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INTRODUCTION

This second meeting in a series on Asian Approaches to Development Cooperation brought together government officials, leading analysts and practitioners from China, India, Korea, Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand to share their views on the objectives and modalities of Asian development cooperation and its implications for High Level Forum 4. The meeting was jointly hosted by the Korea Development Institute (KDI) and The Asia Foundation (TAF) and the Institute of Public Policy and Management (INPUMA) of the University of Malaya. The first planning meeting was held in Seoul in December 2010.

The Malaysia meeting was formally opened and addressed by the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, YB Senator A Kohilan Pillai. YB Tan Sri Syed Hamid bin Syed Jaafar Albar, former Minister of Foreign Affairs gave the key note address at the welcome dinner. Both distinguished speakers provided the historical and current perspective on Malaysia’s role in international development cooperation.

OBJECTIVES OF DIALOGUE SERIES

- To clarify and raise awareness of how Asian development partners operate: their objectives, principles, motivation and funding levels.
- To contribute Southern development partner views to the international dialogue on aid effectiveness and architecture, particularly the HLF 4.
- To promote mutual interest, learning, understanding and opportunities for collaboration between and amongst Northern and Southern development partners and their recipient countries.

OBJECTIVES OF KUALA LUMPUR DIALOGUE

- To discuss the current debates and challenges Asian countries encounter in the provision of their country’s development cooperation programmes
- To provide Asian assessments and critiques of mainstream aid principles, frameworks and forums
• To consider and respond to common views held by traditional donors, recipients, and analysts regarding emerging donors
• To contribute recommendations and examples of South-South cooperation to the international discourse on aid effectiveness

CURRENT DEBATES AND CHALLENGES FOR ASIAN COOPERATION PARTNERS

Officials and development cooperation experts from China, India, Korea, Malaysia, Thailand and Singapore presented the main challenges and debates they encounter in the provision of their country’s development cooperation programmes.

COMMON CHALLENGES AND DEBATES

• The global challenges of climate change, financial crisis, food crisis, and internally and externally displace persons due to war, poverty, environmental crisis. Many of these issues were not anticipated in cooperation planning.
• Complex aid architecture with differing bodies focusing on different issues and development paradigms; E.g., MDGs, OECD/DAC, G20, UNDCF, South-South Cooperation
Forums. Asian countries struggle to identify which, if any, body aligns with their interests.

- Weaknesses with the current global aid architecture and the global discourse on development and aid. Many Asian cooperation partners view the system as:
  - *Exclusive* to DAC donor discourse
  - *Unequal* as the donor vs. recipient dichotomy accentuates the power discrepancy amongst nations, and
  - *Limited* as it does not include large-scale economic infrastructure projects; places less emphasis on loans; and does not acknowledge the comprehensive development approach of many Asian countries which includes FDI, trade, and Development Cooperation

- There is a range of experience in working with the home and recipient country civil society organizations. In some operational environments weak CSOs make this challenging. Also, some Asian donors are not organized to work with CSOs. Some donors work with their home country CSOs but not directly with in-country CSOs.

**Common Features of Asian Development Cooperation**

- Most, if not all, Asian partners emphasize mutual development based on mutual benefit. The benefit to the donor partner may range from economic advantages, to border security, to satisfaction in enabling improvements in the lives of neighbors. “Prosper thy neighbor” seems to be a concept that most Asian partners can embrace.

- Harmonization with other major donors is not strongly emphasized by Asian cooperation partners. However, through innovative triangular or trilateral models and emphasis on sub-regional partnerships similar goals are achieved.

- All Asian partners emphasize their own recent development experience as holding lessons for cooperation with developing countries. There is growing realization that these Asian experiences should be examined for broad lessons rather than viewed as models. Even in seeking to apply lessons, one’s own development experience must be evaluated accurately and allowance must be made for differing contexts.
• The principle of equality underlies most development partnerships - South-South Cooperation is a common feature.
• Regional development focus: Many Asian countries work closely with partners in Asia; Asia-Asia Cooperation
• Comprehensive development: Asian countries use multiple instruments in their cooperation programs. These might include FDI, Trade, Concessional Loans, Grants to provide a more comprehensive source of foreign capital input to developing countries, PPP (Public-Private Partnership), Triangular Cooperation, PDA (Public Development Assistance)
• For most Asian donor partners there appears to be a progression from a) human resource development through invitational training to b) in-country technical consultancies to c) in-country trainings to d) program-based more comprehensive approaches. Larger Asian partners include concessional loan programs in their portfolios while smaller partners do not.
• Smaller Asian cooperation partners tend to focus on human capacity development through training and consulting programs, both in the aid provider country and the partner country, drawing on their own development experience. In these cases challenges include impact evaluation, follow-through support, linkages or value chain, and avoidance of duplication of effort.

DIFFERENCES AND CHALLENGES FOR THE FUTURE

• What is the most effective way to raise a strong voice and role for Asian partners in the global aid architecture and for HLF4?
• How to reduce the gap or recognize the diversity found among Asian partners, particularly on issues such as democracy, governance, sovereignty?
• Is there an Asian modality of development cooperation? More research and advocacy is needed in this area to avoid generalizations and stereotypes.
• Reaching the poor: Although state-to-state cooperation tends to dominate Asian approaches, there is broad agreement that improving the lives of the broad population is the goal. In some cases this can be achieved through state-managed programs but some participants urged more attention to assistance directly reaching and empowering the less privileged in partner countries.
• Overcoming governance challenges: Use of country systems tends to be followed where governance capacity is deemed adequate, but is a challenge in weak governance contexts. In those cases Asian donors may by-pass local systems with more direct program controls. Programs aimed at directly addressing governance weaknesses are a challenge.
• Program mix and sequencing: There is broad agreement that building local capacity for sustainable and widely beneficial economic growth is the overarching goal of cooperation. The challenge is to identify the best mix and sequence of cooperative activities can contribute to this goal in a particular context; and which of these factors the donor partner has the capacity to address.

PERSPECTIVES ON AID ARCHITECTURE

Participants provided Asian assessments of mainstream aid principles, frameworks and forums. Presentations critiqued conventional approaches, offering recommendations for preferences, nuance, improvements or alternatives.

SIRIPORN WAJJWALKU: “PRINCIPLES: REFLECTION ON THE PARIS DECLARATION AND ITS RELEVANCE FOR ASIAN APPROACHES”

Although there is no “Asian Model” of development, there is a general approach that most relatively successful Asian states have followed. Most common is that Asian countries have followed state-centric approaches and tend to emphasize this in their aid approaches. This may not be appropriate for today’s partners. The approach to aid grows from our understanding about development, and so Asian donors must rethink, research and participate in regular dialogue with Western donors and developing partners. People-centred approaches are also important. These may not always be congruent with state centric approaches. How can Asian partners connect state centric support with support for civil society and communities?

WONHYUK LIM: “DEVELOPMENT PARADIGMS”

A comprehensive overview of the evolution of thinking about what supports the economic development process, and the current search for a new paradigm. A good governance agenda is probably central to accelerating economic growth, but questions remain about how to operationalize such an approach. It is not clear that the MDGs as originally formulated and as
they have shaped allocation of aid resources have contributed to growth and poverty reduction. We should think about new goals beyond the MDGs that keep the growth-supporting elements but add objectives that shape aid more toward development effectiveness. An ‘ingredients’ approach which fosters an institutional platform that supports autonomy, diversity, and experiment is critical to sustained productivity-led growth.

**HE WENPING: “CHALLENGES OF THE AID ARCHITECTURE: BUILDING IN THE AREA OF COOPERATION MODALITIES”**

In general there are significant differences between DAC and non-DAC donor countries in two areas: budget support vs. project support, and in use of concessional loans vs. focus on relieving debt burdens. Although budget support can be regarded as a way to strengthen “ownership”, it can also lead to increased donor influence over policy making. And while debt may be a problem in some cases, targeted loans based on the recipient’s ability to repay can actually contribute to development sustainability. One area where there is, or should be, consensus is the essential value of capacity building, and greater cooperation among donors should be possible in this area. In the end, however, attitudes and values of the recipient partners is a critical limiting factor for success.

**JOON-KYUNG KIM: “USING AID FOR DEVELOPMENT: A KOREAN CASE STUDY”**

South Korea’s development success is largely due to its effective use of large-scale aid, especially early in the process. A critical factor was the incentivization of productive activities, especially in the building of social capital. Another major factor was the state’s capacity to command various kinds of aid flows and direct them to investments in basic infrastructure and building an industrial base. Nevertheless, every context is different and even broad lessons must be applied only after careful study of each particular case.

**GENERAL CONCLUSIONS**

- Asian countries tend to abide by performance-oriented rather than process-oriented frameworks such as the Paris Declaration
- The MDGs represent the highest level and broadest global consensus on development and should be improved and built on, not abandoned. A virtuous cycle is needed between MDGs and growth.
- Values may be a factor in development, but are clearly not fixed in any society, but rather respond to changing incentives and perceptions of future prospects.
• Most Asian development reflects a high level of pragmatism rather than ideological rigidity, and thus pragmatism should be an important value in Asian approaches to cooperation with developing partners.
• Development success is not just about getting the prices and economic reforms “right.” It also requires getting political institutions right.

CURRENT ISSUES AND TRENDS IN THE DEVELOPMENT LANDSCAPE

Jomo Kwame Sundaram delivered a framing presentation on current issues and trends in the development landscape. The main points were:

INTERNATIONAL AID TRENDS

• Aid flows are declining, whereas debt relief and providing service are increasing.
• Aid flows to African countries are large but there are not many cases to show that Africans are benefiting; Net ODA to Africa from Nordic countries is larger than that from G8 countries.
• Recent BRICs’ growth and its focus on south-south cooperation create tension on the international development cooperation stage.

FINANCING FOR DEVELOPMENT

• Taxation is an important component of development financing. If a government is heavily in debt, people are burdened with paying large amounts of tax. The international community should consider ways to solve problems of foreign liabilities.
• Trade liberalization will provide a good opportunity to support development finance to poor countries.

AID FOR TRADE

• Providing compensation (aid for trade) for the disadvantaged countries at the international level may raise their capacity in engage in the market.
• Duty free and quota free rates for less developed countries is 97%
ODA

- An ODA system is needed which can maximize recipients’ ownership and minimize transaction costs.
- Donor countries should discuss decreasing financial support for recipients and increasing financial flows from developing countries.
- ODA should be directed to productive sectors in recipient countries thus contributing to economic growth and job creation. (To avoid welfare colonialism)

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC STRUCTURE REFORM

- Following the global financial crisis of 2008, it is time to reform international economic governance initiated through Bretton Woods system. (Call for fair quota distribution among players). Economic issues should be a vital part of ODA discussions.
- G20 is significant as it represents more countries in the world than G7/8 and pursues a framework for strong, sustainable, balanced economic growth, intended to decrease the development gap between developed and less developed countries.
- It is required to invigorate regional development banks like ADB should be reinvigorated to solve economic challenges in the region.

NEWLY EMERGING ISSUES FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION

- Climate change: For implementing Kyoto Protocol, the world has to provide finance to relieve climate change and provide access to skills which can lessen global warming.
- Food security: Food prices and famine have increased, whereas the world poverty rate has decreased. Efforts to solve food security matters drawing on past experience, like the Green Revolution are critical.
- Global resources: There are few studies about international usage of African resources. Since global resources are limited, a strategy is necessary for the efficient use of these resources.
 ADDRESSING COMMON ASSUMPTIONS OR CRITIQUES OF ASIAN DONORS


TRADITIONAL DONOR VIEWS OF ASIAN DONORS

• Most traditional donor countries are critical toward Asia’s way of development cooperation. Reasons include:
  o Asian donors’ lack of transparency in their development cooperation activities;
  o Asian cooperation modalities do not fit into existing aid architecture such as MDGs, Paris declaration, and international norms and rules regarding aid allocations and targets
  o Asians donors use aid as a means to pursue their own interests (e.g., resource diplomacy)
  o Asian donors place more emphasis on concessional loans and also tend to have high levels of tied aid.
  o Perceptions that some Asian donor provide blind support to rogue states or free ride on debt relief

ASIAN DONORS’ VIEW ON TRADITIONAL DONORS’ CRITICISM

• Pursuing national interest through aid is an underlying factor in all foreign aid. This makes DAC traditional donors similar to Asian donors.
• DAC member states rarely implement the 0.7% aid disbursement target; also untied aid and grants are often provided according to the each member state’s interest.
• Asian Approaches can be more effective to help the economic development of poor countries as they tend to be more business and productive sector oriented
• The criticisms of traditional donor approaches cited in Moyo’s ‘Dead Aid’ have resonated with many Asian donors.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR HARMONY BETWEEN TRADITIONAL AND ASIAN DONORS

• Traditional donors should include or incorporate Asian donors’ approaches into their frameworks on aid.
• Asian donors could establish harmonized principles around their preferred modalities, like South-South cooperation and share these with traditional donors.
• Opportunities for more and varied interaction between DAC and Asian donors are welcome e.g. OECD DAC-China forum, G20 development forum.
• Asian donors should be more involved in post MDGs agenda setting including the 2010 G20 Seoul Declaration on Economic Growth with Resilience.

SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION AND TRIANGULAR COOPERATION

Mr Tb A Choesni, Co-Chair from the Task Team on South-South Cooperation (TTSSC) provided lessons and recommendations on South-South Cooperation and Triangular Cooperation from two important meetings held in Bogota and Bali. Mr J S Mukul, Joint Secretary Technical Cooperation, Ministry of External Affairs, India shared India’s experience of South-South Cooperation.

OBSERVATIONS ON SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION

• There is no best practice in SSC, only best fit and good fit because it relies on adaptation.
• Mutual benefit/accountability and equality are key principles.
• To be sustainable, development cooperation should be based on horizontal partnership.
• SSC should be in-line with country’s development strategy (Aid for Development Effectiveness).
• SSC is distinct from North-South cooperation—two separate paradigms of cooperation embodying different principles. North-South cooperation is part of the obligation of developing countries to meet ODA commitments and targets; SSC in contrast is based more on an equal partnership and is supplementary or complementary to N-S Cooperation. Efforts at trying to harmonize the two do not make much sense to many practitioners.
• Geographical nearness is not a pre-requisite for south-south cooperation to be successful.
• SSC is becoming a more common component of the national development plans of developing countries
• The TTSSC is committed to finding synergy between the SSC and the aid effectiveness agenda in 6 key areas:
  o Ensuring ownership and mutual accountability are the basis for horizontal partnerships
  o Ensuring transparency and results management in SSC
  o Exploring how pressing development challenges like climate change and poverty reduction can be effectively tackled through horizontal partnerships
  o Exploring how South-South knowledge exchange might create better and more innovative incentives
  o Demonstrating how triangular cooperation can bridge South-South and North-South cooperation by promoting horizontal partnership
  o Coordinating knowledge exchange with regional and global mechanisms

**Triangular Cooperation**

• TrC, although not new, is slowly but continuously gaining importance as a modality of development cooperation. It aims to bring together complementary strengths from developing countries and traditional donors to support the development challenges of a third developing country(ies).
• The random and isolated character of most of the projects and the lack of information available impedes learning from previous experiences, hampers the development of endogenous capacities and generates considerable transaction costs.
• TrC needs to be based on "win-win-win" outcomes for the three parties involved, i.e., developed (donor) countries, pivotal (providing) countries, and partner (receiving) countries.
• “Horizontal partnership” is ensured if all involved partners work together from the beginning of the project and the needs and perspectives of the receiving partner are taken into account.
• Scaling up TrC requires more evidence to identify best practices and lessons learned. TrC should remain flexible and adaptive to the circumstance.
• More robust and systematic cost and benefit analysis on TrC should be undertaken.
• “Capacity Development” should be the essence of TrC. Good planning in the early stages is key to reducing transaction costs, building political consensus and ensuring ownership and leadership.

LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM ASIAN APPROACHES

The final session provided recommendations and lessons from Asian approaches to feed into the broader discourse on development effectiveness and HFL4.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BUSAN

• Place more emphasis on horizontal partnerships which are based on trust, mutual benefit and equity. Design indicators and criteria to monitor progress in horizontal partnership.
• Recognize the value of knowledge sharing as an effective tool for building capacity and addressing global development challenges. Embrace new ideas on adaptable and efficient support to endogenous capacity development, i.e. good-fit technical cooperation.
• Strengthen capacities in all developing countries to scale up south-south and triangular cooperation programmes and initiatives.
• Strengthen innovative bridges between SSC and ODA through triangular cooperation.
• Important not to conflate development cooperation with aid; if there are multiple objectives there should be multiple streams.
• Aid Effectiveness alone cannot lead to the realization of development
• The ultimate objective of aid giving should be more clearly defined, and that objective should be to end aid. More aid effectiveness indicators prolong the agenda rather than ending it; aid effectiveness is no longer a productive agenda.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DIALOGUE SERIES

• We should resist the temptation to Asianize too much, and make overgeneralizations;
• Busan is a particular discourse of the OECD, and most developing countries do not see themselves as part of that discourse. It might be useful to think collectively on how to shape the discussion in Busan, while at the same time recognizing that there are other forums where we might have more inclusive discussion. E.g., the Bogota discussion is much more sensitive to the broader development debate;
• We should discuss the lack of statistics on countries’ development cooperation.
• We should bring the experience and perspectives of aid recipients both to this dialogue and to the publication that results from it. We need a session on Asian countries as recipients. E.g., China’s position as a recipient (as well as donor) can raise dome interesting issues.
• Is the N-S divide bridgeable? Is harmonization at all possible? Do we require a neo-Washington consensus or a neo-structural approach?
• There were a lot of expectations with the UNDCF as an alternative forum to DAC. But the UNDCF literature and reports reflect the same jargon and terminology of the OECD DAC. How can inputs from this dialogue feed into the UNDCF?
• Need to discuss how trade, investment, etc. has contributed to development effectiveness;
• We should think beyond HLF4 and more about the future in terms of knowledge creation and sharing;
• Our next meeting should give time for development partners’ voices; how do they evaluate our cooperation and effectiveness?

Dialogue Papers and Presentations are available at this link:
http://cid.kdi.re.kr/cid_eng/event/event_view.jsp?seq_no=17264&board_div=03&list_num=10&pageNo=1
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AGENDA

MONDAY MARCH 21:

- Participants arrive
- Hotel: The Gardens Hotel
  The Gardens, Mid Valley City,
  Lingkaran Syed Putra,
  59200 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
  
  http://www.gardenshtlres.com/

TUESDAY MARCH 22:

VISITS TO MALAYSIAN ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED IN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION
8:30     Pick up from Gardens Hotel Lobby (bus arranged) Herizal Hazri (TAF), Nurdiyana Alias (INPUMA) to accompany

9:00 – 10:00 Visit to the International Science, Technology and Innovation Centre for South-South Cooperation under the Auspices of UNESCO (ISTIC)

10:00 Drive to Putrajaya

11:00 – 2:00 Tour of Federal capital Putrajaya, sightseeing and lunch

3:30 – 4:30 Visit to Malaysian Industrial Development Authority (MIDA) hosted by Tan Sri Sulaiman Mahbob, Chairman, MIDA, Adjunct Professor INPUMA

4:30 – 5:00 Return to hotel

WELCOME DINNER: SKYVIEW 7, LEVEL 29, GARDENS HOTEL


7:00     Cocktails

8:00 – 8:10 Welcome Address

Anthea Mulakala, Country Representative Malaysia, TAF

Khadijah Md. Khalid, Executive Director INPUMA

8:10 – 8:30 Speech by Guest of Honour

YB Tan Sri Syed Hamid bin Syed Jaafar Albar
Objective: Host agencies will welcome participants. We will review outcomes of the planning meeting and frame the desired outcomes from this meeting.

8:30 – 8:35 Welcome to Participants

Wonhyuk Lim
Director of Policy Research, Center for International Development, KDI

8:35 – 8:40 Participant Introductions

Anthea Mulakala
Regional Adviser Donor Relations, Country Representative Malaysia, TAF

8:40 – 8:45 Outcomes of Planning Meeting

Objectives of this meeting

Anthea Mulakala

SESSION 2: ASIAN APPROACHES

Moderator: Nick Langton, Country Representative, The Asia Foundation India, Nancy Kim, Deputy Country Representative, China

Objective: This session will provide an opportunity for Asian officials to discuss the current debates and challenges they encounter in the provision of their country’s development cooperation programmes. The session will highlight areas of complementarity, contrast and commonality. Two panels of three countries each will present followed by discussion. Discussants will
summarize the main points of similarity and difference and raise some points for further discussion.

8:45 – 9:45 China, India, Korea (20 minute presentations)

**Sachin Chaturvedi** Senior Fellow
Research and Information System for the Developing Countries, India

**Wenping HE**
Professor, Director of African Studies Section, Institute of West Asian and African Studies
Chinese Academy of Social Science, Member of the OECD-DAC China Study Group

**CHANG Younghoon**
Director General of Operation Services and Evaluation Department, EDCF
Export Import Bank of Korea

9:45 – 10:00 Questions

10:00 – 10:15 Break

Moderator Change: **Nancy Kim**, Deputy Country Representative, The Asia Foundation China (Tbc)

10: 15– 11:15 Malaysia, Thailand, Singapore (20 minute presentations)

**Banchong Amorn chewin**, Director, International Organizations Partnership, Thailand International Development Cooperation Agency (TICA)

**KOH Tin Fook**
Director, Technical Cooperation
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Singapore

**Zakri Jaafar**, Undersecretary
Multilateral Economic Division (MED-MTCP), Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Malaysia

11:15 – 11:30 Questions
11:30 – 11:45 Summary by Discussants

**Eun Mee KIM**, Dean and Professor, Graduate School of International Studies; Director, Institute for Development and Human Security, Ewha Womans University, Korea

**Prabodh Saxena**
Joint Secretary Bilateral Cooperation, India

**FORMAL OPENING CEREMONY:** GARDENS HOTEL, SKYVIEW 1, LEVEL 28

**HONOURABLE GUEST:**

11:45 – 12:00 Arrival of external guests, press, participants

12:15 – 1:15 **YBhg Prof. Dato’ Dr Mohd Jamil Ma’ah**, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and International) Universiti Malaya

**Gordon Hein**, Vice President Programs, Asia Foundation

**YB Dato’ Sri Anifah Aman**, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Malaysia

Group Photo (Minister and participants)

1:15 – 2:30 Lunch with Foreign Minister
SESSION 3: PERSPECTIVES ON AID ARCHITECTURE,

Moderator: Khadijah Md Khalid, Executive Director, INPUMA

Objective: this session will provide Asian assessments of mainstream aid principles, frameworks and forums. Presenters will be asked to critique conventional approaches from their perspective offering up recommendations for preferences, nuance, improvements or alternatives. Four presentations on different issues will be followed by discussion.

2:30 – 3:00
(allowing time for questions)

Principles: reflection on the Paris Declaration and its relevance for Asian approaches

Siriporn Wajjwalku,
Associate Professor, Department of International Relations
Dean, Faculty of Political Science/ Director of International Program
Thammasat University, Thailand

3:00 – 3:30

Development paradigms and agendas: MDGs, Growth, governance, others

Wonhyuk Lim,
Director of Policy Research, Center for International Development, KDI

3:30- 4:00

Cooperation Modalities (budget support, technical assistance, concessional loans etc)

Wenping HE, Professor, Director of African Studies Section, Institute of West Asian and African Studies
Chinese Academy of Social Science, Member of the OECD-DAC China Study Group

4:00 – 4:15 Break

4:00-4:30 Using Aid for Development: A Korean Case Study

Joon-Kyung Kim, Director of Policy Training, Center for International Development, Korea Development Institute, Professor, KDI School

4:30 –5:00 Discussion

THURSDAY MARCH 24, 2011: GARDENS HOTEL SKYVIEW 6, LEVEL 28

8:30 Brief Review of Wednesday's Program

Edward Reed, Country Representative Korea, TAF

SESSION 4: ADDRESSING COMMON ASSUMPTIONS OR CRITIQUES OF ASIAN DONORS

Moderator: Herizal Hazri, Program Director, The Asia Foundation Malaysia

Objective: This session will consider some common views of traditional donors, recipients, and analysts regarding emerging donor programs. The key note speaker will present an overview and analysis of international development challenges and papers will be distributed highlighting common assumptions, questions, and critiques regarding Asian partners. Discussants will offer a response to these papers and the presentation.

9:00- 10:00 “New Challenges for International Development Cooperation”

Jomo Kwame Sundaram,
Assistant Secretary General for Economic Development in the United Nations’ Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA)
10:00 - 10:45  Panel Commentary

Sachin Chaturvedi  Senior Fellow
Research and Information System for the Developing Countries, India

Dong-Joo JOO  Senior Fellow
Korea Institute for Industrial Economics and Trade (KIET), Korea

Nie Fengying
Professor, Director of International Division
Agricultural Information Institute (AII)
Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences

10:45 – 11:00  Break

11:00 – 12:00  Discussion

12:00  Lunch
The Spread, Gardens Hotel, Level 6

SESSION 5.  LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM ASIAN APPROACHES

Moderator:  Gordon Hein, Vice President Programs, The Asia Foundation

Objective: This session will provide recommendations and lessons from Asia approaches to feed into the broader discourse on development effectiveness and HFL4.

1:30 – 2:00  Findings/recommendations from Bogota workshop on S-S cooperation and the Bali meeting on Trilateral cooperation
TB. A. Choesni
Director for State Budget Procurement, Planning, National Public Procurement Agency, Indonesia, Co-Chair Task Team on South-South Cooperation

2:00 – 2:10 Example of S-S cooperation from India (ITEC)

J.S. Mukul
Joint Secretary (TC)
Ministry of External Affairs India

2:10 – 2:30 Discussion

2:30 – 3:00 Suggested set of recommendations based on discussion

Wonhyuk Lim, KDI

3:00 – 3:30 Discussion

3:30 – 3:45 Break

SESSION 6: WRAP UP

Moderator: Kim McQuay, Country Representative, The Asia Foundation Thailand,

3:45 – 4:15 Summary of outcomes and next steps

Anthea Mulakala

4:15 – 4:45 Comments/Discussion

4:45 – 5:00 Final Comments/Thanks

Gordon Hein

Khadijah Md. Khalid

Wonhyuk Lim