



*Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.*

# **Conference Report**

## **South-South Cooperation Providers Workshop: Preparations for the First High Level Meeting of the Global Partnership in Mexico**

**Workshop organised by:**  
**Chinese Academy of International Trade and Economic Cooperation (CAITEC) and**  
**United Nations Development Programme, China (UNDP China)**  
**Beijing, 24 – 25 March 2014**

**Penny Davies, April 2014**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1 Background for and purpose of the workshop .....	7
1.2 Workshop preparation and agenda .....	7
1.3 Outline of the report .....	8
<b>2. The Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation: briefing on context, consultations and lead-up to the First High Level Forum .....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 Overview of discussions, conclusions, key priorities and suggestions for ways forward .....	9
<b>3. Mexico High Level Meeting Outcome Document: the Communiqué .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4. Progress since Busan (HLM Theme 1) .....</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1 Overview of discussions, conclusions, key priorities and suggestions for ways forward .....	11
<b>5. Business as a partner in development (HLM Theme 5) and Partnering for effective taxation and domestic resource mobilisation for development (HLM Theme 2) .....</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1 Overview of discussions, conclusions, key priorities and suggestions for ways forward .....	12
5.1.1 Business as a partner in development.....	12
5.1.2 Partnering for effective taxation and domestic resource mobilisation for development .....	13
<b>6. South-South cooperation, triangular cooperation and knowledge sharing (HLM Theme 3) .....</b>	<b>13</b>
6.1 Overview of discussions, conclusions, key priorities and suggestions for ways forward .....	14
6.1.1 SSC and triangular cooperation .....	14
6.1.2 Knowledge sharing.....	15
<b>7. Development co-operation with middle-income countries (HLM Theme 4) .....</b>	<b>16</b>
7.1 Overview of discussions, conclusions, key priorities and suggestions for ways forward .....	16
<b>8. Conclusions and questions for further consideration.....</b>	<b>17</b>
8.1 Suggestions for what to take forward .....	17
8.2 Suggestions for how to move forward .....	19
<b>ANNEX 1: Participant list</b>	
<b>ANNEX 2: Agenda</b>	

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY<sup>1</sup>

South-South cooperation (SSC) providers have expressed on numerous occasions a need for more opportunities to meet together before large international conferences to discuss and debate the issues among themselves and develop a stronger Southern voice.

In response to this demand, and requests from South-South cooperation provider countries for more information on the first Mexico High Level Meeting (HLM) on the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) in April 2014, UNDP China and the Chinese Academy of International Trade and Development Cooperation (CAITEC) co-hosted a workshop for government and civil society representatives of 11 SSC provider countries, in Beijing on 24-25 March 2014.<sup>2</sup>

The objective of the Beijing workshop was to offer SSC providers an opportunity to prepare for, share views on, and debate topics to be discussed at the HLM. The workshop's key discussions focused on participants' inputs on the HLM Communiqué and highlighted what issues SSC providers want to discuss in Mexico in the context of the HLM themes.<sup>3</sup> Participants also proposed to create a network of Southern think tanks to be established; the inaugural meeting of this network will take place on the eve of the Mexico HLM.

### Overview of workshop discussions

**A) *The Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation:*** At the workshop, participants discussed their various views and positions of the GPEDC, including:

- the necessity for embracing diversity at the HLM, and that the event should be a space for sharing and debating ideas among all the different stakeholders attending. This diversity should also be clearly reflected in the final Communiqué
- the need for clarification on the relationship between the Post-2015 Development Agenda and the GPEDC. In particular, the notion that the Post-2015 Agenda can be seen as the “what”, and the GPEDC as the “how”, as set out in the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft Communiqué, needs to be nuanced
- how to clearly understand the notion of “differential commitments and responsibilities”, and what implications these terms have in practice
- the importance of giving due recognition to South-South cooperation, not portraying it as “an appendix to North-South cooperation”, and looking at how SSC and North-South cooperation can complement each other

**B) *HLM Communiqué:*** The HLM's outcome document will be a Communiqué, based on consultations with a wide array of partners around the world. The Special Envoy to the Mexico HLM, responsible for drafting the Communiqué, was a key participant at the Beijing workshop, so participants' views fed directly into this document. Some of the key points communicated to the Special Envoy at the workshop included the need to:

- adjust the language to ensure the focus is on development cooperation, and wording is in accordance with international shared understandings

---

<sup>1</sup> This report is an overview of workshop participants' diverse views, and does not purport to represent a consensus or official positions of any of the participating countries or organisations. The discussions took place under Chatham House rules.

<sup>2</sup> Participants included representatives from governments, think-tanks, Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) and academia from eleven countries (Brazil, China, Colombia, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, Peru, Russia, Thailand and Turkey), along with representatives of the HLM hosts, two of the GPEDC co-chairs, and the Joint Secretariat.

<sup>3</sup> The five official HLM themes, discussed at the workshop: 1) Progress since Busan; 2) Partnering for effective taxation and domestic resource mobilisation for development; 3) South-South, triangular co-operation and knowledge sharing; 4) Development co-operation with Middle-Income Countries; 5) Business as a partner in development.

- clarify language on the relationship between the GPEDC and the Post-2015 Development Agenda. The former may not only be about “how”, but also about elements of “what” (I. para. 3)
- consider highlighting the diverse forms of development cooperation in the first part of the Communiqué, including reflecting experiences of South-South cooperation (SSC) (I. para. 1-5)
- clarify the difference between North-South and SSC, especially regarding differential responsibilities. It should be made clear that the chapter on “Progress since Busan” refers to the North-South dimension of development cooperation (II.A.)
- keep a clear distinction between South-South and triangular cooperation (II.D)<sup>4</sup>
- refer to the role of multilateral organisations in triangular cooperation (II.D para. 24)
- keep the focus on capacity building when addressing knowledge sharing (II.D para. 25 & 26)
- split paragraph 21 on middle-income countries into two, to both highlight the need for a revision of current categorisation criteria of MICs as well as to offer support for the differential needs of MICs. Nuance the language describing different categories of countries, for example, as Africa is not one homogenous category (II.C, para. 21)
- include a voluntary initiative (in Annex) on establishing a network of SSC provider think tanks which could elaborate a common conception of SSC and indicators by which the impact of SSC could be assessed. Such a network could be announced at the Mexico HLM and could undertake its work in readiness for the subsequent HLM.

**C) HLM themes:** Workshop participants discussed the five official HLM themes and put forward suggestions for ways forward and/or priorities directly or indirectly related to these.

- *Theme 1: Progress since Busan*  
Participants noted that there still exist significant areas for improvement since Busan. These included: accelerating the use of country systems; ensuring transparency efforts are driven by country demand; ensuring country-level coordination mechanisms are inclusive of a range of development actors; and, expanding the engagement in the Global Partnership to achieve a truly multi-stakeholder approach.
- *Theme 2: Partnering for effective taxation and domestic resource mobilisation for development*  
Domestic resource mobilization is a broader concept than taxation alone and needs to include other domestic policies and international support for enhancing growth and policy coherence for development. SSC providers could share experiences of broadening the tax base as well as stimulating growth.
- *Theme 3: South-South, triangular co-operation and knowledge sharing*  
*Define differential commitments and responsibilities of SSC providers:* SSC providers could define what differential commitments and responsibilities mean, and what commitments to take on in this regard. This could include defining key principles of particular relevance for SSC providers, such as ownership and results.

*Assess impact of SSC:* There is a gap in assessing the impact of SSC and a need to identify relevant common indicators against which to assess progress, while respecting differences in national policies and methods.

*SSC providers to work as one constituency:* Providers of SSC could start working as a constituency, and have a common narrative of their role in the GPEDC. SSC providers could have their own institutional body, and establish a platform for sharing views and experiences, or make use of existing platforms within, for example, the UN system.

---

<sup>4</sup> This report reflects the terminology of the HLM, which refers to “triangular”, as opposed to “trilateral” cooperation.

*Engage in triangular cooperation to draw on different expertise of countries:* Triangular cooperation can draw on the respective strengths of different providers of development cooperation, including multilaterals. Triangular cooperation can also be a way of promoting increased understanding among different stakeholders.

*Assess impact of knowledge sharing and training programs of SSC providers:* There is a need to develop methodologies for assessing the systemic impact of knowledge sharing by SSC providers and the impact over time of individual training programs that providers of SSC are engaged in.

*Avoid the trap of one size fits all in knowledge sharing among SSC providers:* Systematic analyses of what works and why in different countries and local contexts is an important foundation for sharing knowledge by providers of SSC. International organizations could help support such analyses.

*Establish mechanisms and build capacity for knowledge sharing, drawing on the unique role of SSC providers:* Providers of SSC can play a unique role in sharing knowledge drawing on their dual role as providers and recipients, or previous experiences of receiving development cooperation. It is important for SSC providers to increase their own capacities as providers and “do their homework” by reflecting on and sharing their experiences of receiving and providing development assistance. It could also be beneficial to develop knowledge hubs and facilitating mechanisms for knowledge sharing at international level.

- *Theme 4: Development co-operation with Middle-Income Countries*

*Define appropriate categorization of countries to capture complexities of MICs:* it would be useful to develop more sophisticated indicators for categorizing countries, including but not limited to MICs. Categorizations should be based on other dimensions than narrow income per capita to capture the different development challenges in MICs.<sup>5</sup>

*Provide tailored development cooperation to MICs:* Because a majority of the world’s poor live in MICs, it is important to continue the provision of development cooperation to MICs based on the specific needs of different MICs. The transition of MICs should be supported through gradual adjustment systems for moving from one category to another, including when this affects the availability of concessional finance.

- *Theme 5: Business as a partner in development*

*Share information on good practices of the role of the private sector among providers of SSC:* There are diverse experiences of SSC providers countries regarding the role of the private sector in development cooperation and public-private partnerships etc. Given the fact that these experiences are not well documented, good practices could be compiled in a Compendium of Good Practices to facilitate experience sharing.<sup>6</sup>

*Promote the development of reporting standards for business that include development perspectives:* Reporting tools for assessing the business sector’s contribution to development could be created, with a view to getting the private sector to conduct business in a way that overlaps with the objectives of development cooperation.

---

<sup>5</sup> Examples mentioned were the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI), The Human Development Index (HDI) and indices that capture progress on the MDGs. It was suggested that decision-making on development cooperation should not be based on one single criterion.

<sup>6</sup> The UNDP Istanbul International Centre for Private Sector in Development was mentioned as a possible resource in this regard.

**D) Conclusions and questions for further consideration:** Workshop participants had ample time in breakout groups and plenary sessions to analyse, draw conclusions, and raise questions for future consideration.

**Suggestions for *what* to take forward:**

- one outcome of the discussions was a call for clarification by SSC providers to define the meaning of differential responsibilities, examine what commitments to take on in this regard, and consider how to determine what principles could underpin such commitments
- a key message from the workshop is the need to develop ways to assess the impact of various types of SSC. Participants noted the importance of identifying relevant common indicators against which to assess progress, while also respecting differences in national politics and methods
- sharing information transparently was raised as a key way to enable mutual learning
- the importance of policy coherence for achieving development outcomes, as development cooperation alone, even when it is effective, is not sufficient to end poverty. The challenge of translating a commitment to policy coherence into practice was also noted

**Suggestions for *how* to move forward (see above for more details):**

- set up a network of think tanks among SSC providers
- SSC providers to work as one constituency
- establish mechanisms and build capacity for knowledge sharing
- share experiences among SSC providers

**Questions for further consideration:**

Participants suggested SSC providers could undertake initiatives among themselves to strengthen cooperation and enhance the developmental impact of SSC, as well as initiatives with others to explore synergies between SSC and the efforts of other development cooperation partners to maximise development impact. In order to pursue these two objectives key questions for consideration could include:

- How SSC providers could make best use of the GPEDC as a platform for developing SSC further and/or for pursuing common global development goals? What other mechanisms exist where SSC providers want to engage and how could they complement each other?
- Should, as suggested at the workshop, SSC providers take steps towards working as one constituency vis-à-vis the GPECD? Should they establish their own body/platform for sharing views and experiences, or make use of existing platforms within for example the UN system?
- Would it be useful for SSC providers to come together after the Mexico HLM to jointly reflect upon its outcomes?
- Would a workshop similar to the one organised in Beijing be useful in order to facilitate preparations for the next HLM?
- At country level, how could SSC providers strive to ensure inclusive processes, such as multi-stakeholder dialogue mechanisms, which draw upon the experiences of CSOs, the private sector and other key stakeholders in the pursuit of common development objectives discussed at the HLM and other fora?

## Introduction

### 1.1 Background for and purpose of the workshop

The First High-Level Meeting (HLM) of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) will be hosted by the government of Mexico, in Mexico City, on 15-16 April 2014. The event will bring together over 1300 participants and will include heads of state and government, ministers, parliamentarians and leaders from international organisations, business, civil society and foundations. The High Level Meeting seeks to: 1) review global progress in making development co-operation more effective; 2) agree on actions to boost progress; and, 3) anchor effective development co-operation in the post-2015 global development agenda.<sup>7</sup>

Stakeholders and participants have been meeting in formal and informal settings across the globe in preparation for the HLM. The South-South Cooperation Providers Workshop was organised as one of the key informal preparatory events. The workshop was co-hosted by the Chinese Academy of International Trade and Economic Cooperation (CAITEC) and UNDP China, in Beijing, on 24-25 March, 2014.

The objective of the workshop was to provide South-South cooperation providers with the opportunity to prepare for, share views on and debate topics to be discussed at the upcoming HLM. In co-organising the workshop, neither UNDP China nor CAITEC sought to promote any particular approach to or view of the Mexico HLM or indeed of the GPEDC more broadly. The intention was rather to provide information and a neutral space for SSC providers to exchange views.

The workshop brought together representatives from governments, think tanks, civil society organisations (CSOs) and academia from eleven countries,<sup>8</sup> along with representatives of the HLM hosts, two of the GPEDC co-chairs, and the Joint Secretariat. (See participant list in Annex 1). The meeting was also attended by the Special Envoy of Mexico for the HLM, entrusted by the Steering Committee of the GPEDC with the task of facilitating the preparation and consultation of the official outcome document of the HLM (the Communiqué).

### 1.2 Workshop preparation and agenda

Ahead of the workshop a draft Pre-Workshop Briefing and draft Agenda were circulated to participants to seek their input in order to ensure the workshop responded to their needs and interests. The briefing provided an overview of and background to the HLM, as well as suggestions for questions to discuss at the Beijing workshop. Participants' inputs informed the final Pre-Workshop Briefing and final Agenda.<sup>9</sup>

The Agenda was organised to provide information on the background and context for the HLM, as well as to provide space for discussing the five official HLM themes:

1. Progress since Busan
2. Partnering for effective taxation and domestic resource mobilisation for development
3. South-South, triangular co-operation and knowledge sharing
4. Development co-operation with middle-income countries
5. Business as a partner in development<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Objectives as stated on the official HLM website: <http://effectivecooperation.org/2014/03/25/first-high-level-meeting-of-the-global-partnership/> visited 28 March 2014.

<sup>8</sup> Brazil, China, Colombia, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, Peru, Russia, Thailand and Turkey.

<sup>9</sup> Agenda in Annex 2.

<sup>10</sup> See official HLM Agenda <http://effectivecooperation.org/first-high-level-meeting-draft-agenda/> visited 3 April 2014.

Resource persons who in their different capacities have played key roles in the preparations of the HLM introduced each theme. The workshop was designed to give ample time for discussions in plenary and groups. The objectives of each session were to discuss what to take to Mexico and how: 1) Priorities for SSC providers; 2) What experiences SSC providers have that they might want to raise at the HLM; and 3) Suggestions for further action that could be taken at the HLM and beyond.

### **1.3 Outline of the report**

The report follows the logic of the workshop and is divided into the following sections:

- Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation: briefing on background, context and objectives of the HLM
- Progress since Busan (HLM Theme 1)
- Business as a partner in development (HLM Theme 5) and Partnering for effective taxation and domestic resource mobilisation for development (HLM Theme 2)
- South-South cooperation, triangular cooperation and knowledge sharing (HLM Theme 3)
- Development co-operation with middle-income countries (HLM Theme 4)

Each section summarises the general discussions, conclusions, key priorities and suggestions for ways forward that came out of the discussions. The outcomes reflect the diverse views of the participants. The identity and affiliation of individual participants are not referred to as the conference was held under the Chatham House Rule, to allow for an open and frank exchange.

The report was written by Penny Davies, Consultant, contracted by UNDP to write the pre- and post-workshop reports, assist in the preparations, and facilitate the workshop in Beijing.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Many thanks to UNDP staff who took notes at the workshop.



## **2. The Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation: briefing on context, consultations and lead-up to the First High Level Forum**

The objectives of the sessions in the first morning of the workshop were to 1) share and provide information on the background and context of the HLM, including consultations and preparations, and provide an overview of its aims and objectives; and 2) provide SSC providers with the opportunity to learn more about the events leading up to the HLM, discuss some of the fundamental concepts that underpin the HLM, and explore in broad terms how they might want to engage.

The representative of the UNDP Joint Secretariat of the GPEDC gave a presentation on the functions of the GPEDC, the evolution of principles leading up to the HLM, and achievements and challenges<sup>12</sup> since the Fourth High Level Forum in Busan in 2011.<sup>13</sup> The Special Envoy of Mexico for the HLM presented the objectives of the HLM along with the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft of and the consultative process on the Communiqué<sup>14</sup> to be adopted at the HLM. Representatives of the Steering Committee Co-chair countries provided commentaries. The introductions were followed by discussions in plenary, the key points from which follow below.

### **2.1 Overview of conclusions, key priorities and suggestions for ways forward**

#### *Diversity is key – HLM as a space for sharing and debating different ideas*

The discussions in the plenary session clarified that the HLM is intended to provide space for sharing ideas and across the board learning among the different stakeholders who will attend. Diversity is key and the HLM will be organised as a conversation to capture different points of view, including those of SSC providers. The Special Envoy of Mexico for the HLM stated that the goal is to reflect this diversity in the Communiqué, the official outcome document of the HLM, whilst building upon voluntary adherence to shared principles, common goals, and differentiated commitments that unite the different stakeholders in pursuit of inclusive and sustainable development worldwide.

#### *The Post-2015 Development Agenda and the GPEDC – a convergence of efforts*

Questions were raised and fruitful discussions took place on the relationship between the Post-2015 Development Agenda and the GPEDC. Participants called for further clarification on how the two processes are related and how they can strengthen each other. The Post-2015 Development Agenda is described in the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft Communiqué as defining the “what” while the GPEDC is said to seek to play an important role as a contributor to the “how”, in the new global agenda.

There was general agreement among participants on the need to nuance the way the two processes relate to each other, as the GPEDC is not only about “how”, but also about “what” should be done to maximise progress on global development objectives. Suggestions were put forward for how to further fine-tune the language in the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft Communiqué in this regard (I. para. 3).

#### *Define differential commitments and responsibilities of SSC providers*

Discussions took place on the evolution of the global development cooperation landscape. It was stated that “on the road from Paris to Busan”<sup>15</sup> there has been a shift towards greater inclusion and recognition of more stakeholders engaged in development cooperation. In Busan a framework was

---

<sup>12</sup> Some of the remaining challenges mentioned were to: accelerate the use of country systems; ensure transparency efforts are driven by country demand; ensure country-level coordination mechanisms are inclusive of a range of development actors; and, finally, expand the engagement in the Global Partnership to achieve a truly multi-stakeholder approach.

<sup>13</sup> For more information on Busan see

<http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/fourthhighlevelforumonaideeffectiveness.htm>

<sup>14</sup> <http://effectivecooperation.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/SecondDraftoftheMexicoHLMCommunique.pdf> visited on 29 March 2014.

<sup>15</sup> The Second High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Paris 2005, when the Paris Declaration was adopted, to the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan 2011.

negotiated in which providers of SSC could participate on a voluntary basis. So-called “new actors” were included on the basis of shared principles but differential commitments.<sup>16</sup>

There was also a general call for clarification on the part of SSC providers themselves to define what differential commitments and responsibilities mean, and what commitments to take on in this regard. This includes defining key principles of particular relevance for SSC providers. It was suggested by some participants that think tanks could contribute to this discussion. (See section 3.)

#### *Capture and give due recognition to South-South cooperation*

Participants discussed how SSC is articulated in the overall HLM process and in the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft of the Communiqué. Participants underlined the need to give due recognition to SSC and not portray SSC “as an appendix to North-South cooperation”, and to further clarify how SSC and North-South cooperation can complement each other. Suggestions were put forward on how to consider highlighting the diverse forms of development cooperation in the first part of the Communiqué, including reflecting experiences of SSC (I. para. 1-5).

### **3. Mexico High Level Meeting Outcome Document: the Communiqué**

The HLM’s outcome document will be a Communiqué, based on consultations with a wide array of partners around the world. The Special Envoy to the Mexico HLM, responsible for drafting the Communiqué,<sup>17</sup> was a key participant at the Beijing workshop, so participants’ views fed directly into this important document. Some of the key points communicated to the Special Envoy at the workshop included the need to:

- adjust the language to ensure the focus is on development cooperation, and wording is in accordance with international shared understandings (in general)
- clarify language on the relationship between the GPEDC and the Post-2015 Development Agenda. The former may not only be about “how”, but also about elements of “what” (I. para. 3)
- consider highlighting the diverse forms of development cooperation in the first part of the Communiqué, including reflecting experiences of South-South cooperation (SSC) (I. para. 1-5)
- clarify the difference between North-South and SSC, especially regarding differential responsibilities. It should be made clear that the chapter on “Progress since Busan” refers to the North-South dimension of development cooperation (II.A.)
- keep a clear distinction between South-South and triangular cooperation (II.D)18
- refer to the role of multilateral organisations in triangular cooperation (II.D para. 24)
- keep the focus on capacity building when addressing knowledge sharing (II.D para. 25 & 26)
- split paragraph 21 on middle-income countries into two, to both highlight the need for a revision of current categorisation criteria of MICs as well as to offer support for the differential needs of MICs. Nuance the language describing different categories of countries, for example, as Africa is not one homogenous category (II.C, para. 21)
- include a voluntary initiative (in Annex) on establishing a network of SSC provider think tanks which could elaborate a common conception of SSC and indicators by which the impact of SSC could be assessed. Such a network could be announced at the Mexico HLM and could undertake its work in readiness for the subsequent HLM.

---

<sup>16</sup> Articles 2 and 14, Busan outcome document: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/49650173.pdf> visited 29 March 2014.

<sup>17</sup> The third draft of the Mexico HLM Communiqué released on April 10, 2014 can be found here: <http://effectivecooperation.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/RevisedDraftoftheMexicoHLMCommunique.pdf>

<sup>18</sup> This report reflects the terminology of the HLM, which refers to “triangular”, as opposed to “trilateral” cooperation.

#### 4. Progress since Busan (HLM Theme 1)

The representative of the UNDP Joint Secretariat of the GPEDC presented the “Progress since Busan” theme. The overall objectives were presented as to: 1) take stock of progress made; 2) offer an opportunity to showcase successes; and 3) strengthen collective efforts to take actions, and build coalitions for action. In terms of what to expect to advance progress, it was stated that the HLM provides an opportunity to make advances and agree on specific deliverables in the areas of the core principles of Country Ownership, Results, Inclusive Development Partnerships, Transparency and Accountability, and finally, Fragility.<sup>19</sup>

The introduction was followed by discussions in plenary. The objectives of this session were to: 1) share views on how the theme could be relevant to SSC providers; 2) discuss what SSC providers might want to see come out of this theme in Mexico; 3) discuss what, if any, role SSC providers could play in Mexico in achieving whatever goals they consider appropriate; and 4) what, if any, new steps could be considered for after Mexico.

#### 4.1 Overview of conclusions, key priorities and suggestions for ways forward

##### *HLM to build on the promise offered at Busan*

The discussion clarified that the HLM will provide an opportunity to build on the promise that was offered at Busan of a new, inclusive, and country-focused approach to working together based on shared principles to achieve development objectives. Furthermore, it was stated that the Busan partnership marked a turning point, as a wider range of development cooperation actors than before signalled support for shared principles to help maximize the impact of development cooperation.

##### *Assess impact of SSC - the next frontier*

There was general agreement among participants on the need to fill a gap in terms of assessing the impact of SSC, and that more needs to be done in this regard. It was suggested that initiatives could include identifying relevant common indicators to assess progress against, while respecting differences in national policies and methods, and collecting and sharing evidence in a coherent manner to allow for comparability.

Participants stated that there is a growing appetite for impact assessments among providers of SSC. Participants suggested there are several initiatives from which to draw experiences. Examples mentioned included Indonesia and Thailand data management reviews, initiatives to put in place data management systems in the UEA, and CSO initiatives. It was concluded that impact assessments are part of a general trend of responding to increasing expectations on all providers of development cooperation to share results.

##### *Sharing results transparently is key*

Several participants mentioned how providers of SSC are becoming more transparent in sharing information on their experiences and lessons learned. To share information on results was also agreed to be important for SSC providers as a way of countering misinformation on their development cooperation programmes that flourishes in the absence of readily available data.

##### *Set up a network of think tanks among SSC providers*

Several participants underlined how think tanks and academia could play an important role in developing indicators and methods for assessing the impact of SSC, and in this way assisting as well as spurring official government led processes. A concrete suggestion was put forward to establish a network of think tanks among SSC provider countries. Such a network could, among other things, elaborate on indicators against which the impact of SSC could be assessed. Such a network could be

---

<sup>19</sup> Information on the objectives of and proposed deliverables from each of the five HLM sessions are available on the HLM website: <http://effectivecooperation.org/first-high-level-meeting-draft-agenda/>, visited 3 April 2014.

announced at the Mexico HLM and undertake its work in readiness for the subsequent HLM.

## **5. Business as a partner in development (HLM Theme 5) and Partnering for effective taxation and domestic resource mobilisation for development (HLM Theme 2)**

At the workshop the two HLM themes on the business sector and on tax and domestic resource mobilisation were discussed in groups running in parallel. The outcomes of the two respective group discussions were thereafter shared in plenary to provide all participants with the opportunity to share views on both themes. The objective was to discuss what to take to Mexico, and how, on certain key topics: 1) Priorities for SSC providers; 2) SSC experiences; and, 3) Suggestions for further action at the HLM and beyond.

An introduction to the theme on business as a partner in development was given by the UK government representative, as lead country on this theme at the HLM. The presenter shared the three overall key issues that will be discussed at the HLM: 1) Catalytic partnerships to create shared value; 2) Public-private platforms for development; and 3) Innovative financing partnerships for development. The eight expected deliverables from this session were also presented.<sup>20</sup>

The taxation and domestic resource mobilisation theme was introduced by a representative of Mexico as HLM host<sup>21</sup>. It was explained that this HLM theme is designed to respond to two major concerns: 1) Equitable and efficient mobilisation of domestic revenue is essential for poverty reduction and economic development; and 2) More and better development co-operation is required for supporting reforms in tax administration and policies. The six proposed deliverables from the HLM theme session were presented.<sup>22</sup>

### **5.1 Overview of discussions, conclusions, key priorities and suggestions for ways forward**

#### **5.1.1 Business as a partner in development**

##### *Essential to ensure the private sector plays a positive role in addressing global poverty*

There was a general recognition of the need to make sure that the private sector plays an important role in addressing global poverty. Participants pointed out that this is a broad discussion and ideas and viewpoints vary among, as well as within, different categories of stakeholders on what role the private sector could play in development cooperation. There was general agreement that this goes beyond the concept of corporate social responsibility (CSR). Several participants stressed the importance of finding ways to ensure that the private sector conducts its core business activities in a way that overlaps with the objectives of development cooperation. This is a general priority not only for SSC providers.

##### *Share information on good practices of the role of the private sector among providers of SSC*

There is a great range of experiences regarding the role of business in development processes. The discussion showed how experiences vary from one end of the spectrum of business engaging in and playing a contributing role to development, to the other end of the spectrum where business has either shown reluctance to engage or is not aligning with, or is having a negative impact on, development objectives. It was pointed out that the concept of 'the business sector' is very wide and

---

<sup>20</sup> Information on the objectives of and proposed deliverables from each of the five HLM sessions is available on the HLM website: <http://effectivecooperation.org/first-high-level-meeting-draft-agenda/>, visited 3 April 2014.

<sup>21</sup> A representative from Nigeria, lead country on this theme at the HLM, was invited but due to visa issues was unable to participate at the last minute.

<sup>22</sup> Information on the objectives of and proposed deliverables from each of the five HLM sessions is available on the HLM website: <http://effectivecooperation.org/first-high-level-meeting-draft-agenda/>, visited 3 April 2014.

includes large multinational companies (MNCs), domestic small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) as well as micro-enterprises.

Given that the different experiences among SSC provider countries on the role of the private sector in development cooperation are not well documented, participants suggested they could be compiled in a Compendium of Good Practices. Such an initiative could facilitate experience sharing and enable the replication of good practices in different countries. The UNDP Istanbul International Center for Private Sector in Development was mentioned as a possible resource in this regard.

*Promote the development of reporting standards for business that include development perspectives*

Some participants emphasized the need for global reporting tools and standards for assessing the business sector's contribution to development. This point was raised as a matter of global priority and is not specifically linked to the experiences and/or priorities of SSC providers.

### **5.1.2 Partnering for effective taxation and domestic resource mobilisation for development**

*DRM is a broad concept that encompasses more than effective taxation and calls for policy coherence for development*

Some participants stressed that domestic resource mobilisation (DRM) is a broader concept than taxation, and also includes other domestic policies that contribute to growth and expands the resource base of developing countries. In this context some participants stated that policy coherence for development is critical for this theme, i.e. to ensure the economic policies of developed countries do not have negative spillovers on developing countries' prospects for mobilising domestic resources and enhancing economic development.

*Share experiences of different types of domestic resource mobilisation among SSC providers*

Some participants suggested that SSC providers could voluntarily share experiences of how to broaden the tax base as well as strategies for stimulating growth.

## **6. South-South cooperation, triangular cooperation and knowledge sharing (HLM Theme 3)**

At the workshop HLM theme three was divided into two separate sessions; one session on South-South cooperation (SSC) and triangular cooperation (TC) with discussions in break-out groups and plenary, and one session on knowledge sharing discussed in plenary. This followed the logic of the HLM, at which the two will be dealt with in one session with two separate segments. The objective for the discussion was to reflect upon what to take to Mexico, and how, on certain key topics: 1) Priorities for SSC providers; 2) SSC experiences; and, 3) Suggestions for further action at the HLM and beyond.

The Special Envoy of Mexico for the HLM introduced SSC and TC, as Mexico is part of the core group of countries taking a joint lead on this theme. The HLM takes as its point of departure the fact that although SSC and TC have increased their relevance in the development cooperation architecture, there is room to consolidate their potential benefits. Objectives for the HLM include showcasing the diversity of experiences, and taking stock of good practices and obstacles to moving forward on both SSC and TC. There are five concrete proposed deliverables for the segment on SSC and TC.<sup>23</sup>

Knowledge sharing was introduced by the Indonesian government representative, as Indonesia will co-host this session at the HLM together with Mexico. A key objective of the HLM session was said to be to improve the understanding of knowledge sharing as a pillar of development cooperation and of

---

<sup>23</sup> Information on the objectives of and proposed deliverables from each of the five HLM sessions is available on the HLM website: <http://effectivecooperation.org/first-high-level-meeting-draft-agenda/>, visited 3 April 2014.

how knowledge sharing can support the MDGs and the Post-2015 Development Agenda. There are three proposed deliverables for the session.<sup>24</sup>

## **6.1 Overview of discussions, conclusions, key priorities and suggestions for ways forward**

### **6.1.1 SSC and triangular cooperation**

#### *Convergence of values, modalities and sectors but differential responsibilities of SSC and N-S aid*

Participants reflected on the differences and similarities between so-called Northern donors and SSC providers. Several participants were of the view that there, to some extent, has been a convergence of values between the two. Northern donors have learned from the South and taken on concepts that originated in the South, including ownership as well as mutual benefit, which some Northern donors now refer to when engaging in development cooperation. However, not all participants agreed, positing that there are differences in how principles are interpreted, including ownership. Furthermore, it was stated that the underpinnings of SSC are different from Northern donor assistance, for example, as SSC providers have faced similar development challenges to those of developing countries more recently than Northern donors.

Furthermore, participants to a large extent agreed that Northern donors and providers of SSC do not differ so much in choice of modalities and sectors as they used to. SSC is today as broad as N-S development cooperation and includes more than technical cooperation, which was key focus for several but not all providers of SSC in the past. Northern donors are to a greater extent (re)engaging in infrastructure and productive sectors, key sectors for SSC providers. Similarly, SSC providers are engaging in social sectors, which are key for Northern donors.

Participants concluded that the main difference between Northern donors and providers of SSC lies in the scale of the responsibilities. Many providers of SSC still have large populations living in poverty and are unable to take on the same commitment as Northern donors. In this context, several participants underlined the need to clarify the difference between N-S cooperation and SSC regarding differential responsibilities in the HLM Communiqué. It should be made clear that the Busan implementation chapter refers to the North-South dimension of development cooperation. (II.A.)

#### *SSC providers to define differential responsibilities and commitments*

Participants agreed that SSC providers should define what differential responsibilities and commitments to take on, a point also raised at the beginning of the workshop (see section 1). It was noted that differential responsibilities does not equate to no responsibilities at all. Participants agreed there is a need to identify principles that are of particular relevance for SSC providers, which they could use as a basis for deciding what commitments to take on. One suggestion was to focus on the principles of ownership and results, as they are at the heart of the development agenda for all stakeholders, not least partner countries “at the receiving end”. To share lessons on these two principles could potentially break down barriers between different stakeholders.

In this context, several participants flagged that setting up frameworks for measuring results is also costly, as it requires investments in systems and human resources. SSC providers need to balance this cost with the actual size of the activity so that the costs do not outweigh the benefits.

#### *SSC providers to work as one constituency*

It was suggested by some participants that providers of SSC should start working as a single constituency, and have a common narrative of their role in the GPEDC. This suggestion was based on previous experiences of challenges in collecting and coordinating views of SSC providers vis-à-vis the

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

GPEDC. Furthermore, it was suggested that providers of SSC should have their own body for coordinating their positions, like member countries of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) do, and establish a platform for sharing views and experiences, or make more use of existing platforms within for example the UN system.

#### *Policy coherence for development is key for SSC*

Several participants raised the importance of policy coherence as essential for SSC as SSC transcends development cooperation and encompasses other policies such as trade, investment policies etc. Countries engaged in SSC, as well as Northern donor countries, should strive to ensure that all policies are coherent with development objectives. It was suggested that SSC providers could share experiences of successes and challenges in this regard.

#### *Set up a network of think tanks among SSC providers*

The proposal of establishing a network of think tanks in SSC provider countries was raised again as a way of moving forward (see section 3).

#### *Assess impact of SSC*

See above, section 3.

#### *Engage in triangular cooperation (TC) to draw on different expertise of countries*

Some participants highlighted the advantage of TC in drawing on the respective strengths of different providers of development cooperation, including multilaterals. In addition, TC was said to be a good example of an inclusive partnership that could explore synergies between different forms of cooperation, N-S-S as well as S-S-S, to maximise development impact. The potential value of TC as a way of promoting increased understanding among different stakeholders was mentioned.

#### *Keep a clear distinction between SSC and triangular cooperation*

Several participants were of the view that the HLM Communiqué (II.D) should keep a clear distinction between SSC and TC, as they are very different from each other. For example, triangular cooperation often involves a Northern donor whereas SSC only involves Southern partners and is based on the principles of SSC.

### **6.1.2 Knowledge sharing**

#### *Assess impact of knowledge sharing and training programmes of SSC providers*

There was general agreement on the need to develop methodologies for assessing the systemic impact of knowledge sharing and the impact over time of individual training programmes that many providers of SSC are engaged in. Four stages of knowledge sharing were mentioned: 1) to identify demand; 2) to respond to the demand; 3) to analyse the impact of what happened and what elements might be transferable; and finally 4) to share knowledge.

#### *Avoid the trap of one-size fits all in knowledge sharing among SSC providers*

It was generally agreed that there is a need for qualified analyses of what works and why in different countries and local contexts when sharing knowledge by providers of SSC. It was suggested that international organisations could help support such analysis.

#### *Establish mechanisms and build capacity for knowledge sharing, drawing on the unique role of SSC providers*

It was generally agreed that providers of SSC could play a unique role in sharing knowledge drawing on their dual role as providers and recipients, or previous experiences of receiving development cooperation. It was emphasized that it is important for SSC providers to increase their own capacities as providers and “do their homework”. The need for facilitating mechanisms of knowledge sharing at

international level was emphasized, as well as the need to establish knowledge hubs. Experiences of CSOs in knowledge sharing were also mentioned in this regard as a resource.

#### *Address knowledge sharing within the framework of capacity building*

Some participants emphasised the importance of framing knowledge sharing within the broader concept of capacity building, and to see knowledge sharing as one dimension of capacity building. Similarly, the comment was made to keep the focus on capacity building when addressing knowledge sharing in the HLM Communiqué (II.D para. 25 & 26).

### **7. Development co-operation with middle-income countries (HLM Theme 4)**

The Special Envoy of Mexico for the HLM gave an introduction to this theme, as Mexico is part of the core group of countries taking a joint lead on the MICs session at the HLM. The objective of the HLM is to engage in discussions on the rightful place of MICs within the new development cooperation architecture, and on the ways in which the international community can continue to support their development efforts.

The HLM theme on MICS was discussed in groups followed by a discussion in plenary. The objective was to reflect upon what to take to Mexico, and how, on certain key topics: 1) Priorities for SSC providers; 2) SSC Experiences; and 3) Suggestions for further action at the HLM and beyond.

#### **7.1 Overview of discussions, conclusions, key priorities and suggestions for ways forward**

##### *Define appropriate categorisation of countries to capture complexities of MICs*

There was general agreement among participants on the need to develop more sophisticated indicators than those currently in use for categorising countries, including but not limited to MICs. Support was expressed for the language in the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft of the Communiqué on this matter. Participants underlined that the MICs category is too broad as it includes a very wide range of countries, and the indicator for classifying MICs is too narrow.

Participants stressed that categorisations should be based on other dimensions than narrow income per capita to capture the different development challenges in MICs. Examples mentioned were the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI), the Human Development Index (HDI), and indices that capture progress on the MDGs. It was suggested that decision-making on development cooperation should not be based on one single criterion.

##### *Provide tailored development cooperation to MICs*

Because a majority of the world's poor live in MICs, there was general agreement on the importance of continuing the provision of development cooperation to MICs based on the specific needs of different MICs. Some MICs might be in need of finance while others might benefit more from technical cooperation. Participants emphasised that a tailored approach for providing developing cooperation to MICs is needed.

There was agreement that as long as the MICs categorisation is in place, the transition of countries when they move up the income ladder should be supported through gradual adjustment systems for moving from one category to another, including when this affects the availability of concessional finance. Participants however underlined that support to MICs should not be given at the expense of support to other poorer countries. Some participants underscored that development cooperation should take people's level of poverty as the point of departure, rather than countries.

A suggestion put forward on the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft of the Communiqué was to split paragraph 21 on MICs into two, to both highlight the need for a revision of current categorisation criteria of MICs as well as to offer support for the differential needs of MICs. Furthermore, it was suggested to nuance the



language describing different categories of countries, for example, as Africa is not one homogenous category (II.C, para. 21)

#### *Share experiences among MICs and pilot innovative approaches to development*

While the suggested focus of the HLM theme on MICs is on their role as recipients of development cooperation, participants also discussed MICs in their role as development assistance providers. Some participants suggested that MICs should be more engaged in sharing best practices, including at regional level, on their experiences of transitions. Moreover, it was suggested that MICs are particularly suited to pilot new development programmes and innovation in country and, based on lessons learned, apply these in their development cooperation.

### **8. Conclusions and questions for further consideration<sup>25</sup>**

The global development cooperation landscape has gone through substantial changes since the birth of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness in 2005. There has been a shift towards greater inclusiveness and diversity of stakeholders taking part in global processes as well as concrete development cooperation initiatives at country level. As a result, SSC is now firmly part of the global development cooperation discourse, including the process leading up to the HLM and beyond. At the same time, we have also witnessed a broadening of the global agenda, from a more narrow focus on aid towards the broader concept of development cooperation, which resonates with the underpinnings of SSC.

This Beijing workshop was the first time a group of SSC providers came together with the aim of preparing for a major international meeting on development cooperation. In this way, it was one contribution among others to greater inclusivity of the global development cooperation landscape. The workshop enabled participants from SSC provider countries to prepare for, share views on and debate topics to be discussed at the upcoming HLM.

Participants discussed the five official HLM themes and put forward their own related priorities, as well as providing concrete suggestions for how to further fine-tune the Communiqué (2<sup>nd</sup> draft) to be adopted at the HLM. The outcomes of the discussions demonstrated a diverse range of views as well as areas of commonality. Some of the HLM themes were discussed in more detail than others, reflecting the priorities and experiences of participants.

Ideas raised at the workshop concerned both content, i.e. *what* issues to take forward, as well as process, i.e. *how* to take them forward. Whilst recognising that the two at times overlap, some of the key ideas from the workshop are clustered below based on this logic, together with reflections on the process ahead. A more comprehensive overview of key points raised at the workshop is provided in the Summary (page 3).

#### **8.1 Suggestions for what to take forward**

##### *1. Define differential commitments, responsibilities and key principles of SSC whilst working towards collective goals at global level*

One outcome of the discussions was a call for clarification by providers of SSC to define what differential commitments and responsibilities mean, and what commitments to take on in this regard. This message was repeated in several of the thematic discussions. It was stated that the process of defining differential responsibilities and commitments should include defining key principles of particular relevance for SSC providers to move forward on.

---

<sup>25</sup> The conclusions include reflections of the facilitator based on, but at times going beyond, the outcomes of the workshop.

The concept of differential commitment, already part of the Busan Partnership Agreement<sup>26</sup>, is a key element of the Communiqué released for approval under a silence procedure ahead of the HLM in Mexico.<sup>27</sup> Likewise, participants underlined the importance of differential responsibilities, referring to the fact that providers of SSC often do not have the same capabilities due to their domestic development challenges to take on the same level of commitments as so called Northern donors. However, participants stated that differential responsibilities does not equate to no responsibilities, and thus there is a need to define what commitments to take on. In this context, participants to a large extent agreed that perhaps the main difference between Northern donors and providers of SSC lies in level of responsibilities as opposed to differences in sector focus or modalities of cooperation. Furthermore, some participants suggested there has been a convergence of values between North-South and South-South, as the North has taken on concepts that originated in the South, including ownership. However, others emphasised the uniqueness of SSC, including the advantage of SSC providers having more recently faced similar development challenges to those of other developing countries.

Looking ahead, a key task at hand for providers of SSC is to define what commitments to take on, on a voluntary basis, based on the concepts of differential responsibilities and commitments. In doing so, the distinctive character and core principles of SSC could be the starting point. At the same time, there is a need to work towards globally shared goals, and frame SSC within this broader picture. SSC providers could seek to define their specific contributions in the collective pursuit of inclusive and sustainable development worldwide.

*Questions for further consideration could include:* What principles could underpin the differential commitments of SSC providers? What differential commitments could SSC providers take forward, individually and/or as a group? How do the principles and commitments contribute to collective global efforts of inclusive and sustainable development?

## *2. Assess impact of SSC and share results transparently*

A key message from the workshop is the need for further work to develop ways to assess the impact of the various efforts of SSC providers. Increased and more standardised impact assessments could enable a better understanding of what progress is being made and why, and would enable learning from past successes as well as challenges. Participants brought to the fore the need to identify relevant common indicators against which to assess progress, while respecting differences in national policies and methods. In particular, participants raised the need to assess the impact of knowledge sharing and training programmes, which are key forms of engagement of many providers of SSC, and to assess impact over time in a systematised way.

Discussions among workshop participants suggested that impact assessment is an important next step for SSC providers to improve the effectiveness of development cooperation in terms of reaching its intended objectives. It should also be recognised that assessing impacts and results is a challenge for all providers of development cooperation. Moreover, to try to share information transparently is also key to enable learning from each other's experiences, and this would contribute to better understanding of SSC on the part of other stakeholders engaged in development cooperation.

*Questions for further consideration could include:* What common indicators would be relevant as a starting point for assessing the impact of SSC, taking into account differences in national policies and methods? What information on impact and results could be relevant and possible to share with a

---

<sup>26</sup> See <http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/fourthhighlevelforumonaideeffectiveness.htm#agreement>

<sup>27</sup> This means that the Communiqué is submitted for approval on a non-objection basis. More information on the Communiqué process is available at: <http://effectivecooperation.org/2014/03/30/draft-communication-for-the-first-high-level-meeting-of-the-global-partnership/>, visited 9 April.

broader range of stakeholders, taking into consideration the various challenges of doing so? How could such information best be compiled and shared; could this be done as a collective effort?

### *3. Ensure that policy coherence for development is part of SSC*

While the issue of policy coherence for development was not a key theme for the discussions at the workshop, it was a message that was reiterated in several of the discussions on the HLM themes, e.g. on domestic resource mobilisation, the role of the private sector and in the discussion on SSC. There was broad agreement that policy coherence is crucial for achieving effective development outcomes. Development cooperation alone, even when it is effective, cannot end poverty. At the same time, to translate policy coherence into practice remains a challenge for all development actors. As noted above, participants underlined the importance of policy coherence as essential for SSC as SSC transcends development cooperation and encompasses other policies such as trade, investment policies etc. Likewise, participants raised the need for Northern countries to ensure their policies do not have negative spillovers on developing countries' prospects for achieving development objectives. Participants agreed that countries engaged in SSC, as well as Northern donor countries, should strive to ensure that all policies are coherent with development objectives.

*Questions for further consideration could include:* What experiences do SSC providers have of successes and challenges in ensuring policy coherence for development, which they could share and learn from? What are the specific challenges SSC providers face to ensure policy coherence and how can they be overcome? How could such experiences be documented?

## **8.2 Suggestions for how to move forward**

A number of non-issue specific ways in which providers of SSC could work together, including in relation to the HLM and GPECD processes, were raised at the workshop.

### *1. Set up a network of think tanks among SSC providers*

Participants put forward the concrete suggestion of establishing a network of SSC provider think tanks that could contribute to several of the identified needs; such as to elaborate on key principles and differential commitments of SSC, as well as develop indicators by which the impact of SSC could be assessed.

### *2. SSC providers to work as one constituency*

Participants suggested it would be helpful if providers of SSC should start working as a single constituency, and have a common narrative of their role in the GPECD. Furthermore, it was also suggested that providers of SSC should have their own body for coordinating their positions, and establish a platform for sharing views and experiences, or make more use of existing platforms within, for example, the UN system.

### *3. Establish mechanisms and build capacity for knowledge sharing*

Participants pointed to the need for facilitating mechanisms of knowledge sharing between SSC providers at international level, as well as the need to establish knowledge hubs. Experiences of CSOs in knowledge sharing were also mentioned in this regard as a resource.

### *4. Share experiences among SSC providers*

Participants raised the usefulness of sharing experiences among providers of SSC on a number of issues discussed, including experiences of good practices of the role of the private sector in development; different types of domestic resource mobilisation; and how to broaden the tax base and stimulate growth; and experiences of transitions of MICs.

*Questions for further consideration:*

Participants suggested SSC providers could undertake initiatives among themselves to strengthen cooperation and enhance the developmental impact of SSC, as well as initiatives with others to explore synergies between SSC and the efforts of other development cooperation partners to maximise development impact. In order to pursue these two objectives key questions for consideration could include:

- How could SSC make best use of the GPEDC as a platform for developing SSC further and/or for pursuing common global development goals? What other mechanisms exist where SSC providers want to engage and how could they complement each other?
- Should, as suggested at the workshop, SSC providers take steps towards working as one constituency vis-à-vis the GPECD? Should they establish their own body/platform for sharing views and experiences, or make use of existing platforms within for example the UN system?
- Would it be useful for SSC providers to come together after the Mexico HLM to jointly reflect upon its outcomes?
- Would a workshop similar to the one organised in Beijing be useful in order to facilitate preparations for the next HLM?
- At country level, how could SSC providers strive to ensure inclusive processes, such as multi-stakeholder dialogue mechanisms, which draw upon the experiences of CSOs, the private sector and other key stakeholders in the pursuit of common development objectives discussed at the HLM and other fora?

## ANNEX 1: Participant list

Brazil	GOV	Mr. Andre Simas Magalhães, First Secretary (Economic), from Embassy in Beijing
Brazil	CSO	Ms. Melissa Pomeroy, Programme Coordinator, Articulacao Sul
China	CSO/ co-organizer	Mr. Gu Xueming, Vice President, CAITEC
China	CSO/ co-organizer	Ms. Wang Luo, Director of the Institute of International Development Cooperation, CAITEC
China	CSO/ co-organizer	Ms. Mao Xiaojing, Division Chief, the Institute of International Development Cooperation, CAITEC
China	CSO/ co-organizer	Ms. Ms.Cao Jinlin, CAITEC
China	CSO /co-organizer	Ms. Gong Yifang, CAITEC
Colombia	GOV	Mr. Daniel Mesa from the Embassy in Beijing
India	GOV	Ms. Sumita Dawra, Counsellor (Economic) from Embassy in Beijing
India	CSO	Dr. Sachin Chaturvedi Senior Fellow, Research and Information System for Developing Countries
Indonesia	GOV / Steering Committee Co-Chair	Mr. Benny Setiawan Kusumo Bappenas' Senior Advisor
Indonesia	CSO	Mr. Donatus Klaudius Marut Coordinator of Indonesia CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness
Malaysia	GOV	Mr. Zainal Abidin Bakar Undersecretary, OIC, D-8, Specialised Agencies and South-South Cooperation Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mexico	GOV / HLM Host	Mr. Mauricio Escanero, Special Envoy to the GPEDC
Mexico	GOV / HLM Host	H.E. Julian Ventura, Mexican Ambassador, Beijing
Mexico	GOV / HLM Host	Mr. Alejandro Alcalde, First Secretary from Embassy in Beijing
Mexico	GOV / HLM Host	Ms. Ana Maria Osorio, Third Secretary from Embassy in Beijing
Mexico	GOV / HLM Host	Mr. Rodrigo Melendrez, Third Secretary from Embassy in Beijing
Peru	GOV	Mr. Fernando Montoya, First Secretary from Embassy in Beijing
Peru	GOV	Mr. Luis Olivera Professor, Peruvian Catholic University
Russia	GOV	Ms. Anastasia Maximova, Head of the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit at the Department for International Development Assistance of Rossotrudnchestvo
Russia	CSO	Mr. Mark Rakhmangulov Deputy Director of the Global Governance Research Centre, HSE International Organizations Research Institute
Thailand	GOV	Ms. Arunee Hiam Senior Development Programme Officer, Thailand International Development Cooperation Agency, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Thailand	CSO	Mr. Tippakoon Phakpoom Lecturer and Assistant Dean for Administration, College of Interdisciplinary Studies, Thammasat University
Turkey	GOV	Mr. Şafak Özdemir TIKA Expert
Turkey	GOV / UNDP	Ms. Ebru Saner, Project Manager, UNDP South-South Cooperation Project UNDP/TIKA
Turkey	CSO	Mr. Mehmet Arda Galatasaray University
UK	Steering Cttee Co-chair	Mr. Anthony Smith Director, DFID International Relations Division
UNDP HQ	Joint Secretariat	Ms. Fadzai Gwaradzimba Deputy Assistant Administrator and Deputy Director, UNDP Bureau for External Relations and Advocacy
OECD (seconded from Mexico)	Joint Secretariat	Mr. Geraldo Bracho, Senior Advisor for Effective Development Cooperation
UNDP China	Co-organizer	Mr. Christophe Bahuët Country Director, Resident Representative a.i.
UNDP China	Co-organizer	Mr. Steven Sabey Deputy Country Director
UNDP China	Co-organizer	Dr. Merriden Varrall Assistant Country Director
UNDP Asia Pacific Regional Centre	Co-convenor of Asia-Pacific consultation	Mr. Thomas Beloe, Climate Change, Governance and Development Effectiveness Advisor
UK	Steering Cttee Co-chair	Mr. Chris Chalmers, Head, DFID China
UK	Steering Cttee Co-chair	Mr. Richard Garratt, Lead Policy Adviser, DFID China

## ANNEX 2: Agenda<sup>28</sup>

Session	Presentation/s	Goals of session
Day One		
7:30-8:30 Breakfast (informal buffet)		
8:00-9:00 Registration		
9:00-9:40 Session 1 Opening remarks	1. UNDP China Resident Representative a.i. Christophe Bahuét (5 min)  2. CAITEC Vice President Gu Xueming (5 min)  3. H.E. Julian Ventura, Mexican Ambassador (5 min)  4. Facilitator presentation of workshop agenda (10 min)  5. Participant self-introductions (15 min)	To introduce the key issues of the workshop and set the tone for a frank exchange, in which all have the opportunity to learn from others
9:40-10:40 Session 2 Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation: briefing on context, negotiations and lead-up to Mexico HLM	1. Background and Context (Fadzai Gwaradzimba, UNDP Joint Secretariat rep.) (15 min)  2. Objectives for Mexico (Mauricio Escanero, Mexico) (15 min)  3. Panel with 3 representatives of the Steering Committee Co-chairs– reactions and views from their constituencies (Benny Setiawan Kusumo, Indonesia; Emmanuel Onyeonunam Nwosu, Nigeria; Anthony Smith, UK)	- Share information on background information, context - Provide information on Mexico negotiations, preparations, aims and objectives; general overview - Commentary on various positions, stakeholders - SSC providers have opportunity to learn more about events leading up to the Mexico HLM, discuss some of the fundamental concepts that underpin the Mexico meeting, and explore in broad terms how they might want to engage in Mexico.

<sup>28</sup> The Agenda was slightly amended at the workshop and the discussion on SSC and triangular cooperation were merged into one session.

	(5 min each)	
10:40-11:00 Tea Break (group photo)		
11:00-12:10 Session 3 Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation: briefing on context, negotiations and lead-up to Mexico HLM, cont.	1. Facilitated discussion – Q&A around background, context and concepts leading up to and at the Mexico HLM (65 min)  2. Wrap-up (Facilitator) (5 min)	As above
12:10-1:30 Lunch (informal buffet)		
1:30- 2:15 Session 4 Mexico HLM side events and sessions briefing	1. Briefing on HLM side events and sessions (Mauricio Escanero, Mexico) (15 min)  2. Facilitated discussion (30 min)	Provide information on format, logistics of Mexico main themes and sessions, as well as side events
2:15-3:15 Session 5 Theme 1: Progress of Busan implementation	1. Presentation on ‘Progress of Busan implementation’ (Fadzai Gwaradzimba, UNDP Joint Secretariat rep.) (15 min)  2. Facilitated discussion (40 min)  3. Wrap-up (Facilitator) (5 min)	To share views on how the theme of ‘Progress of Busan Implementation’ could be relevant to SSC providers; discuss what SSC providers might want to see come out of this theme in Mexico; what, if any, role SSC providers could play in Mexico in achieving whatever goals they consider appropriate; and what, if any, new steps could be considered for after Mexico?
3:15-3:35 Tea Break (Sign-up for break-out group discussions on Themes 2 and 3)		
3:35-5:35 Session 6 Theme 5: Role of the private sector; and Theme 2: Domestic resource	1. Presentation on private sector (Anthony Smith, UK) (15 min)  2. Presentation on domestic resource mobilization (Emmanuel Onyeonunam Nwosu, Nigeria) (15 min)  3. Parallel break-out group discussions on each	To discuss: 1) priorities around the role of the private sector and domestic resource mobilisation in development for SSC partners in Mexico; 2) what experiences SSC partners have that they might want to raise in Mexico; and 3) suggestions for further action that could be taken at the HLM and beyond



mobilization	<p>topic (60 min. Groups to be facilitated by presenters, as above)</p> <p>4. Report back from group discussions (10 min each)</p> <p>5. Wrap-up (Facilitator) (10 min)</p>	
5:35-5:50 Session 7	Day 1 wrap-up (Facilitator) (15 min)	To summarize key points of Day 1
Group Dinner 7:00-9:00	<p>Presentation on relevant regional consultations in lead-up to Mexico. Facilitator: Mao Xiaojing (CAITEC)</p> <p>1. Asia Pacific: Donatus Marut (Indonesia) (10 min)</p> <p>2. Africa: Emmanuel Onyeaunam Nwosu, (Nigeria) (10 min)</p>	To gain understanding of global context and regional positions

Session	Presentation/s	Goals of session
Day Two		
8:00-9:00 Breakfast (informal buffet)		
9:00-9:15 Session 8 Introduction to Day 2	Facilitator introduction to Day 2	<p>-Brief recap of Day 1 and introduction to Day 2</p> <p>-Set the tone for a frank exchange, in which all have the opportunity to learn from other</p>
9:15-11:05 Session 9 Theme 3:	1. Presentation on South-South and triangular cooperation (Mauricio Escanero, Mexico) (15 min)	To discuss: 1) priorities around SSC and triangular cooperation in development for SSC partners in Mexico; 2) what experiences SSC partners have that they would like to raise in Mexico; and 3) suggestions

South-South, Triangular, and Knowledge Sharing	<p>2. Break-out group discussions on South-South cooperation (50 min. Groups to be facilitated by co-hosts)</p> <p>3. Report back from group discussions (5 min each)</p> <p>4. Facilitated discussion (20 min)</p> <p>5. Wrap-up (Facilitator, 5 min)</p>	for further action that could be taken at the HLM and beyond.
11:05-11:20 Tea Break		
11:20-12:45 Session 10 Theme 3: South-South, Triangular, and Knowledge Sharing, cont.	<p>1. Facilitated discussion on triangular cooperation (30 min)</p> <p>2. Wrap-up (Facilitator, 5 min)</p> <p>3. Presentation on knowledge sharing (Benny Setiawan Kusumo, Indonesia) (15 min)</p> <p>4. Facilitated discussion (30 min)</p> <p>5. Wrap-up (Facilitator) (5 min)</p>	For discussion on knowledge sharing, issues to consider could include: 1) priorities around knowledge sharing for SSC partners in Mexico; 2) what experiences regarding knowledge sharing SSC partners have that they would like to raise in Mexico; and 3) suggestions for further action that could be taken at the HLM and beyond
12:45-2:15 Lunch (informal buffet) (Check out for those leaving this evening)		
2:15-4:05 Session 11 Theme 4: MICs	<p>1. Presentation on MICs (Mauricio Escanero, Mexico) (15 min)</p> <p>2. Breakout groups (50 min. Groups to be facilitated by co-hosts)</p> <p>3. Report back from group discussions (5</p>	To discuss: 1) priorities regarding MICs for SSC partners in Mexico; 2) what experiences SSC partners have that they would like to raise in Mexico; and 3) suggestions for further action that could be taken at the HLM and beyond.

	min each)  4. Facilitated discussion (20 min)  5. Wrap-up (Facilitator) (5 min)	
4:05-4:25 Tea Break		
4:25-5:45 Session 12 Wrap-up	1. Overview of issues raised (Facilitator, 10 min)  2. Facilitated discussion: Looking forward (60 min)  3. Final wrap up (Facilitator) (10 min)	- Overview of issues raised summarises main points of discussions over the course of the workshop - Facilitated discussion allows an opportunity to discuss the points raised in the summary overview and what and how to move forward towards the Mexico HLM - In the final wrap-up the Facilitator will draw connections, conclusions, and summarise possible next steps.
5:45-6:00 Session 13 Concluding remarks	1. CAITEC (5 min)  2. UNDP (5 min)	- Summarize some of the key priorities, challenges, lessons learnt - Highlight questions still remaining - Conclude possible steps to take at Mexico HLM - Suggest ways to maintain networks created and continue to explore how to improve effectiveness
6:00-7:30 Dinner (informal buffet for those staying overnight for morning departures)		