

Executive Summary

I . Introduction

1. The Background and Purpose of the Research

Since its affiliation with OECD DAC ten years ago, South Korea has served as a responsible donor country. As the host country of the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (hereinafter "HLF-4") held in 2011, South Korea played a leading role in effecting a paradigm shift from aid effectiveness to development effectiveness. The nation demonstrated excellent leadership in the adoption of the Busan Declaration, which embraced various donors, including developed countries, emerging economies, and the private sector, and in the launch of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (hereinafter "GPEDC"), with all the development stakeholders participating in it. Against this backdrop, this study examined the current discussions on development effectiveness with respect to GPEDC, including the recently launched unofficial working group of OECD DAC, and presented a strategic transition strategy for revitalizing GPEDC in the future.

2. Details of the Research

The study conducted literature reviews, interviews, and Delphi surveys over four months to explore an improvement strategy to revitalize GPEDC for fulfilling Agenda 2030. After establishing the Busan Forum, the monitoring system, and the KOICA Learning and Accelerating Program (LAP) as the constituents of the GPEDC mechanism of "agenda-implementation-training and education," which is often considered a norm of development effectiveness and aid effectiveness, the study analyzed the roles of the constituents and their relationship, and suggested an improvement strategy and action plans.

Ⅱ . GPEDC and the changing global development cooperation paradigm

1. Constitution of the GPEDC

The study reviewed the changes in the global development cooperation landscape and the background of the launch of GPEDC. By following the changes from the Rome Declaration to the Paris Declaration, Accra Agenda for Action, and the Busan Declaration, the study examined the paradigm shift in global development cooperation as the attention moved away from discussions on aid effectiveness toward discussions on development cooperation effectiveness.

2. MDGs and the GPEDC

The study analyzed the composition of the GPEDC monitoring indicators and implementation procedures, which were established to effectively achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and the results of the implementation checks of participating countries. The analysis showed that no incentives were offered to stakeholder to participate in the monitoring exercise and to improve results. In particular, since no visible incentives were offered for the recipient countries' participation in GPEDC monitoring other than the strategic policy dialogues with donor countries, recipient countries, and other stakeholder the provision of direct/indirect incentives should be considered as a way to encourage more recipient countries to participate in the monitoring exercise.

3. Role of the GPEDC in the SDGs era

The study also examined if the transition in 2015 to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) regime and the expanded cooperation through partnerships with parties, such as advanced countries, emerging donors, non-profits, and private businesses, were appropriate for determining the role of GPEDC, setting its

direction, and coping with the changing system. Then, the study examined relevant items such as the evaluation of the implementation of specific criteria of Agenda 2030 and the measurement of specific goals through the transition to SDGs.

III. Role and Structure of the GPEDC

1. Governance and Institutional Setting

GPEDC implements the activities of 1) the High-Level Meeting, 2) the Steering Committee, and 3) the Busan Global Partnership Forum. The High-Level Meeting (HLM) is the top-level consultative body with a 2–3 year cycle, and HLMs have been held twice so far. In 2019, a Senior Level Meeting (SLM) was also held. GPEDC has a Steering Committee, where various stakeholder discuss diverse topics. The Steering Committee is led by three co-chairpersons and composed of representatives from donor countries, recipient countries, civil society, parliaments, and the private sector. It has held 19 sessions since 2012. In addition to these stakeholder meetings, the Busan Global Partnership Forum is held as part of efforts to publicize GPEDC's agenda. The Busan Forum targets various development cooperation stakeholder such as donor countries, developing countries, international organizations, civil society organizations, and businesses, and aims to serve as a venue for active cooperation that promotes the implementation of the four principles of effective development cooperation (ownership, focus on results, inclusive partnerships, and transparency and mutual accountability).

2. Monitoring System

GPEDC's monitoring procedures are implemented at the national level and coordinated mainly by “country coordinators” representing the governments of developing (recipient) countries. The same coordinators drive participation by other GPEDC members, such as donor countries (or organizations), civil society organizations, parliaments, businesses, and trade unions. By collecting and

compiling data on the ten indicators, they regularly publish global monitoring reports. Monitoring reform for the period between 2020 and 2022 was implemented through the 19th Steering Committee session held in 2020. Regarding desired improvements to monitoring, several limitations have been identified with respect to the GPEDC monitoring indicators and the collected statistical data. They can be broadly classified as follows: 1) inconsistent participation in GPEDC monitoring, and 2) limitations of the methodology for each GPEDC indicator.

3. Learning and Accelerating Program (LAP)

A review of related documents, including those on the results of LAP implementation, yielded an LAP implementation improvement plan focused on 1) the current status of LAP implementation and performance, and 2) the areas of improvement. The status of LAP participating countries, current participants, module composition and specifics, and trainee evaluation and feedback were analyzed based on the information on the program and its performance between 2014 and 2018. The areas of improvement for the LAP participating countries and participants were the ambiguity in the criteria for the listing and selection of countries to be invited to LAP, the invitation of actual practitioners, and the addition of the category of education to set up a GPEDC implementation tracking mechanism. Regarding module composition, topical sub-categorization and others were discussed in detail.

IV. Role of GPEDC to realize the 2030 Agenda

1. Research Methods

In order to come up with a plan to improve the GPEDC monitoring process, the study applied the mixed-methods approach that combined the qualitative method, which used in-depth interviews and written interviews, and the Delphi method. The Delphi analysis came up with an improvement plan for the five categories. For the Delphi

study, an eleven-person panel was formed and an analysis was performed through three questionnaire surveys.

2. Research Findings

In the Delphi study, the experts reached a consensus or came up with different plans in the different surveys. Regarding the improvement plan for GPEDC monitoring and indicators, the monitoring procedures should be improved with increased clarity and simplicity. Usability should be boosted so that the monitoring results actually lead to improved development effectiveness. There was an opinion calling for strengthening the linkage between the monitoring details and indicators and SDGs, and improving the indicators accordingly. Regarding the number and scope of the GPEDC participating countries, the panel was unable to reach a consensus on any of the suggested improvement plans. As to the general operation of the Busan Forum, there was a consensus on three improvement plans in the second and third surveys. Specifically, the desired improvements that obtained a consensus were as follows: 2) the goals and contributions of the Busan Forum have to be made clearer, and 5) rather than being a one-time event, the Busan Forum should actively follow up on its discussion on development effectiveness. Regarding whether expert feedback was collected on the overall operation of LAP, it was found that no such feedback was collected on all survey items in either the second or third survey.

V. Policy recommendations for revitalization of the GPEDC

1. Governance and Institutional Set-Up

- 1) Establishing a multi-layered system: Raising the awareness of the international community on development effectiveness

The participation of high-level decision-makers is essential to raise the status of GPEDC in the international community and promote the development cooperation

agenda. Creating behavioral changes that are needed to make development cooperation more effective depends on recognized political leadership that is armed with analytical data and policy recommendations. When political momentum can be built based on evidence, such as data on effective development cooperation and best practices, GPEDC can clearly contribute to the global process for change in development cooperation practices.

2) Strengthening the GPEDC Steering Committee

Since the GPEDC Steering Committee focuses on workplan creation and implementation and associated resource distribution, its original functions cannot be performed effectively with the help of just the support staff from the JST and co-chair countries. Therefore, the creation of a permanent standing body or designation of an inter-agency network needs to be given active consideration to provide substantial support to the Steering Committee. If core funding is implemented to strengthen the functions of the Steering Committee, there can be a sharing of roles, with a designated research institute providing priority support on the discovery of cases and analytical research and JST serving as an administrative support arm dedicated to the operation and monitoring of GPEDC.

2. Monitoring System

1) Reinforcing linkage with SDGs

GPEDC monitoring contributes to the measurement of three specific SDG targets, namely SDG 5.c, SDG 17.15, and SDG 17.16. However, as the GPEDC indicators were developed in the era of MDGs, their linkage with SDGs is weak. Thus, the study presented a plan that selects area(s) in different categories, which are deemed important especially in developing countries or in which developing countries are equally interested, and provides customized indicators in different areas so that systematic and pluralistic approaches are possible. The study, in particular, noted that if the SDGs are monitored for each target, a monitoring platform at the level of

target implementation, which is currently absent, can serve as a distinctive strategy for GPEDC.

- 2) Strengthening the capacity of developing countries to ensure consistency in monitoring

Given that GPEDC monitoring is based on the voluntary participation of developing countries, the continuous participation of developing countries has to be ensured and the quality of GPEDC monitoring has to be improved through capacity building so that quality statistical data may be collected and produced through GPEDC monitoring.

3. Learning and Accelerating Program (LAP)

- 1) Reorganizing and upgrading training by refocusing it on the interests of recipient countries

It is possible to come up with a plan that can at once enhance the core functions of LAP based on the legitimacy of its operation so far and also satisfy the needs of participating countries to achieve development results. LAP may serve as a venue for discussion that can remove the gaps between the discourse on development effectiveness and the capacity to implement it in the real world.

- 2) Revamping the mode of operation and functions of LAP

It is possible to propose ways to assign LAP a new function, which is to serve as a venue where various development partners, such as recipient countries and civil society, can discover, share, and spread best practices.

4. Enhancing Korea's Contribution in the GPEDC

1) Expanding participation in workplan and focus area

We need to clarify how we participate and contribute in Work Plan Implementation Area 1.2. South Korea should actively participate in the workplan implementation by engaging experts or including content that may boost domestic awareness. Moreover, if LAP is utilized as a channel the substantial contribution from South Korea and KOICA has to be closely analyzed, and the format of the partnership with JST and Switzerland, a leader country, needs to be coordinated. Looking forward, South Korea will have the opportunity to contribute to the maintenance and vitalization of the GPEDC regime and lead its agenda by selecting areas that it needs to pay attention to (such as triangular cooperation) and supporting the implementation of the workplan.

2) Activating domestic discussion on GPEDC

The system for discussing how GPEDC can contribute to Active discussion on GPEDC in Korea ODA projects and policy processes should be institutionalized in Korea. A mechanism can be established to involve experts in monitoring results. The presence of best practices may play a crucial role in activating domestic discussion on GPEDC. While working to discover best practices, it is also necessary to figure out what kind of environment triggers best practices in large numbers. It is important to discover a new workstream for which South Korea can take the lead. This workstream should be reflected in the 2023–2025 Work Plan and promoted. To this end, South Korea should implement (that is, bring into the mainstream) projects that reflect the principles of GPEDC, conduct analytical studies, support experts, and activate discussions through seminars.

VI. Conclusion

This study proposed a plan to promote the role and status of GPEDC, and detailed specific measures for improving its organization, governance, and monitoring as well as the LAP operation. As a strategy to improve the operation of GPEDC, the study suggested the need to raise international awareness on development effectiveness by creating a multi-layered system and to strengthen support for the GPEDC Steering Committee. To improve the monitoring system, it is believed that it is necessary to continuously reinforce the linkage with SDGs and strengthen the capacity of developing countries to ensure consistency in monitoring. In addition, to improve the LAP operation, it is necessary to maintain the current mode of operation of LAP, reorganize and upgrade the training content by including areas that recipient countries are interested in (SDGs, development effectiveness, monitoring, etc.), and revamp the operation and functions of LAP to make it a venue for discovering, sharing, and disseminating best practices. In addition, the study suggested expanded participation in the workplan and focus area and promotion of domestic discussion on GPEDC to boost South Korean participation in GPEDC.

The limitations of the research include the differences in the level of interest and understanding of South Korean experts with respect to GPEDC and a general lack of interest, which made it difficult to constitute a Delphi panel. Furthermore, while diverse documents were accessible through the GPEDC website, in-depth analysis was challenging because most of the documents were available only as summaries.

The study suggested that follow-up research be conducted in areas such as the improvement of GPEDC operation, mainstreaming of GPEDC into KOICA projects, and the discovery of best practices in KOICA projects that may be used as LAP content. Furthermore, conducting research on mainstreaming GPEDC into KOICA projects to revitalize GPEDC and discovering best practices to boost the effectiveness of LAP operation can create opportunities to raise local and international awareness on GPEDC and stimulate discussion on development effectiveness.