

d·i·e

Deutsches Institut für
Entwicklungspolitik



German Development
Institute



Konrad
Adenauer
Stiftung

Expert Workshop

Development Cooperation for Achieving the 2030 Agenda: The Way Forward

Summary Report

Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung¹ New York Office, 23 May 2018, 9am – 6:30 pm

Key Points from the Discussion

Achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development requires transformative change and massive contributions from multiple stakeholders, including the public and private sectors and civil society. By bringing together researchers from emerging economies, developing countries and OECD DAC countries this [workshop](#) encouraged discussions going beyond traditional political patterns and lines of argumentation. The 48 participants (researchers, policy makers, representatives of international organizations, and UN delegates) represented a broad range of different backgrounds in terms of countries, organizations, disciplines and research areas. They contributed to a frank and open exchange of views on current issues in development cooperation. The workshop presentations, papers and discussions are the basis for chapters of a book edited by NeST and DIE colleagues. Some of the key points discussed were:

- **Profound changing context of development cooperation:** The global development landscape is significantly changing in terms of public and private relations, the scope of the global collective action and geopolitical power dynamics, which increases requirements on policy coordination, integration and coherence, but also has led to gridlock in many areas of global cooperation, including North-South Cooperation (NSC) and South-South Cooperation (SSC). Triangular cooperation can help overcome gridlocks between NSC and SSC.
- **Addressing global gridlock in discussing SSC and NSC through:** reverting to bottom up approaches from the local, national or regional levels, when negotiations are stuck at the global level; encouraging leadership for multilateralism from individual countries; adopting the Paris Agreement on Climate Change model of “concentric differentiation” of global responsibilities; and taking up the “Korean Deal” of differentiated responsibilities according to own terms.
- **Central topics to watch for in BAPA+40 deliberations:** the potential inclusion of a follow-up mechanism for monitoring the BAPA+40 outcome, the potential inclusion of a monitoring framework, the role of various stakeholders in the deliberation process (e.g. researchers, civil society, SMEs), debates on large-scale infrastructure initiatives like China’s Belt and Road Initiative and discussing financial cooperation alongside technical cooperation.
- **Acknowledging differentiation of “the South”:** there is a need for new labels, such as “North of the South”, “South of the South” or “Middle of the South” to reflect the heterogeneity of the South. At the same time, political debates do not yet adequately reflect this reality.
- **Monitoring and evaluation of SSC, Official Development Assistance (ODA) and private sector:** There is genuine interest in development cooperation to improve transparency and focus on principle based

¹ The workshop was jointly organized by NeST and DIE in collaboration with Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung NY

cooperation. Many existing monitoring initiatives already go beyond the current state of politicised debates and demonstrate real impacts in terms of improvements in people's lives.

Summary

After the "Welcome Remarks" provided by **Stefan Friedrich** (KAS-New York), **Elizabeth Sidiropoulos** (Network of Southern Think Tanks, NeST) and **Stephan Klingebiel** (German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE)), **Jorge Chediek** (United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation) delivered a keynote address on South-South Cooperation (SSC) and Triangular Cooperation (TrC).

Jorge Chediek explained the current process of organizing the [Second High-level United Nations Conference on South-South Cooperation](#) (BAPA+40 Conference) to be held in Buenos Aires from 20 to 22 March 2019 and outlined the need to enhance SSC and TrC to implement the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). At the same time, he recognised many initiatives that have been launched since 1978. He described the challenge of what role the UN should play in the global architecture of development cooperation as a central issue in the deliberations. During the discussion key questions were: How do the conference organizers intend to create a value-addition? How to avoid the repetition of already existing resolutions? How to tackle some pressing issues like private sector engagement (PSE), blended finance and climate change? As a response, Jorge Chediek laid out the current deliberation format and invited active engagement from all stakeholders, including from NeST and DIE. He also asked to manage expectations as some "issues are too big to sort them out, so there won't be a resolution on it." Instead, he highlighted that much work is already ongoing "in the South" on these issues and questioned the need of a universal methodology. From his point of view, a central challenge arising from previous resolutions is their missing implementation and a major improvement for BAPA+40 would be the inclusion of a follow-up mechanism.

Session I: The Changing Context of Development Cooperation - Current Narratives and Trends

The Session was moderated by **Lisa Orrenius** (Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation). The speakers presented different views on the current state of development cooperation in terms of convergence and divergence and on the respective changes inspired by the 2030 Agenda.

Milindo Chakrabarti (Research and Information System for Developing Countries, RIS) demanded that BAPA+40 should focus more on how the Southern countries can better engage in development cooperation. Based on his work with **Sachin Chaturvedi** (RIS), he argued that the "institutional architecture determines the rules of the game to be followed in distribution of access to, withdrawal of, management of, exclusion from, making alteration to and alienation of resources." He also claimed that an "appropriate institutional structure" needs to involve a balancing of interests (= collective action) of all stakeholders to "ensure optimal utilization of the resource in question." Such a structure also requires the definition of rules for operation and rules for specifying the terms and conditions for governance. An example for such a structure is the [International Solar Alliance](#), a multi-stakeholder alliance committed to making the costs of solar power more affordable for remote and inaccessible communities.

Paulo Esteves (BRICS Policy Center) presented a paper co-authored with **Stephan Klingebiel** (DIE) in which they discuss changes of ideas, norms and patterns of development cooperation. By applying a so-called "norm cluster" they examine three processes of development cooperation, which they title: "1) The establishing of twin norm clusters: Official Development Assistance (ODA) and SSC, 2) From Paris to Busan: from diffusion to fusion, 3) After Busan: confusion". Based on this framework, they observe the diffusion of SSC norms exemplified by the trend of Southernization of ODA, "a merger on the level of 'problems' and 'values' but separate approaches when it comes to 'behaviour'" and a widening gap on all three levels "not least because of more confused OECD approaches and actor specific SSC approaches".

Rena Melis Baydag (Ruhr-University Bochum) built her analysis on the foreign aid behaviours of Korea and Turkey on the middle power theory. She illustrated that Korea applied a rather "global approach", while Turkey

followed a more “culture- & region-specific approach” in development cooperation. As middle powers, however, both seem to “pursue a flexible approach between the OECD DAC and SSC”.

[Heiner Janus](#) (DIE) presented a paper jointly written with **Tang Lixia** (China Agricultural University). They examine three ideas - the 2030 Agenda, mutual benefit and development results - which Mr. Janus described in the words of Béland and Cox (2016) as “coalition magnet ideas” because they illustrate means to foster ideational convergence around a specific corridor of policy options (“the extent to which ideas (causal beliefs) held by different development actors become more similar over time”).

In his comment on the presentations, **Bruce Jenks** (Columbia University) highlighted “the sense and the depth of the changing times that we are living in” and outlined that the way the world proceeded has proven wrong many assumptions made over the past decades. To avoid a repetition in this way, he argued in favour of more in-depth research to contribute to a better understanding of the changing world, for instance, on the relationships between the public and private, the scope of the global collective approach and on the challenging powers (versus the status quo powers). In a second comment, **Hamid Rashid** (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, UN DESA) argued against the still widespread focus on the project level in development cooperation assessments. From his perception, this limited view complicates the emergence of a crosscutting approach to development cooperation that is required for implementing the SDGs. Instead of promoting sectoral approaches, he called for aligning policies at the macro and micro levels, in order to develop truly integrative approaches.

In the discussion, several participants related to the case of the International Solar Alliance, and raised further questions on the governance of the initiative and other similar multi-stakeholder initiatives, for example, in regard to the distribution of funding and on the role of subnational units. It was argued that this case exemplified the many similarities in SSC and NSC. Therefore, some suggested speaking of development cooperation instead of SSC. Others wondered whether there are precise mechanisms from where norms diffuse and highlighted the need to better understand how some norms affect the “Global North” and the “Global South” to assess whether there is a real divergence of norms, or whether this divergence is mostly based on the framing of discourse.

Session II: The Global Architecture - Points of Convergence and Divergence

The Session was moderated by **Gülden Türköz-Cosslet** (United Nations Development Programme, UNDP). The presentations addressed the question of how existing platforms can be renewed or better used to improve the effectiveness of development cooperation.

[Qi Gubo](#) (China Agricultural University) presented a paper jointly written with [Li Xiaoyun](#) (China International Development Research Network) and analysed the prospects for China to join the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (GPEDC). She illustrated the history of the GPEDC, and criticised that concepts, such as the often promoted “shared value”-concept, claim to be neutral and sympathetic but “could actually be argued as embodying the West’s hegemony to a certain degree”. She then assessed the role of the GPEDC in the global governance structure and outlined that the “DAC-based development cooperation system has accumulated rich experiences and lessons in almost all aspects of development assistance”. In her view, the role of “emerging powers in international development can only be complementary to the exiting development cooperation structure”. To make the GPEDC more legitimate, she demanded efforts from both sides – the GPEDC and the emerging powers. In the case of China, the GPEDC should propose a concrete field that China might be interested in, such as the Belt and Road Initiative. Correspondingly, China should take the GPEDC as an opportunity to form a joint force to play a role in global development.

[Gerardo Bracho](#) (Centre for Global Cooperation Research) at the beginning of his presentation, referred to the 38 or so “new donor countries” that have appeared in development cooperation since the end of the Cold War, around 10 of them being “Southern Providers”. Focusing on [the GPEDC](#), he argued that the promise from Busan (2011) to create a real global partnership was broken because of the OECD’s push towards a shared monitoring framework. The Southern providers did not accept to be evaluated on the basis of one common

framework: the GPEDC's monitoring framework, which is also used for assessing OECD donors. In Busan, in what Mr. Bracho called the "Korean Deal", it was agreed that the new donors from the South should have been monitored on the basis of different standards to be developed by themselves. However, the new Southern providers failed to specify their different commitments and standards and the GPEDC started monitoring them according to the GPEDC framework. The main Southern providers left the GPEDC and the Busan promise did not materialize. Further, from his point of view, the fragmentation of the Southern provider constituency has up to now more generally limited advances in the SSC narrative.

Vitalice Meja (Reality of Aid Africa Network) focused on the private sector in SSC and presented the cases of Kenya and Uganda to illustrate that the perspective of the providers often dominates the voice and interests of the recipients. While the providers, for example, are interested in the question of how to bridge financial deficits at the national level, for the recipients it is of crucial significance how the investments are made. He argued that investments are regularly tied to private sector actors from provider countries (e.g. in the cases of China and India). Partner governments, such as in Kenya and Uganda, protect such investments politically. From his perspective, it is important to underscore the need for more ownership of the development agenda by governments and to balance win-wins, for instance by considering the domestic private sector.

By asking whether it is necessary to push a systemic approach or to focus on an actor-centric perspective to include emerging economies in a global development cooperation regime **André de Mello e Souza** (Institute for Applied Economic Research) touched the "global architecture" from a different angle. He argued that despite all challenges it is worth building a global development cooperation regime because of the common interests shared with the adoption of the 2030 Agenda and related efficiency gains. Yet, he outlined that for the implementation of some SDGs international cooperation is more important than for other SDGs that depend on national policies.

In his comment, **Manuel Montes** (South Centre) emphasised that development cooperation is not just about the flows of aid and that it is necessary to pay more attention to analytical and historical contexts. For example, one needs to acknowledge that the effectiveness agenda did not start in Paris 2005 but with the Monterrey Consensus in 2002. Moreover, he argued that if governments are not able to regulate private sector actors in terms of illicit financial flows, then the interaction in these flows (public and private) will be incoherent and further contribute to the current unstable and disabling global system. **Uwe Gehlen** (German Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development, BMZ) stressed the need to relate political discussions across the various global platforms to academic assessments. From his perspective, most governments have not changed their agendas and thereby contribute to the gap between "where we want to go in development cooperation and what is really happening." He concluded that we often ask for reforms of existing institutions, but that in the end nothing really changes.

In the discussion, various participants shared ideas for addressing the stalemate in reforms of global institutions in regard to SSC and NSC. Some argued for bottom up approaches from the local, national or regional levels, when negotiations are stuck at the global level. Others referred to the Paris Agreement on Climate Change as a model for "concentric differentiation" of global responsibilities. Another call was made for strong individual leadership, ideally coming from a Head of State, to establish own commitments for international cooperation, for instance by taking up the "Korean Deal" again. Finally, the global development cooperation architecture should not be discussed in isolation, but rather as part of a global "investment and cooperation regime" that emphasizes policy coherence.

Session III: Policy-Roundtable on the Road to BAPA+40

Session III was structured as a Policy-Roundtable to discuss important steps on "the Road to BAPA+40" and was moderated by **Stephan Klingebiel** (DIE). Different from the other sessions, this session was not based on presentations of papers but focused on policy perspectives. The short inputs provided by the five panellists touched on different aspects that shape SSC.

Ambassador Philip Ochen Odida (Permanent Mission of Uganda to the UN), for example, highlighted the huge potential of SSC for capacity building and funding and called for implementing existing commitments, regardless whether they were made by North or South. [Tarik Iziraren](#) (UNOSSC) argued that the UN agencies need to learn more about SSC and that agreement on a shared understanding of monitoring and capacity building could be seen as success factors for the negotiation of the BAPA+40 outcome document. **Andreas Pfeil** (Permanent Mission of Germany to the UN) underlined the need of more differentiation between North-South Cooperation (NSC) and SSC. NSC is often depicted as being about financing and SSC seen as capacity building, although in reality NSC also contributes to technical cooperation and SSC provides financing. Regarding complementarity of NSC and SSC, Mr. Pfeil remarked that more transparency of SSC would be a precondition for understanding the extent of the complementarity of SSC.

Elizabeth Sidiropoulos (South African Institute of International Affairs) put emphasis on the broader geopolitical trends that also influence how processes in development cooperation move forward, as the example of China's Belt and Road Initiative illustrates. Such mega infrastructure initiatives demonstrate the huge complexity and scale of today's development initiatives in comparison to 1978. **Jimena Leiva Roesch** (International Peace Institute) called for a greater focus on trust-building in development cooperation and particularly during the BAPA+40 preparations as from her point of view, "once you create trust, the page is open for new ideas". In particular, the BAPA+40 process should not rely on agreed language, but include new language and give more voice to small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), as they are at the forefront of SSC.

In the discussion, one participant noted that the BAPA+40 process should not only consider "SSC as complement, not substitute", but also pay attention to competitive dynamics between NSC and SSC that are an obstacle for achieving the SDGs. Another participant remarked that debates should move beyond the SSC label that has become outdated over the last 40 years. New discussions on "North of the South", "South of the South" or "Middle of the South" might be needed. The issue of "intertemporal codification" was raised, meaning that international conferences like BAPA+40 are an opportunity to codify existing debates (like on a monitoring framework for SSC) as well as to raise new issues, for instance the acknowledgement of the heterogeneity of the South or a focus on illicit financial flows. Multiple participants brought up the issue of leadership, calling for a country from the South that move beyond old patterns in the BAPA+40 process. Finally, several panellist and participants stressed that new patterns of cooperation across NSC, SSC and within SSC are already a reality, such as the Asian Infrastructure Bank (OECD DAC countries as members) or new infrastructure initiatives by multilateral development banks (e.g. World Bank and African Development Bank).

Session IV: Development Cooperation - Frameworks, Theories and Imperatives for Assessments

Session IV was moderated by **Rahul Malhotra** (OECD) and presented different examples of ongoing monitoring initiatives and case studies.

[Debapriya Bhattacharya](#) (Centre for Policy Dialogue) presented his study on the GPEDC monitoring framework that remains the only global mechanism available for gathering a diverse set of stakeholders around measuring the effectiveness of development cooperation at the country-level. He described the current revisions of the monitoring framework and then outlined three scenarios for the future: 1) business as usual; 2) aspirational; 3) move towards new platform. In the third scenario, OECD DAC members and Southern providers would find a space for comfortable co-existence in the UN system, and agree on common principles for effectiveness but differentiated assessment approaches for measuring the relevance, efficiency and usefulness of the different actors. Such a drastic change from the current status quo might, however, requires "divine intervention". In the meantime, GPEDC should evolve towards a safe space for learning on different approaches.

[Dorothea Wehrmann](#) (DIE) presented a paper jointly written with **Jorge Pineda** on the changing role of the private sector for development cooperation, in which they analyse the GPEDC and the Alliance for Sustainability as cases for understanding the levels of engagement of private sector actors in development cooperation. They

apply the concept of “orchestration” to assess which limitations and potentials multi-stakeholder partnerships like the GPEDC have for engaging the private sector in development cooperation.

[Neissan Besharati](#) (Institute for Global Dialogue) shared findings from his study on the evolving development finance landscape in Malawi, which despite ranking low on indices of human development and income has taken remarkable steps towards achieving the SDGs. An increasing share of Malawi’s development finance comes from Brazil, China and India, while traditional ODA has stagnated. A similar pattern can be observed in trade and private finance, where emerging countries and other African developing countries have an increasingly important role in Malawi.

[Murad Ali](#) (DIE) introduced his study on the [China-Pakistan Economic Corridor \(CPEC\) and the monitoring and evaluation in South-South Cooperation](#), where he understands SSC as a package of loans, grants, trade, investment and technical cooperation. CPEC itself is a USD 46 billion investment-aid-loan model, which he assesses through a M&E framework developed by NeST. His paper shows that Pakistan has institutional mechanisms in place that guarantee ownership but that non-state actors and civil society play little role in this regard. Further, CPEC shows mixed characteristics in terms of horizontality of cooperation, self-reliance and transparency, while overall development efficiency looks promising but is too early to prejudge.

In her comments, **Gail Hurley** (UNDP) challenged the presenters regarding their portrayal of SSC as demand driven and speedy in delivery. She pointed out that these perceived benefits might have costs in terms of lacking local participation, lacking utilization of local resources and overall short-term orientation. Yet, the current development finance landscape is also shaped by the sudden and almost complete withdrawal of OECD DAC donors from budget support, although this modality has proven developmental benefits over the project modality. **Barbara Adams** (Global Policy Forum) warned that there are also unintended consequences built into the SDG indicators, in particular the multi-stakeholder partnerships indicator. This indicator allows for reporting of self-identified partnerships, where the actors are not necessarily motivated by delivering developmental benefits. Regarding the Malawi case study, Ms. Adams expressed the wish that a similar diversification of development funders would also take place in the UN context, where funding is still mainly provided by rich OECD countries.

In the discussion, participants observed that the academic contributions of this session have moved beyond the political debates of policy makers, who would need to catch up to reality. Regarding the GPEDC monitoring, one colleague remarked that there was a strong link between national SDG reporting through voluntary national reviews and the GPEDC framework already. On the actual SDG contributions of companies working within SSC initiatives, it was criticised that currently there is no way to assess or compare the extent of contributions. Another colleague stated that the cases presented work well within a political context that is geared towards preserving sovereignty of the actors involved, but face challenges whenever actors try to transition towards global rule-based systems for cooperation. A panellist added that the current post-modern, individualistic and interest-driven world requires a granular perspective that focuses on rebuilding cooperation from the bottom-up.

In his concluding remarks, **Rahul Malhotra** underscored that, despite all challenges outlined in this session, there is a genuine underlying interest in transparency and accountability. We should therefore not give up on the principle-based nature of development cooperation and remember that we are committed to “leaving no-one behind” when we talk about development results.

Session V: Transnational and National Perspectives on Development Cooperation for Achieving the SDGs

Session V was moderated by **Minh-Thu Pham** (United Nations Foundation) and showcased different transnational and national perspectives on development cooperation.

Elizabeth Sidiropoulos (SAIIA) shared a detailed analysis of South Africa's changing role in development structures. She explained that South Africa has gone through a review of its foreign policy strategies and is now more strongly aligned with the SDGs. On the specific issue of human rights, she stated that there is a growing trend in the South that sees the principle of universality as an instrument of neo-colonial domination. Similarly, the issue of multi-stakeholder partnerships is often seen as undermining the power of the state, which is also one reason why the GPEDC is not seen as having a lot of political traction.

Admos Chimhowu (University of Manchester) presented reflections on the role of development cooperation in new national planning in Least Developed Countries. The underlying empirical phenomenon is the resurgence of national planning and a proliferation of development plans across many countries – today 135 countries have national development plans compared to 62 in 2006. Development cooperation is mentioned in 103 plans mainly in the context of financing, M&E, knowledge circulation or managing globalization (e.g. value chains). In a next step after the initial mapping, it is planned to assess causality between the quality of plans and the outcomes in terms of achieving the SDGs.

Moritz Weigel (The ChinaAfricaAdvisory) highlighted the potential of triangular cooperation on climate change for achieving the SDGs through cooperation between Germany, China and Ethiopia in the transport sector. In Ethiopia, there is a commitment to low-emission climate-resilient transport as documented in various government plans and recent examples of railway construction. China and Germany both have proven track records in this field and have the necessary institutional structures for triangular cooperation, which could be a key starting point for such cooperation in Ethiopia.

Juliana Costa (Articulação Sul) shared a summary of a study on measuring and monitoring Brazilian South-South cooperation from a budgetary perspective. She explained that from 2000-2016 SSC accounted for 28% in Brazil's budget for international cooperation. Through an open and participatory methodology such analysis of the Brazilian budget can help to address the data gap and clarify Brazil's contribution to achieving the SDGs, while enabling an inclusive dialogue among key stakeholders in Brazil on these issues.

In his comments, **Friedrich Soltau** (UN DESA) addressed all four presentations. He agreed the renewed emphasis of South Africa on making partnerships more effective for achieving the SDGs. For national planning, he confirmed that NVRs presented in the High-level Political Forum also indicate the resurgence of planning and looks forward to learning more about the underlying causalities. On triangular cooperation, he wondered whether there should be a dedicated global platform and on budget reporting in Brazil he suggested that other countries also follow such an approach. **Yuko Suzuki Naab** (UNDP) underscored the importance of country context and country ownership across all presentations. She affirmed that planning and financing should not be done in an isolated manner, but rather inform each other. Some efforts in this regard are being undertaken in the GPEDC, which through several initiatives at the country-level focuses on technical aspects of development cooperation that can serve to inform some of the political debates.

In the discussion, one participant questioned how much good planning really matters, as history provides many examples of successful economic transformation with minimal planning. Another colleague challenged the notion that SSC providers are more price competitive, as this is often an assumption that is made without having a real counterfactual to compare against. Some countries are not getting “the best bang for the buck” and just add debt to their growing piles of debt. Further, the issue of a missing regional perspective in many of the debates on SSC, NSC and SDGs was raised. Particularly in politically sensitive areas and situations of global stalemate, the regional dimension of cooperation can be a viable alternative route. Finally, a participant referred back to the BAPA+40 process and criticized the overall lack of ambition, as four decades later discussions still center on technical cooperation, which he called “BAPA-40”.

In the final wrap-up, **Uwe Gehlen** (BMZ), **André de Mello e Souza** (Institute for Applied Economic Research) and **Stephan Klingebiel** (DIE) thanked all participants for their excellent contributions and outlined next steps towards publishing workshop contributions as a book. In particular, they emphasized the importance of bringing

diplomats, policy makers and academic research from various countries together, in order to inform important global negotiations like BAPA+40.