



United Nations
Office for South-South Cooperation



South-South Ideas

**Designing a survey of the
institutional architecture of
South-South Cooperation**

A feasibility study

Copyright: UNOSSC/UNDP and UNDP
All rights reserved

United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation
United Nations Development Programme
304 East 45th Street
New York, NY 10017 USA

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the United Nations, UNDP or the United Nations Member States. The designations employed and the presentation of materials on maps do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations or UNDP concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

South-South Ideas

Designing a survey of the institutional architecture
of South-South Cooperation

A feasibility study

July 2021

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	7
Acronyms	9
Executive Summary	11
1. Introduction	12
2. Key definitions	14
3. Theoretical framework and variables	15
4. Methodology	17
Stage 1. Literature review and analysis	17
Stage 2. Feasibility assessments	17
Stage 3. Development of a survey framework	18
5. Literature review	19
Official sources	19
Academic sources	20
Think tank and non-governmental sources	20
6. Literature analysis	22
Coverage	22
Comprehensiveness	22
Collection of institutional data	23
Collating institutional data across Northern and Southern sources	24
Administrative data variables	25
7. Assessing the value of a global survey	27
Benefits	27
Challenges	28
8. Survey framework: possible ways forward	31
Survey planning	31
Questionnaire design	33
9. Conclusion	34
Annex. Sample questionnaire	36
References	40

Tables

Table 1. Interview and questionnaire response rates	18
Table 2. Summary of literatures reviewed	21
Table 3. Systematic institutional data sources for Southern providers.....	24
Table 4. Weighted average of respondents' answers to the question: "Please consider why (institutional) data would be valuable?"	28
Table 5. Weighted average of respondents' answers to the question: "Why is it difficult to obtain Southern providers' institutional data?"	29
Table 6. Potential sources of data gathering	35

Acknowledgements

This research paper was written by Dr. Nilima Gulrajani, Senior Research Fellow at the Overseas Development Institute (ODI). The author wishes to thank the United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation (UNOSSC) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) for their sponsorship of this research under the 'South-South Global Thinkers - The Global Coalition of Think Tank Networks for SSC' initiative.

Dr. Gulrajani would like to thank colleagues from a range of institutions and organisations for taking the time to engage with this research, and provide comments, insights and information. She would also like to thank the Global Research Consortium on Economic Structural Transformation (GReCEST) network, particularly Beina Xia, for putting this proposal forward for consideration by the South-South Global Thinkers Network. Dr. Gulrajani also expresses her gratitude to UNOSSC for supporting this research, especially Shams Banihani who coordinated ODI involvement. Elize Hefer, Manna Mostaghim and Ruby Morgan-Bennett, all at ODI, are also gratefully acknowledged for their tireless efforts supporting this paper. Lastly, she would like to thank the four anonymous blind reviewers for comments that greatly improved the manuscript.

All views expressed in this publication are the author's alone and do not reflect those of the funders or institutions mentioned in this report.

Acronyms

AMEXCID	Agencia Mexicana de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo
BAPA+40	Second High-level United Nations Conference on South-South Cooperation
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DCD OECD	Development Co-operation Directorate
IsDB	Islamic Development Bank
GIZ	German Agency for International Cooperation
GPI	Global Partnership Initiative on Effective Triangular Cooperation
IATI	International Aid Transparency Initiative
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PIFCSS	Programa Iberoamericano para el Fortalecimiento de la Cooperación Sur-Sur
SEGIB	Ibero-American General Secretariat
SIDICSS	Integrated Ibero-American South-South and Triangular Cooperation Data System
TCA	Technical Cooperation Agency
SSTrC	South-South and Triangular Cooperation
UNOSSC	United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation

Executive Summary

The BAPA+40 outcome document recognises the importance of building institutional capacity to formulate and implement national development policies, strategies and programmes for South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTrC). It also encourages systematic data collection to improve SSTrC quality and impact, as the national methodologies adopted for monitoring, measuring and evaluating SSTrC are currently very diverse. Given these dual aims, this report assesses the feasibility of a global survey on the institutional architecture of SSTrC.

A survey can provide a systematic framework to account for and compare the institutional foundations of SSTrC. Understanding how Southern actors institutionalise their development cooperation can have a direct, positive consequence on delivering Agenda 2030. It can help all countries make critical institutional choices. A survey triangulates various data sources to explore the correlation between Southern institutional choices and other political and policy variables, which can also expand Southern development cooperation scholarship.

The report outlines key definitions following the introductory section. Section 3 presents three dimensions of public administration: governance, regulation and administration, then uses these as a framing device to compare Southern institutional architecture. Section 4 outlines the methods used to assess the feasibility of a cross-national survey collecting primary data from Southern cooperation providers. This involved reviewing existing publications comparing development institutionalisation in the South, interviewing researchers engaged in similar institutional studies, and gathering the opinions of Southern civil servants through an online questionnaire.

Section 5 analyses the findings of the literature review by delving into aspects like its coverage, comprehensiveness, and data collection approaches. Section 6 assesses the benefits and challenges of a global survey, given the methodological, logistical and political challenges and potential practical implications. Section 7 proposes a survey framework and examines how a survey might be planned and a questionnaire designed. Section 8 concludes by arguing that a survey would have considerable value for both policy makers and development practitioners.

1. Introduction

In March 2019, the Second High-level United Nations Conference on South-South Cooperation (BAPA+40) marked the 40th anniversary of South-South cooperation.

The BAPA+40 outcome document recognises the importance of building the “institutional capacity needed to formulate and implement national development policies, strategies and programmes for South-South and triangular cooperation” (UN General Assembly, 2019, Article 27(c)) to implement Agenda 2030. This resolution builds on several official statements and reports in favour of greater investment and support for the institutional design and governance of South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTrC) over the last decade.¹

The BAPA+40 outcome document also highlights the importance of data collection for strengthening learning, knowledge sharing and pragmatic follow-up. Article 25² encourages data collection to improve the quality and impact of SSTrC, recognising the considerable diversity of national methodologies used to monitor, measure and evaluate SSTrC. In the quest to strengthen Southern institutions, improved data and systematic data collection can support monitoring and evaluation, which ensures progress. Data collection is not a way of forcing a one size fits all solution onto everyone; it is designed to foster awareness of the range of choices available. Starting from the aims of the BAPA+40 outcome document, this paper considers the feasibility and value of a global database covering the institutional dimensions of SSTrC.

It might be helpful to step back and ask why strengthening SSTrC institutions and governance is now widely accepted.

It might be helpful to step back and ask why strengthening SSTrC institutions and governance is now widely accepted. The expanding scale and complexity of SSTrC requires an examination of its foundational structures. A 2017 UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs survey found that 74 percent of developing countries provided some form of development cooperation, up from 63 percent in 2015 (United Nations, 2019). As Southern providers expand their development commitments they encounter the challenge of coordinating, managing, monitoring and evaluating development assistance programmes, often in complex multi-stakeholder arrangements across several jurisdictions. Strengthening institutional arrangements can provide a measure of stability and reliability to efforts that have otherwise relied on ad hoc mechanisms and approaches (Quadir, 2013: 328).

Secondly, current SSTrC knowledge gaps, administrative hurdles and financial challenges result in sub-optimal development effectiveness.³ The way in which development cooperation is delivered can have a direct consequence on its ability to meet development needs and indeed the achievement of Agenda 2030. For example, it can affect communications between local actors and central decision-makers, can privilege foreign policy priorities over development imperatives, and can diminish the flexibility to respond to changing local contexts. More data on the institutional foundations of

¹ For example, the UN 2017 ‘Report of the Secretary General on the State of South-South cooperation’ underlines that “the increasing momentum of SSC needs to be supported by strengthened institutionalisation of collaborative efforts.” (UN General Assembly, 2017, Article I(6) A/72/297)

² A/73/L.80

³ UN General Assembly, 2018; UNDP & Chinese Academy of International Trade and Economic Cooperation, 2016. For example, the 2016 study draws a link between the (perceived) effectiveness of development cooperation and efforts to enhance institutional functioning in areas like cross-governmental coordination.

Southern development cooperation is therefore important for improving the relationship between delivery and impact.

There is also a belief that the full potential and ambition of SSTRC cannot be achieved without institutional reinforcement in many countries (Islamic Development Bank (IsDB) & South Centre, 2019: p. 2). Formal institutionalisation is needed to allow different government agencies to review their development policies, respond to new challenges and reorganise national priorities. Identifying and collecting information can also encourage informed decision-making, clear reporting channels, and basic principles and procedures that enhance efficiency and accountability (Ibid p. 26) As Southern governments define and build development cooperation systems; understanding other countries' experiences and data can be a useful decision-making tool that sets the stage for national and global success.

This report tries to assess the feasibility of a global survey of the institutional architecture of SSTRC. A survey gathers information from a sample of individuals representing a fraction of the population studied (Scheuren, 2004: 9). This report begins by outlining some of the definition issues confronted, and then describes our approach. Section 3 presents the theoretical framework and scope used to compare institutional architecture. Section 4 outlines the methods used to assess the feasibility of a cross-national survey collecting primary data from Southern institutions. Section 5 analyses the findings of the literature review, while Section 6 assesses the challenges and benefits of a global survey perceived by those interviewed. Section 7 proposes a survey framework and should be read as recommendations for a future survey. The conclusions are set out in Section 8.

2. Key definitions

Broadly conceived as the exchange of resources, technology and knowledge between Global South countries under shared principles of solidarity and mutual benefit, **South-South cooperation** is a broad sphere of multi-sector and multi-stakeholder activity (UNOSSC, 2019).

Countries are free to adapt and define their efforts within this conceptual framework. **Triangular cooperation** has a similarly expansive definition. The United Nations Framework of Operational Guidance on Support to SSC defines that, "Triangular cooperation involves Southern-driven partnerships between two or more developing countries supported by a developed country(ies)/or multilateral organization(s)" (2016). However, it was also recently articulated by some as cooperation between three actors, two of which (a pivotal and facilitating partner) join forces to assist a beneficiary, and where actors are drawn from a variety of stakeholder groups beyond governments (the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, 2019). Reasons for engagement can vary from pure solidarity, to trade and investment diplomacy, to geopolitical influence, or a combination of all three.

Institutionalisation, defined as the formal structures, rules and features used to provide, manage and govern development cooperation, will reflect national SSTRC definitions and perceptions.

It is also important to be clear that this research focused on states that are, have been, or will become **providers** of South-South and triangular cooperation. While we recognise that SSTRC can encompass multiple stakeholders and use distinct norms and methods to Development Assistance Committee (DAC) donors, this research focuses on Southern states managing outflows of financial and non-financial support to other Southern countries, through bilateral or triangular configurations.

When referring to the **institutionalisation** of SSTRC, provider choices are likely to reflect differences in the ways countries understand its purpose within these broad definitions. This is because public administration is embedded in broader social and political systems (Peters, 1994). Institutionalisation, defined as the formal structures, rules and features used to provide, manage and govern development cooperation, will reflect national SSTRC definitions and perceptions. While informal dimensions may also exist, this research does not attempt to track the embedded cultures and norms within which institutionalisation takes place. Diverse choices partly mirror norms and attitudes towards SSTRC, some of which partly derive from different historical and political trajectories (Milani, 2019; Programa IberoAmericano para el Fortalecimiento de la Cooperacion Sur-Sur, 2014: 7). Gathering Southern providers' institutional data therefore enables pragmatic BAPA+40 follow-up in a way that recognises both the diversity of Southern institutional formats, and common design principles and challenges (Islamic Development Bank & South Centre, 2019).

3. Theoretical framework and variables

There is no systematic framework for describing and comparing the institutional foundations of SSTRC.

This approach swaps in-depth analysis, the full richness of qualitative insights and the normative drivers of institutionalisation, for parsimony and more robust comparability.

A number of policy efforts recently sought to address this challenge, largely by developing frameworks that result from consensus building across multiple SSTRC stakeholders. For example, the Islamic Development Bank and South Centre created an institutional framework revolving around seven pillars, while a research commissioned by UNOSSC presents eight factors relating to the signature and implementation of an SSTRC initiative. (Islamic Development Bank & South Centre, 2019; UNOSSC, 2019). This research differs from policy approaches that view conceptual frameworks as evolving models based on country experiences and feedback. It seeks data relating to core conceptual categories in longstanding academic research in the field of comparative public administration. These categories enable a systematic, pan-national comparison of institutional structures and capacities, and are deliberately broad enough to transcend administrative diversity and variation (Farazmand, 1991, 1996; Peters, 1994; Riggs, 1991; Riggs, 1970; Sigelman, 1976). This approach swaps in-depth analysis, the full richness of qualitative insights and the normative drivers of institutionalisation, for parsimony and more robust comparability. Previously, most analysis of SSTRC institutionalisation has inclined towards the former rather than the latter. A survey of this kind may therefore make an important contribution to our overall understanding of institutionalisation in the global South, especially when married to the more common, existing qualitative case studies exploring its normative, political and historical foundations.

We believe three categories of variable are helpful to understanding and systematically collecting Southern SSTRC provider data. While not exhaustive, they together capture the critical and systematically documentable components involved in the institutional governance of SSTRC provision. Moreover, this classification closely overlaps with policy approaches favouring a development cooperation ‘management system,’ which is defined as “the policy frameworks, institutional arrangements, and operational tools for development cooperation” (UNDP & Chinese Academy of International Trade and Economic Cooperation, 2016: 5). It is therefore reasonable to conclude that these variables categories are both theoretically robust and policy relevant.

The first category of variables relates to **governance** structures belonging to the state involved in development cooperation. This report refers to the role played by national administrative bodies, and focuses specifically on structural aspects, including independence from and relations with other public entities. Architecture supports government decision-making, shaping decisions on how SSTRC will be taken forward. While SSTRC is a multi-stakeholder activity, this analysis focuses on its foundations in states choosing to provide development cooperation. It therefore concentrates on governmental lines of authority and relations. Decision-making on development can derive from these structures.

The second category of variables involves **regulatory** aspects, including the laws, strategies and guidelines that steer state SSTRC actions. Legal mandates can be placed into different categories, for example according to whether they are established in a

constitution, in law, in regulations or in a specific development cooperation mandate (Programa IberoAmericano para el Fortalecimiento de la Cooperacion Sur-Sur, 2014: 20-21). Strategies can include national foreign policy, planning or development, and sometimes even be a specific SSTRC plan (Islamic Development Bank & South Centre, 2019; OECD, 2019). Guidelines can refer to various administrative activities, including monitoring and evaluation, knowledge management or communications (Esteves, 2018; UNDP, 2017).

Finally, the third category of variables involves the **administrative features** that allow a government to achieve its development goals and ambitions (Peters, 1994: 80). This category looks beyond structures and regulations to consider development cooperation mechanisms, including human resources, financial and non-financial means, monitoring and evaluation systems, resources to engage civil society, and public communications capabilities. This category is designed to help develop an understanding of national capacities to deliver SSTRC ambitions and stated goals.

Ultimately, the data within these three categories allows for systematic cross-national data collection that develops understanding of SSTRC institutionalisation (complementary to existing studies) and enables systematic global comparisons.

4. Methodology

This report aims to review existing literature and comparative work on SSTRC institutionalisation in provider states, and to explore a survey's value for Southern policymakers, researchers and other users.

This study was performed in a series of concurrent stages, culminating in an assessment of the benefits and challenges of a trans-national survey in Section 6.

Stage 1. Literature review and analysis

This study began with a review of the literature that deliberately adopts **a systematic comparative approach and empirical focus in studying SSTRC institutions; and was published in English, French or Spanish (languages the author can read and understand) from 2014 onwards**. It used a non-probabilistic sampling strategy, choosing materials the author aware of or that were recommended given the purpose of this study. This approach risks missing potentially useful reports that meet the criteria. However, applying a clear filter allowed us to achieve a depth of understanding of the materials examined, and completion of this report within restrictive time constraints. The initial aim was to review 15 publications. Ultimately 19 publications were reviewed. The sampling strategy was therefore a deliberate and non-exhaustive review of academic and non-academic literatures, published within the five years prior to the study start date.

Processing data accumulated in this first stage involved creating an Excel matrix to assimilate information and compare trends relating to our variables of interest, geographic coverage and the nature of the source itself. An iterative exploration of this literature assessed trends across the body of work, and drew attention to key issues relating to the variables and countries examined. The ultimate aim was to identify publications that could be used to gather institutional data in order to plug any gaps in our survey.

Stage 2. Feasibility assessments

The second stage involved contacting several **SSTRC researchers and development cooperation provider survey method experts** to obtain their views on the value of a global survey on institutional dynamics within SSTRC. It began with a sample group of researchers either known directly, or whose written works were known by the author, with subsequent interviews snowballing from recommendations by these initial interviewees. In total, we reached 15 informants in this way. This allowed this study to investigate the benefits and challenges of a survey in much greater depth. Interviews were structured to explore the contributions of a survey to improving (1) access to information and knowledge-sharing (2) policy decision-making (3) development effectiveness, and (4) future work and research.

This study also contacted a non-random sample of **Southern bilateral officials** through a light-touch online questionnaire about their views, to allow an understanding of both the likelihood of receiving responses to online surveys and also to gather their opinions systematically. We drew on a sample of 37 contacts established at UNOSSC Director Generals' Forum (2018 and 2019) and Global South-South Expo (2018) meetings. The low number of respondents is a clear weakness as conclusions are drawn more by the feasibility and value assessments of researchers working in think tanks, multilateral institutions and academia than civil servants in Southern development cooperation institutions.

It is important to state that most of the Southern officials received multiple invitations to take part in this online questionnaire and chose not to engage. This highlights the importance of institutional support for a global survey, in order to legitimise the exercise and ensure an adequate response rate.

Informal discussions were also held with a range of Southern and multilateral **participants attending the 2019 Director Generals' Forum** in Istanbul. Data collected through all three streams informs reflections on the value of a survey. To widen the sample, further interviews were planned at the JICA Capacity Building Forum scheduled in Brazil in March 2020 . Unfortunately the event's cancellation, made this impossible.

Table 1 summarises our interview and questionnaire response rates.

Table 1. *Interview and questionnaire response rates*

	Number approached	Number respondents	Response rate
Semi-structured interviews	15	15	100%
Online questionnaire	37	4	11%

Stage 3. Development of a survey framework

The final stage of this research attempts to develop a framework for a potential future survey. It will discuss survey planning and implementation, identify specific variables that could be gleaned from existing reports and provide a draft questionnaire.

5. Literature review

The last five years have seen an explosion of policy reports and studies relating to SSTRC. This reflects the practical and theoretical mainstreaming of SSTRC within communities examining global development cooperation.

This section reviews a non-exhaustive sample of literature from official, academic and non-governmental sources. These reports must have been published in the last five years (since 2014), be comparative, have an empirical North-South or South-South component, be written either in English, French or Spanish and address questions of institutionalisation, as defined above. The reasons for these filters were mentioned in the previous section. The following short review of these literatures is followed by a summary of the texts examined in Table 2.

Official sources

UN institutions have actively engaged in a comparative examination of SSTRC institutions. UNDP produced the first ever report on SSTRC in Africa (UNDP, 2019); UNESCAP provided a short overview of Southern cooperation in Asia (UNESCAP, 2018), and two UNDP China reports drew lessons for institutional strengthening in China from other jurisdictions (UNDP, 2017; UNDP & Chinese Academy of International Trade and Economic Cooperation, 2016). Consult Table 2 below for the full titles of these reports.

OECD publications including the Development Co-operation Reports comparatively investigate a fuller range of cooperation providers in more detail, going beyond the 29 DAC members and those who officially report to the DAC by estimating the volume and key features of “the largest providers of development cooperation beyond the DAC membership, on their way to becoming an OECD member or OECD key partners.” (DAC, 2019). Their reports also explore triangular cooperation trends, including institutional models supporting engagement (OECD, 2019).

The regional literature reviewed includes annual reports on the Latin American region by the Ibero-American General Secretariat (SEGIB) and Programa Iberoamericano para el Fortalecimiento de la Cooperación Sur-Sur (PIFCSS) (Programa Iberoamericano para el Fortalecimiento de la Cooperación Sur-Sur, 2014; Secretaría General Iberoamericana, 2018), and work by the Islamic Development Bank on national SSTRC ecosystems (Islamic Development Bank & South Centre, 2019). The latter grew out of its 3-2-C Initiative for Effective Technical Cooperation and brought together member states’ technical cooperation agencies for collaboration and peer learning. All of these reports engaged in varying degrees of comparative narrative analysis of institutional design and governance for effective SSTRC.

Government sponsored publications, often in partnership with other government or regional bodies, perhaps went furthest in the comparative analysis of institutional aspects of SSTRC (AMEXCID-GIZ, 2019; Milani, 2019; Piefer & Vega, 2014).

Academic sources

There is a small subset of peer-reviewed academic research exploring the cross-national historical and political emergence of SSTRC and comparing the resulting institutional structures embedded in provider states (Asmus, Fuchs, & Müller, 2017; Lauria & Fumagalli, 2019; Santander & Alonso, 2018). The Fuchs and Muller study (2018) is the only one to offer a robust, cross-national analysis of the institutional aspects of development cooperation providers, including creation of a structure to oversee development cooperation and legislative aspects.

Think tank and non-governmental sources

Studies published by applied researchers working at think tanks, research centres and other non-governmental organisations, have also compared SSTRC aspects, perhaps with less emphasis on institutional design. Research into the Global South has paid specific attention to monitoring and evaluation frameworks to assess the effectiveness of SSTRC flows (Besharati, Rawhani, & Rios, 2017; Esteves, 2018). A recent exercise by for-profit membership organisation Devex (2018) also provided a comparative assessment of the ‘emerging donor’ landscape including a discussion of institutional aspects.

Table 2. Summary of literatures reviewed

No.	Title	Author	Year
Official sources			
United Nations policy reports			
1	<i>Mix and Match? How Countries Deliver Development Cooperation and Lessons for China</i>	UNDP China & CAITEC	2016
2	<i>Communicating Development Cooperation to Domestic Audiences: Approaches and Implications for South-South cooperation Providers</i>	UNDP China	2017
3.	<i>First African South-South Cooperation Report</i>	UNDP and NEPAD	2019
4.	<i>South-South Cooperation in Asia and the Pacific – A brief overview</i>	UNESCAP	2018
DAC Policy reports			
5.	<i>Development Cooperation Report</i>	DAC	2019
6.	<i>Enabling Effective Triangular Cooperation</i>	DAC	2019
Regional body policy reports			
7.	<i>Report on South-South Cooperation in IberoAmerica</i>	SEGIB	2019
8.	<i>Developing National Ecosystems for South-South and Triangular Cooperation to Achieve Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development</i>	IsDB South Centre	2019
9.	<i>Diagnóstico de los Marcos Normativas e Institucionales Para la gestión de la Cooperación Sur-Sur en los países de Iberoamérica</i>	Programa Iberoamericano Para el Fortalecimiento de la Cooperación Sur-Sur	2014
Government publications			
10.	<i>Experiences of Middle Income Countries in International Development Cooperation</i>	Piefer and Vega (prepared for AMEXCID and GIZ)	2014
11.	<i>Estudio comparativo de 16 Agencias de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo: Insumos para su análisis y reflexiones</i>	AMEXCID GIZ	2018
12.	<i>Revitalizing Global Partnerships for Sustainable Development: Challenges in the Implementation of SDG 17 through South-south and Trilateral Cooperation in Brazil, China, India, Mexico, South Africa and Turkey</i>	AMEXCID GIZ	2019
Academic sources			
13.	<i>BRICS, the southern model, and the evolving landscape of development assistance: Toward a new taxonomy</i>	Lauria and Fumagalli	2019
14.	<i>BRICS and Foreign Aid</i>	Asmus, Fuchs, and Müller	2017
15.	<i>Democracy and Aid Donorship</i>	Fuchs and Müller	2019
16.	<i>Perceptions, identities and interests in South–South cooperation: the cases of Chile, Venezuela and Brazil</i>	Santander and Alonso	2018
Think tank and non-governmental sources			
17.	<i>How Governments of the South assess the results of South-South Cooperation: Case studies of South-led approaches</i>	Esteves	2018
18.	<i>A Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for South South Cooperation</i>	Besharati, Orwanhi and Rios	2017
19.	<i>Emerging Donors 2.0</i>	Devex	2018

6. Literature analysis

The following analysis pinpoints trends from the literature review.

Coverage

All of the studies of Southern providers examined still have a strong focus on BRICS, although these countries are increasingly compared to others like Chile Mexico, Saudi Arabia and Thailand (Esteves 2018, Santander and Alonso, 2018; Lauria and Fumagalli 2019), and with traditional donors (AMEXCID-GIZ, 2019; Devex, 2018; UNDP & Chinese Academy of International Trade and Economic Cooperation, 2016). Regional studies like those on Africa, MENA and IberoAmerica expand comparison beyond BRICS, as required by their mandate..

Asian SSTRC data collection remains the least developed out of all of the regions. It is unclear why there is no regional reporting SSTRC mechanism in Asia and the Pacific. Existing reporting seems to be somewhat *ad hoc* and generally initiated by the UN (UNDP, 2017; UNDP & Chinese Academy of International Trade and Economic Cooperation, 2016; UNESCAP, 2018). Some of those interviewed suggested that this partly reflects the diverse nature of SSC providers. Their differences complicate the consensus required for cross-country data collection. In terms of institutional data, UNDP China qualitative case studies focused on specific aspects of administrative capacity to inform institution building as part of Chinese development cooperation (e.g. the creation of communications units or the choice of development cooperation instruments). A UNESCAP 2018 short survey of eight countries provides some data-based assessment of SSTRC means, priority regions and sectors (UNESCAP, 2018). This survey concluded that SSTRC providers in the region faced challenges deriving from insufficient national legal and institutional arrangements; low-levels of national, regional and global knowledge sharing; limited efforts to systematically gather SSTRC data and statistics and insufficient funding. This report does not discuss the reasons for these challenges.

Comprehensiveness

Asia aside, regional bodies provide the most comprehensive data on SSTRC flows and activities. Latin America began this process in 2007 when the Ibero-American General Secretariat (SEGIB) started producing an annual report on South-South cooperation that draws on double-checked data and is published on an online portal (since 2015, not open access) entitled the Integrated Ibero-American South-South and Triangular Cooperation Data System (SIDICSS). SIDICSS is produced to strengthen SSTRC reporting by Ibero-American countries. In Africa, data gathering began with a 2016 partnership between the NEPAD Planning and Coordination Agency, UNDP Regional Service Centre and SEGIB.⁴

Reporting has been voluntary in both regions. Initially, this has limited coverage (e.g. only nine countries responded to the UNDP African e-survey, although a second report anticipates coverage of roughly 12 states.)⁵ The data collected largely concerns the activities and does not systematically include institutional data. But both the SEGIB and UNDP-NEPAD reports provide some narrative insights into institutional aspects across their respective regions. The SEGIB (2019) report explains how SSTRC can continue to respond

⁴ As NEPAD has transitioned into AUDA-NEPAD, the latter will act as the continental structure for SSTRC.

⁵ This limited participation was attributed to political difficulties in getting Ministers to approve national inclusion in the report and lack of budget to incentivise engagement. The next report expects to build on its predecessor's success to increase participation.

to development challenges and complexities through actions, projects and programmes via TrC relationships and regional associations. The UNDP-NEPAD report (2019: 30-32) highlights the variety of national institutional architecture, including models ranging from specific SSTRC agencies and national focus platforms, to inclusion within Ministries of Foreign Affairs or Ministries of Planning and Economics. It discusses the progress made in SSC regulatory frameworks, the appointment of specialist personnel, the dedication of financial resources, and the establishment of monitoring and evaluation systems.

Collection of institutional data

Official regional and governmental sources are a comprehensive source of provider institutional data (AMEXCID-GIZ, 2019; Islamic Development Bank & South Centre, 2019; Piefer & Vega, 2014; Programa IberoAmericano para el Fortalecimiento de la Cooperacion Sur-Sur, 2014). The IsDB started with an examination of their 'Reverse Linkage' mechanism, which resulted in an exploration of their seven pillars of a national SSTRC ecosystem.⁶ The data collected in 2019 by the Agencia Mexicana de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo (AMEXCID) and the German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ) built on a previously commissioned 2014 study (Piefer and Vega, 2014). It extensively presents institutional data, drawing on civil service, regulatory and administrative aspects. However, this data is largely presented in narrative form across a sample of approximately 20 countries. While both reports attempt to make comparisons across their sample, there are clearly limits to the robust comparative analysis possible when such a large amount of data needs to be digested and presented in qualitative summary formats.

Perhaps the most systematic collection of Southern provider institutional data is an academic publication by Fuchs and Muller (2018: 8) on 114 countries and covering the 1945-2015 period. Their study aims to correct the "rich and democratic" countries data bias. Their database contains information from the 114 countries over 1945-2015 and covers key milestones in their transition to becoming cooperation providers. It will shortly be made public.⁷ These milestones include the year of a country's first outgoing project; the name and year of its current institution responsible for cooperation provision; the name and year of establishment of its first cooperation provision institution; and the name and year of its first cooperation legislation. This data provides a robust empirical answer to the question of how many countries have a dedicated administrative body responsible for providing development cooperation. They held a survey in 2016-2017 and collected data from the official administrative bodies of all 175 sovereign states with a population of over 300,000 inhabitants. They eventually receiving responses from 94 countries. The database highlights a growth trajectory of 13.5 new providers per decade. At least 75 countries now have formal institutions overseeing development cooperation.

Table 3 summarises the number of countries included in all these sources of institutional data, and the primary variables for which data is collected. These five reports represent the best sources for gathering institutional data in terms of both their geographic coverage and our variables.

This study did not review national online or hard copy data sources (e.g. annual reports, white papers), despite the fact that these can be an important source of institutional data. Doing so was untenable given the constraints of this study, and they also vary in terms of their comprehensiveness, disaggregation and the timeliness of data production.

⁶ Reverse Linkage is a technical cooperation mechanism to facilitate knowledge and expertise transfer, and share best practices among partnering Member States introduced by the Islamic Development Bank Group (IsDB). It is a peer-to-peer South-South cooperation. The seven pillars of an effective national institutional framework identified by the IsDB are: political will, national strategies, a national body, SSTRC databases, connected actors, financing mechanisms and performance management.

⁷ The authors are waiting for a peer-review article to be accepted before publishing this data.

This risks a partially independent analysis and limited assurances of global commensurability (Di Ciommo, 2017: 11).

Collating institutional data across Northern and Southern sources

The Development Assistance Committee (DAC), traditionally represented Northern donor interests, but has expanded its scope to include SSTRC. For example, the recent Development Cooperation Report includes estimated volumes and key institutional Southern providers, including those that do not report to DAC but are among the largest providers of development cooperation (DAC, 2019). However, most institutional data is narrative, non-comparable and limited to ten providers (Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Qatar, South Africa).⁸

The OECD's Development Co-operation Directorate (DCD) implements a very active programme of policy research on triangular cooperation (TrC), which is hosted by the Foresight, Outreach and Policy Reform Unit. This unit also hosts the Secretariat of the Global Partnership Initiative on Effective Triangular Cooperation (GPI).⁹ Their most recent report indicates a focus of interest on institutional aspects, including the regulatory frameworks of TrC and a typology of the institutional structures that support implementation (OECD, 2019). The latter also offers a good framework for considering how Southern providers organise their bureaucratic systems to engage in South-South cooperation, with systems ranging from full integration with a Ministry of Foreign Affairs or an Office of the Executive, to a separate ministry charged with policy and implementation and with minimal coordination from the centre (Ibid p. 20-25). However, in all these models the challenge of inter-ministerial coordination between ministries and sub-national actors who often have their own international cooperation budgets and divisions remains.

Table 3. Systematic institutional data sources for Southern providers

Author and title	Countries and Regions examined	Variables of interest
Piefer and Vega (2014): <i>Experiences of Middle Income Countries in International Development Cooperation</i>	Brazil, Chile, China, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, Singapore, South Africa, Thailand, Turkey (11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Date of agency foundation - Legal basis - Agency affiliation - Organisational structure - Country disbursements - Other ministries involved - Development cooperation strategy - Normative principles
AMEXCID and GIZ (2018): <i>Estudio comparativo de 16 Agencias de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo: Insumos para su análisis y reflexiones</i>	Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, France, Germany, India, Mexico, Peru, Russia, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, UK, US (16)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Actors, responsibilities, flows and roles in the global development system - Basic agency information (historical, mandate, HR structure, legal mandate, autonomy, collaborations, budgets, thematic and regional priorities, country partners) - Specific agency information (knowledge management, transparency and accountability, information system, gender policy, links to other actors, budget accountability, planning, monitoring and evaluation)

⁸ It is not clear when exactly this transition occurred, although more detailed non-DAC donor profiles seem to have begun around 2013.

⁹ The GPI was launched at the 2016 High Level Meeting of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation to bring different development stakeholders together to better situate triangular cooperation given the growing importance of South-South and triangular cooperation. It is spearheaded by a core group that includes Canada, the Islamic Development Bank, Japan, Mexico, the OECD and UNOSSC.

Author and title	Countries and Regions examined	Variables of interest
Programa Iberoamericana Para el Fortalecimiento de la Cooperación Sur-Sur (2014): <i>Diagnostico los Marcos Normativos e institucionales para la gestión de la Cooperación Sur-Sur en los países de Iberoamérica</i>	All Ibero-American countries (22)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Internal and external conditions relevant for SSC motivation - Institutional design - Management structures - Conceptual framework - Regulatory frameworks - Political and strategic vision
IsDB and South Centre (2019): <i>Developing National Ecosystems for South-South and Triangular Cooperation to Achieve Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development</i>	Argentina, Azerbaijan, Brazil, China, Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Nigeria, The State of Palestine, Tunisia, Turkey (13)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Political will - National strategy - National body - Databases - Connected actors - Financing mechanisms - Performance management
Fuchs and Mueller (2019): <i>Democracy and Aid Donorship</i>	94 countries of global North and South	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Year of first provision - Structural provision framework, including name of body, foundation year and potential changes to this administrative structure - Legislative mandate governing development cooperation, including name and year of introduction

Administrative data variables

While the literature points to a range of variables that could proxy administrative features, there is no consensus or robust standard for data collection about these features and their relationship to administrative capacity. This is different for the governance structures and regulatory regimes of Southern providers, where there are both more extensive exposition of their importance and systematic approaches to data collection (See Table 3). This is probably because of a greater consensus on the definitions of structural governance (e.g. agency, inter-governmental coordination) and regulations (e.g. laws, rules, guidance notes) than on the variables contributing to administrative capacity. A forthcoming IsDB report on assessing national ecosystem capacity could offer additional insight into potential administrative variables.¹⁰

The ability to **monitor and evaluate** SSTRC is seen as a valuable administrative feature of Southern providers, so much so that “the establishment of assessment systems appears to be part of a broader process of institutionalization of SSC within the structures of the respective states” (Esteves, 2018: 3). Impact assessment, data collection and evaluation systems are not only useful for ensuring results are achieved. The process of their implementation is thought to enlarge policy spaces and enable local development solutions.

Shared criteria and evaluation and impact assessment procedures are rare across Southern providers, resulting in new efforts to craft acceptable frameworks and indicators. For example, Besharati et al. (2017) suggest a series of indicators designed to capture the quality of South-South cooperation, as identified by progress in processes like inclusive ownership, horizontality, self-reliance and sustainability, accountability and transparency and development efficiency. It is interesting to note that some proposed indicator proxies involve assessment of the institutional architecture of Southern providers. For example, arrangements for dialogue and joint action between different state actors as a proxy for multi-stakeholder participation. Elsewhere, an assessment of the capacity to collect, analyse, simplify and publish data on a regular basis is a proxy for accountability and transparency principles. These indicators underline the connections between Southern providers’ institutional foundations, administrative aspects and aid quality.

¹⁰ The report was expected in the Spring but has not yet been published.

Another proxy for Southern providers' administrative architecture that could be assessed in a survey regards **public communications functions**. Southern providers share a common concern that "their population would not think that expenditure on helping other countries is a wise use of money when their own countries are still facing many development challenges." (UNDP, 2017: 3). Undertaking a qualitative comparative study of China, Brazil, India, the Netherlands, South Africa, South Korea, Turkey, and the United Kingdom, the UNDP study concludes that Southern providers could benefit from institutional architecture that communicates (not just reports) development cooperation policy to domestic audiences. Milani (2019: 12) comes to a similar conclusion, suggesting that SSTRC practices and institutions should be "transparent to national societies" to be viable in the long run. Documenting the prevalence of capacities to inform citizens about SSTRC may therefore be an important benchmark of institutionalisation.

Milani (2019) mentions a final capacity variable relating to the institutional architecture that allows Southern providers to engage and support **non-governmental organisations**. The ability to design systems and mechanisms that support policy dialogue and civil society grant giving is particularly relevant in democratic societies.

7. Assessing the value of a global survey

In addition to reviewing recent literatures that explicitly compare the institutional landscape of Southern development cooperation, this paper aims to understand the value of a global survey on SSTRC institutionalisation. This section summarises the information gleaned in interviews, from informal discussions, and through an online questionnaire sent to Southern officials.

Benefits

Notwithstanding the low number of respondents to our online questionnaire, there was unanimous support for more institutional data on Southern development cooperation. Most respondents supported the idea that such data would be valuable, for its ability to foster shared knowledge, followed by its ability to stimulate innovation and learning, identify future partners and permit benchmarking and comparison (Table 4). This position was reinforced in all of the interviews conducted. Some of these ideas will now be explored further drawing on some of the interviews that complemented the questionnaire.

Comparative opportunities

Interviewees suggested that a systemic approach to SSTRC institutionalisation data collection with global coverage creates opportunities for robust comparisons, offers smaller countries the opportunity to strengthen cooperation in a way that avoids getting “lost in the details” of qualitative narrative information and avoids unfair comparisons with BRICS. Access to a global database may also even out access to information and knowledge about national systems currently accessible only to senior policymakers (often located in Cabinet offices and Ministries of Foreign Affairs), and not necessarily to ministries not privy to high-level policy discussions, often on the frontline of implementation.

Currently, several Southern providers are unofficially directed to DAC peer review reports and missions to gain an understanding of institutional questions and choices. A Southern dataset would provide an alternative source of information, providing an illustrative overview of the status quo, documenting commonalities and differences across providers, and avoiding asking the same questions repeatedly as prospective providers grapple with designing structures, introducing regulations and improving administrative capacities.

Table 4. *Weighted average of respondents' answers to the question: "Please consider why (institutional) data would be valuable?"*

Choices	Weighted Average
It can foster knowledge sharing	4
It can help identify partners	3.75
It can stimulate innovation and internal learning	3.75
It can allow for benchmarking and comparison	3.75
It can improve operational effectiveness	3.5
It can improve transparency and communications	3.5

Notes: Statements were ranked on a five point scale where 0 is strongly disagree and 4 is strongly agree.

Data usefulness

All three types of institutional data (governance, regulatory and administrative capacity data) received high average scores in terms of their usefulness. Nevertheless, regulatory data was the most desired data source. In contrast, interviewees suggested there was more value in capacity-related data, especially knowledge management. There was a general sense that Southern providers are 'under data-gathered' when looking at how to make cooperation work in practice.

Positive spillovers

There was some support for overlapping the results of a global survey on Southern provider institutions with other datasets relating to the characteristics of Southern activities and flows. Such an examination of covariant data could reveal new research frontiers and advance knowledge of unknown trends. For example, triangulating datasets could allow greater understanding of public support for cooperation and its relation to questions of institutional design. At least two interviewees suggested that the act of collecting data can unintentionally draw attention to institutional issues and challenges, which are then subsequently reformed or improved. A survey can therefore be valuable both in terms of data collected and in enhancing awareness of key actors, internal systems and processes.

Challenges

Respondents were asked to select what they saw as the challenges to obtaining Southern providers' institutional data from among seven answer options. Their top-scoring answer related to the fact that institutional data may not necessarily reflect national efforts (see Table 5). Additional responses to this question received in interviews and discussions are explored below.

Political challenges

Multiple sources mentioned that there were likely to be political obstacles to collecting institutional data, especially in Asia where India and China offer distinct models and where their collective size and power may generate reluctance about learning among smaller actors. They also shared the global political challenge of collecting any quantitative statistical information on SSC flows, including defining which body should host the survey. Within this challenging political context, several people reflected that the UN Office of South-South Cooperation would provide the ideal institutional home for a global survey.

There were some concerns about the ability to sustain momentum for a global survey, particularly if a multi-annual exercise is envisioned. Initial enthusiasm can quickly give way to apathy and effort is required to encourage survey sustainability.

Methodological challenges

Respondents were also concerned about whether it is possible to compare Southern countries of differing size and influence. They highlighted the importance of selecting variables that allow for conceptual comparison, even if they must be scaled. Another methodological challenge was the lack of a clear definition of South-South cooperation. As mentioned earlier, provider institutionalisation choices are likely to reflect differences in the ways countries conceive the purpose of SSTRC. Therefore, questions capturing institutional variation will be an implicit reflection of different national norms, perceptions and definitions. The absence of a global definition of South-South development cooperation is not particularly problematic for the task of data collection, as providers can refer to their own definition when assessing their institutional capacities and methods (Di Ciommo, 2017: 8).

Table 5. *Weighted average of respondents’ answers to the question: “Why is it difficult to obtain Southern providers’ institutional data?”*

Choices	Weighted Average
The data does not accurately reflect national effort	1.25
The data is not systematically produced	1.5
Nobody is responsible for collecting such data	1.5
The data is not comparable with other countries/regions	1.5
The data is of poor quality	2
The data is not seen as useful	2.25
The data is produced but not made available	2.75

Notes: Statements were ranked on a five point scale where 0 is true and 4 is false.

Logistical challenges

Beyond these methodological challenges, there are logistical difficulties in mustering the resources to conduct a global survey. Establishing a systematic sampling frame, obtaining officials’ contact details and achieving an adequate response rate can be an uphill struggle for all online elite surveys. The low response rate for this study’s informal online questionnaire highlights some of these difficulties. Obtaining authorization to participate in a global survey may also be challenging if faced with uncomfortable results, even those who agree to participate initially can withdraw their consent. Past experiences (Custer, DiLorenzo, Masaki, Sethi, & Harutyunyan, 2018; Fuchs & Müller, 2018) show that partnerships with institutions possessing relevant expertise and relationships will be critical to launching any global survey on SSTRC institutionalisation. While it may be possible to involve multilateral, regional, bilateral and local civil society, hosting such a survey will require a clear organisational home with the legitimacy and network to reach critical stakeholders.

Decisions also need to be made about whether broad or specific insights are desirable. Survey cognitive burdens can be high and interviewees recommended keeping any survey as short as possible to achieve global coverage. This can limit deeper understanding. The alternative would be to collect a wider range of data from a smaller sample, which does not allow full coverage of all Southern providers, thus limiting comparative analysis. Finally, running a survey can be very costly. The expense usually depends on the target sample size, whether it is to be a one-off or multi-annual exercise, whether translation into multiple languages is required and whether off-the shelf software can be used.

8. Survey framework: possible ways forward

The bulk of this report has reviewed existing literature on Southern providers' comparative institutionalisation.

This has produced an overview of existing literatures, including awareness of their geographic coverage and comprehensiveness; knowledge of the most promising publications for gathering institutional data related to our three variables (governance structures, regulatory data and capacity data), awareness of the relevant sub-categories of capacity data; and a sense of Northern publications that are increasingly gathering institutional data from the South. This review allowed identification of the relevant topics to cover in a future survey. Interviews and questionnaire responses were also an opportunity to reflect on some of the benefits and challenges of a survey.

This section outlines key survey planning considerations, and offers some views on these issues. This section **does not provide a complete survey protocol**, which will be required if a survey is to be implemented. It is rather an illustrative framework for considerations about the design and implementation of a future survey, to inform the decision as to whether or not to undertake a survey.

Survey planning

Sampling frame and data collection

A survey sample must be defined to ensure that each individual in the total population has a measurable chance of selection. However, existing elite surveys of development civil servants recognise the challenge of identifying and obtaining every official's contact details. There is no public register of development officials, which means that designing a systematic sampling frame can be very challenging.

One approach to designing a robust sampling frame involves creating an institutional map of each country's public institutions and positions and relaying this back to an ideal/typical developing country government. This was the approach adopted by Aid Data in their *Listening to Leaders* surveys, where a team of researchers spent nearly two years preparing a sampling frame of approximately 58,000 host government and development partner officials, civil society leaders, private sector representatives, and independent experts from 126 countries (Custer et al., 2018: 71). The task then is to identify specific individuals in similar roles across all countries and obtain their contact details.¹¹ This master sampling frame can then be filtered by country, stakeholder group, and institution type, which allows for granular elite survey data that can be published without compromising participant confidentiality.

An alternative approach would be to design the survey to fill institutionalisation information gaps rather than to obtain a representative sample, as in the Fuchs and Mueller (2019) study. They developed a 10-question questionnaire and sent it to each country's Ministry of Foreign Affairs (or Ministry of Development Cooperation where one existed).

¹¹ This can be a challenging exercise. For example, in the 2018 *Listening to Leaders* survey, 58,000 individuals met the sampling frame inclusion criteria but it was only possible to identify the details of roughly 47,000 individuals and thus only 80% of the sampling frame received the invitation to participate.

If this was unsuccessful despite follow-up e-mails, they e-mailed the questionnaire to another relevant ministry (such as the Ministry of Finance), the respective embassy in Germany (where the study was carried out), or both, depending on the availability of contact details. The research team then contacted the relevant institutions by phone. This procedure allowed them to gather information for 94 countries. Finally, the information was verified and/or supplemented with information gathered from alternative sources. This approach seems better suited to the primary objective of gathering data about the institutional architecture of SSTRC. Such a survey could also build on where this study leaves off, by starting to gather data focusing on countries identified as having established institutional development cooperation apparatus.

Both approaches rely heavily on online data collection. Online elite surveys are known to achieve a low response rate, especially compared to household surveys. Often, online surveys are filtered out or sent to spam inboxes making accessing respondents even more challenging. Nevertheless, for practical reasons this study proposes an online survey, supplemented by subsequent telephone interviews if required.

Length, language and frequency

As data in this sector changes very quickly, this study encourages a multi-annual rather than a one-off survey.

After sampling frame and data collection mode choices have been made, consideration must be given to survey length and its intended regularity. As this is primarily an information-gathering exercise aiming for broad insights rather than rich details, the survey needs to be kept as simple and straightforward as possible. We would encourage an approach that limits the survey to under 20 questions.

As data in this sector changes very quickly, this study encourages a multi-annual rather than a one-off survey. We would also recommend translation into several languages to make it accessible and limit failures to respond arising from linguistic diversity. Care will need to be taken to ensure translation is true to the original version.

Sponsoring organisation and data platforms

A survey of this nature requires strong institutional support to ensure legitimacy and minimize non-response. Many respondents named the UNOSSC as the ideal host given its global remit, its credibility among Southern providers, and its ability to disseminate the survey through its networks. This survey could build on other surveys conducted by UNOSCC. Nevertheless, it is also worth considering partnerships with regional organisations like SEGIB and AUDA-NEPAD, as they currently possess the most robust sources of comparative data on institutionalisation. There may also be scope for partnerships with existing data platforms like the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI), a voluntary multi-stakeholder initiative that works to ensure transparent, quality development data. IATI is flexible enough to be used by many types of providers, and data could be submitted to IATI on a voluntary basis (Di Ciommo, 2017: 13-14). Other partnership options could also create opportunities for knowledge exchange between DAC donors and Southern providers, for example through the Development Cooperation Forum (Esteves, 2018: 2).

Open vs. closed questions

The manner in which questions are asked can greatly affect the result of the surveys. This study argues for a simple, parsimonious multi-annual survey that will not require much time to complete. The goal is to develop a product that systematically gathers comparable data on Southern institutionalisation to add value for and complement the qualitative research of Southern providers. This objective leads towards closed questions focused primarily on information gathering, rather than open questions that seek access to opinions or perceptions. Open questions invite respondents to answer in their own words, while closed questions oblige them to choose from a list of answer choices. Ideas need to be conveyed clearly and questions must be easy to understand to reduce cognitive burdens.

Reviewing and pre-testing

Pre-testing is an essential step in the questionnaire design process to evaluate how people respond. While a sample questionnaire is included in the Annex, it will need further refinement, and significant pre-testing to identify any issues, including confusion about the meaning of questions and misinterpretation of individual terms or concepts. Researchers sometimes also conduct a pilot study using open-ended questions to discover which answers are more common and then develop closed-ended questions that include the most common responses as possible answers (Pew Research Centre, 2020). This process aims to ensure the right questions are being asked using the right vocabulary, in order to provide comparative data on institutionalisation.

Data gathering to plug information gaps

Section 5 listed five publications that could be used to gather institutional data. While this study encourages including questions covering all dimensions of interest in the questionnaire, Table 6 presents the variables where there may be opportunities to scrape data and plug any gaps in order to ensure consistency and collection of the most recent data possible.

9. Conclusion

This report provides a preliminary understanding of the literatures and views relating to a global survey of SStrC institutionalisation.

The findings of this study argue convincingly in favour of the value of a survey. Understanding how Southern actors institutionalise development cooperation may have a direct impact on delivering Agenda 2030.

Post BAPA+40, there is a promising global mandate to collect data about Southern providers' governance structures, regulatory systems and administrative features, and unmet demand for robust comparative data. Potential considerations for the design and implementation of a future survey have also been put forward.

The findings of this study argue convincingly in favour of the value of a survey. Understanding how Southern actors institutionalise development cooperation may have a direct impact on delivering Agenda 2030. Most importantly, it could help countries making critical institutional choices to design systems and structures to implement development cooperation from an understanding of the full spectrum of options in the Global South. Secondly, the resulting database could be linked to other data sources to triangulate the relationship between Southern institutional architecture and other important political and policy variables. This could strengthen the evidence supporting certain institutional choices over others. Thirdly, a survey project of this nature could grow the community of Southern scholarship interested in questions of institutionalisation, by linking to other survey, qualitative and project data and UNOSSC research, and also by contributing empirical data. Finally, a global database on the institutional aspects of Southern cooperation can complement current DAC efforts to document SStrC institutions, to enabling better coverage and a greater depth of understanding of Southern institutions. Anchoring data creation in Southern institutions is a way to ensure that the South is actively engaged in its own knowledge and data creation. It also displays good faith and demonstrates willingness to embrace the principles of evidence and transparency that build trust.

Challenges remain, and a global exercise of this scale will need further refinement and resources. This report aims to advance this ambition by identifying state of the art policy and academic literature on questions of institutionalisation. In doing so, it provides insights into potential data sources and conceptual categories that could be useful in any future survey.

Table 6. *Potential sources of data gathering*

Dimensions of institutionalisation	Variables of interest	Source
Governance structures	Name of current leading development cooperation institution	<i>Fuchs and Mueller (2019); AMEXCID and GIZ (2018); IsDB and South Centre (2019)</i>
	Year responsibility assumed by leading institution	<i>Fuchs and Mueller (2019); AMEXCID and GIZ (2018); IsDB and South Centre (2019)</i>
	Previous leading development cooperation institution	<i>Fuchs and Mueller (2019); AMEXCID and GIZ (2018)</i>
	Year responsibility assumed by previous leading institution	<i>Fuchs and Mueller (2019)</i>
	Affiliation of leading agency	<i>Piefer and Vega (2014); Programa Iberoamericana Para el Fortalecimiento de la Cooperación Sur-Sur (2014);</i>
	Ministries involved in development cooperation	<i>Piefer and Vega (2014); AMEXCID and GIZ (2018); Programa Iberoamericana Para el Fortalecimiento de la Cooperación Sur-Sur (2014);</i>
	Name of body coordinating development cooperation across government	<i>Piefer and Vega (2014); Programa Iberoamericana Para el Fortalecimiento de la Cooperación Sur-Sur (2014);</i>
Regulatory	Name of legislation currently governing development cooperation	<i>Fuchs and Mueller (2019); AMEXCID and GIZ (2018); Programa Iberoamericana Para el Fortalecimiento de la Cooperación Sur-Sur (2014);</i>
	Year that legislation was implemented	<i>Fuchs and Mueller (2019); Programa Iberoamericana Para el Fortalecimiento de la Cooperación Sur-Sur (2014);</i>
	Current development cooperation strategy	<i>Piefer and Vega (2014); IsDB and South Centre (2019)</i>
	Gender policy in place	<i>AMEXCID and GIZ (2018)</i>
Administrative features	Knowledge management systems	<i>IsDB and South Centre (2019)</i>
	Monitoring and evaluation capacity	<i>AMEXCID and GIZ (2018); IsDB and South Centre (2019)</i>

Annex. Sample questionnaire

This survey aims to understand the governance structures, regulatory regimes and administrative features of Southern cooperation providers. It seeks to establish a set of baseline data that can be reviewed and published annually.

The information you provide will be treated confidentially, stored securely and comply with General Data Protection Regulations.

Your participation is voluntary and consent can be withdrawn at any time.

If you revoke your consent, we will not include your answers in our results and you will incur no consequences or penalties.

By clicking below, you agree to the terms of the study and voluntarily agree to participate in this survey. (Checkbox)

If you consent to participate, please answer the following questions.

There are approximately 20 questions and the survey should take around 10 minutes.

Question	Possible answers	Type of question
1. What kind of national organisation do you represent?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent development agency A separate development agency overseen by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs A development unit within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Ministry of Foreign Affairs-capital city Ministry of Foreign Affairs-embassy or overseas mission Ministry of Planning Ministry of Finance/Commerce Other ministry (e.g. health, education, environment, etc.) Special national development fund Presidential/Cabinet office Other 	Closed-tick one
2. Please enter the name of the country you represent.	-	Open-ask to type in country
Part 1: Governance structures		
Questions in this section aim to define the governance structures in your country.		
3. Does your country have at least one organisation providing development cooperation to other countries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, it has at least one organisation Yes, it has between 2-5 organisations Yes, it has between 6-10 organisations Yes, it has between 11-15 organisations Yes, it has more than 15 organisations No I don't know. 	Closed-tick one
4. In your country, which government organisation is the leading institution responsible for development cooperation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completely independent development agency A separate development agency overseen by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs The Ministry of Foreign Affairs The Ministry of Planning The Ministry of Finance/Trade Another ministry (e.g. education, environment, etc.) Special development fund Presidential/Cabinet office Other There is no leading institution 	Closed-tick one

Question	Possible answers	Type of question
5. What year did this organisation take the lead on development?	-	Open-ask to type in year and invite clarification if required OR Closed- present years in 1/2 decade bands
6. What are the responsibilities of this leading administrative organisation?	Policy and agenda setting Implementation Cross-government coordination Multilateral engagement Setting budgetary allocations for development spending Communicating with the public Reporting results Monitoring and evaluation Managing aid (ODA) inflows Triangular cooperation Other	Closed-tick all that apply
7. Which organisation is primarily responsible for coordinating development cooperation across the entire government?	Completely independent development agency A separate development agency overseen by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs The Ministry of Foreign Affairs The Ministry of Planning The Ministry of Finance/Trade Another ministry (e.g. education, environment, etc.) Special development fund Presidential/Cabinet office Other Nobody is responsible I don't know	Closed-tick one

Part 2: Regulatory regimes

The questions in this section aim to define the regulations, guidelines and strategies governing development cooperation in your country.

8. Does your country have a national law on development cooperation?	Yes No Maybe I don't know	Closed-tick one
9. If you answered yes to question 8, in which year was this legislation introduced?	-	Open-ask to type in year and invite clarification if required OR Closed- present years in 1/2 decade bands
10. Does your country have strategies, rules or guidelines on development cooperation in the following areas:	Definition of what is included in development cooperation Monitoring and evaluating results Staff performance National plans and vision Partnerships e.g. civil society, triangular, private sector Transparency and public communications Budgetary allocations Triangular cooperation Social (e.g. gender) and environmental safeguards	Closed-tick all that apply

Question	Possible answers	Type of question
Part 3: Administrative features		
Questions in this section aim to define administrative features in your country.		
<i>(a) General questions about current SSTRC activities and methods</i>		
11. How does your country implement development policy?	Project-type interventions	Closed-tick all that apply
	Budget support	
	Core contributions to multilateral institutions	
	Core contributions to NGOs, private bodies, PPPs and research institutions	
	Contributions to specific funds and programmes	
	Technical assistance e.g. sending consultants, volunteers, researchers, personnel	
	Scholarships and training for overseas nationals	
	Debt relief	
	Trade and investment promotion	
	Refugee support	
	Humanitarian assistance	
	Peacekeeping	
Triangular cooperation		
Other		
12. How is development cooperation provided?	Grants	Closed-tick all that apply
	Concessional loans	
	Non-concessional loans	
	In-kind support (e.g. equipment, goods, supplies, etc.)	
	Knowledge and expertise (e.g. secondments, consultants)	
	Equity	
	Guarantees	
	Preferential trade and investment arrangements	
	Other_____	
I don't know		
13. Who funds the national budget for overseas development cooperation?	Taxpayers through allocation by national state budget	Closed-select top five in descending order
	United Nations institutions (e.g. UNDP, IBSA Trust Fund, etc.)	
	Bretton Woods institutions (e.g. World Bank, IMF, IFC, etc.)	
	Regional development banks (e.g. IsDB, AfDB, IDB, AsDB, AIIB, etc.)	
	DAC bilateral donors	
	Southern bilateral providers	
	Philanthropic foundations	
	Private sector	
	Other national actors	
	Other international partners	
I don't know		
<i>(b) Staffing and decentralisation</i>		
14. Approximately how many staff work on development in the administrative body leading overseas cooperation?	0	Closed-tick one of offered bands
	1-5	
	6-20	
	21-100	
	101-250	
	More than 250	
	I cannot estimate	

Question	Possible answers	Type of question
15. Approximately what percentage of the staff identified in the previous question are located in countries receiving development cooperation?	0-10%	Closed-tick one band
	11-25%	
	26-50%	
	51-75%	
	76-100%	
	I cannot estimate	
16. When staff are located in countries receiving development cooperation, where are they primarily based?	The embassy	Closed-tick one band
	A specialist office	
	An institutional partner	
	At a recipient government body	
	Other	
<i>(c) Specific tasks and their location</i>		
17. Does the leading organisation responsible for development have a designated unit with the following responsibilities?	Monitoring and evaluating projects and programmes	Closed-click, yes, no, maybe, I don't know for each one.
	Knowledge management	
	Communicating SSTRC activities to the public	
	Funding non-governmental activities	
	Triangular cooperation	
18. If the leading development organisation does not have any of the above responsibilities, do other government departments/bodies have responsibility for each of the following?	Monitoring and evaluating projects and programmes	Closed-click, yes, no, maybe, I don't know for each one.
	Knowledge management	
	Communicating SSTRC activities to the public	
	Funding non-governmental activities	
	Triangular cooperation	

References

- AMEXCID-GIZ. (2019). Estudio comparativo de 16 Agencias de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo : Insumos para su análisis y reflexiones. Retrieved from https://www.gob.mx/cms/uploads/attachment/file/474927/Estudio_Compartivo_Agencias_de_Cooperaci_n-comprimido.pdf
- Asmus, G., Fuchs, A., & Müller, A. (2017). BRICS and Foreign Aid. In *BRICS and the Global Economy* (pp. 1–55). World Scientific.
- Benn, J., & Luijckx, W. (2017). Emerging providers' international co-operation for development, (April). Retrieved from <http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/content/workingpaper/15d6a3c7-en>
- Besharati, N., Rawhani, C., & Rios, O. G. (2017). A Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for South-South Cooperation. *NEST Africa Working Paper*, (March).
- Custer, S., DiLorenzo, M., Masaki, T., Sethi, T., & Harutyunyan, A. (2018). Listening to Leaders 2018 Is development cooperation tuned-in or tone-deaf?, (May). Retrieved from http://docs.aiddata.org/ad4/pdfs/Listening_To_Leaders_2018.pdf
- DAC. (2019). Development Cooperation Report 2019.
- Devex. (2018). Emerging Donors 2.0.
- Di Ciommo, M. (2017). Approaches to measuring and monitoring South-South cooperation. *Development Initiatives*, (February), 2–3. Retrieved from <http://devinit.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Approaches-to-measuring-and-monitoring-South-South-cooperation.pdf>
- Esteves, P. (2018). How Governments of the South assess the results of South-South Cooperation: Case studies of South-led approaches. *DCF Policy Brief* (Vol. 20).
- Farazmand, A. (1991). *Handbook of Comparative and Development Public Administration*. New York: Dekker.
- Farazmand, A. (1996). Development and Comparative Public Administration: Past, Present, and Future. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 20(3), 343–364.
- Fuchs, A., & Müller, A. (2018). Democracy and Aid Donorship.
- Global Partnership on Effective Development Cooperation. (2019). *Triangular Co-operation in the Era of the 2030 Agenda*.
- Islamic Development Bank, & South Centre. (2019). *Developing National Ecosystems for South-South and Triangular Cooperation 2030 to Achieve 2030 for Sustainable Development*.
- Lauria, V., & Fumagalli, C. (2019). BRICS, the southern model, and the evolving landscape of development assistance: Toward a new taxonomy. *Public Administration and Development*, 39(4–5), 215–230. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.1851>
- Milani, C. (2019). Revitalizing Global Partnerships for Sustainable Development: Challenges in the Implementation of SDG 17 through South-south and Trilateral Cooperation in Brazil, China, India, Mexico, South Africa and Turkey.
- OECD. (2019). *Enabling Effective Triangular Cooperation*. OECD Development Policy Papers.
- Peters, B. G. (1994). Theory and methodology in the study of comparative public administration. In R. Baker (Ed.), *Comparative public management: putting US public policy and implementation in context*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Pew Research Centre. (2020). Questionnaire design. Retrieved June 15, 2020, from <https://www.pewresearch.org/methods/u-s-survey-research/questionnaire-design/>
- Piefer, N., & Vega, B. (2014). Experiences of Middle Income Countries in International Development Cooperation. Joint publication by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) and the Agencia Mexicana de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo (AMEXCID).
- Programa Iberoamericano para el Fortalecimiento de la Cooperación Sur-Sur. (2015). *Strengthening of South-South Cooperation for Implementing Triangular Cooperation in Ibero-America*.
- Programa Iberoamericano para el Fortalecimiento de la Cooperación Sur-Sur. (2014). *Diagnóstico de los marcos normativos e institucionales para la gestión de la Cooperación Sur-Sur en los países de Iberoamérica* (Vol. No. 6). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Quadir, F. (2013). Rising donors and the new narrative of “South-South” cooperation: What prospects for changing the landscape of development assistance programmes? *Third World Quarterly*, 34(2), 321–338.
- Riggs, F. (1991). *Public Administration: A Comparativist Framework*. *Public Administration Review*, 51(6), 473–477.
- Riggs, F. W. (1970). Introduction. In F. Riggs (Ed.), *Frontiers of Development Administration* (pp. 3–37). Durham: Duke University Press.
- Santander, G., & Alonso, J. A. (2018). Perceptions, identities and interests in South – South cooperation: the cases of Chile, Venezuela and Brazil. *Third World Quarterly*, 65(9), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2017.1396533>
- Scheuren, F. (2004). What is a Survey? *American Statistical Association*.
- Secretaría General Iberoamericana. (2018). *Report on South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America*.
- Secretaría General Iberoamericana. (2019). *Report on South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America 2019*. Report. Madrid.
- Sigelman, L. (1976). In search of comparative administration. *Public Administration Review*, 36(6), 612–621.
- UN General Assembly. (2017). *State of South South cooperation*. Report of the Secretary General, 13446 (August).

UN General Assembly. (2018). *State of South-South cooperation Report of the Secretary-General Summary*. New York.

UN General Assembly. (2019) *Buenos Aires outcome document of the second High-level United Nations Conference on South-South Cooperation*.

UNDP. (2017). *Communicating Development Cooperation to Domestic Audiences*. Retrieved from <http://www.cn.undp.org/content/china/en/home/library/south-south-cooperation/communicating-development-cooperation-to-domestic-audiences.html>

UNDP. (2019). *First African South-South Cooperation Report*.

UNDP, & Chinese Academy of International Trade and Economic Cooperation. (2016). *Mix and Match? How Countries Deliver Development Cooperation and Lessons for China*.

UNESCAP. (2018). *South-South Cooperation in Asia and the Pacific – A brief overview*.

United Nations. (2019). *Financing for Sustainable Development Report 2019*. Inter-agency Task Force on Financing for Development. New York.

UNOSSC. (2019). *South-South Cooperation Coherence in a Complex Assistance Framework for Development - The Case of Nigeria*.



United Nations
Office for South-South Cooperation

