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Presentation

“The illiterate of the 21st century will not be those who cannot read and write, but those who cannot learn, unlearn, and relearn.”
Alvin Toffler

This text begins with the above quote from American writer Alvin Toffler, since it is perhaps a fitting introduction to a field, such as development and international cooperation, that combines the traditional, the present and the future.

Development as a goal and cooperation as a means have been the almost exclusive domain of one part of the world in its relations with other parts of the world. Traditional donors have taken an ownership role in development assistance that, as has been the case in other international social relations, has made this development assistance into an instrument at the service of their interests. And, furthermore, a mental map was drawn that defined which ‘development’ was best for others, according to the traditional donors criterion, rather than that of the ‘others’ concerned.

Hence, Alvin Toffler’s reflection calls upon us to learn, unlearn and relearn, although Albert Einstein also warned us that it is easier to smash an atom than a prejudice.

Accordingly, the aim of this text is to delve into the complex map of development and international cooperation. And since it is also fundamentally a word map, we will begin by discussing the concepts, the terminology used in this field of knowledge. Although some times they are a matter of common sense, the fact is that, for example, ‘poor’ is not the same as ‘impoverished’, and ‘developing country’ is not the same as ‘underdeveloped country’.

Development cooperation has become an important element of international life and, as a result, we will outline the key players participating in it. Also in this section, it is indispensable to examine the factors and elements of change that transform an international system still characterized by the Westphalia model to another in which the actors (sometimes ill termed ‘emerging players’) break with this traditional model. In the world of cooperation, we have gone from the donor-recipient binomial – a scheme that is managed and applied by the donor – to a system involving multiple players, with a much broader distribution of roles.

This will lead us into the discussion of the current methods of cooperation, which have also been increased and enriched, not without generating some confusion. Once again, as an appetiser: we have gone from food aid – used essentially to solve the problems of farming surpluses in wealthy countries – to food sovereignty as an exercise of empowerment by various groups, in a system dominated by the large and global transnational corporations that operate in that sector.

If we examine the what, who and how of this issue, we must also look at the why; and in this case raising awareness and education for development have played a significant role. Education for development is an instrument that tends to be overlooked in the South, and that is potentially more important for the North than taking aid to poor countries. This is especially true in situations in which crises may understandably shrink the commitment of part of the population, and reduce the level of solidarity towards other people.

The text ends with a look at the overall result so far, which tends to focus much more on the negatives than on achievements (although there have been many achievements that are often not made visible), and at the challenges and trends for cooperation development in the future.
A future that began on 25 September 2015 with the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals, with the hope, engrained in the 2030 Agenda, of together attaining a set of global goals to eradicate poverty, protect the planet and ensure prosperity.

To achieve our task, the methodology is based mainly on compiling what is considered to be the most relevant material for a document of this kind. This implies a selection process that has been summarized above. Furthermore, it combines description with analysis, so as to provide an all-encompassing view of development cooperation. The idea is also to facilitate understanding of the subject, of the case studies, allowing readers to use the tools so as to make their own judgement in regard to what is a controversial issue. For this purpose, reference will be made to other texts in which the issues discussed in one or other section might be covered more extensively.

Throughout the text there are references to a series of documents, most notably by official bodies, with footnotes for easy access to their contents, which will enable readers to delve more deeply into the material discussed in each section.

At the end of the document is a list of websites, research centres or sites of interest providing updated information on significant issues relating to development and international cooperation, and how to learn opinions and read specialist papers in this connection.

In short, the idea is to provide a general outline of what development cooperation is, who is involved in it and how it works, with an overview of its actions and some of its profiles, so as to learn about its trends.
I. Definition and basic components of development cooperation

As in any field of study or scientific area, development cooperation has its own nomenclature, its own set of technical vocabulary specific to the discipline. The short, but very intense, lifetime of this discipline (there is not a consensus on its being considered such, as we shall see) is peppered by the use of a series of terms, names or concepts that, on the one hand, reflect its variety, heterogeneity and complexity, but on the other hand render it more difficult to obtain a better and more thorough grasp of the issues. So this quite often leads to confusion when it comes to understanding and analysing the topic.

There is a broad range of terminology: aid, assistance, cooperation; the various usages of the term “development” (economic, human, sustainable growth, etc.); the categorization of developing countries, poor countries, underdeveloped countries, advanced countries, less advanced countries, the third world, and so forth.

Although cooperation must be understood as an exercise of solidarity, in practice it has been undertaken as the manifestation of a number of forms of “handout”.

To clarify this confusing map, we will now explain some of these concepts.

**Development cooperation** is a pivotal part of the international dynamic, whereby the various stakeholders work together in order to improve the socio-economic conditions of people in the worst situations, with a view to enhancing their development. Cooperation is the ‘toolbox’ (the set of policies, programmes and projects) to be used by the various stakeholders with different resources and capacity, with the aim of achieving development goals. Accordingly, cooperation is a means to an end, namely development.

As occurs with definitions, especially academic ones, their aim is to establish a model, even though it is not subsequently 100% transferable to reality. In other words, reality is embodied by multiple and varied cases that will not exactly match the definition.

However, the above definition is aimed at highlighting two basic issues: cooperation means working together (according to the dictionary, to cooperate is to act jointly; work toward the same end), while aid always has a benefactorial connotation: someone gives to another; donor—recipient. Development is not only the quantitative improvement for persons suffering from poverty, it being in the donor’s hands to decide how the recipient should develop. Development must be conducted in consonance with its link to rights, and, accordingly, it is the affected population who must exercise those rights, and not be mere ‘recipients of aid’ as has traditionally been the case.

On this basis, the Uruguayan Agency for International Cooperation (AUCI) provides us with the following definition of international development cooperation, which reflects the complexity of the parties involved in it and their various options and modalities:

**IDC** (International Development Cooperation) tends to refer to the transfer of financial or other resources in kind (technology, equipment, knowledge, grants), on a concessory or non-reimbursable basis, aimed at underpinning the efforts of developing countries to achieve the well-being of their people, on the part of another developed country (official development assistance), another developing country (south-south cooperation), or both in tandem (triangular cooperation), or alternatively from a local government (decentralized cooperation), international body (multilateral cooperation), and, more recently, non-state agents (unofficial cooperation).

While there is a variety of definitions for the term development cooperation, there is only one definition for the term **Official Development Assistance (ODA)**. ODA is the term for the
traditional aid, with its changes and transformations, coined by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC), one of the main development aid organizations. The DAC, as we shall see when we discuss the agents involved in cooperation, belongs to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), known widely as the ‘rich countries club’.

According to the DAC’s definition:

**Official Development Assistance** is defined as “those flows to countries and territories on the DAC List of ODA Recipients and to multilateral institutions which are:

1. Provided by official agencies, including state and local governments, or by their executive agencies; and

2. Each transaction of which: a) Is administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as its main objective; and b) Is concessional in character and conveys a grant element of at least 25 per cent (calculated at a rate of discount of 10 per cent).”

The DAC emphasises that the fundamental goal must be to promote development and economic well-being, setting certain limits for the computation of ODA, such as the exclusion of military aid or anti-terrorism activities (activities to combat terrorism are not ODA, since they are generally aimed at threats to both the donor and the recipient countries, instead of being focused on the economic and social development of the recipient). Conversely, assistance to refugees in developing countries is reportable as ODA.

Based on data adapted to these criteria, every year the DAC reports on the ODA of its members; the table below shows the ODA in 2015:
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As you can see, few countries meet the 0.7% requirement linking aid to Gross Domestic Product (GDP): Denmark, Luxembourg, Holland, Norway, Sweden and the UK. Generally, only the Nordic countries exceed this percentage, which was set by the United Nations on 24 October 1970.

Although it became part of the official jargon of cooperation in the 1960s, ODA is also subject to criticism and questions.

These include those raised by CONCORD, the European NGO confederation for relief and development, applying the concept of ‘genuine aid’, i.e. excluding from ODA those actions not aimed at contributing to development, and even benefiting donors: Official Development Assistance (ODA) should “reflect genuine flows rather than inflated elements such as imputed student costs, in-donor refugee costs, debt relief, tied aid and the interest payments on loans.” To compare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3,222</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>4,302</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>3,897</td>
<td>-11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>2,418</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>2,287</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4,287</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>4,240</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>4,965</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3,003</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1,653</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>9,226</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>10,620</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>10,919</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>17,779</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>16,566</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>20,855</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>3,843</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>4,857</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>9,320</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>9,266</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>10,418</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1,857</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>2,011</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>5,813</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>5,573</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>6,952</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>4,278</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>5,086</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5,528</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>-16.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>7,092</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>6,213</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>8,527</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>3,538</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>3,522</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3,758</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>18,708</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>19,306</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>19,919</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>31,976</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>33,906</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>30,765</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DAC</td>
<td>131,586</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>137,222</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>140,210</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Country Effort</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you can see, few countries meet the 0.7% requirement linking aid to Gross Domestic Product (GDP): Denmark, Luxembourg, Holland, Norway, Sweden and the UK. Generally, only the Nordic countries exceed this percentage, which was set by the United Nations on 24 October 1970.
real/quality assistance among donors, CONCORD’s methodology excludes these "inflated aid items from ODA reporting", with the remainder known as ‘genuine’ aid, which refers to quality aid.

The DAC itself is reviewing the term ODA – and its limitations – with a view to using another, broader term encompassing all development assistance, known as TOSD (Total Official Support for Development) 4, including contributions in areas such as climate change, peace, and security.

The transformations of development assistance have been analysed by a number of authors, including Jean-Michel Severino and Olivier Ray 5.

If cooperation is the means, development is the end, in other words, the desired outcome of putting cooperation resources to use.

“"The strength of ‘development’ discourse comes of its power to seduce, in every sense of the term: to charm, to please, to fascinate, to set dreaming, but also to abuse, to turn away from the truth, to deceive. How could one possibly resist the idea that there might be a way of eliminating the poverty by which one is so troubled? How dare one think, at the same time, that the cure might worsen the ill which one wishes to combat? Already Ulysses, to avoid giving in to the sirens’ song, had to plug his companions’ ears and tie himself to the mast of his ship. Such is the opening price to be paid, if one is to emerge victorious from the test of lucidly examining the history of ‘development’.”

These are the first words of Gilbert Rist’s work, The History of Development: from Western Origins to Global Faith, in which he presents some keys for interpreting the post-developmental approach.

Perhaps, when faced with a term that allows so many options and possibilities, we should describe them as polysemic, i.e., having many different meanings.

Traditionally, it has been associated with an econocentric interpretation that identifies development with economic growth; indeed, many conservatives still apply this more conservative reading. Aside from this reductionism, it is possible to observe how this economic interpretation of development predominated among the very first researchers in development following the Second World War (such as Raúl Prebisch and Gunnar Myrdal).

Since then, the expression has been used worldwide, but it has stayed essentially – in terms of its definition and use – in the hands of the West, or rather of powerful Western governments, so it has remained an ethnocentric interpretation.

In its evolution, it encompasses the more dirigiste, interventionist and assistentialist vision: “this is my help and it’s for this kind of development”, would be the phrase that, while never expressed so explicitly, characterises that most rancid form of development. Other options were later added, with a view to meeting basic needs, with the introduction of the Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs, as it is known.

The independence of countries and peoples previously subject to colonial rule is also reflected in the concept of development, although the ‘North-centric’ discourse and practice still prevail.

Evidence of this is the definition provided by the South Commission, chaired by Julius Nyerere, president of Tanzania and a leader who worked to achieve decolonization and African unity:

“Development is a process that enables human beings to realize their potential, build self-confidence, and lead lives of dignity and fulfilment. It is a process which frees people from the fear of want and exploitation. It is a movement away from political, economic, or social oppression. Through development, political independence acquires its true significance. And it is a process of growth, a movement essentially springing from within the society that is developing.”

This influence can also be observed in the UN Declaration on the Right to Development, adopted by the General Assembly on 4 December 1986, article 1 of which reads:

“The right to development is an inalienable human right by virtue of which every human person and all peoples are entitled to participate in, contribute to and enjoy economic, social, cultural and political development, in which all human rights and freedoms can be fully realized.”

In the wake of the Cold War, development was also subject to the tensions of a world in which the old had not yet died and the new was not yet fully born. The old concept of development co-exists with other formulations typical of this changing world.

This is linked to the global summits hosted by the United Nations, which led, at least in their formulation, to an exercise in multilateralism and a greater presence of the various actors, both public and private.

If ever there were two terms that reflect that more all-encompassing vision of development, these are human development and sustainable development.

The term human development is associated with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The UNDP belongs to the United Nations family. Set up on 1 January 1965, it gained significance with the drafting and publication of the Human Development Reports, the first of which was published in 1990, concerning the “Concept and Measurement of Human Development”. One of its proponents was Mahbub ul Haq, former Pakistani Finance and Planning Minister. The starting point is that development does not depend solely on per capita income, a measure used by bodies such as the World Bank; in other words, there is not an automatic link between economic growth and human progress. And the basis for all development is that it must focus on people.

For the UNDP, human development is:

“A process of enlarging people’s choices. In principle, these choice can be infinite and change over time. But at all levels of development, the three essential ones are for people to lead a long and healthy life, to acquire knowledge and to have access to resources needed for a decent standard of living. If these essential choices are not available, many other opportunities remain inaccessible.

But human development does not end there. Additional choices, highly valued by many people, range from political, economic and social freedom [...], and enjoying personal self-respect and guaranteed human rights.”

Human development has two sides: the formation of human capabilities – such as improved health, knowledge and skills – and the use people make of their acquired capabilities – for leisure, productive purposes or being active in cultural, social and...

---

political affairs. If the scales of human development do not finely balance the two sides, considerable human frustration may result.

According to this concept of human development, income is clearly only one option that people would like to have, albeit an important one. But it is not the sum total of their lives. Development must, therefore, be more than just the expansion of income and wealth. Its focus must be people."

This definition was also influenced by the thought of Amartya Sen, from whose prolific work we may highlight *Inequality Reexamined* (1995) and *The Idea of Justice* (2009); another standard-bearer in relation to the capabilities approach is Martha C. Nussbaum (*Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach*, CUP, 2000; *Creating Capabilities. The Capabilities Approach*, CUP, 2000; *Creating Capabilities. The Human Development Approach*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2013).

Along with ‘human development’, the other most commonly used term is ‘sustainable development’; in this case, it is linked to the work carried out to prepare some of the so-called Earth Summits (the first was in Stockholm in 1972 and 20 years later another summit was held in Rio de Janeiro). This term is used in the Brundtland Report (Gro Harlem Brundtland, a Norwegian politician who served as the Prime Minister of Norway) in 1987, titled *Our Common Future*, which considers that “sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. In this link between development and environment, factors such as population and resources, species and ecosystems, energy, industry and the urban environment all play a decisive role. The security, well-being and even the survival of the planet will depend on the changes made in these spheres. The Rio Summit in 1992 afforded it a global dimension.

Both human and sustainable development have, therefore, been included in the global development and international cooperation agenda, and have been widely accepted.

The widespread acceptance of the risk to the environment from the impact of human beings is evidenced by the mounting repercussion of the ecological footprint. The scientific evidence for these effects are only rejected by deniers, whereas the other side is questioning whether a production system based on large-scale consumption can be compatible with sustainable development; thus it is explained by Jorge Reichmann in his book *Autoconstrucción. La transformación cultural que necesitamos* (Self-Building: the cultural transformation we need), Madrid: Los Libros de La Catarata, 2015, p. 13).

Returning to the agenda, which we will examine more closely below, sustainable development took centre-stage with the Sustainable Development Goals, adopted in 2015 as the continuation of the Millennium Development Goals. As the document “Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development” states, the Sustainable Development Goals and targets are integrated and indivisible, and balance all three dimensions of sustainable development: economic, social and environmental.

Shortly before that, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda from the Third International Conference on Financing for Development (27 July 2015): See the document at [http://unctad.org/meetings/en/SessionalDocuments/ares69d313_en.pdf](http://unctad.org/meetings/en/SessionalDocuments/ares69d313_en.pdf) established various action areas that show that, strictly speaking, development cooperation is another of the fields which, together, would achieve this goal. The action areas are:

- Domestic public resources;
- Domestic and international private business and finance;
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- International development cooperation; International trade as an engine for development;
- Debt and debt sustainability;
- Addressing systemic issues (such as global economic governance, migrations, strengthening of institutions);
- Science, technology, innovation and capacity-building.

One of the pivotal goals of development cooperation, as stated in the first Millennium Development Goal, is to combat poverty. And, precisely, there are never simple answers to complex problems such as poverty. It may be reduced to the lack of resources to satisfy the basic needs of any person, to multidimensional poverty.

How to understand the lack of development and what measures are necessary to tackle it from an international cooperation standpoint, are questions that have been facing the international community for decades. Each option and each action contains a political and ideological component that defines the nature of the agents proposing it and putting it into practice.

Of the numerous cases we might encounter, here are two examples: the proposal by President Kennedy in 1961, at the height of the Cold War, and the option put forward by Mexico's Cooperation Agency at present:

John F. Kennedy, Inaugural Address, 20 January 1961:

"To those people in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required – not because the communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

To our sister republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge – to convert our good words into good deeds – in a new alliance for progress – to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty."

Mexican Agency for International Development Cooperation:

International development cooperation (IDC) refers to the transfer, receipt or exchange of resources, goods, knowledge and educational, cultural, technical, scientific, economic and financial experience between Mexico, other countries and international bodies to promote sustainable development. This is one of the means of execution envisaged in Goal 17 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The basic aim of the IDC actions conducted by Mexico as a provider and recipient is to promote sustainable human development, and they contribute to:

- End poverty;
- Combat unemployment;
- Reduce inequality;
- End social exclusion;
- The permanent improvement in levels of education, technology, science and culture;

---

8 For further information in this connection, see, for example, Cándido M. López Pardo: “Concepto y medición de la pobreza”, at http://bvs.sld.cu/revistas/spu/vol33_4_07/spu03407.htm
9 Taken from https://www.jfklibrary.org/Research/Research-Aids/Ready-Reference/JFK-Quotations/Inaugural-Address.aspx
General Framework for Development Cooperation

- Reduce asymmetries between developed and developing countries;
- Protect the environment;
- Combat climate change;
- Strengthen public safety;

These actions are based on the principles of international solidarity, the defence and promotion of human rights, strengthening the rule of law, gender equality, fostering sustainable development, transparency and accountability and the criteria of ownership, alignment, harmonization, results-oriented management and reciprocal responsibility, the latter being the principles of efficacy of development cooperation.

The difficulty in classifying countries by their development level is highlighted by Sergio Tezanos Vázquez and Ainoa Quiñones Montellano, in their paper entitled: “¿Países de renta media? Una taxonomía alternativa del desarrollo de América Latina y el Caribe” (Average Income Countries? An Alternative Taxonomy for Development in Latin America and the Caribbean) .

Research theories into development also combine traditional options, in the most conservative sense of the term, with others that are much more critical and radical, that link current thinking with proposals more associated with a world view. Options such as degrowth, good living or post-development enable us to understand the role of development with another perspective that links it to consumption and the idea of ‘the more, the better’. Two examples of these alternatives are to be found in: “Post-desarrollo y cooperación” (Post-Development and Cooperation), the core topic of Spain’s development journal Revista Española de Desarrollo y Cooperación (issue 24, spring/summer 2009, coord. by Noé Cornago Prieto). And also in the article by Ana Patricia Cubillo-Guevara and Antonio Luis Hidalgo-Capitán: “El trans-desarrollo como manifestación de la trans-modernidad. Más allá de la subsistencia, el desarrollo y el postdesarrollo” (Transdevelopment as a Manifestation of Transmodernity. Beyond Subsistence, Development and Post-Development), in Revista de Economía Mundial, n. 41, 2015, pp. 127-158 .

To complete this section, we recommend you view this YouTube video to gain an idea of what the world would be like if there were 100 people living in it, as it gives a new perspective on the differences that exist in the planet as a whole:

Why? Poverty, inequality, injustice
If the world were 100 people... www.youtube.com/watch?v=CbEhjziqlZM

To learn more:

- Hegoa: Diccionario de Acción Humanitaria y Cooperación al Desarrollo. www.dicc.hegoa.ehu.es/

---

12 See the article at http://rabida.uhu.es/dspace/handle/10272/11728. The summary explains that: In the 21st century, there are four different world views: pre-modernity, modernity, post-modernity and trans-modernity. A different paradigm of well-being: subsistence, development, post-development and trans-development corresponds to each of them. This document analyses the four world views and the four paradigms and observes that trans-modernity is the result of the synthesis between pre-modernity, modernity and post-modernity, and that trans-development is the result of the synthesis between subsistence, development and post-development. These concepts are also defined, along with those of degrowth and good living, which are considered to be manifestations of trans-development, and the article cites examples of these concepts put into practice, such as the Findhorn Ecovillage and the indigenous community of Sarayaku.
- DAC Glossary of Key Terms and Concepts www.oecd.org/dac/dac-glossary.htm
  Guía AECID Modalidades cooperación
- Spanish-only Glossary of the Reality of Aid – OXFAM Intermón www.realidadayuda.org/glossary
2. Emergence and evolution of development assistance

To outline what development assistance is and how it has changed, considering that its evolution combines elements of continuity and change, it is worth observing the evolution of the international system to which it belongs.

Looking back, development assistance has its roots in the aftermath of the Second World War, and it later became a part of the actions belonging to the international dynamic.

This journey can be summarized in various phases: birth (at the end of the Second World War and the start of the Cold War); the impact of decolonization (1960s); the interdependent world of the 1970s; end of the Cold War and... new world order?

2.1. The birth of development assistance and its original sin

There is a consensus that 20 January 1949 signalled a kind of foundational landmark in development assistance. On that day, US president Harry S. Truman, in his inaugural address, outlined four courses of action, the fourth of which was:

“We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas. More than half the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate. They are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas. For the first time in history, humanity possesses the knowledge and the skill to relieve the suffering of these people. [...] our imponderable resources in technical knowledge are constantly growing and are inexhaustible. [...] The old imperialism – exploitation for foreign profit – has no place in our plans. [...] Greater production is the key to prosperity and peace. And the key to greater production is a wider and more vigorous application of modern scientific and technical knowledge.”

Note that the Second World War ended four years previously with the victory of the Allies (essentially the United States and USSR) who, by virtue of their antagonism transferred to a global scale but compromised by the use of nuclear weapons, became enemies that were unable to use Carl von Clausewitz’s statement on war to the full (war is the continuation of politics by other means), but who would use all kinds of ‘weapons’ to expand their influence, including development assistance. The Marshall Plan, announced on 12 July 1947, constituted not only support from the United States for the recovery of a devastated Europe, but an instrument to strengthen the Western system – in other words the American way of life – in the face of communism.

Maggie Black, in the work The No-nonsense Guide to International Development (Oxford: New Internationalist Publications, 2003) establishes some of the keys for interpreting the consequences of that discourse:

As a pillar of US aid, Truman stated: “We must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way, I believe that our help should be primarily through economic and financial aid which is essential to economic stability and orderly political processes”.

“The idea of development was born not in the developing world, but in the West, as a product of the post-colonial age.
The underlying purpose, as with the Marshall Plan, was the consolidation of US influence in places that might otherwise be infected with communist virus.

Countries that wanted to benefit from Western largesse adopted its language and ideas, even though this cast them and their peoples in pejorative terms as ‘ignorant’ and inferior, objects of paternalistic assistance. The crude dichotomy of ‘developed’ and ‘developing’ nations was later re-formulated as North and South.”

One of the main theoretical foundations linking aid with foreign policy was developed by Hans Morgenthau in the paper “A political Theory of Foreign Aid”13, which acted as a trigger for US aid, making the country, to this day, one of the leading donors of development assistance. Morgenthau is to foreign policy what Walter W. Rostow would become for the economy, most notably with the work The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto, published in 1960. The subtitle says it all. The defence of national interests, exports to the free world – even using the Marines – and the production methods of the market economy based on mass consumption, are the bases on which the US built its presence in the world, visible through its armies and its aid, embodied by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID).

One of the best examples of how aid helps satisfy the donor’s interests was Public Law (PL) 480, signed into law in the US in 1954, to provide food aid14, with the suggestive title of “Food for Peace”.

At the same time, European states lost their colonial domains, although they maintained their links with the newly independent states to guarantee the post-colonial relationship. One of the instruments that channels that relationship was development assistance; it is easy to verify this based on the geographic destination of French or British aid.

How did the rich countries really become rich? Asks Ha-Joon Chang in his book Kicking Away the Ladder. Development Strategy in Historical Perspective. Briefly put, his response is that developed countries did not get where they are today through the policies and institutions they are now recommending to developing countries. Most of them implemented policies to protect their infant industries and export subsidies, practices that are today disapproved of, or indeed actively rejected, by the WTO (World Trade Organization)... If this is the case, are not the developed countries, under the appearance of advocating “good” policies and institutions, actually hampering developing countries in the use of the policies and institutions that they themselves previously used to develop economically?

Although states are the main players on the international stage, from the Second World War onwards international bodies and institutions were created.

The Bretton Woods system was launched in 1944, involving the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Although, as we shall see, its numbers have increased significantly, it is still controlled by the major economic powers, especially the United States, since the decision-making power is based on each nation’s contributions to these institutions: the more they contribute, the

more votes they hold. This power is also reflected by the fact that the chairman of the World Bank has always been from the US and the Director of the IMF has always been a European.

A central position on the international cooperation stage must correspond to the United Nations (UN). The Charter of the United Nations was signed in San Francisco in 1945, and establishes as its purpose: “To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion”. Chapter IX of the Charter is devoted to “International Economic and Social Co-operation”, in which task the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) has a predominant role. Furthermore, the broad family of United Nations bodies works in specific spheres: agriculture (FAO), health (WHO), education (UNESCO), children (UNICEF), refugees (UNHCR), etc.

While recognising its magnificent work, the fact is that the UN was mortgaged throughout the Cold War by the use of the veto as a geopolitical weapon by the United States and the USSR, which hampered operations considerably. This also undermined the institution’s credibility, essentially as a result of those who prevented the Charter from being fulfilled.

Also during these years the international system for protecting human rights was launched, based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), supplemented by the International Covenants of 1966 on Civil and Political Rights, and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. As well as the universal applications, there were regional actions in the sphere of human rights: the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights, the European Convention on Human Rights, the American Convention on Human Rights or the ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) Human Rights Declaration.

### 2.2. Assistance linked to the post-colonial relationship

One of the main international changes was driven by the impact of decolonization in the 1960s. Admittedly, Latin American countries had become independent at the start of the 19th century, but in Asia and Africa the major decolonization took place in the 1960s.

Access to independence led to an increase in the number of states in the world, as evidenced by the increase in the number of members of the United Nations.

Aside from this impact, decolonization revealed the extent of colonization: these countries’ devastation, destruction and the grave breaches of human rights. If there is one work that reflects this situation – in this case France’s presence in Algeria – it is the book written by Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, published in 1961, with a preface by Jean Paul Sartre. Accordingly, the initial impact of decolonization was anti-colonialism and the fight for emancipation by countries and peoples that had been subject to colonial dominance.

According to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, of 14 December 1960: “The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation”.

Despite their heterogeneousness, the new countries – led by Gandhi, Leopoldo Sedar Senghor, Jomo Kenyatta, Patrice Lumumba – also called collectively for changes in the rules of the

---

15 In many cases, these revolutionary processes, which called into question the hegemony of the United States in the world, were combated using all kinds of arms, including ‘external aid’. This is shown by John
international system. The Third World was born, embodied in the political sphere with the creation of the Non-Aligned Movement (Bandung, 1955) and in the economic sphere through the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (Geneva, 1964), with the call for ‘Trade Not Aid’.

Taking advantage of their majority in the UN General Assembly, a series of documents were put forward, known as the New International Economic Order. But the authors of the San Francisco Charter left the real power of decision-making in the UN in the hands of the body run by the major powers, namely the Security Council.

Accordingly, the North-South Divide followed on from the East-West dichotomy that was a product of the Cold War.

Without there being an ideological or doctrinal concept for this entire group of countries, one notable denominator is its structuralistic option. This was summarized by the Spanish author Manuel Vázquez Montalbán: there are underdeveloped countries because there are underdeveloper countries. This structuralistic approach expressed in a theory such as that of dependency, can be observed in the work of authors such as Celso Furtado, Samir Amin and Raúl Prebisch.

2.3. The interdependent world of the 1970s

Without altering the theatre of operations of the Cold War, at the end of the 1960s there were changes that did have something of an impact. As Bob Dylan said back in 1964: The Times They Are A-Changin’.

One of the main impacts was triggered by technological advances: on 20 July 1969, Neil Armstrong walked on the moon and we were able to see the Earth from outer space. A planet that is increasingly deteriorated by the impact of human beings, as revealed at the Earth Summit in Stockholm in 1972.

These were years of rebellion and revolution in much of the world: May 1968 in Paris, activism against the Vietnam War, the fight against racial segregation in the US, the anti-apartheid movement led by Nelson Mandela, the student rallies in Mexico Tlatelolco Massacre, the peace movement, the green movement (Greenpeace was created in 1971), etc.

The scope of the global aspect of some issued pushed them firmly onto the international agenda. Along with the environmental deterioration and climate change, another of the worrying issues was demographic growth and the ensuing problems. This is one of the arguments of the Club of Rome report “Limits to Growth”, commissioned to the MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) and published in 1972. The dilemma resides in population vs. resources.

The role of the State was questioned (too big to resolve small problems and too small to resolve big problems; as well as the limitations and erosion of absolute concepts such as sovereignty or borders). In the choice between the global and the local, the ‘glocal’ wins, and the same applies to the transnational over the international.

There was also a reflection in order to research and analyse those changes, and one of the theoretical options is the one that proposes interdependence, through authors such as Joseph Nye and Robert Keohane. Compared with realism – which is based on a leading role for the state, national interest and the conflictive nature of the international environment – interdependence

opts for multilateral solutions for international problems, and for cooperation as a means to achieving them. One contribution of this theory is soft power – the capacity to influence through cultural or ideological means, supplemented by diplomacy – in contrast to hard power, with its military implications.

The presence of the 'Third World' in the United Nations was evidenced through the adoption, on 4 December 1986, of the Declaration on the Right to Development, as we saw above. The outcome of the vote is revealing: 146 votes in favour, one against (US) and eight abstentions. Development is no longer a merely economic consideration, but now has the category of human right. This concept was influenced by the capacity-based approach, in the works of Amartya Sen or Martha C. Nussbaum, which led to the advent of the Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA). 16

### 2.4 Development cooperation following the end of the Cold War

An untypical war like the Cold War came to an end with an untypical peace. Neither adversary was vanquished in battle, and neither was there an ill-termed peace treaty in which the victors could set the conditions for the vanquished, while at the same time becoming the dominating or hegemonic power. For us, the end of the Cold War came symbolically on 9 November 1989, with the fall (or rather the demolition) of the Berlin Wall, the maximum symbol of division between East and West. From then on, events quickly spiralled: German reunification, changes in Europe and the disappearance of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), with a geopolitical shift not only in Europe, but on a global scale.

The victor: the United States. However, what authors like Francis Fukuyama highlight is that what vanquished the USSR, the soviet system as a whole, and communism, are the principles on which 'the American way of life' are based: the free world and capitalism. This is perhaps the essence of the work 'The End of History?' and what Ignacio Ramonet called 'single thought', transferred into political language with the expression 'there is no alternative', a favourite of UK Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, the other half of the winning duo, along with US President Ronald Reagan. The universal recipe was established by the so-called Washington Summit.

The geo-economic scene was redrawn, and, although the United States maintained its position as the world’s most powerful nation, other countries rose to prominence, their growth leading them to abandon the category of developing countries, to become known as emerging countries. This tension is patent in the World Trade Organization (WTO), created in 1995 to devise the rules that regulate trade between countries, and comprising 163 member countries. It is worth noting the role, alongside the major economic powers, of the trade blocs and regional organizations.

Trade, along with investment, is the core theme of the controversial Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), between the United States and the European Union.

Most notable among the so-called emerging countries are the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa), which have used their newly-acquired economic appeal in order to forge alliances and thereby increase their weighting on the world stage. The 6th BRICS Summit took place

in Fortaleza (Brazil), from 14 to 16 July 2014; at the previous summit, a year earlier, the New Development Bank was created (the NDB was officially launched on 15 July 2014). Although the BRICS rank at the top of emerging economies, theirs is not the only acronym reflecting the variety of recognition of countries with newly-found economic clout. Others include, for example, the MINT (Mexico, Indonesia, Nigeria and Turkey).

The G20, comprising 19 countries and one region, occupies an important place in the international economic structure: the G8 (Germany, Canada, United States, France, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom and Russia), plus Saudi Arabia, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, China, South Korea, India, Indonesia, Mexico, South Africa and Turkey). The European Union is also a member of the G20.

This new economic map supplements the institutions created, as we saw, in Bretton Woods (IMF and World Bank).

Goldman Sachs depicted this evolution of the main global economies through the year 2050:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average GDP Per Capita Rank</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Goldman Sachs Economic Research estimates.

The demise of US bank Lehman Brothers in 2008 unleashed a global crisis and recession, albeit with varying measures, impacts and responses, according to the different countries and regions. In any event, what Susan Strange called ‘casino capitalism’ emerged (her works include Mad Money: When Markets Outgrow Governments, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1998). One of the most active denouncers of this system is ATTAC (Association for the Taxation of financial Transactions and Aid to Citizens).

The end of the Cold War generated optimism in the world, which the then Secretary General of the United Nations, Boutros Ghali, identified with the dividends of peace: what the world saved in arms spending could be earmarked for economic and social development programmes.

The hope was short-lived, and, for example, far from increasing development assistance, it actually diminished in those years, in a phenomenon known as ‘donor fatigue’

Donor fatigue:
However, the United Nations gained traction at that time, promoting the efforts of multilateralism. This was evidenced by the major global summits throughout the 1990s, concerning issues and areas that affect humanity as a whole and, in connection with which, it was found that the only possible efficient course of action was the concerted action of states through international cooperation. The topics covered by these conferences include: childhood, environment and development, population and development, women and human rights.

The Copenhagen conference, on 6-12 March 1995 (with the involvement of 117 heads of state and government, along with ministers from another 69 countries), discussed “Social Development”, and a number of commitments were acquired – many of which remain unfulfilled, such as the final point of the text below:

“For the first time in history, at the invitation of the United Nations, we gather as heads of State and Government to recognize the significance of social development and human well-being for all and to give to these goals the highest priority both now and into the twenty-first century.

There has been progress in some areas of social and economic development: [...] Yet we recognize that far too many people, particularly women and children, are vulnerable to stress and deprivation. Poverty, unemployment and social disintegration too often lead to isolation, marginalization and violence.

88.c) Agreeing on a mutual commitment between interested developed and developing country partners to allocate, on average, 20 per cent of ODA and 20 per cent of the national budget, respectively, to basic social programmes;”

A vital institution in this field is the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the adoption of Human Development, as we have seen.
The same applies to the quest for options in regard to a collective approach to general interest matters, such as Global Public Goods\textsuperscript{17}, characterized by non-rivalry (the individual enjoying a good does not prevent or reduce the consumption of another) and the non-exclusion (once the good is produced it is not possible to prevent someone from using or enjoying it). There was to be joint action in fields such as market efficiency, the environment, cultural heritage, healthcare, knowledge and information, peace and security.

### 2.5 From the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

In this context, following the publication of documents by the DAC ("Shaping the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century: The Contribution of Development Cooperation", in 1996) and, in particular, by the UN, OECD, IMF and World Bank (2000. A better World for All. Progress towards the international development goals, June 2000\textsuperscript{18})

The seven goals of international development:

1. Reduce the proportion of people living in extreme poverty by half between 1990 and 2015.

2. Enrol all children in primary school by 2015.


5. Reduce maternal mortality ratios by three-quarters between 1990 and 2015.

6. Provide access for all who need reproductive health services by 2015.

7. Implement national strategies for sustainable development by 2005 so as to reverse the loss of environmental resources by 2015.

This was the prior step to adopting the Millennium Development Goals, whose reference framework was the Millennium Declaration, adopted by the UN General Assembly on 13 September 2000\textsuperscript{19}; the heads of State and Government present, recognize that:

"[...] in addition to our separate responsibilities to our individual societies, we have a collective responsibility to uphold the principles of human dignity, equality and equity at the global level. As leaders we have a duty therefore to all the world’s people, especially the most vulnerable and, in particular, the children of the world, to whom the future belongs.

The Declaration establishes the fundamental values essential to international relations for the 21\textsuperscript{st} century: freedom, equality, solidarity, tolerance, respect for nature and shared responsibility. Once again, the expectations of achieving a better world based on these values are entirely called into question by a reality that shows the exact opposite, with the paradox that the very same governments that pledged to uphold them are a party.

\textsuperscript{17} Inge Kaul, Isabelle Grunberg, Marc A. Stern: \textit{Global Public Goods. International Cooperation in the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century}. Published by the UNDP. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999; see http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/0195130529.001.0001/acprof-9780195130522


\textsuperscript{19} See http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm
The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) include 8 goals, 21 targets and 60 indicators to gauge progress between 1990 and 2015. They are aimed at:

1. **Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger**
2. **Achieve Universal Primary Education**
3. **Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women**
4. **Reduce Child Mortality**
5. **Improve Maternal Health**
6. **Combat HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Other Diseases**
7. **Ensure Environmental Sustainability**
8. **Global Partnership for Development**

To monitor them, the United Nations led a process that entailed more notable aspects:

- **The Millennium Project**, of 2002, to prepare an action plan. In 2005, the independent advisory body chaired by professor Jeffrey Sachs, presented his final recommendation to the Secretary General in a volume titled *Investing in Development: A Practical Plan to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals*.

- **The 2005 World Summit**, based on a set of attainable goals outlined by Secretary General Kofi Annan in March 2005 in his report *In Larger Freedom*.

- **The 2010 Global Summit** on the Millennium Development Goals ended with the approval of a global action plan “Keeping the promise: United to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals” and the announcement of a number of initiatives to combat poverty, hunger and disease.

- **The Future We Want**, Rio de Janeiro (Brazil) from 20 to 22 June 2012. Resolution approved by the General Assembly on 27 July 2012.

- **The Report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda**, “A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies Through Sustainable Development”. More than 5,000 civil society organisations and 250 chief executive officers from major corporations took part in the report, and proposed five big, transformative shifts: leave no one behind; put sustainable development at the core of the agenda; transform economies for jobs and inclusive growth; build peace and effective, open and accountable institutions for all; forge a new global partnership. All of these proposed shifts were accompanied by a “from vision to action” approach: “We believe that these five changes are the right, smart and necessary thing to do. But their

---

impact will depend on how they are translated into specific priorities and actions. We realised that the vision would be incomplete unless we offered a set of illustrative goals and targets to show how these transformative changes could be expressed in precise and measurable terms."

The five transformational shifts were established that could create the conditions – and generate the necessary drive – to make these aspirations a reality:

- Leave no one behind. We should ensure that no person – regardless of ethnicity, gender, geography, disability, race or other status – is denied universal human rights and basic economic opportunities.
- Put sustainable development at the core. Developed countries have a special role to play, fostering new technologies and making the fastest progress in reducing unsustainable consumption. We must act now to halt the alarming pace of climate change and environmental degradation, which pose unprecedented threats to humanity.
- Transform economies for jobs and inclusive growth. We call for a quantum leap forward in economic opportunities and a profound economic transformation to end extreme poverty and improve livelihoods. This means a rapid shift to sustainable patterns of consumption and production – harnessing innovation, technology, and the potential of private business. Diversified economies, with equal opportunities for all, can unleash the dynamism that creates jobs and livelihoods, especially for young people [...] while moving to the sustainable patterns of work and life.
- Build peace and effective, open and accountable institutions for all. Freedom from fear, conflict and violence is the most fundamental human right, and the essential foundation for building peaceful and prosperous societies. We are calling for a fundamental shift – to recognize peace and good governance as core elements of wellbeing, not optional extras.
- Forge a new global partnership. A new spirit of solidarity, cooperation, and mutual accountability that must underpin the post-2015 agenda. A new partnership should be based on a common understanding of our shared humanity, underpinning mutual respect and mutual benefit.

- On 25 September 2013, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon presented member states with his report: A Life of Dignity for All\(^{22}\).
- Report of the Open Working Group of the General Assembly on Sustainable Development Goals, 12 August 2014\(^{23}\).
- The latest update on the Millennium Development Goals can be found in The Millennium Development Goals Report 2015\(^{24}\).

Also significantly, two years after the MDGs, the International Conference on Financing for Development\(^{25}\) was held in Monterrey (Mexico), from 18 to 22 March.

Another of the goals of cooperation is how to improve its impact, which is widely known as the ‘quality of aid’. Along with the MDGs, the Aid Effectiveness Agenda (AEA) was activated, with the Paris Forum from 28 February to 2 March 2005 signalling a milestone in this connection. The

---


\(^{25}\) For information in relation to this Conference’s consensus agreement, see [http://www.un.org/esa/ffd/ffdconf/](http://www.un.org/esa/ffd/ffdconf/)
meeting concluded with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, aimed at increasing effectiveness based on five principles:

**Ownership:** Partner countries exercise effective leadership over their development policies, and strategies and co-ordinate development actions;

**Alignment:** Donors base their overall support on partner countries' national development strategies, institutions and procedures;

**Harmonization:** Donors’ actions are more harmonized, transparent and collectively effective;

**Managing for results:** Managing resources and improving decision-making for results;

**Mutual accountability:** Donors and partners are accountable for development results. These commitments are adopted by donors and partner countries, international bodies, international financial institutions (IFIs) and civil society organizations (CSOs) to achieve more efficiency in development results.

The main guiding principles and participating actors are identified in the chart below:

The Paris forum was followed by others seeking to implement measures to ensure aid effectiveness: the Accra Agenda for Action (Guinea), from 2 to 4 September 2008; the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (South Korea), from 29 November to 1 December 2011, with the shift from effective cooperation aid for effective development and the importance of civil society organizations, South-South and triangular cooperation, and the private sector.
It is worth highlighting the role of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation, which compiles reports on the progress made. The first High-Level Meeting of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation took place in Mexico City on 15 and 16 April 2014, with the aim of fostering broad and plural dialogue and facilitating a renewed exchange of experiences, to help maximise the impact of international development cooperation.

The final years of the MDGs ran parallel to the adoption of what was to be their continuation, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): “a set of goals to end poverty, protect the planet, and ensure prosperity for all as part of a new sustainable development agenda. Each goal has specific targets to be achieved over the next 15 years. For the goals to be reached, everyone needs to do their part: governments, the private sector, civil society and people like you.” They are also aimed at strengthening universal peace and access to justice.

The SDGs are the result of a negotiating process that ended with the adoption of the document “Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”, establishing the following:

“We resolve, between now and 2030, to end poverty and hunger everywhere; to combat inequalities within and among countries; to build peaceful, just and inclusive societies; to protect human rights and promote gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls; and to ensure the lasting protection of the planet and its natural resources.”

The manner and procedures on which the adoption of the SDGs is based are different to their predecessors, the MDGs, which were managed by a small core of organizations. In this case there was a participatory process, the main exponent of which was a global survey involving more than a million people from all countries and sectors. The result was compiled into a report entitled “A million voices: the world we want. A sustainable future with dignity for all”.

The Agenda proposes 17 Goals, with 169 integrated and indivisible targets that encompass economic, social and environmental issues.

The five P’s cover the main aspects to enable all human beings to realise their potential in dignity and equality and a healthy environment: people, planet, prosperity, peace, and partnership.

---

27 See the document http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/MEMORIA-FINAL.pdf?bcsi_scan_11a27411b226e6d9=ef8qvykqy1q8nbfkpzt8kspclecwtaaaa5w+CWg==&bcsi_scan_filename=MEMORIA-FINAL.pdf
29 To access the report online, visit http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/mdg/a-million-voices--the-world-we-want/
The September 2015 conference in New York was not the only significant meeting that year. A few months earlier, from 13 to 16 July, the Third International Conference on Financing for Development took place in Addis Ababa (Ethiopia); the final Declaration outlined the positives and negatives of the status of financing for development which, unlike the MDGs, are debated prior to the final adoption – or in parallel – to the SDGs: significant progress in the mobilization of financial and technical resources, greater presence of developing countries in global trade, helping to substantially reduce the number of persons living in conditions of extreme poverty and to reach the MDGs; but at the same time some countries still lag behind and inequality persists, which, along with the impact of the crisis or the increase in disasters has a negative impact on much of the world’s population.

And the year ended with COP21, the 21st International Conference on Climate Change, held in Paris from 30 November to 11 December, under the auspices of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). This was another historic meeting at which the representatives of 175 countries signed non-binding agreements to tackle climate change. Notably, only two countries, China and the United States, are responsible for almost 40% of polluting emissions. The treaty was opened for signature on 22 April 2016 – at a high-level ceremony attended, among others, by the US Secretary of State, John Kerry, and the Chinese Vice Premier, Zhang Gaoli – and will remain open until 22 April 2017. It is expected to enter into force in 2018.

Accordingly, the Sustainable Development Goals are the culmination of a period that expresses the multilateral option in achieving development, replacing the previous alternative in which development was subject to the relationship between donor and partner, in line with the North-South trend. The SDGs reflect not only a new and broader dimension of development, but also,
with all their limitations, they were agreed with the involvement of a broad range of stakeholders, as we shall see below.

The final part of this document will discuss the challenges and difficulties posed in launching a system to monitor and achieve the Sustainable Development Goals as set by the 2030 Agenda.

3. The key players in development cooperation

The transition from aid to cooperation is key to interpreting the process of change in those involved in achieving development, i.e. the key players in development cooperation.

For decades, aid was an instrument of donors applied under their guidelines, using their resources and expert personnel, to the recipients they chose, based on their geographical selection criteria (geopolitical, post-colonial or based on human development, as in Nordic countries). The map of key players featuring the traditional donors (developed ‘Northern’ countries, that provide ODA to developing countries) has given way to new forms and processes that make for a more complex map of stakeholders.

At present, this map is richer, more diverse, more complex, but may also lead to more confusion in regard to the role played by each actor in the global development cooperation apparatus. The table below shows this multiplicity of players taking part in development cooperation:

![Diagram of the international system of cooperation for development]

Source: Juan Pablo Prado, at [www.sela.org/media/266293/023600004276-0-0-de-4-visions-approaches-and-trends-of-international-cooperation-for-development.pdf](http://www.sela.org/media/266293/023600004276-0-0-de-4-visions-approaches-and-trends-of-international-cooperation-for-development.pdf)

Various methods of categorization, typology and identification may be established for the players involved in cooperation (public-private, North-South, etc.). At the risk of providing an overly simplified view of their characteristics, there follows a description of the players taking part in the cooperation system:
International Organizations

- Intergovernmental.
- Global or regional.
- They represent multilateral cooperation.
- In the United Nations’ system, financial organizations are distinguished from non-financial ones:
  - Financial: International Monetary Fund and World Bank Group.
  - Non-Financial: Organizations (WHO, ILO, FAO…), Programmes, Agencies (UNDP, WFP, UNHCR, UNRWA…).

Regional: Inter-American Development Bank, African Development Bank, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).

Multilateral Development Organizations (MDOs).

Given the wide range of actors and their potential overlapping, duplicity or inefficiency, the United Nations has implemented the “Delivering As One” programme to achieve a more coherent, effective and efficient UN system.

The Development Assistance Committee (DAC), belonging to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and comprising 29 members:

Donor country governments and institutions

- They represent traditional bilateral aid.
- The majority belong to the DAC.
- Each State, based on their aid/cooperation policy, has a specific structure for deciding aid policy and how it will be managed (Spain: AECID; United States: USAID; Japan: JICA; Sweden: ASDI, etc.).
- According to Manuel de la Iglesia-Caruncho, between foreign policy and cooperation policy there are three recognizable models of relations:

31 See https://undg.org/home/guidance-policies/delivering-as-one/
In the first, cooperation policy is an instrument of foreign policy. Its best-known exponent, but not the only one, is the United States.

In the second model, cooperation policy is an element, among others, that defines foreign policy. It interacts with it from a position of relative independence, not subordination, and thereby contributes to shaping foreign policy. In this model, other public policies tackle domestic needs, but cooperation policy is consistent with the goal of development.

In the third model, cooperation policy influences other policies with an impact on Southern countries, and effectively becomes a development policy.

**Decentralized cooperation**

Decentralized cooperation is one of the most active forms of cooperation at present. It involves non-state entities and is therefore dependent upon the political structure of each country. It is also a way for these non-state entities to implement their own foreign projection.

In Spain, it is practised by Autonomous Regions and Local Governments (provincial governments, municipalities or groups of municipalities).


**European Union**

The European Union is an international player in a class of its own, since it assumes competencies transferred by its member states, affording it responsibility of its own (and shared) in both internal matters and international relations, including development cooperation policy, which is managed essentially through EuropeAid.

Along with its Member States, it is the leading global donor of development assistance, as evidenced by the chart above on Official Development Assistance by DAC members.

**Donor/recipient country governments and institutions**

The case of Middle-Income Countries (MICs); characteristics of MICs.

According to the World Bank criterion (2005), 93 countries (or Territories) are classed as middle-income; these are countries whose GNP per capita income is between 766 and 9,385 dollars (2003). These countries are further divided into two sub-groups: lower middle-income-countries, of which there are 56 (their GNI per capita ranges from 766 to 3,035 dollars); and upper middle-income countries, of which there are 38 (whose GNI per capita ranges from 3,035 to 9,385 dollars). Accordingly, the MICs account for around 60% of countries traditionally considered to be developing. Of this figure, 77 countries (and 7 Territories) are also considered to be middle-income by the OECD’s DAC.

---

MICs are to be found throughout the developing world. However, the regions presenting a higher proportion of MICs are Latin America (79%) and North Africa-Middle East (67%).

‘Dual’ countries are those receiving and contributing to cooperation. Peru is a typical example.

**The ‘new’ players in assistance/cooperation**

- Characterized by their economic emergence and more prevalent international role.
- China, India, Russia, Mexico and Colombia are all notable for their cooperation.

**South-South and Triangular Cooperation**

The South is playing an increasingly important role in international relations, although this way of working was parallel to the decolonization process, as we saw previously.

One of the doubts raised by this manner of cooperation is whether it is considered to be an alternative or a supplement to traditional assistance.

**South-South cooperation**

This is also known as “technical cooperation between developing countries”. Although there is currently no broad consensus on a definition of South-South cooperation (SSC) in terms of developing countries, it is possible to infer from international documents that this is “a conscious, systematic and politically motivated process developed to create a framework of multiple links between developing countries” born out of “shared experiences and sympathies, based on their common objectives and solidarity, and guided by, inter alia, the principles of respect for national sovereignty and ownership, free from any conditionalities”.

The South-South cooperation agenda and South-South cooperation initiatives must be determined by the southern countries themselves and guided by the principles of respect for national sovereignty, national ownership and the generation of national and collective self-sufficiency, non-conditionality and non-interference in internal affairs, and mutual benefit. South-South cooperation is also guided by the principles of horizontality, in other words, that countries collaborate with each other as partners; equity, which means the benefits and costs of this cooperation should be distributed fairly between the participants; consensus, which means interventions must have been planned in agreed negotiating frameworks; solidarity and respect for national priorities in reciprocity and pointing towards an exchange of knowledge and experience between countries facing similar challenges.


**Triangular cooperation**

Three players are normally involved in triangular cooperation: a country or international body that provides the financial resources, another country that provides the technical and human resources

---


(pivotal country), and a third, beneficiary country that may also contribute its own resources. This is a mixed system that is generally set up with a northern country providing financial support so that a southern country can provide technical assistance to a third southern country.

Source: www.realidadayuda.org/glossary/cooperacion-triangular

**Private actors**

The list is long, varied and complex. One of the classic actors are NGDOs, which combine with other grassroots organizations, such as Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and other more heterodox bodies such as social movements.

From a business perspective, both enterprises as such and other institutions related to them (like foundations, which may also be public or public-private) play a significant role, especially in the case of large multinational corporations. The role of Corporate Social Responsibility

Trade unions also carry out cooperation work, especially in areas linked to their activity (employment rights, health and safety, etc.).

**Private aid:** Philanthropists (persons with ‘love for humanity’), who use part of their wealth for humanitarian projects; or famous people who collaborate in NGOs’ campaigns.

One of the best-known players in this field is the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (see website: www.gatesfoundation.org/).

**Public-private partnerships**

There is no widely accepted definition of a public-private partnership (PPP). Generally speaking, a public-private partnership refers to an agreement between the public and private sectors in which part of the services or tasks that are the responsibility of the public sector are provided by the private sector under a clear agreement of shared goals to provide a public service or infrastructure. They do not usually include contracts for services or turnkey contracts, since they are considered public contracting projects, or the privatisation of public services in which there is a continued and limited role for the public sector.

In this description of players participating in the cooperation system, the media play an important role by devoting part of their news programmes/dissemination to solidarity and cooperation initiatives. A few examples of this are:

http://blogs.elpais.com/3500-millones/
www.eldiario.es/temas/cooperacion/
www.elmundo.es/solidaridad.html?id=MENUHOM24801&s_kw=fijo
www.theguardian.com/global-development

To better understand the increasing complexity of the development cooperation map, the concept of multi-actor ecosystems is used, which refers to achieving “the highest possible degree of integration for a set of actors”. In other words, an international cooperation environment with
multi-actor participatory structures, coordinated and aimed at achieving common goals, in this case development.\footnote{http://cepei.org/portfolio/la-cooperacion-internacional-para-el-desarrollo-en-america-latina-para-un-contexto-multiactoral/}

One of the main authors for reference on this topic is Homi Kharas, whose work may be consulted at http://www.brookings.edu/experts/kharas; he is the author of books such as Catalyzing Development: A New Vision for Aid (Brookings Press, 2011), and the article “La ayuda al desarrollo en el siglo XXI” (Development assistance in the 21st century), Revista Sistema: 2009, n. 213, pp. 3-36.
4. Modalities and instruments

According to the Spanish Cooperation Agency (AECID) Guide to Cooperation Modalities and Instruments, the terms “modality” and “instrument” tend to be used indistinctly to designate the various options for distributing and materialising aid that are available to donors. There is a general consensus that, in practice, there are no “pure” instruments and modalities, and that they will be more or less adequate depending on the results they seek and the location where they are applied, so the challenge is to find the optimal combination of aid instruments and modalities whose application boosts the quality and enhances the impact of cooperation interventions in accordance with their goals. This combination of modalities and instruments must necessarily respond to the characteristics of the specific context of the intervention, and should be aimed at achieving a more effective and higher quality aid.

Modalities: We will define modalities or “types” of aid as the general options open to donors for channelling and delivering the aid funds, based on: 1. The nature of the aid being transferred; 2. The conditions associated with its delivery; 3. The means of channelling the aid; 4. The level of alignment with the development policies of the recipient country.

Instruments: We will refer to instruments as the options and final tools through which aid is materialized and executed in a specific context to underpin the proposed goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>MODALITIES (Options for channelling and delivering the aid)</th>
<th>INSTRUMENTS (HOW THEY ARE MATERIALISED IN THE PARTNER COUNTRY)</th>
<th>ADMIN PROCEDURES (MECHANISMS TO TRANSFER THE AID)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Financial</td>
<td>- Financial (includes technical cooperation)</td>
<td>- Programmes and projects</td>
<td>- Concurrent international cooperation subsidies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In kind</td>
<td>- Reimbursable/non-reimbursable</td>
<td>- Scholarships and training grants</td>
<td>- Direct international cooperation subsidies (in cash or kind)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATED CONDITIONS</td>
<td>- Linked/not linked</td>
<td>- Technical support</td>
<td>- International cooperation subsidies for humanitarian action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reimbursable/non-reimbursable</td>
<td>- Conditional/unconditional</td>
<td>- Mandatory contributions to international bodies (IBs)</td>
<td>- Nominal subsidies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Linked/not linked</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Voluntary contributions to IBs</td>
<td>- Administrative contracts for supplies and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conditional/unconditional</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Fiduciary funds in IBs</td>
<td>- Private contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANNELS</td>
<td>- Programmes and projects</td>
<td>- Global funds</td>
<td>- Memoranda of understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct bilateral</td>
<td>- Technical support</td>
<td>- Budget support (general and by sector)</td>
<td>- Collaboration agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect bilateral</td>
<td>- Mandatory contributions to international bodies (IBs)</td>
<td>- Pool funding</td>
<td>- Management commissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>- Voluntary contributions to IBs</td>
<td>- Loans, credit lines or financing facilities (including micro-financing)</td>
<td>- FONPRODE and FCAS operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- AECID (direct execution)</td>
<td>- Fiduciary funds in IBs</td>
<td>- Capital transactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public entities in the partner country</td>
<td>- Global funds</td>
<td>- Blending transactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- International bodies (multi-bilateral)</td>
<td>- Budget support (general and by sector)</td>
<td>- Debt relief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- International bodies</td>
<td>- Pool funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DNGOs and the rest of civil society (in accordance with whether or not they are from the partner country)</td>
<td>- Loans, credit lines or financing facilities (including micro-financing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Private sector (in accordance with whether or not they are from the partner country)</td>
<td>- Capital transactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other donors: Triangular cooperation and delegated cooperation</td>
<td>- Blending transactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Debt relief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Guía de Modalidades e Instrumentos de Cooperación de la AECID (AECID Guide to Cooperation Modalities and Instruments)
Cooperation may be embodied in a range of different ways that have grown in number and complexity over time. The most basic and traditional is financial and technical assistance, as it implies the transfer of resources of both these kinds from donor to recipient. A clear case of this development is the fight against hunger, which has gone from food aid (essentially to solve a problem for rich countries, namely the agricultural surpluses that were the result of protectionism), to food security and sovereignty. There has also been progress in connection with the shift from humanitarian aid to humanitarian action.

Over time, and with the appearance of new actors, the range of options has also broadened to include new modalities such as budget and sector support, debt swaps and delegated cooperation.

And recently South-South and Triangular Cooperation have both gained in prominence, linked to the inclusion of southern countries and the new ways of collaborating with northern countries.

Here are a few of the most common classifications.

There is a distinction between bilateral aid (essentially implemented by governments to governments) and multilateral aid (managed through multilateral bodies).

Although there tend to be certain elements of differentiation based on the actor involved, decentralised cooperation is essentially conducted by non-state, regional and local entities. This type of cooperation “can clearly contribute to the principles of aid effectiveness, be it from the point of view of democratic appropriation, responsibility, and mutual rendering of accounts, or from the double perspective of member states, donors and aid recipients”, according to the research document The Debate on Decentralized Cooperation: Aid Effectiveness After 2015, published under the auspices of UNDP-ART, CIDOB and the Millennium Campaign 36.

Another classic distinction is between reimbursable and non-reimbursable assistance; the former is granted in the form of loans or credit (in Spain’s case, reimbursable financial managed by the FONPRODE or micro-loans) while the latter is granted as a donation (as in the case of humanitarian aid).

There is also a distinction between actions, projects and programmes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Cooperation action is conducted on a standalone basis and, generally, there is no signed document. This instrument is used frequently in south-south cooperation between Latin American countries.</th>
<th>Uruguay holds a skill-building seminar on bovine traceability for Latin American countries.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>This is the most common unit of work in international cooperation. It has a defined scope in terms of time and goals. Activities and (development) outcomes are proposed with which to measure their compliance and impact.</td>
<td>Project against gender violence supported by AECID in Uruguay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programmes encompass a set of projects/lines of action that all contribute to the same goals. They are on a larger scale than projects in terms of resources and duration, and the scope of their goals.

The 'Uruguay Integra' programme for social and territorial cohesion financed by the European Union in Uruguay.


The Uruguayan Agency for International Cooperation (AUCI) classifies types of international cooperation based on various criteria:

a) Types of cooperation based on the legal status of the cooperant: Official, Unofficial/Private

b) Types of international cooperation according to the actors involved: North-South/Traditional Cooperation, South-South Cooperation, Triangular Cooperation, Decentralised Cooperation, Global/Thematic Fund, Philanthropy, Cooperation between Non-Governmental Organisations.

c) Cooperation modalities by their implementation method and final beneficiaries: Multilateral Cooperation, Bilateral Cooperation, Regional or Multi-Country Cooperation, Delegated Cooperation, Food Aid, Debt Swap/Relief or Debt Remission/Restructuring, Financial Cooperation, Technical Cooperation, Budget Support (general or by sector), Donor Basket Funds (Pool Funding).

d) Classification by purpose/sector targeted/benefited by the cooperation: Humanitarian Aid, Trade Assistance, Scientific-Technological Cooperation, Cultural Cooperation, Economic Cooperation, Environmental Cooperation, Social Cooperation, Peace-Keeping.

Programmatic Aid: Programmatic aid is a cooperation modality in which the government of the partner country leads the plan or programme, with a single budget framework, supported in a coordinated manner by other donors (see AECID website).

Delegated Cooperation: a donor (known as a silent donor) commissions another (known as the lead donor) the partial or complete execution of an operation.

In the new architecture of aid, programmatic aid is the main mechanism to materialise the concepts that define it. These programme-based approaches, or programmatic aid, present a series of characteristics:

- Leadership by the country or local organization;
- A single, comprehensive programme and budget;
- A formalised coordination between donors and harmonization of procedures for reports, budgets, financial management and procurements;
- Efforts aimed at increasing the use of local systems for design and implementation, financial management, monitoring and evaluation.


For further information, see:

Modalidades e instrumentos de la cooperación http://www.aecid.es/EN/aecid/modalities-and-instruments-of-cooperation
Guía de Modalidades e Instrumentos de Cooperación de la AECID (AECID Guide to Cooperation Modalities and Instruments)

www.aecid.es/Centro-Documentacion/Documentos/Modalidades%20de%20cooperaci%C3%B3n/Guia%20de%20modalidades%20de%20cooperaci%C3%B3n.pdf
5. Significance of awareness-raising and education for development

“Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed”; we might take this statement, which belongs to the pre-amble of the UNESCO Constitution (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), as a reference to highlight the importance of education and awareness-raising for development. Training in values, in citizenship, is vital to shape attitudes that, embedded in knowledge, are based on respect for others, regardless of any criteria. It would seem impossible to cooperate with others without the foundation that is implied by education for development.

We include the definition offered by Spanish Coordinating Council of Development NGOs, CONGDE (Coordinadora ONG para el Desarrollo España):

A process to generate critical consciences, make each person responsible and active (committed), to build a new civil society, in both the North and the South, committed to solidarity, meaning co-responsibility – we are all involved in development and there are no longer borders or geographic distance – and participative, whose demands, needs, concerns and analysis are taken into account when it comes to making political, economic and social decisions.

Source: http://guiarecursos-epd.coordinadoraongd.org/uploads/documentos/que_es_la_educacion_para_el_desarrollo.pdf

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights already emphasized the crucial importance of education:

**Article 26.2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, of 1948:**

> Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

The way to implement it is a fundamental responsibility of public development policy, as acknowledged by the Spanish Cooperation Agency in its document on education strategy for development, **Estrategia de Educación para el Desarrollo de la Cooperación Española**, which defines it as:

> “A formal, non-formal or informal educational process which is constantly works, through knowledge, attitudes and values, to promote a global society committed to solidarity, to combating poverty and social exclusion and to favour sustainable human development.”

The chart below shows the different aspects of education for development:
Education and awareness-raising for development is defined as “a formal, non-formal or informal educational process which is constantly works, through knowledge, attitudes and values, to promote a global society committed to solidarity, to combating poverty and social exclusion and to favour sustainable human development”. Education for development encompasses training, research, awareness-raising and social participation. One of the main options is that education for development actions may focus primarily on the sphere of training in all its aspects, because of its capacity to generate profound change and its multiplying effect (teachers, students, parents). There are two defining features of education for development: they are formative processes involving long-term cultural changes; actions are aimed at specific groups and at the population, and this shapes the potential application of the principles of effectiveness and quality of assistance, devised for development initiatives in partner countries (see Spanish Development Agency’s guide: Guía de Modalidades e Instrumentos de Cooperación de la AECID).
6. Trends and challenges in development cooperation

With all its mistakes and flaws, development cooperation is still one of the elements that can tackle the grave problems facing humanity. It is not easy, in a world plagued by conflict, where violence is presented as the way out of poverty and desperation. The cosmopolitan option has a growing army of enemies: exclusive nationalisms, racists and xenophobes, religious radicalism, ultra-conservative political groups... so one of the best ways to tackle them is to manage a set of issues that affect the interests of the population in their various scales, to properly administer public matters and to strengthen the role of solidarity from the local to the global scale.

The usual picture of what happens in the world does not spur much optimism: poverty, inequality, the impact of climate change, conflicts and humanitarian crises, human rights violations, etc.

The World Humanitarian Summit (Istanbul, 23-24 May 2016) highlighted that we are at a critical juncture. “The world is witnessing the highest level of human suffering since the Second World War.”

We are no longer merely aware of the scope of poverty, the lack of water and sewerage, the disparities in healthcare and education, but we observe the scale of increasing inequality, as underscored by authors such as Thomas Piketty, Branko Milanovic and Martin Ravallion.

According to the Oxfam briefing paper published on 18 January 2016, entitled “An Economy for the 1%. How privilege and power in the economy drive extreme inequality and how this can be stopped.”

“The global inequality crisis is reaching new extremes. The richest 1% now have more wealth than the rest of the world combined. Power and privilege is being used to skew the economic system to increase the gap between the richest and the rest. A global network of tax havens further enables the richest individuals to hide $7.6 trillion. The fight against poverty will not be won until the inequality crisis is tackled.”

38 See https://www.worldhumanitariansummit.org/learn. In connection with humanitarian action, consult the website of the Conflict and Humanitarian Action Research Institute (Instituto de Estudios sobre el Conflicto y la Acción Humanitaria – IECAH) http://www.iecah.org/. In an article entitled “La ayuda en un mundo en crisis, Acnur y otros organismos de socorro abordan una cantidad sin precedentes de necesidades humanas, pero para ello necesitan ampliar su base de apoyo” (Aid in a world in crisis: UNHCR and other aid organizations are facing an unprecedented number of human needs, for which purpose they must broaden their support base), at http://elpais.com/elpais/2015/02/16/planeta_futuro/1424088809_092380.html, Antonio Guterres offers some shocking data: Never, in its 64-year history, has United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) had to tackle so much human misery. In early 2014, more than 51 million people had been displaced from their homes, uprooted by conflicts and persecution.
39 In an interview under the headline “La desigualdad impedirá crecer y reducir la pobreza” (Inequality will prevent growth and hamper efforts to reduce poverty), the economist Martin Ravallion, who established the limit of extreme poverty at one dollar per day, urges governments to take collective action. 13 July 2016 http://elpais.com/elpais/2016/07/01/planeta_futuro/1467382820_163262.html
A hyperglobalized world, in which Dani Rodrik\(^41\) presents the tensions between democracy linked to national interests and a series of decisions made on the global scale:

**Rodrik's Trilemma**

In the face of the challenge posed by the fact that “the imbalance between the national scope of governments and the global nature of markets forms the soft underbelly of globalization”, considering that “markets and governments are complements, not substitutes”, Rodrik poses the “fundamental political trilemma of the world economy: we cannot simultaneously pursue democracy, national determination, and economic globalization. If we want to push globalization further, we have to give up either the nation state or democratic politics. If we want to maintain and deepen democracy, we have to choose between the nation state and international economic integration. And if we want to keep the nation state and self-determination, we have to choose between deepening democracy and deepening globalization. Our troubles have their roots in our reluctance to face up to these ineluctable choices”. He reaches the conclusion that “the great diversity that marks our current world renders hyperglobalization incompatible with democracy”.

One option to tackle the deficiencies of national measures to deal with global issues is to strengthen regional integration processes and increase global governance mechanisms, boosting the role of institutions\(^42\).

In connection with these grave injustices, many people advocate respect and human rights, in extremely adverse conditions, sometimes even risking their lives. There are numerous instances of resistance; we have chosen one which also enables us to recognise a fighter. Her opposition to the Agua Zarca hydropower dam project in Honduras led to the murder of Berta Cáceres, a member of the Lenca indigenous community of Río Blanco, on 3 March 2016; other activists from the Civic Council of Popular and Indigenous Organizations of Honduras (COPINH) have also been murdered. Berta Cáceres’s protest received recognition when, in 2015, she was awarded the Goldman Environmental Prize, also known as the Green Nobel\(^43\). One of the recurring phrases of Mary Robinson, president of the Mary Robinson Foundation - Climate Justice, is that empowering women is fundamental for sustainable development\(^44\).

In a world of turmoil, that is interconnected – with more mobile phones (7.3 billion) than people (7.2 billion), and increasingly dehumanized, in which the most globalized component is fear, cooperation must overcome a number of challenges and difficulties.

The impact of the technological changes is such that new technologies continue to gain ground and seek to conquer the jobs of the future. 65\% of the children starting primary school now will work in jobs that do not yet exist\(^45\).


\(^{43}\) Watch her acceptance speech at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AR1kwx8b0ms](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AR1kwx8b0ms)

If human beings’ impact on the environment is increasing, the rising global population (see the population meter at http://www.worldometers.info) is one of the factors with the greatest impact for the future.

![World Population Table]

**Source:** [www.worldometers.info](http://www.worldometers.info) consulted on 28/09/2016.

Especially significant is the growth of cities and the problems and opportunities it implies. The goal of an inclusive city model in which inequalities are reduced will be one of the themes of the UN Conference on Housing and Sustainable Development – Habitat III, to be held in October 2016 in Quito, Ecuador.

The Millennium Development Goals generated high expectations, as they committed countries to achieving substantial improvements for much of the world’s population. Fifteen years after their adoption, the result has been varied.

Below is the forward to the Millennium Development Goals Report 2015, by Ban Ki-moon.

With regard to Goal 1 (Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger), the Report provides the following figures:

**Unprecedented efforts have resulted in profound achievements**

**GOAL 1: ERADICATE EXTREME POVERTY AND HUNGER**

- Extreme poverty has declined significantly over the last two decades. In 1990, nearly half of the population in the developing world lived on less than $1.25 a day; that proportion dropped to 14 per cent in 2015.

- Globally, the number of people living in extreme poverty has declined by more than half, falling from 1.9 billion in 1990 to 836 million in 2015. Most progress has occurred since 2000.

- The number of people in the working middle class—living on more than $4 a day—has almost tripled between 1991 and 2015. This group now makes up half the workforce in the developing regions, up from just 18 per cent in 1991.

- The proportion of undernourished people in the developing regions has fallen by almost half since 1990, from 23.3 per cent in 1990-1992 to 12.9 per cent in 2014-2016.
In terms of income-based measures of poverty, such as GNI, the performance has generally been positive: “In 1994, 56.1% of the world’s population – 3.1 billion people – lived in the 64 low-income countries. In 2014, this was down to 8.5%, or 613 million people, living in 31 countries. It is heartening to see that over the last one year itself four nations crossed over that critical line from the low-income to the lower-middle income category.” One of the factors with the biggest impact on this performance is China’s economic growth, which has resulted in the improvement of poverty figures globally.

A key issue to boost the impact of cooperation is the coherence of development policies:

“From an overall perspective, coherence is a desirable goal for any government action, since incoherent practices have negative consequences on effectiveness – failure to achieve objectives –, on efficiency – lack of optimization in the management of public resources –, and on the credibility of the country as a whole. Moreover, progress towards greater policy coherence is an improvement in the quality, coordination and transparency of governance, since it can detect interferences and identify complementarities. Hence the coherence becomes a must dimension for efficient and quality governance.

The objective of the PCD implies, in principle, a global commitment of governments in promoting development, which makes it an especially appealing notion, beyond the problems associated with its implementation. It should be noted that coherence has an instrumental value that is subordinated to the objectives defined as priorities within public administration. That is, the coherence among goals, values, policies and instruments can be influenced by various interests, among which human development is not always conceived as a priority. Also, it is worth to remember that in a democratic system coexist by definition contradictory and legitimate interests that represent the diversity of opinions and groups that make up a plural political model. Therefore, only in cases where the behavior and preferences of individuals are expressed homogeneously, or where there is an authoritarian regime, absolute coherence would be possible. Since the first scenario is completely removed from reality and the second case would be a system contrary to any respectful perspective on human rights and freedom, achieving an absolute degree of coherence can become an incompatible and undesirable objective for a pluralistic, open and participatory system.”

On 16 March 2016, the Policy Coherence for Development Index (PCDI) was presented as an innovative tool for measuring countries’ progress as an alternative to measurements based on economic growth.

---


Another challenge is the involvement of the private sector in development cooperation, as evidenced by its increasing participation in international forums. This was the case at the Third International Conference on Financing for Development (Addis Ababa Action Agenda, 27 July 2015)\(^\text{49}\):

"35. Private business activity, investment and innovation are major drivers of productivity, inclusive economic growth and job creation. We acknowledge the diversity of the private sector, ranging from microenterprises to cooperatives to multinationals."

"42. We welcome the rapid growth of philanthropic giving and the significant financial and non-financial contribution philanthropists have made towards achieving our common goals."

This is also the case in connection with the SDG Fund, with the presence of 13 companies, four of which are Spanish (Fundación BBVA Microfinanzas, Ebrofood, Seres and Ferrovial).

Under the auspices of the United Nations, the UN Global Compact was launched\(^\text{50}\):

This is an international initiative aimed at implementing 10 universally accepted principles to promote corporate social responsibility (CSR) in the spheres of Human Rights and Business, Labour Regulations, Environment and Anti-Corruption measures in the activities and business strategies of enterprises. With more than 13,000 signatory companies in more than 145 countries, it is the largest voluntary corporate social responsibility initiative in the world.

At the time of writing this text, we are almost a year away from adopting the Sustainable Development Goals, for which the adoption of indicators and monitoring mechanisms was left pending. Participating in this task, for which governments are primarily responsible, are also not only inter-governmental entities, but, crucially, civil society.

The question “What must governments do to comply with the 2030 Agenda?” is posed in the article “Ya tenemos 17 Objetivos, ¿y ahora qué?” (We have the 17 goals. Now what?)\(^\text{51}\). “The time has come for states to assume the commitments they acquired to safeguard the future for all”, asserted Alicia Bárcena (Executive Secretary to the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean), Pascal Lamy (former Director General of the World Trade Organization) and


\(^{50}\) https://www.unglobalcompact.org

\(^{51}\) See http://elpais.com/elpais/2016/02/26/planeta_futuro/1456484933_719548.html. See also the article by Gabriel Ferrero: "Reformas necesarias para implementar los ODS" (The reforms needed to implement the SDGs), http://elpais.com/elpais/2016/02/22/planeta_futuro/1456160516_880929.html?rel=mas. José Antonio Sanahuja and Sergio Tezanos: "Del milenio a la sostenibilidad: en ruta hacia la Agenda 2030 de Desarrollo Sostenible" (From the Millennium to Sustainability: en route to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development), Sistema digital, 254-255 (25 July to 31 July 2016). A reference point are the suspicions in regard to compliance with the MDGs, as outlined by the man considered to be their co-architect, Jan Vandemoortele, "No creas todo lo que dicen de los ODM" (Don't believe everything they say about the MDGs), http://elpais.com/elpais/2015/02/09/planeta_futuro/1423489334_643762.html. UNICEF: Qué son los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible y por qué van a cambiar tu mundo (What are the Sustainable Development Goals and Why are they going to change your world?) http://www.unicef.es/actualidad-documentacion/noticias/objetivos-de-desarrollo-sostenible-que-podemos-conseguir-en-los
Connie Hedegaard (former European Commissioner for Climate Action)\textsuperscript{52}. In this connection, accountability and transparency are indispensable\textsuperscript{53}.

Gonzalo Fanjul asks if there is any way to fulfil the new development goals, with reference to the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) Report \textit{Projecting Progress: Reaching the SDGs by 2030}\textsuperscript{54}:

\textbf{BOLETÍN ODS (SDG BULLETIN)}

\textbf{2030 OUTCOMES}

\textbf{REFORM}

\textbf{REVOLUTION}

---

\textsuperscript{52} See call for action at http://elpais.com/elpais/2016/05/10/opinion/1462871572_233436.html.

\textsuperscript{53} For this purpose, there are tools such as the Aid Transparency Index http://ati.publishwhatyoufund.org/, “Aid transparency: are we nearly there?”, at http://www.cgdev.org/blog/aid-transparency-are-we-nearly-there.

## Approaching the final stretch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1 Eradicate extreme poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.1 GDP growth in least developed countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.2 Halt deforestation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Slow progress means we are not on target**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1 Reduce maternal mortality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1 University education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.1 Reduce violent deaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.1 Strengthen domestic resource mobilisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1 End hunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2 Universal access to sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.1 Universal access to energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3 End child marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.2 Industrialisation of least developed countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**We need a change of direction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.1 Reduce income inequalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.1 Reduce population living in slums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.5 Reduce waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.2 Combat climate change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the options for staging and monitoring the SDGs is the High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development. To monitor its activity, see [https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/hlpf/2015](https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/hlpf/2015).

With regard to the option of working in multi-actor ecosystems:

It may also be useful to learn from global experiences such as the one implemented by the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) through the approval of a document detailing the lines for conducting national consultations within the framework of the preliminary work for the adoption of the 2030 Agenda, in order to stimulate an inclusive, grassroots debate aimed at decision-makers on the post-2015 Agenda, contributing ideas on how to foster inclusive consultations with the involvement of government representatives, NGOs, civil society, grassroots organizations, indigenous peoples, social movements for women, young people and children, and the private sector, among others.

In his Encyclical Letter “Laudato Si”, of 24 May 2015, Pope Francis reflected on the world in which we live and, as a result, our collective responsibility in tackling the grave problems facing humanity. Pope Francis calls for a new form of universal solidarity, as in the following sections:

> “51. Inequity affects not only individuals but entire countries; it compels us to consider an ethics of international relations. A true ‘ecological debt’ exists, particularly between the global north and south, connected to commercial imbalances with effects on the environment, and the disproportionate use of natural resources by certain countries over long periods of time.”

---

55 To monitor its activity, see [https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/hlpf/2015](https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/hlpf/2015)

“56. In the meantime, economic powers continue to justify the current global system where priority tends to be given to speculation and the pursuit of financial gain, which fail to take the context into account, let alone the effects on human dignity and the natural environment.”

“Leave no one behind” is one of the most strongly worded phrases of the Sustainable Development Goals and the 2030 Agenda, and it is perhaps one of the biggest concerns for an agenda that combines its universal nature with its effective application to every man and woman on the planet.

Development cooperation, as a reflection of global solidarity, has become a fundamental instrument for achieving this goal.

7. Abbreviations and acronyms

**AEA** Aid Effectiveness Agenda  
**ODA** Official Development Assistance  
**AECID** Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo (Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation)  
**AUCI** Agencia Uruguaya de Cooperación Internacional (Uruguayan Agency for International Cooperation)  
**WB** World Bank Group  
**BRICS** Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa  
**DAC** Development Assistance Committee

---

57 “What does it really mean to ‘leave no one behind’?”, [http://www.socialwatch.org/node/17349](http://www.socialwatch.org/node/17349)
CONCORD European NGO Confederation for Relief and Development
CONGDE Coordinadora ONG para el Desarrollo España (Spanish Coordinating Council of Development NGOs)
HRBA Human-Rights-Based Approach
IMF International Monetary Fund
OECD Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
MDGs Millennium Development Goals
SDGs Sustainable Development Goals
WTO World Trade Organization
UN United Nations
CSOs Civil Society Organizations
UNDP United Nations Development Programme
MICs Middle Income Countries