

Chair Summary on Meeting Outcomes and Agreements¹

The global architecture of development cooperation is changing rapidly. In the contemporary world, various types of countries are engaged in development cooperation and thus contribute to the provision of global public goods in numerous ways. Many middle-income countries (such as Brazil, China, India, and South Africa) and even low-income countries (for instance, Rwanda) are doing this through South-South Cooperation (SSC) approaches, along with other modalities of cooperation.

In recognition of this, an informal policy roundtable was organized in Seoul, Republic of Korea by UNDP Seoul Policy Centre (USPC) on December 3rd, 2019 to facilitate a discussion on the “Future of the Global Architecture of Development Cooperation”, particularly through the perspective of SSC partners. For this reason, USPC invited leading experts from various institutions involved in researching, advising, and providing SSC. These individuals include the following (in alphabetical order by name):

Adisak Jantatum	UN Office for South-South Cooperation, Asia-Pacific Regional Office
Andre de Mello e Souza	Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada, Brazil
Artemy Izmetiev	UNDP Seoul Policy Centre
Debapriya Bhattacharya	Centre for Policy Dialogue, Bangladesh
Emel Parlar Dal	Marmara University, Turkey
Gerardo Bracho	Associated Fellow of the Centre for Global Cooperation Research
Paulo Esteves	BRICS Policy Center, Brazil
Philani Mthembu	Institute for Global Dialogue, South Africa
Piper Hart	UNDP Headquarters
Sachin Chaturvedi	Research and Information System for Developing Countries, India
Stephan Klingebiel	UNDP Seoul Policy Centre (Chair)
Xu Xiuli	China Institute for South-South Cooperation in Agriculture, China
Hyunjoo Oh*	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Observer)
Yeseung Lee	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Observer)

* Director-General Hyunjoo Oh only participated in the beginning of the meeting as an observer.

With the intention to learn from the expertise of different institutions and countries, three panel sessions were held in compliance with the Chatham House Rules (see program in the annex).

The first session sought to identify the common grounds shared amongst SSC providers, and

¹ This paper does not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The main purpose of this document is to document the similarities and differences in perception towards the topics that were discussed in the workshop. The opinion expressed does not necessarily reflect the views of the institutes to which participants are affiliated.

between them and OECD donors. Subsequently, the second session hoped to elaborate upon what it would take to work together, and the possible extent of doing so. Finally, the third session facilitated a discussion on the specific steps that could be taken in order to begin this partnership.

In the perspective of the workshop chair, the discussions that took place during these three panel sessions led to the following outcomes:

1. Rationale and Substance

a. The status of global governance is a challenge in many regards. The need for collective action has increased from previous years due to complex problems related to climate change and the increasingly high number of refugees, amongst other reasons. Much more ambitious forms of inter- and transnational cooperation are needed to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). At the same time, the willingness and capacity to engage in multilateral approaches is weakening. **This fundamental paradox between the strong need for more and better cooperation, and the decreasing willingness and ability of the international community to act collectively is a key feature of today's global governance.**

b. The emergence of nationalism and populism within several countries has resulted in the international **'thinning of multilateralism'** and the inward orientation of many countries; **unilateralism is on the rise.**

c. **Development Cooperation (DC) is part of a much bigger picture.** DC is intended, among other things, to increase the capacity and resources needed for collective global action. However, the 'thinning of multilateralism' and emergence of unilateralism is affecting its ability to do so.

d. **South-South Cooperation and Triangular Cooperation are significant and dynamic factors** in the global discourse on DC and its modalities. The BAPA+40 UN Conference in 2019 has demonstrated the high relevance of the SSC modality. This approach is often viewed to have contributed in changing the norms of the formerly predominant OECD approach for DC, which is based on Official Development Assistance (ODA), though others have argued that the two are developing in a parallel manner. As such, there is currently no common understanding on whether the international society is experiencing a situation of 'convergence' or (continued) 'divergence' between these two approaches.

e. **A limiting factor** in global policy dialogues **is the missing definition of and criteria for SSC**; so far, there is no clear consensus (for example, in the BAPA+40 outcome document) on this fundamental term.

f. There is **no global consensus about the level of similarities or dissimilarities between SSC providers and OECD-DAC donors**. In fact, this debate seems to be one of the most controversial aspects on the current discourse occurring in this field.

2) Platforms and Processes

a. **An effective and legitimate global platform for all DC modalities does not exist**. From the perspective of several actors, especially SSC providers, platforms such the Global Platform for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) are not suitable for all partners as perceptions towards it differ significantly. However, there was agreement regarding the need to use ‘talkshops’ which could subsequently lead to an environment that encourages ‘negotiations’ on DC issues.

b. **One of the main factors that led to a shrinking consensus** on a global platform after the Busan High-Level Meeting on Aid Effectiveness **was the expected application of monitoring standards** for all types of DC.

c. Despite its importance, a **new global platform incorporating DC modalities is unlikely to emerge** because of the lack of enabling factors, such as the little trust in existing mechanisms.

d. It is **important to take advantage of ‘bridging countries and actors’**, such as the Republic of Korea, to continue to facilitate forums and discussions. The development experiences, particularly the recent ‘graduation’ experiences, of these countries may result in new insights that can only be accrued by going beyond the traditional discourses occurring between the Global North and the Global South.

3) Follow-up Initiatives

a. **Discussions between ‘knowledge actors’** (including the one which is the basis of the present brief) **continue to provide important insights**. It would be crucial to continue this kind of informal policy dialogue, for example, at the side-lines of other events such as the annual High-Level Political Forum, and the Busan Forum.

b. At the same time, there is a **continued need for analytical thinking on development concepts and approaches**. In this regard, it is important to improve collaboration between actors on concrete formats of exchange and learning. Through this, DC partners might find **more common ground through dialogue on specific modality debates** (like how to organize sustainable knowledge exchange or new approaches such as ‘bonds’) regarding **specific (sub-)sectors with specific countries and country groups**. More **joint evidence collection** and **joint analytical work** could contribute to a fruitful dialogue that could result in specific

benefits for the partners involved.

c. One area which might bring more opportunities for the collective action of different DC partners is **triangular cooperation, which has transcended the traditional and narrow definition** limited to the partnership between an OECD partner, a SSC provider, and the developing country receiving the assistance. Triangular cooperation has the potential to be used as an innovative modality based on multi-actor approaches, involving the private sector and academia, and country constellations different from traditional DC methods (e.g. OECD countries learning from the Global South or from other OECD partners).

d. **The views of the DC partners that significantly depend on external support remain largely under-represented in relevant global debates**; this applies both to ODA and SSC. These views need to become better incorporated in the future.

e. It is **important to include process actors** (not the least based on today's positive experience) who are directly engaged in relevant policymaking processes as a part of these knowledge discussions. One potential means in which USPC could contribute in doing so is by utilizing upcoming events to discuss the knowledge exchange modalities within our specific areas of expertise with a variety of actors.

Seoul, 10th February 2020

Stephan Klingebiel

Annex: Program for the Informal Policy Roundtable on the Future of the Global Architecture of Development Cooperation

Date 2-3 December 2019
Venue LOTTE Hotel
30 Eulji-ro, Euljiro 1
Jung-gu, Seoul,
Republic of Korea

INFORMAL POLICY ROUNDTABLE

**Future of the global architecture of development cooperation
The perspectives from the South-South Co-operation partners**

DAY of ARRIVAL – Monday, 2th December 2019 (36th floor Peacock suite)

18:00 – 21:00 Welcome dinner

ROUNDTABLE – Tuesday, 3th December 2019 (36th floor Astor suite)

(Chatham house rules applied)

09:00 - 09:30 Arrival and coffee

09:30 - 10:00 Opening remarks
*Ms. Oh Hyunjoo, Director-General for Development Cooperation,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea*
Mr. Stephan Klingebiel, Director of UNDP Seoul Policy Centre

10:00 - 11:45 Panel Discussion I – Exploring a possible common ground shared by SSC providers, and between SSC and OECD countries in development cooperation

Moderator: *Artemy Izmestiev, UNDP Seoul Policy Centre*

Inputs by:

- *Dr. Debapriya Bhattacharya, CPD;*
- *Xiuli Xu, CISSCA;*
- *Philani Mthembu, IGD;*

Questions for discussion:

- What are the key aspects of progress achieved, constraints met by individual SSC country and/or SSC community in past 5 years?
- What are the intermediate objectives of SSC?
- What are the common goals for SSC; for OECD countries in development cooperation?
- What are the issues of common interest and concerns between SSC and OECD countries?
- What are the commonalities between the policy instruments of the South and North (e.g. BAPA+40 vs. documents of OECD/DAC)?



11:45-13:00

Lunch at Charlotte suite (36th floor)

13:00-14:15

Panel Discussion II – What would it take to work together & what is the extent that would make sense for all actors?

Moderator: Gerardo Bracho, Permanent Delegation of Mexico to OECD

Inputs by:

- Emel Parlar Dal, *Marmara University*;
- Paulo Esteves, *BRICS Policy Center*;
- Adisak Jantatum, *UNOSSC*;

Questions for discussion:

- Would an information exchange dialogue on development cooperation among SSC countries and with OECD countries be feasible? If so, how to organize and facilitate this?
- Where is the boundary for the information exchange and future potential policy discussions - issues that cannot be shared/discussed?
- What else can be done to reach a policy coherence on global development cooperation from SSC perspective?

14:15 - 14:30

Coffee Break

14:30 - 16:00

Panel Discussion III – Future of the global architecture for development cooperation: specific steps

Moderator: Philani Mthembu, IGD

Inputs by:

- Sachin Chaturvedi, *RIS*;
- Andre de Mello e Souza, *IPEA*;
- Gerardo Bracho, *Permanent Delegation of Mexico to OECD*;

Questions for discussion:

- What sort of architecture would be acceptable from SSC countries' point of view?
- What are the foreseeable challenges in the short term?
- What are the feasible next steps?

16:00 - 16:25

Conclusions

Mr. Stephan Klingebiel, Director of UNDP Seoul Policy Centre



PARTICIPANTS

Adisak Jantatum	UN Office for South-South Cooperation, Asia-Pacific Regional Office
Andre de Mello e Souza	Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada, Brazil
Artemy Izmistiev	UNDP Seoul Policy Centre
Debapriya Bhattacharya	Centre for Policy Dialogue, Bangladesh
Emel Parlar Dal	Marmara University, Turkey
Gerardo Bracho	Former Fellow of the Centre for Global Cooperation Research
Paulo Esteves	BRICS Policy Center, Brazil
Philani Mthembu	Institute for Global Dialogue, South Africa
Piper Hart	UNDP Headquarters
Sachin Chaturvedi	Research and Information System for Developing Countries, India
Stephan Klingebiel	UNDP Seoul Policy Centre
Xu Xiuli	China Institute for South-South Cooperation in Agriculture, China
Hyunjoo Oh	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Observer)
Yeseung Lee	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Observer)