

WP-EFF Plenary (27-28 October, 2010)
Draft Conclusions from the WP-EFF Plenary

DAY 1

Purpose of the HLF-4

a) How does the WP-EFF view the main purpose of HLF-4?

The principles that guide the HLF 4 are that it is a:

- Political event, that attracts ministerial attendance;
- Focus on country-level implementation
- Streamlined and cost effective

Objectives:

1. Draw conclusions from the PD/AA process (stocktaking)
 - Focus on aid effectiveness and reaffirm commitments due to the unfinished business
 - Draw conclusions on what has worked, what hasn't worked and why not
 - Identify themes / issues that need further collective global work
 2. Maintain the focus on aid while situating it in the broader development context (forward looking)
 - Need to take into account the changed environment and a broader range of actors and partnerships, both state and non-state
 - Need to take into account the impact and role of aid on the broader development agenda (ex. MDGs, PCD, global public goods)
 - Mobilisation of domestic resources, stimulation of private investment, policy coherence for development/impact of non aid policies
- b) What should be the characteristics and main components of an outcome document?**
- Learn lessons from Accra – link it to evidence, finalise discussion only in Busan itself
 - Too early to pin down now: will be done throughout 2011 as evidence becomes available

HLF-4 Event Format

c) Does the WP-EFF agree with the proposed format, including the concept of Political Debates leading to conclusions for the outcome document?

- Structure follows substance
- Overall support for proposed format (3 types: Plenary, Interactive Sessions and Political Debates) :
 - Day 1: stocktaking, looking back;
 - Days 2 & 3: Political Debates and looking forward

- Overall support for forward looking political debates although divergences regarding shape/ types/sequencing of such debates – plus mixed views on linking them to outcome document
 - Inter-linkages between Interactive Sessions and Political Debates needs to be clearer
 - Size of the event: no agreement on numbers of participant
- d) Does the WP-EFF prefer Option A (short, successive Political Debates) or Option B (longer, parallel Political Debates)?**
- Some support for B, but overall preference for option A, although still an open question (see above)

HLF-4 Substantive Themes

e) Feedback on themes

- Need for a sharper focus - Tensions between narrow focus on aid related issues and a wide range of related global topics
- Risk of Christmas tree
- Need to ensure that we prioritise and deepen commitments: country systems, division of labour, predictability, capacity development (feedback from partner countries)
- Some recurring themes:
 - need for differentiated, more context specific approach (fragile states, MICs, LICs, regional);
 - development architecture and role of aid as a catalyst
 - different actors (private sector, emerging actors and SSC, etc.)
 - capable states (governance) and right-based approach
 - cross-cutting areas – capacity development, results, accountability and transparency

f) Does the WP-EFF agree on the role of the WP-EFF clusters and work-streams and other bodies in organising Interactive Sessions / Political Debates?

- Open question on whether the WP-EFF/Busan is the right forum to address some issues
- No agreement clusters should take this forward. Some argue in favour of the ExCom taking this on: possible point for ExCom on Friday

g) Does the WP-EFF agree to the milestones outlined in the Roadmap to decide themes for Interactive Sessions/ Political Debates?

- No agreement on the dates: January 2011 is too early to decide on themes
- Keep open as long as possible (First Survey findings available July 2011)

DAY 2

Preparation Process and Milestones

h) Does the WP-EFF agree to this preparation process and the milestones set out above?

Evidence for HLF 4

- Need to balance quantitative and qualitative information. Clarify criteria for what constitutes “evidence” and priority topics; draw on input from WP-EFF as well as other independent sources (CSO, academia)
- Need to reflect global progress, as well as regional, contextual and country-specific realities
- The main document needs to be very short, use simple language and targeted at policy makers. It should address 1) what has been achieved, how and why not; and 2) what’s next.
- Call for monitoring post-HLF 4

Consultations for HLF 4

- Recognise the role of regional institutions and parliamentarian and CSO platforms to cast a wide net for consultation, build confidence, share information and also collect information and evidence for HLF 4.
- Recognise the need to coordinate own processes with milestones for HLF 4

Negotiations for HLF 4

- Assure legitimacy, ownership, transparency and cost-effectiveness of the process at all levels.
- Strong support for high-level partner country contact group (proposal forthcoming?), as well as for assuring political-level engagement of donors and other stakeholders.
- WP-EFF, which will be the main negotiating platform, should only meet when meaningful discussion can take place based on availability of evidence and outcomes of consultations. WP-EFF may not meet in full plenary in March: alternatively, a March ExCOM and a more substantive July WP-EFF plenary to start the negotiations can be envisaged.
- Revise timeline (particularly Q4 2011) in view to ensure that evidence and consultations from the country, regional, WP-EFF workstreams as well as other processes (ex. INCAF) are coordinated and has impact from the start.
- Recognise the need to clarify the structure for political-level negotiations at Busan.

HLF-4 Organisation and Logistical Aspects

i) Decision on the overall size and level of the HLF-4

- Recognize that the number and size of delegations will depend on the format and the agenda.
- All categories of actors should be adequately represented, but keep a realistic and sober view on the number and size of delegations.
- Recognize that event needs to have a manageable size to have meaningful discussions. ExCOM to consider options to take forward.

j) Agreement on role and membership of the core group on logistics

- Agreement to keep the core group very small and discussed in ExCOM.

k) Agreement on the financial aspects

- Need to be aware of the full cost of HLF 4 (including preparation) during a time of economic downturn

l) Donor pledges for partner country travels and communication.

- UNDP Trust Fund, as well as dedicated trust fund managed by AsDB planned. For the latter, some legal issues may need to be cleared for some institutions.
- Pledges received from some, including from partner countries (Colombia).

m) Communication strategy: agreement on branding, overarching message and funding

General Observation:

- Level of ambition of the communication strategy need to be reviewed, perhaps too ambitious.

Branding

- Include the work “aid” or “aid effectiveness” in the title. Option to have a sub-title to reflect broader context. Communications Group to propose options and better to focus on core messages.

Overarching Message

- Need to have an overall positive tone. The Communications Group should craft the core messages based on evidence and substance by July 2010.

Funding

- Be aware of cost and value for money