

European Perspectives for International Development

The scientific community and the managers of official development assistance (ODA) are currently immersed in a dynamic process to define the links between knowledge and implementation. This is reflected in the new 2009-2012 Master Plan, which identifies development research as one of its seven strategic points.

Their objective is jointly to outline a Spanish identity for development studies that is both unique and integrated within a wider context, encompassing debate at the European level as well as with regard to our partners in the South.

The European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EADI) will hold its annual meeting on 23 and 24 April, in Madrid. The Spanish members of EADI (Real Instituto Elcano; Centre for International Relations and Development Research, CIDOB; Complutense Institute of International Studies, ICEI; and Fundación para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Diálogo Exterior, FRIDE), with the support of Spanish Development Cooperation, wish to seize this opportunity, where more than thirty representatives of renowned European research centres will be present, to organise a conference aimed at showing the results of reflection, action and research in the field of development and cooperation from a Spanish perspective, directed at a European audience.

The conference will seek to contribute to the following goals:

- To compare the development and international cooperation agendas from the European and Spanish perspectives, with a view to enriching both perspectives, and paying due attention to the future Spanish presidency of the European Union (EU).
- To establish links between Spanish and European research centres and researchers, as well as to foment substantial institutional participation in the EADI network in Spain.
- To compare and contrast different configurations of development studies, strategic financing of development research and human resource training and capacity building – striving for high quality development assistance in many European countries.



**Programme for the seminar on
European Perspectives for International Development**

9.00	Opening
9.30 – 12.00	<p>Development cooperation relations post-Accra – a move towards new forms of dialogue?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Juan Lopez-Dóriga</u>, Director, General Directorate for the Planning and Evaluation of Development Policies/ Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation (DGPOLDE/ MAEC) – The new partnership approach in the Master Plan (<i>to be confirmed</i>) ▪ <u>Karin Christiansen</u>, Publish What You Fund – Transparency and accountability ▪ <u>Sven Grimm</u>, German Development Institute (DIE) – Triangular cooperation and South-South cooperation in Africa ▪ <u>Nils-Sjard Schulz</u>, Fundación para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Diálogo Exterior (FRIDE) – Triangular cooperation and South-South cooperation in Latin America
12.00 – 14.00	Working groups (register on site)
	<p>International financing for development Chair: Iliana Olivie (Real Instituto Elcano)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Andrew Mold</u>, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Development Centre ▪ <u>Federico Steingberg</u>, Real Instituto Elcano
	<p>Migration and development Chair: Gemma Pinyol, Centre for International Relations and Development Research (CIDOB)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Beatrice Knerr</u>, Kassel University ▪ <u>Jaime Atienza</u>, Studies and campaigns for Intermón Oxfam (IO) ▪ <u>Marta Carballo de la Riva</u>, Development and Cooperation University Institute (IUDC), Complutense University of Madrid ▪ <u>Sara Bayes</u>, FIIAPP (<i>to be confirmed</i>)
	<p>Gender and fragile states Chair: Clare Castillejo (FRIDE)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Wendy Harcourt</u>, European University Institute (EUI) and European Development Report (EDR) ▪ <u>Nava San Miguel</u>, Responsible for gender in DGPOLDE / MAEC, Spain.
15.00 – 17.30	<p>Development research and human resources in development cooperation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Gabriel Ferrero y de Loma-Osorio</u>, Deputy Director for Development Policies, Planning and Aid Effectiveness, DGPOLDE / MAEC, Spain ▪ <u>Sergio Tezanos</u>, International and Ibero-American Cooperation Chair (COIBA), University of Cantabria, Spain ▪ <u>José-Antonio Alonso</u>, Director for Complutense Institute of International Studies (ICEI)
18.00-19.00	<p>Round-table – International development cooperation: challenges for 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Juan Francisco Montalbán</u>, Ambassador Special Mission for development policies, DGPOLDE / MAEC ▪ <u>Luc Bagur</u>, Head of Unid AIDCO/01, Organisation strategies, aid effectiveness and relations with bilateral donors, EuropAid Co-operation Office, European Commission • <u>Stefan Meyer</u>, senior researcher FRIDE

Partnerships in the field with partner countries: A move towards new forms of dialogue?

Organised by FRIDE
Moderator: Stefan Meyer

Partnerships in the field with partner countries: A move towards new forms of dialogue?

The dynamics engendered by the aid effectiveness agenda have had significant effects upon donor-partner relations. This process was started in the 1990s with the World Bank's Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF) and the Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRS), followed by the Millennium Summit, the ensuing Development Goals, and the Monterrey Consensus, culminating in the Paris Declaration, which was further reinforced by the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA). Development partners' relations are undergoing increasing regulation with respect to the partnership dimension, which acts as a yardstick for mutual compromise and points towards an effective global governance of aid.

Global governance is understood as a process in which the best practices, standards, financing levels and criteria of development cooperation are increasingly based on mutual agreements between aid suppliers ("donors") and aid recipients ("partners") reached through horizontal negotiations – the implementation and results of which are supervised by independent multilateral organisations.

These dynamics have been reiterated and expanded upon by new elements at the Accra High Level Forum. Existing issues such as the reduction of conditionalities, predictability in the middle-term, more national control over technical assistance, and international mutual accountability have been complemented by two new dimensions: division of labour and South-South cooperation. The sum of these processes will bring new relevance to the concept of accountability.

Advances in country-level mechanisms of mutual accountability. The new Spanish model

Spain has recently approved the 2009-2012 Master Plan, in which it advocates a new model for relations with partner countries, in line with the standards of the "spirit of Accra". The most notable principles include support for and a "territorial" approach to the planning and implementation of aid interventions, which stress promoting partner-country leadership whilst fomenting the capability of civil society ownership. In order to carry out this commitment, the new Spanish model will be guided by partner-country decision-making cycles; generate with partner countries a new "partnership framework" to replace country strategies; strengthen leadership capabilities; and outline public policies, progressively delegating the responsibilities of its offices on the field. In this way, Spanish Development Cooperation is aligned with the most progressive line of thinking in the donor community. What are the measures that must be adopted in the following years to institutionalise this model? How will this model be adapted to specific Spanish cooperation priority-country situations?

South-South and triangular cooperation: A move towards a new horizontality?

South-South cooperation is one of the issues that the Accra Agenda for Action has advanced with further impetus within the aid effectiveness agenda. It acknowledges the value of mutual learning and knowledge transfer amongst Southern countries as a key aspect of the global aid architecture. In this sense, article 19 of the AAA establishes commitments with regard to the adaptation of aid effectiveness principles to South-South cooperation (§19a), the role of triangular cooperation (§19b) and complementarity between South-South and North-South cooperation, as well as founding South-South cooperation upon the principle of non-interference (both in §19d). In this general mandate, which lacks an outline of activities or progress indicators, resides the challenge of translating these commitments – that are highly relevant to the partnership dimension – into the conceptual, methodological and operative spheres. In light of the next High Level Forum, in 2011, there are significant opportunities to contribute new inputs to the aid effectiveness agenda, drawing on the deepening of experiences, strategies and operative bases of South-South cooperation. In order to increase horizontality in aid relations - one of the principal aims of some Southern countries - the prospect of regionalisation offers a historical opportunity to situate South-South cooperation within the framework of the Accra and Paris commitments.

Global governance of aid. Mutual accountability and transparency

The aid chain stretches all the way from the contributors to the citizens in the South. It runs along many structures and agencies both within donor and partner countries, and finds, in each of its points of delivery, its respective responsibility and accountability mechanisms. More transparency throughout this system of financial flows and relations would help to support Northern citizens' commitment to the volume of aid, as well as to stimulate Southern civil society to demand accountability from states, both in fiscal transparency and the provision of services; furthermore, it would give rise to the global supervision of aid structures as a whole. Accra bred a donor initiative to delineate the standards of transparent donorship: the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI). This rapidly found a response in the civil society initiative, Publish What You Fund (PWYF), which has outlined a series of principles with respect to the publication of data and access to information that may serve as an advocacy instrument for non governmental organisations (NGOs) and transparency guidelines for donors. Many donors have subscribed to this initiative; nevertheless, country-level experience is still scarce – experience that could bring to life this information device whilst a real supervision mechanism, based on reliable data, is being set up. This would add a citizen-watch superstructure to mutual accountability relations. How do transparency and access to information initiatives influence the partnership dimension? What is the counterbalance of civil society capacity building at the national and global levels?



Migration and Development: Moving towards sustainable solutions?

Organised by the CIDOB Foundation

Moderator: Anna Ayuso and/or Gemma Pinyol, CIDOB Foundation

Traditionally treated as two separate portfolios, migration and development have seen their links multiplied in view of the increasing interrelation between these fields. While development-oriented actions may help to overcome the root causes of migration flows, migration might itself contribute positively towards development in terms of economic growth, social strengthening and technological progress. On the other hand, unregulated migration flows may pose serious challenges to developing countries and, in turn, engender social conflict in recipient countries. Responsibly managing migratory flows and, concomitantly, responding to challenges such as the loss of human capital in countries of origin, or the absorption of foreign workers in destination countries, demands coherent policies and more cooperation and dialogue among countries of origin, transit and destination.

In spite of the apparent rediscovery of the links between migration and development, and increasing research focused on these interconnections, the results of these actions and studies have not been used in a systematic fashion so as to guide policy-making. Moreover, a wide variety of issues are still under-researched, and there is a general lack of coherence between development and migration policies both in origin and destination countries.

This session aims to collect in a systematic manner the principal issues that have been raised with respect to migration and development, in order to advance their theoretical discussion and, in turn, an evaluation of the implications of the traditional concepts that link migration and development. In particular, the session aims to debate the role of diasporas as actors of development in migration origin countries, and/or the role of remittances with the same questioning. Furthermore, it intends to reflect on the role of immigration policies as instruments of development, as well as to raise the question of the distortions caused by the conditionalities of development assistance policies (aid conditioned to the fight against irregular immigration, for example) on the effectiveness and allocation of aid. In sum, it puts forward the necessity for a debate about the coherence among and between migration and cooperation policies.

1. The management of migration as a development mechanism

How does migration affect development in origin countries? Can migration flows be seen as an opportunity for the development of origin countries? The debate is thus set. The claim of human capital loss in origin countries is counter-argued by remittance flows, coupled with the prospects of social promotion in migrant destination countries. However, the use of migration policies as mechanisms of poverty reduction or development promotion in origin countries gives rise to the debate about the risks of limiting ourselves simply to the development–migration nexus. Such a limitation may have adverse effects on development, as pointed out by the European NGO Confederation for Relief and Development (CONCORD): “Linking development and migration policies presents clear risks of undermining the focus on the eradication of poverty and inequalities in the poorest countries.”

2. The diasporas as agents of development

Interest in the role of the diasporas as agents of human, social and economic development in migration origin countries has grown in recent years. Through direct investment, remittances, technological innovation and support for origin-country projects, amongst others, the objective is to analyse the influence of the diasporas on poverty reduction and economic growth in origin

countries, as well as to become acquainted with the different mechanisms that multiply such effects – both in origin and destination countries – in order to reinforce the transnational links that represent the diasporas. Return and recruitment policies are also a part of the interest to delineate the role of the diasporas in the development of migrant destination countries.

3. The third 'R': The role of remittance flows

Do remittances help to improve the living conditions of recipients in migration origin countries? Giving remittances a central role when debating the migration–development nexus has certain risks. As an economic flow, it is difficult to avoid the comparison of remittances with official development assistance. However, the fact that remittance flows are considerably larger than ODA does not necessarily mean that the former is a more apt foundation for the development of a country than the latter. The debates are centred on the risks of replacing public and state responsibilities with private initiatives borne out of remittance flows, even if these are later turned into collective projects.

4. Instrumentalisation of development cooperation

Must development cooperation in migration origin countries be prioritised? The link between aid to developing countries and advances in the management of migration flows and/or the control of illegal migration, or even readmission agreements, is increasingly evident. The distinction between migration agreements with third countries and the conditions for development cooperation is a debate left unfinished since it came to the fore, in 2002, within the European framework. The use of development aid as either a “prize” or a “punishment” for the level of third-country involvement in the fight against irregular migration must arouse reflection on the role of development cooperation policies.



International Financing for Development

Organised by the Real Instituto Elcano

Moderator: Iliana Olivé

Since the successive crises that affected many developing countries and emerging economies, between the mid-1990s and the beginning of the current decade, there has been a changing trend in international financing for development. Firstly, this trend has implied a larger concentration of international financing in developed countries. There has also been a shift in the proportion of the types of financing available for developing countries, namely an increase in the relative significance of foreign direct investment in the South; this, however, has become increasingly condensed within a small number of countries, namely China and, to a lesser extent, India.

The fall in international financing was partly compensated by healthy exports, and consumption in rich countries. Therefore, the ever graver crises that have taken shape in the last few years – at first, in energy and food, followed by finance and economics – present us with a troubling outlook on the present and future perspectives of international financing for developing countries and emerging economies.

This paper seeks schematically to gather the trends and challenges of the main sources of international financing available to developing countries. In particular, we shall focus on four flows of international financing: international trade, migrant remittance flows, foreign direct investment and foreign debt.

1. International trade

International trade works as a source of development financing in the sense that a current account surplus generates a net inflow of resources (as well as financing for imports) for developing countries. However, in the last few decades developing countries have tended to run a current account deficit, giving rise to the need for external import financing.

There is a significant exception to this pattern: the external surplus generated by the majority of Asian economies since the financial crisis of 1997. Also, the considerable rise in the prices of energy, raw materials and food, since 2004, has allowed Latin American economies (and a few African ones) to accumulate current account surpluses. All this in a context of faster growth of international trade than that of gross domestic product (GDP) in the period 1990-2005, a time frame which also saw 65 percent of developing countries unilaterally drop tariffs below the level agreed at in the World Trade Organisation (WTO).

International trade has thus revealed itself as a powerful instrument of development for countries that have adopted a gradual and strategic economic opening. In the East Asian development models, this has led to the further development of industry and significant technological transfers. These advances have been possible due to the reasonable policy space for institutional innovation retained by these countries; a space which is being undermined by recent North-South trade agreements.

What is more, global markets are not yet sufficiently open to developing countries' exports – agricultural and textile products in particular – in the same measure as they are to most other

economic sectors. Therefore, of crucial significance is the conclusion of the WTO Doha Round, at a standstill after eight years of negotiations, where the only remaining issue is the liberalisation of agriculture and manufacturing (not the new points of the global trade agenda). To this end, bright prospects are not expected, given the new wave of protectionism unfolded by the global financial crisis.

- What is the adequate trade policy for developing countries?
- Is policy space being subverted by the new international trade agenda?
- How serious is the protectionist threat? How would it affect developing countries?

2. Immigrant remittance flows

Many international organisations, such as the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank, have stressed the prospects of this external savings source for social and economic welfare in the origin countries of migration. It is not simply a matter of the significant growth in flows pointed out by official sources. Rather, the fact that remittances are received directly by migrants' relatives, and/or other affiliates, is further considered as highly relevant to the impact of these flows on development – in comparison with other external flows, such as foreign direct investment, international trade and ODA. The countercyclical nature of remittance flows is also significant, for it contributes to softening shocks suffered by the origin countries of migration.

Recent academic studies have, in general terms, added new nuances to the analysis of the impact of remittances on economic and social development. Remittances, notably in some Latin American countries, are often transferred by non-poor migrants and received by relatives who are not poor either; the latter, not infrequently, direct a considerable sum of these savings to consumer goods, which have but a mild impact on human development and produce only a faint, hardly significant multiplier effect on economic development. At any rate, the literature also points to the difficulty in forming any remotely homogeneous patterns of impact on economic and social development. This can be explained by the close links between remittances and a myriad of other local factors that may impact development, among them, the particular characteristics of different migration flows.

In any case, the current economic crisis has brought to the surface the possibility that migrant remittance flows, which have been displaying notable strength in recent years, might come to an end. Growing unemployment in the main destination countries is likely to abate international remittance flows significantly – considering the problems facing the construction labour market in both the United States and Spain.

- What are the prospects for international remittance flows in the middle- and long-run?
- Are public instruments aimed at linking remittances and socio-economic development in the origin countries of migration appropriate and efficient?

3. Foreign direct investment

Despite its growing significance in the first years of the current decade as a source of foreign funding for developing countries, the flow of foreign direct investment (FDI) has been, in large part, concentrated within a small number of countries, notably China, India and Vietnam. Thus, in most cases, particularly with regard to Sub-Saharan Africa and Central Asia, FDI is not a feasible source of financing for local development.

Furthermore, developing countries face two additional problems with respect to FDI as an instrument of financing for development in the middle- and long-run. First, not all foreign direct investment has the same capacity to impact development in a positive manner. For example, investments focused on extractive mineral industries do not generate an economic dynamism comparable to that engendered by investments in labour-intensive sectors, or in other areas with a larger capacity to absorb technological transfers, which, moreover, may generate rent-seeking activities. It follows, secondly, that host-country industrial and FDI attraction policies are crucial to the objective of facilitating the link between FDI and development. In spite of this, international

norms, principally within the scope of the WTO, point towards the harmonisation and liberalisation of national industrial and productive regulations, thereby diminishing the policy space of member countries. The prospect of public institutions safeguarding or promoting the nexus between foreign direct investment and development is thus undermined.

In any case, the current international situation, marked by a national and international financial drought, raises doubts about the very possibility of attracting external funds in the form of FDI, both in developed and developing countries.

- What are the prospects for foreign direct investment in the middle- and long-run?
- To what extent does the current economic crisis raise doubts over the recent trends in international norms with regard to trade and industrial policies? Is a window of opportunity opening for larger policy space?

4. Foreign debt

Over the course of the last ten years, we have witnessed an extraordinary weakening (unprecedented since the 1970s) in the process by which developing countries and emerging economies acquire foreign debt. Partly for political reasons, but also due to economic factors, many parts of Latin America and East Asia have taken advantage of a favourable international juncture to pay off their outstanding debts to many different multilateral creditors.

What is more, to state what may be construed as an economic paradox, a large portion of the developing world (China and some oil exporting countries, in particular) has in recent years become the financier of the developed world (here, notably the United States).

The current crisis will perhaps reverse this situation anew. Foreseeable falls in other sources of external finance – migrant remittances, export revenue, foreign direct investment and, perhaps, official development assistance – will force developing countries once again to accumulate higher levels of foreign debt, inasmuch as international liquidity levels allow this to occur.

Nevertheless, recent global imbalances and the current crisis have concurred to resume the debate over sharing responsibilities and costs among debtors and creditors in cases of international debt defaults. Should the current situation allow the political agenda to make inroads in this field, the conditions of future developing country liability might then be significantly different from the past.

- What are the prospects for the foreign debt of developing countries in the middle- and long-run?
- Can the global imbalances of recent years lead to a reassessment of cost sharing among debtors and creditors of international debt?

5. Main challenges: The global financial, economic and food crisis

- Can the lack of international financing be compensated, even if only in a partial manner, by local financing mechanisms? What mechanisms would these be?
- Public sector vs. private sector. Will developed countries be able to supplement with public funds the lack of private financing for developing countries?
- Will the more dynamic developing countries be able to borrow in international markets, considering the financial crisis and the increasingly large debts of rich countries?
- Will the new wave of protectionism undermine the prospects of developing countries for export-based financing?

Organised by FRIDE
Moderator: Clare Castillejo

Gender in fragile state contexts

High levels of gender inequality are a central feature of state fragility. Men and women are differently affected by the widespread human rights violations, pervasive poverty and physical insecurity that characterise fragile states, and they play different roles in conflict, peace-building and state-building.

The differential gender impacts of fragility are manifested in a wide variety of ways. In some contexts – for example Liberia or the Democratic Republic of Congo - gender based violence and the state's lack of will or capacity to protect women from this violence is a major element of state fragility. In other fragile contexts women's fundamental rights may be "bargained away" or delegated to traditional authorities by a weak state seeking to maintain the support of male community leaders, as is seen in many African settings and in recent legal developments in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Moreover, while most citizens in fragile state contexts have a weak relationship to the state, for women this relationship is even more limited, meaning that women in fragile states face even greater barriers in accessing state institutions, claiming their rights, participating in governance, and holding the state to account.

Not only are men and women affected by fragility in different ways, they also play different roles in reducing conflict and fragility and within peace-building and state-building processes. It is now widely recognised that women have an important role to play in constructing peace (as expressed in UN Security Council Resolution 1325). Women's peace movements have been major actors in ending conflicts and have created space for women to have a stronger public role and political voice in post-conflict settings. However, implementation of SC 1325 by national and international actors - and the genuine engagement of women in all levels of peace-building - remains limited and is often just restricted to the level of policy commitment.

Evidence from a range of fragile contexts (e.g. Sierra Leone, Liberia, Guatemala and Burundi) suggests that even where women have been highly involved in peace-building, once peace is established more traditional gender relations are often reasserted and women are excluded from the process of rebuilding and reshaping the state. This is problematic, as for state-building processes to result in the development of states that are inclusive of and accountable to women, women's full involvement in these processes is required, as is a recognition that any actions to reshape the state will impact men and women differently. While there is growing appreciation of the gender aspects of state-building among some donors, in general state-building approaches remain largely gender blind.

There is currently significant donor interest in how best the international community can support the development of capable and accountable states in contexts of fragility. This is reflected, for example, in discussions regarding the application of the aid effectiveness agenda in fragile states; in the development of guidelines for work in fragile states (e.g. the DAC Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations); in the development of new theories and approaches to state-building; and in the focus of the European Development Report on "Development in a Context of Fragility". However, despite this growing international engagement on issues of fragility, most donor policy and programming in fragile contexts - and the research and theory on which this draws - does not address the gender aspects of fragility in a

comprehensive way. Where gender is addressed this tends to be within a narrow focus on gender equity in service delivery rather than an attempt to link gender equality considerations to broader human rights and good governance reform and capacity-building agendas.

The failure by donors to address gender inequalities within their policy and programming in fragile contexts can have serious consequences. As well as undermining women's rights, it can also undermine the effectiveness of strategies to reduce fragility, both by ignoring the different ways in which fragility affects men and women and by missing opportunities to engage both women and men as agents of change. In this context it appears that stronger research and policy making on gender in contexts of fragility is urgently required.

Given this background, some of the questions that this session will address are:

- How could a comprehensive and political focus on gender be integrated into international responses to state fragility? What are the challenges and opportunities for doing this?
- How should theoretical and research work on fragility and state-building engage with gender issues? How could it engage with existing knowledge on gender and governance?
- What knowledge is required to better understand the gender aspects of fragility? What do we already know and where are the gaps? What knowledge is needed by policy makers?
- What is the future research agenda on gender and fragility?



Research and development: Institutional mechanisms for research support – an assessment

Organised by ICEI

An efficient and high quality development policy must be based on the unremitting research into and study of developing world realities and the implications of policies implemented. Diagnoses, analyses of experiences, policy-making and interventions must be founded on the solid grounds of expertise, a basis that requires continuous analysis to be carried out. In this sense, it is not without reason that donor countries set aside a portion of their resources to promote development research in North and South alike. There is a diversity of institutional mechanisms through which this support is channelled, which varies according to each case. Similarly, the extent to which the various cooperation systems take advantage of research activity is also quite variable.

The relationship between development research and practice should be bidirectional: through their work, researchers should inspire development policy-makers in their formulations, and, in turn, the latter's experience should guide researchers and analysts in their learning and research. However, the lines that connect both ends are often quite fragile. This weakness is furthered by the fact that the work of the two different processes occurs at different points in time, as well as by the lack of interface mechanisms to conflate their respective purposes and results into a common language.

Besides being furnished with research activity, a cooperative system must also create the necessary mechanisms for its institutions, experts and managers to undergo a constant learning process, based on the systemising of experiences and case-studies. To this end, creating the requisite conditions requires work on the organisational routines, culture, and information channels.

This session will seek to tackle some of these issues. In effect, it will, at the very least, reply to the following four questions:

- What should the relationship between development policy practice and research activity be like?
- What are the most appropriate institutional mechanisms to promote high quality development research?
- In what ways can further progress in research capabilities be encouraged, in particular with regard to countries in the South?
- What are the prerequisites for the existence of a continuous learning process within development cooperation systems and their institutions?

International development cooperation: challenges for 2010

Organised by FRIDE
Moderator: Stefan Meyer

In 2010, international development cooperation will have to prepare for defining its future scope and nature.

The international crisis will unravel its impact on developing countries, both directly by the decreasing economic activity and its impact on the poor and most likely indirectly by an expected downsizing of aid flows. As the impact of the global financial crisis will draw around 50 million more people into poverty, the international development agencies cannot proceed with business as usual. On the other hand, the global architecture is reconfiguring. Emerging powers have sat on the table with developed countries and are unlikely to lose this status. After the discrediting of the existing global regulation, voices from the developing world are more likely to be heard.

In this context, in 2010 a number of events of the international agenda provide space for renegotiating the aid agenda. The review of the Millennium Development Goals will have to start looking beyond 2015. The monitoring of the Paris Declaration, the implementation of the Accra Agenda for Action and the preparation of the fourth High Level Forum on aid effectiveness will consolidate the global governance of aid. The European Union is going to celebrate two interregional summits, one with Latin America hosted in Spain and one with Africa hosted in Libya, both of which will be dominated by issues beyond aid.

This table asks policy makers from Spain and the European Commission to expose their work plans and projections on how to tackle these upcoming challenges.