



Economic Commission for Africa
Subregional Office for Southern Africa

Report of the Ad hoc Expert Group Meeting on
**New Trends in South-South
and Triangular Cooperation:**
Implications for Southern African Countries

Ad-Hoc Expert Groups
Windhoek, Namibia
15-16 March 2011



Economic Commission for Africa

Report of the Ad hoc Expert Group Meeting on New Trends in South-South and Triangular Cooperation: Implications for Southern African Countries

Ad-Hoc Expert Groups

Windhoek, Namibia
15-16 March 2011

United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
Subregional Office for Southern Africa

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS	v
1. Introduction	1
2. Organization of proceedings	3
3. Opening session	4
4. Account of proceedings	6
5. Closing session	18
Annex I: summary of conclusions and recommendations	19
Annex II: agenda	22
Annex III: list of participants	24

Acronyms

AEGM	Ad Hoc Expert Group Meeting
AUC	African Union Commission
AU-SARO	African Union Commission Southern Africa Regional Office
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
DAC	Development Assistance Committee (of the OECD)
EAC	East African Community
ECA	Economic Commission for Africa
ECDPM	European Centre for Development Policy Management
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
IOC	Indian Ocean Commission
IRCC	Inter-Regional Coordination Committee
IT	Information Technology
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NS	North-South
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SRO-SA	Subregional Office for Southern Africa
SS	South-South
SSTC	South-South and Triangular Cooperation
TCDC	Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries
UN	United Nations
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
WBCG	Walvis Bay Corridor Group

1. Introduction

1. The Subregional Office for Southern Africa of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA SRO-SA) in cooperation with the Government of the Republic of Namibia organized the Ad hoc Expert Group Meeting (AEGM) on “New Trends in South-South and Triangular Cooperation: Implications for Southern Africa Countries”. The objective of the AEGM was to review the background report of the study on “South-South and Triangular Cooperation: Implications for Southern Africa countries” with a view to recommending key revisions that should form the basis for finalizing the report. In particular, the experts assessed whether the report adequately addressed the following:

Identifying indicators for monitoring and assessing the impacts of South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTC) in the subregion.

- (a) Assessing the effectiveness of SSTC in addressing development priorities of member States in the subregion.
- (b) Assessing how the two pivotal countries of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) subregion (Mauritius and South Africa) are performing in triangulating development cooperation to the rest of the subregion; and assessing what pivotal countries from outside the subregion are doing in Southern Africa and what cooperating mechanisms they are using.
- (c) Identifying the most effective frameworks for triangulation of international cooperation at the country and subregional levels. Related to this, identifying the embedded features of SSTC in the NEPAD framework and how those features are being (or can be) implemented in the Southern Africa subregion.
- (d) Drawing lessons and informing policy on modalities for establishing or strengthening South institutions for triangulation of international cooperation in Southern Africa, and implications for donors.

2. The AEGM was held at the Safari Hotel in Windhoek, Namibia from 15 to 16 March, 2011. The meeting was attended by 47 experts, practitioners and policymakers in the fields of international cooperation for development, multilateral finance and aid facilitation. They were drawn from the following member States: Democratic Republic of the Congo, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Other organizations that were represented are

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the African Union Commission Southern Africa Regional Office (AU-SARO) based in Lilongwe, Malawi and the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA). Private sector participants were drawn from the Walvis Bay Corridor Group (WBCG), the Polytechnic of Namibia, Standard Bank Namibia and the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM).

2. Organization of proceedings

3. The AEGM discussions were organized into five plenary sessions and two breakaway sessions. Each plenary session comprised a presentation followed by discussions. The sessions were ordered as follows:

- (a) Plenary Session I: Introduction and Overview of South-South and Triangular Cooperation in Southern Africa;
- (b) Plenary Session II: Impact of South-South and Triangular Cooperation in Southern Africa;
- (c) Breakaway Session I: Relevance and Impact of South-South Cooperation in Southern Africa;
- (d) Plenary Session III: Group Reports on Relevance and Impact of South-South Cooperation in Southern Africa;
- (e) Plenary Session IV: Presentation of Conclusions and Recommendations of the Study;
- (f) Breakaway Session II: Implications of the study for donors and for pivotal and beneficiary countries;
- (g) Plenary Session V: Group Reports on the Implications of the Study.

4. A Closing Session adopted the Outcome Statement of the AEGM. This was immediately followed by the closing of the meeting by officials of ECA and the Government of Namibia. The AEGM agenda is included in annex II.

3. Opening session

5. The opening session included statements by the Officer-in-Charge of ECA SRO-SA, a representative of COMESA, and a representative of the AUC. A representative of the Government of the Republic of Namibia officially opened the meeting.

6. Mr. Emile Ahohe, Officer-in-Charge of ECA SRO-SA welcomed participants and conveyed his Commission's gratitude to the Government of Namibia for hosting the AEGM. He underlined the importance ECA attaches to the role of SSTC in helping Southern Africa to mobilize international resources that are critical for the advancement of various developmental goals. He expressed the hope that the AEGM would stimulate a rich debate that would identify key issues, conclusions and recommendations on strengthening the effectiveness of SSTC in addressing developmental priorities and promoting mutually beneficial relationships between pivotal and beneficiary countries in the subregion.

7. Mr. Ahohe noted that South-South (SS) cooperation had been on the agenda of the United Nations (UN) for over three decades and had also been the focus of the United Nations Secretary General's Report to the General Assembly. He stated that the AEGM was in line with General Assembly Resolution 64/222 of 2009 which called for the strengthening of interregional dialogue and exchange of experience on SSTC with the view to its expansion and enhancement. He highlighted the findings of the Secretary-General's Report that pivotal countries, albeit more advanced, also faced developmental challenges and were equally in need of development assistance. He further underlined the need for beneficiary countries to meaningfully engage pivotal countries and emphasized the key role that subregional institutions such as SADC and COMESA had in formulating a framework for international cooperation that would render SSTC more effective.

8. Mr. Razafinsalama, COMESA Head of Department for Technical Cooperation and Resource Mobilization, thanked ECA for extending an invitation to COMESA to participate in the meeting. He conveyed best wishes for the success of the AEGM from the Secretary General of COMESA, Mr. Sindiso Ngwenya. He stated that COMESA attaches great importance to the subject of SSTC and was already an active participant of such cooperation. In this context, he mentioned that COMESA was a member of the Inter-Regional Coordination Committee (IRCC), which encompasses five regional economic groupings (COMESA, SADC, Indian Ocean Commission (IOC), East African Community (EAC) and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)). He said that the objective of the IRCC was to capitalize on complementarities, seek synergies and avoid duplication in order to achieve efficient use of available aid resources from the European Union through the implementation

of joint programmes. He noted that the COMESA-EAC-SADC Grand Free Trade Area is another SS cooperation initiative in which COMESA was actively participating.

9. Mr. Salif Sall, AU Regional Delegate to SADC expressed his pleasure to participate in the AEGM and expressed the compliments of Mr. Jean Ping, Chairperson of the AUC, as well as the staff of the AU-SARO in Lilongwe. He applauded ECA for maintaining an active cooperation with the AUC in the subregion. He also extended his thanks to the Government of Namibia for hosting the meeting.

10. Mr. Sall remarked that SS cooperation was an area that had so far received little attention compared to North-South (NS) cooperation, which was considered more productive. He stated that the global economic crisis and the emergence of China, India and Brazil as economic powers had raised the profile of SS cooperation and underscored the need to examine its impact and that of triangular cooperation on Africa's development. He noted the need for the study to examine SS cooperation at the continental level and also to explore cooperation at the level of relations between the various economic groupings which are the building blocks of continental integration. He concluded by hoping that the AEGM recommendations would inspire the various regional economic groupings to undertake similar studies to enable them to enhance and make better use of SSTC.

11. Mr. Sylvester Mbangi, Acting Permanent Secretary of the National Planning Commission of Namibia, welcomed the participants on behalf of the Government and people of Namibia. He said that Namibia was honoured to host the AEGM. He remarked that Global Partnership for Development denoted the very essence of international cooperation necessary to speed up progress towards meeting all other internationally agreed development goals. He underlined the need for the subregion to continue its efforts to improve public financial management, natural resource wealth management, public debt and asset management and governance in order to assure continued and much needed support and engagement from development partners in the aftermath of the global economic crisis.

12. Mr. Mbangi called on the AEGM to reflect on a number of issues including how best to unlock the potential that South Africa and Mauritius offered as pivotal countries, how best the region could position itself to benefit from triangular cooperation arrangements, identifying policy or capacity gaps in taking advantage of such cooperation and whether countries in the subregion shared similar views on the long-term benefits of triangular cooperation. He pledged his country's continued support to ECA in providing capacity-building to SADC member States in the area of SSTC. He further applauded ECA analytical and advisory support in the context of NEPAD and SADC regional integration agenda and again pledged Namibia's continued support in these specific areas. He concluded his remarks by declaring the AEGM officially opened.

4. Account of proceedings

PLENARY SESSION I: CONSIDERATION OF THE STUDY

Presentation: Introduction and overview of South-South and Triangular Cooperation in Southern Africa

13. The secretariat presented the introductory chapters of the report to the AEGM. The presenter began his presentation by giving an overview of the topic in terms of development aid (loans, grants, budget support and technology transfer). He explained that historically, development aid had been associated with NS Cooperation but more recently SS Cooperation has gained more prominence especially in the face of emerging economic strongholds (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa). He said that SSTC involves three partners, a donor, a pivotal and a beneficiary countries working together to support development.

14. He used the Paris Declaration framework to illustrate the concept of aid effectiveness, explaining that aid is considered effective when a beneficiary country decides/determines its own priorities in terms of how aid should be used. He pointed out that aid should always be properly coordinated and aligned to recipient country systems, and that donor support should be harmonized in order to reduce transaction costs associated with a multiplicity of donors. He also highlighted the specific objectives of the report, the approach that was employed which involved collection of data and information from various secondary sources. He also explained the challenges of data gaps on SS Cooperation particularly in the subregion.

Discussions

15. In ensuing discussions, three broad issues emerged that included definitions of pivotal countries, conceptual issues and data challenges. Concerning pivotal countries, participants were concerned with the criteria used to determine pivotal countries and suggested that the role of Mauritius as a pivotal country needed to be expanded as the country played a particularly important role amongst island States of the Indian Ocean. They pointed out that Mauritius had created a roadmap for technical cooperation and had signed agreements with Singapore and Mozambique within the framework of SS cooperation to address issues of food security and rice production in the concerned countries. The meeting was also informed about Mauritius' intention to setup an economic zone with China to promote trade with Africa with the goal of lowering barriers and creating a conducive environment for international cooperation.

16. The discussions proved that the study focused on the role of the two pivotal countries (Mauritius and South Africa) in the subregion. It clarified that pivotal countries were developing countries that, by virtue of their capacities and experience in promoting SS cooperation, were positioned to play a 'lead' role in the promotion and application of Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries (TCDC), mainly by sharing their capacities and experience with other developing countries in their region or in other regions. The concept of pivotal countries was created in 1995 within the new directions given to TCDC by the High Level Committee following recommendations of the United Nations General Assembly¹.

17. Concerning conceptual issues, the meeting noted the varied definitions of triangular cooperation in the document and observed that the terms triangular and trilateral cooperation had been used interchangeably throughout the report, hence the need to maintain consistency. Furthermore, it explained that countries not officially defined as pivotal might still have assistance to offer and, in particular, that SSTC did not mean that only one set of countries should provide development assistance. It emphasized that all Southern countries could give assistance depending on their experience and expertise. It thus suggested that the report must define the process and relationship among donors, beneficiary and pivotal countries.

18. The presenter of the report acknowledged the need to define indicators and effective measures of SSTC. The meeting observed that some data were incomplete, inaccurate or out of date and recommended that the secretariat should update data and tables in the final draft of the report. It also recommended that the report should use clear quantitative and qualitative measurements or indicators of SS cooperation as well as clear criteria for categorizing countries within the framework of SS cooperation.

19. Considering the scope of the report, the meeting urged ECA to conduct studies of SSTC in other subregions, so that member States could deepen their understanding of the dynamics of SSTC and their implications for the subregion. The secretariat noted, with appreciation, the comments by participants that the consultant did not have access to all the literature available from the various member States and organizations. The experts were therefore invited to provide the secretariat with any relevant literature, documents or references that may be used to enrich the final report.

¹ <http://ssc.undp.org/faq/>

PLENARY SESSION II: CONSIDERATION OF THE STUDY

Presentation: Impact of South-South and Triangular Cooperation in Southern Africa

20. The secretariat presented the chapter on Impacts of SSTC in Southern Africa. The presenter explained that SADC member States were cooperating in a number of areas, including macroeconomic policy convergence. He pointed out that while it was difficult to isolate impacts of SSTC per se, there were positive trends in intra-SADC trade, Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) inflows, volume and type of assistance, quality of assistance and trends in human development that could be attributed to SSTC. He observed that SSTC processes were then aligning with national priorities to achieve financial and fiscal quality, transparency in procurement processes, quality of service delivery and harmonization and coordination of donor efforts.

21. The presenter elaborated the impact of SSTC on governance, global partnerships, Southern institutions, relationships between pivotal and other countries and the willingness and preparedness of beneficiary countries to use SSTC. He explained that according to OECD, triangular cooperation maximizes aid effectiveness, combines advantages of different actors and involves appropriate and cost-effective expertise from pivotal countries unlike financial and technical assistance from the North. He also observed that the limited scale of technical cooperation projects, unclear division of functions, roles and responsibilities between pivotal and beneficiary countries and lack of national policy frameworks and civil society participation in beneficiary countries were weaknesses of current SSTC arrangements.

Discussions

22. In ensuing discussions, a number of participants noted that the analysis and findings of the report on the relevance and impact of SSTC were overly reliant on qualitative rather than quantitative evidence. They noted that qualitative impressions about the extent to which SSTC had contributed to aid effectiveness needed to be backed by empirical evidence in order to convey a meaningful message to policymakers. The response to the concerns raised was that recipient countries did not consistently and uniformly collect data on SSTC to permit quantitative analysis. Data availability was a peculiar problem which UNDP was also facing. The problem of incomplete data was further complicated by the fact that various Government departments in member States received SSTC assistance directly without a national system of data collection and reporting on development assistance by sector. They also observed that some of the major sources of SS flows did not have a system of reporting such development assistance flows.

23. Participants felt that the meeting would have benefited from the participation of more pivotal countries from Africa. The secretariat stated that even though the contribution of various pivotal

countries and development partners was recognized, the emphasis was placed on the participation of South Africa and Mauritius since the focus of the AEGM was Southern Africa. The question was raised as to how SS cooperation rated in terms of cost effectiveness, compared to triangular cooperation. Participants perceived that both SS and triangular cooperation were cost effective compared to traditional NS cooperation. They also agreed that the difference in transaction costs between SS and triangular cooperation was not significant.

24. In addition to issues of inadequacy of statistical data, they recommended a number of additional improvements in the analysis, including the need for the report to acknowledge fundamental differences between technical cooperation from Development Assistance Committee (DAC) members and emerging economies of the South as providers of development cooperation. It was emphasized that some emerging economies do not view themselves as donors, hence the report, which currently presents the discourse in terms of the traditional conceptualization of donor and beneficiary, might need to be adjusted to take into account the new reality. They also explained that development assistance constituted a small proportion of financial and trade flows that determined the relations between the emerging economies and their Southern partners.

25. The meeting also noted the coincidence that pivotal countries had benefited from SSTC more than beneficiary Southern countries and that, consequently, Brazil, China, India and South Africa were increasing their FDI to the subregion. This should be reflected in the report after consultation with the United Nations Secretary-General and United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) Annual Reports on SSTC. It further reiterated that the report should address weaknesses in data, for sound evidence; definitions and concept; and presentation of statistical evidence in tables, some of which were either incomplete or out-dated.

26. Another aspect of analytical interest that was discussed was the dimension of trilateral cooperation whereby Northern donors were gaining invaluable insight on how to make their aid more effective by working directly with pivotal countries. The meeting observed that the designated pivotal countries were also those countries that had concrete strategies in place to exploit partnerships with other emerging powers such as China and Brazil. Participants noted that it would be useful for the report to explore the implications of these elements for the rest of the subregion. It therefore recommended that the report should better relate the workings of traditional NS Cooperation and the SS Cooperation with the objective of assessing aid effectiveness.

BREAKAWAY SESSION I: RELEVANCE AND IMPACT OF SOUTH-SOUTH AND TRIANGULAR COOPERATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

27. The first breakaway session was on the topic above. There were two breakaway groups which discussed the following questions: (1) Are SSTC relevant frameworks for addressing economic growth and development in the subregion? (2) Is this trend in development cooperation one that will have significant implications for the development agenda/ strategies of countries in the subregion? (3) How can we address the obstacles/challenges that hinder the widespread adoption/use of SSTC in the subregion? (4) What role should the private sector, IGOs, NGOs and other civil society organizations play in influencing/determining the type of interventions by SSTC? (5) How can we ensure that SSTC frameworks engage a broad spectrum of stakeholders and CSOs in order to gain broad-based participation and familiarity/understanding of the frameworks? (6) Questions of capacity: Do member States have the capacity and political will to put in place the necessary national policy frameworks for SSTC to function? If not, how might we address this?

28. A synthesized summary of what transpired in the breakaway groups is reported below.

PLENARY SESSION III: SUMMARY OF BREAKAWAY SESSION I

29. The groups noted that the SSTC framework was relevant but not enough in addressing economic growth and development in Southern Africa. There was a need to clearly define the frameworks of cooperation in order to identify gains from SSTC developments. In addition, the meeting noted that SSTC frameworks should be properly defined, managed and complemented by other sectoral policies at the subregional and national levels. In particular, transparency, result-oriented approach, institutional mechanisms and policy dialogue were needed to strengthen mutual accountability in the delivery of SSTC.

30. They also recommended that countries in the subregion should learn from the experience of NS cooperation and Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness to make SSTC more effective. Moreover, there was a need to explore the possibility of including trade and going beyond traditional assistance grants and concessional loans in implementing SSTC. They also recommended that countries should foster real public-private partnerships, learning from the Namibian model, to engage the private sector and NGOs in the delivery of SSTC. The meeting emphasized the need for countries to learn from one another and build on best practices identified in some countries within and outside the subregion.

31. The meeting also noted that political will and stability should be promoted if the benefits from SSTC were to be harnessed. Related to this was the need to develop the capacity of member

States in the region. In particular, the meeting recommended that regional capacity-building initiatives such as the Regional Multi-disciplinary Centre of Excellence in Mauritius should be promoted to address capacity gaps within countries.

PLENARY SESSION IV: CONSIDERATION OF THE STUDY

Presentation: Conclusions and Recommendations of the Study

32. The secretariat presented the Conclusions and Recommendations of the Study. The presenter explained that SSTC was likely to grow in the subregion, taking into consideration redefinition of development cooperation, ascendance of Southern bilateral and multilateral cooperation and emergence of new principal players in SSTC. Furthermore, he expressed optimism that SSTC would grow with the establishment of the South African Development Partnership Agency. He indicated that data for monitoring and evaluation of SSTC should ideally include Official Development Assistance and FDI flows, SS and NS trade, and macroeconomic and development indicators.

33. The presenter also emphasized the centrality of NEPAD in SSTC. He said that NEPAD should be used as a framework for advancing technical cooperation, particularly in the absence of national policy frameworks and limited civil society/local stakeholder participation. In terms of recommendations, he outlined the need for formal agreements among partners and national policy frameworks for beneficiary countries, and that beneficiary countries should demand and own development cooperation. Furthermore, he recommended long-term strategic frameworks for pivotal countries, the need for implementable frameworks for promoting aid effectiveness and cooperation among pivotal countries, as well as the need for beneficiary countries to have development strategies or plans.

Discussions

34. In ensuing discussions, participants raised questions regarding the recommendation that the relationships of SSTC should be formalized, namely: (a) who would be partners and actors in facilitating the creation of a formal framework? and (b) would the countries involved accept a formalized structure for the SSTC? They noted that at the moment SSTC was driven in an informal and ad hoc manner, which worked against transparency and accountability as most of these arrangements lacked monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. In addition, formal agreements might be necessary to guide the relationships among the parties and to enhance effectiveness of aid delivery.

35. There was a general observation that countries (pivotal and beneficiary) did not have strategic frameworks and policies on SSTC and hence the need for countries of the South to put in place policies and frameworks for development cooperation that would allow for the implementation of SSTC.

Participants further noted the need for beneficiary countries to develop national policy frameworks and strategies for engaging pivotal countries in their subregions.

36. They again raised the issue of definitions, stating the importance of defining the concepts collectively, adding that definitions would add to the clarity of thought and were needed as a premise for the arguments and to move the discussion forward. They also wondered whether the definition of the concepts of SSTC should be left to a more appropriate high-level forum. They felt that in order to move the debate forward it might be necessary to adopt broad definitions of the terms so as to avoid controversies. They then observed that member States of the South (in various international fora) have not achieved consensus on the definition of SSTC that is useable for this report.

37. Participants noted that donor countries often negotiated packages for regional support through Regional Economic Communities (RECs). They further explained that such packages often comprised substantial amounts of money annually and were classified as bilateral aid. There was therefore concern that reclassifying such aid flows as triangular cooperation might be conceptually problematic. That referred to arrangements such as EU funding African institutions like NEPAD or RECs on a multi-lateral and bilateral basis. Therefore, to conceptualize the bilateral modalities into triangular cooperation might be problematic to Northern donors as it would lead to confusion and inaccuracy in monitoring and evaluation of donor assistance. It was recommended that the report should make a distinction between bilateral cooperation and triangular cooperation. However, it was conceded that there were other SSTC arrangements whereby RECs played the role of pivotal institutions, consistent with the definition of triangular cooperation.

38. The meeting emphasized the need for harmonized and consistent application of definitions and concepts, the importance of caution when taking into account the aid effectiveness agenda and the traditional SS agenda as seen by the G77 plus China group. They recommended that the report should align the concepts of SSTC to the existing definitions found in United Nations documents (for example, General Assembly or High Level Conferences on SSTC, as well as the Outcome document of the 2010 Nairobi High Level Conference on SS Cooperation). The meeting called for a common, comprehensive and progressive definition of SSTC.

39. The meeting discussed whether SSTC debate should be associated with aid effectiveness agenda or result orientation (development effectiveness) agenda. The meeting recalled that the discussions at the 2010 High Level Conference in Nairobi clearly showed some level of resistance to Aid Effectiveness agenda by the G-77. The experts recommended that the report should be cautious not to use concepts that had not yet been internationally agreed like the Paris Aid Effectiveness, Accra Declaration or the Dakar Platform for Action which narrowed the concept of development cooperation to aid management modalities. In addition, it was observed that some countries which are ac-

tive in SS cooperation did not consider themselves as donors and that not all countries active in SS cooperation had acceded to the Paris Declaration, i.e. Brazil and China.

40. The experts expressed the need to take the recommendations from the meeting to the Conference of Ministers for possible adoption at a higher level. The meeting reiterated that at the level of policymaking countries needed to have long-term strategies and policy frameworks that engaged the private sector and CSOs. It was emphasized that citizens as final beneficiaries must have a voice at all levels of the process of SSTC. It elaborated that SSTC arrangements must take on the properties of a grassroots process to ensure inclusion and ownership of the process. Thus, the experts expressed the need for dialogue and national consultation, noting that dialogue was important because SSTC was an area full of controversies and general absence of mutual accountability, particularly at the level of beneficiary and pivotal countries.

41. They further noted that the differences between traditional NS and the emerging SS aid flows must be acknowledged. While it was generally accepted among DAC donors that traditional aid flows must be transparent and subject to accountability, emerging countries such as China and India were not obliged to record their aid flows. It was therefore recommended that beneficiary countries must move towards a more transparent and accountable system as well as international standards or frameworks on how to manage SSTC processes. They observed that although SS cooperation never excluded the issue of accountability, the report must be mindful of the underlying controversies. Also, the meeting took note of the fact that accountability to entities external to the South may create problems. Furthermore, countries that must follow the principles of SSTC should be involved in the design and implementation process to ensure ownership.

42. The principles and values of SS cooperation should be respected by all parties that enter agreement to cooperate. It was reiterated that policy and long-term strategies that emphasize inclusive consultations with national institutions including parliaments, broad based stakeholders and the private sector should be formulated to enable ownership. The role of the private sector as beneficiaries from the knowledge transfer by SSTC was also underscored. It was further recommended that ECA should note that the study of SSTC was a complex one that needed comprehensive documentation of practices by various stakeholders.

BREAKAWAY SESSION II: IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

Breakaway Group I: Implications of the Study for Donors

43. In Breakaway Group I, participants discussed the implications of the study on donors. Discussions focused on the following questions: (i) what should donors do to make SSTC more effective

in development cooperation? (ii) What are the key features for triangular cooperation that require harmonization/coordination by Northern partners, pivotal country and beneficiary countries? (iii) What framework should be put in place to coordinate efforts and resources in triangular cooperation? (iv) What indicators should be used for monitoring and evaluation of SSTC by donors

44. In the breakaway group and plenary session discussions, participants emphasized the need for donors to eliminate duplication and overlapping in aid delivery mechanisms. They advocated that donors should coordinate their efforts and synergize their actions to remove overlapping. This recommendation was addressed to all donors participating in NS or SS cooperation. In addition, they recommended that donors should have a standard template for receiving project proposals and for reporting purposes. Experts also expressed the need for donors to adopt accountability and transparency to make the cooperation more effective.

45. Participants reiterated the need for national policy frameworks to be set up at the level of recipient countries. In this regard, they observed that since there was a difference between SS and triangular cooperation, the recommendations on SS and triangular cooperation needed to be separated as they did not apply in a blanket format to both. For SS, there should not be any involvement of the donors, whereas, the implications discussed by the group refer only to Triangular Cooperation. Specifically, it was noted that beneficiary Governments were accountable to donors and should similarly be accountable to citizens on whose behalf they entered into triangular cooperation agreements. In this regard, Governments should make every effort to facilitate citizen participation and to enhance national ownership. It was similarly observed that there was a need for donors to insist on policy frameworks from recipient countries as a precondition for alignment.

46. It was further recommended that Northern partners should harmonize the format for monitoring and reporting development assistance in NS and triangular cooperation. While agreeing that untying of the aid was necessary by removing conditionalities on goods and services for technical assistance, the meeting suggested that there should be a requirement of transfer of knowledge and capacity-building to reduce dependency on the North.

47. The experts expressed the need for donors to facilitate dialogue among partners in triangular cooperation and enable pivotal countries to exactly cater for the needs of beneficiary countries. Pivotal countries also needed to establish regional mechanisms, codes and procedures and to pursue coordinated approaches and application of standards. For beneficiary countries, effective civil society participation was crucial at all levels from design to implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Hence, the need to strengthen institutions at beneficiary country level, including anti-corruption structures.

48. Participants expressed the need to enhance national systems by linking them to the principles of the Paris Declaration. In this regard, the meeting benefited from the experiences of Zambia Joint Assistance Strategy. Experts also raised the need for further studies to flag best practices to be replicated in all recipient countries to harmonize the SSTC framework. Apart from harmonization of processes, participants also articulated the need to cultivate political will to drive the process of triangular cooperation. In this regard, they called for the involvement of key leaders with convening powers and decision-making mandates. They also observed that where frameworks existed these should be enhanced to ensure comprehensive sectoral coordination.

49. For monitoring and evaluation, the experts noted the need to develop benchmarks against which indicators could be formulated and tracked, including generic indicators that could be readily applied. They proposed supplementing the benchmarks with sector-specific indicators. Some of the issues to be considered when coming up with indicators should include timely delivery of projects, involvement of civil society and the private sector, capacity-building and transfer of knowledge to the local populace, national ownership of projects, capacity of absorbing funds into the projects and programmes and use of standardized methodologies such as result-based approaches.

BREAKAWAY GROUP II: IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY FOR PIVOTAL AND BENEFICIARY COUNTRIES

50. In Breakaway Group II, participants discussed implications of the study for pivotal and beneficiary countries. The discussions focused on the following questions: (a) What should pivotal and beneficiary countries do to make SSTC more effective in development cooperation? (b) What frameworks should be put in place to promote and strengthen SSTC in the subregion? (c) How should member States manage issues of concessionality, channels of assistance; priority sectors and projects, which may arise from triangulating development assistance? (d) What should pivotal countries do to develop mutual trust with beneficiary countries in triangular cooperation? (e) Which issues should be addressed in order to create a transparent and accountable environment for SSTC between the actors in the subregion? [i.e., (i) between pivotal and beneficiary countries and (ii) between the South Partners (pivotal and beneficiary) and DAC donors].

51. The ensuing discussions digressed for a while to clarify the initial criteria for choosing pivotal countries and their “Terms of Reference”. In this regard, information was provided that in 1995, the United Nations High-Level Committee on the Review of Technical Cooperation Among Developing Countries released a report on “New Directions for Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries” in response to General Assembly resolution 49/96 of 1994. The report proposed that countries of the South with a certain level of knowledge, including IT preparedness, expertise, resources and

willingness to help other countries in need and who request for such assistance would be classified as pivotal. The list of pivotal countries was not exhaustive.

52. The participants expressed the need to increase awareness in pivotal and beneficiary countries of benefits, opportunities and challenges with SSTC. Experts expressed the need for a single forum where pivotal and beneficiary countries could meet to share ideas on how to make SSTC frameworks more effective. They recommended that ECA subregional offices informed by RECs should operationalize subregional strategic frameworks. Similarly, national strategies should be harmonized with the subregional framework. They emphasized that within the subregion, ECA with the support of other United Nations agencies in the spirit of delivering as one, was well placed to provide facilitation. They also suggested that the process of harmonization of the strategic framework for development cooperation should have a three-pronged dimension consisting of policy, institutional and legal frameworks.

53. The issue of how far the donors were willing to go through triangular cooperation in delivering aid was highlighted. It was recognized that though on paper it was a straight forward issue, the reality on the ground was different. While recognizing the need to develop and strengthen a subregional strategic framework for SSTC as well as alignment and harmonization of national strategies and policies, experts recommended that when channelling development assistance, preference should be through budgetary support.

54. They recommended that parties to SSTC should promote joint planning and identification of beneficiaries. Furthermore, they argued that countries should develop and strengthen monitoring, evaluation and reporting systems within the framework of a participative result-based approach. Furthermore, member States could use the NEPAD framework to strengthen SSTC in the subregion and ensure cooperation modalities are formalized.

55. The importance of mutual participation in decision-making among stakeholders in pivotal and beneficiary countries was emphasized, and that monitoring and evaluation systems should be developed and reports discussed amongst stakeholders, including donors. In this regard, they observed that when a country chose a modality to support another country, it was pertinent to use the motive and comparative advantages of choosing triangular cooperation over bilateral cooperation. However, each case of development cooperation should be treated on its own merit.

56. Participants also noted that triangular cooperation frameworks should be considered for programme support. Experts however recognized that donors decided on a sector-by-sector basis. They recommended that donors should be encouraged to work together to synchronize their support to beneficiary countries. Participants acknowledged the existence of a subregional cooperation frame-

work in the Windhoek Declaration endorsed by SADC, noting that the framework could be used as a starting point for strengthening SSTC in the subregion.

57. Furthermore, they recognized that frameworks of SSTC would have to be built gradually and in a coordinated manner. In particular, dialogue and consultation by pivotal and beneficiary countries using SADC, NEPAD or other subregional blocs was needed to ensure that the resulting frameworks were realistic and pragmatic given that donors were already willing to engage. They noted that most emerging countries, including China, did not take part in the existing donor fora and that specific SS policy was needed to bring China on board. They proposed that sectoral donor coordination at the country level could help in identifying synergies among all donors from North and South.

58. Finally, the participants recommended that member States should promote long-term strategies and policies that emphasize consultations with national institutions, including parliaments, broad-based stakeholders and the private sector to allow for national ownership. Furthermore, member States were urged to involve citizens as final beneficiaries of SSTC in the policy development process through national dialogue and consultation to ensure inclusiveness and ownership of the process.

5. Closing session

59. The closing session commenced with the adoption of the Outcome Statement (summarized in annex I) followed by closing remarks from ECA and the Government of Namibia.

60. Mr. Emile Ahohe, Officer-in-Charge of ECA SRO-SA, thanked the experts for their substantive contributions and insights during the two-day meeting. He explained that the objectives of the meeting were fully achieved and assured participants that their comments and group work contributions would be taken into account when finalizing the report. He indicated that he was considering a further review of the report by a smaller group drawn from participants before finalization and dissemination of the final report. He also thanked the Government and people of Namibia for hosting the meeting. He concluded by thanking the consultant, Professor Chipeta for delivering the draft report and ECA SRO-SA staff for successfully organizing the AEGM.

61. Speaking on behalf of the Government of Namibia, Mr. Michael Mutonga thanked ECA for inviting Namibia to host the AEGM. He went on to thank the secretariat for its commitment in the organization of the meeting. He stated that he would report to his principals regarding the outcome of the meeting, so as to enable the Government to take the process forward at the national and sub-regional levels. He urged colleagues to make available their assistance on the issue of SSTC, should they be called upon. Lastly, he noted that the Government of Namibia would be looking forward to the completion of the report and the next forum in which trends in SSTC would be discussed.

Annex I: Summary of conclusions and recommendations

The following is a summary of conclusions and recommendations as adopted by the meeting from the Outcome Statement. The recommendations are for the attention of member States and other stakeholders:

62. SSTC should be strengthened towards enhancing Global Partnerships and building stronger SS Institutions.

63. Data gaps and inconsistency due to insufficient capturing and measurement of SSTC by member States and organizations is a common problem. There is need to strengthen and harmonize reporting mechanisms and systems for data collection and analysis on SSTC flows.

64. There is need for member States to develop strategies to foster partnerships with emerging countries such as the BRICS, learning from the experience of pivotal countries which are already benefiting from the SSTC.

65. Building on the UN Secretary-General's Reports of 2009 and 2010, and Outcome Document of the High Level UN Conference on South-South Cooperation held in Nairobi in December 2009, pivotal countries equally require assistance as they also face developmental challenges.

66. There is need for beneficiary and pivotal countries to meaningfully engage through sub-regional institutions such as SADC and COMESA, in formulating a framework for international cooperation that would render SSTC more effective. Member States should reflect on how best to unlock the potential that South Africa and Mauritius offer as pivotal countries and how best the subregion could position itself to benefit from SSTC arrangements including identifying policy or capacity gaps in taking advantage of such cooperation.

67. There is need to have clear criteria of categorizing countries within the framework of SSTC. Member States must note that although some countries may not be officially defined as pivotal they may still have assistance to offer.

68. The SSTC framework is relevant but not enough in addressing economic growth and development in Southern Africa. There is need to clearly define the frameworks of cooperation in order to maximize gains from SSTC developments.
69. SSTC frameworks need to be properly defined, managed and complemented by other sectoral policies at subregional and national level.
70. The subregion needs to learn from the experience of NS cooperation and Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness to make SSTC more effective.
71. In implementing SSTC, there is need to go beyond traditional assistance, grants and concessional loans and to explore the possibility of framing SSTC in the context of broader economic relations, including trade and investment cooperation.
72. Countries should foster real public-private partnerships, learning from the Namibian model, to engage the private sector and NGOs in the delivery of SSTC.
73. Institutional mechanisms and continuous policy dialogue are needed to strengthen mutual accountability, result oriented approach and transparency in the delivery of SSTC.
74. Countries are encouraged to learn from each other and build on best practices identified in some countries within and outside of the subregion.
75. Political will and commitment should be promoted if the benefits from SSTC are to be harnessed.
76. Regional capacity-building initiatives, such as the Regional Multi-disciplinary Centre of Excellence in Mauritius, should be promoted to address capacity gaps for designing and implementation strategic frameworks for international cooperation.
77. Pivotal and beneficiary countries should build awareness on SSTC and establish fora for experience sharing to make the framework more effective.
78. There is need to develop and strengthen Subregional strategic framework for SSTC and align and harmonize national strategies and policies.
79. Channels of development assistance should be through budgetary support and member States should promote joint planning and identification of beneficiaries.

80. Countries should develop and strengthen monitoring, evaluation and reporting systems within the framework of a participative result based approach.
81. Member States could use NEPAD framework to strengthen SSTC in the subregion and make sure cooperation modalities are formalized.
82. Member States should promote policy and long term strategies that emphasize consultations with national institutions including parliaments, broad based stakeholders and the private sector to enable national ownership.
83. Member States should involve citizens as final beneficiaries of SSTC in policy development through national dialogue and consultation to ensure inclusiveness and ownership of the process.
84. Partners and parties to development cooperation should abide by principles of Aid Effectiveness and should strengthen their coordination efforts by synchronizing their actions.
85. Participants took note of the report of the High Level Committee on South-South Cooperation in the sixteen session of the UN General Assembly and the 2009 Outcome document of the High Level United Nations Conference on South-South Cooperation of December 2009 in Nairobi. They recommended that progress on research and discussions regarding aid effectiveness, SSTC through various processes and fora-including the forth coming Bhusan (South Korea) meeting should be monitored closely.

Annex II: Agenda

DAY 1: TUESDAY, 15 MARCH 2011

TIME	AGENDA ITEM	ACTIVITY
08:00-09:00	REGISTRATION	
09:00-09:45	OPENING SESSION	OPENING STATEMENTS ADOPTION OF AGENDA OBJECTIVES OF THE MEETING
09:45-10:00	TEA/COFFEE BREAK	
10:00-11:15	PLENARY SESSION I	CONSIDERATION OF THE STUDY <i>Presentation: Introduction and overview of South-South and Triangular Cooperation in Southern Africa</i> Discussions
11:15-12:30	PLENARY SESSION II	CONSIDERATION OF THE STUDY <i>Presentation: Impact of South-South and Triangular Cooperation in Southern Africa</i> Discussions
12:30-14:00	LUNCH BREAK	
14:00-15:30	BREAKAWAY SESSION I	GROUP DISCUSSIONS <i>Topical Issue: Relevance and Impact of South-South and Triangular Cooperation in Southern Africa</i>
15:30-15:45	TEA/COFFEE BREAK	
15:45-17:00	PLENARY SESSION III	GROUP REPORTS

DAY 2: WEDNESDAY, 16 MARCH 2011

TIME	AGENDA ITEM	ACTIVITY
09:00-10:00	PLENARY SESSION IV	CONSIDERATION OF THE STUDY Presentation: Conclusions and Recommendations Discussions
10:00-10:15	TEA/COFFEE BREAK	
10:15-12:30	BREAKAWAY SESSION II	GROUP DISCUSSIONS Implications for donors Implications for pivotal and beneficiary countries
12:30-14:00	LUNCH BREAK	
14:00-15:00	PLENARY SESSION V	GROUP REPORTS Implications for donors Implications for pivotal and beneficiary countries
15:00-15:15	TEA/COFFEE BREAK	
15:15-17:00	CLOSING SESSION	OUTCOMES AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MEETING CLOSING STATEMENTS
18:00	RECEPTION	RECEPTION KINDLY HOSTED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF NAMIBIA

Annex III: List of participants

Democratic Republic of Congo

Mr. Leon MUNDONE MAMBO, Senior Manager, Planning Ministry, P.O. Box 9378, Kinshasa I, Democratic Republic of Congo. Telephone: 243 997383342 or 243 821024549, Email: mambo-leon2002@yahoo.fr

Lesotho

Mrs. Seriti E.M. KETA, Chief Economist, Ministry of Finance and Development Planning, P.O. Box 630, Maseru, Lesotho. Telephone 266 22 311100, Mobile: 266 63295481, Fax: 266 22 310281, Email: kseriti@yahoo.com or Seriti.keta@gov.ls

Malawi

Mr. Harry Mwamlima, Director, (PR&SP) Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation, P.O. Box 30136, Lilongwe 3, Malawi. Telephone: 265 1 788888,

Email: mwamlimaharry@yahoo.com

Mauritius

Mr. Baratt Aucharaj, Senior Analyst, Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, Port Louis, Mauritius. Telephone: 230 201 3551, Mobile: 230 754 0012, Fax: 230 201 2822, Email: baucharaj@mail.gov.mu

Mozambique

Mr. Orlando Zefanias Mazive, Technician, Ministry of Planning Development, P.O. Box 4087, Maputo, Mozambique. Telephone: 258 21 492 705, Mobile: 258 82 7524330, Fax: 258 21 495463, Email: omazive@mpd.gov.mz

Namibia

Mr. Michael Mutonga, Deputy Director, National Planning Commission,

Telephone: 264 61 2834107, Mobile: 264 811404303,
Email: mmutonga@npc.gov.na
Ms. Mary-Tuyeni Hangula, Deputy Director, Namibia National Planning Commission,

Private Bag 13356, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 2834081, Mobile: 264 811221383,
Fax: 264 61 256756, Email: mtangula@npc.gov.na/mhangula@gmail.com

Mr. Immanuel Mulungu, Petroleum Commissioner, Ministry of Mines and Energy, P.O. Box 13297,
Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 2848212, Mobile: 264 811277267, Fax: 264 61 2848200,
Email: imulunga@mme.gov.na

Ms. Lena Kangandjela, Chief Development Planner, Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare,
Private Bag 13359, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 2833113, Mobile: 264 812491151, Fax:
264 61 226842, Email: lkauluma@mgecw.gov.na and cclex1229@yahoo.com

Mr. James Seibeb, Deputy Director, Ministry of Finance, P.O. Box 98009, Windhoek, Namibia. Tel-
ephone: 264 61 2092221, Mobile: 264 811277565, Fax: 264 61 245696,
Email: james.seibeb@gov.mof.na

Ms. Nasilele Mavis Tungulu, Foreign Relations Officer, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, P.O. Box 13347,
Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 2822106, Mobile: 264 811272821,
Fax: 264 61307702, Email: nasitungulu@yahoo.com

Mr. Paulus Hangula, Economist, National Planning Commission, P.O. Box 2644, Windhoek, Na-
mibia. Telephone: 264 61 2834147, Mobile: 264 812376361, Fax: 264 61 226501,
Email: braclo@web.com.na

Mr. Joseph Hausiku, Economist, National Planning Commission, P.O. Box 61905, Windhoek, Na-
mibia. Telephone: 264 61 2834143, Mobile: 264 812238638, Email: jhausiku@npc.gov.na

Mr. Ivin Lombardt, Chief Executive Officer, Namibia NGO Forum Trust, P.O. Box 96186, Windhoek,
Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 212503, Mobile: 264 813151054, ibombardt@gmail.com

Ms. Martha Wilhelm, Chief Economist, Ministry of Finance, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61
91 2042077, Mobile: 264 811 288009, Fax: 264 61 886 29508,
Email: Martha.wilhelm@gov.mof.na

Ms. Angela Dan-Pretorius, Acting Deputy Director, Ministry of Trade and Industry: Namibia Invest-
ment Centre, Windhoek, Namibia.

Mr. Leevi Jordan Tshoopara, Manager, GIPF, P.O. Box 24134, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 2051284, Mobile: 264 811271778, Fax: 264 61 2051248, Email: ltshoopara@gipf.com.na

Ms. Victoria Manuel, Economist, National Planning Commission, P.O. Box 24498, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 2834123, Mobile: 264 812208190, Email: vmanuel@npc.gov.na

Mr. Lawrence M. Siyanga, Chief Health Programme Administrator, Ministry of Health and Social Services, P.O. Box 25881, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 2032556, Mobile: 264 811283757, Fax: 264 61 222558, Email: lsiyanga@mhss.gov.na

Mr. Nandi-uasora Mazeingo, Chief Economist, P.O. Box 24775, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 2834085, Mobile: 264 816034585, Email: nmozaingo@npc.gov.na

Ms. Leena Amukushu, Economist, National Planning, P.O. Box 266, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 2834113, Mobile: 264 813227760, Email: lamukushu@npl.gov.na

Ms. Sghiwete Ndinela, Economist, National Planning Commission, P.O. Box 40717, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 2834152, Email: ndaiponofi@gmail.com

Mr. Orro Desmond Akudhenga, Transport Officer, National Planning Commission, P.O. Box 13356, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 2834247, Mobile: 264 811404447

Ms. Esther Heita, Economist, National Planning Commission, Private Bag 50512, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 2834122, Email: eheita@npc.gov.na

Mr. Tobias Sisamu, Economist, National Planning Commission, P.O. Box 13356, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 2834236, Mobile: 264 816395401, Email: tsisamu@npc.gov.na

Ms. Ingo Saara, Economist, National Planning Commission, P.O. Box 96147, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 283 4089, Mobile: 264 812739617, Email: singo@npc.gov.na

Ms. Aili Andreas, Chief Development Planner, National Planning Commission, P.O. Box 24035, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 2834087, Mobile: 264 812044766, Fax: 264 61 226501, Email: aandreas@npc.gov.na

Ms. Martha K. Tsheehama, Acting Deputy Director, National Planning Commission, P.O. Box 4095, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 2834120, Mobile: 264 812984888, Fax: 264 61 226501, Email: mtsheehama@npc.gov.na

Mr. Felix Amporo, Foreign Relations Officer, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, P.O. Box 23216, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 282 2378, Mobile: 264 813767333, Email: samporo@mfa.gov.na

Mr. Ngakare Keeja, Foreign Service Official, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, P.O. Box 394, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 2822429, Mobile: 264 813215392, Email: nkeeja@hotmail.com

Mr. Gilbert Boois, Manager: Projects and Funding, Walvis Bay Corridor Group (WBCG), P.O. Box 25220, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 251669, Mobile: 264 814472625, Fax: 264 61 251683, Email: projects@wbcg.com.na

Ms. Johanna Absalom, Reporter, Namibia Economist, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 272498, Mobile: 264 812304238, Fax: 264 61 220615, Email: absando10@gmail.com

Mr. Eden Tate Shipanga, Lecturer, Polytechnic of Namibia, P.O. Box 13388, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 2072738, Mobile: 264 81 148 5841, Fax: 264 61 2072087, Email: eshipanga@polytechnic.edu.na

Ms. Sepo Haihambo, Senior Relationship Manager, Standard Bank Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 294 2367, Email: sepo.lamaswala-haihambo@standardbank.com.na

Frans Mupurua, Economist, National Planning Commission, P.O. Box 13356, Windhoek, Namibia. Telephone: 264 61 2834151, Mobile: 264 812855618, Fax: 264 61 226501, Email: fmupurua@npc.gov.na

Mr. Gilbert Frikkie Boois, Manager: Projects and Funding, Walvis Bay Corridor Group, P.O. Box 25220, Windhoek, Namibia. Tel: 264 61 251 669, Fax: 264 61 251863, Email: projects@wbcg.com.na

Tanzania

Mr. Maguye A. Maguye, Economist, Ministry of Finance, P.O. Box 9111, Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania. Telephone: 255 22 2111174-6, 255 753-223000, Fax: 255 22 2123924, Email: maguye4@yahoo.co.uk

Zambia

Ms. Ireen Musonda, Principal Economist, Ministry of Finance and National Planning, P.O. Box 50062, Lusaka, Zambia. Tel: 260 211 257178, Mobile: 260 966 764613, Fax: 260 211 251078, Email: ireen.musonda@mofnp.gov.zm or musondai@gmail.com

Zimbabwe

Mr. Mutasa Dzinotizei, Principal Director, Finance and Taxation, Ministry of Finance, P.O. Box 7705, Harare, Zimbabwe. Telephone: 263 4 706850, Mobile: 263 7122 11 553, Fax: 263 4 792750, Email: mdzinotizei@nao.co.zw

Mr. Chathebert Mudhunguyo, Senior Economist, Ministry of Finance, P.O. Box 7705, Harare, Zimbabwe. Telephone: 263 4 706850, Mobile: 263 773305887, Fax: 263 4 792750, Email: cmudhunguyo@gmail.com

COMESA

Mr. Julien Emile Razafintsalama, Officer-in-Charge for Technical Cooperation and Resource Mobilization, Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), P.O. Box 30051, Lusaka, Zambia. Telephone: 260 211 231722, Mobile: 260 978 317403, Fax: 260 211 225107, Email: jrazafintsalama@comesa.int

African Union Commission

Mr. Salif Sall, Africa Union-Southern Africa Regional Office, P.O. Box 30898, Lilongwe 3, Malawi. Telephone: 265 1 775 335/265 1 774 878, Fax: 265 1 775 330, Email: oau-saro@malawi.net

UNDP

Mr. Francois Ekoko, Regional Coordinator, UNDP-SSC Africa, UNDP Special Unit for South Africa Cooperation, Johannesburg, South Africa. Telephone: 27 11 603 5008, Fax: 27 11 603 5071, Email: francois.ekoko@undp.org or razafje@yahoo.com

Academic and Research

Professor Chinyamata Chipeta, Consultant, Southern African Institute for Economic Research, P.O. Box 1373, Zomba, Malawi. Telephone: 265 1 525205, Mobile: 265 999 311166,

Fax: 265 1 527296, Email: chipetac@sadnp.org.mw

Mr. Charles Minega, Regional Advisor/Research Specialist, Centre of Studies on Regional Integration, Eduardo Mondlane University CEDIR-UEM, P.O. Box 257, Maputo, Mozambique. Telephone: 258 21 490764, Mobile: 258 821427880, Fax: 258 21 494 630, Email: charles.minega@uem.mz

Mr. Francesco Rampa, Programme Associate-Economic and Trade Cooperation, European Centre for Development Policy Management, Onze Lieve Vrouweplein 21 6211 HE, Maastricht, Netherlands. Telephone: +31 43 350 2929, Fax: +31 43 350 2902, Email: fr@ecdpm.org

Mr. Bwalya Ngandu, Managing Consultant, Lantern Solutions Limited, P.O. Box 34035, Lusaka, Zambia. Telephone: 260 979 860110, Fax: 260 211 283522, Email: lantern@macrolink-zm/bngandu@macrolink.zm

Freelance Interpreters

Ms. Catherine Jele, Email: c.jele@qii.net, cathou@yebo.co.za

Mr. Tall Ouseynou, teranga52@yahoo.com

Mr. Kasanga Muteba, Interpreter, P.O. Box 284629, Sandton, South Africa. Telephone: 27 11 8841588, Mobile: 27 732804930, Fax: 27 11 7846590, Email: kasangam@gmail.com

Ms. Michelle Searra, franglais@icon.co.za

ECA

Mr. Emile Ahohe, Officer-in-Charge, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, Southern Africa Office (UNECA-SA), P.O. 30647, Lusaka, Zambia, Telephone: 260 211 228502, Fax: 260 211 236949, Email: srdcsa.uneca@un.org

Ms. Susan Mokonyana, Programme Officer and UNECA Liaison Officer to SADC, United Nations Place, 22 Khama Crescent, P.O. Box 54, Gaborone, Botswana. Telephone: (267) 3633-792, Fax: (267) 395-6093, Mobile: (267) 7642-9875, Email: smokonyana@uneca.org or s.mokonyana@gmail.com

Mr. Johnson Oguntola, Senior Regional Adviser (IWRM), UNECA-SA P.O. BOX 30647, Lusaka, Zambia. Telephone: 260 211 228502, Fax: 260 211 236949, Email: jakinbolaoguntola@uneca.org

Mr. Alemayehu Haile, Economic Commission for Africa, Office of Strategic Planning and Programme Management (OPM), P.O. Box 3001, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Ms. Matfobhi Riba, Economic Affairs Officer, UNECA-SA, P.O. BOX 30647, Lusaka, Zambia. Telephone: 260 211 228502, Fax: 260 211 236949, Email: mriba@uneca.org

Ms. Keiso Matashane-marite, Economic Affairs Officer, UNECA-SA P.O. 30647, Lusaka, Zambia. Telephone: 260 211 228502, Fax: 260 211 236949, Email: matashane-marite@un.org

Jean Luc Mastaki Namegabe, Economic Affairs Officer, UNECA-SA P.O. 30647, Lusaka, Zambia. Telephone: 260 211 228502, Fax: 260 211 236949, Email: jnamegabe@uneca.org

Mr. Jack Jones Zulu, Social Affairs Officer, UNECA-SA, P.O. BOX 30647, Lusaka, Zambia. Telephone: 260 211 228502, Fax: 260 211 236949, Email: jzulu@uneca.org

Mr. Benjamin Mattondo Banda, Economic Affairs Officer, UNECA-SA, P.O. 30647, Lusaka, Zambia. Telephone: 260 211 228502, Fax: 260 211 236949, Email: bandab@un.org

Ms. Maame Agyben, Associate Economic Affairs Officer, UNECA-SA, P.O. Box 30647, Lusaka, Zambia. Telephone: 260 211 228502, Fax: 260 211 236949, Email: magyeben@uneca.org

Ms. Avelyne Alaniesst, Translator/Revisor, Economic Commission for Africa, P.O. BOX 3001, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Mr. Bedson W. Nyoni, Information Management Assistant, UNECA-SA, P.O. Box 30647, Lusaka, Zambia. Telephone: 260 211 228502, Fax: 260 211 236949, Email: bnyoni@uneca.org

Ms. Ruth Kananda, Administrative Assistant, UNECA-SA, P.O. Box 30647, Lusaka, Zambia. Telephone: 260 211 228502, Fax: 260 211 236949, Email: rkananda@uneca.org

Ms. Dailes Matoka, Senior Staff Assistant, UNECA-SA, P.O. Box 30647, Lusaka, Zambia. Telephone: 260 211 228502, Fax: 260 211 236949, Email: dmatoka@uneca.org

Ms. Anne Mwansa, Staff Assistant, UNECA-SA, P.O. Box 30647, Lusaka, Zambia. Telephone: 260 211 228502, Fax: 260 211 236949, Email: mwansaa.uneca@un.org