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Programme

9:00-9:15 Welcome and introduction (Stephen Brown and Meibo Huang)

9:15-10:10 Session 1 – EU Joint Programming: Lessons from South Sudan for EU Aid Coordination
Moderator: Christof Hartmann, University of Duisburg-Essen
Presenter: Frank Vollmer, DIE
Discussant: Sebastian Paulo, DIE

10:10-10:20 Short break

10:20-11:15 Session 2 – How to engage with the tiger and the dragon? Rwanda’s relations with China and India
Moderator: Tobias Debiel, KHK/GCR21 / INEF
Presenter: Christine Hackenesch, DIE
Discussant: Meibo Huang, KHK/GCR21 / University of Xiamen
11:15-11:35  **Coffee break**

11:35-12:30  **Session 3 – Non-DAC development partners and humanitarian assistance**  
Moderator: Marlies Ahlert, KHK/GCR21  
Presenter: Emma Mawdsley, Cambridge University  
Discussant: Christine Hackenesch, DIE

12:30-13:45  **Catered lunch**

13:45-14:40  **Session 4 – Triangular Cooperation: A Feasible Path to Promote Global Partnership for Development**  
Moderator: Morgan Brigg, KHK/GCR21  
Presenter: Meibo Huang, KHK/GCR21 / University of Xiamen  
Discussant: Emma Mawdsley, Cambridge University

14:40-14:50  **Short break**

14:50-15:45  **Session 5 – Myths of the Near Future: The Paris Declaration, Developmental Terminologies and Tales of Aid Effectiveness**  
Moderator: Abou Jeng, KHK/GCR21  
Presenter: Elena Sondermann, University of Duisburg-Essen  
Discussant: Frank Vollmer, DIE

15:45-16:05  **Coffee break**

16:05-17:00  **Session 6 – Patterns of international cooperation: a macro-perspective on development cooperation**  
Moderator: Cornelia Ubert, INEF  
Presenter: Sebastian Paulo, DIE  
Discussant: Elena Sondermann, University of Duisburg-Essen

17:00-17:20  **Wrap up** (Stephen Brown and Meibo Huang)
Abstracts

“EU Joint Programming: Lessons from South Sudan for EU Aid Coordination”
Frank Vollmer, German Development Institute (co-authored with Mark Furness)

Many fragile states suffer from a proliferation of providers of development assistance and a fragmentation in the delivery of aid, understood as the “donor spread across many sectors [...] and small project size” (according to a classification of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). Fragmentation of aid is troublesome as it increases transaction costs for both the donor community and the partner government, which, in turn, reduces the potential of aid to be applied in the most efficient and effective way. The problem is known and has been attempted to overcome by several tools - including the European Union’s Code of Conduct on Complementarity and Division of Labour from 2007 – with mixed results. Joint programming (JP) is the latest initiative of the European Union to better streamline the aid delivery of the European Delegation and its Member States (MS). JP attempts to coordinate and – wherever possible - integrate the various aid strategies of the EC and its MS at an early stage of the aid delivery, at the programming phase. JP consists of a joint analysis of the partner country’s development strategy, a joint response of the EC and its MS to that strategy, the identification of sectors of intervention, an in-country division of labour and an indicative multi-annual financial allocation. Assumed benefits include a better alignment with the partner country’s strategy, more complementarity among the MS and as a consequence, a less fragmented aid landscape and hence, a more effective aid delivery. Since South Sudan gained independence in July 2011, JP is used to avoid the emergence of aid fragmentation in the country with the hope of increasing the effectiveness of aid. Based on a desk review and field research, this paper analyses early experiences with this tool in South Sudan to assess, whether a) benefits of this tool are realistically set and whether b) signs of a more coherent aid delivery can be identified.

“How to engage with the tiger and the dragon? Rwanda’s relations with China and India”
Christine Hackenesch, German Development Institute

International power shifts and the rise of countries such as China and India provide new opportunities for African countries like Rwanda to shape external political and economic relations. Rwanda’s economic and political relations with China have grown considerably in recent years and China has already become one of the key partners for the Rwandan government. Rwanda’s economic and political relations with India are not (yet) as important as relations with China. The paper discusses some of the challenges and opportunities that the Rwandan government faces in shaping new partnerships with China and India. The paper builds on original empirical data from field research in China, India and Rwanda.
“Non-DAC development partners and humanitarian assistance”

Emma Mawdsley, Cambridge University

The humanitarian system constitutes a particular ‘sub-ecology’ within the wider field of international development. It constitutes a political and ethical space that is acutely contested - unlike much longer term mainstream 'development', humanitarianism is much harder to 'render technical' - although hegemonic actors certainly attempt to do so. The contexts for humanitarian action (whether the perceived causes are primarily due to 'natural' disasters or conflict), foreground both ethical and political questions of motives, intentions, effectiveness and relationships. This paper will examine the ways in which different 'emerging powers' are engaging with the international humanitarian system, bilaterally and multilaterally, and examines the extent to which this reflects or departs from the wider discourses, modalities and motivations of South-South development partnership. Key themes include the issues of visibility, domestic experiences and responses, sovereignty, and questions about coordination and cooperation.

“Triangular Cooperation: A Feasible Path to Promote Global Partnership for Development”

Meibo Huang, Centre for Global Cooperation Research / University of Xiamen

To establish a global partnership for development is the prospect of international aid architecture and an important approach to realize the post-2015 global development agenda. The key to establishing such a partnership is incorporating North-South Cooperation (NSC) and South-South Cooperation (SSC) into it. Triangular cooperation (TrC) is an important channel bridging NSC and SSC, facilitating cooperation and communication among various development actors. Furthermore, TrC serves as an important platform where parties involved can work together to promote global development cooperation. However, TrC also means an increase of coordination and transaction costs. And all the parties involved in TrC have their own underlying economic and political motivations. Therefore, to bring TrC’s potential into real play in strengthening cooperation and communication, promoting the establishment of global partnership to the best, all the development actors are supposed to seek similarities and allow the differences at the same time. This might be a feasible way for the parties concerned to build global partnership for development.

“Myths of the Near Future: The Paris Declaration, Developmental Terminologies and Tales of Aid Effectiveness”

Elena Sondermann, University of Duisburg-Essen (co-authored with by Franziska Müller)

This paper looks at the debate on aid effectiveness initiated and fostered by the OECD’s Development Assistance Committee (DAC) using ‘myths’ as an analytical concept. It explores how myths of international development cooperation have been both questioned and re-interpreted with the DAC’s Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the adjacent norms for international development cooperation (ownership, accountability, harmonization, alignment and management of results). Using Roland Barthes’ work as an analytical concept allows us to carve out which silencing, harmonizing, depoliticizing or emancipatory effects are created through such myths. With a focus on the DAC’s Busan High Level Forum (November 2011), the chapter analyses how the myth is now retold and diversified in order to incorporate demands to include more actors (e.g. so called new donors) as well
as topics (e.g. South-South cooperation) under the umbrella of aid effectiveness. Theoretically, this chapter focuses on (post)structuralist understandings of myths, especially Roland Barthes’s work on myths and their political functions and refers to the methodological claims of interpretive policy analysis.

“Patterns of international cooperation: a macro-perspective on development cooperation”
Sebastian Paulo, German Development Institute

Global shifts in wealth and poverty are transforming development cooperation. Accounts of this transformation stress the growing complexity of the development landscape, characterised by a proliferation of actors, a diversification of instruments and a broadening of goals. Attempts to grasp this complexity centre on notions such as “from aid to global public policies” or “beyond aid”. These accounts have in common that they apply a policy-specific or insider’s perspective on development cooperation. Changes are mostly interpreted as deviations from the benchmark model of Official Development Assistance (ODA) provided through traditional bi- and multilateral cooperation.

This paper offers a macro-perspective on development cooperation as an alternative to the insider’s perspective. The macro-perspective focuses on the polity and politics of international cooperation rather than on particularities of development cooperation as a policy area. The paper identifies patterns of international cooperation drawing on the literature of international relations and global governance. Dominant debates in this literature have highlighted, in particular, growing institutional complexity and the pluralisation of modes of governance as major trends in international cooperation. Building on these debates, the paper develops a conceptual framework to map patterns of international cooperation at three different levels of development cooperation: the “traditional” aid system, the global aid architecture and the “beyond aid” landscape. This mapping exercise results in an alternative view on the transformation of development cooperation that can complement the policy-specific perspective. The proposed framework also renders development cooperation as a domain of international cooperation more comparable with other international policy areas.