Task Team
CSO Development Effectiveness
and Enabling Environment

Assessing CSO engagement: The Global Partnership and the Sustainable Development Goals Monitoring Frameworks

A Task Team Discussion Paper

25 September 2015

Overview

The Post-2015 Outcome Document *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* and the *Addis Ababa Action Agenda on Financing for Development* envisage engagement of civil society organizations (CSOs) in the implementation and review of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The Outcome Document also envisages peaceful and inclusive societies with SDG 16 calling for participatory and inclusive decision-making. However, how CSO engagement and broader participation and inclusion aspirations will be shaped and incorporated into the SDG Monitoring Framework remains to be resolved in the months following member states' endorsement of the SDGs in September 2015.

Meanwhile the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) acknowledges the important role CSOs play in development, reflected in the fact that its Monitoring Framework contains Indicator Two on the enabling environment for civil society. The GPEDC recognizes an enabling environment as a precondition for effective CSO engagement in development, and in 2015 will launch a second round of monitoring using a country-led multi-stakeholder approach.

This discussion paper illustrates the relevance of the GPEDC's Monitoring Framework and Indicator Two specifically, to the SDG Monitoring Framework and explores how Indicator Two could be used to inform SDG monitoring. It offers the following recommendations:

1. Use of Indicator Two as a multi-purpose indicator in the SDGs Global Monitoring Framework
2. Use of Indicator Two as a source for a CSO enabling environment thematic assessment
3. Use of Indicator Two as a national indicator within the framework of ongoing GPEDC monitoring
4. GPEDC engagement in the IAEG-SDGs' construction of the SDG Monitoring Framework

This discussion paper is offered to the GPEDC as it continues to work with its Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG) on developing a GPEDC position in relation to the SDG agenda.

It is written by the Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment, a multi-stakeholder informal network concerned with advancing the roles of civil society in development.

Disclaimer and authorship

The views contained in this document do not necessarily reflect those of all Task Team participant institutions or the Task Team Co-chairs.

The document has been authored by Adinda Ceelen and Jacqueline Wood of the Task Team Secretariat.

Introduction

With the UN Summit for the Adoption of the Post-2015 Development Agenda in September 2015, a final Outcome Document *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* (hereafter: Outcome Document) was agreed upon by member states in August 2015. The Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA) that lays out a broad consensus on a Financing for Development agenda was also agreed upon in July 2015.

What is clear is that the Outcome Document[1] and the AAAA[2] envisage CSO engagement in the implementation and review of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The Outcome Document also envisages progress toward peaceful and inclusive societies with SDG 16 calling for participatory and inclusive decision-making and the protection of fundamental freedoms. However, how CSO engagement and broader participation and inclusion aspirations will be shaped and incorporated into the SDG Monitoring Framework remains to be seen. CSOs are one of many partners anticipated to contribute to SDG implementation, while the Outcome Document makes no specific reference to the CSO enabling environment as part and parcel of peaceful and inclusive societies, despite numerous efforts by various stakeholders to this end.[3] It is also unclear whether the protection of fundamental freedoms would include core freedoms of civil society, including the freedoms of association, assembly, and expression. The SDGs' silence on the CSO enabling environment reflects the political challenge that this topic faces in the UN forum. Its exclusion does not bode well for the prospect of progress in an environment where the space for CSOs continues to shrink in many countries around the world.

Meanwhile the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) acknowledges the important role CSOs play in development, and its Monitoring Framework contains Indicator Two on the enabling environment for civil society. The GPEDC thus recognizes an enabling environment as a precondition for effective CSO engagement in development.

This paper explores the relevance of the GPEDC's Monitoring Framework – specifically Indicator Two – to the SDG Monitoring Framework. It first looks at references to CSO engagement in the Outcome Document and its follow-up and review framework, and in the AAAA. Subsequently it addresses the GPEDC Monitoring Framework – notably Indicator Two – and its unique value and advantages, prior to exploring how the SDG Monitoring Framework could draw from Indicator Two. A number of options are considered to link the two Frameworks in relation to CSOs, including through a global indicator on CSO engagement; the establishment of CSO engagement as a subject of thematic monitoring; and the reinforcement of a national level indicator on CSO engagement. A recommendation is made for the GPEDC to explore the possibility of joining the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDGs) to contribute to the construction of the SDG global Monitoring Framework.

CSOs are important both as a means and an end of development. As a means, CSOs can contribute to development, including in relation to service delivery and – through access to the poor and marginalized – helping ensure that no one is left behind. In addition, they play a role in holding governments and others accountable, while bringing in different and sometimes challenging perspectives to policy dialogue. As an end, a vibrant and diverse CSO sector is a key component of good governance and of democratic societies.

This paper is offered by the Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment (Task Team), a multi-stakeholder network concerned with advancing the roles of civil society in development.

The inclusion of CSO engagement in the monitoring framework is imperative to encourage stakeholders to take action on this front. Recognizing that Indicator Two is a very relevant and useful instrument for this purpose – while bearing in mind that the GPEDC is working with its Monitoring Advisory Group on developing its position in relation to the SDG agenda – this paper is offered to the GPEDC to highlight the value of its Monitoring Framework and to share ideas on how it, and particularly Indicator Two, can inform the SDG Monitoring Framework.

CSOs in the Post-2015 Development Agenda

Various key actors in the Post-2015 Development Agenda setting process have underscored the importance of engaging CSOs in the implementation and review of the SDGs.[4] Throughout the four-part Outcome Document the imperative of CSO engagement is made explicit. The importance of CSO engagement for implementation is evidenced by the reference to civil society partnerships under SDG target 17.17, concerned with the means of implementation.[5] Meanwhile, the section on follow-up and review calls for CSO engagement in global and national reviews.

While on paper there is a clear call for CSO engagement, how this engagement will exactly be shaped and incorporated in the SDG monitoring framework remains unclear. Yet for CSOs to be able to play a role in implementing and reviewing the SDGs, an enabling environment – with laws, policy and practice consistent with internationally agreed rights – needs to be established. The importance of an enabling environment for the "free, active and meaningful engagement of civil society"[6] is well recognized by the UN Secretary General.

However, despite its appearance in early SDG agenda-setting dialogue and contributions, neither the Outcome Document nor the AAAA specifically refer to the enabling environment for civil society. The absence of explicit reference to the CSO enabling environment in the Outcome Document raises concern that this subject will not receive the attention it merits as political negotiations over the SDG Monitoring Framework unfold.

More generally on the enabling environment, however, the AAAA indicates that member states commit to strengthen their domestic enabling environments, including the rule of law, and to combat corruption at all levels and in all its forms.[7] The Outcome Document commits to "pursuing policy coherence and an enabling environment for sustainable development at all levels and by all actors, and to reinvigorating the global partnership for sustainable development".[8] It also acknowledges that: "democracy, good governance and the rule of law as well as an enabling environment at national and international levels, are essential for sustainable development".[9] An important element of the enabling environment for CSOs as pertains especially to the SDGs Means of Implementation is the right to seek funding from both national and international sources. Although the AAAA contains a commitment to work with all partners and to create the aforementioned environment for all actors, the AAAA contains no explicit call for governments to provide resources for CSOs to help them implement the SDGs. At the same time, the AAAA encourages strengthening tax regimes and curbing illicit financial transfers. Combined with the absence of reference to an enabling environment for CSOs, this could result in more impediments to CSOs' access to resources.

Especially with regard to the aim of curbing illicit financial transfers, foreign funding restrictions on CSOs are mounting around the world, in part on the grounds of curbing terrorist financing or money laundering despite a lack of evidence that CSOs are particularly vulnerable to such uses.[10]

Under SDG 16 – the governance goal – a number of the targets are of direct relevance to the CSO enabling environment. These include target 3 on the rule of law and equitable access to justice; target 6 addressing effective, accountable and transparent institutions; target 7 calling for inclusive decision-making; target 10 that is concerned with public access to information and the protection of fundamental freedoms; and target 16b) on non-discriminatory laws and policies. The Outcome Document thus upholds the High Level Panel of Eminent Persons' (HLP) position that "the rule of law, freedom of speech and the media, open political choice and active citizen participation, access to justice, non-discriminatory and accountable governments and public institutions help drive development and have their own intrinsic value. They are both means to an end and an end in themselves."[11]

In light of the above, an enabling environment for CSOs can be seen as embedded in the new Agenda as a component of SDG 16 on good governance. The enabling environment for civil society – which includes protection of the rights to freedom of expression, assembly and association – is also embedded in the new agenda as a component of international human rights law, in which the new agenda is grounded[12] and which underpins mechanisms and processes of governance.[13] The HLP referred to these rights – alongside increased public participation and civic engagement - as a component of their proposed goal on good governance and effective institutions, while the Secretary General referred to them as "enablers of sustainable development".[14] These rights were initially also specifically referred to by the Open Working Group (which developed the SDGs and targets) as part of focus area 19 on peaceful and non-violent societies (which eventually became SDG 16 on peaceful and inclusive societies). In addition, "strengthening civil society" was initially also expressly mentioned as an element of peaceful and non-violent societies.[15] CSO engagement and the enabling environment for CSOs are thus significant if not entirely explicit elements of the SDGs.

Follow-up and review of the SDGs

A quick overview

The Outcome Document establishes a framework for follow-up and review of the SDGs. As a general principle, governments will have primary responsibility at all levels: national, regional and global. The follow-up and review framework will be country-led, voluntary, participatory and inclusive – supporting reporting by all relevant stakeholders.[16]

> **At the global level,** the High Level Political Forum (HLPF) will play a central role in tracking progress in implementing the SDGs (including the means of implementation) and in overseeing follow-up and review. The reviews are voluntary and member-state-led, but should include civil society. The global review will build on existing platforms and processes and be informed by the outcomes of national processes.[17] The global indicators are in the process of being developed by the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDGs) and will be complemented by regional and national level indicators to be developed by member states.[18]

Follow-up and review at the HLPF will be informed by an annual SDG report[19] and the Global Sustainable Development Report. The HLPF will also conduct thematic reviews.[20] The Secretary General will be asked to draft organizational arrangements for member-state-led reviews at the HLPF (including reporting guidelines), clarify institutional responsibilities, and provide guidance on annual themes and a sequence of thematic reviews.[21]

At the country level, indicators are to be developed by member states. Country-level reporting – encouraged to be done regularly – should draw on contributions from other stakeholders including CSOs.[22]

At the regional level, countries are envisaged to engage in peer learning, sharing of best practices and discussion on shared targets.[23]

The scope of SDG follow-up and review

The SDG monitoring framework will primarily be concerned with measuring progress in realizing the development goals. However the Outcome Document notes that "the means of implementation targets under goal 17 and under each SDG are key to realizing the agenda, and are of equal importance with the other SDGs and targets". It furthermore stipulates that the indicator framework will include the means of implementation.[24] Meanwhile in the AAAA, member states "commit to fully engaging, nationally, regionally and internationally, in ensuring proper and effective follow-up and review on the financing for development outcomes and all the means of implementation of the post-2015 development agenda."[25] For both the Outcome Document and the AAAA, the scope of follow-up and review thus covers both the goals (i.e. the "what") and the means of implementation (i.e. the "how").

The GPEDC Monitoring Framework and Indicator Two:
Relevance and value-added to the SDG Monitoring Framework

Looking at how CSO engagement is supported and whether enabling conditions are in place to maximize impact, Indicator Two constitutes a potential instrument to assess CSO engagement as part of SDG 17 on the means of implementation as well as SDG 16 on good governance and sound institutions.

The GPEDC Monitoring Framework

The work of the GPEDC - an open and inclusive platform that brings together all development stakeholders - is concerned with improving the quality and effectiveness of development cooperation. The GPEDC seeks to maximize the impact of development guided by the principles of effective development cooperation. These principles – country-ownership, results-focus, inclusive partnerships and transparency and accountability – have evolved out of a global dialogue with various key state and non-state actors since the early 2000s.

Given that the realization of the SDGs will require engagement of a large and diverse group of stakeholders as well as the mobilization of vast amounts of resources (financial and otherwise) the GPEDC's efforts to

maximize impact are highly relevant for the SDGs, particularly as regards the means of implementation.[26] Questions such as whether resources are used efficiently and whether partnerships are operating effectively should be routinely raised in SDG implementation. The UN Secretary General,[27] the UN Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing[28], and the AAAA[29] all recognize that the principles of effective development cooperation are crucial for the achievement of sustainable development for all.

The Secretary General specifically acknowledges the role and value of the GPEDC, noting it can "help review and strengthen the global partnership for sustainable development."[30] The Outcome Document further "encourages ongoing efforts by states in other fora to address key issues which pose potential challenges to the implementation of our Agenda; and we respect the independent mandates of those processes. We intend that the Agenda and its implementation would support, and be without prejudice to, those other processes and the decisions taken therein".[31] Simultaneously in going forward the GPEDC wishes to position itself as "a centre of excellence for development effectiveness, providing a significant contribution to the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals."[32]

In this context, the GPEDC's monitoring can make a significant contribution to this ever-changing and complex landscape of international development cooperation in which more and more emphasis is placed on the need for multi-stakeholder partnerships as a cross-cutting principle.

The GPEDC's Monitoring Framework consists of ten indicators that measure progress in improving the effectiveness of development cooperation in a number of areas. Key attributes of the GPEDC Monitoring Framework are that it:

- Is inclusive and encourages all stakeholders to improve their effectiveness
- Provides an evidence-based approach to accountability
- Is geared toward multi-stakeholder dialogue, learning and sharing of lessons
- Is country-led and grounds the monitoring exercise in developing countries' own accountability mechanisms and information systems[33]

Relative to the emerging SDG Monitoring Framework, the GPEDC Monitoring Framework has the following advantages:

- **History and expertise.** The GPEDC has its own history and mandate stemming from the aid effectiveness dialogues. Over the past nearly fifteen years, these aid effectiveness and development cooperation effectiveness dialogues have produced an impressive consensus and a vast amount of knowledge and expertise.
- **Focus on the how.** The GPEDC's Monitoring Framework is unique because of its focus on the "how" of development cooperation. It "places particular emphasis on behavior change in development co-operation efforts in order to help achieve the results defined in developing countries' own development strategies."[34] A number of the indicators are also well fitted to assess elements of the "what" of the SDGs.
- **Complementarity.** Although the Outcome Document indicates that follow-up and review will encompass the means of implementation, given the enormous scope of the SDGs it also states that the SDG framework needs to be simple and robust. The GPEDC Monitoring Framework offers a

level of depth and detail on the means of implementation that can complement what the SDG Monitoring Framework will ultimately assess.
- **Continuity of a ready-made framework.** The GPEDC completed the first round of monitoring in 2014 with a second round due to be completed in 2016. Its monitoring exercise builds on almost a decade of monitoring Paris Declaration commitments and, since 2011, Busan commitments such as on inclusive partnerships with civil society and the private sector. Indicator Two is a work in progress with considerable GPEDC investment to date in refinement to maximize its potential.

Indicator Two

Indicator Two of the GPEDC Monitoring Framework assesses to what extent "civil society operates within an environment that maximizes its engagement in and contribution to development". Its value is that it seeks to maximize impact from CSOs, recognized as a key development actor both by the GPEDC and the Outcome Document. Indicator Two is also valuable in assessing inclusiveness as an integrated or cross-cutting theme across the development cooperation effectiveness agenda.[35] The enabling environment is central to Indicator Two not only for its potential to assess progress toward CSO engagement but also in recognition of the fact that in recent years the environment for CSOs to operate in has been deteriorating in a substantial number of countries worldwide.

Through a multi-stakeholder process the GPEDC has established a comprehensive four-module framework comprising key elements of the enabling environment and CSOs' practices.

Indicator Two's four-module framework:
1. Space for multi-stakeholder dialogue
2. CSO development effectiveness
3. Official development cooperation with CSOs
4. The legal and regulatory environment for CSOs

This four-module framework is unique in that it looks not only at what governments and development cooperation providers can do to enhance the CSO enabling environment but also encourages examination of what CSOs can do to strengthen their accountability and improve their effectiveness – which is in line with the multi-stakeholder approach underlying the SDGs. In recognizing that responsibility for a CSO enabling environment is shared across stakeholders, Indicator Two's four-part module can help build the necessary political will both to engage in its monitoring, and to foster progress. The GPEDC's second monitoring round method is also unique in that it will involve a questionnaire to be filled out and validated at country level in a multi-stakeholder fashion, involving government, civil society and development cooperation provider agencies or embassies. The joint exercise is intended to share information and spark dialogue amongst stakeholders on opportunities in creating an enabling environment for CSOs in a particular country context. This contextual approach is in line with the Outcome Document that recognizes "there are different approaches, visions, models and tools available to each country".[36] Validation will also be provided through complementary desk studies.

Indicator Two can inform the SDG Monitoring Framework both as regards to SDG 17 on the means of implementation and SDG 16 on peaceful and inclusive societies. It corresponds well to target 17.17 that addresses the need to encourage and promote effective civil society partnerships to enable effective implementation of the entire SDG agenda. In addition, Indicator Two is relevant for SDG 16 on good governance as an enabling environment for civil society offers a proxy for the inclusiveness of societies and institutions and the protection of fundamental freedoms. Particularly modules 1 and 4, respectively on space for multi-stakeholder dialogue and on the legal and regulatory environment for CSOs (encompassing

international human rights law) are pertinent to assess whether decision-making is responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative (target 16.7); whether institutions are effective and accountable at all levels (target 16.6) and whether fundamental freedoms are protected (target 16.10).

Options for linking: How the SDG Monitoring Framework can draw from the GPEDC Monitoring Framework

In the current situation where there remain many unknowns and much is still to be decided, it is an opportune moment to explore how CSO engagement can be incorporated – both as a means of implementation and part of a goal – into the SDG Monitoring Framework. This section explores whether and how Indicator Two can be used for the SDG Monitoring Framework, exploring different scenarios that correspond to the multi-tiered approach to the SDG follow-up and review exercise. Implicit in these offerings of complementarity is the need to respect the integrity of the GPEDC Monitoring Framework and Indicator Two within it. The GPEDC monitoring is concerned with a number of areas – including but not limited to CSO engagement – that are not directly addressed in the SDGs or other fora but that merit continued focused attention. With each monitoring round revealing unfinished business, the GPEDC's monitoring is crucial for the continued promotion of progress, the pursuit of accountability across all development actors, and for the ongoing multi-stakeholder dialogue necessary to make these happen.

Global level

CSO engagement as part of the SDGs global indicator framework
The global indicator framework is to be developed by the IAEG-SDGs. This is an important task because to a large extent what gets measured is what gets done. One author aptly notes: "these are public policy questions, not just technical or computational issues. For UN member states, the choice of indicators for the SDGs is a major policy decision, with long-term consequences, nationally and globally".[37]

For this task the IAEG-SDGs received guidelines from member states which *inter alia* stipulate that the number of global indicators should be limited, that the indicator framework must respond to the goals and targets agreed in the Open Working Group and that no new or contentious indicators may be introduced.[38] In addition, there also appears to be broad agreement among member states that the global indicators should include multi-purpose indicators that address several targets at the same time.[39] Recognizing the limited capacity of states some have called for one indicator per target while others have mentioned limiting the number of indicators to 100.[40] Meanwhile, during a briefing on progress, the chair of the United Nations Statistical Committee noted that while the number of indicators must be limited, some targets will require multiple indicators to measure its different aspects.[41]

The draft list of indicators proposed by the IAEG-SDGs in August/September 2015 for SDG 16 and SDG 17 is concerning. The proposed indicators address only parts of each target and do not address elements of the CSO enabling environment. To illustrate, the draft list does not address participatory decision-making as called for by SDG 16.17 nor does it measure civil society partnerships as called for by SDG 17.17.

However the process of developing the global indicator framework is still ongoing. Therefore, at this stage it is difficult to predict what the indicator framework will look like since it is not clear how many indicators will be selected and whether there will be prioritization within goals as well as between goals and means of

implementation.[42] Additionally complicating is that the final list of global indicators will be passed by the UN General Assembly and ECOSOC and finally be monitored by the High Level *Political* Forum. As a result, the risk for politicization is high. Some speculate that only a few goals and targets will be selected for global review.

Because the global indicator framework will be applicable to all member states, it would be ideal if CSO engagement – reflected through the existence of an enabling environment for CSOs and informed by GPEDC's Indicator Two – is covered by at least one of the global indicators. Linking Indicator Two to the SDG Monitoring Framework would increase the profile of the Indicator and the GPEDC and its members' work around it while helping to ensure that this critical indicator receives the attention it merits in monitoring and subsequent follow up. Just as the GPEDC Indicator Two is meant to assess progress on the integrated or cross-cutting theme of inclusiveness, so too can it serve as a multi-purpose indicator addressing multiple SDGs.

In this vein, Indicator Two offers an instrument to assess SDG 17 target 17. Target 17.17 however covers a broad range of inclusive partnerships and is not only limited to CSO partnerships. Preference may be given to an indicator that covers this range of partnerships, though it is difficult to imagine what such a comprehensive indicator would look like. The IAEG-SDGs may opt for multiple indicators if it is unsuccessful in finding a single indicator reflective of the full content of target 17.17. In that case, Indicator Two could be offered as an instrument to assess target 17.17's civil society component.

In addition, Indicator Two offers an instrument to assess SDG 16 overall and 16.7 (responsive, inclusive, and participatory decision-making) and 16.10 (fundamental freedoms) in particular. While SDG 16 does not contain a stand-alone target on CSOs, there is a clear link between SDG 16 on good governance and fundamental freedoms on the one hand and Indicator Two on the other hand, as previously indicated. As a multi-purpose indicator for SDG 16, Indicator Two can help address a number of its targets.

Thematic monitoring

The Outcome Document stipulates that at the global level the HLPF will conduct thematic reviews.[43] Meanwhile, the Secretary General is requested to provide "guidance on annual themes" as well as a "sequence of thematic reviews".[44] Given that the realization of the SDGs is dependent on a renewed global partnership that is understood to also encompass CSO engagement, and the relevance of CSO engagement to SDG 16, the UN Secretary General could propose CSO engagement as a topic for global thematic review. Here too however there exists the aforementioned risk of politicization. Whether member states collectively attach enough value to CSO engagement to accept it as a subject of thematic review remains to be seen, though the Secretary General's position on the importance of civil society as both means and end in development is clear. Thematic reviews are meant to provide external sources of evidence to complement global, regional and national monitoring of the SDGs. The GPEDC could offer its Indicator Two assessment as such a complementary thematic source.

National and regional level

To complement the global indicators, member states are to establish or adjust their own national indicators. Given the breadth of the SDGs and the voluntary nature of the monitoring exercise, it is conceivable that member states will cherry-pick the goals and targets that they would like to monitor. The GPEDC is supported by 161 states. As such, GPEDC adherents could be encouraged to include CSO engagement as a

national level indicator for inclusive decision-making (as part of SDG 16), CSO enabling environment as part of fundamental freedoms (also SDG 16), and CSO partnerships (as part of SDG 17) to be informed by their own country-level assessment of Indicator Two. Seeing as supporting states have already made the commitment to Indicator Two, linking it to the SDGs Monitoring Framework as a national indicator, does not result in an additional reporting burden on these governments. Like the SDG Monitoring Framework, the GPEDC Indicator Two assessment is voluntary and state-led. With the second monitoring round coming up, this would be an opportune moment for the GPEDC to, in its outreach to member states, highlight Indicator Two's relevance to SDG monitoring going forward to 2030.

The Outcome Document regards follow-up and review at the regional level as "useful opportunities for peer learning, including through voluntary reviews, sharing of best practices and discussion on shared targets".[45] The GPEDC has strong networks at the regional level and could support regional peer learning, allowing member states to discuss their assessment of CSO engagement (amongst other issues) in a regional context. This could be proposed during the upcoming regional pre-workshops ahead of the second round of monitoring, and followed up at the next GPEDC High Level Meeting late in 2016.

Strategic positioning

If any of these options are to come to fruition, the GPEDC will need to strategically position itself to make the case for the value-added of the GPEDC Monitoring Framework. Whether there is a possibility for the GPEDC to join the IAEG-SDGs could be explored, in collaboration, as needed, with interested GPEDC stakeholders. Marketing of the GPEDC's Monitoring Framework within the context of the ongoing SDG indicator setting and monitoring planning could be a key component of the GPEDC's communications and outreach plan.

In sum, options moving forward include:

> 1. Indicator Two as a multi-purpose indicator in the SDGs Global Monitoring Framework
> 2. Indicator Two as a source for a CSO enabling environment thematic assessment
> 3. Indicator Two as a national indicator within the framework of ongoing GPEDC monitoring
> 4. GPEDC engagement in the IAEG-SDGs' construction of the SDG Monitoring Framework

Conclusion

> *"Without effective partnerships that yield concrete results, the international community will struggle to deliver on its goals".[46]*

It has been said that when the relevance of the GPEDC Monitoring Framework for the SDG Monitoring Framework was first mentioned at the UN, it was met with some resistance from member states who commented that the GPEDC has a process-oriented approach whereas monitoring of the SDGs requires an outcome-oriented approach. However with respect to the SDGs, the high level of ambition coupled with limited resources demand effectiveness[47] and "it will be important that the full range of development cooperation actions and partnerships are conducted as effectively as possible to enhance their impact".[48] The GPEDC's work on maximizing impact of development cooperation on the people it is ultimately meant to serve – including its process-oriented approach of monitoring – is thus not only relevant but also highly

significant for the SDGs. As an existing multi-stakeholder platform which does not create additional reporting burdens on governments, elements of this Monitoring Framework could be drawn from to inform SDG follow-up and review.

The Outcome Document and the AAAA also prescribe that both the goals and the means of implementation are to be part of the SDG Monitoring Framework. This paper argues that because CSO engagement is crucial for the SDGs – both as a means and an end – it should be part of the Monitoring Framework in order to encourage stakeholder efforts on this front. Indicator Two has been offered as an instrument to assess CSO elements of the SDGs. Without an enabling environment for CSOs as well as CSO development effectiveness – two key components of Indicator Two – there can be no effective CSO engagement. Although at the moment Indicator Two requires further application and refinement, its current focus on shared responsibility, dialogue, learning and improvement corresponds well to the multi-stakeholder approach underlying the SDGs. Both the multi-stakeholder content and method for Indicator Two assessment offer a means to help overcome the potential political hurdles related to the CSO enabling environment in the SDG context. In short, this position paper has demonstrated that Indicator Two can be used to assess both the goals and the means of implementation. Meanwhile the GPEDC Monitoring Framework as a whole can be a valuable complement to the SDG Monitoring Framework.

Whether and how CSO engagement will be incorporated in the SDG Monitoring Framework remains to be seen. But as the contours of global, regional, national and thematic monitoring are in the process of being drawn up, there is an opportunity to actively promote the inclusion of CSO engagement in the SDG Monitoring Framework and to offer Indicator Two as a potential instrument of value and relevance to the Post-2015 Development Agenda.

ANNEX 1-SELECTION OF REFERENCES TO CIVIL SOCIETY IN KEY POST-2015 DOCUMENTS

Outcome Document "Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development"

Declaration

9. We envisage a world in which every country enjoys sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and decent work for all. […] One in which democracy, good governance and the rule of law as well as an <u>enabling environment</u> at national and international levels, are essential for sustainable development, including sustained and inclusive economic growth, social development, environmental protection and the eradication of poverty and hunger. […]

39. The scale and ambition of the new Agenda requires a revitalized Global Partnership to ensure its implementation. We fully commit to this. This Partnership will work in a spirit of global solidarity, in particular solidarity with the poorest and with people in vulnerable situations. It will facilitate an intensive global engagement in support of implementation of all the Goals and targets, bringing together Governments, the private sector, <u>civil society</u>, the United Nations system and other actors and mobilizing all available resources.

41. We acknowledge the role of the diverse private sector, ranging from micro-enterprises to cooperatives to multinationals, and that of <u>civil society organizations</u> and philanthropic organizations in the implementation of the new Agenda.

52. "We the Peoples" are the celebrated opening words of the UN Charter. It is "We the Peoples" who are embarking today on the road to 2030. Our journey will involve Governments as well as Parliaments, the UN system and other international institutions, local authorities, indigenous peoples, <u>civil society</u>, business and the private sector, the scientific and academic community – and all people.

59. We recognise that there are different approaches, visions, models and tools available to each country, in accordance with its national circumstances and priorities, to achieve sustainable development […].

Means of Implementation

62. This Agenda, including the SDGs, can be met within the framework of a revitalized <u>global partnership</u> for sustainable development, supported by the concrete policies and actions outlined in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, which is an integral part of the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development. The Addis Ababa Action Agenda supports, complements, and helps contextualize the 2030 Agenda's means of implementation targets. […]

Follow-up and review

79. We also encourage member states to conduct regular and inclusive reviews of progress at the national and sub-national levels which are country-led and country-driven. Such reviews should draw on contributions from indigenous peoples, <u>civil society</u>, the private sector and other stakeholders,

84. The HLPF, under the auspices of ECOSOC, shall carry out regular reviews, in line with Resolution 67/290. Reviews will be voluntary, while encouraging reporting, and include developed and developing countries as well as relevant UN entities and other stakeholders, including <u>civil society</u> and the private sector.

Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development

10. The enhanced and revitalized global partnership for sustainable development, led by Governments, will be a vehicle for strengthening international cooperation for implementation of the post-2015 development agenda. Multi-stakeholder partnerships and the resources, knowledge and ingenuity of the private sector, <u>civil society</u>, the scientific community, academia, philanthropy and foundations, parliaments, local authorities, volunteers and other stakeholders will be important to mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, complement the efforts of Governments, and support the achievement of the sustainable development goals, in particular in developing countries. This global partnership should reflect the fact that the post-2015 development agenda, including the sustainable development goals, is global in nature and universally applicable to all countries while taking into account different national realities, capacities, needs and levels of development and respecting national policies and priorities. We will work with <u>all partners</u> to ensure a sustainable, equitable, inclusive, peaceful and prosperous future for all. We will all be held accountable by future generations for the success and delivery of commitments we make today.

20. We will strengthen our domestic <u>enabling environments</u>, including the rule of law, and combat corruption at all levels and in all its forms. <u>Civil society</u>, independent media, and other non-State actors also play important roles.

117. We will encourage knowledge-sharing and the promotion of cooperation and partnerships between stakeholders, including between Governments, firms, academia and <u>civil society</u>, in sectors contributing to the achievement of the sustainable development goals.

125. High-quality disaggregated data is an essential input for smart and transparent decision-making, including in support of the post-2015 agenda and its means of implementation, and can improve policy-making at all levels. A focus on quantitative and qualitative data, including open data, and statistical systems and administrations at the national and subnational level will be especially important in order to strengthen domestic capacity, transparency and accountability in the global partnership. National statistical systems have a central role in generating, disseminating and administering data. They should be supplemented with data and analysis from <u>civil society</u>, academia and the private sector.

130. Mechanisms for follow-up and review will be essential to the achievement of the sustainable development goals and their means of implementation. We commit to fully engaging, nationally, regionally and internationally, in ensuring proper and effective follow-up of the financing for development outcomes and all the means of implementation of the post-2015 development agenda. To achieve this, it will be necessary to ensure the participation of relevant ministries, local authorities, national parliaments, central banks and financial regulators, as well as the major institutional stakeholders, other international development banks, and other relevant institutions, <u>civil society</u>, academia and the private sector.

---

[1] "Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", 2015, available <u>here</u>. See Annex I for the most relevant paragraphs.

[2] "Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development", available <u>here.</u> See Annex I for the most relevant paragraphs.

[3] "The new global development framework needs to explicitly recognize the necessity to create an enabling environment for civil society with targeted indicators to measure progress on civic freedoms of expression, association and peaceful assembly. The OWG-SDGs proposal with its broad reference to "fundamental freedoms" worryingly lacks specificity on these freedoms." See D. Sriskandarajah & M. Tiwana, "Hearing the neediest voices, community and public participation in development: why civil society and civic space matter" in Friends of Governance (ed.), *Governance for Sustainable Development: Ideas for the Post-2015 Agenda*, 2015, available <u>here.</u>

[4] Already in 2013 the High Level Panel of Eminent Persons' report noted that CSOs "have important parts to play in designing, realizing and monitoring this agenda". See "A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies through Sustainable Development – the Report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda", 2013, at p. 11, available <u>here.</u> The Intergovernmental Open Working Group in its report to the United Nations General Assembly acknowledged that the implementation of sustainable development goals will depend on a global partnership for sustainable development with the active engagement of governments, as well as civil society, the private sector, and the United Nations system. See "Open Working Group Proposal for Sustainable Development Goals", 2014, at para. 14, available <u>here.</u> The Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing report also referred to the need to engage CSOs in the SDGs: "The effective cooperation for sustainable development […] requires a global partnership with the meaningful involvement and active participation of developing and developed countries, […] civil society organizations and other stakeholders". See "Report of the Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing", 2014, at para. 174, available <u>here.</u>

[5] SDG 17.17 "Encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships". See "Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", op. cit., at p. 23.

[6] The Secretary General's Synthesis Report states an "enabling environment […] must be secured for the free, active and meaningful engagement of civil society and advocates reflecting the voices of women, minorities, LGBT groups, indigenous peoples, youth, adolescents, and older persons". See UN Secretary General, "The Road to Dignity by 20130: Ending Poverty, Transforming All Lives and Protecting the Planet, advanced unedited version of 4 December 2014, 2014, at para. 78, available <u>here.</u> The Report also notes that freedom of peaceful assembly, freedom of association and freedom of expression are "enablers of sustainable development" (Ibid). The Report of the High Level Panel of Eminent Persons also made a notable call for an enabling environment and access to due process as a necessary condition for CSOs and other non-state actors to fulfil their varied roles in sustainable development, op. cit, at p. 11.

[7] "The Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development", 2015, op. cit, at at para. 20.

[8] "Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", op. cit., at para. 63.

[9] "Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", op. cit., at para. 9.

[10] Transnational NPO Working Group on FATF, "Recommendations: Financial Action Task Force Typology Review", February 2014, available here.

[11] "A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies through Sustainable Development – the Report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda", op. cit., at p. 4.

[12] "Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", op. cit., at para. 10.

[13] UNDP, "Discussion Paper Governance for Sustainable Development: Integrating Governance in the Post-2015 Development Framework", 2014, at p. 4, available here.

[14] "A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies through Sustainable Development – the Report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda", op. cit., at p. 50. See UN Secretary General, op. cit., at para. 78.

[15] Open Working Group, "Focus Areas Document", 2014, available here.

[16] "Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", op. cit., at paras. 47, 72 and 74.

[17] "Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", op. cit., at para. 74.

[18] "Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", op. cit., at para. 75.

[19] The SDG report will be prepared by the UN Secretary General and based on the global indicator framework and the data produced by National Statistical Offices.

[20] "Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", op. cit., at para. 85.

[21] "Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", op. cit., at para. 90.

[22] "Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", op. cit., at para. 79

[23] "Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", op. cit., at para. 80.

[24] "Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", op. cit., at para. 75.

[25] Addis Ababa Action Agenda, op. cit. at para. 130.

[26] The GPEDC's knowledge and experience can inform the Post-2015 Development Agenda with respect to the efficient use of public, private, philanthropic and CSO finances, inclusive multi-stakeholder partnerships as well as country-led monitoring and accountability.

[27] Secretary General, op. cit., at para. 93.

[28] Report of the Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing, op. cit., at para. 120.

[29] Addis Ababa Action Agenda, op. cit., at para. 58.

[30] Secretary General, op. cit., at para. 148v.

[31] "Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", op. cit., at para. 58.

[32] GPEDC, "Draft Political Roadmap Toward the Second High Level Meeting", 2015, at p. 2, available here.

[33] Co-chairs of the GPEDC, "Ensuring Quality of Development Co-operation Post-2015", October 2014, available here.

[34] GPEDC, "Making Development Co-operation More Effective: 2014 Progress Report", 2014, at p. 22, available here.

[35] GPEDC, "Fourth Meeting of the Steering Committee: Summary", November 5, 2013.

[36] "Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", op. cit., at para. 59.

[37] Bill Orme, "Will Statisticians Get the Last Word on the UN's New Development Goals?" 2015, available here.

[38] The guidelines were offered during the third session of intergovernmental negotiations in March 2015 and repeated during the IAEG-SDGs' first meeting. See UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, "Report of the First Meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators", 2015, at p. 2, available here. See also IISD, "SDG Group Discusses Indicator Selection, Way Forward", 2015, available here.

[39] UN Department of Economic and Social Affair, op. cit., at p. 2.

[40] There seems to be agreement that the 169 targets are too numerous to be fully measured and tracked.

[41] UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, op. cit. at p. 2.

[42] Some have suggested that the means of implementation should be excluded from the global indicator framework and be included in a list of supplementary indicators from which countries could potentially choose. See Bill Orme, op. cit.

[43] "Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", op. cit., at para 85.

[44] "Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", op. cit., at para 90.

[45] "Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", op. cit., at para. 80.

[46] Co-chairs of the GPEDC, op. cit., at p. 4.

[47] CSOs have even gone as far as stating: "The AAAA is also deeply inadequate to support the operational Means of Implementation (MoI) for the Post-2015 Development Agenda, exposing an unbridged gap between the rhetoric of the aspirations and reality of the actions." See "Third FfD Failing to Finance Development: Civil Society Response to the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on Financing for Development", 2015, at p.1, available here https://csoforffd.files.wordpress.com/2015/07/cso-response-to-ffd-addis-ababa-action-agenda-16-july-2015.pdf.

[48] Co-chairs of the GPEDC, op. cit., at p. 1.