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On March 2009, the Government of Colombia presented a proposal to the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF) of the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD-DAC) for the creation of a Southern-led platform to map the synergies between South-South cooperation and aid effectiveness and to identify good practices. Resulting from the strong support received by many partners, especially the middle-income countries, the Task Team on South-South Cooperation (TT-SSC) was endorsed by the WP-EFF.

What followed were months of building a framework, including identifying and engaging key people and gathering resources, which then allowed us to launch the TT-SSC in September 2009 with the participation of more than seventy representatives from partner countries, multilateral institutions, donors, and civil society organizations all over the world.

Today, only six months after its launch, the TT-SSC has proved to be an extremely vibrant and vivid platform for representatives of a changing, proactive, and innovative developing world. In this short period of time, TT-SSC members have met in Addis Ababa, Bogotá, Brussels, Mexico City, Pretoria, Seoul, and Washington, DC, reflecting on how South-South cooperation can be embedded in the evolving effectiveness agenda. Regional platforms have engaged with the TT-SSC, such as New Partnership for Africa’s Development in Africa, the Asian Development Bank in Asia-Pacific, and the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Organization of American States in Latin America and the Caribbean. At the global level, the World Bank Institute supports our efforts and a global core team is guiding us through the analytical, policy, and communication work.

Importantly, the TT-SSC has also become a vital place to discuss our role as partner countries in building a Southern agenda that could contribute more inclusive and effective development architecture. Together with other global platforms, such as the UN Development Cooperation Forum at the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), our common vision is that it is high time for the developing world to not only influence, but actually shape global development policies.

What you hold in your hands is a direct consequence of the TT-SSC’s desire to map Southern
practices and experiences in order to build evidences for global policy-making. Just in time for the High Level Event on South-South Cooperation and Capacity Development in Bogotá on March 24–25, 2010, this case story catalogue illustrates the enormous energy that developing countries and other partners are investing in showing the reality of South-South cooperation and its potential to move ahead toward more inclusive and effective development partnerships.

In the following pages, you will be able to take a glance at the TT-SSC’s work and read the main messages emerging from 110 case stories involving practitioner and cooperation officials from 133 countries, as well as 10 multilateral organizations, 4 civil society organizations, and 3 parliamentary bodies from all over the world, and revise overviews of all case stories.

And this is only a starting point. As planned, the TT-SSC is now preparing the next phase. Deeper case studies will help to identify good practices on South-South cooperation in the context of aid effectiveness, which will in turn inform the High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Seoul in late 2011. We have clearly heard the message of developing countries that, despite all restraints in time and resources, have contributed their rich and diverse experiences. The message is that a South-South learning and knowledge exchange is to become a core element of the evolving global development architecture.

Enrique Maruri Londoño
Chair, TT-SSC
Bogotá, March 12, 2010
The Task Team on South-South Cooperation at a Glance

1. WHAT IS THE TASK TEAM ON SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION?

The Task Team on South-South Cooperation (TT-SSC) brings together partner countries, especially middle-income countries, donors, civil society, academia, and regional and multilateral agencies under a common objective of mapping, documenting, analyzing, and discussing evidence on the synergies between the principles of aid effectiveness and the practices of South-South Cooperation (SSC).

Derived from the Accra Agenda for Action’s commitment to inclusive partnerships, the TT-SSC is a Southern-led platform hosted by the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF) at the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD-DAC). The TT-SSC is chaired by Colombia, with active support from the World Bank Institute and regional platforms in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and the Caribbean.

The TT-SSC’s activities search to contribute to defining the role of partner countries and Southern perspectives in the evolving global aid architecture. The TT-SSC is contributing to global policy-making, leading up to the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, to be held in Korea in 2011, and other influential fora and platforms.

2. WHY DOES SSC MATTER IN THE CONTEXT OF AID EFFECTIVENESS?

In the ever-changing global development governance, SSC entails diverse forms of cooperation among developing countries. In this context, the TT-SSC focuses on documenting, analyzing, and discussing practices of SSC and their synergies with the aid effectiveness agenda, particularly addressing a “threefold mandate” emerging from the Accra Agenda for Action (article 19):

- Adapting the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action principles for SSC (AAA art. 19a);
- Enriching the effectiveness agenda with the practices and experiences of SSC (AAA art. 19b);
• Identifying complementarities between SSC and North-South cooperation (AAA art. 19e).

The TT’s analytical work focuses on the practices of technical cooperation, in particular those led by middle-income countries, as both providers and recipients of development assistance. At the global level, the TT-SSC aims to contribute to the evolving global effectiveness agenda by boosting horizontal partnerships and peer learning, making technical cooperation more useful, promoting Southern expertise, and contributing to developing capacities.

Being a young but vibrant platform, the TT-SSC has identified key aspects to guarantee the quality of its analytical work as a real learning process and not just a marketing exercise of South-South Cooperation. In this sense, identifying not only what works, but also those aspects that do not work so well in SSC practices has emerged as a critical challenge to ensure straightforward messages.

3. TT-SSC: A SIX-MONTH JOURNEY

During its first six months of work, the TT-SSC has focused its attention on two main aspects: strengthening regional platforms and collecting and analyzing South-South cooperation cases stories within the framework of aid effectiveness.

Strengthening regional platforms

The support of New Partnership for Africa’s Development in Africa, Asian Development Bank in Asia-Pacific, and the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Organization of American States in Latin America and the Caribbean has been crucial to inform and involve countries and organizations from all three regions in the call for case stories and the organization of the TT’s regional meetings with the aim to generate and share regional perspectives.

The work promoted by these platforms has been substantial for the inputs of the TT-SSC in the organization of the Bogotá High Level Event on South-South Cooperation and Capacity Development. Providing cases and recommendations from the different regions allows ensuring a diverse and broad spectrum of perspectives in which to ground an event that is inclusive and representative of Southern actors. The next step in the TT’s journey is to deepen the consolidation of dialogue and articulation mechanisms among the regional platforms and other SSC platforms.

Generating an analytical work based on collected case stories

The core of the TT-SSC’s activity is building an evidence base for mapping South-South Cooperation practices in the context of aid effectiveness. From late November 2009 to January 2010, there was an open call for case stories on experiences that address South-South or triangular technical cooperation among two or more governments or organizations.

After nine weeks, 110 cases involving 133 countries were submitted. These cases involved a wide range of topics, budgets, institutional engagements, and regional and interregional connections. Even though this is only a first step in the collection of experiences and analytical work, the wide response from countries and organizations involved in South-South and triangular cooperation demonstrates the relevance of the TT’s undertaking. These cases and their analysis by the TT-SSC are essential inputs for the evidence-based approach that will give ground to the discussions at the Bogotá High Level Event. The next step in this direction is to deepen the learning process and to take the step forward from case stories to case studies, which may provide better evidence for policy recommendations.

The synthesis report of the cases and all the cases can be consulted at www.southsouthcases.info. For further information and feedback on the TT-SSC, please contact the TT-SSC core team at southsouthcases@gmail.com.
South-South cooperation in the context of aid effectiveness

Telling the story of partners in 110 cases of South-South and triangular cooperation

Non-reviewed first draft (March 12, 2010)

Disclaimer: This document is a first draft of the summary report on 110 case stories presented to the Task Team on South-South Cooperation between December 22, 2009, and February 25, 2010. It intends to serve as an input to the discussions at the High Level Event on South-South Cooperation and Capacity Development in Bogotá on March 24–25, 2010. Due to time constraints, this version has not undergone peer review and thus should not be treated as a final draft. Peer reviews will be conducted over the next weeks in order to obtain a consolidated version.

Nils-Sjard Schulz
Policy advisor to the Task Team on South-South Cooperation

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: BOOSTING SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION IN THE CONTEXT OF AID EFFECTIVENESS

In less than three months, dozens of countries and organizations drafted and discussed 110 case stories in which they shared their experiences and practices on South-South cooperation in the context of aid effectiveness. This summary report is only an early exploration of the enormous diversity and strength of the contents and messages that individuals in ministries, agencies, academia, civil society and parliamentary organizations contributed to the process of the TT-SSC.

From this vibrant process, the following key messages have emerged.

Adapting the aid effectiveness principles to South-South cooperation is a challenge welcomed by almost all case storytellers. Ownership (and
its democratic quality) seems to be one of the strengths, together with the use of specific comparative advantages, especially in difficult contexts. Three main tasks are pending for actors involved in South-South learning and knowledge exchange:

- **Information systems** need to be boosted in order to generate quantitative and qualitative data for measuring, assessing, and accounting for the inputs in a transparent, regular, and timely way;
- **Sound result management** may enable actors to show the scope, relevance, and impact of South-South knowledge exchange and learning;
- **Mutual accountability** is closely related to the previous two tasks and needs to be attended more consistently in the future, especially at the country level.

**Enriching the aid effectiveness agenda** with the practices and experiences of South-South cooperation will continue to be on the top of the agenda of those developing countries that desire to contribute clear-cut contents to global development policies. Regional platforms have a critical role to play to facilitate these contributions. Three main pillars can be used for deepening the agenda toward the Seoul HLF in 2011:

- **Horizontal partnership** is a key element for mutual learning among diverse development actors and is based on trust, mutual benefit, and equity;
- **Efficiency** in South-South knowledge exchange appears to outbid traditional technical cooperation, using not only cheaper, but also more adapted human resources. Yet, this thesis needs to be backed with accurate research on inputs and impacts;
- **Incentives for policy and institutional reform** are at the heart of South-South dynamics, especially in difficult contexts. Deeper analysis should explore the role of South-South incentives as a powerful tool for policy and institutional change and capacity development.

**Identifying complementarities between South-South and North-South cooperation** is not difficult in face of the increasing interest of traditional donors to become “emerging triangulators”, on the one hand, and the growing family of mechanisms, on the other. However, bringing diverse development actors together refers to very recent processes, reflecting also the new need for innovative collective action between different actors:

- **Triangular cooperation** appears as a still recent gangway with great potential for horizontal partnership and win-win-win situations. Learning from existing risks, such as transaction costs and fragile recipient ownership, should ultimately lead to stronger foundations for triangular efforts;
- **Several mechanisms for promoting South-South cooperation** are available and it is now time to build an architecture connecting national, regional, and global platforms where innovation, lessons, experiences, and forms of coordination can be captured and systematized.

### 2. SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION IN PRACTICE: THE CASE STORY PROCESS

In the midst of a multifaceted global crisis, policymakers and practitioners in the developing world and their partners share a perception: South-South learning and knowledge exchange is a powerful tool to assess development challenges and find paths to address them from within. There is a sense that, beyond conventional North-South transfer of expertise and technologies, developing countries’ skills and solutions can be extremely relevant to their peers and partners.

Drawing on a wide range of experiences, this report confirms that this perception corresponds to an encouraging and vibrant reality. Indeed, developing countries are becoming providers and contributors to development and, in particular, to capacity development. As we will see in the following pages, Southern officials and experts are
South-South cooperation in the context of aid effectiveness

exchanging knowledge in an impressive array of policy and institutional areas, including climate change, public sector reform, and epidemics control. Adapted development tools are being designed by and spread throughout the developing world, such as conditional cash transfers, demobilization and reintegration strategies, public debt management, earthquake-resistant housing, aviation security, and vaccines production.

The global development community has already acknowledged that this form of cooperation can be of immense value for fighting poverty and achieving the Millennium Development Goals. In September 2008, ministers and heads from more than 125 countries and 30 institutions gathered in Accra in order to deepen the aid effectiveness agenda, boosted by the Paris Declaration in 2005. As a result, the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) encourages all development actors, including providers of South-South cooperation, to build more effective and inclusive partnerships for development.

This strong mandate of embedding South-South cooperation in the context of aid effectiveness inspired the launch of the Task Team on South-South Cooperation (TT-SSC) in mid-September 2009. Over seventy representatives from developing countries, donors, multilateral institutions, academia, and civil society organizations agreed to engage in the mapping and analysis of evidences on the synergies between the aid effectiveness principles and the practice of South-South cooperation. In the Washington meeting, a conceptual framework was endorsed addressing three main dynamics of the Accra mandate (for more details, see the concept note in Annex 1):

- **Adapting the aid effectiveness principles** to South-South cooperation;
- **Enriching the aid effectiveness agenda** with the practices and experiences of South-South cooperation;
- **Identifying complementarities** between South-South and North-South cooperation.

Recognizing the huge need for documenting and understanding these dynamics, the TT-SSC launched in late November 2009 a call for case stories looking into South-South technical cooperation in the context of aid effectiveness. In particular, partner countries, but also donors and non-governmental actors were invited to share their experiences replying to simple, yet concise questions of a preestablished template. The TT-SSC members were very explicit in their desire to reflect on what works and what does not work, engaging therefore in deeper reflections on South-South cooperation as a historic modality that suffers from a persistent lack of systematization. A specific focus was given to the need to generate substantial inputs to the High Level Event (HLE) on South-South Cooperation and Capacity Development in Bogotá on March 24–25, 2010. In the medium run, also the next High Level Forum (HLF) on Aid Effectiveness, to be held in Seoul in late 2011, is on the horizon of the TT-SSC.

Regional platforms engaged with the TT-SSC in order to anchor the analytical work, including the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) in Africa, the Asian Development Bank (AsDB) in Asia-Pacific, the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), and the Organization of American States (OAS) in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC). At the global level, support was given by the World Bank Institute and a global core team, including communication and policy advisors.

The response from countries and organizations has been overwhelming. Beyond any expectations, 110 case stories were presented in only nine weeks, two of which corresponded to the 2009 Christmas break. The showcased experiences involve 133 countries from all regions, as well as 10 multilateral organizations, 4 civil society organizations, and 3 parliamentary bodies. Case story drafts were discussed at meetings in Addis Ababa, Bogotá, Brussels, Mexico City, Pretoria, Seoul, and Washington, DC. It is likely to be the broadest and most participative universe of country-led experiences ever created in both South-South cooperation and aid effectiveness.

In the next pages, we will explore in detail how these two areas are linked to each other and can
create synergies between two often still disconnected worlds of development cooperation. As such, the experience of collecting and discussing case stories entails some key messages that are of high relevance in the shifting global development architecture:

- **Sharing practice and experiences on South-South cooperation and aid effectiveness is a key priority for many developing countries.** Even developing countries with very limited capacities and almost no voice at the international level have engaged in the process. This impressive demand for sharing Southern perspectives should inspire policy-makers and practitioners to continue mapping and analyzing country-led experiences.

- **Regional networks are an essential factor for success in generating Southern perspectives.** The experience of the TT-SSC shows that regional platforms, despite all resource shortages, are able to mobilize peers and partners almost immediately, act as brokers for regional perspectives, and create an enabling environment for horizontal cooperation, that is, a context in which developing countries feel comfortable.

- **Southern-led experiences and evidence should feed into policy-making on global development policies.** From the start, the TT-SSC stressed that the case stories will inform the policy-making process on South-South cooperation and aid effectiveness, in particular during the Bogotá HLE and the Seoul HLF. This created strong incentives for a broad range of countries and organizations to engage in the case story process.

- **A sound conceptual framework for easy-to-use tools.** Good-quality, yet broadly shared analytical work have been generated in a very short period of time. This success is built on easy-to-use methodologies (that is, the case story template with key questions), which case story tellers found useful. At the same time, these tools informed directly the conceptual framework of the TT-SSC, which referred to a clearly defined niche: South-South technical cooperation and capacity development in the context of aid effectiveness.

- **Learning is decisive for the current development agenda, but needs a proper architecture.** Instead of subcontracting the analytical work, the TT-SSC has created in only six months an ad hoc learning architecture for enabling developing countries to contribute experiences from within. Using existing capacities in the countries, this involves just-in-time assistance, detailed feedback on early drafts, face-to-face discussions, immediate online dissemination, and direct support to country-led drafting processes. It is now time to consolidate this learning architecture connecting both global and regional levels.

### 3. MEETING THE TRIPLE MANDATE OF THE AAA

The 2008 High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Accra constituted a milestone in global development policies by deepening partnerships among the developed, the developing, and those that are in between. As one of its three pillars, the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) bids for inclusive and effective development partnerships, regarding both nontraditional actors (such as middle-income countries, global funds, and private foundations) and emerging modalities (such as South-South and triangular cooperation). This inclusiveness aims to “harness the energy, skills, and experience of all development actors,” especially for boosting capacity development in the developing world. Paragraph 19 of the AAA includes South-South cooperation and embeds this modality in the context of aid effectiveness.

Launched twelve months after the Accra HLF, the Task Team on South-South Cooperation (TT-SSC) committed to implement paragraph 19 of the AAA. A conceptual approach was endorsed by the TT-SSC (see concept note in Annex 1) that highlights the following triple mandate:
• Adapting the aid effectiveness principles to South-South cooperation: “We encourage all development actors, including those engaged in South-South cooperation, to use the Paris Declaration principles as a point of reference in providing development cooperation” (AAA para. 19a);

• Enriching the aid effectiveness agenda with the practices and experiences of South-South cooperation: We acknowledge [...] in particular the role of middle-income countries as both providers and recipients of aid. We recognize the importance and particularities of South-South cooperation and acknowledge that we can learn from the experience of developing countries” (AAA para. 19b);

• Identifying complementarities between South-South and North-South cooperation: “[SSC] plays an important role in international development cooperation and is a valuable complement to North-South cooperation” (AAA para. 19e).

Graphically, the triple mandate of linking South-South cooperation and the aid effectiveness principles refers to the following interplay:

The following pages respond to this triple mandate by exploring how South-South cooperation, in particular South-South technical cooperation, interacts with the context of aid effectiveness. The first section addresses how the five principles of the Paris Declaration—ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for development results, and mutual accountability—can be adapted. The case stories offer insights on how these principles can inform the practice of South-South cooperation and which challenges are still ahead. The second section explores how the experiences of South-South cooperation can enrich the aid effectiveness agenda. Issues such as horizontal partnership and regional solutions will be assessed against the showcased practice. Finally, some reflections will address the third mandate with a look into the possible complementarities and bridges between North-South and South-South cooperation. Here, triangular cooperation and mechanisms to promote South-South cooperation are building interesting gangways between both forms of development cooperation.

3.1 Adapting the aid effectiveness principles

The case stories shed a strong light on the adaptability of the five principles enshrined in the Paris Declaration. In most cases, the submitting countries and organizations considered that these principles constitute a useful point of reference. Quite surprisingly, and with only a few exceptions, the case story tellers offered very detailed reflections on how these principles interact with South-South cooperation. Three global lessons can be extracted. First, the aid effectiveness principles and their actual content are widely known, despite the rather abstract high-level debates around these. Second, they constitute a global public good that is recognized as valuable and relevant. Third, if one wonders how the principles could be implemented in different contexts and modalities, there is an easy answer: ask those who are actually involved in development activities.

The Accra mandate (1)

Adapting the aid effectiveness principles to South-South cooperation

We encourage all development actors, including those engaged in South-South cooperation, to use the Paris Declaration principles as a point of reference in providing development cooperation (AAA para. 19a).
However, room for opening up the range of principles is also reclaimed. For example, the Ibero-American General Secretariat (SEGIB) (LAC-1), reflecting a regional consensus in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), stresses that the effectiveness South-South cooperation should be assessed foremost against its “essential characteristics”: sustainable impact and operational coherence with horizontality, consensus, and equity. Other Southern providers, such as Brazil, Cuba, and Nigeria, highlight that they have not ratified the Paris Declaration and would rather emphasize guiding principles such as respecting the national sovereignty of the partner countries (LAC-43 and AFR-16). At any rate, as stated in the Cuban case (AFR-20), “non-interference in domestic policies does not in any way limit [the] potential for effective South-South development cooperation.” Some also reflect on the relevance of lessons learned in North-South cooperation for situations in which the South-South partners do not share the same level of development. For example, the India-Brazil-South Africa partnership (IBSA), describing a project fostering food security in Guinea-Bissau (AFR-18), explains that the principles were originally “made in the context of traditional aid relationships,” but due to their “relative development compared to poorer nations, (…) they [IBSA countries] must commit themselves to the principles of the Paris Declaration when working in places such as Guinea-Bissau.”

The following main messages on how South-South technical cooperation and capacity development are adapting the five principles highlighted by the Paris Declaration can be summarized from the case stories.

### 3.1.1 Ownership

National leadership is a core value of South-South technical cooperation highlighted in the vast majority of the case stories. Most experiences supported national policies through learning exchange and responded to a specific demand from the recipient country. This can be confirmed in several recipient-led case stories, indicating that ownership tends to be an actual asset of South-South learning and knowledge transfer. In this sense, Laos describes how its Public Administration and Civil Service Authority identified Vietnamese experiences in reforming local administration as especially useful for the national reform process (AP-16). The Guatemalan Institute for Public Penal Defense spotted Colombian expertise in quality management which was then included in its bid for obtaining ISO 9001-2000 certification (LAC-39). Also, regional platforms emerge from country demand, such as the Asian-Pacific Capacity Development for Development Effectiveness Facility (CDDE), supported by AsDB and United Nations Development Program (UNDP), which enables South-South exchange as a trigger for developing capacities for implementing aid effectiveness (AP-4). Thus, there seems to be a consensus that “success in South-South cooperation is built on ownership, political support, and strong leadership” (AFR-5).

"The success of this project is due also to clear political commitments at senior levels in both countries and the establishment of specific objectives, identifying the role of each side" (AFR-22).

Indeed, high-level political support in setting up and implementing South-South technical cooperation is a recurrent theme in a large number of case stories. Presidents have been particularly proactive in backing South-South initiatives. In 2002, Vicente Fox (Mexico) and Luis Angel Macchi (Paraguay) agreed to promote learning exchange on the Maquila sector (LAC-40). In 2003, Ricardo Lagos from Chile visited the Transmilenio in Bogotá, a public bus rapid transit system, which then informed the implementation of the Transantiago in his own capital (LAC-28). India’s prime minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh, was driving the launch of the development policies exchange between Chinese and Indian think tanks in 2006 (AP-22). Ministers have been strongly involved in boosting South-South cooperation, especially at
the regional level, around trade (LAC-3), education (AFR-5), health (LAC-8), labor issues (LAC-4), aviation (AP-6), and public administration reform (AFR-3). However, some case stories also highlight the need to strongly involve the implementing actors, preferably those “who are in positions of practical authority to act on the information they share” (AP-9) and practitioners and officials with direct responsibilities in day-to-day decision-making (LAC-2).

Beyond the concrete response to national policies, the experiences also reflect the improvements of national capacities for effective leadership in development and aid coordination. Sharing similar challenges as post-conflict countries, East Timor benefitted from Cambodian experiences in setting up a sound aid management system, including an Official Development Assistance (ODA) database (AP-1). Cuba, Bolivia, El Salvador, Paraguay, and Uruguay are learning from the cooperation maps, an online tool for mapping aid flows designed by the Colombian agency Acción Social (LAC-2). Capacity development for consistent aid coordination is increasingly boosted by peer-to-peer learning in Communities of Practices (CoP), for example, around Development Assistance Data Bases. In a joint initiative by the UNDP, International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI), and Synergy, South-South knowledge exchange on managing country-level aid information management systems not only supported national ownership. It also stimulated an “informed dialogue between the government and the donors, and an evidence-based decision-making on the allocation of aid,” for example, in Pakistan, the Central African Republic, and Sri Lanka (AP-3). Similarly, the Development Gateway Foundation is facilitating a wide knowledge sharing and peer learning network on aid management systems and good practices, offering software solutions and training for countries such as Malawi and Tanzania (AFR-2).

In the broader context of national policies and institutions, a core element of how the Paris Declaration understands ownership, South-South technical cooperation entails a great potential, especially in difficult contexts. In a program coordinated by the South African Public Administration Leadership and Management Academy (Palama), structural capacities for public service delivery are built through peer learning among public sector schools (Management Development Institutes) at the Ministries for Public Administration in Burundi, Rwanda, and Southern Sudan, all countries that have emerged from violent conflict (AFR-3). Also, supported by the IDB, Public Debt Management Agencies in LAC have engaged in mutual and bottom-up institutional capacity building around this critical policy area (LAC-9).

Changing actors: How to face a key challenge in South-South cooperation

While setting up South-South learning and knowledge exchange often draws on enormous enthusiasm of the involved actors, implementing longer-term activities can face challenges. Frequent changes of decision-makers and officials in the public sectors stand out as a critical factor putting at risk continuity in implementation and accumulation of lessons learned. In many developing countries, electoral cycles imply a complete overhaul of staff working in the government, including its ministries and agencies. As highlighted by CARICOM (LAC-3), Argentina (LAC-31), and Palama (AFR-3), this can cause delays of ongoing projects, also because many initiatives have been designed on a trust basis and rely on strong commitment by the involved individuals. A smart solution is to broaden the ownership toward actors that do not depend on governmental terms of office. For example, the new agency in Uruguay (LAC-20) identified the role of parliaments and media as particularly relevant for policy and institutional continuity.
Interestingly, South-South learning and knowledge exchange not only intends to boost national capacities for leading aid and development, but can actually influence the quality of this ownership. Democratic ownership has been added in Accra to the aid effectiveness agenda, and the case stories illustrate that South-South technical cooperation is a vibrant modality in areas such as governance and democratic values. As a self-monitoring system among the twenty-five member states of the African Union, the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) uses peer pressure to foster accountability, government efficiency, and good governance as “the necessary direction for economic prosperity of the continent” (AFR-9). Similarly, South-South parliamentary cooperation on the reduction of small arms in the Great Lakes and Horn of Africa region shows the potential for deepening democratic ownership, transparency, and accountability (AFR-28). The role of parliaments is also strengthened through the transfer of technology and expertise from the Chilean Senate to the Paraguayan Congress, building a web database on legislative initiatives in Paraguay (LAC-50). Electoral technical cooperation between Mexico and Ecuador helped to improve formal democratic procedures and institutional capacities at the Ecuadorian National Council for Elections before Ecuador’s general elections in April and May 2009 (LAC-26).

“Mutual learning was the final outcome of the project that could be highlighted, and which continues under development regardless of the funding we may collect for our cooperation” (AP-6).

Also subnational ownership is benefitting from South-South learning and knowledge exchange. The cooperation among forty-five municipalities in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras helps to manage regional public goods, such as water, in the Trifinio region (LAC-11). Here, regional South-South cooperation has transformed a “zone of tensions (no-man’s armed borders) into a zone of integration and development” (LAC-6). Other experiences describe how South-South knowledge exchange can speed up gender equality and women’s political participation at the municipal level in Central America, using “learning-roads” methodology (LAC-46). Promoting human rights appears to be an attractive niche as well, which has been exploited by university cooperation between Argentina and Paraguay on the access to justice for vulnerable groups, including land rights (LAC-48). Land tenure, in addition to social services, housing, and livelihood, is also a key aspect of the global network of slum dwellers, reminding policy-makers and development agencies their duties with the urban poor (AP-24).

Does this mean that ownership can be taken for granted in South-South technical cooperation? The case stories indicate that there is a strong link between horizontal partnership and up-front involvement of the recipient countries, but this is not written in stone. The fact that sometimes it is difficult to achieve the agreed counterpart by the recipient (see section 2.1.5.) shows that ownership is not automatically built into South-South dynamics. Three main lessons could be addressed in the future. First, if the activity was boosted by high-level politicians, it often remains difficult to translate this commitment into actual implementation. Second, providers tend to focus on their ownership of the development programs and take a rather general look into the recipient’s leadership. Finally, embedding South-South learning and knowledge exchange in the national planning process seems to be the most promising way of ensuring that also smaller-scale activities are responding to national leadership.

3.1.2 Alignment

Focusing on capacity development and technical cooperation, most case stories elaborate on aligning South-South technical cooperation to the recipient’s public policies rather than using national public financial management and procurement systems. According to these experiences, policy alignment is high. This can be explained with the fact
that horizontal intergovernmental cooperation embeds these initiatives in the policies and plans of the corresponding ministries and governmental agencies of the recipient country. For instance, the New Rice for Africa initiative, to promote adapted species of cultivated rice, is implemented as part of agriculture national research programs in ten African countries (AFR-6). Indonesia’s support to Uganda’s microfinance sector, including Sharia-based microfinance, is embedded in the Rural Services Finance Program of the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development in Kampala (AFR-8). Finally, Argentina assists Haiti to develop capacities in public expenditures on childhood corresponds directly to priorities outlined in the latter’s Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (LAC-31).

On the other hand, the case stories also illustrate how South-South mutual learning contributes to better quality and usability of partner country systems. Southern-led capacity development around aid management platforms is enhancing the possibilities to improve the incentives of donors to use country systems (AFR-2). Costa Rica’s public financial management is learning from Chile’s experiences in the institutional capacity to evaluate budget management (LAC-30), and the AsDB-hosted CoP on managing for development results (MfDR) shares good practices on results management in country systems (AP-2).

Finally, while the Paris Declaration commits donors to draw conditions from the national development plans, the absence of conditionalities seems to be of specific relevance for the Southern debate. Especially in the African context, the featured experiences stress that South-South technical cooperation, as a trust-based modality, can be implemented in an unconditional partnership, which is exposed in Cuba’s Integrated Health Program (AFR-20) and Nigeria’s Technical Aid Corps (AFR-16). Similarly, Ecuador supported Bolivia’s capacities in controlling dengue without conditions, drawing rather on the developmental proximity, shared interest, peer-to-peer political dialogue, and noninterference as basic guarantees for successful implementation (LAC-25).

Focusing mostly on South-South learning and knowledge exchange, the case stories do not explicitly address alignment to country systems, and information on coordinating technical assistance, one of the alignment proxies of the Paris Declaration, is still sketchy. There are indeed signs of difficulties to ensure this form of alignment, especially in regional contexts, where actors such as IDB found it rather challenging to take into account the distinct country systems in the three members of the Trifinio region (LAC-11). In the future, a particularly important issue will be the coordination of capacity development within broader national programs and a close attention to the effective use of existing capacity at the country level.

3.1.3 Harmonization

With an often limited presence of Southern providers in the recipient country, it seems that their activities are not yet creating the inherent problems of overlapping donor activities (for example, in missions and analytical work), which the Paris Declaration intends to tackle. According to the case stories, a reasonable strategy to meet the risk of further fragmentation, especially through small-scale capacity development activities, lies in aligning to national policies and supporting public institutions from within. While South-South learning is a top priority for many recipients, this enthusiasm still prevents a deeper look into transaction costs generated by South-South technical cooperation.

But there are also very interesting signs of enhanced harmonization. Several experiences have succeeded in bringing together donors around
South-South learning and expertise exchange. The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP), a NEPAD-led continental initiative aiming to eliminate hunger, reduce poverty, and promote economic growth, launched in 2008 a World Bank–hosted Multi-Donor Trust Fund, to which the European Commission (EC), the Netherlands and the United States are contributing (AFR-10). The Plan Trifinio facilitates a double harmonization through coordination among three recipient countries (El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras) to boost the harmonization of several European donors and development banks (LAC-6). Knowledge exchange between Morocco and Mauritania incentivized closer cooperation of bilateral donor agencies and multilateral development banks in the water and sanitation sector of the latter country (AFR-26). The Thailand-led initiative for improving human resource development in the Mekong region has generated guidelines for development partners’ participation, facilitating the coordination of donor members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD (AP-8). These examples already indicate that, when attracting interest and commitment, South-South cooperation can be a strong trigger for harmonization among traditional donors. Mechanisms and platforms seem to play a very important role in this dynamic as well (see section 2.3.2.).

Comparative advantages are another essential dimension of harmonization and its most advanced form, the division of labor. Almost all case stories indicate clear and very specific added values on the providing side. In other words, accumulated expertise is key for being useful for peers, and, in general, Southern providers are very clear about their specific area of comparative advantage. This is reflected in the support, facilitated by AsDB, of the Phnom Penh Water Supply Authority, a lead water utility in the Asian-Pacific region, to its Vietnamese twin around non-revenue water reduction, customer service improvement, and better financial management (AP-9). Also, Egypt’s experience in aquatic weed control in the Nile streams became essential for supporting Uganda in cleaning the outlets of the Kyoga and Albert lakes and thus contributing to ensuring the fishery sector and avoiding health risks (AFR-22). Drawing on their successful waste management in poor neighborhoods, the Brazilian municipalities of Belo Horizonte, Brasilia, Curitiba, and Rio de Janeiro helped to shape an inclusive municipal recycling program in Bogotá, Colombia (LAC-43). ChileCompra, a lead procurement agency, helped to reform the procurement system of the Buenos Aires province in Argentina, fostering efficiency, transparency, and, importantly, access by small and medium enterprises (LAC-20).

“In Brazil, Viva Rio works from within the neighborhood rather than from without, confronting its ‘outsider status,’ being more spatially and socially connected to ground truths than most other external actors in the country” (LAC-43).

“In Brazil, Viva Rio works from within the neighborhood rather than from without, confronting its ‘outsider status,’ being more spatially and socially connected to ground truths than most other external actors in the country” (LAC-43).

“Despite social, cultural, historic, and economic differences, Argentina and Haiti share the condition of countries that have experienced important political crises and that suffer a high economic and social vulnerability, which strengthens empathy among them, mutual commitment, and consequently ownership of the shared ideas” (LAC-31).

In sum, the case stories indicate clearly that specific comparative advantages are observed as constitutive elements, even a raison d’être, for setting up and implementing South-South capacity development. However, these initiatives need to be coordinated, especially when scaling up small-scale activities. Also, a deeper look into still uncertain transaction costs would be useful. The impact of South-South learning would benefit from the lessons learned in harmonization over the last years, especially regarding incentives of working hand in hand with other development actors.
3.1.4 Managing for Development Results (MfDR)

Applying the practices and standards of managing for development results still poses challenges to South-South technical cooperation, especially to small-scale capacity development activities. Methodologies highlighted in the recollected experiences include the logframe approach (AFR-3, LAC-18, LAC-21), surveys and feedback from participants (AFR-1, AFR-2, AP-2), or strengthening communities to measure the results in their immediate context (AP-23). Outputs are clearly identified, but due to the lack of evaluation practices it remains difficult to assess impact. As a proxy for many other cases, this is reflected in the Ecuador-Bolivia cooperation on dengue control, which took place in a dengue emergency affecting 7,000 people. The storytellers identified the urgent need to “include mechanisms for managing for results able to show the effectiveness of sharing knowledge, in particular for avoiding deaths and vector transmission” (LAC-25). Thus, evident success, palpable in all case stories submitted, needs to become more visible in the future. Similar challenges exist in some triangular experiences, where pilot initiatives such as the collaboration of Japan, Brazil, and Angola fail to integrate a results focus. The reasons: “Lack of time, experience, and expertise when three countries formulate [a] triangular cooperation project” (AFR-15).

Most countries still struggle with building monitoring and evaluating (M&E) systems and generating transparent, regular, and timely information. Learning how to be an effective Southern provider is still incipient, although opportunities are emerging, in particular in the realm of information management, reporting, and transparency. Databases seem to attract a growing interest by new development actors (AP-3), cooperation maps can be adapted to SSC information flows (LAC-2), and agreeing on reporting systems seems to be a promising way (LAC-1). Overall, while the case stories show that ownership is a key element for South-South learning, operational challenges need to be tackled in order to use this modality for effective capacity development from within. It is, above all, a capacity problem at the provider end, which does not reveal the full scope, relevance, and impact of South-South technical cooperation.

However, the case stories also depict the investments in MfDR capacities at the recipient country level. Both the African and the Asian-Pacific CoP on MfDR are very strongly committed to good practices and peer-to-peer learning as a tool to build strong country systems capable of measuring development results and informing public policies. Data collection and analysis for policy design and implementation is pursued in several experiences. For example, a regional system of standardized citizen security and social violence indicators informs policy-makers in Colombia, Dominican Republic, Honduras, and other countries (LAC-10). Transferring easy-to-use research methodologies, the India-based ASER Centre and the East African civil service organization Uwezo build local capacity for assessing results of education policies in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda. The surveys strive to feed into education reforms and to create informed, homegrown, “bottom-up pressure” to effectively improve education systems (AP-23). These examples indicate that there is a continued demand for MfDR in the partner countries, which South-South learning can support through sharing and exchanging practices, methodologies, and approaches.

Over the next years and looking into the 2015 deadline for the Millennium Development Goals, MfDR will remain critical for justifying development efforts in general. Adapted methodologies to assess impact need to be developed for South-South learning and knowledge exchange. Results and impact also need to be communicated in a more straightforward way to citizens in the developing world.

“As a multi-ethnic society, Malaysia offers successful development experiences to countries experiencing conflict or rebuilding their communities after conflict” (AP-11).
3.1.5 Mutual accountability

Being at the heart of development partnership, the mutual accountability on each other’s commitments has found a fertile ground in the featured experiences. The regional experiences are especially strong in creating peer pressure around sensitive policy areas. The APRM, which enables African countries to engage in peer reviewing each other on the progress in good governance and accountability (AFR-10), is an enlightening example. Likewise, the joint effort of ten Pacific islands, supported by AsDB, around aviation safety is based on “mutual oversight and enforcement of national compliance with safety and security standards in the aviation sector,” with important changes in the behavior of individual countries (AP-7). Reinforcing parliamentary oversight over development policies through networking and experience exchange, national parliaments in the Great Lakes and Horn of Africa region are pressing for more accountability and transparency of both government and donors, opening up critical democratic policy space (AFR-28).

But a deep look into the universe of South-South experiences also gives insights on the limitations of mutual accountability. Often, these are related to a rather sporadic country presence and scarce institutional capacities of Southern provider agencies. Goodwill from both sides does not necessarily mean that mutual commitments are met. For instance, Uganda was delayed in living up to its pledge to ensure tax exemptions for Egyptian products and services that were helping to fight the rise of aquatic weed in its lakes (AFR-22). The collaboration between the African Union and Indian Technical and Economic Cooperation (TCIL), intended to create a Pan-African satellite-run e-network, faces challenges because some African contributions (in the form of infrastructural facilities) are overdue. On the other hand, the agreement did not include any mechanism to hold the provider, TCIL, accountable for the quality and timeliness of its services and products (AFR-23).

While evolving South-South development partnerships are growing more complex and ambitious, learning from mutual accountability frameworks will become more relevant in the near future. If horizontal cooperation (see below) is to be taken serious, meeting mutual commitments should be at the heart of South-South learning. In particular, incentives and accountability should be addressed in the process of creating and strengthening provider agencies in the South.

3.2 Enriching the aid effectiveness agenda

Within a mutual learning between South-South cooperation and the aid effectiveness agenda, countries and organizations involved in South-South technical cooperation feel that there is much to contribute to the evolving global development policies. Acknowledging that lessons learned by traditional donors can help to improve the impact of South-South cooperation, there are also many opportunities to enrich the aid effectiveness agenda with the experiences and practices, especially of middle-income countries as both providers and recipients of aid.

Therefore, enriching this agenda constitutes also a starting point for partner countries from all over the world to engage with a practice-oriented and evidence-based approach in the discussions on how to achieve better development results. The case stories include a rich menu of proposals of Southern contributions to the evolving partnership paradigm, in particular with a look into the next High Level Event, to be held in Seoul in late 2011. Some of these have already been touched upon in the previous section, such as strong consideration of comparative advantages and the engagement in democratic ownership. The following pages will show how South-South cooperation contributes to strengthening three elements less attended in the conventional approach to aid effectiveness:

“South-South cooperation in which both parties directly engage, manage, and participate can help strengthen the competencies of the parties along the whole process” (AP-1).
first, a strong bid for horizontal partnership based on mutual trust, in which all partners learn; second, the capacity to mobilize regional dynamics and solutions for shared development challenges; and third, the case stories have generated valuable inputs to the discussion on good-fit technical cooperation, that is, a potentially more efficient, context-responsive support to capacity development, able to create strong incentives for policy and institutional change.

### 3.2.1 Boosting horizontal partnership

The case stories illustrate a very specific form of development cooperation relationships that can be described as horizontal partnership. Peer-to-peer learning, mutual knowledge exchange, and sustainable investments in long-term partnerships can be described as basic ingredients. South-South cooperation does not automatically entail horizontal cooperation, and horizontal cooperation is not limited to South-South cooperation, as shown in the experiences in triangular cooperation (see section 2.2.2.). As the case stories depict clearly, horizontal partnership is based on trust, mutual benefit, and equity among the partners that engage in South-South and triangular cooperation for capacity development.

**Trust and mutual respect** is identified in several experiences as a key factor for success. A knowledge exchange on controlling the arsenic contamination of water and food between the Bangladesh Chemical Society and the Argentinean Institute for Scientific and Technical Research has shaped this kind of “solid and self-sustained cooperation based on mutual trust.” A nonexisting budget did not hinder the partners to engage in horizontal learning on water treatment with cheap but effective technologies (AP-6). Confidence also played a role in the transfer of Argentinean expertise to Haiti in estimating public expenditures in childhood, with the result that “Haitian authorities allowed even sensitive information to flow without any type of conditions.” Here, an
important factor for trust was the creation of a peer-to-peer relationship, especially at the level of the officials from both countries’ ministries (LAC-31). Trust-building is also an intrinsic component of CDDE’s bid for strengthened relations across countries, for example, through electronic communication at the individual level (AP-4). In triangular cooperation, mutual confidence constitutes a core element for an increasingly smooth coordination among the larger range of actors, as shown in the collaboration between Germany, Brazil, and Mozambique around quality standardization (AFR-14). Differences in opinion in setting up a public sector triangular cooperation between Spain, Chile, and Paraguay were resolved in a “climate of greater trust and openness” (LAC-17).

Mutual benefit is a recurrent theme in different case stories. Most prominently, the China-Africa program draws on a mutually benefitting process, transferring Chinese experiences in poverty reduction and development to Africa and enabling China to improve its partnership with African countries through a wider network of stakeholders and better adaptation of its program (AFR-17). Mutual interest is also recognized by Egypt in its cooperation with Uganda, where Cairo desired to “strengthen its relations with Uganda as one of the most important Nile Basin focal points for Egypt’s supply of Nile water from Lake Victoria” (AFR-22). Especially in South-South learning among middle-income countries, many provider countries openly identify their benefit from supporting the recipient, inherent to peer-to-peer learning. For example, the Ecuadorian Ministry of Health stresses the concept of “double dividends” where both sides, here with Bolivia, strengthened their capacities in managing and controlling dengue epidemics (LAC-26).

In another case story, the Center of Legal and Social Studies, an Argentinean non-governmental organization, expressed its gratitude for having achieved a better understanding of the human rights situation in Paraguay after its collaboration in the creation of human rights chairs in two Paraguayan universities (LAC-48). Finally, transferring its Bolsa Familia, a conditional cash transfer (CCT) model, to other countries, Brazil’s Ministry of Social Development and Hunger Alleviation is benefitting from learning how to expand and consolidate a CCT (AFR-31).

Equity as a third ingredient for horizontal partnership is very much related to the perceptions of similar challenges faced by the partners. Evident in almost all case stories, the perception of sharing the same contextual opportunities and caveats seems to build a strong fundament for building effective partnership, in some cases resulting in a short cut to development solutions. The water facilities twinning exercise between Cambodia and Vietnam, boosted by AsDB, relates to the fact that both sides work with similar technologies and draw on “common cultural traits”, allowing a smoother exchange of experiences and practices (AP-15). The sense of equity seems to be especially strong in difficult contexts and critical development challenges. For example, Colombia shares its lessons in disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration with peers in Liberia, Haiti, Sri Lanka, and the Philippines. Facing armed conflicts, peer learning appears to be a powerful tool for achieving basic conditions for human development, since not only lessons, but also political sensitiveness is shared (LAC-24). This is also strongly reflected in the peer learning process around public sector capacity development in post-conflict Burundi, Rwanda, and Southern Sudan, where “more equal power relations [are] leading to greater openness, camaraderie, and spirit of ‘umuntu, ngumuntu, ngabantu,’ meaning a person is a person through others” (AFR-3).
3.2.2 Regional learning, regional solutions

Regional processes have not been included in the Paris Declaration, but constitute a versatile dimension for boosting aid and development effectiveness. South-South knowledge exchange and mutual learning often follows a regional logic in Africa, Asia-Pacific, and LAC. There is a perception that regional dynamics can address shared development challenges and facilitate joint management of regional public goods.

“Over the last three years, the different public debt agencies have accumulated personal, professional, and governmental knowledge and synergies can be generated through a simple telephone call” (LAC-5).

It is therefore not surprising that another powerful contribution from the case stories can be found in regional learning processes. Often, these are facilitated by the regional development banks, but also some bilateral DAC donors engage in activities covering several countries in certain region or subregions. Finally, cross-regional knowledge exchange is emerging with great potential for cross-fertilization between distinct development contexts.

In LAC, both the IDB and the OAS are playing a brokering function for South-South learning, which countries are using very actively. A strong message comes from the collaboration of ministries of labor of the thirty-four OAS member states that come together under the umbrella of the Inter-American Network for Labor Administration (RIAL), created in 2005. In addition to workshops, the RIAL is successfully promoting high-quality technical assistance and mutual capacity development between the ministries in areas such as security of employment, migration, and gender equality and labor implications of free trade agreements (LAC-4). Similarly, the IDB is boosting South-South cooperation around institutional strengthening of public debt management agencies within the LAC Debt Group. Here, an electronic list has proved to be a very powerful tool for channeling quick communication of national practitioners around debt management models and protocols (LAC-9). Subregional cooperation does not lag behind. The fifteen CARICOM members have engaged in a mutual training program on implementing their single market and economy, “extending the tradition of pooling resources to capitalizing comparative advantages through transfer and sharing” (LAC-3). In Asia-Pacific, AsDB plays a key role facilitating country-to-country exchanges, for example in the twinning exercise between Cambodia and Vietnam (AP-15), and regional dynamics, such as the CDDE (AP-4), and the AsCoP (AP-2). Furthermore, the Thailand-funded Asia-Pacific Development Center on Disability mobilizes more than 30 ministries and agencies, as well as 200 associate organizations, for the social and economic empowerment of persons with disabilities, who constitute one out of ten people in the region (AP-5). In Africa, the NEPAD-led CAAPD engages with its member countries in learning and experience exchange on trends in African agriculture and rural development, as well as policy options around land and water management, market access, hunger, and agricultural research (AFR-10).

Still incipient and less structured, cross-regional learning is also taking place, especially between Asia and Africa. Often, these initiatives have been supported by the World Bank’s South-South Experience Exchange Trust Fund (SEETF) and Japan’s Third Country Training Program. Cross-regional learning can involve African partners supporting an Asian country, as happened in the SEETF-funded transfer of Ghanaian and Zambian road management expertise to Laos (AP-25). Or it takes place between several partners in both regions, for instance, Malaysia’s investments in the consolidations of peace for multicultural nations, such as Afghanistan, Iraq, Sudan, Sri Lanka, East Timor, and Bosnia-Herzegovina (AP-11). But surprisingly, cross-regional South-South technical cooperation also occurs in a smaller scale and without a strong donor behind. In these cases, partners are benefitting from communication technologies and...
clearly identified comparative advantages. This is the formula for success in the Argentina-Bangladesh exchange on water management, as stated above. Also from Argentina, the mutual insurance association AMPF coordinated an online training and capacity development course for the Ministry of Labor in Niger interested in creating a similar association for its employees. Here, both sides shared an amazing verve to overcome cultural, geographical, linguistic, and technological distances (AFR-7).

Evidently, regional learning for adapted solutions refers directly to the shared challenges that are addressed through peer-to-peer exchanges. It is therefore closely linked to the three basic elements of horizontal partnership as described above (trust, mutual benefit, and equity). While the conventional approach of the aid effectiveness agenda mostly looks into country situations, the regional energy of South-South cooperation can connect developing countries with each other in order to find effective solutions to common problems.

The case stories offer several important lessons on how to enhance technical cooperation that might further enlighten this relevant debate. South-South technical cooperation seems to rely on certain comparative advantages that relate to its efficiency, the use of adequate expertise, and its potential to generate the right incentives.

As the most obvious characteristic of South-South learning, efficiency has been highlighted by several experiences as significant added value. The Cuban Program for Integrated Health in Africa mostly draws on 1.259 high-quality medical staff and experts from the Caribbean island, with no cost for the recipient countries (AFR-20). Cuba also generated substantial cost reduction by supporting Egypt’s plans to produce mandatory vaccines and thus become more self-reliant. Estimates indicate a cost savings of around 50 percent in comparison to the international market (AFR-22). Improved efficiency was also achieved in ChileCompra cooperation with the Buenos Aires province’s procurement agency, where costs were reduced with software donations and free training (LAC-29). No-cost cooperation activities are rather the rule, especially in South-South activities implemented by middle-income countries.

Evidently, this added value is very closely related to the use of specific human resources for peer-to-peer capacity development. It is true that South-South technical cooperation has of course a cost, even if it is not reported (and still very difficult to report). However, the vast majority of Southern technical cooperation providers use existing and available human resources in their own public institutions, such as ministries or specialized agencies. This is the case of the officials of the Argentinean Ministry of Economy and Public Finances, which supports Haiti's capacities for childhood-related public expenditure, a formula that makes it more efficient than North-South cooperation. But more importantly, these staff are also engaging in a strong peer relationship based on “empathy, mutual commitment, and consequently ownership” (LAC-31). Similarly, Vietnam selected senior officials and economic advisors involved in the design and implementation of the Doi Moi Policy as trainers.

3.2.3 Investing in good-fit technical cooperation for capacity development

In recent years, traditional technical cooperation is being re-scrutinized against its impact on capacity development, the alignment to national priorities, its accountability, and the overall efficiency. Some donors, most prominently the European Commission, have engaged in a reform process, and platforms such as the Capacity Development Alliance are investing efforts in identifying the best ingredients for good-fit technical cooperation. The skills and experiences provided by the Indonesian experts and training programs are very unique and unavailable in more developed countries, where well-maintained infrastructure and highly mechanized equipment are required to perform agricultural activities” (AP-17).
and speakers in its support to Nepal’s new growth and development strategy. Here, the members of the Nepalese Constituency Assembly obtained in-depth policy insights in the processes leading to a market-based economy (AP-19). But the collected case story universe also included (rather rare) examples of Southern consultants engaging in South-South learning. The Japan-funded Triangle of Hope for promoting investment in Zambia has involved a Malaysian advisor bringing in his experience as former deputy director-general of Malaysia Industrial Development Agency. This person could share over a longer period of time the strategies used in Malaysia and links Zambian institutions to Malaysia and other Asian countries, helping to overcome “invisible barriers” to African trade and investment relations with Asian-Pacific countries (AFR-13). In sum, high-quality technical cooperation can be facilitated by committed and experienced Southern experts, which helps to ensure that South-South technical cooperation is adapted, attractive, and effective for the recipient country.

The closer relationship between provider and recipient seems to be one of the reasons why South-South technical cooperation is an effective trigger for capacity development. Another essential ingredient is the incentives that South-South learning and knowledge exchange create for implementing policy and institutional reform. A new vigor for actually transforming learning into action is emerging when, in similar institutional and structural development challenges, one or several champions have identified feasible and adapted paths to achieve improvements despite the caveats. This is clearly the case in Brazil’s expertise in conditional cash transfers, the Bolsa Familia Program, which contributes effective income-transfer solutions for targeting the use of conditionalities and performance-based public management (AFR-31). While Northern solutions often appear abstract in Southern contexts, practitioners from the developing world are speaking the same language. Tackling more directly the (non-)enabling environment, the solutions are potentially more context responsive, especially when they draw on the provider’s comparative advantage (see section 2.1.3). This is neatly reflected in the success of the regional CoP in boosting MiDR in Asia-Pacific (AP-2) and Africa (AFR-1), as well as the UNDP/IATI initiative on development assistance databases, where the “South-South exchanges among countries with similar challenges often resulted in an extra motivation and greater incentives to implement solutions back home” (AP-3). Peer pressure, such as described for APRM (AFR-10), plays an important, yet still underexplored role for generating strong incentives. In another context, Cambodia and East Timor experienced that the “soft part of the partnership” helps to “accommodate and broker different values, interests and positions of the parties”, a clear advantage to traditional partnership, “less resilient in this regard” (AP-1). South-South consensus on practices, frequently thriving in regional processes such as the IDB-driven system of social violence indicators, is another trigger for boosting actual policy and institutional change (LAC-9). Together, these experiences show that South-South learning and knowledge can create more effective incentives. In the future, this assumption could be tested against an analysis of the how-to’s and the process-related conditions under which better motivation and feasible reform is fostered by mutual learning.

In sum, the case stories open a wide floor for exploring the specific values and comparative advantages of South-South learning in the overall bid for more effective technical cooperation. Deeper research is necessary to obtain more conclusive results, especially in the realm of efficiency. Further investment in transparency regarding inputs and outcomes are necessary. In other words, sound information systems and an
enhanced results management is required to assess the efficiency of South-South cooperation on a solid ground. Importantly, improved and adapted incentives, very much promoted in the discourse on capacity development, should also be explored more systematically. It is in this area that horizontal cooperation can make a clear difference and even revise current thinking on reforming policies and institutions. Future analytical work could therefore draw on the quite consistent messages from the case stories on how to improve the effectiveness of technical cooperation.

3.3 Identifying complementarities between South-South and North-South cooperation

Over the last years, South-South cooperation has often happened in parallel to and even isolated from the more conventional development cooperation provided by DAC donors. During the HLF in Accra, donors, partner countries, and multilateral institutions recognized that this gap needs to be bridged, not only through mutual learning (as shown in the two previous sections), but also through actual and concrete complementarities. In this sense, paragraph 19e of the AAA highlights that “South-South cooperation (...) is a valuable complement to North-South cooperation,”, while paragraph 19b “encourage[s] further development of triangular cooperation,” especially with middle-income countries as both providers and recipients of aid.

The collected evidence illustrates that this complementarity is already in full motion. Significant efforts have been invested in recent years. An encouraging picture emerges from the case stories, with interesting details of how the developed, the developing, and those that are in between could build gangways between South-South and North-South cooperation. Two main pillars can be identified. First, triangular cooperation is a tool for mutual learning and venturing horizontal partnership, which entails some risks, but also huge opportunities. Second, mechanisms for promoting and funding South-South cooperation are often strongly backed by traditional donors and multilateral organizations, in particular the multilateral development banks. The case stories show that, while still needing to capitalize knowledge and feedback, these mechanisms are a critical contribution, even a conditio sine qua non, for scaling up horizontal partnership within a flexible, sustainable, and demand-responsive logic.

3.3.1 Triangular cooperation

As a modality for development cooperation, triangular cooperation can be defined as the collaboration between a Southern (sometimes called pivotal) provider and a Northern donor in benefit of a third recipient country. Triangular cooperation entails learning on all sides and should not be confused with direct support to South-South cooperation, for example, through “hands-off” funding. This basic definition requires a deeper look into specific situations. Among different constellations, the case stories point out trilateral, regional, and multilateral cooperation, sometimes even in a mixed form. For example, the OAS facilitated part of a triangular cooperation in which Chile, financially backed by Canada, helps seven CARICOM members to boost their social protection systems (LAC-16). However, most triangular cooperation projects submitted in this call for case stories are following quite closely the above-mentioned “triangle formula”. Germany, Japan, and Spain are the DAC donors with most activities in triangular cooperation, but Canada, Ireland, and Korea are also entering the stage.
Several lessons can be drawn from the role of triangular cooperation as a bridge to South-South cooperation in the context of aid effectiveness. The cases show that triangular cooperation is very much related to the concept of horizontal cooperation, in which all partners are learning. However, they also demonstrate that one of the greatest risks of triangular cooperation is to undermine the ownership of the recipient country. Another limitation is the substantial transactions costs of setting up triangular operations and bringing together a larger range of actors, all of them with different institutional settings and interests. One of the solutions seems to be country-led comparative advantages, ensuring a division of labor aligned to recipient policies and priorities. These are the essential basics to take into account for future investments in triangular cooperation.

Learning for horizontal partnerships: Since triangular cooperation is still a new modality for both traditional donors and Southern providers, the relations between the partners tend to be more horizontal. DAC donors have shown a high interest in venturing new roles and in learning how they can improve their performance toward the developing partners. As a pioneer in supporting South-South cooperation, Japan promoted triangular cooperation through its JICA-ASEAN Regional Cooperation Meeting (JARCOM). This platform encouraged Japan to acquire skills as a “low-profile facilitator (…) more responsive to the diverse multilateral needs of Southern partners” (AP-10). Ireland engaged in a particularly inspiring triangular learning partnership with Liberia and East Timor on the role of women in conflict prevention, management, and resolution in light of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 (AFR-30). Also, Germany and Spain express their strong desire to have a more active role in triangular operations. A pilot on quality standardization and consumer protection in Mozambique, implemented by Brazil and Germany, boosted a learning process finally translated in a shared official concept and guidelines, opening the door for future scaling-up among the two providers (AFR-14). Similarly, Spain started triangulating efforts with Chile with the aim to assist Paraguay’s public sector modernization, gathering sensitive lessons on how to embed triangular cooperation in the aid effectiveness agenda (LAC-17). As one of the newcomers in triangular cooperation, Korea tested the modality for the first time by working with Peru and Algeria. The objective was to improve the latter’s capacities in breeding seed potatoes and thus enhancing its food sovereignty (AFR-12). In this case, Peruvian provider capacities were also upgraded. Benefits for the Southern provider can also be observed in Mexico’s improved abilities and strategic positioning after having implemented with Japan triangular cooperation for earthquake-resistant popular housing in El Salvador (LAC-13).

Ensuring recipient ownership in the triangle: Ownership of the recipient country can be still a challenge for triangular cooperation. The risk of losing touch with the recipient is especially imminent if the traditional donor and the Southern provider are focusing their attention on setting up their collaboration and the recipient country has not taken the lead, as was observed in discussions in Nicaragua (LAC-47). There are good examples of how triangular cooperation was effectively aligned to national priorities, for example, by Germany’s and Brazil’s support to Mozambique’s quality standards, critical for the globalization and regional integration of its economy (AFR-14). In Algeria’s case, the demand for Korea’s and Peru’s collaboration came directly from its National Institute for Agriculture Research (AFR-12). Guatemalan ownership went further by actually funding, with its own resources, a follow-up phase of Mexico’s and

“An export of the successful Mexican experiences is of high interest to other countries in the region, especially in Central America and the Caribbean, which can learn a lot from the factors of success and the difficulties overcome in solid waste management in Mexico” (LAC-15).
Germany’s training in integrated solid waste management (LAC-15).

However, it is evident that there is a need for balancing “uneven horizontalities”. While the relationship of peers between the traditional donor and the Southern provider advances, the leadership of the recipient should not be taken for granted, as shown in the joint Spain-Chile preparation of a public sector modernization project in Paraguay (LAC-17). This is especially critical when the demand side is uncertain. Japan’s JARCOM program offers some relevant lessons on balancing supply and demand, while taking into account that triangular cooperation should aim to narrow gaps and “making boundaries among cooperating and beneficiary countries less relevant” (AP-10). Matching demand and supply carefully can mean that the advantages of the Southern provider might wane. After a successful knowledge exchange, El Salvador’s vice ministry of Housing and Urban Development showed less interest in a continued support from Mexico’s National Center for Disaster Prevention (LAC-13). This example shows how recipient leadership has a huge potential to effectively guide triangular efforts within a reasonable division of labor.

**Comparative advantages as the basis for triangular efforts:** Indeed, comparative advantages are guiding most of the triangular case stories. Algeria’s National Institute for Agricultural Research improved its capacities for breeding potatoes (and ultimately ensuring food security) by drawing on Peru’s ample expertise in potato breeding (being the cradle of the potato) and Korea’s advances in research technology (AFR-12). Malaysia and Japan offered learning on how to consolidate peace in multicultural nations (such as Sri Lanka, Iraq, or East Timor), based on their experiences of maintaining peace in a plural society and vast experience in post-conflict reconstruction, respectively (AP-11). In an OAS-facilitated project, Bolivia and Peru learned from Mexico’s advantages in measuring natural gas flows and Brazil’s capacities in metering chemical composition of this natural resource, while the German National Metrology Institute contributed high-quality technical and technological solutions (LAC-14). Given the lack of a recipient or Southern provider-led case story on triangular cooperation, it is difficult to assess whether these comparative advantages are the same ones that the final beneficiary would highlight. However, it can be assumed that, when based on national ownership, the review of comparative advantages of the offering partners (both individually and collectively) is certainly a powerful tool for ensuring that triangular cooperation is effective.

**Recovering transaction costs through scaling up:** Triangular cooperation tends to involve a larger range of actors than North-South or South-South cooperation. A brief screening of the case stories reveals that some experiences induced the collaboration of up to eleven parties. Far from being an exception, the joint Japan-Brazil pilot on training health staff for the Joseina Machel, a reference hospital in Angola, generated efforts of two Angolan counterparts (Ministry of Health, the hospital), two official Brazilian parties (the agency ABC in Brasilia, the Embassy in Luanda) and three Brazilian universities, as well as Japan’s headquarters and its offices in South Africa and Brazil (AFR-15). Lacking operational procedures and policy guidelines, the start-up of a triangular cooperation operation is very time and resource consuming for the involved partners. Delays from six to twenty-four months to translate the initial agreement into the start of the implementation are the rule. The setting-up process is lively depicted in the case story on Spain’s and Chile’s support to Paraguay’s public sector reform. One conclusion from this case is that triangular cooperation “faces more challenges in management, coordination, and implementation than traditional North-South cooperation:

“Learning is an essential results for its application to the rest of the programme and the contribution of generated knowledge to the debate on triangular cooperation” (LAC-17).
the convergence among three countries with distinct management systems, the diversity of stakeholders, the geographic and cultural distances, the uneven horizontality in the relations, and the indecision on the rules of the game” (LAC-17).

However, it might not be fair to assess short-term investments against long-term gains in horizontal partnership. This calculation has led to a substantial reshaping of the JARCOM model, because, put bluntly, the “benefits of long-term capacity development (...) are difficult to verify despite relatively high immediate costs” (AP-10).

Yet, traditional donors also perceive the benefits of institutional learning and investing in pilots that then can be scaled up. For example, the Japan-Brazil Partnership Program launched a second phase in Angola based on the lessons learned (AFR-15), while Germany and Brazil agreed on joint standards after having implemented the pilot in Mozambique (AFR-14). In fact, systematizing lessons in triangular cooperation and scaling-up of triangular efforts seems to be a smart way for recovering the initial investment. It should be also acknowledged that horizontal cooperation can come at a somewhat higher institutional price, but also tends to bear broader fruits involving more stakeholders and facilitating innovative learning.

A conclusion from analyzing the case stories is that triangular cooperation entails a huge potential for horizontal partnership. True win-win-win situations, in which all partners learn and benefit from each other, can emerge, thereby blurring the boundaries of donors and recipients. However, triangular cooperation also faces two major challenges. First, national ownership of the final beneficiary is not automatically built into triangular efforts, but rather fragile. This is especially true when the traditional donor and the Southern provider focus on creating a strong equal relationship among them, which can, however, result in an uneven partnership toward the third country. Second, transaction costs tend to be high due to a multiplication of actors and a more complex coordination among three parties. A too simplistic approach to these costs should be avoided, since they also relate to institutional learning and investing in horizontal partnership. The immediate benefits might be somewhat intangible, but no less relevant when the partnership paradigm enshrined in the Paris Declaration and the AAA is to be taken seriously. Both challenges, ownership and transaction costs, could be resolved by embedding triangular cooperation further in country-led coordination, opening also the view on comparative advantages as a basis for scaling-up.

### 3.3.2 Mechanisms for promoting South-South cooperation

While South-South learning and knowledge exchange is gaining traction, it often draws on very scarce resources and takes place in an isolated form. Developing countries willing to share their expertise tend to resolve this lack of fuel with creativity and (often personal) commitment, recycling available budgets and human resources. However, this approach entails severe limitations, especially in terms of scaling-up, coordination among South-South partners and their platforms, accumulative learning, and the generation of good practices. It is also one of the main causes why there are still some voices that claim that South-South cooperation does not exist: it frequently happens in an informal, uncoordinated, and ultimately invisible way.

Because of the meaningful work of IPRCC, donors and international professionals are gradually getting attracted to work for and with IPRCC (AP-12). While part of the solution could lie in better information systems (see section 2.1.4), several case stories describe very clearly how mechanisms and platforms have enabled them to promote effective South-South cooperation. These are sometimes related to funding, such as Canadian CIDA’s financial support to Rio Vivo’s engagement in reducing...
Social violence in communities of Bel Air in Haiti (LAC-49) or to the South African program on building state capacities in post-conflict Burundi, Rwanda, and Southern Soudan (AFR-3). Japan is very actively supporting South-South exchanges through its Third Country Training Program, to be found behind several case stories (AFR-4, AP-10, AP-16, and AP-19). Resources come from multilateral institutions as well, such as the OAS’s Cooperation Fund for the Labor Network RIAL (LAC-4) or the IDB’s Program for Development Effectiveness (see LAC-29, LAC-30, and LAC-50). Interestingly, developing countries have engaged in setting up their own funds. The Egyptian Fund for Technical Cooperation was instrumental to kick off its support to Uganda in its effort to control aquatic weeds (AFR-22). With rather small funds, the Argentinean Fund for Horizontal Cooperation financed part of the trainings facilitated by Argentinean Plata University to the Peruvian National Service for Agricultural Health (LAC-23) as well as the transfer of olives cultivation and processing capacities from Argentinean National Institute for Agriculture Technology to the Peruvian Commission for Export Promotion (LAC-32).

Moreover, recent years have seen the emergence of mechanisms that include funding, but also go beyond by promoting learning, matching demand and supply, innovating modalities, and coordinating actors. The case stories illustrate an impressive diversity of mechanisms located at national, bilateral, regional, and global levels, which are promoted by multilateral institutions and increasingly partner countries as well. While these mechanisms are likely to mushroom as a result of the renewed momentum for South-South and triangular cooperation, lessons from the case stories show that an effective mechanism needs to be set up with sufficient political will and sophisticated resources, engages in straightforward coordination with other platforms and development actors, brokers demand and supply in a balanced way, and is committed to open-minded and accumulative learning.

Setting up a sound mechanism for promoting South-South cooperation: A quick review of the showcased mechanisms shows that tools for promoting South-South cooperation are still in an early stage of development. All but one platform have been created after 2003, the exception being the Nigerian Technical Assistance Corps (TAC) launched in 1987. It is therefore a good moment to assess what it takes for designing and launching an effective mechanism for South-South cooperation. One first answer is high-level political commitment. The World Bank–hosted South-South Experience Exchange Trust Fund (SEETF) was launched in 2008 as an initiative of a World Bank managing director, who, as a former Nigerian minister of finance, had experienced a successful exchange with Chilean experts and desired to create a flexible funding mechanism for South-South learning (GL-1). Chinese leaders, including the president and ministers of three government departments, strongly committed in 2005 to the creation of the International Poverty Reduction Center in China (IPRCC), a national mechanism, feeling “that they could share their experiences with the developing countries and assist them to reduce poverty” (AP-12). The regional Ibero-American Program for Horizontal South-South Cooperation was endorsed in 2008 by sixteen directors for development cooperation from Latin America (and Spain) with the objective to seize opportunities and face challenges of South-South cooperation in LAC (LAC-18). CDDE benefits from strong ministerial support for its chair and steering committee (AP-4). Mexico and Chile launched their bilateral fund as part of their 2006 Strategic Partnership Agreement, aiming at renewed bilateral relations, especially in the technical-scientific and cultural areas (LAC-21). Nigeria boosted its TAC at the presidential level “as a foreign policy tool for the
consolidation of Nigeria’s role in the independence struggles of some African countries” (AFR-16).

A second lesson is that putting this political will into practice requires a critical amount of funding. In the experiences where these numbers are available, resources range from to US $1.5 million for the Ibero-American Program to US $4.35 million for the SEETF.

Importantly, institutional set-up requires close attention, as stressed in the IPRCC case story. Apart from political support and financial means, it is critical to create a responsive bureaucracy with a strong poverty focus, which develops capacities to design and implement serious and relevant programs. Attracting external expertise, professionalization, and incentives to retain high-profile staff constitute another crucial task, especially for new institutions in the global South (AP-12). During its reform process, the Office for Planning and Budget of the Uruguayan Presidency, partly converted into a capable platform for “horizontal partnership”, came to similar conclusions. An adapted legal framework, hiring and consistent training of staff, coordination with other government branches, such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, are basic ingredients to build and boost sound institutions for South-South cooperation (LAC-20).

**Matching demand and supply:** One of the core functions of South-South cooperation mechanisms lies in targeting needs in one context and mobilizing expertise from another. Comparative advantages in capacity development are more easily identifiable to regional and global mechanisms with a broader picture. CDDE manages the demand-supply match through its website aideffectiveness.org, a help desk, and face-to-face events (AP-4). SEGIB’s program covers this dimension through the database on good practices (LAC-18), and the regional development banks have developed specific, sometimes very simple tools to ensure that availability and lack of capacity, for example, in public debt management, is matched (LAC-9). The latter case indicates that meeting demand and supply seems to work especially well if the area of expertise is clearly delimited. In contrast, global mechanisms, such as the World Bank’s SEETF, work on a case-by-case basis. Countries can request financial support to learn about how to address priority development challenges. Since country demand has already been identified, the World Bank’s global brokering function plays an important role in the success of the response (GL-1). The supply side is often very visible in national mechanisms. As such, IPRCC strives to share the “enormous experiences of China in alleviating poverty, China [being] a storehouse for such learning” (AP-12). The China-Africa program shares specific Chinese expertise in sectors such as agriculture reform, rural development, infrastructure development and financing, foreign direct investment, and trade development (AFR-17). Efforts to identify the actual supply side are described in detail in the case story on Colombia’s Caribbean Strategy. Its set up included workshops with national entities, field visits, and exchanges with partners of the region, thus ensuring a sound match with the existing demand as well as the actual provision capacity (LAC-19). It is, however, evident that the brokering function of mechanisms needs to be developed further in order to generate a transparent and just-in-time South-South exchange, which should be based on actual comparative advantages. While the demand can be quite easily identified at the country level, the provision of Southern expertise would benefit from regional and global approaches to finding, assessing, and channeling relevant supply.

**Creating a consistent menu of modalities.** The modalities designed and implemented by the featured mechanisms cover a large range of tools and methodologies for promoting exchange and learning. In line with its role as “global connector”, the World Bank-led SEETF mainly funds study tours, workshops, training, video conferencing, and round-table discussions (GL-1). As a national platform, IPRCC is built on four main pillars: training, research, exchange events, and cooperation with other development actors, all of which is further boosted by an active dissemina-
tion through websites and publications (AP-12). Drawing on resources of their joint fund, Mexico and Chile have conducted mutual consultancies, exchange of experts and officials, internships, short- and medium-terms missions, training, workshops, dissemination, and exhibitions, especially in the area of scientific and cultural cooperation (LAC-21). SEGIB’s Ibero-American Program seeks to improve institutional South-South cooperation capacities of Latin American agencies and ministries through a regional set-up that includes enhanced information systems, training, an annual report on South-South cooperation (see LAC-1), a database of good practices, and thematic debates (LAC-18). In Asia-Pacific, CDDE draws on both traditional means (such as events, analysis, and a help desk) as well as new technologies (such as a knowledge management portal and web-based exchanges) (AP-4). Encouraging ingredients for strong and useful mechanisms are emerging; however, most platforms still seem to struggle with the synergies among different modalities and embedding these in a continued learning and feedback cycle.

Learning to manage knowledge: Contradictorily, the verve of South-South learning is often restrained by the lack of knowledge management. Regional and global mechanisms especially have a critical role to play in systematizing lessons and innovating tools, methods, and modalities. Once institutionalized, they can mobilize resources for gathering information and comparing data, for example, on factors leading to success or failure. For instance, the Ibero-American Program manages knowledge through an annual report on South-South cooperation in LAC while also setting up a database of good practices. It is also implemented against a battery of M&E indicators. Still at an early stage, the gathered lessons might become a regional knowledge capital for improving South-South technical cooperation and its effectiveness (LAC-18). Also, SEETF has invested efforts in documenting practices and lessons through an improved knowledge management on both sector issues and South-South exchange as a practice in itself (GL-1). At the national level, IPRCC recognizes the need for sound results management, both as an institution (AP-12) and in its China-Africa program (AFR-17). As described above, IPRCC shares sensitive lessons of how to set up an excellence-based national mechanism (AP-12). However, the current, rather sketchy, picture of South-South cooperation indicates that learning, feedback, and evidence generation have been fragmented. If systemic capacities are to be developed, mechanisms will need to broker not only Southern expertise, but also lessons learned on South-South exchanges as a tool for effective development cooperation.

Building an architecture for promoting South-South technical cooperation: While providing fuel to South-South learning and knowledge exchange, the birth of many mechanisms can also lead to overlapping efforts. Almost all case stories indicate a strong interest in coordinating with other platforms, but actual steps are rare. National mechanisms often work closely with multilateral institutions, as reflected in IPRCC’s engagement with UNDP and the World Bank (AP-12), or Colombia’s explicit bid to coordinate its Caribbean strategy with regional actors such as the IDB, OAS, and others (LAC-19). At the global level, the SEETF is coordinated internally with different World Bank branches and states that it should be used in tandem with other mechanisms” (GL-1).

Countries and organizations interested in accessing or sharing knowledge still lack a concise overview of existing options for sponsorship and anchorage at the different platforms. Global, regional, and national mechanisms are disconnected from each other, with little communication
and no coordination among the different layers. With mechanisms mushrooming, it is thus time to engage in a sound architecture for promoting South-South cooperation where innovation and lessons can flow smoothly in benefit of the providers and recipients of South-South expertise.

**Coordinating with other development actors:** As depicted in section 2.1.3., South-South cooperation can sometimes be a trigger for harmonization, especially if its activities attract the support by different development partners. In this line, the African agriculture program CAADP build up a donor trust fund (AF-10) and the Morocco-Mauritania water and sanitation initiative created an umbrella for joint discussions with donor agencies from Belgium, France, Germany, Japan, and Spain as well as multilaterals such as the African and Islamic Development Bank (AFR-26). With some exceptions, the showcased mechanisms have not been able to fully exploit this important potential. CDDE is one of the platforms that has generated very consistent interest from different other global and regional partners (AP-4). During its pilot year, the SEETF succeeded in mobilizing financial support from six donors, including Mexico and China, but harmonization efforts have been mainly in house so far (GL-1). Representative for most cases, the Ibero-American Program recognizes that it “still needs to engage in closer relation with other initiatives” (LAC-18). With an eye on the growing importance of South-South cooperation in global development policies, this seems to be a task that should not go unattended for too long.
### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>Accra Agenda for Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRM</td>
<td>African Peer Review Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AsDB</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAADP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDDE</td>
<td>Capacity Development for Development Effectiveness Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARICOM</td>
<td>Caribbean Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoP</td>
<td>Communities of Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCT</td>
<td>Conditional Cash Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLE</td>
<td>High Level Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLF</td>
<td>High Level Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBSA</td>
<td>India-Brazil-South Africa partnership (trilateral initiative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCIL</td>
<td>Indian Technical and Economic Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDB</td>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IATI</td>
<td>International Aid Transparency Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPRCC</td>
<td>International Poverty Reduction Center in China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JARCOM</td>
<td>JICA-ASEAN Regional Cooperation Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDR</td>
<td>Managing for Development Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD</td>
<td>New Partnership for Africa’s Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAS</td>
<td>Organization of American States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Official Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALAMA</td>
<td>Public Administration Leadership and Management Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIAL</td>
<td>Inter-American Network for Labor Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEGIB</td>
<td>Ibero-American General Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEETF</td>
<td>South-South Experience Exchange Trust Fund (World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>Technical Assistance Corps (Nigeria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT-SSC</td>
<td>Task Team on South-South Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case stories Overview

AFRICA

[AFR-1] AfCoP—Pan African peer learning on managing for results
[AFR-2] Development Gateway—Spreading and sharing aid management practices
[AFR-3] Palama—Building public sector capacities in post-conflict countries
[AFR-6] Africa Rice Center—New Rice for Africa
[AFR-7] Argentina-Niger—Technical capacity development for the provision of health services in Niger
[AFR-8] Indonesia-Japan—Institutionalizing micro finance in Africa
[AFR-10] NEPAD—Investing in agriculture and food security in Africa
[AFR-11] NEPAD—Promoting e-schools in Africa
[AFR-12] Korea-Peru-Algeria—Joining efforts around seed potato production in Algeria
[AFR-14] Germany-Brazil-Mozambique—Sharing quality standards
[AFR-15] Brazil-Angola-Japan—Building capacities at the Josina Machel Hospital
[AFR-16] Nigeria—Technical Aid Corps
[AFR-17] China-Africa—Experience sharing on development
[AFR-18] IBSA-Guinea Bissau—Boosting food self-sufficiency
[AFR-19] Nigeria—Recovering from brain drain through scientific and technical exchange
[AFR-20] Cuba Africa—Promoting integrated health services
[AFR-21] Cuba-Egypt—Joint manufacturing on vaccines
[AFR-22] Egypt-Uganda—Aquatic weed control
[AFR-23] India—Pan African e-network for medical services and human resources
[AFR-25] India-Tanzania-Uganda—Boosting dairy cooperatives
[AFR-26] Morocco–Mauritania—Achievement of Millennium Development Goals related to drinking water supply and sanitation
[AFR-27] Competence sharing among nongovernmental organization partners in South and East Africa
[AFR-28] AWEPA—Parliaments joining efforts in the fight against small arms
[AFR-29] South Africa–Kenya—Pan African Infrastructural Development Fund
[AFR-31] Brazil—Sharing a quiet social revolution

ASIA PACIFIC

[AP-1] Cambodia–Timor-Leste—Learning exchange on aid management
[AP-2] AsDB—Asian-Pacific CoP on MfDR
[AP-3] DAD—South-South learning on aid information and development effectiveness
[AP-5] Thailand—Asia-Pacific Development Center on Disability
[AP-6] Argentina–Bangladesh—Water management for water and food security
[AP-7] AsDB PASO—Investing in aviation safety in the Pacific
[AP-8] Thailand ACMECS—Human resources development
[AP-9] Japan—South-South networking around paddy fields
[AP-10] Japan—Innovative triangular cooperation with ASEAN countries (JARCOM)
[AP-12] China–IPRCC as a platform for South-South cooperation
[AP-13] Bangladesh–Korea—ICT Training Centre for education
[AP-14] Bangladesh–Korea—BRAD community development
[AP-16] Laos–Vietnam—Exchanging on local administration reform
[AP-17] Indonesia–Japan—Participatory Agriculture Extension
[AP-18] Indonesia–Japan—Training on artificial insemination of dairy cattle
[AP-20] Barefoot College—Boosting rural solar energy
[AP-21] ITEC India—Indian expertise for sustainable development
[AP-22] AsDB China India—Exchanging development experience
[AP-23] ASER—Informing education policies with research
[AP-24] Slum Dwellers International—Mutual learning for human development

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

[LAC-1] SEGIB—Ibero-American South-South Cooperation Report
[LAC-2] Colombia—Sharing cooperation maps
[LAC-3] CARICOM—On-the-job training support for key senior officials
[LAC-4] OEA—Inter-American Network for Labor Management (RIAL)
[LAC-5] Colombia—Sharing experiences in public debt management
[LAC-7] OAS—Boosting small tourism enterprises
[LAC-8] IDB—Jointly surveilling diseases in the Caribbean
[LAC-9] IDB—Exchanging practices on managing public debt
[LAC-10] IDB—Cooperating on citizens’ security and violence prevention in LAC
[LAC-12] IDB—Joint database for MERCOSUR social security institutions
[LAC-13] El Salvador-Mexico-Japan—TAISHIN (earthquake-resistant popular housing) project
[LAC-14] OAS—Triangulation of efforts for natural gas metrology
[LAC-16] OEA-Chile-Caribbean—Promoting social protection
[LAC-17] España-Chile-Paraguay—Building triangular partnerships in the public sector
[LAC-18] SEGIB—Ibero-American Program of South-South Cooperation
[LAC-19] Colombia—Caribbean Strategy
[LAC-20] Uruguay—Building institutions for horizontal partnership
[LAC-21] México-Chile—Joint Cooperation Fund
[LAC-22] Argentina-Bolivia—Managing genetic resources in the Tucuman rain forest
[LAC-23] Argentina-Peru—Investing in agrarian health
[LAC-24] Colombia—Deepening disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration
[LAC-25] Ecuador-Bolivia— Fighting together against dengue
[LAC-26] Mexico-Ecuador—Sharing electoral systems
[LAC-27] Brazil-Colombia—Rural energization
[LAC-28] Colombia-Chile—Transmilenio as a public transport option
[LAC-29] Chile-Argentina—Innovating the system of public purchases and contracts
[LAC-30] Costa Rica-Chile—Improving the assessment of budget management
[LAC-31] Argentina-Haiti—Improving public expenditure on childhood
[LAC-32] Peru-Argentina—Olive growing (preliminary)
[LAC-33] OAS—Measuring water courses (preliminary version)

[LAC-34] Costa Rica- Colombia—Promoting community rural tourism
[LAC-35] Colombia-Brazil—Promoting exports through the official postal service
[LAC-36] PAHO—Overseeing food and nutritional security
[LAC-37] PAHO—Vaccination on the Argentina-Brazil border
[LAC-38] Guatemala-Colombia—Improving public defence (preliminary version)
[LAC-39] Guatemala-Colombia—Improving the quality of the ombudsperson institution
[LAC-40] Mexico-Paraguay: Maquila sector capacities (preliminary)
[LAC-41] Mexico—Promoting university exchanges with Central America (preliminary)
[LAC-42] Guatemala-Colombia—Implementing the electronic signature
[LAC-43] Brazil-Colombia—District recycling capacities
[LAC-44] EuroSocial—Promoting ombudsperson institutions
[LAC-45] PROCASUR—Taking paths to learning
[LAC-46] UN-INSTRAW—Learning from women’s representation in local governments (preliminary version)
[LAC-47] Nicaragua—Managing information, promoting ownership
[LAC-48] Argentina-Paraguay—Promoting human rights and public interest clinics in universities
[LAC-49] Rio Vivo, Brazil-Haiti—Respect for Bel Air, Port-au-Prince
[LAC-50] Chile-Paraguay—Modernizing parliaments with new technologies
[LAC-51] Argentina—Sharing mutualism
[LAC-53] Cuba-Colombia—Learning the benefits of sericulture (silk farming)

GLOBAL

[GL-1] World Bank—Investing in South-South knowledge exchange
[AFR-1] AfCoP—Pan African peer learning on managing for results

Organization(s): The African Community of Practice on Managing for Development Results (AfCoP-MfDR)

Country(ies): Thirty-seven African countries are part of the AfCoP. Members from all of them are taking part in the knowledge-sharing process and are therefore both providers and recipients of development cooperation. The countries are Angola, Benin, Burkina Faso, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Congo-Kinshasa, Congo-Brazzaville, Côte d’Ivoire, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guinea, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Overview: The African Community of Practice on MfDR is a bilingual community established in 2007 and made up of more than 1,000 members from 37 African countries. Its members aim at building African capacity to manage for development results through sharing experiences, networking, and building strong learning relationships between practitioners in Africa and around the world. Its web platform is a key component of the community to ask questions, exchange experiences, and to ensure sustained dialogue throughout Africa. Members strive to make their organizations more results oriented, effective, and accountable to ensure that the lives of their fellow citizens are improved.

Duration: Start date: February 2009

Budget (optional): Regional focus. The first three years of the AfCoP-MfDR trust fund were supported by contributions both in cash and in kind from the African Development Bank, the Canadian International Development Agency, the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the International Fund for Agricutlure Development, the US Agency for International Development, and the World Bank. The average annual budget of the AfCoP has been US $550,000. The AfCoP will reach the end of its initial trust fund in June 2010. The AfCoP is actively fund-raising with donors throughout the development community to ensure ongoing activity and expansion beyond the depletion of its initial funding. National focus. The few AfCoP national chapters that have already been established are supported to a large extent by local government and agencies. This involvement from government is expected to grow as more national communities are created.

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Mr. Abdou Karim Lo; Mr. Devandra Parsad Ruhee

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Cochairs of the AfCoP-MfDR, respectively from Senegal and Mauritius

City: Respectively Dakar and Port Louis

[AFR-2] Development Gateway—Spreading and sharing aid management practices

Organization(s): Development Gateway (DG)

Country(ies): Burkina Faso, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Haiti, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Niger, Senegal, Southern Sudan, and Tanzania

Overview: Implementing information technology projects in developing countries is inherently complicated, and the biggest challenges can be nontechnical. These institutional, political, coordination, and process challenges can be common across different country contexts. DG’s annual knowledge-sharing workshops facilitate the exchange of good practices and lessons learned across the growing network of Aid Management Platform users in multiple countries; identify key issues in aid information management; foster partnerships between countries; and encourage regional leadership in aid management.

Duration: Ongoing since December 2008

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Stephen Davenport
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Director, Aid Effectiveness Team
City: Washington, DC

[AFR-3] Palama—Building public sector capacities in post-conflict countries

Organization(s): Public Administration Leadership and Management Academy; South Africa Ecole Nationale d’Administration; Burundi; Rwanda Institute of Administration and Management; Rwanda Capacity Building Unit in the Ministry of Labour, Public Services and Human Resource Development; Southern Sudan; the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA); Canada
Country(ies): South Africa, Rwanda, Burundi, Southern Sudan, and Canada

Overview: The RCB Project is a five-year donor-funded development intervention that has its genesis in South-South collaboration and is based on participatory approaches and innovative methodologies.

Palama established effective partnerships based on mutual respect and cooperation with three partner management development institutes (MDIs) and the donor, CIDA. This is a South-South multi-country project involving the donor through trilateral cooperation.

Through joint and bilateral planning sessions, the project improves the capabilities of the MDIs to deliver relevant training to develop public sector management skills and improve service delivery.

Duration: 2008–2013

Budget (optional): CAN $10.9 million provided by Canada. In-kind support is provided by partners in terms of time devoted to the project, for example, their time for conducting the baseline studies, or training needs analyses in conjunction with external experts.

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Dr Saloshini Muthayan

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Branch Head, International and Special Projects Branch at the Public Administration Leadership and Management Academy; and Project Leader of the Regional Capacity Building Project
City: Pretoria, Republic of South Africa


Organization(s): Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI) in collaboration with Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)


Overview: Environmental resilience and improved quality of life are development issues that require regional cooperation. The entry point is social forestry, or forestry for the people, as a participatory concept and tool that not only integrates biological and socioeconomic diversity prevailing in the area, but is also responsive to subsistence and development needs of rural and non-rural communities.

It recognizes capacity building as key for growth among African countries to enhance awareness, understanding, and actions.

Duration: The course was held once a year. The course covered a period of five weeks (thirty-three to thirty-five days). It was held in the months of September to October or January to February.

These were preferred due to prevailing dry weather conditions to depict the true ecological conditions in Kenya and similar areas of the participating countries.

Budget (optional): JICA’s contribution to fourteen courses in fourteen years is about US $1 million. KEFRI’s, Ksh 12.8 million.
Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Michael Mukolwe; Josephine Wanjiku; Dr. Ebby Chagala-Odera; Dr. Ben E.N. Chikamai

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Senior Scientist/Training Manager; Senior Scientist/Training Officer; Assistant Director; Director

City: Nairobi, Kenya


Organization(s): Centre for Mathematics, Science and Technology Education in Africa (CEMASTEA) and the Ministry of Education (Kenya)


Overview: Kenya and Japan, jointly implemented SMASSE through INSET (1998–2003 pilot; 2003–2008 national program) for teachers and education managers. SMASE-WECSA was formed for collaboration in addressing common challenges in member countries. Kenya is a beneficiary of the Philippines and Malaysia and a pivotal country in implementing teacher training programs, workshops, and dispatch of experts for more than thirty beneficiary African countries under Japan International Cooperation Agency’s SSC through CEMASTEA.


Budget (optional): This program has three financial resources, as follows: 1) JICA US $2,000,000 per year (technical support for the program activities; 2) Kenya Facility and Human Resource through CEMASTEA; and 3) WECSA member countries US $9,000 per year (annual subscription of US $300).

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Professor Karega Mutahi

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Education, Kenya

City: Nairobi, Kenya

[AFR-6] Africa Rice Center—New Rice for Africa

Organization(s): Ministry of Agriculture in all participant countries; Africa Rice Centre (WARDA); United Nations Development Program; Gatsby Foundation; Rockefeller Foundation; Japan International Cooperation Agency; Japan International Research Center for Agricultural Sciences; the Food and Agriculture Organizaition of the UN; the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries, and Fisheries (Uganda); and the United Nations Development Program-Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries (UNDO-TCDC)

Country(ies): Providers: China, Colombia, Philippines, Japan. Recipients: Nigeria, Ghana, Benin, Sierra Leone, Togo, Côte d’Ivoire, Gambia, Mali, Liberia, and Burkina Faso

Overview: New Rice for Africa (NERICA) technology refers to the successful crossing by researchers from the Africa Rice Center of the two species of cultivated rice to produce plants that combine the best traits of both parents (known as interspecifics): high yields from the Asian parent and the ability to thrive in harsh environments from the African parent—a feat not successfully achieved before in the history of rice breeding. Through the crossing of the two rice species, the NERICA technology gives researchers access to new genetic combinations. The NERICA name was trademarked in 2004.

The main aim of this project was to contribute to poverty alleviation and food security in Africa through research, development, and partnership
activities aimed at increasing the productivity and profitability of the rice sector in ways that ensure the sustainability of the farming environment. For upstream research and development, the Interspecific Hybridization Project (IHP) model—a triangular South-South partnership—was developed to bring together the pool of expertise from advanced research institutes, such as the Africa Rice Centre, with that of national programs. The rice varieties that were developed from this project were, in 1999, dubbed New Rice for Africa, commonly known as NERICA, a name that was trademarked in 2004.


**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Africa Rice Center

*[AFR-7] Argentina-Niger—Technical capacity development for the provision of health services in Niger*

**Organization(s):** Organization of Mutual Entities of the Americas, Labor and Public Office Ministry (Republic of Niger), and the Mutual Family Protection Association (AMPF) (Republic of Argentina)

**County(ies):** Republic of Niger and the Republic of Argentina

**Overview:** This case refers to the assistance on capacity development for the provision of health services provided by AMPF to the Labor and Public Office Ministry of Niger through the creation of a mutual entity. This activity was carried out through long-distance education, maximizing the resources of both parties. This initial stage was successfully finished regarding long-distance education and mutual health issues.

**Duration: NA**

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Martín Orlando

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Manager of International Relations

**City:** Buenos Aires

*[AFR-8] Indonesia-Japan—Institutionalizing micro finance in Africa*

**Organization(s):** Directorate of Technical Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Indonesia (GoI), Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), Government of Japan (GoJ), and Non-Aligned Movement Centre for South-South Cooperation (NAM-CSSTC)

**Country(ies):** Indonesia, Algeria, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Sudan, Zambia, Namibia, Madagascar, Mozambique, and South Africa

**Overview:** NAM-CSSTC—in cooperation with the GoI and JICA/GoJ—has implemented a training program on microfinance for the African region since 2004. Batch I (2004–2006) focused on the operational aspects of microfinance, while Batch II (2007–2011) emphasized the establishment and management of a microfinance institution. The idea is also based on positive feedbacks expressed by the alumni of the past TCTPs.

**Duration:** Phase I: 2004–2006. Current phase II: 2007–2011 (Every year, a training program of approximately two weeks was implemented.)

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Achmad Rofi’ie

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Assistant Director for Program, NAM-CSSTC

**City:** Jakarta, Indonesia

Organization(s): African Union (AU), New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), and African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM)

Country(ies): Algeria, Angola, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Nigeria, Republic of Congo, Rwanda, São Tomé and Príncipe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, and Zambia

Overview: The APRM is a mutually agreed-upon instrument voluntarily acceded to by the member states of the AU as an African self-monitoring mechanism. The APRM is a bold, unique, and innovative approach designed and implemented by Africans for political and corporate accountability. Participation in the APRM is open to all member states of the AU and it is of general consensus among African countries that peer pressure in objective manner generates positive outcomes.

Duration: Started since 2003, with countries reviewed every five years

Budget (optional): US $7.1 million annually

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Mr. Assefa Shifa

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Officer in charge of the APRM secretariat

City: Midrand, South Africa

[AFR-10] NEPAD—Investing in agriculture and food security in Africa

Organization(s): African Union, Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), and New Partnership for Africa’s Development

Country(ies): African countries

Overview: CAADP focuses on improving food security and nutrition and increasing incomes in Africa’s largely farming-based economies. It aims to do this by raising agricultural productivity by at least 6 percent per year and increasing public investment in agriculture to 10 percent of national budgets per year. CAADP is about bringing together diverse key players—at the continental, regional, and national levels—to improve coordination, to share knowledge, successes, and failures, to encourage one another, and to promote joint and separate efforts to achieve the CAADP goals.

Duration: 2003–2015

Budget (optional): 6 to 10 percent of the annual national budget of each participating country

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Professor Richard Mkandawire

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Coordinator

City: Midrand, South Africa

[AFR-11] NEPAD—Promoting e-schools in Africa

Organization(s): New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), private sector, and national governments

Country(ies): The countries invited to participate in the first phase were those that acceded to the Memorandum of Understanding of the NEPAD African Peer Review Mechanism as follows: Algeria, Angola, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Republic of Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Mali, Mauritius, Mozambique, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, and Uganda.

Overview: The purpose of the NEPAD e-school program is to accelerate development of information and communication technology (ICT) infrastructure and skills through supporting technical and information-technology-based education. It is also intended to bridge the digital divide in Africa and between Africa and the rest of the world. The e-Africa Commission was created in 2001 and adopted as an ICT Task Team by NEPAD in 2002. It is responsible for developing policies, strategies,
and projects at the continental level as well as managing the structured development of the ICT sector in the context of NEPAD.

**Duration:** 2006–2015

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Professor Mzobz Mboya

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Advisor: Education and Training

**City:** Midrand, South Africa

[AFR-12] Korea-Peru-Algeria—Joining efforts around seed potato production in Algeria

**Organization(s):** Korea International Cooperation Agency

**Country(ies):** Providers: Korea and Peru. Recipient: Algeria

**Overview:** Crop demand in Algeria has continued to rise sharply, thus expanding the volume of imports. Imports of crops have increased more than 50 percent, especially the potato, which is one of the major staple foods in Algeria. Algerian potato production is so insufficient to provide to the Algerian people that they have to import 80,000 tons every year. Korea and Peru provided technical assistance in potato production skills in order to alleviate the food crisis and poverty in Algerian rural areas.

**Duration:** January 2007 to November 2009

**Budget (optional):** US $1,800,000

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Mr. Jun Kyung-Moo

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Manager

**City:** Seoul, Korea


**Organization(s):** Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), the government of the Republic of Zambia, and the Zambia Development Agency

**Country(ies):** Zambia and Malaysia

**Overview:** The project aims at facilitating promotion of trade and investment to Zambia with JICA’s technical assistance. The project pays special attention to how best successful economic development experiences in East Asia (in this case, Malaysia) can be utilized in the context of present economic development challenges in Zambia as well as in Africa. The project is implemented with a Malaysian advisor (former deputy director-general of Malaysia Industrial Development Agency), who has thirty years of practical experiences in successfully promoting trade and investment in Malaysia as a backbone of economic development in Malaysia with three important actors—government, public services, and the private sector—working hand in hand as the Triangle of Hope.


**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Mr. Hajime Fukuda

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Assistant Representative

**City:** Lusaka, Zambia

[AFR-14] Germany-Brazil-Mozambique—Sharing quality standards

**Organization(s):** National Institute of Standardization and Quality (INNOQ) (Mozambique); National Institute of Metrology, Standardization and Industrial Quality (INMETRO) (Brazil); Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC); Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (Germany); German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ); and the German National Metrology Institute (PTB)

**Country(ies):** Mozambique, Brazil, and Germany

**Overview:** Due to growing industrial expansion and entrance in the international market, Mozam-
bique decided to engage in a triangular cooperation initiative with Brazil and Germany in order to improve Mozambican quality infrastructure through institutional and technical development of INNOQ. This project also contributed significantly to the development of an official concept and guiding principles for Brazilian-German triangular cooperation. Mozambican consumers gained access to institutional means to demand better quality standards of products in the national market.


**Budget (optional):** US $312,184,00 (pilot project). ABC: US $89,184; PTB: US $77,160; GTZ: US $79,200; Inmetro: US $66,640. Shared between the Brazilian and German counterparts. The Mozambican counterpart provided permanent personnel and logistical support for the implementation of the activities.

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Daniel Alker

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Counselor of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development in Brazil

**City:** Brazilian Federal District, Brazil

**[AFR-15] Brazil-Angola-Japan—Building capacities at the Josina Machel Hospital**

**Organization(s):** Ministry of Health (Angola), Josina Machel Hospital (JMH) (Brazil), Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC), Campinas University, São Paulo University Institute of Heart, Santa Cruz Hospital, Sofia Feldman Hospital (Japan), and the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

**Country(ies):** Angola

**Overview:** In this project, professionals of JMH, Lucrecia Paim Maternity Hospital, thirteen primary health care centers, and other hospitals were trained in five areas as follows: hospital administration, equipment maintenance, nursing care, radiology, and laboratory. The training course was conducted by Brazilian experts and Angolan professionals under the coordination of Japan, Brazil, and Angola with utilizing the facility of JMH, which was rehabilitated by the Grant Aid Cooperation of Japanese Government.

**Duration:** April 2007 to March 2010

**Budget (optional):** Share of Japan’s contribution: US $549,450,00 (76.04 percent). Share of Brazil’s contribution: US $173,129,97 (23.96 percent). The budget of former Grant Aid Project by the Japanese government was approximately US $40 million.

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Mr. Kota Sakaguchi; Mr. Wofsi Yuri de Souza

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Assistant Representative, JICA Brazil Office; Coordinator of Bilateral Cooperation, ABC

**City:** Brasilia, Brazil

**[AFR-16] Nigeria—Technical Aid Corps**

**Organization(s):** Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Nigeria)

**Country(ies):** Provider: Nigeria. Recipients: Ethiopia, Sierra Leone, Uganda, Jamaica, and Belize

**Overview:** The Technical Aid Corps (TAC) program is a technical cooperation between Nigeria and African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) nations. It is an alternative to direct financial aid designed for sharing Nigeria’s know-how and expertise with other ACP countries. Nigeria uses professionals from various sectors, such as medicine and academia, to carry out this program in the recipient countries. The program acts as a channel through which South-South collaboration is enhanced through streamlined program assistance to other developing countries. It shows enormous amount of local ownership and knowledge transfer from Nigeria experts to participating personnel of the recipient countries. TAC has played a cardinal role in cementing existing relations between Nigeria...
and beneficiary countries, and, on a wider scale, in creating an atmosphere of partnership where it otherwise would not exist.

**Duration:** TAC was established in 1987 and it is an ongoing program

**Budget (optional):** Determined and managed through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Mamman Daura

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Ambassador

**City:** Abuja, Nigeria

[AFR-17] **China-Africa—Experience sharing on development**

**Organization(s):** International Poverty Reduction Center in China

**Country(ies):** Angola, Benin, Burundi, Cameroon, Central Africa, Chad, China, Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. A total of thirty-six countries were involved.

**Overview:** The program is expected to be multi-year, sponsored by the Chinese government, with strong support from the World Bank. Two events have been successfully organized in 2008 and 2009, respectively, nine days each, including a three-day workshop and field visits to two provinces in China. Sixty-five senior African government officials, fifty Chinese government officials and leading experts, as well as forty representatives from international development agencies and embassies in China participated in the event. Presentations, discussions, and field visits were conducted on Agricultural Reform and Rural Development, Infrastructure Development and Financing, Special Economic Zones, FDI, and Trade Development, as well as China’s Cooperation and Engagement with Africa. Strong commitment and support of the Chinese government have been provided to this program. Besides financial support and policy guidance, ministers/vice ministers of the three hosting ministries of China participated in the events. Through the program, better mutual understanding on development strategies, policies, and practices has been established between the African countries and China with some follow-up actions taking place.

**Duration:** The program is expected to be multi-year and has developed and implemented two successful events in 2008 and 2009, nine days each.

**Budget (optional):** Financed by the Chinese government with strong support from the World Bank. The budget of each event is around US $300,000 (the participants’ expenditure of international travel is included), 81.85 percent of which is shared by Ministry of Commerce and Ministry of Finance of China, and 18.15 percent is shared by the World Bank.

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Ms. LI Xin

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Deputy Division Chief, Division of Exchanges, International Poverty Reduction Center in China

**City:** Beijing, China

[AFR-18] **IBSA-Guinea Bissau—Boosting food self-sufficiency**

**Organization(s):** South AFRICAN Institute of International Affairs, Business Unity South Africa (BUSA), Institute for International Trade Negotiations, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, and the CUTS Centre for International Trade, Economics and Environment

**Country(ies):** India-Brazil-South Africa (IBSA)

**Overview:** The project was designed to explore the current and future volume and composition of trade between India, Brazil, and South Africa (IBSA), while factoring the perceptions of stakeholders on trade and economic cooperation.
Duration: One year

Budget (optional): Almost US $500,000

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Phathiwe Mokoena

Title of Primary Contact Person(s):

City: Pretoria, South Africa

[AFR-19] Nigeria—Recovering from brain drain through scientific and technical exchange

Organization(s): Directorate of Technical Cooperation in Africa in Nigeria. Universities, polytechnics, and colleges of education and research centers collaborated with national, international, and regional organizations.

Country(ies): Nigeria, South Africa, Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique, and other African countries

Overview: The Scientific and Technical Exchange Programme (STEP) seeks to reverse the brain drain trend by offering attractive research facilities in African countries such as South Africa to Nigeria. STEP has created opportunities to engage the services of highly trained Nigerian/African researchers who are willing and able to offer quality services to research and development in Africa. The expectation of the Nigerian technical cooperation department is that STEP will produce the synergy for African technological liberation as it could also be bilaterally and multilaterally implemented.

Duration: Started in 1999; still present

Budget (optional): The program is funded by the Nigerian government through normal budgetary allocations and the Technical Cooperation Fund established by Nigeria at the African Development Bank

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Office of the Director General

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): The Director General

City: Abuja, Nigeria

[AFR-20] Cuba-Africa—Promoting integrated health services

Organization(s): Ministry of Health (Cuba) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Cuba)

Country(ies): Provider: Cuba. Recipients: African countries of Angola, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea (Conakry), Lesotho, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Rwanda, SADR (Western Sahara), São Tomé and Príncipe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Swaziland, Uganda, and Zimbabwe

Overview: Cuba’s assistance in international health care is evidenced in its health programs in Africa as South-South development cooperation. The objective of enhancing the capacities of medical personnel in Africa is pursued through the Integral Health Programme initiated by Cuba in 1998. This program, which is primarily earmarked for rural areas, involves the sending of medical personnel to African countries. More importantly, Cuba is greatly involved in the international campaign against HIV/AIDS in Africa.

Duration: Two years per batch, but still ongoing

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Yiliam Jiménez; Merlyn Rivero

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): The director of cooperation of the Cuban Ministry of International Affairs; Cuban Embassy in South Africa

City: Havana, Cuba; Pretoria, South Africa

[AFR-21] Cuba-Egypt—Joint manufacturing on vaccines

Organization(s): Cuba: Two companies: Finlay and Heber Biotec; Egypt: Vacsera and the Ministry of Health

Country(ies): Provider: Cuba; Recipient: Egypt

Overview: The technical cooperation between Egypt’s national vaccine producing institution,
Vacsera, and Cuba’s specialized vaccine producers, Finlay and Heber Biotec, aims at the transfer of Cuban technology and know-how to Egyptian technicians in the field of selected vaccine manufacturing. These particular vaccines are of high national priority and at the same time would foster the Cuban counterparts exportation of raw material used to produce such vaccines.

**Duration:** November 2007 to (tentative) 2009, but was extended due to the delays referred to above

**Budget (optional):** 10 million Egyptian pounds

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Dr. Hamdalalah H. Zedan; Radwa Helmy Abdel-Raouf

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Chairman and CEO of Vaccines, Sera and Drugs (Affiliate of Vacsera Holding Company for Biologicals and Vaccines); Executive Assistant to the Cochair, OECD/DAC Working Party on Aid Effectiveness

**City:** Cairo, Egypt

[AFR-22] Egypt-Uganda—Aquatic weed control

**Organization(s):** Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation (Egypt) and the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (Uganda)

**Country(ies):** Provider: Egypt. Recipient: Uganda

**Overview:** In 1998, the Government of Uganda called for assistance to control the growth of aquatic weeds that blocked the outlets of both lakes Kyoga and Albert, causing flooding around the lakes’ shores. The Egyptian government responded by offering the Government of Uganda a three-phase technical and financial support project to deal with this problem:


**Duration:** 1999–2014

[AFR-23] India—Pan African e-network for medical services and human resources

**Organization(s):** Nodal Ministry for Implementation—Ministry of External Affairs, Tele-Communications Consultants India Limited (implementing agency), and several universities and super specialty hospitals in India

**Country(ies):** Provider: Government of India. Recipient: African Union member states (fifty-three countries total)

**Overview:** Recognizing that Africa-India cooperation can go a long way in the globalizing world for mutual advantage inspired by a boost in expertise in it’s information technology and medical sciences sector, and in an effort to contribute to the Millennium Development Goal of increasing education levels across the developing world, the Government of India proposed the Pan African e-network project that allows India and African countries to be linked to one another through a satellite-run network that will further enable the transfer of other facilities such as teleconferencing between heads of states, tele-medical consultations, and so on.

**Duration:** Ongoing

**Budget (optional):** INR 5,429 million; Over $125 million

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Surabhi Tandon

Organization(s): South African Department of Trade and Industry and Department of Transport

Overview: The SDI is a project made up of a cluster of projects designed to develop small communities through infrastructural development. The main project under the SDI is the Maputo Development Corridor, which involves the Maputo Corridor Toll Road, the railway from Ressano Garcia to Maputo, and the Maputo Port and Harbor. Other secondary projects are in the fields of agriculture, mining, and tourism. The development from the SDIs would mean future cooperation among the Southern African countries as the SDIs were spread across various provinces in the region.

Duration: Maputo Development Corridor launched on June 6, 1998

Budget (optional): In all, 694 projects have been identified, to the estimated value of R 1,148 billion/$182 billion in the tourism, education, craft, commercial and agriculture sectors, including substantial opportunities for communities and small businesses. Ten development initiatives have been designated and have already generated around 400 investment projects valued at R 83 billion.

[AFR-25] India-Tanzania-Uganda—Boosting dairy cooperatives

Organization(s): World Bank
Country(ies): Provider: India. Recipients: Tanzania and Uganda

Overview: A knowledge-sharing initiative was launched in 2008 to collate and apply lessons from India’s successful experience in developing its dairy sector to support more rapid growth of Tanzania’s and Uganda’s dairy industries. Participants in the exchange were exposed to a range of new strategies for increasing milk and dairy product consumption and improving marketing and production practices. The improved understanding and subsequent adoption and adaptation of these key strategies are intended to improve food security, nutrition, and incomes in the poorest communities in these two countries.

Duration: August 2008; 1 year

Budget (optional): $60,000

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Michael Wong; Moses Kibirige
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Senior Private Sector Development Specialist; Financial and Private Sector Development
City: Washington, DC

[AFR-26] Morocco–Mauritania—Achievement of Millennium Development Goals related to drinking water supply and sanitation

Organization(s): National Office of Potable Water (ONEP) (Morocco) and the International Water and Sanitation Institute (on launching phase)
Country(ies): Provider: Morocco. Recipient: Mauritania under the coverage of the Global Water Partners Alliance (GWOPA) (UN-HABITAT) with support from the water and sanitation operators in the following countries: France (Agua de Paris, SIAAP); Belgium (SWDE, Vivaqua); Burkina Faso (ONEA); and Spain (Spanish Cooperation Agency, AECI)

Overview: The cooperation between ONEP and SNDE aims at the development of capacities of the Mauritanian operator to turn it into a competent tool, enabling it to accomplish its public service missions and allowing the country to reach the MDGs related to water supply.

This South-South cooperation is not intended to be exclusive; it is expected to be open toward...
Northern countries through support from a network of water operators and northern cooperation agencies (France, Belgium, and Spain). This cooperation has evolved toward twinning partnerships sponsored by the GWOPA UN-HABITAT.

**Duration:** Estimated in three to five years (It will be specified after issuing the ongoing diagnostic study and after the second round table, planned for June 2010 in Nouakchott)

**Budget (optional):** AECI has established a credit line of US $600,000 to fund consultancy expenses in order to finance primarily the work of experts from ONEP for Sub-Sahara Africa, with a particular priority on the Mauritania project. Other partners from the operator network (Paris Water, Vivaqua, SWDE, ONEA, and ONEP) have officially declared after the Rabat Round Table that they will make in-kind contributions for the provision of the necessary workforce corresponding to fifteen men per day during the preparatory phase (diagnostic study), and that they would be ready to continue making in-kind contributions in order to make true certain actions that result from the action plan agreed upon for June 2010.

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Samir Bensaid

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** General Director International Water and Sanitation Institute, organization affiliated to the National Office of Potable Water, in charge of capacity development of the App Research

**City:** Rabat, Morocco

**[AFR-27] Competence sharing among nongovernmental organization partners in South and East Africa**

**Organization(s):** Southern and east African NGO partners of PYM Aid Norway

**Country(ies):** Kenya, Uganda, Somaliland, Swaziland, Mozambique, and Rwanda

**Overview:** The CSNP is a learning initiative among thirteen African church partners of PYM Aid Norway. Highly participatory annual meetings, complemented by visits between partners, have enabled considerable learning to take place and, more importantly, be applied in practice. This has had catalytic knock-on effects on networking outside CSNP. This case study shows the value of strong local ownership and facilitation in South-South learning.

**Duration:** The CSNP started in 2006 and is still continuing (forty-eight months so far). It has secured funding until 2012.

**Budget (optional):** The CSNP is generally low cost. It costs about US $50,000 per year to operate. Meetings are kept to a small budget, with cheap and simple venues. The coordination and facilitation of the learning network group is largely voluntary. For example, the current coordinating chair estimates he spends approximately sixty days per year (25 percent of his time) on the network. He receives US $100 per month as recompense. Given the undoubted impact of the CSNP, the costs are relatively small compared with other learning networks or capacity building interventions such as consultancy and training.

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Festus Mukoya

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):**

**City:** Nairobi, Kenya

**[AFR-28] AWEPA—Parliaments joining efforts in the fight against small arms**

**Organization(s):** Association of European Parliamentarians with Africa (AWEPA)

**Country(ies):** Africa: Great Lakes and Horn of Africa region

**Overview:** This case story is a reflection on the cooperative efforts of the national parliaments of the Great Lakes and Horn of Africa region in the reduction of small arms.

**Duration:** 2000 to the present

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Dr. Jeff Balch
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Director, Research and Evaluation, AWEPA
City: Amsterdam, The Netherlands

[AFR-29] South Africa–Kenya—Pan African Infrastructural Development Fund


Overview: The PAIDF raises money from private investors and pension funds from its many member countries across Africa and invests the money in overseas markets. The profits from those investments are used to fund projects across Africa.

Duration: Started in 2007 and has a fifteen-year investment horizon

Budget (optional): Initial target is to raise US $1 billion. So far, US $625 million has been raised by the investors in the fund.


Organization(s): Department of Foreign Affairs (Ireland)

Country(ies): Ireland, Northern Ireland, Timor-Leste, and Liberia

Overview: The Conflict Resolution Unit of the Department of Foreign Affairs of Ireland is partnering with women and men from Ireland/Northern Ireland, Liberia, and Timor-Leste in a cross-learning process on UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace, and Security. The broad purpose of the process is to understand and learn from those directly affected by conflict on how best to promote and protect women’s leadership and interests in conflict resolution and peace building.

Duration: January 2009 until ongoing to completion in December 2010

Budget (optional): US $1 million

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Liz Higgins

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Principal Development Specialist, Policy Planning and Effectiveness Unit, Irish Aid
City: Dublin, Ireland

[AFR-31] Brazil—Sharing a quiet social revolution

Organization(s): Ministry of Social Development and Hunger Alleviation (MDS) and the World Bank

Country(ies): The Bolsa Família Program (BFP) has been the object of multiple requests for study tours and visits. Until December 2009, this process involved visits from about thirty countries, including luso-phone Africa, Costa Rica, Nigeria, India, Pakistan, Peru, the Philippines, and Panama, among others. Representatives from MDS also participated in seminars in Morocco, India, Colombia, and Egypt.

Overview: As the largest conditional cash transfer in the world and one of the first in its kind, the BFP is unique in its institutional arrangements—especially those that favor coordination among sectors and cooperation between States—as well as its scale of operations. It is also a successful experience from a political and social perspective. This has attracted attention both in Brazil and abroad, and moved several countries in the first stages of implementation of a CCT to ask for advice from the BFP team. That cooperation takes place in the form of visits to the federal management of the program and through technical cooperation activities with MDS.
Duration: South-South Cooperation between the BF team and the African countries started in 2005 and has increased year after year. The Brazilian government is improving the channels by which cooperation takes place and is now working on projects with more specific timelines along with its partners.

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Francisco Ochoa
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Consultant, Social Protection Unit, Human Development Department, World Bank
City: Washington, DC

ASIA PACIFIC

[AP-1] Cambodia–Timor Leste—Learning exchange on aid management

Organization(s): Cambodian Rehabilitation and Development Board of the Council for Development of Cambodia (CRDB/CDC) of the Royal Government of Cambodia, the National Directorate for Aid Effectiveness of the Ministry of Finance (Timor-Leste), and the Government of Timor-Leste
Country(ies): Cambodia and Timor-Leste (and Japan)
Overview: During 2009, Cambodia and Timor-Leste engaged in an exchange intended to help Timor-Leste, that is, the National Directorate for Aid Effectiveness (NDAE) of the Ministry of Finance, set up an information management system that can serve as a tool for the NDAE in its policy dialogue, management, and coordination of development cooperation projects and programs supported by development partners in Timor-Leste. During the exchange, the two countries also shared with each other initiatives, experiences, knowledge, and lessons learned in managing development cooperation activities, in particular those in the last five years. The learning exchange involved a series of activities including an exchange of visits of officials directly responsible in the area of interest. The cooperation between CRDB/CDC of the Royal Government of Cambodia and the NDAE was enabled financially by the Japan International Cooperation Agency offices in both countries.

Duration: June to September 2009
Name of Primary Contact Person(s): HENG CHOU
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Sr. Policy Specialist, Cambodian Rehabilitation and Development Board/Council for Development of Cambodia, Royal Government of Cambodia
City: Phnom Penh, Cambodia

[AP-2] AsDB – Asian-Pacific CoP on MfDR

Organization(s): Asian Development Bank (ADB)
Country(ies): Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, China, Cook Islands, Fiji Islands, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Vanuatu, and Vietnam as at December 2009 (Open to all Asian Development Bank’s (ADB) developing member countries)

Overview: AsCoP-MfDR, created in 2006, was the first regional developing country network on managing for development results (MfDR). ADB is the secretariat.

AsCoP-MfDR gives members access to good practices, tools, and training opportunities on MfDR through peer-to-peer learning activities, including specific South-South collaborations.

The success of AsCoP-MfDR influenced the creation of the Latin American and Caribbean CoP and the African CoP. The OECD-DAC recently reaffirmed regional CoPs as essential hubs for learning and promoting MfDR-based country systems.

Budget (optional): Phase I: Asian Development Bank: US $900,000. In-kind contribution from the partner organizations (Singapore’s Civil Service College supported by Singapore’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy of the National University of Singapore, and the Asia-Pacific Finance and Development Center in Shanghai supported by the Ministry of Finance of the People’s Republic of China).

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Farzana Ahmed

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Principal Coordinator, Asia Pacific Community of Practice on MfDR, Asian Development Bank

City: Manila, Philippines

[AP-3] DAD – South-South learning on aid information and development effectiveness


Country(ies): Afghanistan, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Comoros, India, Iraq and the Kurdistan Regional Government, Namibia, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, and Yemen

Overview: The 2009 Development Assistance Database (DAD) Community of Practice (CoP) Workshop, which took place from October 5–9 at Synergy’s Global Learning Center in Yerevan, Armenia, brought together forty-five government officials from thirteen southern countries. The central goal of the DAD CoP Workshop was to facilitate the systematic sharing of South-South knowledge on and experiences in managing country-level aid information management systems (AIMS) so as to strengthen national capacities for aid management and coordination.

Duration: October 5-9, 2009

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Richard Bradley

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Aid Effectiveness Advisor

City: Washington, DC


Organization(s): Government of Nepal, Government of Sri Lanka, Government of Bangladesh, Government of Samoa, Green Movement of Sri Lanka/Reality of Aid, INFID Indonesia/Reality of Aid, Member of Parliament of Indonesia/Inter-Parliamentary Union, Asian Development Bank, Government of Japan, United Nations Development Programme, the World Bank, and a range of other governments and other stakeholders in the region

Country(ies): Nineteen countries across Asia-Pacific have benefited from the CDDE Facility to date, including Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Kiribati, Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor-Leste, and Vietnam.

Overview: The CDDE Facility was set up in response to the request from partner countries that more systematic and predictable support be provided to partner countries grappling with the localization and implementation of PD and AAA principles and actions.

The CDDE Facility aims to contribute to the three key results areas:

1. Asia and the Pacific signatories will achieve the Paris Declaration targets by 2010 and the AAA actions by the time of the Fourth High Level Forum in 2011.

2. Asia and the Pacific countries establish South-South networks that deliver real improvements in national capacities for development effectiveness.
3. Asia and the Pacific countries contribute to the strengthening of international aid policies and aid architecture.

The CDDE Facility offers the following key features:

1. Initiatives developed by partner country governments and other stakeholders including civil society organizations (CSOs) and parliaments.

2. The Asia-Pacific Aid Effectiveness Community of Practice is a multi-stakeholder group giving emphasis to broadening partnerships as articulated in the Accra Agenda for Action.

3. Members include representatives from partner country governments, legislature, CSOs, and donor partners.

Duration: The CDDE Facility was launched in March 2009; it is continuing, and demand for its services is increasing. The current time frame for results monitoring is up to end 2011.

Budget (optional): ADB: US $200,000; Government of Japan: US $30,000; UNDP: US $125,000; World Bank: US $50,000; World Bank Institute: US $30,000; Total: US $435,000

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Mr. Lava Awasthi
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Joint Secretary, Ministry of Education, Government of Nepal
City: Katmandú, Nepal

[AP-5] Thailand – Asia-Pacific Development Center on Disability

Organization(s): Thailand International Development Cooperation Agency (TICA), Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS), Government of Thailand Foundation of the Asia-Pacific Development Center on Disability (APCD Foundation), and the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

Country(ies): As the regional center on disability and development, APCD has been collaborating with thirty-two countries in the Asia and Pacific. ASEAN subregion is one of its priorities.

Overview: Facilitating persons with disabilities (PWDs) and their groups/organizations in the context of disability and development, APCD provides training and information support based on its network in the Asia and Pacific region. Particularly, APCD’s approach is to mobilize resources at all levels (individual, organizational, and societal) in collaboration with more than thirty focal point organizations (government ministries/agencies in charge of disability) and around 200 associate organizations (self-help groups/organization of PWDs, and grassroots nongovernmental organizations at the national level).


Budget (optional): 1) About 30 percent from TICA/MSDHS and the Government of Thailand; 2) About 30 percent from APCD Foundation; 3) About 40 percent from JICA

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Mr. Akiie Ninomiya
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Executive Director, APCD
City: Bangkok, Thailand

[AP-6] Argentina-Bangladesh—Water management for water and food security

Organization(s): Training Center of the Bangladesh Chemical Society, Dakha, and Dr. Javier Quagliano and the R&D Institute of the Ministry of Defense (Buenos Aires)

Country(ies): Argentina, Bangladesh

Overview: This case is about cooperation between Argentina and Bangladesh for dealing with arsenic contamination of water and food. In Bangladesh arsenic is in waters that supplies a population of a hundred million. Moreover, well waters are used
mainly for irrigation in agricultural production and toxic migrates to crops, as in certain areas of Argentina cropland. Solving this problem with scarce resources is a big challenge and needs different approaches from very different countries and cultures.

**Duration:** 2007 to date

**Budget (optional):** 2000

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Dr. Abul Basher Miah; Dr. Javier Quagliano

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Head of Institute; Associate Projectist

**City:** Dakha, Buenos Aires

[AP-7] AsDB PASO—Investing in aviation safety in the Pacific

**Organization(s):** Council of Directors (comprising representatives of each member country that sets policy and monitors implementation and enforcement of technical findings of PASO), National Civil Aviation Authorities of member countries (CAA), Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, private air transport service operators, Asian Development Bank (Pacific Department), and the International Civil Aviation Organization

**Country(ies):** PASO member countries that are currently parties to the Pacific Islands Civil Aviation Safety and Security Treaty (PICASST) are the Cook Islands, Kiribati, Niue, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu. Countries that are also members of PASO but not parties to the PICASST are Australia, Fiji, and New Zealand. Associate member organizations of PASO are the Asian Development Bank, Association of South Pacific Airlines, US Federal Aviation Agency, and the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat. PASO membership is open to all Pacific Island Forum member countries.

**Overview:** The PASO project is a regional technical cooperation through intergovernmental finance and institutional development to improve safety and security standards within the aviation sector of the Pacific Islands participating countries.

Aviation safety and security are public goods; however, given the small and fragmented nature of the Pacific aviation sector, it is difficult to provide the necessary oversight on a national and regional basis to ensure adequate provision. Aggregation of services or functions on a regional basis creates economies of scale and scope that transform their provision.

The Pacific Plan recognizes that a new and innovative approach to the unique challenges that the Pacific Island countries face is through a framework of greater regional cooperation and integration—the PASO project is aligned to this proposition.

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Mr. Robert Guild

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Principal Transport Specialist, Pacific Department, Asian Development Bank

**City:** Mandaluyong City, Metro Manila, Philippines

[AP-8] Thailand ACMECS—Human resources development

**Organization(s):** Thailand International Development Cooperation Agency and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

**Country(ies):** Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Vietnam, and Thailand

**Overview:** Human resource development and capacity building projects/activities provided to member countries in seven areas of cooperation: trade and investment facilitation, agricultural cooperation, industrial and energy cooperation, transport linkages, tourism cooperation, public health, and environment.

**Duration:** Since the first ACMECS Summit on November 12, 2003, in Bagan, Myanmar
Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Mrs. Jitkasem Tantasiri

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Director of Thai Cooperation Branch I, Development Cooperation Bureau, Thailand International Development Cooperation Agency, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Thailand

City: Bangkok, Thailand

[AP-9] Japan—South-South networking around paddy fields

Organization(s): International Network for Water and Ecosystem in Paddy Fields (INWEPF)

Country(ies): Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Vietnam

Overview: A South-South network to improve policies and practices related to paddy (rice) agricultural systems in Monsoon Asia. INWEPF holds annual general meetings and more frequent meetings of the three working groups focusing on 1) technical issues, 2) policy and awareness, and 3) development cooperation, plus a regular e-newsletter.

Duration: INWEPF was established formally in November 2004 and intends to continue into the foreseeable future.

Budget (optional): INWEPF does not collect membership fees or other types of fees from members. INWEPF activities of each member are implemented and funded by the member organizations. Some members, especially the host countries of INWEPF annual meetings, allocate a budget specifically for INWEPF activities. Because INWEPF doesn’t have a dedicated secretariat, however, the total budget of INWEPF-related activities is not accounted. In the case of Japan, the budget is 8,600 thousands Japanese Yen (equivalent to US $95,000). This is used for the activities of INWEPF Japanese committee and financial assistance to some members to participate in INWEPF meetings.

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Mr. Yasuhisa Kayama; Mr. David Groenfeldt, PhD (INWEPF Consultant); INWEPF Japanese secretariat

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): The Japanese Institute of Irrigation and Drainage; Director Water and Culture Institute; Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries

City: Santa Fe, New Mexico

[AP-10] Japan—Innovative triangular cooperation with ASEAN countries (JARCOM)

Organization(s): Council for the Development of Cambodia; Bureau for Technical Cooperation, State Secretariat of Indonesia; Department of International Cooperation of Lao People’s Democratic Republic; Economic Planning Unit of Malaysia; Foreign Economic Relations Department of Myanmar; National Economic and Development Authority of the Philippines; Technical Cooperation Directorate of Singapore; Thailand International Development Cooperation Agency; Ministry of Planning and Investment of Vietnam; National Directorate for Planning and External Assistance Coordination of Timor-Leste (observer); and Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

Country(ies): Cambodia, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Vietnam, Timor-Leste (mainly as recipients), Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand (mainly as providers), and Japan (donor for the triangular cooperation)

Overview: JICA-ASEAN Regional Cooperation Meeting (JARCOM) was a unique triangular cooperation framework in Southeast Asia. Originally designed as a mechanism to formulate good quality SSC projects, it gradually evolved into a forum to discuss common development challenges in the region. While the Northern donor stepped back as a facilitator, it’s all-stakeholder-participatory and transparent process enhanced the ownership of both recipients and providers. Peer pressures
among ASEAN members nurtured self-help efforts and leaderships in the South.

**Duration:** 2002–2007 (duration of JARCOM annual meetings)

**Budget (optional):** Budgets for SSC training are varied depending on the number of trainees, travel costs, duration, and subject matter, but roughly ranging from US $30,000 to US $80,000. Some pivotal countries shared the costs with JICA (Malaysia: 50 percent; Singapore: 50 percent; and Thailand: approximately 30 percent).

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Ms. Yasuko Matsumi (author of case study); Mr. Tatsuhiro Mitamura (focal point of JICA headquarters)

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Former Regional Project Formulation Advisor, JICA Regional Support Office for Asia (Thailand), currently Project Formulation Advisor at JICA Egypt Office; Assistant Director, Development Partnership Division Operations Strategy Department, JICA

**City:** Cairo, JICA Egypt Office (current country of residence); JICA headquarters, Tokyo, Japan


**Organization(s):** Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), the Government of Malaysia, Malaysia Technical Cooperation Programme (MTCP), International Institute of Public Policy and Management (INPUMA), and the University of Malaya

**Country(ies):** Malaysia

**Overview:** Malaysia as a multicultural and religious nation with successful economic and social development can provide other developing countries with unique opportunities to learn how the Government of Malaysia has been managing its complex cultural and religious aspects with different ethnicities as a nation. A total of twenty-four government officials from Afghanistan, Iraq, and Sudan were invited to the program. The 2009 course was the fifth year of the six-year cooperation with MTCP and JICA. In the past we had also invited participants from Sri Lanka, East Timor, and Bosnia-Herzegovina based on their current situation and needs.

**Duration:** Two weeks every year from 2005 to 2010

**Budget (optional):** Cost of conducting the course is shared by the MTCP and JICA on a 50 percent–each basis.

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Dr. Khadijah Khalid

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Executive Director, International Institute of Public Policy and Management (INPUMA)

**City:** Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

[AP-12] China—IPRCC as a platform for South-South cooperation

**Organization(s):** International Poverty Reduction Centre in China (IPRCC) closely connected with China’s State Council Leading Group Office of Poverty Alleviation and Development, Ministry of Commerce, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the National Development and Reform Commission and Ministry of Finance. IPRCC is also linked with the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), World Bank, Asian Development Bank, and the UK Department for International Development

**Country(ies):** China, Africa, Asia-Pacific region, and Latin America

**Overview:** IPRCC, launched in 2005, is an international organization jointly initiated by the Chinese government, the UNDP, and other international organizations. The boards of trustees and advisors have been established. IPRCC has grown to be one of the flagship organizations in China for South-South cooperation. Core activities include:
• Organizing international exchange on poverty reduction through sharing of knowledge, information, and experiences;

• Providing training and consultancy services to professionals involved in poverty reduction worldwide;

• Organizing theoretical and applied research for knowledge building, policy analysis and advocacy.

• Cooperating with international organizations to design and implement poverty reduction programs for specific needs in developing countries.

Duration: Started in 2005. Ongoing

Budget (optional): IPRCC Revenue and Expenditures in 2008 (excluding capital investments):

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Ms. Li Xin

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Deputy Division Chief, Division of Exchanges, IPRCC

City: Beijing, China

[AP-13] Bangladesh-Korea—ICT Training Centre for education

Organization(s): Bangladesh Bureau of Education Information & Statistics (BANBEIS), Ministry of Education

Country (ies): Bangladesh

Overview: In pursuance with national ICT policy 2002 to foster knowledge-based society, Bangladesh Bureau of Education Information and Statistics (BANBEIS), in collaboration with Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA) initiated a project “Establishment of Bangladesh-Korea ICT Training Center for Education (BKITCE)” to facilitate building appropriate IT infrastructure by setting up and operating a state-of-the-art Training Center in the country with 5 (five) ICT labs in the renovated and remodeled BANBEIS Computer Division as the centre of excellence.

Duration: July 2006 – June 2009

Budget (Optional): Total: US$ 1.78 million (Project Aid : US$1.6 million, Govt.: US$ 0.18 million)

Name of Primary Contact Person: (1) Mr. Monowar Ahmed (if not available, please contact)
(2) Mr. Rafique Ahmed Siddique

Title of Primary Contact Person: JCS Coordination Officer, Aid Effectiveness Unit, Economic Relations Division (ERD)

City: Dhaka, Bangladesh

[AP-14] Bangladesh-Korea—BARD community development

Organization(s): Bangladesh Academy for Rural Development (BARD), Kotbari, and Comilla

Country(ies): Bangladesh, Korea

Overview: Bangladesh and the Republic of Korea share the common strategy for accelerated poverty reduction and achievement of other Millennium Development Goals. In pursuance with common development approach, Korea International Cooperation Agency and BARD launched the Integrated Community Development Project in Burichang Upazila of Comilla District in Bangladesh. The project aims at establishing a participatory community development model to champion the national priority by improving institutional and physical infrastructure of the rural community and enhancing the capacity of the people’s organization in the planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluation of development objectives.

Duration: July 2008–June 2011


Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Dr. Kamrul Ahsan
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Project Director, Integrated Community Development Project in Burichang Upazila of Comilla District in Bangladesh
City: Comilla, Bangladesh

[AP-15] AsDB Cambodia-Vietnam—Twinning of water utilities

Organization(s): Binh Duong Water Supply Sewerage Environment Company Limited (BIWASE) and Phnom Penh Water Supply Authority (PPWSA)

Country(ies): Provider: Cambodia (PPWSA). Recipient: Vietnam (BIWASE)

Overview: Asian Development Bank (ADB) has adopted and improved on twinning as a development strategy for its Water Operators’ Partnership (WOPs) Program. The WOPs program promotes knowledge sharing and builds the capacity of water operators and utilities in the Asia and Pacific region. Among its key initiatives is the twinning of twenty water utilities and operators in the Asia-Pacific region.

Where most twinning arrangements pair off entities with similar characteristics on the assumption that they will share similar problems and solutions, ADB’s approach is to match a stronger water and sanitation utility (expert) with a developing utility (recipient). The aim is to enable the latter to improve service coverage and delivery, financial sustainability, and other aspects of its performance.

Duration: July 2007–October 2009

Budget (optional): ADB Advance Payment Facility budget for the BIWASE and PPWSA twinning: US $31,000

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Paulus van Klaveren; Nguyen Van Thien; Dr. Chea Visoth Ing (PhD)

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Water Supply and Sanitation Specialist, Energy and Water Division, Southeast Asia Department; Director Binh Duong Water Supply—Sewerage Environment Co. Ltd; Assistant General Director Procurement and Training Center, PPWSA
City: Manila, Philippines

[AP-16] Laos-Vietnam—Exchanging on local administration reform

Organization(s): Public Administration and Civil Service Authority, Laos National Academy of Public Administration, Vietnam Japan International Cooperation Agency

Country(ies): Laos and Vietnam

Overview: Currently, Lao People’s Democratic Republic is implementing a Local Administration Reform. This workshop will therefore help Lao People’s Democratic Republic to draw lessons to proceed in an effective way with the Local Administration Reform in the country though exchanging experiences, insights, and advice between Vietnam and Laos. It is well known that neighboring Vietnam has accomplished several milestones in reforming and strengthening its local administration, which will help the Lao People’s Democratic Republic government to accelerate the implementation of its own reform program and achieve tangible results in this area.

Duration: November 12–13, 2009

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Kouthong Sammala
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Anolack Chanpasith
City: Vientiane Capital, Lao People’s Democratic Republic

[AP-17] Indonesia-Japan—Participatory Agriculture Extension

Organization(s): Agency for Agricultural Human Resource Development (AAHRD), Ministry of Agriculture, Government of Indonesia (GoI), Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), and the Government of Japan (GoJ)
Country(ies): Indonesia, Cambodia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Egypt, Kenya, and South Africa

Overview: In line with the wide-ranging reforms in 1998—including democratization, decentralization, and public governance—the AAHRD decided to modify its training system for agricultural extension officers with the “bottom-up approach” by introducing—among others—more participatory trainings, which were successfully disseminated to Indonesian officers by AAHRD in cooperation with JICA. To share the Indonesian experiences with other countries, GOI and GoJ agreed to jointly organize the “Training of Trainers for Participatory Training Program on Agricultural Extension Methodology.”


Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Ir. Ella Rosilawati K, M.Si.

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Head of Division for Agriculture Training Program and Cooperation, Bureau of Agriculture Training Development

City: Jakarta

[AP-18] Indonesia-Japan—Training on artificial insemination of dairy cattle

Organization(s): Singosari National Artificial Insemination Centre (SNAIC), Ministry of Agriculture, Government of Indonesia (GoI), Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), and the Government of Japan (GoJ)


Overview: The Strengthening of Artificial Insemination Centre in Indonesia was jointly established by the GoI (Directorate General of Livestock Services, Ministry of Agriculture) and the GoJ (JICA). The project was implemented in Singosari AI Center from 1986 to 2002. The center has carried out training program since 1986 and trained 5,602 trainees both domestic and overseas.

To better share Indonesian experiences in artificial insemination with other countries, GoI and GoJ agreed to conduct “Development Countries Training Course of Artificial Insemination on Dairy Cattle” under the JICA’s Third Country Training Program.

Duration: The course was from 2007–2009, with detail as follows. First batch: February 19–March 17, 2007. Second batch: February 26–March 24, 2008. Third batch: February 16–March 15, 2009. The course for 2010 has been proposed by the GoI and is currently under consideration by the GoJ.


Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Mrs. Herliantien

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Director of SNAIC

City: Malang, East Java Province, Indonesia


Organization(s): Constituency Assembly (Nepal), Ministry of Finance (Nepal), National Planning Commission (Nepal), Ministry of Planning and Investment (MPI) (Vietnam), Central Institute of Economic Management (CIEM) (Vietnam), Vietnam Academy of Social Science (VASS) (Vietnam), Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), Nepal, and Vietnam

Country(ies): Nepal and Vietnam

Overview: The primary objective is to provide some thought materials for Nepal’s leaders to con-
sider the development strategy for the new federal republic of Nepal through the exchange of views and experiences with Vietnamese counterparts.


**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Mr. Cao Manh Cuong and Mr. Toru Arai

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Deputy Director General, Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment and Senior Aid Coordination Advisor, JICA Vietnam, Hanoi.

**City:** Hanoi, Vietnam

---

[AP-20] **Barefoot College—Boosting rural solar energy**

**Organization(s):** Barefoot College; Indian Technical and Economic Cooperation; Division of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India; multiple governments; multiple nongovernmental organizations

**Country(ies):** India, Afghanistan, Bhutan, Ethiopia, Tanzania, Sierra Leone, Mali, Cameroon, Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Morocco, Mauritania, Uganda, Benin, Malawi, Rwanda, and Bolivia

**Overview:** Barefoot College trains rural, uneducated (illiterate and semiliterate) women to build, install, maintain, and repair solar electrification systems for off-grid electrification. Participants from developing countries (mostly in Africa) are trained in six months at the Barefoot campus in Tilonia, Rajasthan. After completing the course, the equipment the women build is shipped to their villages, where it is used to electrify the houses and schools in the community.

**Duration:** September 2008 to present

**Budget (optional):** Financial Year 2008-09: Total annual budget: US $2.5 million (Rs. 46). Sources: Government: 6 percent; Foreign donors: 54 percent; Own sources: 40 percent

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Michael Dickerson

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Consultant, Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations

**City:** New Delhi, India

---

[AP-21] **ITEC India—Indian expertise for sustainable development**

**Organization(s):** Indian Technical and Economic Cooperation (ITEC); Division of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India; forty-five institutions in India, and 156 partner countries

**Country(ies):** India and 156 other developing (partner) countries

**Overview:** The ITEC Civilian Training Programme was created to share Indian expertise in a range of fields to develop human capital in other developing countries (particularly the LDCs). The Government of India provides participants in the program return airfare, course fees, accommodations, and a modest allowance. Participants may take courses from forty-five reputable Indian institutions in government, information technology, telecommunications, management, SME/rural development, renewable energy, and other specialized disciplines. The ITEC Civilian Training Programme trains close to 5,000 participants per year.

**Duration:** Ongoing

**Budget (optional):** Approximately $11 million annually (100 percent funded by the Government of India)

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Michael Dickerson

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Consultant

**City:** New Delhi, India

---

[AP-22] **AsDB China-India—Exchanging development experiences**

**Organization(s):** Ministry of Finance of the Governments of the China (PRC) and India, Insti-
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Institute of Public Policy Studies at Peking University, Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations, and the Asian Development Bank (AsDB)

Country(ies): PRC and India

Overview: This ADB technical assistance program provided support to PRC and India to implement a program of studies on their development experiences on selected sectors and areas. The main objective of this program is to provide an opportunity for the policy-makers in both countries to learn from each other’s experience in meeting their common development challenges.

The underlying theme of this exchange of development experiences is to obtain an Indian perspective on PRC development experience through studies by Indian think tanks and scholars and, likewise, to acquire a PRC perspective on Indian development experiences through studies by PRC think tanks and scholars.


Budget (optional): ADB: US $954,000, technical assistance resources to cover the costs of consultants, seminars and workshops, exchange visits, publications, and contingencies. In-kind contribution from governments in the form of staff time and facilities besides meeting the indirect/overhead costs (over and above ADB’s contribution) incurred by the participating government financed institutions.

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Mr. Vankina B. Tulasidhar

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Advisor, IED, Asian Development Bank

City: Manila, Philippines

[AP-23] ASER—Informing education policies with research

Organization(s): Hewlett Foundation (funding), ASER Centre (civil service organization providing expertise), Uwezo East Africa (civil service organization/recipient)

Country(ies): Provider: United States (funding) and India (expertise). Recipients: Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda

Overview: This case story documents an example of South-South/triangular cooperation in the context of building capacity with regard to primary and elementary education research. It involves a civil society organization from India, the ASER Centre, sharing its expertise and experience with an organization, Uwezo East Africa, operating in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda, with funding from the Hewlett Foundation in an effort to build capacity to undertake primary and elementary education research to assess the status of rural education (learning levels, enrollment, and so on).

Duration: 2008 to present

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Michael Dickerson

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Consultant, Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations

City: New Delhi, India

[AP-24] Slum Dwellers International—Mutual learning for human development

Organization(s): SDI stands for a transnational federation whose members are hundreds of national organizations from countries across the global south.

funding, from self-saving projects to donations made by foundations, development organizations, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) in the North, and respective national governments.

**Overview:** SDI operates as a transnational network of local slum dweller organizations that have come together to form federations of the urban poor. Their mission is to “link urban communities from cities across the South to transfer and adapt the successful mobilization, advocacy, and problem-solving strategies they develop in one location to other cities, regions, and countries.”

**Duration:** Ongoing.

**Budget (optional):** Each SDI affiliate operates on their own savings and budgets. SDI groups receive grants and loan finance from a wide range of agencies, including local foundations and financing agencies, local and national government sources, embassy and consultant funds, corporations, northern NGOs, northern foundations, bilateral agencies, and multilateral programs.

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Surabhi Tandon

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Consultant, ICRIER

**City:** New Delhi

**[AP-25] Laos-Ghana-Zambia—Learning on road maintenance**

**Organization(s):** World Bank and Ministry of Public Works and Transport, Government of Lao People’s Democratic Republic (GoL)

**Country(ies):** Providers: Ghana and Zambia. Recipient: Lao People’s Democratic Republic

**Overview:** In the late 1990s, GoL was considering a sustainable financing mechanism for road maintenance. In February 1999, a delegation of key GoL officials visited Ghana and Zambia to learn firsthand from their successes in financing road maintenance. Through the study tour to Africa, the GoL understood that road users were willing to pay for better road services and that users should be represented in the Road Fund Board. This exchange helped lay the foundation for the GoL decision to create a Road Maintenance Fund, which today covers the maintenance of Lao People’s Democratic Republic entire national road network and a portion of the local road network.

**Duration:** The exchange between GoL and Ghana/Zambia took place in 1999. The impact is still ongoing.

**Budget (optional):** Study tour budget: US $25,000 to $50,000

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** H.E. Sommad Pholsena

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Minister Ministry of Public Works and Transport

**City:** Lao People’s Democratic Republic

**LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN**

**[LAC-1] SEGIB—Ibero-American South-South Cooperation Report**

**Organization(s):** General Ibero-American Secretariat (SEGIB)

**Country(ies):** The twenty-two countries that are members of the Conference Ibero-American, namely Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Spain, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Paraguay, Portugal, Dominican Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Andorra

**Overview:** This is about the production of the annual report on South-South cooperation in Ibero-America, which offers a general perspective on South-South cooperation involving Latin American countries. This perspective focuses on the technical dimension and modalities (Horizontal Bilateral, Horizontal Regional, and Triangular) of South-South cooperation.

**Duration:** Within the framework of the Ibero-American Program for the Strengthening of
Horizontal South-South Cooperation, the Ibero-American South-South Cooperation Report, of annual publication, should remain being published, at least, until its sixth issue (corresponding to 2012).

Budget (optional): The annual budget destined to defray production, composition, proofreading, publishing, and diffusion costs of the report. Practically three-fourths of this budget (US $80,000) are being granted by SEGIB. The rest of it (about US $30,000), comes form the United Nation’s Program for Development and is destined to the English translation of the report.

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): José María Vera; Cristina Xalma
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Planning Director of the Cooperation Secretariat of SEGIB; Researcher of the Cooperation Secretariat of SEGIB
City: Madrid, Spain

[LAC-2] Colombia—Sharing cooperation maps

Organization(s): Presidential Agency for Social Action and International Co-operation (Acción Social)
Overview: Many Latin American countries need to compile information on the international cooperation programs operating in their territory for the purposes of decision-making and the planning of cooperation by the various stakeholders. Over the past few years, Colombia has developed cooperation maps, which are information systems designed to ensure efficient management and dissemination of international cooperation. Colombia has so far made agreements, through its social action agency, for technology transfer and an exchange of experts with Bolivia, El Salvador, Cuba, Paraguay, and Uruguay.
Duration: 2007 to present

Budget (optional): The estimated cost per project is US $60,000.
Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Monica Varona Guzman
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): International Cooperation Map Coordinator
City: Bogotá, Colombia

[LAC-3] CARICOM—On-the-job training support for key senior officials

Organization(s): Caribbean Community (CARICOM) Secretariat and the Technical Action Services Unit (TASU)
Country(ies): The CARICOM member states are Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Montserrat, Saint Lucia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, and Trinidad and Tobago. (The Bahamas, Montserrat, and Haiti are currently not part of the CSME.)
Overview: An attachment program providing on-the-job training support for key senior officials with responsibility for implementation of decisions of CARICOM. A host member state was identified where administrative systems are more advanced and a five-day program was developed in collaboration with the CARICOM secretariat to meet a particular capacity need of another member state. A maximum of five officials nominated by the member state with the capacity need are afforded the opportunity in real time to observe and participate, allowing for the transfer and subsequent adaptation of best practices.
Duration: April 2003 to April 2008
Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Mr. Melbour Phillip
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Technical Coordinator
City: Georgetown
[LAC-4] OEA—Inter-American Network for Labor Management (RIAL)

Organization(s): Organization of American States (OAS) and Department of Social Development and Employment/Executive Secretariat for Integral Development

Country(ies): The thirty-four states members of OAS: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, the United States, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Dominican Republic, Santa Lucia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Vicente and the Grenadinas, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

Overview: RIAL is the cooperation and technical assistance mechanism between all ministries of labor. Its purpose is to strengthen the institutional and human capacities of these ministries through a mechanism aimed at the integration and divulgence of knowledge and experiences.

Duration: Starting date: May 2006. Currently under execution


Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Maria Claudia Camacho

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): RIAL Coordinator and Labor Specialist, OAS

City: Washington, DC

[OEA—Inter-American Network for Labor Management (RIAL)]

[LAC-5] Colombia—Sharing experiences in public debt management

Organization(s): Ministry of Treasury and Finance—General Office of Public Finance and National Treasury

Country(ies): Colombia

Overview: During the past ten years, Colombia has developed a debt placement scheme based on the international experience of market makers. For that purpose, a set of rules, a structure, and a strategy were developed, enabling Colombia to build a local debt market and to keep high standards with regards to financing, types of debt, terms, and so on.

Duration: The construction of the LAC Debt Group started about four years ago with the support of the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) on the assumption that, given market dynamics, permanent contact allows know-how transference without the establishment of a deadline to finish the work.

Budget (optional): The IDB has provided substantial resources for the annual organization of two-day meetings of all public debt offices. The meetings that took place in Brazil, Colombia, and Uruguay have been highlighted, with participation of over eighteen counties. Costs have been defrayed by the public debt offices and by the IDB.

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Jorge William Ortiz Linares

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Deputy Director of National Internal Financing

City: Bogotá, Colombia

[OEA—Inter-American Network for Labor Management (RIAL)]


Organization(s): Office of the Vice President of El Salvador

Country(ies): El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala

Overview: The creation of the Trifinio region meant institutionalizing a South-South cooperation process that began in 1988 between El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras. Based on the experiences and learning obtained from joint management under the Trifinio Plan, the cooperation consolidated a trinational entity that redefined the borders between the three countries as integration
and development zones. By recognizing the zone as an indivisible entity, it posited that only joint and coordinated action by the three countries could provide effective responses to its social and environmental problems.

**Duration:** 1997 to present

**Budget (optional):** The consolidated total investment made in all cooperation in the region, from 1997 to the present day, is currently unknown. Efforts are being made to obtain that information.

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Claudia Aguilar Garza

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Director-General of Development Cooperation

**City:** San Salvador

---

[LAC-7] OAS—Boosting small tourism enterprises

**Organization(s):** Executive Secretariat for Integral Development Department of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism Organization of American States

**Country(ies):** Antigua, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, El Salvador, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Peru, and Ecuador are all recipients of the STEP program assistance.

**Overview:** The Small Tourism Enterprise Programme (STEP) was designed to provide assistance to small tourism enterprises and hotels to enhance their competitiveness. STEP provided training in product and services delivery, a mechanism to embrace international standards, and avenues for cost-effective marketing. STEP was first initiated in the Caribbean and replicated in Central and South America. The program’s success can be accredited to participatory engagement by the government and private sector that were active collaborators in implementation.

---

[LAC-8] IDB—Jointly surveilling diseases in the Caribbean

**Organization(s):** Ministries of Health of the Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago. The strategic partners accompanying the initiative are the Inter-American Development Bank; the University of the West Indies at St. Augustine; the Pan-American Health Organization, mainly through the Caribbean Epidemiology Centre; and the Caribbean Community Secretariat.

**Country(ies):** The Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago

**Overview:** The purpose of the project is to develop a Caribbean Regional Non-Communicable Disease (NCDs) Surveillance System that will contribute to better plan and deliver and monitor comprehensive and integrated responses to NCDs. The system aims to improve the collection, systematization, and analysis of data associated with NCDs in the countries of the Caribbean. It will help define programs and health protocols targeting services for health promotion in the context of NCDs, their prevention, and treatment. Ultimately, the project aims to achieve improvements in the capacity of countries to deliver cost-effective health services associated with NCDs, now recog-
nized as the major cause of mortality and morbidity, both at the regional and the global levels.

**Duration:** Execution period: thirty-six months. Disbursement period: forty-two months

**Budget (optional):** IDB-FRPG: US $650,000. Local counterpart: US $580,000. Total: US $1,230,000

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Laura Bocalandro

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Coordinator, Regional Public Goods Programme, Inter-American Development Bank

**City:** Washington, DC

----------

**[LAC-9] IDB—Exchanging practices on managing public debt**

**Organization(s):** National Debt Management Offices of the Ministries of Finance and Economy of Argentina, the Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Strategic partners accompanying the initiative are the Inter-American Development Bank, the Monetary Council of Central America, Caribbean Regional Technical Assistance Centre, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank.

**Country(ies):** Argentina, the Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

**Overview:** This initiative focuses on creating and using knowledge transfer mechanisms and sharing debt management models and protocols by continuously exchanging experiences across countries in order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the National Debt Management Offices in Latin America and the Caribbean. It provides the necessary resources for 1) facilitating shared research in the subject area and knowledge transfer activities among participating countries, including South-South cooperation, 2) designing a regional information system, and 3) developing environments for transfer of capabilities and skills.

**Duration:** Execution period: thirty-six months. Disbursement period: forty-two months

**Budget (optional):** IDB: US $500,000. Local counterpart: US $200,000. Total US $700,000

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Laura Bocalandro

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Coordinator, Regional Public Goods Program, Inter-American Development Bank

**City:** Washington, DC

----------

**[LAC-10] IDB—Cooperating on citizens’ security and violence prevention in LAC**

**Organization(s):** National Planning Department (Colombia); Secretary of State, Interior and Police (Dominican Republic); Ministry of Government and Police (Ecuador); National Police (Honduras); Ministry of Interior, Vice-Ministry of Internal Security (Paraguay); Ministry of Interior (Peru); and Ministry of Interior (Uruguay). Strategic partners accompanying the initiative are the Inter-American Development Bank and the Institute for Research and Development on Violence Prevention and Promotion of Social Coexistence.

**Country(ies):** Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Honduras, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay

**Overview:** Before the inception of this South-South cooperation project, the countries in the Latin American region were searching for a collaborative mechanism that would allow them to deal with high levels of crime and violence through the implementation of preventive and control public policies. Therefore, the South-South cooperation project consisted in the design and implementation of a regional system of nineteen standardized indicators to measure levels of criminality and violence.
affecting the citizens of the participating countries. The regional system of indicators made possible the identification, monitoring, and comparison of regional phenomena linked to crime and violence. A common methodology for the measurement of each agreed indicator was developed through the joint collaboration of the participating institutions and countries. Also, the capacity of institutions in each participating country was strengthened in terms of consolidating their institutional coordination skills and internally improving their data collection methods. The project also promoted an inter-institutional dialogue at the national level that resulted in cooperation agreements for continued support in improving the preparation of relevant information.

**Duration:** Execution period: thirty-six months. Disbursement period: forty-two months

**Budget (optional):** IDB: US $1,800,000. Local counterpart: US $890,000. Total US $2,690,000

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Laura Bocalandro

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Coordinator, Regional Public Goods Program, Inter-American Development Bank

**City:** Washington, DC

[LAC-11] **IDB—Coming together in the Trifinio region of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras**

**Organization(s):** Forty-five municipalities from the three countries that comprise the Trifinio region’s Upper Lempa River Basic, the Trifinio Plan Commission, the three national governments through their vice-presidencies offices, the thirteen National League of Municipalities (Mancomunidades), the Tri-national Federation of Municipalities’ Leagues (Mancomunidad Trinacional), Municipal Environmental Units, other national, departmental (state), and municipal education units, associations and unions in the private sector, local non-governmental organizations, and civil society

**Country(ies):** El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras

**Overview:** This initiative seeks to develop and promote trinational mechanisms for integrated and sustainable water management as a regional public good in the Upper Lempa River Basin (ULRB) by promoting strong horizontal cooperation among the participating countries: El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras. The project involved three components: the generation and management of information on water resources, human resource training in water management, and trinational water management institutions.

**Duration:** Execution period: thirty-six months. Disbursement period: thirty-nine months

**Budget (optional):** IDB: US $830,000. Local counterpart: US $110,100. Total: US $940,100

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Laura Bocalandro

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Coordinator, Regional Public Goods Programme, Inter-American Development Bank

**City:** Washington, DC

[LAC-12] **IDB—Joint data base for MERCOSUR social security institutions**

**Organization(s):** National Social Security Administration of Argentina, the Ministry of Social Welfare of Brazil, the Social Welfare Institute of Paraguay, and the Social Welfare Bank of Uruguay. Strategic partners accompanying the initiative are the Inter-American Development Bank and the Ibero-American Social Security Organization.

**Country(ies):** Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay

**Overview:** This initiative aims to contribute to protecting the social security rights of migrant workers of the MERCOSUR countries through the creation of a Single Database for Social Security Institutions (SDSI) in the MERCOSUR region. The purpose is to integrate the social security systems
of the MERCOSUR countries through developing and implementing a Data Transfer and Validation System (DTVS) to process retiree benefits under MERCOSUR’s Multilateral Social Security Agreement. The initiative focuses its resources on promoting a horizontal partnership and capacity development, carrying out baseline studies to assess the situation before the project, developing and implementing the SDSI, training personnel from social security agencies, and disseminating information to stakeholders.

**Duration:** Execution period: forty-eight months. Disbursement period: fifty-four months

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Laura Bocalandro

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Coordinator, Regional Public Goods Program, Inter-American Development Bank

**City:** Washington, DC

---

**[LAC-13] El Salvador-Mexico-Japan—TAISHIN (earthquake-resistant popular housing) project**

**Organization(s):** Vice Minister of Housing and Urban Development of El Salvador, Mexico’s National Center for Disaster Prevention, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

**Country(ies):** El Salvador, Mexico, and Japan

**Overview:** After suffering a series of severe earthquakes, the government of El Salvador requested Japan to extend technical cooperation and established the TAISHIN project with JICA. The project was implemented as a triangular project of El Salvador, Japan, and Mexico because JICA had offered assistance to Mexico for the same solutions in the past and it indeed generated numerous SSC advantages to implement the project in El Salvador.

**Duration:** Phase I: TAISHIN project: From December 2003 to November 2008 (five years). Phase II: TAISHIN project: From May 2009 to April 2012 (three years)

---

**[LAC-14] OAS—Triangulation of efforts for natural gas metrology**

**Organization(s):** National Center Of Metrology (Mexico), Bolivian Institute Of Metrology, Bolivia National Institute Of Competition Defense and Intelectual Property Protection, Peru National Institute Of Metrology, Normalização E Qualidade Industrial, Brazil Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt Braunschweig Y Berlin, Alemania

**Country(ies):** Donor: Germany (of financial resources and technical assistance). Providers: Brazil (of technical assistance) and Mexico (of technical assistance). Recipients: Bolivia (of technical cooperation and assistance) and Peru (of technical cooperation and assistance)

**Overview:** Project initiates in 2007 within the framework of the Inter-American System of Metrology.

**Objectives:**

- Strengthening regional cooperation
- Widening technical capacity of the National Institutes of Metrology of Bolivia and Peru
- Contribute to the efficiency of the natural gas market and consumer protection
- Potentializing reference services in order to provide assistance to consumers, gas-supplying enterprises; and regulating authorities from Bolivia and Peru

**Duration:** October 2007 to September 2010

**Budget (optional):** Financial resources from the German government of US $1,450,000 (50 per-
percent in first phase and 50 percent in second phase post-2010). Cost of technical assistance from Germany, Brazil, and Mexico: US $750,000. Total: US $2,200,000.

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Oscar Harasic
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Head of the Department of the Science, Technology and Innovation Office, Department of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism of the Organization of American States
City: Washington, DC


Organization(s): Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mexico Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, Guatemala, the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH
Country(ies): Mexico, Germany, and Guatemala
Overview: Guatemala was the first country to approach Germany and Mexico requesting assistance to achieve institutional strengthening and capacity development in integrated solid waste management. A first generation of the GIRESOL Network in Guatemala was formed in 2007 by help of Mexican and international experts. In a second phase, seven Guatemalan environmental promoters from the first generation were trained in Mexico as instructors who then capacitated a second generation of solid waste experts in 2008 and 2009.
Duration: Start: December 2006. End: Official end of support for triangular cooperation: June 2009, but activities are ongoing. Duration: thirty-one months
Budget (optional): According to the financial planning, the estimated budgets for the two phases of cooperation were the following: Total budget of the first generation: 93,750 € (US $135,000 in 2007): Guatemala: 33 percent; Mexico: 32 percent; Germany: 35 percent. Total budget of the second phase: 25,200 € (US $39,000 in May 2008): Guatemala: 77 percent; Mexico: 5 percent; and Germany: 18 percent
Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Mr. Axel Macht
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Program Director
City: Mexico City, Mexico

[LAC-16] OAS-Chile-Caribbean—Promoting social protection

Organization(s): Department of Social Development and Employment and the Organization of American States
Country(ies): Provider: Chile. Recipients: Barbados, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago
Overview: The Puente in the Caribbean is a horizontal cooperation initiative that seeks to strengthen social protection strategies in CARICOM countries by transferring the knowledge and lessons learned on the Chile Puente Program through capacity-building activities. It was launched in June 2007 as a pilot program, involving Jamaica, Saint Lucia, and Trinidad and Tobago and is in its second phase with four additional countries. The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and the Government of Chile finance this project.
Duration: June 2007 to December 2010
Budget (optional): CIDA: US $324,000; Government of Chile: US $200,000; OAS in-kind contribution: US $681,685 (approximate). These totals do not reflect the cash and/or in-kind contributions of the recipient countries.
Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Julie Nurse
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Social Development Specialist
City: Washington, DC
[LAC-17] Spain-Chile-Paraguay—Building triangular partnerships in the public sector

Organization(s): Technical Triangular Cooperation, Civil Service Office of Paraguay (SFP), International Cooperation Agency of Chile (AGCI), Spanish Agency of International Cooperation for Development (AECID)

Country(ies): Paraguay, Chile, and Spain

Overview: This experience is the development of a cooperation partnership between Paraguay, Chile, and Spain in the project “Strengthening of Management and Human Development of public sector workers in Paraguay,” which is currently under execution.

The case centers on the identification and design stages of the project. The process has been characterized by political support and by joint technical and institutional learning, which also entails the construction of a relation and work model.

Duration: The identification process started with a first mission in Paraguay on May 11, 2009. The cooperation agreement and the project document were signed on November 24, 2009. The total period was six and a half months.

Budget (optional): SFP: approximately US $1,100 (logistics for identification and design meetings in Paraguay, logistics for the agreement signing event and communications on the signed agreement). AGCI: approximately US $8,400 (design and identification internship in Paraguay—two technicians form AGCI, travel allowance for formulation internship in Chile—two general directors from SFP, agreement signature Internship—AGCI executive director). AECID: approximately US $4,000 (design and identification internship in Paraguay—one technician from AECID, plane tickets for formulation internship in Chile—two general directors from SFP, and agreement signature Internship—General Coordinator Chile’s Technical Office)

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Cristina Aldama Calles; Izaskun Sánchez Tolosa

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): General Coordinator of Spanish Cooperation in Chile; Person in charge of the project in the Technical Office of Cooperation of Chile

City: Santiago, Chile

[SEGIB—Ibero-American Program of South-South Cooperation

Organization(s): People responsible for Ibero-American Cooperation (directors of Cooperation Agencies/General Directions of Ministries of Foreign Affairs). Promoted and coordinated by the International Cooperation General Direction of the Colombian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ibero-American General Secretariat (SEGIB).

Country(ies): Sixteen countries have joined and participated in the construction of the program: Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Spain, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, Paraguay, Dominican Republic, and Uruguay.

Overview: Progress has been made in the debate and reflection on South-South cooperation within the framework of the meetings of Cooperation Directors and in relation to the Ibero-American Conference.

The analysis has served as a basis for the identification of strengths, weaknesses, and challenges of Latin American countries in the field of South-South cooperation (gathered also in the annual South-South Cooperation Report) and in the practice of other Horizontal Programs supported by the SEGIB.

The program of South-South Cooperation Reinforcement, which was approved at the eighth Ibero-American Summit in San Salvador (2008) and prepared for being implemented through 2009, includes guidelines for the improvement of information and coordination systems; human resource building; the annual South-South Cooperation Report; a bank of good practices; and the organization of forums and debates on the subject.
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**Duration:** Three years starting January 1, 2010

**Budget (optional):** Minimal contributions committed to financial resources: Chile: US $60,000; Colombia: US $100,000; El Salvador: US $10,000; Spain: US $600,000; Mexico: US $100,000; Dominican Republic: US $90,000; SEGIB: US $500,000. Total: US $1.5 million. Other participant countries don’t rule out making financial contributions, and they have offered human resources as well as their experience and technical resources.

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Patricia González; Enrique Maruri; José María Vera

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Manager of the Program; Director of International Cooperation at the Colombian Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Planning Director of SEGIB.

**City:** Bogotá, Colombia

[LAC-19] Colombia—Caribbean strategy

**Organization(s):** Leading organization in the cooperation program: Colombian Ministry of Foreign Relations. Other organizations involved: State Entities for Technical Assistance and Training from the twenty-five countries of the Caribbean basin; institutions in charge of enforcing food security policy in seventeen countries of the Caribbean basin; offices in charge of disaster prevention and assistance in sixteen countries of the Caribbean basin; universities from fifteen Caribbean countries; Ministries of Foreign Affairs of the twenty-five countries; Heart Trust NTA; Association of Caribbean States; Organization of American States; Colombian Ministry of Education; National Learning Service of Colombia; Colombian Institute for Credit and Technical Studies Abroad; Colombian Family Welfare Institute; National University of Colombia; Food Safety Network; Presidential Agency for Social Action and International Cooperation (Acción Social); and the Pan-American Development Foundation

**Country(ies):** Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Granada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Surinam, Trinidad and Tobago, and Venezuela

**Overview:** The Cooperation Strategy for the Caribbean Basin emerged as a response to the needs identified by countries of the region, in terms of knowledge exchange, to consolidate regional economic development. The strategy is centered on the strengthening of institutions in five priority areas: technical education and vocational training, disaster assistance and prevention, food safety and nutrition, bilingualism, and academic mobility. This initiative has a participative approach, in which the main interests and expectations of participant countries are fundamental at each stage of the project.

**Duration:** First phase: January 2009 to December 2009. Second phase: January 2010 to December 2010

**Budget (optional):** First phase: Ministry of Foreign Affairs input: US $458,500; input of national associated institutions: US $260,000. Second phase: Ministry of Foreign Affairs input: US $500,000; input of national associated institutions: US $600,000; input of regional mechanisms: FUPAD US $500,000; OEA: US $100,000

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Enrique Maruri Londoño

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Director of International Cooperation, Colombian Ministry of Foreign Affairs

**City:** Bogotá, Colombia

[LAC-20] Uruguay—Building institutions for horizontal partnership

**Organization(s):** Planning and Budget Office—Presidency of the Republic, Uruguay

**Country(ies):** Recipients: Uruguay (partner/recipieent), Chile, and Colombia. Partner: Mexico
Overview: In 2007, the Uruguayan government set out to undertake a process of institutional reform regarding international aid management and geared toward increasing the impact of aid in national and regional development. During this process, the program coordination settled for a strategy based upon partnerships with key agencies in the region in the framework of South-South cooperation agreements.

Duration: March 2008 to August 2010

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Martin Rivero Illa
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Program Coordinator/Director of the International Cooperation Department of the OPP
City: Montevideo, Uruguay

[LAC-21] México-Chile—Joint cooperation fund
Organization(s): Economic Relations and International Co-operation Unit/Directorate General of Technical and Scientific Co-operation, Ministry of Foreign Relations, And International Co-operation Agency of Chile
Country(ies): Donors and recipients: Mexico and Chile, since this is horizontal cooperation

Overview: The Mexico-Chile Strategic Partnership Agreement (SPA), signed on January 28, 2006, provides for the creation of a joint cooperation fund with an annual endowment of US $2 million during the first three years of operation, with Mexico and Chile each contributing US $1 million.

The aim of the fund is to finance technical-scientific and education-cultural cooperation programs, projects, and activities in the public sector, based on reciprocity, shared interest, and complementarity, addressing political-institutional, democracy, human rights, economic, environmental, labour, cultural, social, agricultural, forestry, tourism, and educational issues.

Duration: Starting month: March 20, 2007. Finishing month: No specific date

Budget (optional): At the time of writing, annual contributions had been made by Mexico and Chile totalling US $6 million.

[LAC-22] Argentina-Bolivia—Managing genetic resources in the Tucuman rain forest
Organization(s): National Institute of Farming Technology and Tropical Agriculture Research Center
Country(ies): Argentina and Bolivia

Overview: Traditionally, forestry activity in Latin America has been characterized for its extractive and selective exploitation of forests, producing high vulnerability on native forests with high-commercial-value resources, such as Cedrela lilloi and Cedrela balansae. In the Tucuman-Bolivian Forest, a large part of these populations is subject to severe fragmentation and degradation processes, thus requiring the technical cooperation of Argentina and Bolivia in order to evaluate the conservation state of these resources and to delineate some appropriate strategies of joint conservation.

Duration: June 2009 to November 2010

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Dr. Luis Fornes
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Coordinator of the National Project for Native Species Domestication of Argentinean Subtropical Forests (INTA)
City: Tucuman, Argentina.

[LAC-23] Argentina-Peru—Investing in agrarian health
Organization(s): National Agrarian Health Service of Peru (SENASA) and La Plata University (Argentina)

Overview: The Diagnostic Center of Animal Health of SENASA didn’t have the required conditions or the trained staff to start its diagnosis work on avian health. For this reason, the center found it
convenient to request assistance from Argentina to train Peruvian professionals on this subject matter. The project relied on the consultancy of experts from La Plata University in Argentina, who worked for over four years. It was a triangular cooperation project with Japan.

By the end of the project, SENASA counted on trained staff and was carrying out diagnoses it couldn’t perform before. The project also impacted universities, partnerships of producers, and professionals who have been indirectly trained.

**Duration:** Started in 2003 and ended in 2006

**Budget (optional):** Due to the fact that this is a South-South cooperation project, there was no budget management right from the beginning. The estimated cost of the project was approximately US $100,000, including in-kind contributions. This is one of the weaknesses in South-South cooperation, since there is no management of a fixed budget and only tickets and travel allowances are estimated.

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Carlos Pando Sánchez

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Executive Director, Peruvian Agency of International Cooperation

**City:** Lima, Peru

[LAC-24] Colombia—Deepening disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration

**Organization(s):** Office of the High Presidential Counselor for Reintegration (Colombia) (ACR)

**Country(ies):** Haiti, the Philippines, Brazil, Sri Lanka, the Department of Peace Keeping Operations of the United Nations (DPKO), and Colombia

**Overview:** Disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) processes require not only considerable human and financial resources, but, more importantly, innovative solutions that can only be attained with the contribution of every experienced practitioner in this field. Up to 2009, there were few mechanisms and forums aimed at promoting the exchange of experiences in DDR. Thus, the TSSC strategy on DDR objective is to provide an actionable plan to improve DDR practices by filling this void. This cooperation strategy began as a response to Colombia’s interest in internationalizing its experience and the need to understand the global know-how in DDR. However, the development of the process has taken its own dynamic and follows a path led by the specific needs and interests of the countries that participated in the first International Congress on DDR organized by the ACR.

**Duration:** The strategy started in February 2009 and it is estimated to end on the first quarter of 2011

**Budget (optional):** Government of Colombia: US $500,000; Government of Sweden: US $50,000; Government of Brazil: US $30,000; Government of the Philippines: US $35,000; United Nations Development Program: US $150,000; UN DPKO: US $5,000; OIM: US $50,000. To be funded: US $250,000. Total: US $1,070,000

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Juan Viana

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** International Cooperation Advisor, Office of the Presidential High Counselor for Reintegration

**City:** Bogotá, Colombia

[LAC-25] Ecuador-Bolivia—Fighting together against dengue

**Organization(s):** Ministry of Public Health of Ecuador

**Country(ies):** Ecuador. Partner: Bolivia

**Overview:** In the year 2009, Bolivia presented a large number of dengue hemorrhagic cases in its tropical areas. For this reason the government declared a public health emergency in the area and requested international support. In the past few years, the Ecuadorian government developed technical capacities in order to face and control
the dengue hemorrhagic, thus enabling Ecuador to deliver a mission of ten experts on the subject with the purpose of controlling the epidemic.

The initiative that was implemented focused on:
- Epidemiologic surveillance
- Outbreak control
- Community participation and inter-institutional coordination
- Appropriate clinical management of dengue and dengue hemorrhagic

**Duration:** Ten days, from March 20–29, 2009  
**Budget (optional):** Estimated budget: tickets and accommodations: US $42,000; Equipment and inputs: US $372,000; Experts: US $5,454.5; Input transportation: US $16,142.25. Total: US $435,595.75

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Gustavo Adolfo Giler Alarcón  
**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** International Cooperation Coordinator, MPH  
**City:** Quito, Ecuador

**[LAC-26] Mexico-Ecuador—Sharing electoral systems**

**Organization(s):** Organization of American States (OAS), Department for Electoral Observation and Cooperation, Mexican Electoral Federal Institute (IEF), the Electoral Tribunal of the Federal Judiciary (TEPJF), and the Ecuadorian National Council for Elections (CNE)  
**Country(ies):** Mexico and Ecuador

**Overview:** In preparation for Ecuador's general elections in April and May 2009, the OAS and the IFE signed an agreement to provide electoral cooperation to Ecuadorian electoral authorities. To support this initiative, they combined efforts with TEPJF by sending experts to Ecuador to collaborate with CNE staff in electoral organization, communication, electoral training, and other electoral tasks.  
**Duration:** January to March 2009  
**Budget (optional):** US $208,478  
**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Maria T Mellenkamp  
**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Coordinator, Section of Electoral Technical Cooperation/Department for Electoral Cooperation and Observation  
**City:** Washington, DC

**[LAC-27] Brazil-Colombia—Rural energization**

**Organization(s):** Mining and Energy Planning Unit, Ministry of Mining and Energy  
**Country(ies):** Recipiente: Colombia

**Overview:** Brazil’s South-South technical bilateral cooperation covers several diverse areas such as agriculture, education, and bio-energy. In 2009, ABC had conducted the implementation of 594 projects and activities in benefit of 56 countries. This included trilateral South-South operations with developed countries and international organizations. From 2003 to 2009, the number of partner countries on Brazilian cooperation grew by 150 percent, with projects and activities of over US $90 million.  
**Duration:** October 2006 to April 2007  
**Budget (optional):** Total: US $27,630.00  
**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Márcio Lopes Corrêa  
**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** General Coordinator of Multilateral Technical Cooperation  
**City:** Brasilia, Brazil

**[LAC-28] Colombia-Chile—Transmilenio as a public transportation option**

**Overview:** The construction of a mass transportation system involves institutional, financial, operational, and even cultural challenges, inasmuch as it constitutes a structuring element of urban planning.
In cities with large populations, mass transportation systems of the BRT (bus rapid transit) kind represent an optimum solution for passenger transportation due to their relatively moderate cost and implementation periods if compared to other alternatives such as subway systems, light trains, and the like. They also allow passengers to interconnect different zones of the cities, generating benefits for users. To be successful, each city must adapt these improvements to its particular basic needs.

Transmilenio, the public mass transportation system of Bogotá, is one of the eldest among its own kind and has consolidated as an efficient, self-sustainable, and successful system. Thus, its experience is useful for the design and implementation of similar systems. Being aware of that, Transmilenio S.A. has designed a portfolio of services in order to share its knowledge with who may require it.

**Duration:** Initial visits from the Chilean government to Bogotá in order to become familiar with the Transmilenio case: December 2002. Period of consultancy to Aditiva S.A.: August 15 to September 19, 2006

**Budget (optional):** Technical-assistance contract value between Transmilenio S.A. and Aditiva S.A.: US $9,000.00

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Martha Lucía Gutiérrez Echeverri

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Trading Director, Transmilenio S.A.

**City:** Bogotá, Colombia

[LAC-29] Chile-Argentina—Innovating the system of public purchases and contracts

**Organization(s):** General Secretariat of the Governor’s Office of the Buenos Aires Province and ChileCompra Office in Chile

**Country(ies):** Argentina and Chile

**Overview:** Experience exchanges and technology transfers were performed from the entity ChileCompra, with the aim to modernize the system of public purchases and contracts of the Province of Buenos Aires (Argentina). The implementation of the system used by ChileCompra entailed significant financial savings. It also responded to the needs of the General Secretariat of the Governor’s Office of the Province of Buenos Aires by substantially improving productivity, transparency, and access of small- and medium-sized businesses.

**Duration:** This experience was initiated in March 2008, when the Provincial Office of Public Management and the Office of ChileCompra made contact. The project is currently under its implementation phase.

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Miguel Ángel Mouriño

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Provincial Director of Public Management

**City:** La Plata, Argentina

[LAC-30] Costa Rica-Chile—Improving the assessment of budget management

**Organization(s):** General Office of National Budget, Ministry of the Treasury of Costa Rica; Public Budget Office, Ministry of the Treasury of Chile

**Country(ies):** Provider: Chile. Recipient: Costa Rica

**Overview:** The promulgation of the new Financial Management and Public Budgeting Law (LAFRPP) No. 8131 of 2001 in the Republic of Costa Rica demands an effective accountability for the use of financial resources based on the development of a programming and assessment methodology of budgetary management for the above-mentioned entities.

In principle, I have been working as an officer with expertise on the topic, and in a latter, more active stage, I have worked in the directive level on the implementation of said methodology with a special emphasis on the organs of the Central Government of Costa Rica.
**Duration:** Start: 2007. End: At the moment, the project is in the phase of generalizing the experience to the rest of the public sector. This phase was gradually put into effect, having currently advanced to approximately 80 percent, and is anticipated to be concluded by 2012.

**Budget (optional):** Activities have reached an approximate cost of US $500,000,00 that were contributed to the Program by the IDB through the PRODEV Program. There was a national counterpart of approximately US $100,000,00, which have fundamentally been assigned in-kind as human-resource provisions and other material resources assigned in the program.

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Fabián David Quirós Álvarez

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** General Deputy Director of National Budget

**City:** San José, Costa Rica

**[LAC-31] Argentina-Haiti—Improving public expenditure on childhood**

**Organization(s):** Office of Public Expenditure Analysis and Social Programs (DAGPyPS), Department of the Ministry of Economy and Public Finance (Argentina); National Observatory of Poverty and Social Exclusion, Department of the Ministry of Planning and External Cooperation (Haiti); Office of Economic Studies, Department of the Ministry of Economy and Finance (Haiti); Argentinean Horizontal Cooperation Fund; funds managed by the Ministry of Foreign Relations, Foreign Trade and Religious Affairs (MREClyC) (Argentina); United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) (Haiti)

**Country(ies):** Argentina, Haiti

**Overview:** The GPdNH project is a contribution to the strengthening of Haitian government's capacities to quantify, analyze, and make decisions regarding social investment on Haiti's children. Specifically, the project intends to estimate public resources invested for the growth of children and adolescents in Haiti on the basis of a methodology developed by DAGPyPS and UNICEF in Argentina.

**Duration:** The GPdNH project started to gestate by mid-2007, and its effective implementation started in May 2009. The project is expected to conclude by March 2010.

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Martin Langsam

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Member of the Argentinean team (from DAGPyPS)

**City:** Buenos Aires, Argentina

**[LAC-32] Peru-Argentina—Olive growing (preliminary)**

**Organization(s):** Export Promotion Commission (PROMPEX) (now known as PROMPERU), National Institute of Agricultural Technology (INTA) of Argentina.

**Country(ies):** Provider: Argentina (financing through the Argentine Co-operation Fund). Recipient: Peru

**Overview:** Given its climate and geographic location, Peru is one of the few countries in the world where olives can be left to ripen on the tree before being harvested. Despite these natural advantages, there are a number of deficiencies in the way this crop is cultivated, owing to ignorance of good practices, as well as in its processing (BPM/HACCP/ISO) and in marketing and technical standards.

PROMPEX identified Argentina as a country with experience in growing this crop, and it requested technical assistance from INTA. This was implemented in successive stages with highly positive and sustainable results and visible impact on farmers in the southern zone of Peru.

**Duration:** 1999–2006

**Budget (optional):** As it forms part of the South-South scheme, it does not have an identifiable budget, but it is estimated at around US $100,000.
[LAC-33] OAS—Measuring water courses (preliminary version)

**Organization(s):** Hydro-meteorological services of countries of the Central American isthmus and the Dominican Republic

**Country(ies):** Recipients: Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Panama, and the Dominican Republic. **Donors:** Germany, Cooperating organizations: United Nations Global Platform for the Promotion of Early Warning and United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. Agencies cooperating in the organization IDEAM (Colombia) and World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) and INETER (Nicaragua).

**Overview:** Twenty-one professionals from seven countries received training on techniques for measuring water courses (liquid and solid). The workshop instructor was provided by IDEAM (Colombia). The project was organized by DDS/OAS as part of the “Programme for flood vulnerability reduction and development of early warning systems in minor river basins in Central America: Development of a regional platform,” supported by INETER (Nicaragua) and the WMO.

**Duration:** November 16–27, 2009

**Budget (optional):** Government of Germany USD 40,000.00; WMO: USD 3,000.00; INETER Nicaragua: USD 6,000.00; IDEAM Colombia: USD 5,000.00

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Javier Lopez

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Coordinator of the “Programme for flood vulnerability reduction and development of early warning systems in minor river basins in Central America: Development of a regional platform.”

**City:** San Bernardino, California

[LAC-34] Costa Rica-Colombia—Promoting community rural tourism


**Country(ies):** Donors: Costa Rica (technical) and Germany (financial). **Recipient:** Colombia (technical)

**Overview:** South-South co-operation helps to create shared responsibility and solidarity between neighboring countries whose specialists understand their economic, cultural, and social reality. This is the first SSC with Colombia on issues in which Costa Rica has wide experience and leadership, involving both public and private organizations. The aim is to strengthen relations between Costa Rica and Colombia by jointly building a solid and permanent bilateral SSC program.

**Duration:** May 12–22, 2008. Community tourism in Costa Rica and its projection in Central America, supported by COOPRENA R. L. (total duration: eleven days). Support for the exchange of community experiences in managing and restoring ecosystems, supported by MINAE (total duration: five days). Internship on the development of organic agriculture and the restoration of forest ecosystems in Costa Rica, supported by MAG (total duration: five days).

**Budget (optional):** The total cost of the project was US $31,189.

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** María Chaves Sánchez

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Project Analyst, Multilateral Co-operation Unit, MIDEPLAN

**City:** San José, Costa Rica
[LAC-35] Colombia-Brazil—Promoting exports through the official postal service

Organization(s): Government of the Federative Republic of Brazil, Ministry of Communications of Brazil, Ministry of Development, Industry and Foreign Trade of Brazil; Government of the Republic of Colombia, National Planning Department—Project Coordinator; Ministry of Information and Communication Technologies, Servicios Postales Nacionales S.A. (National Postal Service), Ministry of Trade, Industry and Tourism, Department of National Taxation and Customs, PROEXPORT—Export and Tourism Promotion Agency in Colombia. Strategic partnerships with Regional Competitiveness Commissions, ANALDEX, ACOPI—organizations providing business development and advisory services to microenterprises and SMEs.

Country(ies): Colombia, Federative Republic of Brazil

Overview: Under the auspices of the Initiative for the Integration of South American Regional Infrastructure (IIRSA), cooperation between the Federative Republic of Brazil and the Republic of Colombia, formalized through the memorandum of understanding to promote the “Exports by post for micro, small-, and medium-sized enterprises—Exportafácil” project, signed on December 2, 2008, aims to formulate and implement the project in Colombia. The objective is to enable micro, small-, and medium-sized enterprises to gain access to the international market, through a simplified export system that uses the country’s official postal service: Servicios Postales Nacionales (4-72). The project seeks to provide a logistics solution based on using the infrastructure of the public postal service, which has a universal service mission.

Duration: Start date: September 2009
Budget (optional): USD 388,000
Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Juan Camilo Granados Riveros
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Deputy Director of Telecommunications
City: Bogotá, Colombia

[LAC-36] PAHO—Overseeing food and nutritional security

Organization(s): Pan-American Health Organization/World Health Organization, the Health Ministries of the countries involved, University of Puerto Rico, University of Costa Rica, Universidad Veracruzana, Xalapa campus (Mexico), Nutrition Institute of Central America and Panama (INCAP)

Country(ies): Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, and Puerto Rico

Overview: Food and nutritional surveillance involves a permanent process of compiling, analyzing, and disseminating the information needed to maintain up-to-date knowledge of nutritional status and its determinant factors, describing its distribution and trends, predicting possible variations, and supporting decision-making processes. INCAP has been supporting Central American countries and a number of higher education institutions in Mexico to provide human resource training in the food and nutritional health area, as well as the design and implementation of food and nutritional surveillance systems, at the national, sector, and local levels.

Duration: March to December 2009
Budget (optional): US $61,400
Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Dr. Rebecca de los Rios
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Senior Advisor, Partnerships and Alliances, Pan-American Health Organization
City: Washington, DC

[LAC-37] PAHO—Vaccination on the Argentina-Brazil border

Organization(s): Pan-American Health Organization/World Health Organization

Country(ies): Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Colombia, Chile, Guyana, French Guyana, Paraguay, Peru, Surinam, Uruguay, and Venezuela
Overview: The project’s final purpose is to eliminate rubella, congenital rubella syndrome, and to consolidate the elimination of measles in the Americas. The proposal envisions immunization of populations who reside and circulate through formal and informal border points (blind spots) in countries that share borders with Argentina and Brazil.

The project is expected to achieve the vaccination of 95 percent of population identified in the border-crossing points. It also expects to bring the same coverage level to border municipalities.

Duration: August to November 2008

Budget (optional): Total cost: US $571,451. Including contribution from national parties (human resources, infrastructure, supplies) and from PAHO/WHO.

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Rebecca de los Rios
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Senior Advisor
City: Washington, DC

[LAC-38] Guatemala-Colombia—Improving public defence (preliminary version)

Organization(s): Public Defence Institute of Guatemala
Country(ies): Guatemala

Overview: The Public Criminal Defence Institute, an institutionalised, autonomous, and functionally independent body, is responsible for ensuring access to justice and due process. Although it is the smallest institution in the justice system, it plays a leading role in pursuing democratic justice. In fulfilling its activities, it receives specialized assistance on forensic issues to ensure procedural balance and equal resources in the process. Its activity goes beyond the simple interpretation of forensic reports by promoting the inclusion of scientific evidence media through technical support to promote the rights of defendants.

Duration: Start: October 12–16, 2009. Finish: November 29–December 2009. The SSC experience is expected to be continued by developing a distance-training program for staff of the technical support unit, on criminal and criminology topics, in 2010. This has already been planned, and the corresponding contacts have been made.

[LAC-39] Guatemala-Colombia—Improving the quality of the ombudsperson institution

Organization(s): Public Criminal Defence Institute (IDPP)
Country(ies): Guatemala

Overview: The Public Criminal Defence Institute is an autonomous body within Guatemala’s justice system. Its functional organizational structure is designed for, and targeted on, low-income persons seeking access to justice, and it ensures respect for due process. It also serves women, girl children, and adolescents who have been victims of violence in all forms, fulfilling its mission by providing free legal advice and assistance.

Duration: Start: August 24–29, 2009. Finish: November 16–20, 2009. The SSC experience is expected to be continued in the future, with the arrival of a Colombian expert on management systems in June 2010, to monitor and support the action plan as formulated, and to participate in the AIDEF congress to be held in June 2010, organized by the Public Defence Institute of Guatemala.

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): María Del Carmen Ortíz
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Special Adviser of the General Management Division on Strategic Planning, International Co-operation and Projects
City: Guatemala

[LAC-40] Mexico-Paraguay—Maquila sector capacities

Organization(s): Ministry of Industry and Trade (MIC) of Paraguay/National Council of Maquila Export Industries (CNIME).
Country(ies): Donors: Mexico and Japan. Recipient: Paraguay

Overview: Mexico-Japan trilateral cooperation for third countries aims to implement joint activities of major impact and scale, taking advantage of the strengths of comparative advantages of the two countries.

During the project, a dynamic and participatory joint venture was undertaken between the three countries in which experts from the Ministries of Economy and Finance and Public Credit of Mexico transferred experiences, knowledge, and techniques to MIC/CNIME. Special technical assistance was also provided by a Mexican maquila firm acting as an external consultant.


Budget (optional): Approximately US $97,355.00

[LAC-41] Mexico–Promoting university exchanges with Central America

Organization(s): Supreme Council of Central American Universities (CSUCA)


Overview: The program aims to expand and consolidate systems for transmitting, creating, and applying scientific and technological knowledge by promoting the formation of human resources on priority issues for regional development and the study of the most pressing problems. The program will be undertaken through invitation sent to Mexican and Central American academics who already collaborate through academic cooperation projects in priority areas such as education, health, disaster prevention, tourism, environment, agriculture, and livestock breeding. The aim is to support five to ten projects per year


Budget (optional): US $30,000.00

[LAC-42] Guatemala-Colombia—Implementing the electronic signature

Organization(s): Ministry of the Economy of Guatemala (MINECO), Planning and Programming Secretariat of the Office of the President of Guatemala (SEGEPLAN), Industry and Trade Superintendent of Colombia (SIC), Presidential Agency for Social Action and International Co-operation of Colombia (Acción Social).

Country(ies): Cooperation recipient: Guatemala. Cooperation provider: Colombia

Overview: In Guatemala, legislative and institutional development to enable the use of electronic signature services began in 2009. As part of that process, the Government of Guatemala sought assistance from Colombia, which has ten years of experience in the regulation and use of such services. The cooperation consisted of an exchange of experts, and although still underway, it has already produced results such as the creation of forums and working networks for better exchange of experiences on the subject.

Duration: The internship in Colombia lasted from July 26, 2009, to July 31, 2009. Although the internship in Guatemala was scheduled for November last year, it has not been possible to carry it out owing to budgetary problems.

Budget (optional): Phase I: US $5,325.00 (MINECO staff in Colombia). Phase II: US $3,550.00 (SIC staff in Guatemala) (not yet undertaken). Total: US$ 8,875.00

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Ervin Arturo Cano Romero

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Under-Secretary for Information Technology, Ministry of the Economy of Guatemala

City: Guatemala, Guatemala

[LAC-43] Brazil-Colombia—District recycling capacities

Organization(s): Public Utilities Executive Unit—Municipality of Bogotá
Case stories Overview

Brazil's bilateral South-South technical cooperation covers various areas such as agriculture, education, and bio-energy. In 2009, the ABC implemented 594 projects and activities benefiting 56 countries, including trilateral South-South operations with developed countries and international organizations. Between 2003 and 2009, Brazil's cooperation partner countries grew in number by 150 percent, with projects and activities worth around US $90 million.

**Country(ies):** Recipient: Colombia

**Overview:**
Brazil's bilateral South-South technical cooperation covers various areas such as agriculture, education, and bio-energy. In 2009, the ABC implemented 594 projects and activities benefiting 56 countries, including trilateral South-South operations with developed countries and international organizations. Between 2003 and 2009, Brazil's cooperation partner countries grew in number by 150 percent, with projects and activities worth around US $90 million.

**Duration:** August 2006 to October 2008

**Budget (optional):** US $40,188.00

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Márcio Lopes Corrêa

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** General Coordinator of Multilateral Technical Cooperation

**City:** Brasilia, Brazil

---

**[LAC-44] EuroSocial—Promoting ombuds-person institutions**

**Organization(s):** Leader of the EUROsociAL Justice program consortium: International Foundation for Ibero-America of Public Administration and Policies (FIIAPP) (coordination); Institution responsible for the project: Ibero-American Union of Colleges and Associations of Lawyers (UIBA); Transferor organizations: UIBA Social Defence Office of the College of Lawyers of Pichincha (Ecuador), Provincial Court of Pichincha, Institute of Public Criminal Defence of Guatemala; Recipient organization Bolivia: College of Lawyers of Oruro (Bolivia), with collaboration from: the Technical University of Oruro, Mexico: Public Defence Institute of Veracruz (Mexico), with collaboration from: the Federation of Colleges, Bars and Associations of Lawyers of the State of Veracruz; Veracruzana University, Costa Rica: Public Defence Service of Costa Rica, with collaboration from: the College of Lawyers of Costa Rica, Ministry of Justice of Costa Rica, University of Costa Rica.

**Country(ies):** Transfers: Guatemala and Ecuador. Recipients: Bolivia, Costa Rica, and Mexico. Coordination: FIIAPP (Spain) and UIBA EUROsociAL Justice consortium: Germany, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Spain, France, Hungary, and Mexico, together with the OAS Justice Studies Center for the Americas. Over 900 institutions have participated in EUROsociAL Justice activities, 70 percent of them from Latin America.

**Overview:** The project forms part of the EUROsociAL Justice program, a technical cooperation initiative between the EU and Latin America, based on the exchange of experiences between the public agencies of the two regions.

Support has been provided for creating ombuds-person institutions in recipient countries (Bolivia, Costa Rica, and Mexico), in which ombuds-person institutions and colleges of lawyers collaborate to improve access to justice by providing free legal assistance to the most underprivileged prison population. In defining the tasks of the ombuds-person institutions, experiences (good practices) have been exchanged with Guatemala and Ecuador.

**Duration:** January to December 2008

**Budget (optional):** US $222,094.14

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Inma Zamora

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Technical Director of the EUROsociAL Coordination Office

**City:** Madrid, Spain

---

**[LAC-45] PROCASUR—Taking paths to learning**

**Organization(s):** Regional Corporation PROCASUR, FIDA, Ford Foundation

**Country(ies):** Latin America: Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, Chile, and Colombia, Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Mexico, and Costa Rica. Africa: Malawi, Uganda, Rwanda, Mozambique, South Africa, Tanzania, and Kenya. Asia: Bangladesh, India, and Sri Lanka
Overview: “Paths to Learning” is a training methodology implemented in Latin America, Africa, and Asia to expand the capacities of rural development stakeholders. It forms part of the South-South cooperation strategy, whereby public and private institutions that invest on behalf of poor rural population groups, capitalize on experiences, circulate good practices, and upscale innovations that improve the effectiveness and efficiency of local and rural development policies, programs, and projects.

Duration: 2006–2010

Budget (optional): US $200,000.00, 1.5 donors, five PROCASUR and partners

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Gloria Ochoa

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): President, PROCASUR Corporation

City: Santiago, Chile

[LAC-46] UN-INSTRAW—Learning from women’s representation in local governments (preliminary version)

Organization(s): United Nations International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (UN-INSTRAW) and PROCASUR.

Country(ies): Costa Rica, El Salvador, Dominican Republic, Bolivia, Ecuador, Nicaragua, AND Guatemala

Overview: This is an experience-based training program known as “Paths to Learning” in which women representatives of local councils and municipalities visited Central American municipalities that have made outstanding progress in reducing gender inequalities. By the end of the “path,” the participants submitted proposals to apply what they had learned from the training in their countries and municipalities. Women from Central and South America participated.

Duration: August 2008 (one week), although follow-up extended for a further two months.

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Martha Barriga

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Consultant for UN-INSTRAW when the SSC was developed

City: Toronto, Canada, and Bogotá, Colombia

[LAC-47] Nicaragua—Managing information, promoting ownership

Organization(s): Secretariat of Economic Affairs and Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Country(ies): Nicaragua. There was no participation from donors.

Overview: Due to different SSC initiatives on the part of different donors and institutions, it was imperative to make a country-led effort to try to coordinate, gather information, and establish an organized management mechanism through an electronic platform, from a demand perspective. It was also necessary to clearly identify those cooperators interested in trilateral funding for SSC.

Duration: 2000–2005

Budget (optional): It was carried out with the country’s own capacities, and funded with resources from the general national budget.

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Mauricio Gómez Lacayo

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): International Advisor in Cooperation and Development

City: Managua, Nicaragua

[LAC-48] Argentina-Paraguay—Promoting human rights and public interest clinics in universities

Organization(s): Center for Socio-Legal Studies (Argentina), Universidad Columbia (Paraguay), and Universidad Católica de Asunción (Paraguay)

Country(ies): Recipients: Argentina and Paraguay

Overview: CELS—relying on more than a decade of work experience with human rights legal clinics—in alliance with Columbia University and Univesidad Católica Nuestra Señora de Asunción in Paraguay, have designed, formalized, and con-
solidated two public interest clinics that ensure development of two aims: training of professors and students in legal techniques for the defense and protection of human rights in practice, and access to justice instances for traditionally excluded minorities such as indigenous peoples, migrants, and inmates.

**Duration:** 2007–present.

**Budget (optional):** All exchange, training, and transfer of skill actions between Argentinean CELS and Paraguay universities have been feasible thanks to the support of the National Endowment for Democracy (NED). 1) Collaboration Project Framework CELS-Paraguay, submitted to the NED agency. 2) Working Paper on legal clinics. 3) Agreement between CELS from Argentina and the Universidad Católica Nuestra Señora de Asunción de Paraguay.

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Diego Morales

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Director, Litigation and Legal Defense Area

**City:** Buenos Aires, Argentina

[LAC-49] Rio Vivo, Brazil-Haiti—Respect for Bel Air, Port-au-Prince

**Organization(s):** NGO Viva Rio (Brazil), Canadian International Development Agency, Norwegian Church Aid

**Country(ies):** Brazil, Canada, Haiti, Norway (triangular cooperation between DAC donors and Southern partners)

**Overview:** The project “Honor and Respect for Bel Air” aims to promote reduction of armed violence and urban rehabilitation in the neighborhood of Bel Air, Port-au-Prince, Haiti. It is led by the Brazilian nongovernmental organization Viva Rio with the support of the Brazilian Embassy in Haiti, Canada, Norway and international organizations. The areas of intervention are diverse, including water supply, solid waste management, and education. Activities are often associated with peace-keeping purposes, women empowerment, and youth education.

**Duration:** Activities started in 2007 and the project is still in implementation. (New activities are regularly planned and presented to stakeholders and continuation depends on support from each partner involved in the triangulation.)

**Budget (optional):** US $3,606,695.00 (from January 1, 2008–March 31, 2009; combined contributions from Canada, Norway, and United Nations)

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Talita Yamashiro Fordelone

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Research Assistant, Development Cooperation Directorate (OECD/DCD)

**City:** Paris, France

[LAC-50] Chile-Paraguay—Modernizing parliaments with new technologies

**Organization(s):** Senate of the Chilean Republic and Congress of the Republic of Paraguay

**Country(ies):** Donor: Chile. Recipient: Paraguay

**Overview:** This South-South cooperation activity consisted of a software donation, including source codes and implementation, which entailed a transfer of technology but also of those administrative processes regarding the information tool. There was a joint work with the legislative and informational areas of the above-mentioned organizations that extended to the production phase of the information system.

**Duration:** The starting date of this cooperation was September 4, 2006 (date in which the institutional cooperation covenant was signed) and its ending date was December 2007, on which occasion the Legislative Information System was formally introduced to the citizens in a ceremony held at the Paraguayan Congress. The system was put into force in March of the following year.
Budget (optional): The software, gratuitously donated by the Chilean Senate to the Congress of Paraguay, was priced at nearly US $1,000,000 (when developed for the Senate of Chile). The adaptation and implementation costs were covered with funds of the Project “Congress Modernization” (Congress of the Republic of Paraguay), financed by the World Bank. The total amount assigned to the project is unknown.

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Roberto Bustos L
Title of Primary Contact Person(s):
City: Chile

[LAC-51] Argentina—Sharing mutualism

Organization(s): Organization of Mutual Entities of the Americas (Odema), Mutual Entities of Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, the Dominican Republic, and Uruguay. Mutual Society for Family Protection (AMPF) (Argentina)
Country(ies): Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, Dominican Republic, and Uruguay

Overview: The activity to which this case makes reference is the assistance provided by the Mutual Society for Family Protection of Argentina (AMPF) to the member entities of the Organization of Mutual Entities of the Americas (Odema) in the above-mentioned countries for the exchange of knowledge and operational experience on mutual health, social work, economic aid, pharmacy, and communication services. This is done with the aim to provide more and better social services to low-income populations of those countries.

Due to the scarce presence of the state as a provider of basic services in many of these regions, mutualism has always been an alternative for people with no access to state services and who are unable to afford the cost of private service provision.


Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Martín Orlando
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Manager of International Relations
City: Buenos Aires, Argentina


Organization(s): Center for Digital Inclusion (CDI; formerly known as the Committee for Democracy in Information Technology)
Country(ies): Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay, and Jordan. CDI Community Centers exist in 66 communities and 22 municipalities in Argentina; and respectively Chile has 51/11; Columbia: 4/2; Ecuador: 16/4; Mexico: 30/21; Peru: 5/5; Uruguay: 32/10; Brazil: 650+ community centers in 23 regions; and Jordan: 120 schools.

Overview: Delivering on our mission, the CDI network is working to replicate CDI’s experience and educational strategy in a true model of “social franchise” globally, leading to human and community development through ICT education and citizenship-building skills that transform lives and communities. Today, CDI schools graduate 70,000 students per year from 800-plus schools in 9 countries from the global South. Since 1995 we have graduated more than 1.25 million students.

Duration: Founded in 1995, CDI is an ongoing project expanding outside of Latin America in 2009.

Budget (optional): Annual Operating Budget: US $2,542,740 (4.5 million Brazilian Reais)

Name of Primary Contact Person(s): Christine Clauser
Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Executive Director CDI USA
City: New York
[LAC-53] Cuba-Colombia—Learning the benefits of sericulture (silk farming)

**Organization(s):** Experimental Pasture and Forage Station of Cuba, Ministry of Higher Education, Cauca Silk Farming Development Corporation, and the Presidential Agency for Social Action and International Co-operation.

**Country(ies):** Main countries participating in the cooperation agreement: Colombia and Cuba. Other countries participating in forums and exchanges related to the subject: Argentina, Bolivia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela

**Overview:** Sericulture encompasses a group of cultural activities based on silk, including the production of mulberry trees, silkworms, threads, fabrics, and products used in medicine, cosmetics, and for other end-user benefits.

Thanks to the experience shared with Colombia, silk farming in Cuba is currently a mechanism for improving incomes in rural areas, since it is a source of employment for men and women in the sector; it involves various society stakeholders such as peasant farmers, families, students, and persons with disabilities; and it is a source of animal food, organic fertilisers, and medicinal uses.

**Duration:** The project began in June 2008 and has not yet finished.

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Roberto Carlos Fiallo Madruga

Title of Primary Contact Person(s): Head of the Sericulture Project in Cuba

City: Matanzas, Cuba

**Global Cooperation**

[GL-1] World Bank—Investing in South-South knowledge exchange

**Organization(s):** World Bank

**Country(ies):** Global

**Overview:** The South-South Experience Exchange Trust Fund (SEETF) is a flexible funding mechanism to facilitate just-in-time knowledge and experience exchanges among development practitioners. The facility is designed to respond to specific demands from low-income countries that want to learn from their counterparts in other developing countries.

**Duration:** Ongoing initiative. Launched October 2008

**Budget (optional):** US $4.35 million

**Name of Primary Contact Person(s):** Gudrun Kochendorfer-Lucius

**Title of Primary Contact Person(s):** Director, World Bank Institute Capacity Development and Partnerships Department

City: Washington, DC
The Task Team on South-South Cooperation would like to express its deep gratitude to all people and institutions who have submitted their experiences despite all restraints in time and resources. Furthermore, the case story process and this catalogue have benefitted from the collaboration of the following organizations and supporters:


**Platform in Asia:** Angie Cortez, Ilaria Caetani, Manju Senapaty (all Asian Development Bank), Michael Dickerson, Rajiv Kumar and Surabhi Tandon (all Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations)

**Support in Latin America and the Caribbean:** Andrés Osorio, Angela María Noguera, and Carolina Camacho (all Fedesarrollo)

**Global core team:** Daniel Duque (Enlaza), Jeff Kwaterski (Impact Alliance), María Clara Sanin Betancourt (Enlaza), Nils-Sjard Schulz (policy advisor), Norma Garza (Impact Alliance), and Silvia Chaves O’Flynn (Enlaza)
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This concept note delineates the conceptual and analytical basis for the analytical work that the Task Team on South-South Cooperation (TT-SSC) will conduct in order to map and analyze South-South cooperation (SSC) practices and their synergies with the aid effectiveness agenda, in particular the Paris Declaration (PD) and the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA). Acknowledging the rich diversity of SSC, the analytical work of the TT-SSC will concentrate on South-South technical cooperation as a tool for capacity development and a trigger for more equitable and horizontal development partnerships, particularly among middle-income and low-income countries.

Interpreting article 19 of the AAA, three main lines of synergies are identified:

- **Adapting** the PD and AAA principles to SSC (AAA art. 19a);
- **Enriching** the aid effectiveness agenda with the practices and experiences of SSC (AAA art. 19b); and
- **Identifying complementarities** between SSC and North-South cooperation (AAA art. 19e).

Along these lines, the concept note offers a detailed overview of the hypotheses emerging from the AAA (see Section 3 and Annex 2). The adaptability of the five PD principles (ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for results, and mutual accountability) to SSC is explored, while the aid effectiveness agenda might learn from concrete contributions of SSC in areas such as a good-fit technical cooperation, a broader
development agenda, regional and multilateral learning, improved coordination, and a more equitable development partnership. Synergies with North-South cooperation could be fostered by clarifying the comparative advantages of South-South technical cooperation and triangular cooperation as a main entry door for collaborative modalities.

1. PURPOSE

As a starting point for the analytical work of the Task Team on South-South Cooperation (TT-SSC) of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF), this concept note creates the conceptual and analytical framework for the case studies that, in line with the TT-SSC objectives, will map and analyze SSC practices and their synergies with the Paris Declaration (PD) and Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) principles.

The AAA includes an approach for understanding SSC in the context of the aid effectiveness agenda, which is framed by the following three lines:

- Adapting the PD and AAA principles to SSC;
- Enriching the effectiveness agenda with the practices and experiences of SSC; and
- Identifying complementarities and synergies between SSC and North-South cooperation.

From these three angles, the TT-SSC will map and analyze effective SSC, which will help to identify emerging good practices of SSC in the context of aid effectiveness (for more detail on the analytical process, see Annex 1).

At the general level, the analytical work on threefold good practices will feed into a Southern-led implementation of the AAA and enhance the overall process leading from the 2009 Accra High Level Forum (HLF) via the 2010 Colombia HLE to the 2011 Korea HLF (see Annex 1). It is thus a mirror of the strong commitment of partner countries to the aid effectiveness agenda as a tool for effectively achieving development results and shaping more horizontal development partnerships.

The analytical work of the TT-SSC is of critical relevance for the different stakeholders involved in South-South cooperation:

- Partner countries providing SSC, particularly middle-income countries (MIC)² as providers and recipients, seeking a consistent conceptual and operational adaptation of the Paris and Accra principles to their particular institutional and technical characteristics, capacities, and interests;
- Partner countries receiving SSC interested in diversifying their “menu” of development cooperation on the basis of evidence on comparative advantages of SSC, particularly with regard to capacity development and technical cooperation;
- Multilateral and regional organizations aiming to foster South-South learning processes within more effective and inclusive development partnerships and seeking to understand good practices and operational choices of support;
- Traditional donors desiring to engage in innovative aid modalities, such as triangular cooperation and direct support to SSC, and interested in mutual learning processes on aid effectiveness, including collaborative coordination at the country, regional, and global level;
- Civil society organizations participating in South-South learning and mutual exchange, especially in their role as actors for development on their own right, that desire to contribute to more effective and inclusive development partnerships;

² This concept note will focus particularly, although not exclusively, on middle-income countries (MIC), which are defined in terms of the income categories of the World Bank based on GNI per capita. In 2008, MIC (including lower- and upper-middle-income economies) achieved a GNI between 976 and 11,905 USD per capita. For more details, see http://go.worldbank.org/K2CKM78CC0.
• **Academia and experts**, particularly from developing countries, that are working on SSC, triangular cooperation, and the aid effectiveness agenda, and have an interest in innovative networking and learning on SSC within the aid effectiveness agenda.

2. **BACKGROUND**

Based on a longstanding history of solidarity among developing countries, SSC has been introduced into the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) as an essential element for acknowledging and enhancing the role of Southern actors within more effective and inclusive partnerships for development. The Accra round table nine became an outstanding opportunity to introduce a broader vision of how new development actors could engage in the effectiveness agenda on the basis of key messages presented in the corresponding Issues Paper (OECD 2008b, 2008c). During the negotiations in Accra, SSC was one of the key priorities of partner countries and particularly MIC. Thus, the inclusion of SSC in the AAA reflects vividly the desire of partner countries to become proactive drivers of the achievement of the development results and ultimately the transformation of the current aid architecture into a more equitable global governance of aid.

As a result of this broader process, the AAA sheds a sharp light on SSC as a pillar for “more effective and inclusive partnerships.” Concretely, the AAA stresses “the role of middle-income countries as both providers and recipients of aid” and “recognize[s] the importance and particularities of South-South cooperation and acknowledge[s] that we can learn from the experience of developing countries” (art. 19b), while also encouraging development actors engaged in SSC to “use the Paris Declaration principles as a point of reference in providing development cooperation” (art. 19a). Based on the “principle of noninterference, equality among developing countries, and respect for their independence,” the SSC constitutes “a valuable complement to North-South cooperation” (art. 19e). Finally, SSC is also defined as a key driver for capacity development (CD), with developing countries and donors agreeing to “promote the provision of technical cooperation by local and regional resources, including through South-South cooperation” (art. 14b).

This framework for understanding and promoting SSC in the context of the overall aid effectiveness agenda is addressed by the TT-SSC, a Southern-led initiative facilitated by Colombia and endorsed during the WP-EFF meeting on April 1, 2009, with strong support by partner countries, donors, and multilateral organizations. Committed to implementing the AAA provisions on SSC, the TT-SSC aims, in a first step (until the HLE 2010), to map and analyze SSC practices and their synergies with the aid effectiveness agenda, and, in a second step (until the HLF 2011), to foster the identification and agreement of good practices on SSC in the context of the Paris Declaration and the AAA. In general terms, the TT-SSC is also expected to serve as a platform for collaboration and networking among southern countries and organizations interested in peer learning and South-South exchange.

This concept note thus constitutes a central tool for the TT-SSC in its commitment with the implementation of the AAA commitments on SSC.

3. **UNDERSTANDING SSC IN THE CONTEXT OF AID EFFECTIVENESS**

Tracing the insertion of SSC in the context of the PD and the AAA requires a brief review of the definitions and roots of both SSC and the aid effectiveness agenda.

The aid effectiveness agenda, with the PD and the AAA as international agreements endorsed by more than 100 countries, constitutes a long-term...
process of building a more horizontal partnership between donor and partner countries around the effective use of foreign aid resources for the achievement of development results such as the Millennium Development Goals. The aid effectiveness agenda reflects a set of commitments for development cooperation that were agreed upon at the intergovernmental level during the High Level Forums in Paris (2005) and Accra (2008). For the purpose of the TT-SSC work, a politically sensitive lecture of the five aid effectiveness principles (defined by the PD) is useful and looks into two essential dimensions of the PD: on the one hand, the technical aspects include good practices in the principles of alignment, harmonization, and management for results; on the other hand, through ownership and mutual accountability, the political spirit aims to overcome the asymmetries inherent in cooperation between the North (donor) and the South (partner country). Both dimensions, the technical and the political, form the core of the partnership between donors and recipients. Reinforcing the PD, the AAA creates the basis of a stronger role of partner countries in the international aid architecture, guiding the aid effectiveness agenda toward a more horizontal global governance of aid, and introduces a stronger bid for development effectiveness, that is, the effective achievement of development results. In this regard, SSC, among other elements, such as capacity development, fulfills an important function in fostering the diversity of roles, contributions, and choices by partner countries and particularly MIC committed to implementing the Paris and Accra provisions, which are both providers and recipients of aid, playing thus a pivotal role between traditional North-South cooperation and SSC.

**South-South cooperation** is a multilayered form of development cooperation with a history of more than fifty years. Initiated in Southeast Asia, SSC was promoted in the 1960s and 1970s by the United Nations (UN), particularly the G-77, and other multilateral platforms such as the Non-Alignment Movement. A key policy document is the 1978 Buenos Aires Plan of Action for Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries, which was followed up by a High Level Committee at the UN General Assembly. SSC achieves particular relevance for MIC in the aftermath of the international agreements on concentrating aid and development efforts in less developed countries, such as the 2000 Millennium Declaration and the 2002 Monterrey Consensus on Financing for Development. While potentially receiving increasingly limited development financing, but simultaneously engaging in the provision of SSC and particularly South-South technical cooperation, MIC intend to position themselves in a shifting aid architecture as recipients and providers of aid. Today, SSC constitutes a complex mosaic of actors, scales, and modalities (see ECOSOC 2008a, Manning 2006, Kumar 2008, Rowlands 2008, and SEGIB 2008), ranging from rather isolated activities to budget support and large-scale loans. A basic distinction can be made between technical and financial cooperation, the latter including loans and debt relief, as well as budget and balance of payment support (see ECOSOC 2008a). Triangular cooperation, with traditional donors supporting SSC among developing countries, is often observed as an additional booster for SSC and could create a corridor for the complementarity between SSC and traditional North-South cooperation (ECOSOC 2008b). However, there is still a gap of research, analysis, and data on the effectiveness and impact of SSC, as well as its political and technical features within the new aid architecture. The unique diversity of SSC and its modalities creates an inspiring environment for understanding its synergies with aid effectiveness. Most developing countries receive a mix of SSC, with much appreciated support in crucial areas for their development, such as trade and foreign direct investment. Furthermore, SSC entails a strong political component, as SSC delivery is often related to foreign policy agendas and a high-level commitment to Southern development agendas and more horizontal relations, for example, at the UN level.

While acknowledging the diversity and underlying dynamics of SSC in all its expression, the analytical efforts of the TT-SSC will focus on technical
cooperation (TC), although other forms of cooperation, especially if a TC component is included, should be considered on an ad hoc basis. The TT-SSC has identified this specific niche on the basis of its comparative advantages as a Southern-led platform committing to the implementation of the AAA, but will engage as actively as possible in coordination with other complementary analytical efforts that are currently being conducted, for example, at the UN Development Cooperation Forum (for more detail, see Section 6).

Apart from the need for a specific niche, the following key issues illustrate why TC represents a key dimension of SSC within the implementation of the AAA:

- The AAA identifies SSC (art. 19) as a tool for capacity development (art. 14), particularly in the realm of TC provided by local and regional resources, and thus sets a clear framework for concentrating on TC as an effective feature of SSC and as a tool for capacity development;
- SSC within the aid effectiveness agenda is a process primarily encouraged by (and for) MIC that are engaging in sharing knowledge and expertise. The specific type of horizontal and equitable partnership (for example, based on mutual learning) is unique and needs to be differentiated from the one related to financial transfers. However, coordination with studies on the broader SSC agenda will be ensured (see Section 7);
- South-South TC has a strong potential to foster the role of low-income countries (LIC) by diversifying their options of development cooperation, creating more horizontal relationships, and opening opportunities to become providers themselves. Furthermore, LIC might also help to integrate SSC in the existing aid effectiveness mechanisms at the country level. In sum, SSC enables LIC to become proactive partners in the evolving international aid architecture;
- SSC-focused analysis might contribute learning and feedback to a key concern of developing countries: the quality of and national leadership in coordinating TC, which are critical to country ownership over development processes.

4. HYPOTHESES: UNPACKING THE ACCRA MANDATE

Several assumptions can be made about the particularities and comparative advantages of South-South TC with respect to North-South technical cooperation. The existing literature (Sanín Betancourt and Schulz 2009, Kumar 2008, and Scott 2009) illustrates different aspects of uniqueness that still need to be explored from a critical perspective in the analytical work of the TT-SSC.

The following distinctive features of SSC within the aid effectiveness agenda can be highlighted:

- **Capacity development:** South-South technical cooperation tends to strongly focus on capacity development as a process (as opposed to a product), where technical cooperation is embedded as a tool for mutual learning;
- **A broader choice of support, leading to horizontal partnerships:** South-South technical cooperation offers a different type of relationship and might improve the diversity of choices for technical cooperation at the country and regional level, while also creating more horizontal forms of development partnerships;
- **Cost effectiveness:** Drawing on regional and national resources, value for money of South-South technical cooperation is perceived as clearly superior;

---

4 For the purpose of this study, technical cooperation (TC) seeks to enhance the human and institutional capacities (for example, skills, knowledge, and expertise) of persons and institutions in developing countries and to create an environment conducive to development. Among its tools, technical assistance, and advice, training, student programs, and institution-building are relevant expressions of TC. (Note: this definition needs to be revised with comments and suggestions by TT-SSC members.)
• **Demand-driven character:** Given the scarce resources and the horizontal relations between the partners, South-South technical cooperation is more aligned with the recipient’s priorities and needs;

• **Adaptability:** Since recipient and provider share similar development challenges, South-South technical cooperation might provide highly adapted and relevant solutions (for example, in technological, cultural, and linguistic terms);

• **Southern knowledge:** South-South technical cooperation diversifies the generation of knowledge and expertise beyond industrialized models.

While focusing on South-South TC, the following three basic assumptions on SSC in the context of aid effectiveness are highlighted by the AAA:

• **Adapting the Paris and Accra principles to SSC** ("point of reference", AAA art. 19a) could be pursued by considering ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for results, and mutual accountability as an orientation for SSC;

• **Enriching the Paris and Accra principles with the practice and experiences of SSC** ("learn from the experience of developing countries" and "role of middle-income countries", AAA art. 19b) could emerge from the particular characteristics of SSC and thus enrich the overall aid effectiveness agenda, particularly with respect to capacity development, technical cooperation, and mutual learning;

• **Complementarity with North-South cooperation** ("a valuable complement", AAA art. 19e) might be explored through the increasing diversity in technical cooperation and opportunities for triangular cooperation, including the use of regional mechanisms.

The following figure illustrates the environment and dynamics of SSC in the context of the aid effectiveness agenda:

![Dynamics of SSC in Aid Effectiveness Agenda](image)

5. **ACTORS AND PLATFORMS: TOWARD PARTNERSHIPS AND COMPLEMENTARITIES**

The TT-SSC will coordinate as far as possible its conceptual and analytical work with other processes, platforms, and organizations, engaging as well international experts and academia for feedback and peer reviews.

The planned case studies are of particular relevance for a coordinated partnership approach, since the TT-SSC desires to complement its own efforts (around ten case studies) with the ongoing analysis and research conducted by other actors. Possible paths include the sharing of criteria, terms of reference, and experts for the case studies. Particularly, the TT-SSC intends to engage in strategic collaboration with the following organizations and platforms.

During its second phase (2009–2010), the Development Cooperation Forum (DCF) at ECOSOC will build on its previous work on SSC (ECOSOC 2008a, 2008b), aiming to increase the development impact of South-South and triangular cooperation. A South-South Working Group has been established at the DCF. Highly relevant synergies of the TT-SSC analytical work might appear in the context of a DCF-commissioned study on improved SSC data and voluntary reporting (until November 2009), improved analysis of how the...
effectiveness of SSC might be increased (until April 2010), and the consensus on desirable indicators for SSC effectiveness (during the 2010 DCF).

The South-South Cooperation Unit at UNDP is conducting a survey on SSC and triangular cooperation through field research in sixteen countries in close collaboration with the national governments. The focus is on policy design, institution building, partnership, budgeting, M&E, scaling-up and sustainability.

UNDP/UNDG is conducting case studies on middle-income countries, capacity development, and SSC, which will feed into the Global Event on Capacity Development in November 2010 (tbc). Several activities have been developed with agencies from middle-income countries over the last months.

The work on capacity development will also be coordinated with LenCD, in particular at the country level and within regional learning processes.

Close coordination is also planned with the CD Alliance, particularly regarding its aim to design a code of conduct on technical assistance (CD Alliance Annual Work Plan SO 3.1).

The World Bank Institute (WBI) will be a key partner for innovative South-South learning processes. The WBI’s Capacity Development and Partnerships Department is building up a South-South practitioners network, will launch a South-South practice group, and will support the conceptual and methodological design of the case studies. The WBI is also managing the South-South Experience Exchange Facility, which aims to shape experience by sharing lessons learned and is currently conducting case studies. The specific added value of the WBI for the TT-SSC work is its technical and methodological capacity to create linkages and mutual learning between development partners.

The Asian Development Bank (ADB) documents case studies and experiences of SSC as a part of its ongoing work on regional cooperation and integration, with capacity development components among the countries of the Asia-Pacific region. These cover areas of infrastructure development, trade agreement facilitation and research, and global goods and environment, which might become references for the TT-SSC work.

For more than five years, the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) has been conducting case studies on SSC on regional public goods and policies with a focus on development effectiveness. These analytical efforts and the experiences in managing the case studies might constitute crucial orientation points for the TT-SSC in addressing the regional perspective in LAC.

The DAC (DCD) is currently finalizing a study on triangular cooperation and two country-level mapping exercises (in Tanzania and Mozambique) on ODA and SSC, identifying complementarities after Accra.

The second phase of the Paris Declaration evaluation is an outstanding opportunity to foster South-South mutual learning processes and generate inputs to the ongoing North-South assessment process. A bid for regional promotion of the aid effectiveness agenda (regional workshops during the second phase of the evaluation) could create an outstanding opportunity to link the TT-SSC work with the broader learning on aid effectiveness while fostering a more proactive role of partner countries.

SEGIB is continuing its work on reporting on SSC in LAC, which is highly relevant for understanding regional dimensions, expressions and experiences in the region. The Ibero-American Programme on Horizontal SSC was launched in late 2008 and will gather experiences and identify good practices where very relevant synergies could emerge.

The Capacity Development for Development Effectiveness (CDDE-Asia Pacific) Facility is a strategic partner for mutual learning in a Southern-led regional network, facilitating collaboration across countries in the Asia-Pacific by government officials, parliamentarians, civil society representatives, and donors in solving common aid effectiveness challenges. The CDDE Facility, and the South-South peer initiatives it supports—on issues ranging from mutual accountability to aid effectiveness and parliamentarians—can provide
a strong case study for South-South cooperation supported through a multidonor facility. Individual initiatives being implemented under the CDDE can also be good references for the Task Team on South-South Cooperation. The CDDE Facility is governed by a steering committee including six partner country members and three donors (ADB, Japan, and the World Bank), is supported by a joint ADB-UNDP secretariat, and works to a constituency of more than 500 hundred partner country members of the Asia-Pacific Aid Effectiveness Community of Practice. The CDDE Facility itself represents a good practice in building country-level capacity for aid effectiveness through its technical and financial support for South-South exchange and knowledge management.

Civil society organizations such as the North-South Institute are conducting activities on Southern perspectives on the global development finance architecture, in general, and technical cooperation, in particular, which might become additional inputs to the work of the TT-SSC.

ACRONYMS

AAA Accra Agenda for Action
ADB Asian Development Bank
AfDB African Development Bank
CD Capacity development
CDDE Capacity Development for Development Effectiveness Facility
DAC Development Assistance Committee
ECOSOC Economic and Social Council
HLF High Level Forum
HLE High Level Event
IADB Inter-American Development Bank
LAC Latin America and the Caribbean
LenCD Learning Network on Capacity Development
LIC Low-Income Country
MIC Middle-Income Country
OECD Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PD Paris Declaration
SEGIB Ibero-American General Secretariat
SSC South-South cooperation
TC Technical cooperation
TT-SSC Task Team on South-South Cooperation
UN United Nations
UNDP United Nations Development Programme
WBI World Bank Institute
WP-EFF Working Party on Aid Effectiveness
ANNEX 1   Analytical work of the TT-SSC—The way to Seoul 2011
## ANNEX 2  
**SSC in the context of aid effectiveness: Hypotheses emerging from the AAA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Adapting the Paris and Accra principles to SSC (“point of reference”, AAA art. 19a)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of hypothesis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Related Paris Declaration / AAA commitments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1. Ownership</strong> Country ownership, particularly national demand and leadership in SSC coordination, is crucial for the effectiveness of SSC.</td>
<td>PD 15: “Respect partner country leadership (…)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC can strengthen national capacities for an effective leadership on development and aid coordination, including learning on country systems of PFM, procurement, statistics, and cost-effective M&amp;E as well as the corresponding diagnostic tools.</td>
<td>PD 15: “(…) and help strengthen their capacity to exercise it”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA 14b: “Donors’ support for capacity development will be demand driven and designed to support country ownership. (…)”</td>
<td>AAA 15c: “(…) Where country systems require further strengthening, developing countries will lead in defining reform programs and priorities. Donors will support these reforms and provide capacity development assistance.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA 23c: “Donors (…) will support and invest in strengthening developing countries’ national statistical capacity and information systems, including those for managing aid.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2. Alignment</strong> The design and implementation of SSC should be adapted and aligned to national priorities and programs as well as national and sector strategies.</td>
<td>PD 16 (indicator 3): “Donors commit to base their overall support—country strategies, policy dialogues, and development cooperation programs—on partners’ national development strategies and periodic reviews of progress in implementing these strategies (…)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting national capacity development objectives and strategies is inherent to SSC and should be done in a harmonized way and effectively using existing capacity.</td>
<td>AAA 14a: “Developing countries will systematically identify areas where there is a need to strengthen the capacity to perform and deliver services (…)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD 24 (indicator 4): “Donors commit to align their analytic and financial support with partners’ capacity development objectives and strategies, make effective use of existing capacities, and harmonize support for capacity development accordingly.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA 14b: “(…) developing countries and donors will i) jointly select and manage technical cooperation, and ii) promote the provision of technical cooperation by local and regional resources, including through South-South cooperation.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA 14c: “Developing countries and donors will work together at all levels to promote operational changes that make capacity development support more effective.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Adapting the Paris and Accra principles to SSC (“point of reference”, AAA art. 19a) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of hypothesis</th>
<th>Related Paris Declaration / AAA commitments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3. Harmonization</strong></td>
<td>PD 32 (indicator 10): “Donors commit to (...) work together to reduce the number of separate, duplicative missions to the field and diagnostic reviews; and promote joint training to share lessons learnt and build a community of practice”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missions, analysis, and lessons learned on SSC should be shared and coordinated as far as possible among SSC providers and with traditional donors.</td>
<td><strong>Comparative advantages of SSC are identified by SSC recipients that are leading the coordination among SSC providers and with traditional donors.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4. Managing for results</strong></td>
<td>PD 34: “Partner countries commit to provide clear views on donors’ comparative advantages and on how to achieve donor complementarity at the country or sector level.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing for development results improves the scope of relevance and impact of SSC, needs to rely on transparent, regular, detailed and timely information, and should be aligned to country information and M&amp;E systems.</td>
<td><strong>AAA 17a: “Developing countries will lead in determining the optimal roles of donors in supporting their development efforts at national, regional, and sectoral levels.”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.5. Mutual accountability</strong></td>
<td>PD 36: “Donors and partner countries jointly commit to reform procedures and strengthen incentives—including for recruitment, appraisal, and training—for management and staff to work toward harmonization, alignment, and results.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building of SSC agencies and organisms in MIC, including professionalization, evaluation culture, and a good set-up of their organizational and staff incentives, are essential for achieving better effectiveness.</td>
<td><strong>AAA 14a: “(...) Donors will strengthen their own capacity and skills to be more responsive to developing countries' needs.”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AAA 23d:</strong> “We will strengthen incentives to improve aid effectiveness. We will systematically review and address legal or administrative impediments to implementing international commitments on aid effectiveness. Donors will pay more attention to delegating sufficient authority to country offices and to changing organizational and staff incentives to promote behavior in line with aid effectiveness principles.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Enriching the Paris and Accra principles with the practice and experiences of SSC (“learn from the experience of developing countries” and “role of middle-income countries”, AAA art. 19b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of hypothesis</th>
<th>Related Paris Declaration / AAA commitments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **2.1. Good-fit TC**  | PD 24: “Donors commit to align their analytic and financial support with partners’ capacity development objectives and strategies, make effective use of existing capacities, and harmonize support for capacity development accordingly.”  
AAA 14a: “Developing countries will systematically identify areas where there is a need to strengthen the capacity to perform and deliver services at all levels […] and design strategies to address them […]”  
AAA 14b: “Donors’ support for capacity development will be demand driven and designed to support country ownership. To this end, developing countries and donors will […] promote the provision of technical cooperation by local and regional resources, including through South-South cooperation.”  
(CD Alliance Work plan 2009–2010 strategic objective #3.1. “TC and S-S cooperation”) |
| **2.2. Broad development agenda** | AAA 14a: “Developing countries will systematically identify areas where there is a need to strengthen the capacity to perform and deliver services at all levels—national, subnational, sectoral, and thematic—and design strategies to address them […]”  
AAA 14b: “Donors’ support for capacity development will be demand driven and designed to support country ownership. To this end, developing countries and donors will […] promote the provision of technical cooperation by local and regional resources, including through South-South cooperation.” |
| **2.4. Regional and multilateral learning** | (missing) |
| **2.5. Improvement coordination** | PD 34: “Partner countries commit to provide clear views on donors’ comparative advantage and on how to achieve donor complementarity at the country or sector level.”  
PD 35: “Donors commit to make full use of their respective comparative advantage at the sector or country level (…)”  
AAA 17a: “Developing countries will lead in determining the optimal roles of donors in supporting their development efforts at national, regional and sectoral levels. (…)” |
| **2.6. Boosting development partnership** | PD 50 (indicator 12): “Partner countries and donors commit to jointly assess through existing and increasingly objective country-level mechanisms mutual progress in implementing agreed commitments on aid effectiveness, including the Partnership Commitments”  
AAA 24b: “We will step up our efforts to ensure that—as agreed in the Paris Declaration—mutual assessment reviews are in place by 2010 in all countries that have endorsed the declaration. These reviews will be based on country results reporting and information systems complemented with available donor data and credible independent evidence. They will draw on emerging good practice with stronger parliamentary scrutiny and citizen engagement. With them we will hold each other accountable for mutually agreed results in keeping with country development and aid policies.”  
AAA 31: “(…)We welcome the contribution that the ECOSOC Development Cooperation Forum is making to the international dialogue and to mutual accountability on aid issues. We call upon the UN development system to further support the capacities of developing countries for effective management of development assistance.”  
}
3. Complementarity with North-South cooperation (“a valuable complement”, AAA art. 19c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of hypothesis</th>
<th>Related Paris Declaration / AAA commitments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.1. Comparative advantage South-South TC | **PD 24:** “Donors commit to align their analytic and financial support with partners’ capacity development objectives and strategies, make effective use of existing capacities, and harmonize support for capacity development accordingly.”  
**AAA 14a:** “Developing countries will systematically identify areas where there is a need to strengthen the capacity to perform and deliver services at all levels—national, subnational, sectoral, and thematic—and design strategies to address them (…)” |
| The demand-driven character, efficiency, and adaptability of SSC create comparative advantages particularly in the realm of TC by national and regional resources that might be explored by traditional donors. | |
| 3.2. Diversity of choices for TC and CD | **PD 24:** “Donors commit to align their analytic and financial support with partners’ capacity development objectives and strategies, make effective use of existing capacities, and harmonize support for capacity development accordingly.”  
**AAA 14b:** “Donors’ support for capacity development will be demand driven and designed to support country ownership. To this end, developing countries and donors will 1) jointly select and manage technical cooperation, and 2) promote the provision of technical cooperation by local and regional resources, including through South-South cooperation.” |
| SSC might improve the availability of choices of TC by partner countries looking for support in capacity development, especially if country systems and donors are more open to SSC providers. | |
| 3.3. Triangular cooperation | **AAA 14b:** “Donors’ support for capacity development will be demand driven and designed to support country ownership. To this end, developing countries and donors will 1) jointly select and manage technical cooperation, and 2) promote the provision of technical cooperation by local and regional resources, including through South-South cooperation.” |
| Among other collaborative, inclusive, and innovative modalities, triangular cooperation represents an entry point for synergies between SSC and North-South cooperation, particularly in the realm of capacity building with expertise from North and South. | |
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