

## **“The Evolving Global Aid Architecture”**

Chair’s Summary of the Seoul Workshop, 30 November-1 December, 2010

*This summary report offers a synthesis of the recommendations and conclusions emerging from the plenaries and roundtables of the workshop on the evolving global aid architecture. The workshop was an opportunity for different stakeholders to engage directly in the preparation process for the HLF-4. It recognized the need to evolve new norms, beyond the Paris Declaration targets set for 2010, to accommodate the diversity of players, challenges and approaches involved in development cooperation. A full record of the agenda, policy briefs, and recommendations is available at [www.odakorea.go.kr/eng/news/News/List.php](http://www.odakorea.go.kr/eng/news/News/List.php)*

### ***Background to the Seoul Workshop***

This workshop was hosted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of the Republic of Korea, in cooperation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan based on an agenda discussed at the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness of the OECD’s Development Assistance Committee. It took place against a backdrop of two important international meetings on development—the UN Summit on the Millennium Development Goals (September 20-22, 2010) and the G-20 Seoul Summit (November 11-12, 2010) which culminated with adoption of the Seoul Development Consensus and Multi-Year Action plan. The workshop was a key milestone in the roadmap to the Busan High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness to be held on November 29-December 1, 2011.

The purpose of the workshop was to provide a multi-stakeholder forum in which participants could share their views to improve understanding of how the global aid architecture might evolve, so as to deepen and broaden global partnerships for development cooperation. A diverse group of around one hundred and sixty participants attended from partner country officials, OECD development partners, new development partners, multilateral agencies and global funds, parliamentarians, NGOs (international and Southern), private business, think-tanks and academia.

The workshop had two plenary sessions and nine roundtables, each of which provided a set of action-oriented recommendations for how the HLF4 might address the topic of the evolving aid architecture. Although there have been notable improvements in aid effectiveness in recent years, most visibly in the allocation of aid resources in support of the Millennium Development Goals and in the quality of country systems, budget support and sector-wide programs and donor coordination, there is a recognition that making global aid more effective requires an understanding of an evolving new development ecosystem, one that is organic and dynamic, responding to *new players, new challenges* and *new approaches*.

The Seoul workshop showcased this new ecosystem operating in practice. Participants from CSOs, private sector, academia, and think tanks were given prominent roles in preparing briefing documents and guiding the discussions at the roundtables. These participants were able to bring to bear new ideas, experiences and concerns to challenge the current approach to development. They also brought a sense of urgency and pragmatism to the table.

The workshop participants were impatient for action now, based on what is already known. The challenges they put at the forefront of the debate were around fragile states, financial commitments to aid, and building country systems, as well as on the nature of global fora for international development dialogue and global accountability.

At the same time, the aid community was commended for being flexible and adapting in many recent innovations, with the experience of global vertical funds, results-based management and in-country accountability mechanisms getting particular attention. The tone was established early on as “exciting but sobering”: exciting in the visible improvements taking place on the ground and the move beyond the traditional ODA paradigm; sobering in the continued difficulties with advancing the aid effectiveness agenda.

Yet the spirit of the workshop was optimistic. Participants clearly recognized the formidable challenges of development, especially in complex situations like those prevailing in fragile states, and in complex tasks like capacity development. But they pointed to real progress in development outcomes, and reflected an optimism derived from the resilience displayed by many countries in the face of global economic turmoil. More and more developing countries were felt to be taking ownership of their own development prospects and to be organizing themselves in ways that gave them stronger voices vis-à-vis donors. In many areas, leadership of the development process and mutual accountability mechanisms are gaining ground.

### ***Five Pillars for Action***

The workshop recommendations underscored the need for action. Global issues are becoming more pronounced, so more coordination is desirable. But the number of actors is also increasing, making effective coordination harder and more expensive. With so many development stakeholders, the discussions at the Seoul workshop pointed to the need for a fresh **global development partnership** or compact to be developed at Busan. Such a partnership should be inclusive of the new actors and approaches and broad enough to be relevant in addressing new challenges. From the discussion, managing the process should be based on four additional pillars for action: country ownership, exit from aid, strong leadership and political will, and diversity of approaches with coordination.

#### ***1. Country Ownership***

In discussions, the participants returned again and again to the **importance of country ownership**. While recognizing that progress has been made, the participants

recommended that concerted effort be made at Busan to advance the country ownership agenda in a significant way. Specifically, the workshop participants recommended:

- Rapid implementation of good practice standards of transparency on aid at the country level—one cannot “own” what one does not know;
- A move beyond a focus on country systems to self-reliance and technological proficiency in sectoral areas—countries must own the “fishing rod” and be capable of implementing their own development agendas;
- Empowering and trusting countries to make their own choices by increasing the share of country programmable aid in total aid and making most aid on-budget;
- Simplifying and speeding up aid procedures such as those governing studies, contracting and procurement;<sup>1</sup>
- Professionalizing aid coordination meetings and avoiding bureaucratization of coordination procedures;
- Delegating the voice of development partners to those with in-country professional expertise in the relevant sector so as to ensure an informed and substantive policy dialogue;
- Inclusion of domestic accountability mechanisms (CSOs, parliamentarians) in aid coordination processes;
- A greater role for regional bodies and platforms to provide more “equality” between partners and an honest broker function in development cooperation.

In the workshop, country ownership was seen as a credible way of operating even in situations where states are fragile and/or have weak capacity. In fact, bilateral and multilateral forums on aid effectiveness have repeatedly endorsed country ownership as a necessary condition for sustainable development. Most recently, the G-20 Seoul Development Consensus called a country’s own development policy the most important determinant of successful development. The discussions at the workshop reiterated this theme.

## 2. *The Exit from Aid*

The participants agreed that the **purpose of aid is to end aid**. This implies refocusing the results agenda onto development outcomes rather than aid effectiveness inputs. The participants recommended that this concept be further pursued in Busan and translated into an action agenda. To advance the results agenda, the workshop participants recommended:

- The development of norms to address good practice exit strategies for aid and the transitioning to different development cooperation partnership structures when countries reach middle income status;
- The leveraging of aid to support and promote growth, private investment and other instruments for development, such as trade, scientific and technical knowledge exchange and climate adaptation funding to support and promote productive capacity and growth;
- The metrics of aid success to explicitly include self-sustaining growth;

---

<sup>1</sup> On this point, it is noteworthy that, at the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Cancun, developing countries expressed strong support for “direct access” to any new funds for climate change adaptation and mitigation, so as to avoid the bottlenecks and delays they see as applying to traditional ODA.

- A focus on technology transfer and learning by doing to ensure sustainability and acceleration of development transformations;
- Support for efforts to develop programmatic and/or systematic approaches that achieve results at scale;
- Mainstreaming capacity building into all development cooperation activities

Looking at aid through the lens of an exit strategy raises the importance of monitoring and evaluation at the country level. Several participants at the workshop believed that impact evaluation can become a common global standard for measuring results.

### 3. *Strong Leadership and Political Will*

The participants recognized that in many cases, the technical issues on improved aid effectiveness have been resolved. What is needed is **political will** to address collective action problems and to speed up implementation. The workshop participants recommended that at or before Busan, political strategies are adopted to:

- Raise political awareness of the importance of HLF4 and commit to maintaining strong financial support for development, and additionality of efforts to address global issues;
- Link the HLF4 narrative of improving aid effectiveness to the UN narrative of making every effort to achieve the MDGs by 2015 and the G-20 narrative of self-sustaining growth;
- Communicate development results in a single framework, as a product of a development partnership—collectively agree to minimize “flag-flying” and unilateral results from development cooperation;
- Avoid the “renationalization” of aid and re-create the spirit of multilateralism to reduce transaction costs;
- Restore cooperative, pooled funding approaches to reduce proliferation, especially in health, climate change and agriculture;
- Utilize partner country systems more broadly;
- Clarify mandates, expectations and time frames for development results in fragile states;
- Promote a whole of government approach, in particular in fragile states

Politically, there is a concern that the aid agenda is losing momentum in the face of fiscal pressures and the increased challenges to the proposition that aid is delivering results in a way that helps sustain the global economy and addresses global challenges. It will be important to present evidence at Busan, in simple language, of the impact of aid. In this regard, the resilience displayed by developing countries during the recent financial crisis and the large number of rapidly growing developing countries provide strong evidence that the policy dialogue supported by development partnerships has paid a handsome dividend. Busan could provide a political bridge between the community of those concerned with aid effectiveness and those concerned with broader development, security and humanitarian issues.

#### 4. *Diversity with Coordination*

The participants recognized the value of the **unique perspectives and approaches of diverse aid providers and development agents**, including CSOs, non-DAC donors and the private corporate sector. In the workshop, the benefit of a structured dialogue between these stakeholders was demonstrated. The workshop participants recommended that this be pursued further at Busan through an open, frank and inclusive dialogue among all development cooperation actors on the relevance and applicability of the aid effectiveness agenda. To promote inclusive approaches, the workshop participants:

- Underscored the coordinating role of national governments and recommend strengthening of country level institutional coordination structures, especially at the sectoral level;
- Appreciated the role of South-South Cooperation as an effective tool for national development, while understanding the challenges that remain to maximize the full development potential of SSC;
- Believe that regional organizations can play a useful role in reducing transaction costs of coordination, especially for South-South cooperation;
- Encourage further work on an appropriate division of labor among development partners;
- Called on all development partners, official and private, to develop structures to be transparent in their activities and permit sharing of experiences, and lessons of success, with each other;
- Recognized the roles that diverse stakeholders within a country can play, including local governments, CSOs and parliamentarians.

The speed with which new development partners, including from the private sector, are expanding their activities places a larger burden on developing countries to take the lead in coordination. All development partners recognize and respect the host government's responsibilities to articulate and implement a national development strategy, and appear ready to cooperate in providing necessary information on their activities. At the same time, not all development cooperation activities have to involve the government—private sector and civil society activities may move ahead in parallel but should be shaped by the overall country development strategy.

#### 5. *A New Global Development Partnership*

The participants discussed how Busan could become a “turning point” for a new Global Development Partnership or Compact that **leaves no country behind**. The participants recognized that the Paris Declaration principles have been useful for building Global Development Partnerships, but that development partners have found different ways of implementing these principles to mutual benefit. The workshop participants discussed a range of flexible partnerships that offer promise and recommended that at Busan ways be found to support:

- South-South cooperation and triangular cooperation;
- Multistakeholder sectoral partnerships, at both global and local levels;
- Partnerships with the private business community;
- Scaling up partnerships;

- Local government/decentralized partnerships;
- People-to-people volunteer and exchange programs.

In the discussions, it was clear that partnerships are difficult to implement and sustain. Successful global partnerships have some common characteristics, among which the most important are: political leadership and country ownership; appropriate time frames to mature; clear division of responsibilities; focused mandates and expectations of results. These criteria are evident in global vertical funds that have achieved considerable results, despite some shortcomings, as discussed at the workshop. But many more partnerships can be leveraged to promote development. Busan can be an opportunity to formalize or give greater structure to these efforts. It can reposition aid from being governed by the current limited partnerships of DAC donors to a comprehensive network of flexible partnerships covering all development actors.

### ***The Way Forward***

Through two days of stimulating discussion at the workshop, the way forward was repeatedly seen as being the development of stronger development cooperation partnerships. This means moving beyond traditional ODA partnerships that have been strengthened through the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action to encompass other forms of partnerships with new development actors, including other developing countries, philanthropic groups and the private business community, as well as civil society organizations, parliamentarians and other organizations within developing countries that have a stake in, and contribute to, the national development strategy. These partnerships must be led by, or contributing to, national government approaches and must extend beyond aid to a wide range of development cooperation instruments.

The success or failure of these partnerships will be governed by their ability to deliver results in a transparent way. Yet this remains a challenge for almost all partnerships and there is significant underinvestment in developing partnerships that *simplify, reduce transaction costs and achieve scale*. Monitoring and evaluation within developing countries is in its infancy and decisions by development partners cannot readily be made on the basis of considered judgments on value for money. Transparent, evidence-based discussions are needed to make a breakthrough in development partnerships.

The Seoul workshop provided many examples of such a dialogue at work, especially in the context of Roundtable discussions and plenaries where issues could be debated in depth. On this basis, a number of detailed recommendations were made. These are attached in the Appendix to this report. They provide a granularity and specificity that could be taken into account in the deliberations of the various clusters and in the preparation of technical Perspective Notes under the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness. The participants encourage the WP-EFF working party to consider the recommendations of this workshop during the March meeting of its Executive Committee. They further suggest additional work on building evidence and initiating pilot programs prior to Busan. They believe that in this way the Seoul workshop will be seen as influential in setting the stage for a successful outcome of the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness at Busan next year.

## ***Appendix 1: Recommendations for HLF4 from Seoul Workshop Plenaries and Roundtables***

### *Plenary I: Stocktaking and Issues- How is the Global Aid Architecture Evolving?*

The first plenary highlighted the need for more aid coordination given the recognition that global issues requiring global cooperation have become more important in development. At the same time, with more development actors, coordination has become harder to achieve. The aid architecture needs to evolve in a way that maximizes the benefits and minimizes the costs of coordination.

- Country ownership, as evidenced by the experience of Vietnam and Korea, is key. This implies countries need to mobilize their own resources to support development programs and to build their capacity to plan and implement development programs. Country ownership is best supported when all aid providers put their aid on budget.
- Demonstrating development effectiveness, value for money and results is needed to maintain political support for official development assistance. Showing that aid generates results needs to be a key element of the conversation at Busan. For aid recipients, establishing aid management systems that have transparency and monitoring and evaluation systems for donor programs is essential for managing for development results and mutual accountability. There is also a need for aid providers and recipients to capture results and to spend time and resources on communicating the results achieved by recipients with the support of official development assistance more clearly and in an easily accessible manner. But not all development objectives can be easily captured in monitorable results, and caution must be exercised that the results-agenda not weaken the emphasis on building and strengthening institutions (that ultimately leads to the highest leveraging of aid's impact) even though this is inherently difficult to measure.
- The very difficult budget environment needs to be kept in mind as we prepare for the HLF4. Worries were expressed over the trend towards bilateral aid and pointing to specific contributions of each aid provider, or planting one's flag. The PD/AAA agenda is one of working together to support country programs, even though this approach makes it very difficult to generate political support by highlighting key achievements of individual donors. The role that aid plays in making progress on key global priorities such as improving health systems strengthens the case for cooperation and multilateral programs and approaches.

### *Roundtable A: How Much Does Aid Effectiveness Improve Development Outcomes? Lessons from Recent Practice*

This roundtable presented specific examples of how aid effectiveness was starting to work on the ground. The central message was to stick with the Paris and Accra agendas

and give them time to work. The early indications are that behavior on the ground is starting to change, but it must be understood that behavior change is inevitably a slow process. There will then inevitably be a further time lag until behavior changes are reflected in improved outcomes. The roundtable recommended:

- Support country capacity to take charge of aid coordination and to bring to the forefront new challenges (fragility, climate change etc)
- Treat results measurement as a global public to which the Paris principles of countries in the lead and use of local systems also apply. This means improve monitoring and evaluation at the country level; be honest and recognize and learn from errors as well as successes; bring cross-cutting issues like gender to a country level where action is feasible; and fix the disconnect in some aid agencies between headquarters and the field.
- Re-examine mutual accountability by focusing on regional and sectoral levels where results are more easily identified and discussed. Make every effort to promote frank, informal and equal discussion among development partners.
- Get the narrative right on aid effectiveness. The current story-line is complex and often negative, and risks undermining support. There is also a tendency to dismiss or ignore survey findings about limited progress toward the Paris targets in some indicators. Development partners need to be honest about their commitments to these targets and perhaps to simplify the message on aid effectiveness to pass the “elevator test”—explain in plain language, and in a succinct fashion, what aid effectiveness is achieving in terms of results.

#### *Roundtable B: Fragile States- Lessons Learned and Principles of Engagement*

Fragile states are at the center of a series of global challenges, ranging from peace and stability to poverty reduction and empowerment of women and the youth. State-building, as a disciplined approach to deal with both issues of capacity and legitimacy, needs to be embraced and emphasized in Busan. This roundtable called for fundamental change in aid delivery systems in fragile states to offset the current international and regional division of labor along the functional lines of defense, development and diplomacy. That approach has hardened into silos that impose high costs of coordination and costly trade-offs. The Roundtable participants recommended six actions:

- Create and monitor incentives for collaboration across defense, development and diplomatic organizations and develop mechanisms for effective coordination to achieve an integrated approach to state-building;
- Rethink capacity development strategy with a move away from traditional technical assistance towards a system that is more demand-driven, has greater quality; is more appropriate to the circumstances in which it operates (“Nano”, not “Mercedes”), and has real commitments and accountability for results. There is consensus that technical assistance as currently practiced is costly and inefficient. Busan should endorse an overhaul of the technical assistance industry, promoting alternative approaches that result in measureable changes in national accountability systems and systematic improvement of country-systems;
- Adjust aid modalities to fragile state conditions, and scale up based on what actually works. The rules, business practices and assistance instruments of



multilateral and bilateral aid organizations pose a constraint to crafting and tailoring solutions to fragile states. These rules and business practices should be revised to allow organizations to offer solutions tailored to context, using appropriate risk-management instruments devised to offset identified types of risks that are present in fragile states;

- Be explicit and honest about the risks and timeframes of operating in fragile states and communicate them clearly;
- Build on the g7+ process in strengthening mutual accountability and positioning of fragile states in the international development dialogue;
- Create and promote instruments to enhance regional cooperation to promote development and good governance.

*Roundtable C: Combining Aid Effectiveness and a Results Focus on the MDGs—Lessons from Global Programs*

This roundtable underscored the need for global responses to global risks which have become more and more apparent. It drew on the advice to "think twice" before setting up a new global program to counter each new global challenge. However it widened the debate to request donors to think carefully about the right mix of channels to create appropriate development partnerships to respond effectively to new challenges. This has been an important lesson from the experience of tackling health, and increasingly climate and financial crises. The roundtable found a "surprising consistency of what is needed in the recommendations from diverse partners." It recommended:

- Funders should follow up and fulfill commitments already made, and ensure existing funding is tracked carefully alongside new funding;
- They should carefully assess the options for support and build in effectiveness principles up-front;
- Decisions should emerge from assessment of options, based on comparative advantage, and should involve early consultation of partner countries;
- Decisions should assess how funds will be distributed taking into account need and country income, among other criteria;
- Avoid fragmentation by consolidating existing institutions in the sector before creating new institutional overheads;
- Ensure a complementary and economical mix of channels to fight new challenges.

The roundtable also suggested drawing the maximum learning from the results and impact achieved since 2000 in different countries. It recommended that development partners form a better integrated development partnership to manage financing for results and impact. Specifically, it recommended a learning document for Busan that:

- records cases of impressive development results and impact (as shown, for example, by Rwanda and Ethiopia), as well as country examples where results have been fragmented and uneven;
- illustrates components of effective country development partnerships for impact – and of steps needed to achieve them, including

- Alignment of financing with the country strategies, salaries, and budget, to allow accountability including with parliamentarians
- Results based financing approaches by donors that take account of the capacity to sustain results within countries
- Division of labor and clear roles among development partners under clear country leadership such as policy support from bilaterals, capacity building from development banks, and under the leadership and oversight of country partners and their parliaments.

*Roundtable D: New Development Partners- Perspectives on Aid Architecture, Coordination and Cooperation*

This roundtable sought to address the challenges of the evolving aid architecture through an open, frank and inclusive dialogue among all development cooperation actors on the relevance and applicability of Paris Declaration principles and other aid effectiveness concepts and standards to all development cooperation partners. Based on this dialogue, it recommended:

- Develop a “global compact” or a common, flexible aid effectiveness baseline, applicable to all development assistance providers to promote an inclusive global development cooperation partnership maximizing the different roles and comparative advantages of all development assistance providers;
- Identify how and where best this dialogue and common platform among all development assistance actors can be taken forward at the international level pre- and post-Busan HLF4.

*Roundtable E: Private Development Assistance – Ready for Greater Responsibility*

This roundtable developed a deeper and more nuanced understanding of the complementarities between ODA and private aid, as well as the synergies that result from strategic combinations of ODA, private aid and civil society action. It recommended that the dialogue at HLF4 should enhance knowledge and understanding of all development stakeholders, including both ODA flows and the substantial diverse private aid flows, that range from foundations to INGOs. Moreover, consistent with the AAA commitments, HLF4 should endorse the Istanbul “CSO principles of development effectiveness” which create the basis for effective and accountable CSO action and define the minimum standards for a rights-based enabling environment that assures CSO existence and their participation as development actors in their own right. The roundtable called for:

- Recognition of the role of membership-based civil society organizations such as women’s organizations, trade unions, rural organizations and the like as vectors for democratic development and equally important in the aid systems as private foundations and service delivery organizations. Governments and development partners should ensure the promotion of policy space for the democratic participation of citizens and citizen organizations.

- Development effectiveness of development cooperation to realize the internationally agreed development goals and set a process of regular forums to monitoring implementation of these commitments.
- Establishment of an inclusive, accountable, rights-based framework for effectiveness of development cooperation encompassing all governments, that shall succeed the WP-EFF and that includes CSOs as independent actors in their own right among other stakeholders, and recognizes the necessity of coordination of OECD and UN mechanisms such as DCF.
- Integration of gender equality, human rights, environmental sustainability and decent work into the preparations for Busan HLF4 as cornerstones for achieving and measuring development outcomes. To this end, indicators have to be identified based on the existing international instruments on gender equality, application of international labor standards, respect for human rights and the elements of respecting environmental sustainability.

#### *Roundtable F: The Private Business Community – Leveraging Global Partnerships*

This roundtable concluded that aid effectiveness should include support for inclusive economic growth at its core with more coordinated approaches to enabling vibrant domestic private sectors and well-functioning markets by catalyzing more and better foreign private resources (commercial investment, hybrid financing and corporate philanthropy). It recommended five areas for action:

- Increase cooperation to improve domestic and regional enabling environments for business;
- Greater analysis and use of incentives for engagement, innovation, replication and scaling;
- Capacity development of economic institutions and business associations;
- Common standards for corporate accountability and transparency;
- Better research and data on market-based solutions and new models of partnership and financing.

#### *Roundtable G: Innovations for Greater Impact- Transparency and Scaling Up*

This roundtable revealed a shared understanding that aid transparency is a pre-requisite to unlocking the potential and impact of both aid and domestic revenues and systems in developing countries. High levels of aid dependence, particularly “off-budget flows” can undermine the formation and integrity of the very systems needed to build and sustain public policy. Central to achieving the gains from greater aid transparency is ensuring that recipient governments can receive timely, comparable and comprehensive information about aid in a format that allows for integration into the planning and budget systems. The roundtable recommended that all donors make every effort to meet their transparency commitments made at Accra, by the time of the Busan HLF4, especially by making public information they already have, or have reported to the DAC. It commended the World Bank as an example of the value of adopting an aggressive transparency policy. The roundtable recommended:

- Recipient countries should together define data standards most useful to them in terms of identifying aid information formats compatible with recipient country budget systems, as well as predictability and forward flows on aid. This would include establishing a contact group and coordinating with relevant fora. These could include CABRI, Commonwealth Finance Ministers, and the NGOs and recipient country representatives on the IATI Steering Committee. Donors are encouraged to invest in the development and implementation of these standards;
- All donors should commit to provide information on request by partner countries. Already a number of ‘proof of concepts’ or pilots are underway to demonstrate the technical feasibility of build a bridge between real-time donor aid information and budget data;
- Encouragement for the use of new technologies, including geo-coding and beneficiary feedback, as possible path-breaking innovations in transparency;
- Encouragement for those who wish to move toward common information and transparency standards.

The roundtable also discussed scaling up and recommended that:

- The Busan HLF4 should introduce the objective of helping partner countries to scale up impact based on sound evidence of what works—scaling up is a “must”.
- Scaling up impact requires country ownership and is critical to development effectiveness and managing for results;
- Supporting scaling up impact should be made explicit in aid agency mission statements, operational activities and evaluations;
- Scaling-up impact should be the default mode of operating and can be used as a framework on which to build partnerships;
- Scaling up impact can support policy coherence, including the use of market mechanisms for growth and development;
- Scaling up impact is inclusive of a range of stakeholders and must involve political engagement, including with parliamentarians.

#### *Roundtable H: South-South Knowledge Exchange – Towards Horizontal Partnerships*

This roundtable discussed practical experiences and forward-looking perspectives of how to take full advantage of South-South knowledge exchange. It proposed that South-South Knowledge Exchange be considered a key issue for Busan HLF4 and beyond with the potential to promote “horizontal partnership” and to enable mutual capacity development. The roundtable concluded that in an increasingly multi-polar world, the development architecture is undergoing deep changes with the involvement of a diverse set of actors, including a growing number of middle income countries and low-income countries, eager to share their experiences and learning from their peers. As acknowledged in the 2009 Nairobi Declaration, the 2010 Bogota Statement and the recent G20 Development Consensus, peer-to-peer learning can harness the transformative potential of a world in which solutions can come from virtually everywhere and where every development actor has something to share. The roundtable recommended:

- More southern-led evidence is needed to understand what works and what does not work in South-South and Triangular Cooperation
- Collaboration and coordination between global platforms such as G20, the ECOSOC Development Cooperation Forum, the UN High Level Committee on SSC and the Task Team on South-South cooperation of the OECD-DAC Working Party on Aid Effectiveness;
- Establishing complementarities between South-South Knowledge Exchange and Official Development Assistance, based on comparative advantages of each modality;
- Mechanisms to scale up knowledge sharing (at multilateral, regional and country levels) by improving their quality, ensuring sound follow-up and working towards results and impact;
- Additional support for developing and expanding country capacities to promote SSC and triangular cooperation.

#### *Roundtable I: Partner Country Perspectives- Ownership and Mutual Accountability*

This roundtable started from the recognition that country ownership and mutual accountability have been the most difficult Paris principles to define and put into practice. It highlighted the difficulties many partner countries are having in translating national strategies into sector strategies, as well as decentralized programmes and functioning accountability systems. It recommended:

- Mutual accountability and results should form a center pivot for post-Busan, with a clear framework of mutual accountability at different levels based on adequate information management and disclosure, to be treated as a public good;
- Proactive design of the building blocks of development effectiveness;
- Institutionalization of aid/development effectiveness mechanisms to overcome political risks, through ample consultation processes (for example including national, sub-national, and non-state actors)
- Political level engagement for the aid/development effectiveness agenda, with effective communication packages and exchange of best practices;
- Clear identification of partner country leadership roles in ownership and mutual accountability.

#### *Plenary II: The Evolving Global Aid Architecture: The Development of Global Partnerships*

This plenary reviewed the challenges faced by existing global partnerships in incorporating new development partners and in expanding the scope of partnerships to achieve more coherent development (as opposed to simply aid) programs. It reviewed the complementarities among alternative forums for discussing development issues. It highlighted:

- The absence of a mechanism where new development partners can readily play a constructive role;

- The usefulness of broad consensus forums like the UN-DCF and the MDG Summits for setting common standards, norms, principles and global objectives, while other forums, like the Seoul Development Consensus forged by the G20 provide more specific operational and implementation guidance on development;
- The value of regional mechanisms and organizations for consultation and implementation of global partnerships;
- The value of new partnerships like those on South-South cooperation and knowledge exchange;

The Busan HLF4 provides an opportunity for the aid community to develop greater coherence with other parts of the development community as well as with other states and non-state actors. It offers an opportunity to provide greater clarity on the division of labor and on the principles on which a number of global partnerships for development can be based. At Busan, “partnerships of partnerships” should be considered to maximize development effectiveness.