

**DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE
Development Assistance Committee**

Working Party on Aid Effectiveness

MEETING OF THE GROUP OF HLF-4 OUTCOME DOCUMENT SHERPAS

DRAFT SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIRST MEETING

Paris, 4 November 2011

This document contains a draft summary of the meeting held on 4 November 2011 of the group of sherpas designated to finalise the outcome document for the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness. It is shared with HLF-4 delegations for information.

Contact:

Mr. Robin Ogilvy, tel. +33 (0)1 45 24 94 48, email: robin.ogilvy@oecd.org

JT03311041

Document complet disponible sur OLIS dans son format d'origine
Complete document available on OLIS in its original format



GROUP OF HLF-4 OUTCOME DOCUMENT SHERPAS
DRAFT SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIRST MEETING
PARIS, 4 NOVEMBER 2011

I. Introduction

Introductory remarks

1. The Chair of the meeting, Ms Enna Park (Korea, WP-EFF Vice-Chair), welcomed participants and explained that she would chair the session on behalf of Mr Talaat Abdel-Malek (WP-EFF Chair). Ms Park shared a statement provided by Mr Abdel-Malek, in which he outlined his desire that the group should build on efforts made by the WP-EFF to ensure that Busan forges a new style of partnership going beyond traditional “donor-recipient” models of co-operation, and that the process of finalising the outcome document for HLF-4 should lead to the political endorsement by the broadest possible range of actors of a set of common principles and actionable commitments, while recognising the need for appropriate differentiation across types of stakeholders. This statement also stressed the importance of reaching consensus on the key features and principles for post-Busan efforts to support implementation of agreements.

2. The Chair reminded participants of the trust vested in the sherpas through their nomination by a broader set of constituents, and drew attention to the agreement that only designated sherpas should participate in the proceedings.¹ The group was informed that, as agreed in its telephone conference of 27 October, Rwanda and the African Union Commission had consulted with African governments to nominate an additional sherpa from the region, with Mr Modibo Makalou (Mali) welcomed to the group to fulfil this role.

3. The Chair went on to emphasise the importance of efficient, transparent working, inviting sherpas to focus on the limited number of issues identified in the telephone call of 27 October, and stating clearly the reasons for endorsement of the text or the proposal of alternative text throughout the proceedings. Ms Park emphasised the need for HLF-4 to deliver an action-oriented, forward-looking set of outcomes that would benefit from broad political endorsement, while reminding participants that the HLF-4 outcome document is not legally binding and should be kept concise. She reminded the group that the third draft outcome document for HLF-4 would act as a starting point for the meeting’s deliberations [[DCD/DAC/EFF\(2011\)13](#)] and that, on the basis of the consensus reached during the meeting, the WP-EFF Chair, Vice-Chairs and Secretariat would circulate a revised draft of the outcome document as a starting point for discussions in its next meeting on 18 November 2011.

1. Further details on the process agreed for finalising the outcome document, including representation arrangements for the group, are contained in an information note which was circulated as a background document for the meeting [[DCD/DAC/EFF\(2011\)14](#)].

Adoption of the agenda

4. Participants approved the agenda circulated in advance of the meeting (Annex A), agreeing that discussions should prioritise those issues highlighted in the agenda and featuring as text in square brackets in the third draft outcome document, with any additional issues being raised at the end of the meeting subject to time constraints.

Summary record

5. The draft summary record of the telephone conference of the sherpas [[DCD/DAC/EFF/M\(2011\)3/PROV](#)] was approved without comment.

II. Detailed discussion of the third draft Outcome Document for HLF-4 [[DCD/DAC/EFF\(2011\)13](#)]²

Preamble (paragraphs 1-12 of third draft outcome document)

6. In presenting the draft preamble (paragraphs 1-12), the Chair stressed the need for this part of the document to take the form of a concise, political statement setting out a shared vision and principles, going further than previous agreements. She invited comments and suggestions that would improve this part of the document without lengthening it substantially.

7. Discussions pointed to consensus on the inclusive nature of and broad adherence to the document set out in paragraph 1, which was approved without modifications.

8. Recognising the need for efficient discussions, participants agreed that the Bureau would give careful consideration to the range of textual suggestions provided by sherpas in writing which may help to improve the quality of the existing text. Sherpas agreed to raise for discussion in the meeting only those points that were of the highest priority to their respective constituents. Based on these points, the Bureau will propose a revised preamble with the support of the Secretariat.

9. BetterAid proposed the addition of a reference to human rights in paragraph 2, with the United Kingdom, United Nations Development Group (UNDG) and European Commission (EC) expressing broad support for the addition of a reference to human rights in the preamble. The United States proposed that the preamble should quote from the text of the Millennium Declaration, referring to its written proposal submitted to the group in advance of the meeting. The Chair noted that reference to existing agreements on human rights is made in paragraph 10 of the draft and questioned to what extent it would be desirable to lengthen the existing text. France suggested that no additional reference should be made to human rights in paragraph 2, in view of the existing reference in paragraph 10 and the need for a balanced statement which could be adhered to by all actors. Participants agreed with the suggestion from France that paragraph 2 should refer to “shared” growth, consistent with G20 language on the issue.

10. China noted the emphasis placed on South-South and triangular co-operation in the draft preamble, and suggested that the preamble should place greater emphasis on “north-south” co-operation

2. Note: sherpas were invited to propose textual suggestions in a limited number of areas in advance of the meeting. These were collated in a compendium of inputs released as a room document. An updated version of this compendium including text circulated by some sherpas during the meeting is available as [DCD/DAC/EFF\(2011\)15/WD](#).

and ODA as the main channels of development co-operation, rather than setting up the same criteria and indicators for South-South co-operation as for North-South co-operation. South Africa conveyed its view that the differentiation of responsibilities across actors should feature in the preamble. Mexico proposed that, rather than referring to differentiation of responsibilities in the preamble, this should be highlighted at the outset of the second part of the document which begins at paragraph 13. Mexico pointed to a lack of clarity in the references made to inclusive partnerships in paragraph 10 and suggested that the next draft could further clarify this drawing on written suggestions provided by Mexico. Japan indicated that it does not support the inclusion of a reference to common and differentiated responsibilities in the preamble, but that it would have no objection to an alternative explanation of this concept featuring elsewhere in the document.

11. The United States suggested that paragraph 10 should make reference to the catalytic nature of development co-operation, drawing on its written proposal or on text that featured in the second draft Outcome Document. Rwanda called for a greater emphasis on poverty eradication in the preamble. Mexico, Rwanda and the United Kingdom proposed that further consideration should be given to the inclusion of transparency as a shared principle in the preamble or more specifically in paragraph 10. Rwanda and France proposed that more explicit reference be made to mutual accountability in paragraph 10(d). No agreement was reached on these issues.

12. BetterAid expressed its concern with the way in which developing countries are referred to in the third draft. In particular, it suggested that the formulation “countries and their citizens” may perpetuate the notion that “countries” refers to executives only. Mexico suggested that a simpler reference to “developing countries” could address this concern. The EC suggested that explicit reference be made to democratic ownership in paragraphs 10(a) and 11(a). BetterAid asked that consideration be given its proposals provided in writing for paragraphs 8 to 11.

13. The UNDG suggested that references to “partnership” should be tightened and clarified, particularly with regard to the distinction between partnership as a principle and the use of “partnership” in the context of a specific mechanism or forum. The UNDG asked that consideration be given to its written comments, and in particular those relating to equity, vulnerability, gender and youth.

14. Rwanda proposed that the use of country systems “as a default position” should feature in paragraph 11(a). The United States asked that any reference made to country systems should use language that featured in the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) rather than introducing new terminology. The Chair drew attention to the previous agreement that specific Paris Declaration and AAA commitments should not be repeated in the outcome document as the document reaffirms the agreements set out in these declarations in full. No agreement was reached on Rwanda’s proposal.

15. Summarising the discussion on the preamble, the Chair confirmed that efforts would be made to address the range of views and suggestions identified – particularly where these are not controversial – in the next draft. The meeting agreed that the text contained in paragraph 12 would need to be revisited at a later stage to ensure that it reflects any agreement reached on paragraphs 30 and 31 (post-Busan arrangements).

Clarifying differentiation of responsibilities and commitments by different stakeholders

16. Participants discussed the extent to which the commitments proposed throughout the document should be implemented by different types of stakeholders that endorse the document, including the need to recognise the varying abilities of countries at different stages of their development to implement some of the specific actions set out in the draft outcome document.

17. Mexico proposed that the concept of differentiation across actors and types of co-operation provider should feature before the existing paragraph 13, with a new paragraph added to make the link from shared principles to the differentiated ways in which these are implemented. Mexico invited participants to consider its written proposal contained in the compendium of inputs. Mexico stressed that its intention is to see emerging economies adhering to principles, recognising that they may aspire to implement some of the specific actions set out in the document in the future, and that this must not lead to a reduction in the level and nature of commitments made by other countries. The chair noted that an element of explanation is provided in the existing paragraph 7 and that some of this text could feature in a new paragraph proposed by Mexico rather than introducing repetition in the document.

18. China agreed that there is a need for the common and differentiated nature of responsibilities to be better explained. It expressed its view that there are important differences between North-South and South-South co-operation, and that South-South co-operation should be seen as a complement to North-South co-operation. China expressed its concern that the current use of the term “providers of development co-operation” throughout the document does not recognise that some commitments cannot be adhered to at present by providers of South-South co-operation, and informed the meeting that it was unable to agree to these elements of the document in their current form. The Chair invited China to provide a written proposal of text which might form the basis for an acceptable compromise.

19. France underscored its view that the effectiveness agenda is now a common challenge, in which all providers of co-operation could share knowledge, and proposed that the outcome document should reflect this in a positive tone and an overarching message of unity. BetterAid took note of Mexico’s proposal and asked that this be revisited to recognise the role of non-state actors.

20. The meeting agreed that the next draft of the outcome document would draw on elements of Mexico’s written proposal, with BetterAid and China agreeing to propose specific language that may help to refine this proposal.

Paragraph 15(e) – Aid untying

21. Participants were invited to discuss the bracketed text contained in paragraph 15(e) of the third draft outcome document. No consensus was reached on whether the HLF-4 outcome document should go beyond the existing agreement on untying set out in the Accra Agenda for Action.

22. Rwanda and Honduras indicated their support and that of the countries they represent for a commitment to untie all aid, proposing that a deadline of 2013 should be fixed for this so as to ensure that the full untying of aid contributes to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals by 2015. BetterAid supported the proposal to untie all aid by 2013. It indicated that untying should not only improve value for money, but should also lead to benefits for development through increased use of local procurement in developing countries.

23. Japan informed the meeting that it was not able to commit to untying fully its aid, for the reasons set out in its written submission to the meeting (see compendium of inputs). The United States informed that it was not able to commit to untying its aid fully for political reasons. It indicated its willingness to explore opportunities for the Busan outcome document to go beyond the DAC Recommendation on Untying by, for example, giving consideration to further untying technical assistance, or identifying actions that would support use of local procurement in developing countries. The EC indicated that it could not realistically commit to untying all aid by 2015, and would not wish to make commitments going beyond those contained in the AAA. It proposed that the text could spell out more fully the rationale and benefits of untying aid.

24. France proposed that the text should highlight the importance of efforts to use local procurement, and proposed that further efforts should be made to monitor carefully existing commitments relating to untying. The United Kingdom indicated that it supports the position set out by Rwanda, while recognising that moving the agenda forward would be challenging. It indicated that it would be willing to accept a compromise that would include commitments that go beyond existing commitments on untying, for example, by expanding areas that might be covered by a commitment on untying as proposed by the DAC Chair (e.g. expanding types of aid that would be untied; expanding the coverage of countries to which an agreement on untying aid would apply). Mexico indicated its support for the UK's proposal, noting that failure to make some progress would have political implications given that the negotiating text is in the public domain.

25. The UNDG proposed that the document should at least contain benchmarks and deadlines to show how progress on untying would be made. Honduras proposed that a compromise could place emphasis on operationalising the untying of aid, with a timeframe to ensure progress.

26. The Chair emphasised the importance of ensuring that any compromise goes beyond existing agreements or recommendations on untying. The United Kingdom and EC were invited to propose text which could act as the basis for such a compromise.

Paragraph 20(c) – Transparency

27. The discussion on the existing text in paragraph 20(c) moved forward the consensus on the need for action-oriented commitments that would see an international standard for the publication of aid information implemented within a specified period of time. Further work is needed to refine the existing text, and to confirm the proposed deadline of 2015 for full implementation of the standard.

28. The UK proposed that the outcome document should better clarify the aims of different standards for publishing aid information and to support statistical reporting on aid flows, recognising the complementarity between the two. It referred to its specific textual proposal (see compendium) and emphasised the need for the outcome document to specify a timeline for implementation. The UNDG supported the proposal by the UK, suggesting that the outcome document needs to set out benchmarks and timelines to ensure operationalisation. Rwanda welcomed the focus of the text proposed in paragraph 20(c), indicating that commitments should focus on the implementation (rather than the design) of a standard, and that the deadline for full implementation should be brought forward to 2013. The EC indicated its support for the implementation of a standard as proposed by the UK and Rwanda, stressing that this should be based on IATI and the OECD-DAC standard, and that the 2015 deadline for full implementation was realistic. The World Bank expressed its support for the positions set out by the UK and UNDG.

29. While drawing attention to its support for the broad objective of improved transparency, Japan indicated that it would not wish to adhere to a single standard based on IATI, and expressed concern with the timeline for implementation proposed in the third draft outcome document.

30. Honduras reminded participants that the IATI standard was designed jointly by donors, partner countries and CSOs, and that as such, it should be considered a “partner country friendly” solution. It suggested that a clear distinction needs to be made between IATI as a standard for publishing aid information, and the CRS as a tool and standards for statistical reporting. Honduras also asked that paragraph 20(a) should make reference to the terms and conditions associated with aid. This proposal was supported by BetterAid, which also emphasised the link between improved aid information and efforts to strengthen country systems.

31. France drew attention to the differing objectives associated with the publication of aid information and reporting on aid flows, suggesting that there was a need to better distinguish between different objectives (accountability at different levels; predictability and support to partner country public financial management). At the same time, it expressed concern with the costs associated with meeting all publication and reporting requirements, suggesting the need for a balanced and realistic set of commitments in this area.

32. China suggested that the principle of transparency should apply to North-South co-operation, but that it should not be seen as a standard for South-South co-operation.

33. The United States expressed concern with formulation of the commitment to make the “full range of information” available in the existing text of paragraph 20(a), suggesting that this needs to be specified more clearly. It noted the convergence between the IATI and CRS standards. Timor-Leste disagreed with the view of the United States that making available the “full range of information” would be problematic. It proposed that commitments could go further by making reference to the publication of information compatible with country systems (*e.g.* compatible the budget classifications of developing countries).

34. Several participants expressed concern with China’s proposal that the principle of transparency should be applied only to North-South forms of co-operation. The United Kingdom expressed its view that the commitments set out in paragraphs 13-23 should not apply only to North-South forms of co-operation, pointing to the evolving landscape of development co-operation and the notion that as countries change, they should be encouraged to adhere to a fuller set of actions in this area. Mexico agreed with the position of the United Kingdom, while noting that the extent to which some countries could implement norms that other countries have been working on for decades would evolve over time. Mexico suggested that one possible approach would involve inviting emerging providers of development co-operation to respond after Busan by signalling what they individually or collectively intend to implement.

35. The United States proposed the need for a clearer distinction between principles – which could be shared by a full range of co-operation providers – and specific commitments, which it may be unrealistic to invite all providers to implement at this stage. The United States stressed that Busan offers the opportunity to describe an evolving co-operation landscape, and that the concepts of provider and recipient are useful. The UNDG expressed its support for the view shared by the United States, but stressed the need for the document to better set out a vision for implementation in this area with clearer roles and responsibilities.

36. Rwanda proposed that the sharing of information – particularly when developing countries request it – should happen regardless of the type of provider or partner involved. Rwanda stressed the need for shared ambition in this area. Rwanda also proposed that the deadline for full implementation of a publication standard referred to in 20(c) should be brought forward to 2013.

37. Consensus was reached on the need for the text to better frame the intentions underpinning commitments on transparency; the deletion of the text “Design and” at the start of paragraph 20(c); the need to better distinguish between the objectives of IATI and the DAC CRS, and the notion that countries at different stages in their development would implement actions to varying degrees, but that the overarching principles and commitments remain relevant.

38. France agreed to propose specific language that would help to clarify the purpose of the actions referred to in paragraph 20, and the Bureau and Secretariat will reconsider the definition of “full range of information” in paragraph 20(a).

39. Noting that 2015 presents a realistic compromise by way of a deadline for full implementation of a standard for the publication of aid information, the Chair asked that Japan consults at the ministerial level on the feasibility of accommodating this deadline with a view to confirming this over the coming days.

Paragraph 20(d) – Medium-term predictability

40. The United Kingdom informed participants the bracketed text, “introducing structural and legal reforms where needed”, presents challenges for some of the countries that it represents, indicating that paragraph 20(d) would be acceptable in its current form with the bracketed text omitted. The EC also expressed its support for the deletion of the bracketed text.

41. The United States indicated that political realities present it with a challenge to making further progress on existing commitments on medium-term predictability, suggesting that a focus on providing information on future aid flows over a one year horizon may offer a more realistic compromise. Japan suggested the deletion of the word “comprehensive”, with a view to ensuring that the text in paragraph 20(d) reflects the agreement set out in the AAA.

42. The Chair reminded participants that the AAA had already committed donors to providing rolling three- to five-year forward expenditure and/or implementation plans and urged participants to agree on language which would support the implementation of this commitment or go further than this. South Africa reminded participants that it – like many countries – has moved beyond a one-year budget process, calling for fuller implementation of measures that enhance predictability over a three- to five-year horizon. It reminded participants that the indicative nature of the information on future flows provided does not prevent donors from revising indications when circumstances call for this. Honduras indicated its desire to see the outcome document going beyond the AAA commitment, and indicated that it would not support the omission of the bracketed text in 20(d).

43. China proposed that paragraph 20(d) should apply to “donors” rather than “providers of development co-operation”, emphasising its view that the provisions contained in this paragraph should be applicable to North-South forms of development co-operation. Mexico referred to its earlier proposal that differences in types of country should be referred to in order to help clarify to which countries this commitment applies. The Chair proposed that it would be unwise to drop language referring to “providers of development co-operation” in favour of “donors” in view of previous discussions within the WP-EFF on this issue.

44. No consensus was reached on paragraph 20(d). The United States was invited to propose text which would better set out how full implementation of the AAA commitment could be achieved in the context of the Busan outcome document. This paragraph will be revisited in the meeting of 18 November.

Paragraph 21(a) - Fragmentation

45. Participants agreed that the introductory text at the beginning of paragraph 21 should place a more positive emphasis on the diversity of co-operation actors and the opportunities that this presents.

46. At the same time, participants agreed that fragmentation is a shared concern, and that collective efforts are required to reduce it. It was agreed that 21(a) will retain the text setting out the objective to “reduce fragmentation”, with a possible further clarification or explanation of this objective to be introduced in the next draft.

47. The World Bank indicated that the second sentence in paragraph 21(a) is, in its view, too prescriptive. The EC, Honduras and Rwanda objected to the removal of this text which sets out how fragmentation will be reduced. The World Bank explained that it finds a commitment to increased use of

“joint strategies” to be problematic. Consensus was reached on the deletion of the words “strategies and” in paragraph 21(a), with the remainder of the text unchanged.

48. Rwanda proposed that a more specific target be specified to ensure progress in this area by 2013. No agreement was reached on this proposal.

Paragraph 21(b) – Multilateral effectiveness and proliferation

49. France expressed its support for the full text presented in paragraph 21(b), suggesting that the brackets be deleted and the text contained in them be retained in full.

50. Mali proposed that the reluctance of global programmes to use country systems or co-ordinate with other co-operation actors was more problematic than the proliferation of channels.

51. The United States agreed with the need to address jointly the challenges set out in paragraph 21(b), though indicated its reluctance to include a deadline for agreeing guidelines to reduce proliferation. The United Kingdom agreed on the importance of the issues being addressed in paragraph 21(b), though indicated that some of the countries that it represents are concerned that the proposed commitment focuses on a process rather than setting out what it will achieve.

52. Participants agreed on the importance of the issues raised in paragraph 21(b) and the need to address these in the outcome document, though no consensus was reached on the text. Participants agreed on the need for the text to set out both a vision and concrete actions in this area.

53. The United Kingdom and South Africa agreed to propose alternative text for 21(b), with UNDP indicating its readiness to support further thinking in this area.

Paragraph 21(c) – Countries that receive insufficient assistance

54. Several participants (France, EC, United States) noted the importance of the issue of countries receiving insufficient assistance. The Chair reminded participants of an existing commitment to address this challenge in the AAA, which has thus far not led to progress. With this in mind, she asked that participants focus on proposing actions that might advance progress in this area.

55. The World Bank indicated that it would be difficult to agree on “actions to address this issue” when there is no consensus on how a country receiving insufficient assistance is defined, or on a list of such countries. It proposed the removal of text proposing that multilateral organisations could play a “balancing” role in the allocation of resources, noting that the problem of countries receiving insufficient assistance was in part the result of bilateral allocation decisions. Participants agreed to removal of text suggesting that multilateral organisations could play a specific role in addressing the needs of countries that receive insufficient assistance.

56. The United States proposed text which would commit stakeholders to put in place a framework by the end of 2012 to help address the issue of countries receiving insufficient assistance (see compendium). The Chair invited the United States to propose a shorter version of this text which may form the basis for compromise.

Paragraph 28(b) – Efforts to combat illicit flows in the absence of mutual legal assistance requests

57. The United States and EC proposed that the bracketed text (“including in the absence of mutual legal assistance requests”) should be deleted.

58. Participants agreed to the existing formulation and placement of paragraph 28 with the removal of the text contained in square brackets.

Paragraph 29 – Climate change finance

59. Participants expressed differing views on the extent to which the HLF-4 outcome document should consider climate change finance. China conveyed its view that the UNFCCC remains the appropriate forum for discussions on climate finance, proposing that HLF-4 is not an appropriate platform for this. Mexico, Rwanda, the United States and the EC expressed their broad support for a statement on climate finance and what may be learned from experiences to date in the area of development co-operation.

60. Honduras and the UNDG proposed revised text for paragraph 29 based on consultations with the UNFCCC. Participants agreed that this proposal could form a starting point for subsequent discussions on paragraph 29, and that it should overcome concerns from some stakeholders that HLF-4 should not seek to take decisions on matters that fall within the mandate of other international fora. The Chair invited participants to propose suggestions for refinements to the Honduras and UNDG text.

Paragraphs 30 and 31 – The road ahead

61. Introducing the discussion, the Chair pointed to the need for Busan to set out a consensus on two key issues: (i) the nature and scope of future efforts to monitor the Busan agreement, and (ii) the international mechanism through which implementation and political accountability will be supported.

62. Participants expressed a range of views on the elements of a proposal for post-Busan monitoring and governance structures set out in the draft outcome document. Consensus was reached on the need for the text of the outcome document to better reflect the globally “light” nature of proposed working modalities after HLF-4.

63. There was broad consensus on the need for future monitoring efforts and indicators to be focused at the country level, with support among several participants for these to be linked with a light global monitoring framework and indicators. Japan proposed the deletion of paragraphs 30(a) and (e) which refer to global indicators and monitoring processes. France agreed with the need for global-level benchmarks, though noted that annual reporting may be burdensome. The EC expressed its view that new indicators should not be developed, proposing that there are too many such indicators in place at present. BetterAid proposed that any indicators should be relevant, and that it has no objection to the development of a limited set of such indicators. Rwanda expressed its view that Busan must commit to the development of global targets, suggesting that the outcome document should go further by proposing such indicators and targets. Mali expressed its desire to see at least a simple set of indicators developed. The United Kingdom and UNDG pointed to the importance of a streamlined set of indicators.

64. Participants reached broad consensus on the need for a light global governance structure comprising a manageable political-level group convened regularly to oversee implementation of agreements, which ensure linkages with the work of the UN Development Cooperation Forum and other relevant fora. The United Kingdom drew the attention of participants to a brief paper presented by the Nordic plus group of countries which sets out an initial vision for post-Busan arrangements. It was agreed that such a global structure would require the support of a secretariat, with participants suggesting that the OECD and UNDP may be called on to fulfil such a role based on their respective comparative advantages, and ensuring strong linkages with efforts undertaken at the country level. UNDP expressed its interest and willingness to explore opportunities for such collaboration further.

65. China sought further clarification on the extent to which a post-Busan partnership should consider “development effectiveness”, indicating that it was giving further consideration to the formulation

of the partnership in the context of the outcome document. France suggested that the declaration by the G20 might act as a starting point for identifying an approach and scope for such a partnership.

66. The Bureau and Secretariat agreed to propose revised text for paragraphs 12, 30 and 31 in order to try and better reflect elements of emerging consensus. It was suggested that the meeting on 18 November should lead to consensus on commitments and actions that are specific enough to facilitate future monitoring.

Other issues relating to the third draft outcome document

67. Some participants noted the desire to ensure that some parts of the outcome document that were not discussed in the meeting are given consideration in the meeting of 18 November. Timor-Leste and UNDG asked that the Bureau give specific consideration to proposals made in writing on fragile states. The United States highlighted its serious concern with paragraph 15(b) and its provision that providers of development co-operation should refrain from imposing additional frameworks, while also highlighting its desire to see the issue of gender equality featuring more prominently in the document. South Africa asked that further consideration be given to the content and placement of paragraph 16 as it relates to effective institutions. The Chair indicated that the meeting of 18 November should offer an opportunity to consider text provided by the champions of the HLF-4 building block on effective institutions. BetterAid invited participants to review a proposal submitted in writing relating to the role of social partners.

68. The Chair noted these concerns and indicated that efforts would be made to cover other issues highlighted by participants as the most important priorities in the meeting of 18 November.

III. Next steps

69. The Chair thanked participants for their active participation in the discussions while stressing the need for the meeting of 18 November to go further in reaching consensus on outstanding issues. The Chair urged participants to consult with their respective ministers and constituents over the coming days with a view to proposing compromise in those areas where no consensus has been reached.

70. It was agreed that where individual participants were called on to provide proposals for revised text, such proposals should be submitted to the Secretariat no later than 0800hrs CET on Tuesday, 8 November 2011. The following participants agreed to provide such inputs:

- China and BetterAid to review Mexico's proposal for a new paragraph 12 explaining the differentiation of stakeholders and their responsibilities, and to propose refinements to this as appropriate.
- United Kingdom and EC to propose text on untying (15d) that would go beyond existing agreements and could form the basis for compromise.
- France to propose edits to the paragraph on transparency (paragraph 20) with a view to further clarifying the purpose of the actions set out.
- United States to propose text that would support full implementation of existing commitments on medium-term predictability (paragraph 20d).
- United Kingdom and South Africa to propose text relating to multilateral effectiveness and proliferation (21b).

- United States to propose a shorter version of its proposal for 21(c) on countries receiving insufficient assistance.
- All participants invited to propose further refinements to the text proposed by Honduras and the UNDG relating to climate finance (replacement paragraph 29).

71. The Bureau will, with the support of the Secretariat, propose a revised draft outcome document reflecting the consensus reached in the meeting with a view to ensuring its circulation to HLF-4 stakeholders by Thursday 10 November. This revised text will act as a starting point for the discussions of the group of sherpas in their meeting on 18 November 2011.

Annex A: Draft Agenda

MEETING OF THE GROUP OF HLF-4 OUTCOME DOCUMENT SHERPAS

4 November 2011
OECD Conference Centre, 2 rue André Pascal, 75116 Paris

DRAFT AGENDA

Friday, 4 November 2011	
Venue: Restaurant des Nations, OECD Conference Centre	
1230-1330hrs	<p>Lunch with the DAC Chair (for designated sherpas only)</p> <p>This lunch will provide the opportunity for introductions and initial discussion among the sherpas. The DAC Chair, Mr Brian Atwood, will offer an overview of the main points relating to HLF-4 preparations from the meeting of the DAC held on 3 November.</p>
Venue: Chateau Room E, OECD Conference Centre	
1345-1400hrs	<p>1. Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductory remarks (Ms. Enna Park, Korea) • Adoption of the agenda • Approval of the summary of the telephone conference of 27 October 2011 [DCD/DAC/EFF/M(2011)3/PROV]
1400-1530hrs	<p>2. Detailed discussion of the third draft Outcome Document for HLF-4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall political messaging and discussion of specific proposals for amendments to paragraphs 1-12 (“preamble”). • Clarifying differentiation of responsibilities and commitments by different stakeholders. • Paragraph 15(e) – untying of aid
<i>1530-1545hrs</i>	<i>Break</i>

1545-1800hrs	2. Detailed discussion of the third draft Outcome Document for HLF-4 (cont'd) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Paragraph 20(c) – provisions relating to transparency of development co-operation• Paragraph 20(d) – commitment to medium-term predictability• Paragraphs 21(a) to 21(c) – fragmentation, proliferation, multilateral effectiveness and countries that receive insufficient assistance
<i>1800-1815hrs</i>	<i>Break</i>
1815-1945hrs	2. Detailed discussion of the third draft Outcome Document for HLF-4 (cont'd) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Paragraph 28(b) – efforts to combat illicit flows in the absence of mutual legal assistance requests• Paragraphs 29(b) and (c) – global climate change finance• Paragraphs 30 and 31 – The road ahead
1945-2000hrs	3. Next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Summarising points of consensus.• Identification of priorities for discussion prior to and on 18 November.

Annex B: List of participants

Chair

Ms. Enna PARK

Director General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Korea (WP-EFF Vice-Chair).

Bangladesh

Mr. Monowar AHMED

(representing Mr. Iqbal MAHMOOD)

Secretary, ERD, Ministry of Finance.

BetterAid

Mr. Antonio TUJAN

International Director, IBON.

China

Mr. Yong LI

(representing Ms. Ruhua CHEN)

First Secretary, Embassy of the People's Republic of China, Paris.

European Commission

Mr. Gustavo MARTIN PRADA

Directeur de la Direction A, DG DEVCO

France

Mr. Serge TOMASI

Director of Global Economy and Strategy, Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs

Honduras

Ms. Lidia FROMM CEA

Director General for Co-operation, Ministry of Planning and Co-operation

Japan

Mr. Mitsuhiro WADA

Deputy Director General, International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mali

Mr. Modibo MAKALOU

*Coordinateur, Mission de Développement et
Coopération, Présidence de la République*

Mexico

Mr. Gerardo BRACHO

Counsellor to the OECD

Rwanda

Mr. Ronald NKUSI

*Director, External Finance, Ministry of Finance
and Economic Planning*

South Africa

Ms. Mmakgoshi PHETLA-LEKHETHE

*Director General, National Treasury of South
Africa*

Timor-Leste

Mr. Helder DA COSTA

*National Co-ordinator, International Secretariat of
g7+, Aid Effectiveness Directorate, Ministry of
Finance*

United Kingdom

Mr. Richard CALVERT

*Director General, Department for International
Development*

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Ms. Sigrid KAAG

*Assistant Secretary-General and Assistant
Administrator, Partnerships Bureau*

United States

Mr. Dirk DIJKERMAN

U.S. Representative to the DAC

World Bank

Mr. R. Kyle PETERS

Director, Operations Policy and Country Services

OECD

Mr. Brian ATWOOD (observer)

DAC Chair

Mr. Jon LOMØY

Director, Development Co-operation Directorate

Ms. Brenda KILLEN

Head of Division, Aid Quality and Architecture

Mr. Robin OGILVY

Policy Analyst, Aid Quality and Architecture