies. These sectors included the Labour (through the Trade Union Development Effectiveness Principles), the Feminist Group (with their manual for implementing DE principles among Women's Organisations), and the Faith-Based Organisations, Youth, and Migrants (all implementing workshops and trainings on CSO DE and IP). All regions were nonetheless committed to further enhancing the implementation of their own effectiveness. Manuals and guidelines were developed in order to guide CPDE regional members on their effectiveness. Later in the activities portion, this will be further explained as renewed commitments on implementing CSO DE and the Istanbul Principles were generated through the conduct of the CSO DE Global Days in Bangkok, Thailand.

Originally, the Action Research aimed to present seventeen (17) case studies from the geographic regional and global sectoral units of the platform. However, after persistent requests for inputs, APRN, the chair of the CPDE CSO DE WG, finally published the status of the implementation of CSO DE and Accountability in these contexts, highlighting only eleven (11) case studies from four (4) geographic regions of Asia, Africa, LAC, and North America and four (4) global sectors of the Trade Union, Feminist Group, Youth sector, and the Migrants. Furthermore, the action research stressed on the global trend of implementing CSO DE and Accountability and deferred the synthesis of the regional trends given the inputs available.

***Training Needs Analysis for the Conduct of Sectoral CSO Training on CSO Development Effectiveness and Accountability.*** Under the EC-SIDA Action, CPDE plans to conduct CSO trainings on CSO Development Effectiveness and Accountability for sectors. An essential part of these trainings is gauging the needs of sectoral organisations through a Training Needs Analysis (TNA) which was integrated to the 2016 OCA.

The TNA found out that among sectoral organisations, there is an overall medium-upper capacity to uphold and practice of the Principles, with strong awareness and commitment to implementing it. Among the needs they have identified includes capacity to use IP communications materials. They have scored low in progress markers associated to the implementation of IPs, in particular implementing Principles 4 (Environmental Sustainability), 6 (Equitable Partnerships) and 7 (Creating Knowledge and committing to mutual learning). On the other hand, there is relatively stronger capacity in using transparency and accountability mechanisms.

***Knowledge Management Strategy and Implementation Plan.*** The Knowledge Management Strategy and Implementation Plan (See Annex M) envision to ensure that the information needs of the platform are provided in a timely,

effective and efficient manner, fuelling the internal communications of its global structure, providing appropriate tools for CSO capacity building, and providing vital intelligence for the advocacy work of the platform and its CSO constituency.

The GS received two (2) Eols for the consultancy service. The eventual service contractor is a Knowledge Management expert based in The Netherlands. At the moment, the KMS has already finished the Needs Analysis and Strategy Documents. The analysis covers data generation, collection, distribution, security and use within and outside the platform.

An Implementation Plan that looks into developing systems, tools and mechanisms for an improved knowledge management system is being completed. It is expected that the implementation plan will respond to the needs earlier identified.

Overall, slight changes in the logical framework will be made in order to address the 2016 landscape mentioned above. In doing so, CPDE can be more relevant and up-to-date on the on-going policy discussions, and results are assured of being aligned to the pressing issues of the development community. Additionally, these adjustments are needed in order to ensure that the Platform is able to further its own work, rather than being tied to a priority that has been addressed already.



## B. Activities

The following activities served as spaces for CSOs to (1) advocate their key demands and emphasise their positions on issues most relevant to their contexts and (2) learn from the experiences of other CSOs on further developing their effectiveness in implementing the Istanbul Principles. The activities in this portion of the Interim Report will be categorised according to (1) Policy and Advocacy Engagement and (2) Capacity Development and Knowledge Sharing. This way, it will be easier to identify at which specific outcome of the Action the activities attribute its results to.

### Activity 1.1 CSO Participation in policy arenas

#### Activity 1.1.1 Participation in GPEDC

***Participation in the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> GPEDC Steering Committee Meetings.*** As mentioned in the previous portions of this Interim Report, the main advocacy engagement of the CSO Partnership is the GPEDC SC. Its meetings serve as a space for CSOs to influence meaningfully the direction of development cooperation at the global scale. The 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> GPEDC SC Meetings focused heavily on planning the HLM2 and mandate of the Global Partnership as the main hub of implementing development cooperation at all levels.

In terms of mandate, CPDE asserted that the GPEDC should maintain its primary role of ensuring that policies for effective development cooperation are aligned with the principles espoused and agreed in the previous high level forums on aid effectiveness (i.e., Rome, Paris, Accra, and Busan). Watering down its mandate to merely a learning hub for development cooperation will undermine the progress in terms of making development cooperation effective. This is most especially relevant with the GPEDC being the only development partnership that advances such cause. Aside from this, CPDE asserted that efforts on implementing accountability of stakeholders should be scaled up. As most governments and multilateral bodies undermine the commitments from the unfinished business, GPEDC has the primary responsibility of renewing such commitments and aligning global and national policies to these internationally agreed principles for effective development cooperation.

***CPDE Engagement in the GPEDC Second High Level Ministerial Meeting.*** Noting the changes in development landscape detailed in the previous portion of this Report, the advocacy expanded to universalising effective development cooperation (uEDC), a product of the platform's Strategic Planning exercise early in the year. Coming from the HLM1 in Mexico where the primary advocacy was to demand for inclusive development and development effectiveness, this expansion in the advocacy priority meant that development commitments and actions, consistent with effective development co-operation, should be informed by the principles of democratic country ownership, a focus on partner country development results, inclusive development partnerships, transparency and mutual accountability. It asserts that effective development co-operation is essential to ensure overall sustainable development through development partnerships.

Furthermore, this meant that the core business and five priority advocacy objectives related to today's development landscape together will strengthen effective development cooperation. The five other advocacy themes are: (1) CSO Development Effectiveness; (2) CSO Enabling Environment; (3) Private Sector Accountability; (4) South-South Cooperation; and (5) Conflict and Fragility. In strategising the platform's engagement in the HLM2, it heavily focused on introducing this new concept to the development community. Preparations for this engagement involved the organisation of specific structures and the mobilisation of members who had been heavily involved in the policy discussions of the GPEDC and its work streams.

In terms of structures, the CSO Partnership organised the following: (1) a Negotiation Team, responsible for developing the key CSO positions that would be forwarded to the negotiation of the Nairobi Outcome Document (NOD); (2) an International Organising Committee (IOC), responsible for fundraising and oversight of the CSO selection process; (3) a Local Organising Committee (LOC), responsible for the mobilisation of Kenyan CSO delegates and logistics preparations for the Nairobi Civil Society Forum (NCSF) and the CSO engagement to the HLM2; and (4) the Preparatory Forum Committee (PFC), responsible for the preparations of the NCSF. All these structures coordinated all preparations with the CPDE CC, to whom they were all accountable, and the Global Secretariat (GS), which provided the necessary staff support to carry out the work. Aside from these structures, the CC also organised a core group, which led the work required to influence the content of key plenary sessions of the HLM2 – i.e., Plenary 1 (on stock-taking progress of implementing Busan commitments), Plenary 2 (on SDGs), Plenary 3 (on SSC), Plenary 4 (on Private Sector), Plenary 5 (on Women and Youth empowerment), Plenary 6 (on Leaving No One Behind), and Plenary 7 (on Partnerships).

The work of these structures resulted in some incremental gains for the advocacy of uEDC<sup>3</sup>. CPDE organised an amphitheater session on uEDC, highlighting the core business and its important elements. The session emphasised the need for ensuring the continuous implementation of previous commitments – i.e., also stressing the development effectiveness principles and transparency and accountability in development cooperation. The core group was also able to field CSO speakers in all plenary sessions of the HLM2 – i.e., providing CPDE a space to advance its agenda on the specific thematic priority discussed in the plenary session. Aside from this, CPDE also set up a booth at the Marketplace where platform merchandise, reference materials and constituency policy products were exhibited. The advocacy campaign, nonetheless, made an impact as the outcomes of the negotiations had been significant in terms of ensuring that an enabling environment for CSOs could be provided. The negotiation of the NOD had been fruitful as it provided acceptable language on CSO EE and core business. Weeks after the HLM2, CPDE released an analysis of the NOD.

Similar to 2014, CPDE consolidated the CSO delegation through a CSO Forum, which aimed to discuss the advocacy on universalising EDC and informing CSO positions with constituency specific issues that needed to be addressed. CPDE provided members with a CPDE Advocacy Toolkit (Annex N) and the

---

<sup>3</sup> Refer to the Nairobi Outcome Document (Annex A) for a more direct reference to these incremental gains.

Communications Toolkit (Annex O) to support meaningful engagement to the HLM2. The 2016 Nairobi Civil Society Forum was entitled *Universal Effective Development Cooperation Towards a People's Agenda*. The sessions clarified the CSO Key Asks to all the delegates and provide updates on the on-going negotiation of the NOD. Aside from this, the NCSF also provided a space for constituencies to consolidate their respective delegates, discuss the issues relevant to their context, and inform the CSO Statement with their context-specific positions and language. The NCSF Documentation Report and CSO Statement are provided in this Interim Report Report as Annex O and P respectively. Unlike in 2014, the HLM2 provided a separate space for major sectors of the Women and Youth to discuss their important role in realising effective development cooperation. A Women's and Youth's Forum on Development Effectiveness were held simultaneously on 28 November.

In this activity, the Global Secretariat provided logistics support as well. Flight itineraries and hotel accommodations were provided to delegates following a funding scheme. The amount of per diem also varied because of this funding scheme. Delegates who were funded by the UN Development Programme (UNDP) encountered difficulty in securing their Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) earlier because of lack of communication channels with the UNDP personnel. The DSA only arrived on December 1, 2016, which was already at least four (4) days delayed for some delegates who reached Kenya in time for the preparatory forums leading to the HLM2. CPDE funded participants, on the other hand, received their per diems as soon as the CPDE meetings started – i.e., November 26 or 27 depending on the delegate's arrival date in time for the official meetings s/he was required to attend. The per diems of delegates included meal and local transportation allowance. Reimbursements were also made on site for some participants who initially shouldered the payment of their visa application and/or airline ticket.

The Global Secretariat also commissioned Reality of Aid Africa Network (RoAfrica) as the local host of the CPDE meetings. The local host is responsible for scouting accommodations accessible to the HLM2 venue, which is the Kenyatta International Convention Center. It is also responsible for meeting with the HLM2 organisers to ensure that CSO engagement to the policy milestone is well informed by the plans of the Joint Support Team (JST) of the GPEDC and that CSOs are informed about the Standard Operating Procedures in conducting their activities.

#### **Activity 1.1.2 Participation in other global and regional policy arenas**

***Engagement in the Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment (TT on CSO DE and EE)***. In 2016, follow-up preparations were conducted in its meetings in May and October in London and The Hague respectively. Bulk of the work in 2016 were carryover workload from 2015 which involved the contributions to the GPEDC 2MR and the engagement in the GPEDC HLM2. The discussions in the meeting were related to the TT's monitoring work on Indicator 2 (EE). The TT gathered eleven (11) country case studies to influence the outcomes of the GPEDC 2MR, and it was also planned that a stocktaking exercise of the GPEDC Monitoring work would be conducted in order to inform the multi-stakeholder initiative (MSI) studies of the TT as part of

GPI 12. Aside from this, the TT also started the discussion on developing a strategy of engagement to the UN SDGs 2030 Agenda. An initial mapping of constituency activities related to the 2030 Agenda was done during the meetings, and the TT Secretariat was tasked to monitor other opportunities where engagement of the TT and its stakeholders would be relevant.

The Global Secretariat provided support to the CSO representatives in terms of logistics. Flight itineraries were handled and negotiated with participants to ensure timely arrival in the venue. Accommodations of some participants were also covered, and per diems were given to representatives for their daily allowance. The Global Secretariat also coordinated with the TT Secretariat from the International Institute of Social Studies (ISS) in Netherlands to make sure that logistics requirements (e.g., meeting venue) were also met.

***Engagement in the 16<sup>th</sup> European Development Days (EDD16).*** The engagement in the EDD16 in Brussels, Belgium on June 15-16, 2016 was hinged on introducing the concept of universalising Effective Development Cooperation (uEDC) to the audience that the EDD caters to and initially acquiring some buy in on the advocacy. In order to do this, the CSO Partnership organised its own brainstorming lab session entitled *Universalising Development Co-operation (EDC): Advancing people centred development, defining accountability in development co-operation and the 2030 Agenda*. The lab session took on a talk show format where interactive sessions between the speakers and the audience allowed for more clarifications on the advocacy to surface. The one-hour and fifteen-minute session highlighted discussions on (1) the core business of Rome, Paris, Accra, and Busan and (2) how the EDC approach can address people's realities in light of the aspirational 2030 Agenda. Speakers from the Asia-Pacific Research Network (Ms. Tetet Nera-Lauron), European Commission (Ms. Rosario Bento Pais), International Trade Union Confederation (Ms. Paola Simonetti), Dutch Foreign Affairs Ministry (Mr. Cornelius Hacking), and the People's Coalition on Food Sovereignty (Mr. Pedro Guzman) were invited to illuminate further advocacy of effective development cooperation and the coordination work required in order to make sure that the mechanism would work. The annotated programme of the brainstorming lab session is annexed in this Interim Report (See Annex Q). The lab session was able to generate an estimated total number of fifty (50) attendees ranging from local authorities, other CSOs, the academe, and other development practitioners.

The Global Secretariat worked with Development Cooperation (DevCo) unit of the EC, which basically organised the EDD16, in ensuring that logistics requirements of the brainstorming were met accordingly. This also made sure that the logistics requirements of the Village Stand were met. The Village Stand exhibited publications and reference materials of the CSO Partnership that discussed its advocacy on uEDC. The materials were made available in order to make sure that participants who were not able to attend the brainstorming lab session would still be informed of the advocacy.

***Participation in the Asia-Pacific Forum on Sustainable Development (APFSD).*** The CPDE Asia region spearheaded the engagement in the APFSD. The focus of the engagement was hinged on the current state of enabling environment at the regional and global levels, most especially in the countries of

the Asian region. A side event entitled *Diminishing Democratic Spaces in the National and Regional Levels* steered a conversation on thinking about enabling environment. The session highlighted the need for a CSO Enabling Environment and denounced legal and extra-legal trends that restricted CSO participation in development processes in the region. The result of the discussions in this side event informed and united CSO positions on enabling environment and accountability. These positions were advanced in the APFSD meetings where various development actors were present.

The Reality of Aid Network – Asia-Pacific coordinated the engagement and ensured that CPDE members were able to bring the CSO advocacies in this regional multi-stakeholder platform. A selection process was followed in identifying CSO delegates, and the Asia regional governing body approved and endorsed the selection.

***Engagement to the UN DCF, HLPF, FfD, RCEM and OEDC-DAC.*** Funded under the ‘Continuing Campaign’ Programme, the CPDE – as a platform or through its members - also engaged several other regional and global policy arenas. The following are short description of these engagements:

Engagement to the UN-DCF started in 2014 when the GPEDC attempted to establish links to make development cooperation more effective. The work rolled out in 2015, and CPDE actively participated in the joint consultations that were conducted. In 2016, the advocacy in the DCF Symposium in New York on July 21-22 was already anchored on the outcomes of the CPDE Strategic Planning exercise. Universalising EDC became the rallying call of engagement, and CPDE representatives called for effective development cooperation actors not to backtrack on existing commitments while targeting areas such as the (1) accountability of the private sector in development; (2) south-south cooperation principles; (3) security, peace and development; (4) CSO enabling environment and development effectiveness. CPDE saw that the 2016 UN DCF Symposium could be an opportune time and appropriate platform to gather evidence and generate a multi-stakeholder discussion. The DCF could aid in “framing the priorities for the next two (2) years in order for the DCF to play pivotal role (through thematic Symposium and research briefings) regarding 1) how to universalize the effective development cooperation principles to better implement the 2030 Agenda, 2) what it would take to make sure that the effectiveness principles can apply to different kinds of financing for development tools, including the role of the private sector, and 3) how to make sure it is relevant to the right holders at all levels”<sup>4</sup>.

Unlike in 2014 and 2015, the CPDE engagement to the 2030 Agenda processes in 2016 had been more focused on influencing policy discussions on the outcome documents of key milestones relevant to the platform. Due to the shift in priority themes as espoused in the CPDE Strategic Plan, the CPDE CC mandated that the 2030 Agenda be mainstreamed in all of the Platform members’ work. The Post MDG WG was tasked to develop an engagement strategy that constituencies could adopt in their specific contexts. Nonetheless, CPDE still engaged key activities related to the 2030 Agenda. The most important

---

<sup>4</sup> See Annex R CSO Messages to the 2016 UN DCF Symposium in New York.

engagement of the year was during the High Level Political Forum (HLPF) in New York where CPDE influenced the outcomes of the HLPF Resolution and endorsed the Open Letter of the NGO Major Group (See Annex S and T respectively).

The 2030 Agenda engagement was also hinged on influencing the outcomes of the Financing for Development (FfD) Forum. CPDE organised a structure and developed a position paper on influencing this area of work, particularly the FfD3 Addis Ababa Conference. Despite calls for advancing the development effectiveness principles, most especially HRBA, the outcomes of the FfD3 Conference remained unfavourable for CSOs. There remained the primacy of the role of private sector in development without legally binding agreements to regulate its actions. In 2016, CPDE engaged the inaugural forum in New York. The outcome document was minimalistic, neglecting the importance of the Monterrey and Doha commitments. All the substantive issues were lost in the negotiations due to diverging views. Due to this, a statement of the CSO FfD group (See Annex U) was released reiterating the key demands of CSOs on illicit financial flows, ODA, and commitments from previous FfD forums, particularly Doha and Monterrey.

CPDE also engages the Asia-Pacific Regional CSO Engagement Mechanism (RCEM). As a regional mechanism hinged on lessons learned from previous engagement to the Rio+20 Conference, the RCEM prides itself of its inclusive character in terms of bringing together CSO voices at the regional level and advancing a common political vision of development justice. CPDE effectively engages this regional mechanism through its members who sit as focal points in a number of the five (5) thematic working groups and the seventeen (17) Major Groups. CPDE members are holding key positions as focal points to the (1) Farmers constituency and (2) Central Asia sub-region. The Asia-Pacific Research Network (APRN) is also one of the incumbent co-chairs of the platform. As the RCEM aims to consolidate CSO voices at the regional level to share lessons from previous engagements and influence policy discussions at the global level, it is important for CPDE to advance its key advocacy positions in this mechanism. In some of the key milestones of the RCEM, side events on Enabling Environment and Multi-stakeholder partnerships were conducted in order to emphasise the need to uphold the commitments made in the numerous development conferences from which the inauguration of the RCEM was anchored on.

CPDE also continues to endeavour for closer ties with the OECD-DAC. Although observer seats were available at the Senior High Level Meeting, CPDE request for an observer seat had not been seriously considered. The OECD-DAC is vital to CPDE engagement as it often takes into account issues related to the GPEDC and the FfD. It is also becoming even more important as critical discussions regarding the role of the private sector in development cooperation will take-place here. Currently CPDE engages this platform through its members, specifically the Trade Union Advisory Committee (TUAC).

### **Activity 1.1.3 Action Research and Policy Development on Institutionalising Participation and Enabling Environment**

In the run up to the HLM2 engagement, the CSO Partnership planned on developing a policy research on the current state of Enabling Environment for CSOs and policies institutionalising CSO participation in multi-stakeholder dialogues. It was envisioned that this planned policy research would influence the evidence-based policy lobbying and advocacy engagement of the platform to the HLM2 – i.e., presenting country cases and justifying the perennial cause for reversing trends on shrinking civic spaces. Running parallel to this was the contribution of CPDE members in 28 countries to the Second Monitoring Round, most especially on Indicator 2 (Enabling Environment). As efforts of platform members were already invested on influencing the 2MR, the action research would seem like a duplication of efforts. In this regard, the CSO EE WG of the CSO Partnership deemed it necessary to defer the development of this research to 2017.

In lieu of the postponement, the CSO EE WG utilised the inputs from the country members and developed a synthesis of evidence instead. This synthesis of evidence on Enabling Environment informed the policy positions of CPDE on enabling environment, which was also brought to the negotiation table of the HLM2. The report highlighted the progress on (1) space for multi-stakeholder dialogues, (2) CSO Development Effectiveness, (3) Official Development Cooperation with CSOs, and (4) CSO Legal and Regulatory Environment.

While more than one-third of the fifty (50) countries examined in the synthesis report still had no multi-stakeholder dialogues taking place, CPDE welcomed a slight progress in providing opportunities for CSOs to influence the discussions in multi-stakeholder dialogues. However, institutionalising CSO participation would still be germane to the fulfillment of an enabling environment for CSOs. This is most especially necessary with the strong correlation of having positive legal and regulatory frameworks with CSO Enabling Environment. Most of these spaces posed uneven practices in terms of CSO consultation processes, and the European Union Roadmaps for Engagement with CSOs was a good example of such practice. In light of this, CPDE urged other providers of development cooperation to strengthen and improve their bilateral and joint consultations if only to improve the quality of development cooperation at all levels.

## **Activity 1.2 Policy Research on the Implementation of HRBA and South-South Development Cooperation**

### ***Activity 1.2.1 Policy Research on the Implementation of HRBA in DPs***

HRBA as an advocacy priority was mainstreamed during the Strategic Planning exercise of the CSO Partnership. This meant that this is not anymore a specific advocacy work of one single organisation or member of CPDE. However, it will be the responsibility of CPDE members to ensure that their advocacies are informed by the positions on HRBA. In line with this development, the HRBA WG was dissolved, and the policy research was mandated to the Global Secretariat and the CPDE Coordination Committee. The GS through IBON International will conduct this research, as main applicant to the EC Action.

Originally planned in time for the HLM2 engagement, the CSO Partnership deferred the development of this policy research to 2017 to invest all efforts at

making a fruitful and meaningful engagement to the HLM2. The policy research aims to establish the baseline information on the current state of implementing HRBA as a framework of various development partnerships.

Specifically, the research aims to examine Development Partnerships for sustainable development in terms of its adherence to a human rights based approach. It will use the UNDG Common Understanding of HRBA as a baseline for examining to what extent do development partnerships contribute to the realisation of human rights; how these partnerships adhere to human rights principles and standards; and how these help empower people, most especially the marginalised people, to claim their rights. The study also aims to examine whether or not these partnerships put in place meaningful accountability frameworks to hold duty-bearers to account and provide effective means for redress for all actors impacted by these partnerships. The findings of this research will inform policy recommendations on further deepening the adoption and implementation of a human-rights based approach to development partnerships.

The Guidance Note on the Policy Research is found in Annex V.

#### **Activity 1.2.2 Policy Research on the Operationalising People-Oriented South-South Development Cooperation (SSDC)**

The change in the focus of this policy research from the implementation of inclusive partnerships in DPs to the operationalisation of a people-oriented SSDC was informed by internal and external factors relevant to CPDE. Prioritisation has been key to developing a more relevant policy research that will inform CPDE's evidence-based policy influencing.

Internally, the CSO Partnership underwent a Strategic Planning exercise, and South-South Cooperation was identified as one of the advocacy priorities of the platform. What is new to this advocacy priority is the mainstreaming of HRBA in SSC.

Externally, there has been a steady rise in the primacy of SSC since the 1950s with the Bandung Conference, a meeting convened by organisations from the Asia and Africa regions. Since the Bandung meeting, SSC has been practiced in a number of ways and combinations, but no one framework has been widely utilised in development cooperation and partnerships. Observations by UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA) point out that SSC is different from the usual Official Development Assistance (ODA) of the OECD DAC countries. In terms of process and implementing rules, regulations, and guidelines, SSC is more flexible and convenient compared to its North-South development cooperation/partnership counterparts. Leading the provision of SSC globally are the Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa (BRICS). However, challenges to the implementation of SSC express its strong departure from HRBA to development. While more convenient and practical, SSC encountered strong critiques in terms of violation of human rights principles – i.e., most especially violations on labour rights. As SSC providers expand their operations in neighbouring and fellow Southern partner countries, the expansion was done to minimise costs despite claims of non-conditionality in SSC.



In this regard, the policy research aims to examine the extent to which South-South Development Cooperation adheres to existing internationally agreed human rights principles and how it helps empower marginalised people to claim their rights. The research will inform policy recommendations on how to further deepen the adoption and implementation of HRBA in SSDC.

The Guidance Note on this Policy Research is found in Annex W.

## **Activity 2.1 CSO Capacity Development Activities**

### **Activity 2.1.1 Capacity Assessment**

**Organisational Capacity Assessment.** With the commencement of programme implementation for the EC Action, the CSO Partnerships conducted an Organisational Capacity Assessment. The aim of this capacity assessment is to gauge the existing CSO capacities in terms of monitoring development partnerships and implementing the Istanbul Principles. The main aim is to scope the extent to which CPDE members have already been doing work in terms of monitoring development policies and see how the programme intervention can further improve such capacity after three years of implementation.

The highlights of the findings of this capacity assessment were discussed in the outputs portion of this Interim Report. CPDE contracted the consultancy services of UBORA after receiving three (3) Expressions of Interest from able consultancy firms. UBORA presented the most comprehensive methodological proposal and had the benefit of conducting the 2014 OCA of CPDE. Their exposure to the dynamics of the platform structure and the familiarity to the CPDE programmes served as strong qualifications for the grant of the contract.

**CSO Mapping Exercise.** As the first phase in rolling out the capacity development programme of CPDE, CPDE conducted the CSO Mapping Exercise to scope the existing initiatives of members in monitoring development partnerships. Assumed to be part of their regular advocacy work, CPDE wanted to establish some baseline information to ground the overall framework of the global and regional skills training for observatorio. Noting that regions have varying contexts (i.e., social, economic, and political) in operating their mandates, the mapping exercise aims to find an overarching theme in the observatorio and use it as anchor for conduct of the capacity development activities in the region.

The highlights of the findings of the mapping exercise were discussed in the outputs portion of this Interim Report. CPDE contracted the consultancy services of UBORA as well for this initiative. Similar qualifications with the OCA were considered in granting the contract with UBORA also knowledgeable of different organisational development strategies that can be recommended and integrated in the specific contexts of the regions.

### **Activity 2.1.2 Planning Workshops for Policy Monitoring**

**CPDE Global Strategic Planning Workshop.** With the dynamism of the socio-political and development landscape, the CSO Partnership needed to adjust its

strategies to ensure timely and relevant results of its programmes. Having succeeded the paradigm shift of policy discussions from aid effectiveness to development effectiveness in Busan in 2011, the context of programme implementation was sustaining these discussions and ensuring that development effectiveness principles remained relevant and referenced in outcome documents of important policy milestones. However, with the increasing role of the private sector in development cooperation, the rise of far-right populist leaders in some major development actors, the heightened security and terrorist threats in a number of developed and underdeveloped countries, and the steady 0.4% per GNI contribution of DAC countries to ODA, the advocacy on advancing the DE principles needed to expand.

As early as the last quarter of 2015, CPDE already started developing the Terms of Reference of the Power Mapping Exercise Consultant. As the CPDE CC signed off the TOR, the contracting immediately rolled out in February of 2016. After receiving three (3) Expressions of Interest (EOIs), the CPDE CC decided to avail the consultancy services of MINK'a. The Power Mapping exercise was deemed fundamental in order to assess the development landscape and map out the relevant actors working, most especially, on the issue of effective development cooperation. The Power Mapping document (See Annex X) served as the primary document for the CPDE CC to develop the CPDE Strategic Plan (See Annex Y) entitled *Account, Build, Commit: Towards Effective People-Centered Development*, a five-year plan that details the advocacy priorities of the Platform in the medium term and a supplementary document to the Nairobi Declaration on Development Effectiveness (See Annex Z), the founding document of the CSO Partnership developed in 2012. The Power Mapping document provided recommendations on the various work areas of the platform (e.g., coordination, programme management, policy and advocacy engagement, capacity development, and communications) to the CPDE CC in addressing the gaps in platform/network management.

Late in February, the Strategic Planning Core Group met in order to strategise the approach in handling the discussions during the Strategic Planning Meeting slated in March 2016 in Brussels, Belgium. The CPDE CC also deemed it necessary to request MINK'a to participate in this meeting and facilitate the actual Planning Meeting, given the Platform's decision to hire External Facilitators and to avoid conflict of interest in moderating an important meeting such as the Strategic Planning exercise. This Core Group meeting resulted to an initial thinking around the agenda of the actual Strategic Planning for review of the CPDE CC.

In terms of arranging the logistics requirements for these meetings, the Global Secretariat facilitated the finalisation of participants' needs (e.g., hotel accommodation, flight booking, meeting venue, and per diem among others). Members of the Secretariat were tasked to take on different tasks pertaining to logistics to address such needs online and on-site.

***CPDE 10<sup>th</sup> Coordination Committee Meeting and Policy Conference in The Hague, Netherlands.*** After the conduct of the Strategic Planning Meeting in March 2016, the CPDE CC deemed it necessary to meet again in June 2016 in order to discuss the engagement strategy in the HLM2. Additionally, the CPDE

CC convened in a Policy Conference in order to identify the main advocacy points that would be brought to the negotiation table of the HLM2. The discussion became fruitful as the Policy Conference clarified the fundamental elements of the call for universalising Effective Development Cooperation, and the CPDE CC was able to zero in on the policy discussions leaving the programme and network management discussions in the CC Meeting.

The Global Secretariat again took on most of the logistics arrangements for the participants. Per diems were provided as allowance for the official meeting dates, and the local transportation allowance was also provided to the participants. There were no problems encountered in the conduct of this meeting.

***CPDE 11<sup>th</sup> Coordination Committee & 4<sup>th</sup> Global Council Meeting in Nairobi, Kenya.*** The 11<sup>th</sup> CC Meeting was devoted for the planning of the engagement to the HLM2, the discussion on the agenda for the Civil Society Forum which the CSO Partnership spearheaded in organising, and some discussions on handling the 4<sup>th</sup> GC Meeting. The CC Meeting discussed redlines which were the minimum requirements from CSOs that the NOD should contain. If the NOD would not reference these redlines on the (1) core business of Rome, Paris, Accra, and Busan, (2) Enabling Environment for CSOs, and (3) Accountability of the Private Sector in development and their initiatives. The meeting also discussed the agenda of the CSO Forum which was slated on 29 November 2016. This resulted to a revised agenda for the Forum with emphasis on clarifying the CSO positions and redlines, the Advocacy Strategy of CPDE espoused in the Advocacy Toolkit, the current state of the negotiations on the NOD, and the HLM2 plenary sessions where CPDE was able to influence the agenda. Aside from this, some platform/network management issues were discussed and endorsed for the GC's approval. Some of these issues included the Independent Accountability Committee report and membership concerns on the inclusion of the Migrants sector and new members from countries and sectors.

Since most of the discussions were already clarified in the CC Meeting, the GC simply needed to be informed about the discussions of the CC and seek for the assembly's approval of the decision points. Generally, the GC mandated the advocacy for uEDC as the rallying call at the HLM2. However, in finalising the advocacy, the GC had some interesting discussion on the realities on the ground – i.e., the plight of the farmers for land reform, the human rights violations brought about by companies in ancestral lands of some IPs groups in the Philippines and Africa, and the continuous shrinking civic spaces which regulated CSO activities in the regions of Asia, LAC, and Africa among others. The CC who were sensitised to the global development policy discussions appreciated the sharing session as these realities were barely raised during CC meetings. Aside from this, membership concerns were raised, most especially on the authority that constituencies have in approving membership applications. The GC also mandated the CC to develop a strategy for operationalising the Strategic Plan which should reflect in the 2017 plans of action.

The Reality of Aid Africa Network was responsible for the logistics requirements of the GC Meeting. Albeit some miscommunication between the local host RoA-Africa and the Global Secretariat, the CPDE Meetings were pulled off well, and

fruitful discussions were reached in relation to planning the engagement of and consolidating CSO delegates on the Key Asks.

The Documentation Report of these Meetings is found in Annex AA.

## **Activity 2.2 Promotion of CSO Development Effectiveness Principles**

### ***Activity 2.2.1 Breaking Ground, Taking Roots: The Istanbul Principles @ 7***

Seven years since, the CSO Partnership celebrated the inauguration of the Istanbul Principles – i.e., espousing the principles to abide by in ensuring that development is effective. Given the uneven buy-in of regions and sectors with regard to the Istanbul Principles, this conference renewed the commitments of CSOs in upholding commitments to implementing the IP. Through the Bangkok Unity Statement, CSOs and partner national governments renewed this commitment.

The Conference was highlighted by sessions that aim to take stock of the progress in implementing the IP. Guided by the seventh IP, CSOs pledged to create and share knowledge and commit to mutual learning in order to ensure their development effectiveness. The conference also became an avenue for CSOs to gauge the level of commitment they have in terms of accountability to its implementation. This also reinforced the need to continue improving their implementation of the DE principles in their own ways. Ultimately, the conference reaffirmed five (5) important points: (1) the important role of civil society as an independent development actor; (2) the unity and commitment of civil society to align development frameworks in HRBA and support people's empowerment and sovereignty; (3) the need for an enabling environment for CSOs to further contribute to effective development cooperation; (4) the continuous improvement and strengthening of CSOs to practice their own effectiveness; and (5) the need for an effective development cooperation and multi-stakeholder partnerships to realise the 2030 Agenda of the UN Sustainable Development Goals.

Further to these, CSOs committed to make concrete actions: (1) to expand CSO Accountability frameworks and develop country and sectoral compacts on DE; (2) integrate HRBA in various CSO development cooperation efforts; (3) support inclusive partnerships for results; (4) integrate climate justice, oceans management, and environmental sustainability into all CSO policies; (5) uphold mutual accountability; (6) support country-led results frameworks; (7) use evidence-based researches and processes; (8) continue the engagement with the GPEDC; (9) participate and engage in all development policy arenas with the objective universalise effective development cooperation; and (10) share and disseminate these commitments with other development partners.

Overall, the IP@7 Conference deepened and reinforced the need for development frameworks to be aligned with these principles in order to ensure that development cooperation is genuinely effective and people-oriented. The Asia-Pacific Research Network spearheaded the organisation of this conference, and the Documentation Report is annexed to this Interim Report (See Annex AB).

### **Activity 2.2.2 Communication Activities**

In guiding its communication work for the EC Action, the CSO Partnership developed a communications plan (See Annex AC) based on the objectives set out in the proposal. The communications work of the platform aims to: (1) increase awareness on the merits of inclusive partnerships and emphasise the importance of a clear space and role for civil society participation; (2) inform and mobilise CSOs on issues relevant to post-2015 development partnerships; and (3) highlight CSO best practices in upholding CSO DE principles and advances in operationalising CSO Accountability. These objectives were patterned based on specific target groups, and corresponding activities were identified to ensure the fulfillment of each objective.

On increasing awareness, CPDE targeted donor and multilateral agencies, the media, and the private sector to gain an idea of the CSO positions on inclusive partnerships and enabling environment. While most of the researches to support this advocacy were stalled for 2017, CPDE utilised its engagements in the GPEDC SC Meetings, HLM2, EDD16, and APFSD in advancing its positions on EE and inclusive partnerships. There was an amplification of the social media and other online means (e.g., webinars) to influence the policy discussions on this thematic priority. The CPDE Perception Survey informed that governments, multilateral organisations, and the private sector support CPDE positions on enabling environment and inclusive partnerships. These positions resonate well with these development actors. However, there is a need to further improve messaging on the advocacy for private sector accountability, as it seems to be the least popular CSO demand at the moment.

In terms of information and mobilisation for post 2015 DPs, CPDE targeted its constituencies to have internal discussions on the issues relevant to the thematic priority. There were challenges in generating interest on this internally, and CPDE needed to review its engagement in this policy arena. In fact, the CPDE Strategic Planning exercise recommended that the work on the 2030 Agenda be mainstreamed in all of the platform's work. Such discussion will be steered within the WG and see how it figures in the CPDE overall advocacy on universalising effective development cooperation.

Cognizant of the fact that in order mobilise CSOs effectively in discussing these issues, an effective document management system and database will need to be developed. Currently, the knowledge management strategy is being reviewed in order to operationalise its recommendations from the consultant. This will be integrated in the improvement of the website and the intranet facility.

As part of the capacity development component, the database for monitoring various DPs has yet to be developed. With the regional observatorio trainings stalled for 2017, CPDE will ensure that outputs of these observatorios will include the development of a database.

Finally, in highlighting best practices in implementing DE and CSO Accountability, CPDE published the research entitled *Istanbul Five Years After*, which basically documents the progress made in the implementation of the DE principles. This publication was launched in the HLM2 where governments, media, multilateral agencies, and the private sector were present. Copies were

disseminated to these development actors to inform them of the CSO initiatives to further their own effectiveness in development. Additionally, the IP@7 Conference in Bangkok, Thailand reinforced further such commitments with the Bangkok Unity Statement – i.e., with an expanded advocacy for Accountability that aims to develop country and sectoral compacts.