Dialogue 6: Modes, ideas and innovations for cooperation beyond ODA

To create a new system of international cooperation which is stable, efficient and consistent with the shifts in world politics, it is necessary to establish new visions and perspectives, as well as new modalities and instruments of cooperation to fill the emerging new structures with life. We would like to explore ideas, tools and innovations which could contribute to achieving sustainable development in a setting beyond or post-ODA. How do conventional approaches have to change and be adapted, and which alternative modes of cooperation can be developed? What are the roles of different actors, such as the private sector, regional development banks and civil society? What might be innovative instruments for sharing knowledge on and solutions to development challenges and how can we join forces to secure and provide important public goods?

The discussion was held between *Citlali Ayala Martínez*, Research Professor at Instituto Mora, *Semih Boyaci*, Co-Founder of Impact Hub Istanbul, *Riad Ragueb Ahmed*, Manager ‘Reverse Linkages’ at the Islamic Development Bank (IsDB), and *Ulrich Wehnert*, Head of Section Governance and Human Rights, Division for Global Affairs at GIZ. It was facilitated by both editors of this publication: *Ulrich Müller*, Senior Advisor to GIZ’s projects on knowledge sharing, networks, southern development cooperation agencies and trilateral cooperation, and *Juliane Kolsdorf*, Senior Policy Advisor at GIZ’s Corporate Development unit.¹⁰⁸

Citlali, having worked for several years as a researcher at Instituto Mora and being a member of global and regional think tank networks, you have been investigating new forms of cooperation, the role of Mexico as a southern provider, triangular cooperation, networks and funds, as well as knowledge sharing. What are your most outstanding findings in that research?

Citlali Ayala: At the Network of Southern Think Tanks (NeST)¹⁰⁹, we are currently working on strengthening our regional chapter in Latin America in order

108 For better distinction from the discussants, the inputs and questions by the facilitators are displayed in italic without naming the respective person.

109 NeST was established on the sidelines of the first high-level meeting of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) in Mexico in April

to further research what is happening with South-South and triangular cooperation, and what think tanks can contribute to this discussion. We are aware of the current situation, moving away from ODA and no longer being full recipients, and the challenges of becoming a southern provider. As a southern think tank, Instituto Mora has participated in specific studies like the ‘Decalogue’ for improving South-South and triangular cooperation in the Meso-American region¹¹⁰ through a workshop on inter-agency coordination. There are other opportunities besides traditional development cooperation, for example working on intra-institutional coordination and improving the mobilisation of technical and financial resources. There, we could see that the private sector is playing an important role and is becoming a stronger partner, for instance through public-private partnerships for development, with initiatives like the Mexico-Germany Alliance for Sustainability or the Mexican Alliance for Haiti. The above initiatives include projects where convergence between technical cooperation, financial cooperation and capacity building has been encouraged, as well as processes of gradual partner ownership. Research has also shown that, at least in the Meso-American region and in Central America, development cooperation can be beneficial not only for development but also for regional integration. Finally, given the sensitive matter of migration, we can see today that governance and security issues rank highly on the current agenda for development cooperation.

Riad, the Reverse Linkages Programme¹¹¹ is quite outstanding for multilateral banks. As far as I know, it is the only one that focuses on triangular cooperation, on knowledge sharing. From this practice and your observations, what is your vision for the future?

Riad Ragueb Ahmed: When you see what is going on now, such as the trade tensions between US and China, the spread of coronavirus, and other global trends, the vision for the future is blurred. However, based on my experience working with 57 countries from the Global South at different levels of

2014, and as a follow-up to the Conference of Southern Providers held in Delhi in April 2013. Its purpose is to provide a global platform for southern think tanks to collaboratively generate, systematise, consolidate and share knowledge on South-South cooperation approaches in international development. For more information, see: <http://southernthinktanks.org/index.html> (15.04.2020).

110 Decálogo de Cooperación Sur-Sur y Triangular en Mesoamérica, see: https://www.mx.undp.org/content/dam/mexico/docs/Publicaciones/Publicaciones_GobernabilidadDemocratica/Decalogo_Digital_2019.pdf (15.04.2020).

111 Reverse Linkage is a technical cooperation mechanism introduced by the IsDB to facilitate South-South and Triangular Cooperation and knowledge exchange amongst IsDB member countries.

development, I would like to highlight three points that need to be kept in mind when we think ‘beyond ODA’.

First, the dual role of each country. I believe that all countries in the South can be recipients and providers of knowledge and solutions. I prefer to use the term of ‘solution’ rather than ‘knowledge’ because it is more inclusive and comprehensive than knowledge. And here I will be provocative – the North should also accept having this dual role, particularly in being a recipient and not only a provider of solutions. The North needs to have a paradigm shift and accept receiving solutions coming from the South or to partner with the South in providing to others collaboratively. So, all countries in the world should embrace this dual role. Of course, the degree and magnitude of a country’s role as a recipient and provider may vary. Some countries may be more active as recipients, others more providers. But this paradigm shift in the mindset of all countries and governments to take on that dual role is important. We should not assume that developmental solutions or knowledge are only a privilege of a group of countries. They can be available in all countries at various levels in different degrees.

Point number two: Nowadays, the divide between the North and South needs to be transcended. Many emerging countries from the South will be among the largest economies of the world within the next few years. We have to elevate and strengthen the North-South / South-South cooperation by enhancing triangular cooperation, where each partner brings something to the table. It is a partnership among equals. All the partners – the financier, the recipient and the knowledge provider – should be considered as equals, and the approach of imposing conditionalities because one side has the resources and the other side has the need should be abandoned.

And my last point which I consider as a crucial element while talking about ODA and beyond, is the necessity of having adequate institutional arrangements. To play an effective role in development cooperation and fully benefit from it, each country needs to take the lead at the national level and put in place relevant institutional arrangements or a national ecosystem. We did a study that was published in September 2019 in the margin of the UN General Assembly¹¹². This study identified a set of pillars that can be considered by the countries for their institutional arrangements related to development cooperation. We are currently advocating for and encouraging each country to enhance its national capacity to manage South-South and triangular cooperation and ODA.

Ulrich, you have vast experience on global projects and global networks, which is an important and interesting point of view when we look at the issue of going beyond ODA. What are your ideas and comments on our topic?

Ulrich Wehnert: If we really move beyond ODA, we should leave development behind us, this connotation of development, this concept of development. For me, moving beyond ODA entails us beginning a new game: new actors, new principles and a new attitude. I very much agree with Riad when he said that we should all be providers and recipients. That is right and even our minister for development says Germany is a developing country to underline the universal approach of the 2030 Agenda.

Still then, thinking in terms of providers and recipients is an old concept of development, and moving beyond ODA, in my view, would mean that each country is a provider. There are no recipients. We all provide to something, and it is not development, it is sustainability. That would be my hope, at least. I do not know what this new system could look like, but if we really would like to meet on an equal footing, we need an exchange that goes beyond just dialogue to knowledge sharing, to co-creation. I think you can only co-create if all actors involved provide something. If you have a provider-recipient relationship, you are not on an equal footing. These are my 20 years of experience, and I am really frustrated about this. You can also try to work around this and find new methods and approaches to overcome the provider-recipient dogma; but, in the end, in a new world beyond ODA, I do hope that we are all providers, providing ideas and co-creating approaches to global sustainability.

Semih, you probably represent the most exceptional organisation in our discussion. With the Impact Hubs, a new type of organisation is arising. If we take up what Ulrich has said, that we need to initiate a new game, do you have models for that game? What should we take care of? What should we keep in mind when discussing going beyond ODA?

Semih Boyaci: First of all, I will briefly explain what we do as Impact Hubs¹¹³. We are a global network of social innovators and social entrepreneurs, which is now active in 102 locations around the world. Each Impact Hub is a co-working space for social innovators and social entrepreneurs, impacting on individuals and on organisations. But it is much more than a space. All these people coming together as a global community are creating positive impact on society via their projects or start-ups. And we, as Impact Hub teams, organise and support programmes to empower these people to have a further impact. In addition

113 For further details, see Semih's contribution on the Impact Hub network in this publication.

to having spaces around the world and organising events, we develop a lot of content that empowers social leaders.

On your question, I would like to start with the SDG Agenda. In order to achieve the goals that we have for 2030, making existing models better is not enough at all. It is required, but we also need new models; and social entrepreneurs do exactly that: they create new models that can use existing resources in a more sustainable way. For example, consider that we have one-third of all the food wasted globally, and yet we have so much hunger in the world. Social entrepreneurs create models that use food waste to create more nourishment. What they do is particularly inspirational, and it is already showing that each country is a provider. Today, Turkey is considered a developing country and it has not graduated yet. But this social venture was developed here. It takes the food waste from producers and retailers to food banks, so that they help a lot of people in need. Now, they are establishing the same system in Germany and Italy.

This shows that South-North cooperation is already happening at the grass-roots level. But it needs to be transferred to existing systems so that more resources can flow into innovation and new models. The problem is that resources are not moving as fast here because it is considered risky. But even if only one out of ten social entrepreneurs is successful, this creates a huge impact because they find that critical gap in the system and develop a model based on this. We should also have capacity for supporting new impact-driven models, as we do for developing existing models. And these should go hand in hand. There are many inspiring examples of social ventures that are creating significant impact globally, especially from developing countries. As Impact Hub, we support these people and accelerate their ventures, so that they exponentially increase their impact. A good example of this is 'Accelerate2030', a global Impact Acceleration Programme where we select impact ventures that contribute to the SDGs and help them scale globally, particularly in developing countries. I had personally been enrolled in the Turkey chapter of this programme three years ago and one start-up in that programme cohort (Whole Surplus) was selected as the best social venture in Europe by the European Investment Bank last year. There is great potential and there is no difference between North and South at the grassroots level, in my opinion.

Based on your inputs, I would like to propose four topics and one question for our dialogue. First, the dual role of countries and the partnership among equals; second, the linkage and relationships between development and other policy areas like security or migration; third, the flow of resources; and fourth, the role of the private sector. Finally, if we leave traditional development co-operation behind us and begin a new game, what would that be?

Let us start with the terminology. We heard that all countries should have a dual role. We need partnership among equals, go beyond this divide between North and South and everyone should be a provider. At the same time, we live in a world where everybody is programmed to broadcast her or his views but only few are really listening. So, I wonder if it is good to have only providers. Isn't there also a need to have those who are ready to receive, in a sense of listening and learning, and to understand 'recipient' as an active role? Not in an attitude of demand and gratitude, like "Please do that for me and I will not take up the responsibility". Should we not rethink what it means to be a recipient? What do you think?

Riad Ragueb Ahmed: Sometimes, the energy and effort that we lose in terminology take us far from the action on the ground. We have to keep in mind that five years have already passed since the adoption of the SDGs. And we are still debating about how we can finance the SDGs. In the meantime, climate change and other issues are not awaiting.

For me, the most important focus is the previously highlighted dual role with the fundamental principle of partnership among equals. This also implies that we respect the demand, needs and context of each country. We listen to each other while doing business in development. All of us, as equal partners, North and South, should look for solutions. The nature of the solutions and how they fit the context of each country will vary depending on each situation, but we should join our efforts. We should reconsider on how to deal with that, how to work together hand in hand. It may be idealistic but accepting this dual role for all countries in the world would, for me, be a first step. I also like Ulrich's point on sustainability a lot. Yes, we must join our efforts for sustainable solutions.

Citlali Ayala: From a 'beyond ODA' point of view, I would like to add that ODA is official, and if you talk about the dual role of countries, countries are considered to be governments. But currently, we are discussing development in our countries with a participatory approach, with a multi-stakeholder approach and with multiple actors, plurality and inclusiveness. Possibly at this point it is possible to glimpse that official development aid will at some point become obsolete as we have known it for decades. Recent debates on development aid and the discussion of alternative terms such as the TOSSD show that it is not possible to conceive of official development aid without the new providers from the South, the private sector and remittances. Economic dynamics and sustainable development, in their broad understanding, require broader and more inclusive concepts that translate into equally inclusive financial instruments and cooperation policies. Current ODA discussions cannot exclude other actors anymore, like social or private actors. It is true that this is changing, but maybe too slowly.

In the last few years, I have been thinking that instead of becoming complete donors, middle-income countries should advocate this duality, because we as middle-income countries can enhance and improve the capacity to receive development cooperation, which is not aid, and provide better development cooperation. So, as dual countries, we can sophisticate and improve the capacity to manage development cooperation. In specific initiatives, like the programme that the German government has on institutional strengthening with the Mexican development agency AMEXCID and the different projects within that initiative, I have the perception that the equality among partners is in political dialogue, sharing methodologies and sharing different approaches. So, as a Mexican, I think that we are listened to and we can build an equal development solution in different aspects for Germans, for example.

In terms of what Mexico is doing with Central America on issues like migration and others, this equal dialogue can be deepened further. Duality among North and South and South and South requires a horizontal dialogue. I repeat constantly to my students that this recipient-donor approach is obsolete and this North and South approach is used less. 'Development partners' can be a stronger term, and it has already been used by some countries, instead of talking of recipients. 'Recipient' has a passive connotation.

Riad Ragueb Ahmed: Just to build on that: when we talk about the dual role, particularly at the receiving end, we have to make sure that the relevant institutional arrangements to absorb the solution, and to adapt it to the local context exist. The right legal framework, supporting policies and regulations as well as adequate capacity should be put in place to allow each country to play this role effectively. Without these arrangements resources and funds will be wasted. It is of paramount importance to strengthen the human and institutional capacities in each country to play these dual roles.

Citlali Ayala: Maybe we can support the term 'beneficiary' instead of 'recipient'. That could be something to think about.

Related to the partnerships among equals: in the studies conducted by the Overseas Development Institute during the first stage of our project, regional or global programmes were quoted as a good way to continue partnerships, also in a post-ODA setting. How is the division of roles in these programmes? Is it any different from bilateral programmes? I was just wondering: if there are more players, are they also more equal?

Ulrich Wehnert: Definitely. In my experience, if you are meeting on a global issue, if you meet with countries from the global South and North, coming together in, let us say, Bangkok, you are on an equal footing. You invited the experts from the global community, and it does not matter if they come from Germany, Togo or Indonesia. You invited the experts with their expertise and

that should be the standard. And that could be an approach for going beyond ODA.

ODA means Official Development Assistance. Germany has to live up to its promises and commitments and spend two or three billion each year to the South. This makes it very difficult to achieve true partnership ambition. If you give money as a donor, there will be a receiver. That is ODA; that is the system. All of us do not like it, but the logic of the system, in the end, finds its way into our mindsets. But the global cooperation dimension is: you meet, you come to a dialogue, you share knowledge, and you very often come to co-creation models. And I do hope that beyond ODA, we will have a partnership among equals. My hypothesis is that in a world beyond ODA, you will have countries that are mature, that have resources, and there will not be the question of who has the money. All countries will have the money and the resources to meet. And that, in my understanding, is the precondition for meeting on an equal footing. Everyone puts money on the table, not the same amount, but everyone contributes something. That is the difference to ODA.

Semih, how does that sound to you? Is it an old discussion which you are simply beyond?

Semih Boyaci: I do not have a background in the internal structures of development organisations, but I will comment based on general observations about South-North relationships. In every kind of environment, with all kinds of stakeholders I see locally and globally, one of the main things we lack is that we do not do much to bring different stakeholders together. We do not focus much on extracting the shared wisdom in those groups and investigating facilitation models. This is, in general, the problem I see when I go to big conferences and workshops. There are nice connections one-to-one, but overall, there is a lack of participatory models that bring together different agendas in co-creation settings.

With regard to your question, in the last few years we have started to see more funding being allocated to entrepreneurial activities that support North-South collaboration. And on this front, I think it is quite hopeful that development organisations will start to allocate funding to programmes like Accelerate2030. For instance, that programme has been developed by Impact Hub Geneva, together with UNDP. The funding reinforced new ideas and models, from particularly the emerging countries that have the potential to create an impact in both the South and North in all countries. UNDP saw the potential, with the Impact Hub global team, that innovations that can contribute to a more sustainable world could come particularly from emerging and developing countries. Considering the impact created by the ventures that joined that programme, this is a really good case to show the potential of countries that are normally perceived as recipients. These countries have the ability to create these models.

That is where there is most potential, and hopefully we will have more initiatives like that in the future.

Let us move on to our next topic, the relation between policy areas. Ulrich, based on your experience with global projects: when we are discussing global networks, they often have a specific topic. Are other actors taking this seriously – the Ministry of Economic Affairs, the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Defence – when development actors are working on these issues? Or is there still a strong divide between the policy areas and do we remain in a niche? What is the change going on with regard to this kind of policy coherence, which may be needed to achieve the SDGs?

Ulrich Wehnert: My observation is that over the last five, maybe ten years our rhetoric has changed, and we do talk about linking those fields: development, peace and security, climate and foreign policy. All of this is stressed in daily speeches. However, in reality, many of us, be it state actors, be it implementing agencies, be it civil society, be it think tanks, are looking into their own silos. In the end, it is a fight about resources in various organisations concerning certain subjects. In this way, to my understanding, we have not yet achieved the 2030 Agenda, which has tasked us with finding a way to cross sectors and to link fields. We are still searching for ways to implement the complexity of the 2030 Agenda. To be positive, we are thinking about this much more than we did in the past. But again, we have not found a good approach yet.

Riad, how are you dealing with that in the Islamic Development Bank? For instance, you have so many member countries where security issues are a big topic. How far do you get into these policy areas with your work, with something like ‘reverse linkages’?

Riad Ragueb Ahmed: I fully agree with what Ulrich said. In our case, we are ‘mainstreaming’ these cross-sectoral or thematic issues such as climate change, women empowerment, youth empowerment and building resilience in our operations. It is not an easy exercise because it is multidimensional. As a development bank, we have put in place policies on many of these issues, such as a climate change, woman empowerment, etc to properly guide every single intervention. When it comes to fragile states, it is even more complex because most of the time you do not even have fully-functioning governments in place. We are conscious of it. We are doing our best but there is no one single ‘miracle’ solution. The important point here is that there is now an awareness on a global level that those issues have to be mainstreamed and considered in every single action.

Citlali, do you have examples that could be inspiring in this process of change that we are heading for, but that apparently, we have not reached yet?

Citlali Ayala: I will mention the Plan for Integral Development in Central America, which is supported by the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC). It is executed mostly by AMEXCID with national and international funds, it aims to reduce poverty and foster development, and also tries to diminish migration from Central America, i.e. undocumented immigrants from Central America going to the United States through Mexico. Personally, I find this Plan has really changed AMEXCID's recent way of working and it is its current priority. The news show officers from AMEXCID going to the southern border every week to implement specific actions of the programs that include the Integral Plan, register beneficiaries, offer jobs and send money through diplomatic channels. At the same time, the Mexican government is trying to replicate a brand-new national initiative called 'youth building the future' in the region. This initiative tries to create jobs in Central American countries and to provide the population in poverty with better conditions, so that they stop leaving their countries.

A possible constraint I see is that the original programme, the original initiative in Mexico, has had only one year of implementation. It has not been tested nor proved to be successful yet. In Mexico, the original programme follows an assistance approach; the government gave money directly to young people and they worked in a small enterprise on temporary jobs. I do not want to criticise the programme because it is brand new, but I was really concerned that it was replicated in Central America that soon. In addition, the programme will develop other initiatives in Central America with 30 million USD for each country, i.e. for Guatemala, for Honduras and for El Salvador. This means that it has been designed for the long term, but I still wonder if it will also be sustainable in the long term and where the money is going to come from. Alicia Barcena, the (Mexican) Executive Secretary of ECLAC, is very engaged and has already called for a donors' meeting in Mexico City. It is a different form of creating a regional fund for Central America.

Perhaps, Semih, in this initiative on 'youth building the future', Mexico should work with the Impact Hub?

Semih Boyaci: Yes, why not! I have a separate addition to this. As you know, migration is also a big issue in Turkey because of the war in Syria. There has been huge funding from the EU delegation, around 3 billion EUR, to developmental organisations working in Turkey. GIZ is one, but the World Bank, UNDP and other UN organisations, KfW and others are also disseminating this funding to the projects and partners they have here. There are around four million refugees in Turkey. It has been more than five years since this funding was distributed and at first it was more focused on aid but now, after a long time, it is moving more in the direction of livelihoods.

And this is also an example of how things still work in silos and why there is a lack of innovation in the use of this funding. When this funding is being distributed, big organisations are almost the only ones eligible because there is a financial and organisational capacity issue. That is one of the problems that I see, because it means that mediocre projects get the big funding, and some of the projects implemented do not create results. They perhaps tick the checklists in the audit, but they do not create a real impact in the field. There are so many people implementing all these programmes, it has become a bit like an industry. For me, this is one of the major problems that I see in Turkey. New organisations that want to do new things cannot get access to these funds. We as Impact Hub can get them because we worked and invested a lot on this, and now we have more capacity. But a lot of organisations that are trying to do things in a really innovative way do not have access to such funds, even though they do good work and can present their portfolios. Sometimes the requirements are too high. That blocks the degree of innovation in using these funds.

Another point is that when these funds for livelihood projects first started, they did not involve the host communities much. This shows that co-design was not very successful; it created negative reactions in the host communities. Today, donor organisations are more careful about balancing the beneficiaries.

Let us shift to the topic of resources. On the issue of diversity, what I am observing is, and Semih made a comment in this direction already, for reasons of efficiency, we always try to organise big funds in a very standardised way. Does that correspond to the diversity that we find? Or how can we channel resources – which are obviously there and often not utilised in the best way – to the organisations that have the best solutions?

Riad Ragueb Ahmed: First, reiterating my earlier point on terminology: while financial resources are important, resources can be more wide ranging and go beyond financial matters. Intellectual property or technologies or knowledge/indigenous knowledge or in-kind contribution, etc are also resources that we often do not capture. Therefore, the term resources should be considered comprehensively. Second, when we talk about resources, we also have to keep in mind what can be mobilized from the private sector, from civil society, and from the public sector. We should not only think about government resources.

On your question, certainly flexibility is required. However, all institutions have policies and rules that govern their actions and sometimes do not allow for a lot of flexibility. We may come up with new mechanisms that will allow us to be more flexible in our way of managing resources.

Ulrich Wehnert: Actually, I am not so much concerned about resources, be it financial or in-kind, human resources, if we are moving into a mode beyond

ODA. ODA, again, is a very strict, narrow system of channelling financial resources from the North to the South. That was the idea back in the 60s, after World War II. We should not make the mistake again of coming up with a second rigid system. In 'beyond ODA', we will have various channels: private, public and from various actors. I might be wrong, but I would like to hold the uncertainty and see if such a system can somehow be created.

The alternative to this could be to set up a global fund for global sustainability. Something where the UN and many other countries bring in huge amounts of financial resources, from which international cooperation for global sustainability could be financed. That would probably be a huge thing but could be worth reflecting on.

Riad Ragueb Ahmed: At BAPA+40 discussions, some concerns were raised regarding the North reducing its support and moving away from its responsibility of implementing the 2030 Agenda. When we talk about beyond-ODA, we must clarify that it does not translate into less funding, less resources going from the North to other countries, which can be interpreted as a sign of diminishing solidarity.

Ulrich Wehnert: It is my understanding that ODA will still be there for many years, but that maybe a second system, beyond-ODA, will somehow complement the current system as we know it. That would be my guess.

Citlali Ayala: I would like to add that financial resources still are an issue for many southern providers, and it will remain that way for many years, as long as we do not have a specific budget for development cooperation. On the other hand, we can recall the evolution and the discussion of the Total Official Support for Sustainable Development, where the private sector and remittances and different financial sources are included, and various other countries can participate beyond the DAC.

I would also support Riad's idea that knowledge, local knowledge or ancestral knowledge, human resources, technical resources and material resources, are all part of this umbrella of resources. It is not only about financial resources; instead when it comes to South-South and triangular cooperation, the strong part, at least in the Latin American approach, is knowledge and technical resources. We will scale up on this topic when we have a national budget for development cooperation, which we currently do not have. That remains our constraint. But on the other hand, different kinds of alliances, funds and networks can exchange different kinds of resources to propose development solutions. Some of these funds and networks still lack financial resources, but it is not a limitation to continuing with building development solutions.

Semih, in the Impact Hub, how much do you depend on ODA money? Do you already have this second pillar of funding that Ulrich was talking about?

Semih Boyaci: It is actually a very low percentage in our case. We mobilise a lot of private sector resources for the Sustainable Development Goals, and this works a bit more like typical consulting: you make a good match between the areas of priorities and social needs, as well as what you can provide. For example, a private sector company funded the Accelerator2030 programme in Turkey, the local chapter of the programme I mentioned as an example before. Mobilising these resources is easier, but obviously they are much less in amount compared to the funding from development organisations. The process is quicker, but the amount is much lower. In addition to that, we also work with big foundations and generate resources from there. Overall, I would say ODA funding is not more than 10 per cent in our case.

We work like a typical social enterprise, in our own model. We want to make it less financially dependent because it is a very risky model. But we also try to establish links with this funding, in our way, to organisations in our own network. For example, the office I am in right now is rented by GIZ, within Impact Hub. GIZ has a team here and it was not easy for them to rent an office in a shared space. But they wanted to get out of the bubble and meet more innovative organisations here. In that respect, I'm very happy to have GIZ here.

My second comment is related to that. I think the issue of resources, on the one hand, is about the management of the resources and allocation of the resources, but, on the other hand, about interacting and explaining potential partners how this resource management works on the side of development organisations, because other people have no idea about how these systems work. There is no other form of exposure than finding out if such collaborations can occur. I was also very unaware of, for example, GIZ before Impact Hub and GIZ signed their global memorandum on working together on topics related to Sustainable Development Goals. That memorandum has now spread to all Impact Hubs worldwide. It is a very good move to disseminate social innovation and collaboration in all these countries. So, yes, exposure and establishing these links with other ecosystems, particularly northern ecosystems, is important.

To continue, Semih, what is your experience and maybe recommendation regarding the involvement of the private sector? How much does the language have to change? How are you doing it?

Semih Boyaci: There are a couple of things that have moved the private sector in this direction. I think by far the biggest one is the changing behaviour of customers and consumers. Obviously, depending on the country, sensitivities are different, but all these sensitivities are related to the SDGs. There is a great deal of pressure everywhere in moving in this direction and allocating resources for sustainable development. This is also an argument that we use in developing projects and it is always a good way to catch them, because they see this as a

market in the end. They may not do all this for good purposes; the profit motive is still always number one. But, in addition to becoming more sensitive, the fear of losing customers is becoming a trigger for them. Another trigger is that they are quite concerned about retaining the Y and Z generations. People are looking for social impact in their work environments. Young people are looking for meaning in their social environments, and private companies struggle to retain people like they did before. That means that they have to invest – not like green-washing, but in a sincere way – and this also mobilises a lot of resources.

From my point of view these are the two main motivators. We also explain to them that the world is shifting, and since they are living this reality, they understand it. Then they ask about how to proceed. Our approach in general is that we study the organisations, their products, their services and their priority areas in terms of the SDGs. We always try to make a link between the social impact and their core business. For instance, circular economy has to work for them because it does create social good, but it is also important for their resource management and cost-effectiveness, today and five years from now.

In sum, it is also a competitiveness issue. It is not just philanthropic. And they are becoming more and more aware of this. For them to become more circular, more sustainable, they must collaborate with organisations that create social innovation technologies, new green production methodologies, new ways to reduce carbon footprints, new forms of transportation. I mean, they have to do all these things. And if they do not create their systems in such a way that they correspond to these new demands, they will be much less competitive in the market ten years from now. That is basically the picture that we share with them.

Ulrich Wehnert: I would also see much more space for the private sector in the beyond-ODA world simply because it will also be a very digitalised world. People will get connected on a global dimension. The Impact Hub is a good example of where private actors move in, connecting people all over the world. This already shows that there is scope for the private sector to be more involved.

Riad Ragueb Ahmed: It goes without saying that the private sector is a very important stakeholder when it comes to development cooperation. Its involvement is crucial. It owns most of the technologies, licences, intellectual properties needed for development solutions. The private sector is also more results-oriented and will develop relatively quickly solutions, while governmental institutions may need more time due to heavier procedures and processes. The involvement with the private sector brings efficiency, results, flexibility and agility, which donors sometimes lack.

However, when it comes to the private sector, we have to distinguish between two elements: their corporate social responsibility (CSR) and their normal business. CSR could be easy to engage in development cooperation and we

can quickly collaborate with the private sector, making sure that CSR is contributing to the 2030 Agenda. As for the business-as-usual, it is more complex to engage them in South-South and Triangular Cooperation. In this regard, we should particularly ensure that we are supporting the beneficiary country. The private sector aims to make profit which is normal. They have the power to influence, to sometimes impose their own solutions or their own view, especially in a small or fragile country. We, as development partners, should make sure that we assist the countries that receive funding under South-South and Triangular Cooperation from the private sector in a way that it is beneficial for them: beneficial for them in terms of employment creation, economic benefit partially maintained in the country, etc. It is quite challenging, but I think this must be ensured. We must encourage the private sector more and more to contribute and support the implementation of the 2030 Agenda by providing the right channels, incentives and mechanism for them to do so.

Citlali Ayala: I would like to add that the national legal frameworks are important when we talk about the participation of the private sector and mobilising private contributions. In the case of Mexico, we have some legal constraints when managing financial funds. For example, the Mexico-Chile Fund for Development Corporation, this bilateral fund, is administrated by the Chilean government, not by Mexico, because here we have some legal constraints regarding the administration of that money. But that has not been an obstacle to replicating this kind of funding. For example, we have a similar fund with Uruguay and Spain, and the bilateral fund agreed with Germany. So, it is kind of a funny situation because we do not have a federal budget for development cooperation, but we have bilateral funds with southern partners and with northern partners that are successful as soon as they are managed outside our country. It is like a paradox. On the other hand, we have all those successful experiences, like the Mexican Alliance for Haiti, in which the private sector, universities and AMEXCID participated. Maybe due to the context, coordination was the most difficult part.

I agree with Ulrich that the beyond-ODA world will be a more digitalised world. And in that regard, we need to think in terms of a future ‘ODA’ that supports more innovation, science and technology and inter-agency coordination. Security and climate change are obviously priorities in the agenda of cooperation, but digitalisation and development are a future priority and a future strategy for our countries.

For your final statement: if we leave development behind us and begin a new game, what would that be? What I hear is: the future is emerging. There are many good examples. We are on the way, but we are not yet there. This is what I have understood from you.

Semih Boyaci: To achieve the 2030 Agenda, one of the most important things is for all sides to act more like an ecosystem, moving together in one direction. We talked about the disadvantages of thinking in silos. Shifting from “ego-system” to ecosystem would be, for each actor, a key determinant of this transition. As a person active in the social innovation and social entrepreneurship ecosystems, another suggestion would be that the ecosystems of the development sector especially, the private sector and also the public sector more widely, should come closer with social innovation ecosystems. The examples and success stories we see show the potential of this and this should be scaled up.

Ulrich Wehnert: Going beyond ODA would mean finally realising true partnerships and heading towards, preparing the way to achieve global sustainability.

Riad Ragueb Ahmed: Time is not in our favour. If we look at climate change and what is going on around the world, we must be very concerned. As development partners, we have to come together with every means we have got. It is important to complement ODA and play a dual role, all of us, in mutually responsible and equitable partnerships.

Citlali Ayala: The future fields, in my view, are in innovation, science and technology, applied to education, health and economic development. It is also important to ‘cross over’ development cooperation and to mainstream it in public policies and to social actors. ODA will remain being ODA. But as soon as it is inclusive and participatory and open, and if we have new forms of participation regarding diversity and legal and budgetary conditions, we can strengthen capacities and find new ways to work better – according to each case but trying to build a common ground and a common vision of everyone working as equal partners. Sustainable development has three spheres, and we can look for some progress in that respect in order to achieve the 2030 Agenda.