



**Supporting South-South Cooperation from the North in the
Context of Aid Effectiveness: A Comparative Evaluation of
the United States and Spain's Respective Experiences in
Triangular Cooperation with Chile as a Strategic Partner**

RYAN FLANDERS

**DOCUMENTO DE TRABAJO N° 35
Octubre 2015**



DOCUMENTO DE TRABAJO Nº 35

Supporting South-South Cooperation from the North in the Context of Aid Effectiveness: A Comparative Evaluation of the United States and Spain's Respective Experiences in Triangular Cooperation with Chile as a Strategic Partner

Ryan Flanders



SERIE DOCUMENTOS DE TRABAJO

ISSN: 2253-8542

IMAGEN DE PORTADA:

<http://fondosg.com/fondo-de-triangelos-de-colores-para-escritorio-de-pc/>

Instituto Universitario de Desarrollo y Cooperación IUDC-UCM

C/ Donoso Cortés, 65, 6º. 28015 Madrid.

Tel.: (34) 91 394 64 09/19 – Fax: (34) 91 394 64 14

E-mail: iudcum@pdi.ucm.es

Página web: www.iudc.es

AUTOR

RYAN FLANDERS

EDICIÓN Y MAQUETACIÓN

EVA GRACIA

IUDC-UCM

Este documento es producto del trabajo final de máster realizado por Ryan Flanders, dirigido por el profesor José María Larrú. Contenido dentro de la titulación, Máster de Cooperación Internacional al Desarrollo impartido por la Universidad Pontificia Comillas.

Abstract

This paper seeks to evaluate the role of traditional development donors in supporting South-South cooperation through triangular cooperation in the context of the aid effectiveness agenda. As a case study, it compares the United States and Spain and the partnerships each country has established with Chile to carry out triangular (trilateral) development projects. First, it establishes the conceptual and historical framework for the promotion of South-South and triangular cooperation. Then, it examines the U.S.-Chile and Spain-Chile partnerships' origins, framework, and projects in Latin America, and conducts an evaluation of their use of best practices based on Chile's own criteria. Finally, a SWOT analysis is completed, recommendations are made for improving the U.S. and Spain's involvement in triangular cooperation initiatives, and opportunities for future research are considered. Further studies and systematization of experiences are needed to continue advancing in understanding the role of Northern donors in triangular cooperation and the modality's potential impact on positively reshaping North-South development cooperation.

Key words: *South-South Cooperation, Triangular Cooperation, aid effectiveness, best practices, evaluation*

Resumen

Este trabajo pretende evaluar el papel de los donantes tradicionales de desarrollo en el apoyo a la cooperación Sur-Sur a través de la cooperación triangular, en el contexto de la agenda de eficacia de la ayuda. Como estudio de caso, compara Estados Unidos y España y las alianzas que cada país ha establecido con Chile para llevar a cabo proyectos triangulares (trilaterales) de desarrollo. Primero, establece el marco conceptual e histórico de la promoción de la cooperación Sur-Sur y triangular. Luego, examina las alianzas EE.UU.-Chile y España-Chile y sus orígenes, marcos y proyectos ejecutados en América Latina y realiza una evaluación de buenas prácticas según los criterios elaborados por Chile. Finalmente, se elabora un análisis FODA, se hacen recomendaciones para el mejoramiento de la participación de EE.UU y España en iniciativas de cooperación triangular y se plantean ideas para futuras investigaciones. Son necesarios más estudios y sistematizaciones de experiencias para seguir avanzando en la comprensión del papel de los donantes de Norte en la cooperación triangular y el posible impacto de la modalidad en la reestructuración positiva de la cooperación al desarrollo Norte-Sur.

Palabras clave: *Cooperación Sur-Sur, Cooperación Triangular, eficacia de la ayuda, buenas prácticas, evaluación*

Table of Contents

Acronyms	5
1. Introduction	6
2. General Framework: South-South Cooperation, Triangular Cooperation, and Aid Effectiveness	8
2.1. Definitions, Terminology, and Basic Concepts.....	9
2.1.1. North-South Cooperation	9
2.1.2. South-South Cooperation	10
2.1.3. Triangular Cooperation	12
2.2. Origins of SSC and TrC.....	15
2.3. The Rise of SSC and TrC in the Context of the Aid Effectiveness Agenda	17
2.4. Promoting and Strengthening SSC from the North.....	21
3. Chile as a Lead SSC Provider and TrC Strategic Partner	23
3.1. Chile’s Emergence as a Provider of Development Cooperation	23
3.2. Chile’s Dedication to Quality and Knowledge Generation	25
3.3. Chile’s Main TrC Partners.....	29
4. The United States and Spain’s TrC with Chile.....	30
4.1. The United States and Chile.....	31
4.1.1. The United States’ Experience in TrC: Background	31
4.1.2. The United States and Chile’s TrC Partnership: Origins and Framework	34
4.1.3. The United States and Chile’s TrC Initiatives	35
4.1.4. Evaluating U.S.-Chile TrC Initiatives for Best Practices.....	37
4.2. Spain and Chile	40
4.2.1. Spain’s Experience in TrC: Background.....	40
4.2.2. Spain and Chile’s TrC Partnership: Origins and Framework	41
4.2.3. Spain and Chile’s TrC Initiatives.....	43
4.2.4. Evaluating Spain-Chile TrC Initiatives for Best Practices	44
5. Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats.....	48
6. Conclusions	52
Bibliography.....	56

Acronyms

AAA	Accra Agenda for Action
AECID*	Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (<i>Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional al Desarrollo</i>)
AGCI*	Chilean Agency for International Cooperation (<i>Agencia de Cooperación Internacional de Chile</i>)
BAPA	Buenos Aires Plan of Action
BMZ*	Federal Ministry for Economic Development and Cooperation (Germany) (<i>Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung</i>)
BRICS	Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CBSI	Caribbean Basin Security Initiative
CDCS	Country Development Cooperation Strategy
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DCF	Development Cooperation Forum
ECOSOC	UN Economic and Social Council
HLF	High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IDB-INTAL	IDB Institute for the Integration of Latin America and the Caribbean
IMF	International Monetary Fund
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
LDC	Least Developed Country
MAG	El Salvador Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock
MAP*	Country Association Framework (<i>Marco de Asociación País</i>)
MERCOSUR*	Southern Common Market (<i>Mercado Común del Sur</i>)
MIC	Middle Income Country
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NSC	North-South Cooperation
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
PIFCSS*	Ibero-American Program for the Strengthening of South-South Cooperation (<i>Programa Iberoamericana para el Fortalecimiento de la Cooperación Sur-Sur</i>)
SADPA	South African Development Partnership Agency
SEGIB*	Ibero-American General Secretariat (<i>Secretaría General Iberoamericana</i>)
SFP*	Public Function Secretariat (Paraguay)
SSC	South-South Cooperation
TCDC	Technical Cooperation Among Developing Countries
TrC	Triangular Cooperation (interchangeably with Trilateral Cooperation)
TT-SSC	Task Team on South-South Cooperation
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNOSSC	United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WFP	World Food Program

*Denotes acronyms in original language other than English

1. Introduction

The field of international development is changing, and has been for some time. In an ever more multipolar world where developing countries are increasingly asserting sovereignty over their own development priorities and working together to achieve them, over the last 15 years South-South cooperation (SSC) has risen to be a force for shaping the present and future of development cooperation. During this same time, and especially since the 4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan in 2011, traditional development donors and the international community are recognizing the importance of SSC for promoting country-ownership and other aid effectiveness principles while at the same time making their own development assistance more horizontal. Along these lines, more and more providers of development cooperation from the North and the South have begun participating in triangular cooperation (TrC), both as a way to strengthen SSC and for its potential as an effective modality for achieving development objectives while advancing principles such as recipient country leadership, equality, horizontality, and the prioritization of endogenous solutions.

Chile, as a top provider of SSC in Latin America, has become perhaps the world's leading proponent of TrC both in terms of projects carried out and the priority it gives to knowledge sharing. The United States and Spain, for their part, are two of the traditional donors that most participate in TrC, and both countries have established separate partnerships with Chile for carrying out joint development initiatives in third, comparatively less developed countries with a focus on Latin America. Chile's partnerships with Spain and the U.S., although newer than those formed with its other main Northern partners, Germany and Japan, are active and based in strong bilateral relations. These factors, along with considering the U.S. and Spain's geographic, cultural, and historic ties to Latin America, make the U.S.-Chile and Spain-Chile partnerships a good comparative case study for understanding different TrC approaches and applications.

While TrC and its potential impacts are increasingly being studied, few researches have focused specifically on examining and critiquing the role of Northern countries in this still new modality, with Bancet (2012), Alonso, Aguirre & Santander (2011), and Abdenur &

Fonseca (2013) being a few notable exceptions. Particularly important for the present study, Abdenur & Fonseca (2013) have stressed the importance of TrC being a two-way street, where both Northern and Southern partners learn and contribute to shaping the relationship and setting priorities, as opposed to Northern donors imposing their development models and project management practices on Southern partners and thus “keeping the foothold” on their influence. Additionally, the authors point to the need for further study on how Northern aid is reshaped through TrC, both in practice and discourse, which would “shed light on the agency of SSC providers...in their interface with Northern aid.”¹ Also, as highlighted by McEwen & Mawsdley (2012), empirical studies of TrC experiences are scarce, with the majority of papers to date being theoretical in nature.²

In part, this paper attempts to respond to these research gaps, seeking to evaluate how Northern donors support SSC, especially through participating in TrC. To accomplish this, we will compare the experiences of the United States and Spain in their TrC partnerships with Chile, evaluating their use of best practices for TrC initiatives. We will also assess their strengths and weaknesses, as well as opportunities for (and potential threats to) their expansion and improvement. Although we will look at the rise of TrC and Northern support for SSC in the context of the aid effectiveness agenda, we will base our evaluation on Chile’s own criteria for identifying best practices as opposed to any Northern-identified standards or even the Paris Declaration principles themselves. In addition to this paper’s unique approach to evaluating TrC for best practices, its specific analysis of the U.S. experience is a significant contribution to the field, considering that prior extensive analysis of U.S. involvement in TrC is practically non-existent in the literature.

The structure of this paper will be as follows. After this introduction, we will start in Chapter 2 by examining the rise of SSC and TrC and their promotion in the context of the aid effectiveness agenda, by first establishing definitions, terminology, and basic concepts before mapping their origins and evolution in the context of aid effectiveness. Then, in Chapter 3, we will look at Chile’s role as a lead SSC provider and TrC strategic partner, and

¹ ABDENUR, A. E. & FONSECA, J. M. (2013):“The North’s Growing Role in South-South Cooperation: keeping the foothold.” *Third World Quarterly* 34, pp. 1475-1491.

² MCEWAN, C. & MAWDSLEY, E. (2012): “Trilateral Development Cooperation: Power and Politics in Emerging Aid Relationships.” *Development and Change*, 43, pp. 1185–1209.

introduce its criteria for identifying best practices for TrC initiatives. We then begin our case study in Chapter 4, analyzing the U.S.-Chile and Spain-Chile TrC partnerships by first examining their backgrounds, frameworks, policies, and initiatives, before proceeding to evaluate their use of best practices. Finally, to wrap up the comparative analysis, in Chapter 5 we will present a brief assessment of each partnership's strengths and weaknesses, as well as opportunities for (and possible threats to) their expansion and improvement. In conclusion, we will see that both partnerships appear to generally be set up according to best practices for TrC, especially as it relates to horizontality and equality between Chile and its Northern partners, the use of Chile's comparative advantages, and recipient country leadership in identifying priorities. However, both partnerships have significant room for improvement, Spain-Chile in applying lessons learned from a project evaluating that showed tendencies towards vertical flows of assistance and imposition of Spanish project management and reporting requirements, which limit their capacity to be a two-way street of mutual learning where the recipient country contributes to knowledge generation. For U.S.-Chile initiatives, a lack of detailed project documentation and evaluations limits the extent conclusions can be drawn in regards to mutual learning and horizontality through the project execution phases, with increased transparency and knowledge sharing being the partnership's main area for improvement.

2. Conceptual and Historical Framework: South-South Cooperation, Triangular Cooperation, and Aid Effectiveness

In this chapter, we will set the general framework for South-South and triangular cooperation in the context of aid effectiveness. First, we will present definitions, terminology, and basic concepts. Then, we will map their origins before the year 2000 followed by their rise in the new millennium in the context of the aid effectiveness debate. Finally, we will briefly consider some ways that traditional donors from the North provide support to SSC, before looking at Chile's role in Chapter 3.

2.1. Definitions, Terminology, and Basic Concepts

2.1.1. North-South Cooperation

For the purposes of this paper, North-South cooperation (NSC) refers to bilateral or multilateral development assistance provided by a developed country or multilateral organization in the North to a developing country in the South. The South consists of the developing and historically poorer countries of Asia, Latin America, and Africa. The North, for its part, refers to the historically richer and more developed countries concentrated in the Northern Hemisphere (The United States, Canada, European countries, and Japan), as well as Australia and New Zealand.³ Major multilateral development organizations such as the IMF, the World Bank, and European Union agencies are considered part of the North as well.

Among the 34 members that currently belong to OECD, founded in December 1960, 28 countries and the European Union are members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC).⁴ As such, their qualified development assistance to the South is considered Official Development Assistance (ODA), which is an important element of NSC. The term *traditional donor* is also used in this paper and can refer to either a DAC member country or the aforementioned multilateral organizations. Traditionally, NSC has been seen as a vertical flow of assistance, driven by donor-identified needs, priorities, and interests.⁵ However, we have recently seen improvement in this pattern, at least rhetorically, notably observed in a shift in terminology preferring “partners for development” instead of “donors and recipients.”⁶ Further, increasing emphasis is also now placed on locally identified solutions and country ownership. This shift is reflected in the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and subsequent High Level Fora on Aid Effectiveness in Accra and Busan, which we will examine further in Section 2.2.2.

³ ROSSEEL, P., DE CORTE, E., BLOMMAERT, J. & VERNIERS, E. (2009): *Approaches to North-South, South-South and North-South-South Collaboration*. Catholic University of Leuven.

⁴ <http://www.oecd.org/dac/dacmembers.htm>

⁵ Roseel, P. et al. (2009)

⁶ SHEARER, M. & TRES, J. (2013): “South-South and Triangular Cooperation in Latin America and the Caribbean: Much Ado about Nothing?” *Integration and Trade Journal*, 36 (17), 1-10.

2.1.2. South-South Cooperation

Many definitions for South-South cooperation (SSC) exist, but generally, it can be understood as the transfer of resources, ideas, knowledge, expertise, skills, and/or technology between two or more countries from the South, to resolve problems and take advantage of opportunities in pursuit of development objectives. Emphasis is placed on transferring “demonstrated” and “reproducible” techniques, knowledge, and experiences in order to identify best practices for development.⁷ SSC is thus development cooperation in, between, and for the South that prioritizes endogenous solutions, guided by principles that include equality, horizontality, unconditional assistance, respect for national sovereignty, and the pursuit of mutual benefit, among others.⁸

Despite the intended horizontal nature of SSC, we can often identify a predominant flow of cooperation from a relatively more developed (often called “emerging”) country to another, comparatively less developed country. The terms *provider* (or *supplier*) and *recipient* of SSC are often used to describe the parties involved, in preference over the terms *donor* and *beneficiary*. The term *emerging donor*, which refers specifically to non-DAC development cooperation providers, is also frequently used when discussing lead SSC providers, although its use in this context is rejected by some authors as well as some countries from the South.⁹

However, SSC does not only take place through ODA-like exchanges. We can also consider political cooperation, trade, and investment flows when discussing SSC. As Ayllón (2009) suggests, this political aspect of SSC cannot be ignored, since one of SSC’s primary objectives is to achieve greater balance in international relations and the global economic system. This is pursued through strengthening bilateral and multilateral relations between Southern countries, which gives the South greater influence in international negotiations.¹⁰ In economic terms, following Roseel et al. (2009), an “aim of SSC is to promote self-sufficiency

⁷ AYLLÓN, B. (2009a): “Cooperación Sur – Sur: innovación y transformación en la cooperación internacional.” *Nombres propios*, Fundación Carolina 18 de diciembre.

⁸ SOUTH CENTRE (2009): *South-South Cooperation Principles: An Essential Element in South-South Cooperation*. South Centre. New York

⁹ OJEDA, T. (2010): “La cooperación sur-sur y la regionalización en América Latina: el despertar de un gigante dormido.” *Relaciones Internacionales*, 15, pp. 91-111.

¹⁰ AYLLÓN, B. (2009a)

among Southern nations and to strengthen economic ties among states whose market power match more equally than in asymmetric North-South relationships.”¹¹

Finally, it is important to mention that, while SSC may have its comparative advantages that differentiate it from traditional development assistance,¹² it is not meant to substitute or replace NSC.¹³ SSC and NSC are and should be seen as complementary, with each modality offering different opportunities for effective cooperation based on the resources, knowledge, and experiences unique to each development partner. Neither SSC nor NSC is inherently better or worse than the other, as they are merely different types of cooperation.¹⁴ In regards to horizontality, as highlighted by Dominguez (2013), SSC exchanges can be as vertical as many traditional NSC relationships.¹⁵ Thus, horizontality is a principle that should be pursued in development cooperation as a whole, in line with the Paris Principles on Aid Effectiveness. As Brenda Killen from the OECD puts it, “what really matters is not what the providers of development cooperation (be it South-South or traditional) are interested in, but what the country receiving this cooperation wants and needs.”¹⁶

According to the Ibero-American General Secretariat (SEGIB for its acronym in Spanish), the five most active providers of SSC in Ibero-America¹⁷ are, in order, Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, Chile, and Colombia. Cuba and Venezuela are also important providers, though their activity has declined in recent years. Of these countries, Brazil, Mexico, and Chile have well established, dedicated international development cooperation agencies, while Argentina

¹¹ ROSEEL, P. et al. (2009)

¹² AYLLÓN, B. (2009a)

¹³ TT-SSC (2010): *Bogota Statement – Towards Effective and Inclusive Development Partnerships*. High Level Event on South-South Co-operation and Capacity Development. Bogotá. 25 March.

¹⁴ AYLLÓN, B. (2009a)

¹⁵ DOMÍNGUEZ, R. (2013): “Desmitificando la Cooperación Sur-Sur”, *Centro de Información sobre la Cooperación Internacional. América Latina y el Caribe*. http://eficacia.info/doc_detalle.php?id=834

¹⁶ From: KILLEN, B. (2013): Interview with IDB-INTAL. *Trade and Integration Journal*, 36 (17), pg 149-151.

¹⁷ For the purposes of this paper, Ibero-America is understood as those countries who are members of the SEGIB consisting of Spanish and Portuguese speaking Latin American countries, as well as Spain, Portugal, and Andorra from the Iberian Peninsula. It does not include French and Creole speaking Latin American countries (most notably Haiti) or the English and Dutch speaking Caribbean. It is important to note that, unless explicitly mentioned otherwise, statistics and rankings from the SEGIB mentioned in this paper do not take into consideration SSC or TrC initiatives where the primary recipient is a French, Creole, Dutch, or English speaking country.

and Colombia coordinate actions through their Ministries of Foreign Affairs.¹⁸ Outside of Latin America, other members of the BRICS are important SSC actors. China and India are particularly active in economic cooperation, and South Africa has recently established its own South African Development Partnership Agency (SADPA). It is important to note that in Latin America, nearly every country plays the role of both provider and recipient of SSC.¹⁹

2.1.3. Triangular Cooperation

The term *triangular cooperation* can refer to any development cooperation activity conducted between three countries, but for the purposes of this paper, TrC can be generally understood as the involvement of a traditional DAC donor country from the North (or multilateral organization) in supporting a South-South cooperation initiative. This can include providing “funding, training, and management and technological systems, as well as other forms of support.”²⁰

However, no internationally agreed upon definition, or even standard concept, of TrC exists, and even terminology varies widely.²¹ A notable example of terminology variation is the United States’ use of the term *trilateral cooperation*²² or even *trilateral development cooperation*²³ in addition to occasionally using *triangular cooperation*.²⁴ The term *tripartite cooperation* is also sometimes used, particularly by northern European donors, and *triangular South-South cooperation* (Triangular SSC) is preferred by the SEGIB.²⁵ Following

¹⁸ Based on number of projects carried out in 2012. From: SEGIB (2014): *Report on South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America 2013-2014*. SEGIB. Madrid.

¹⁹ SEGIB (multiple years)

²⁰ UNOSSC (n.d.): “What is South-South Cooperation?” UNDP. Accessed February 2015. http://ssc.undp.org/content/ssc/about/what_is_ssc.html

²¹ OECD (2013b): *Triangular Co-operation: What’s the Literature Telling Us?* Literature review prepared by the OECD Development Cooperation Directorate. See Annex 2 on page 31 for a list of different definitions commonly used. For more definitions in Spanish, refer to page 93-94 of AYLLÓN, B. (2013b): *La cooperación sur-sur y triangular ¿Subversión o adaptación de la cooperación internacional?* Primera edición. Editorial IAEN. Quito.

²² AGCI & USAID (2013): “U.S.-Chile Trilateral Cooperation Fact Sheet.” 4 June.

²³ U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE (2011): “The United States and Chile: Trilateral Development Cooperation.” Fact Sheet. Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs. 20 March

²⁴ U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE (2014a): “United States and Indonesia Sign South-South and Triangular Cooperation Memorandum of Understanding To Support Developing Countries.” Media Note. Office of the Spokesperson. 17 February.

²⁵ OECD (2013b), and SEGIB (2014)

the preferred terminology used by most international organizations and lead SSC actors, we will use the term *triangular cooperation* throughout (and its abbreviation TrC), except when directly quoting or referencing language used in the policy documents of specific agencies that use other terms, such as USAID.

Despite the variation in concepts and definitions, TrC in practice often takes the form of i) a traditional donor (country from the North or an international organization) joining forces with ii) one or more SSC providers (that may also be a receiver of NSC) to implement a development cooperation project or promote a sharing of knowledge and experiences in iii) a third, comparatively less developed country from the South.²⁶ However, TrC can also be used to describe South-South-South exchanges, such as projects carried out under the Chile-Mexico Joint Cooperation Fund.²⁷

Terms used to describe the partners involved in TrC also differ, depending on the perspective of the author or agency. The OECD prefers *provider of development cooperation* (sic) while the UNDP uses *donor* to refer to the Northern partner, with both organizations using the terms *pivotal country* and *beneficiary country* for the Southern partners.²⁸ The Chilean Agency for International Cooperation (AGCI for its Spanish acronym), a lead Southern proponent of TrC, uses *triangular partner* to refer to the traditional donor or fellow SSC provider (such as Mexico), and *South-South partner* to refer to the primary recipient.²⁹ The term *strategic partner* is preferred by some authors and many SSC providers as opposed to *pivotal country* and the disputed term *emerging donor*. For us, the term *beneficiary country* to describe the primary recipient is insufficient, since in theory TrC is designed to benefit more than one partner, if not all partners. The SEGIB refers to the SSC provider as the *first provider*, emphasizing its leading role in the exchange, using *second provider*, to refer to the traditional donor.³⁰ For our purposes in comparing the involvement of the U.S. and Spain, we will follow Gómez Galán et al. (2011) and use *traditional donor*,

²⁶ Adapted from: OECD (2013a) *Triangular Co-operation: What Can We Learn from a Survey of Actors Involved?* Report prepared by the OECD Development Cooperation Directorate.

²⁷ AGCI (2014c): "Draft Working Paper: Chile's Role as a Triangular Partner for Development Cooperation". Santiago. http://issuu.com/agcichile/docs/web_agci

²⁸ OECD (2013b) and UNDP (2009): *Enhancing South-South and Triangular Cooperation*. Special Unit for South-South Cooperation. New York.

²⁹ In Spanish "socio triangular" y "socio sur-sur". AGCI (2015c)

³⁰ SEGIB (2014)

strategic partner (also *South-South provider*), and *recipient country* when describing TrC relationships,³¹ also using the AGCI's terms described above when directly referring to information obtained from the AGCI.

The specific structure of how TrC partnerships are established can also vary, in function of whether the initiative for the cooperation activity originates from: a) an existing bilateral South-South partnership; b) an existing North-South partnership between the traditional donor and the strategic partner; c) a North-South partnership between the traditional donor and the recipient country; or d) a joint partnership established between all three partners from the beginning.³²

Clearly related to both SSC and NSC, TrC is a space that provides opportunities to take advantage of the synergies between the two modalities and apply the comparative advantages of each partner. In this regard, the Bogotá Statement of 2010 has called it a “bridge” between the two modalities.³³ However, as Ayllón (2013b) and Lopes (2010) declare, TrC should not be seen as a “subdivision” of NSC, nor as a “natural evolution” of SSC. It should also not be seen as inherently superior to SSC or NSC merely by “integrating the best of both” modalities. TrC should instead be understood as “a complement to SSC, without substituting or replacing it,” and that SSC principles should guide TrC frameworks.³⁴ Further, as asserted by Abdenur & Fonseca (2013), “bridging” must happen in both directions, thus ensuring that, at the same time Northern actors support SSC, Southern actors have opportunity to increase their influence in reshaping NSC and development cooperation as a whole.³⁵

For the purposes of effectively achieving development goals, Northern and Southern actors may choose to enter into TrC partnerships (as opposed to carrying out bilateral NSC or SSC

³¹ In Spanish, “donante tradicional”, “socio estratégico”, and “país receptor”, as appearing in GÓMEZ GALÁN, M., AYLLÓN, B., and ALBARRÁN, M. (2011): *Reflexiones prácticas sobre cooperación triangular*. CIDEAL. Madrid.

³² See OECD (2013b) page 14-15 for examples and diagrams of different models for establishing triangular cooperation and the varying nature of partnerships. The AGCI (2014c) also provides examples from the Chilean experience.

³³ TT-SSC (2010a)

³⁴ Quotes translated from Spanish, adapted from Ayllón (2013b) in reference to Lopes (2010)

³⁵ Abdenur, A.E. & Fonseca, J.M. (2013)

actions) in given situations for a variety of reasons. Compared to NSC, one benefit of TrC is that it offers the opportunity to harness and build on the technical expertise of SSC providers and their relevant knowledge of the context, derived from their recent successful development experiences as well as the geographical, cultural, linguistic, and/or socio-economic proximity they often have with the recipient country. It can also harness the knowledge and initiative of the recipient country while promoting mutual learning, horizontality, and other principles associated with SSC. A reason SSC actors might choose TrC would be the availability of resources and knowledge from the traditional donor that would normally not be at their disposal in a bilateral SSC initiative. Other potential benefits of TrC include strengthening SSC, improving NSC, potential cost effectiveness through cost sharing, and opportunities for innovation through dynamic partnerships, among others.³⁶

In Latin America, where some of the most prominent examples have been seen, the traditional donors that most participate in TrC are Japan and Germany, followed by Spain and the United States, with Canada and Portugal showing growing interest. As far as multilateral organizations are concerned, the UN (in its various agencies) is a prominent actor. Worldwide, Chile, Brazil, China, Mexico, and South Africa are among the SSC providers that most actively participate in TrC. In Latin America in 2012, Paraguay and northern Central American countries (El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras) were the top TrC recipient partners.³⁷

2.2. Origins of SSC and TrC

As many authors have noted, SSC is definitely not a new concept, despite the recent “boom” that has been observed.³⁸ SSC is almost as old as the modern concept of international development cooperation itself, which is regarded to have its origins in the post-World War II 1940s, with the establishment of the World Bank, IMF, and UN, along with the Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe. Technical cooperation initiatives in Southeast Asia in the 1950s are

³⁶ AGCI (2014c), Abdenur, A.E. and Fonseca, J.M. (2013), Bancet, A. (2012), Chaturvedi, S. (2012), Fordelone, T. (2009), McEwen & Mawdsley (2012), OECD (2013b), UNDP (2009), and others.

³⁷ OECD (2013a), SEGIB (2014), and Chaturvedi, S (2012)

³⁸ For example, ECOSOC (2008), Ayllón, B. (2009a), Roseel, P. et al. (2009), Ojeda, T. (2010), Xalma, C. (2013), PIFCSS (2014) among many others

generally regarded as the first instances of SSC, along with the Bandung Conference in 1955, which eventually gave rise to the Non-Aligned Movement.³⁹ In 1961, the first development bank set up by a developing country was opened, the Kuwait Fund for Arab Economic Development (KFAED).⁴⁰ In the late 1960s, during the same time period that the UNDP was established⁴¹ and the OECD-DAC was defining the North-South concept of ODA,⁴² China began providing infrastructure development assistance to African countries, such as the Tazara Railway between Tanzania and Zambia.⁴³

SSC's first emergence into the international spotlight came during the 1970s, with the establishment of the United Nations Special Unit for Technical Cooperation Among Developing Countries (TCDC) in 1972. Out of this special unit, 138 countries adopted the *Buenos Aires Plan of Action for Promoting and Implementing Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries* (BAPA) in 1978, regarded as the first important international agreement regarding SSC.⁴⁴ The BAPA recognizes TCDC as a "new dimension in international development cooperation" and presents itself as "a detailed blueprint for major changes in approaches to development assistance and for a dramatically heightened emphasis on national and collective self-reliance among developing countries as foundations for a new international economic order."⁴⁵

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, despite being a period where developing countries' capacities for cooperation were severely limited by marked budget restraints due to structural adjustment, the foundations for SSC continued to be built. Important events during this period include the High Level Conference on Economic Cooperation among Developing Countries held in Caracas in 1981, the formation of the Group for South-South Consultation and Coordination (G-15) in 1989, and the September 1994 Ministerial Meeting

³⁹ ECOSOC (2008), Ayllón, B. (2009a), Roseel, P. et al. (2009), Ojeda, T. (2010), Xalma, C. (2013), PIFCSS (2014)

⁴⁰ ECOSOC (2008)

⁴¹ CUTS-CITEE (2005): "Trilateral Development Cooperation: An Emerging Trend." *Briefing Paper*, No. 1/2005

⁴² HYNES, W. & SCOTT, S. (2013): "The Evolution of Official Development Assistance: Achievements, Criticisms and a Way Forward", *OECD Development Co-operation Working Papers*, No. 12, OECD Publishing.

⁴³ ECOSOC (2008): "Trends in South-South and Triangular Development Cooperation." Background Study for the Development Cooperation Forum. April.

⁴⁴ OJEDA, T. (2010), PIFCSS (2014), Xalma, C. (2013)

⁴⁵ UN SPECIAL UNIT FOR TCDC (1978): *Buenos Aires Plan of Action*

of the Group of 77, which made a call for further discussion and consolidation of SSC's recognition in the United Nations and Southern countries' development programs.⁴⁶

Conversation about TrC in international fora was sparse before the new millennium, although it also is not a new concept. Japan had been actively participating in triangular projects and promoting SSC as an integral component of its development cooperation strategy since the 1970s. Germany has been involved in triangular activities for more than 25 years as well. The United States was also involved in a few triangular activities in the 20th century, such as working with India in the late 1950s to construct roads and radio networks in Nepal and Afghanistan.⁴⁷

In 1999, the importance of TrC as a synergy between NSC and SSC began to be promoted by the High-Level Committee on Review of TCDC, which in its eleventh session recognized that SSC should be seen as complementary to NSC, and not a substitute.⁴⁸ Stressing the importance of SSC in international development cooperation, the Committee "emphasized the need to promote triangular approaches to facilitate South-South programmes and projects (sic)."⁴⁹

With the foundations for SSC and TrC firmly set, after the year 2000 both modalities would experience an extraordinary increase in prominence and activity, particularly in Latin America, our region of interest, which we will address in the next section.

2.3. The Rise of SSC and TrC in the Context of the Aid Effectiveness Agenda

The beginning of the new millennium brought with it a renewed vigor in the international community for pursuing development worldwide, expressed in the Millennium Declaration

⁴⁶ OJEDA, T. (2010), Roseel, et al. (2009)

⁴⁷ CHATURVEDI, S. (2011): *Characteristics and Potential of Triangular Development Cooperation (TDC): Emerging Trends, Impact and Future Prospects*. UNDESA. New York

⁴⁸ CUTS-CITEE (2005)

⁴⁹ UN Press Release, DEV/2214, 4 June 1999. (<http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/1999/19990604.DEV2214.html>)

and the subsequent Millennium Development Goals (MDG).⁵⁰ The energy towards pursuing these goals spurred efforts in the international community to improve aid effectiveness and efficiency, which in turn set the stage for a rapid increase in SSC and TrC prominence and activity, particularly in Latin America. Two factors contributed to this increase. The first factor is the overall net reduction of ODA directed to middle income countries (MICs), which make up most of the Latin American region. Initially, this reduction is attributable to traditional donors increasing the concentration of their assistance to the least developed countries (LDCs) in accordance with MDG 8 (developing a global partnership for development). Then, the world-wide economic crisis that sparked in 2008 resulted in 17 OECD-DAC member countries reducing their aid budgets, further propelling the descent of ODA to Latin America. Overall, this reduction of aid led to increased demand for SSC in Latin America. The second factor relates to the emergence of two concrete movements which would see SSC and TrC ascend in the international agenda: Financing for Development, and Aid Effectiveness.⁵¹

According to Xalma, the ascent of SSC and TrC in the post-2000 international agenda can be divided into two periods, from 2000 to 2007, and from 2008 to the present.⁵² In the first period, one of the most important moments for SSC and TrC was the 2002 Monterrey Summit for Financing in Development. The Summit's final declaration encouraged strengthening of SSC and TrC as well as the "exchange of views on successful strategies, practices and experience and replication of projects."⁵³ The United Nations Day for South-South Cooperation in 2003 was another important event. The recognition of SSC and TrC in the aid effectiveness movement coordinated by the OECD was more gradual. The first High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (HLF) in Rome (2003) did not mention the two modalities. The second HLF in Paris (2005) and resulting Paris Declaration (PD) considered SSC and TrC's importance for aid effectiveness in their preparatory documents, but did not mention the

⁵⁰ UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY (2000): *United Nations Millennium Declaration, Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly*, 18 September, A/RES/55/2

⁵¹ XALMA, C. (2013): "The New Boom in South-South Cooperation: The Experience of Ibero-America." *Integration and Trade Journal*, 36(17), pg 25-38. Inter-American Development Bank, and PIFCSS (2014): *Cronología e historia de la Cooperación Sur-Sur: Un aporte desde Iberoamérica*. Documento de Trabajo No. 5. PIFCSS. Madrid

⁵² Xalma, C. (2013)

⁵³ UN (2003): *Report of the International Conference on Financing for Development*, Monterrey, Mexico, 18-22 March 2002. A/CONF.198/11.

modalities in the final PD.⁵⁴ Nonetheless, the principles of the PD are largely regarded as important for the evolution of SSC and TrC.⁵⁵ This is most notably seen in the “consensus that vertical relationships between ‘donors’ and ‘recipients’ were hindering efficiency” reflected in the principles of promoting more horizontal collaborations and local ownership of development solutions.⁵⁶

The year HLF-3 was held in Accra, 2008, has been called a “watershed” year for SSC and TrC.⁵⁷ Starting with the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA), the product of HLF-3 that sought to expand upon the for aid effectiveness and set up a framework for their implementation, the importance of actors participating in SSC was recognized for successful advancement of the aid effectiveness agenda. Also in 2008, regarding development finance, the Doha Summit’s final declaration⁵⁸ explicitly encouraged the deepening of SSC and TrC in adherence to PD principles, and recognized the dual role of MICs as both recipients and providers of development cooperation. Both documents stressed SSC and NSC’s complementary roles in shaping the new aid architecture.⁵⁹

Coming out of Accra, the OECD-DAC sponsored the establishment of the Task Team for South-South Cooperation (TT-SSC) in 2009, the same year the landmark High Level United Nations Conference on South-South Cooperation was held in Nairobi.⁶⁰ The TT-SSC is a Southern-led platform tasked with advancing knowledge and practice of SSC and TrC in accordance with the AAA. Upon collecting information on 110 case studies, the Task Team concluded that the following features of SSC contribute to the aid effectiveness agenda: its

⁵⁴ AYLLÓN, B. (2013): “El debate sobre la eficacia de la ayuda: reflexiones sobre su aplicación a la cooperación Sur-Sur en el caso latinoamericano.” *Revista Perspectivas do Desenvolvimento*, 1(1), pp. 126-142. Also, XALMA, C. (2013)

⁵⁵ OJEDA, T. (2010)

⁵⁶ KILLEN, B. (2013)

⁵⁷ XALMA, C. (2013)

⁵⁸ UN (2009): *Doha Declaration on Financing for Development: Outcome Document of the Follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development to Review the Implementation of the Monterrey Consensus*. Doha, Qatar, 29 November-2 December 2008. A/CONF.212/L.1/Rev.1

⁵⁹ AYLLÓN, B (2013), OJEDA, T. (2010), XALMA, C. (2013)

⁶⁰ PIFCSS (2014)

focus on capacity building, emphasis on horizontal partnerships, cost effectiveness, demand-driven character, adaptability, and use of Southern knowledge.⁶¹

The TT-SSC's findings drove the agenda at the 2010 Bogotá High Level Event on South-South Cooperation, and strongly influenced the most recent HLF-4 held in Busan in 2011. Busan provided the strongest endorsement of SSC and TrC seen to date in the HLFs, addressing their contributions to the effective development cooperation agenda and linkages with NSC, as well as impact measurement, assessment, promotion of best practices, and their scaled-up application. Busan also set up and Building Block on South-South Cooperation aimed at concentrating efforts and improving results.⁶²

Other important platforms for advancing SSC and TrC knowledge and best practices include the World Bank's South-South Experience Exchange and the UN Office for South-South Cooperation (UNOSSC). In Latin America, the Ibero-American Program for the Strengthening of South-South Cooperation (PIFCSS for its acronym in Spanish), established out of the SEGIB in 2008, leads in advancing SSC and TrC in the Ibero-American community.⁶³ While not specifically focused on SSC and TrC, the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, product of Busan,⁶⁴ and the UN ECOSOC's Development Cooperation Forum (DCF) recognize the modalities' role in the overall agenda for effective development cooperation.⁶⁵

For TrC in particular, the period starting in 2008 is especially significant. In ECOSOC's important 2008 report, it was characterized as being not "a significant part of the global development cooperation architecture."⁶⁶ Indeed, the exact quantitative flow of TrC remains unknown due to a lack of reliable and consistent tracking on par with the DAC's ODA reporting system. However, its role in the new aid architecture, both as a way to

⁶¹ SCHULTZ, N.S. (2010): "Implementing Accra: South-South Cooperation in the Context of Aid Effectiveness." Concept Note. *Boosting South-South Cooperation in the Context of Aid Effectiveness: Telling the Story of Partners Involved in More than 110 Cases of South-South and Triangular Cooperation*. TT-SSC. Bogotá, pp 91-104.

⁶² AYLLÓN, B. (2013) and XALMA, C. (2013)

⁶³ www.cooperacionsursur.org

⁶⁴ <http://effectivecooperation.org/wordpress/hlm2014/>

⁶⁵ <http://www.un.org/en/ecosoc/dcf/>

⁶⁶ ECOSOC (2008)

strengthen SSC as well as its potential as an effective and efficient cooperation modality in itself, is becoming more widely recognized. Today, it is well documented that instances of TrC have been progressively increasing, particularly in Latin America, and that more and more actors from the North and the South are exploring its application as a tool for effective cooperation.⁶⁷

Calls have been made by the international platforms mentioned above and in academia for increased reporting and systematization of SSC and TrC experiences, so as to promote best practices and scale-up their application. These calls are being heeded, with case studies and reports being shared by the platforms themselves and multilateral organizations, as well as by country development agencies such as Chile's AGCI (see Chapter 3). September 2014 saw the release of one of the first public, comprehensive evaluation of a triangular project. This evaluation, which we will look at more closely in Section 4.2.4, describes a technical cooperation project jointly executed between Spain, Chile, and Paraguay from 2009 to 2013.⁶⁸

Promoting SSC and TrC now features prominently in the agenda for effective development cooperation, and the contributions they can make to the post-2015 agenda are well recognized. In the next section, we will briefly introduce the concept of Northern support for SSC, by considering some ways that traditional donors have sought to strengthen the modality, both directly and through participating in TrC.

2.4. Promoting and Strengthening SSC from the North

There are many ways that Northern actors have worked to strengthen and promote SSC. One is through encouraging or facilitating spaces for advancing SSC and disseminating knowledge about experiences and best practices. Spain is a clear international leader in this regard. A notable example is its leading role in the aforementioned SEGIB and PIFCSS, which

⁶⁷ For examples, see OECD (2013a), OECD (2013b), XALMA, C. (2013) BANCET, A. (2012) and the annual SEGIB *Report on South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America*.

⁶⁸ MAEC (2014): *Evaluación final del proyecto triangular Chile-España-Paraguay: Fortalecimiento de la gestión y el desarrollo de las personas del sector público al servicio de la ciudadanía de Paraguay 2009-2013*. Informe sintético. Madrid

annually publish the *Report on South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America*. This report is an international reference for tracking and systematizing SSC and TrC experiences, and can itself be considered “an intergovernmental, horizontal, and collective instance of SSC.”⁶⁹ Spain is also a member of the TT-SSC steering committee⁷⁰ and the Building Block on SSC created out of Busan,⁷¹ was on the steering committee for the High Level Event in Bogotá⁷², and financially contributes to the World Bank’s South-South Experience Exchange.⁷³

Additionally, Spain has contributed significant amounts of ODA to strengthen SSC. According to SEGIB, Spain provided about US\$35 million in 2009 (about half of its contributions to Latin American regional organizations) to specifically support bilateral SSC.⁷⁴ This amount has gradually declined however (which follows the declining trends observed overall in Spanish ODA⁷⁵), with US\$28 million allocated in 2010⁷⁶ and about US\$25.5 million in 2011.⁷⁷

Participating in TrC is another way that traditional donors can support SSC, with support taking place in a number of ways. One is by making “resources available to two partners in the South that the traditional donor will not implement directly,”⁷⁸ or that would not otherwise be available to the Southern partners. Another way is that the SSC provider’s institutional development cooperation capacities can be directly or indirectly strengthened in the process of carrying out the triangular initiative. In the case of USAID’s Trilateral Assistance Program (TAP) with South Africa, capacity building of South Africa as a development cooperation provider is an explicit objective. Along with promoting development goals in the region and advancing a TrC model framework, one of the TAP’s stated objective is to “improve South African technical, financial and managerial capacity to

⁶⁹ XALMA, C. (2013)

⁷⁰ <http://www.southsouth.org/en/seccion/9/who-we-are>

⁷¹ WORKING PARTY ON AID EFFECTIVENESS (2011): *South-South and Triangular Cooperation: Unlocking the Potential of Horizontal Partnerships for Better Development Outcomes*. Building Block Proposal presented at the 4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan, South Korea, 29 November to 1 December.

⁷² TT-SSC (2010)

⁷³ AYLLÓN, B. (2009b): South-South Cooperation (SSC) and multilateral governance of the aid system: The implications for Spanish aid. *Comments*, June. FRIDE. Madrid.

⁷⁴ SEGIB (2010)

⁷⁵ For analysis of Spanish ODA flows, see: LARRÚ, J. M. (2014): “La contribución de la cooperación española al desarrollo global: Balance del período 2005-2013.” *VII Informe sobre exclusión y desarrollo social en España*. Fundación FOESSA. Documento de trabajo 8.5

⁷⁶ SEGIB (2011)

⁷⁷ SEGIB (2012)

⁷⁸ From: GARRANZO, R. (2013): Interview with IDB-INTAL. *Trade and Integration Journal*, 36 (17), pp 153-156.

implement strategic development programs in collaboration with other African countries.”⁷⁹ Institutional capacity building can also happen in a more bilateral manner, even within the framework of a TrC partnership agreement. This has been seen in Chile and Spain’s partnership, where capacity building of the AGCI has taken place through the Chile-Spain Joint Fund, outside the context of specific TrC projects.⁸⁰

In the chapters that follow, we will further explore the topic of strengthening SSC from the North, specifically through TrC. This will be done by comparing the United States and Spain’s policies and experiences in TrC, specifically through evaluating their respective partnerships with Chile and their use of best practices based on Chile’s criteria. But first, in the next chapter, we will give a general overview of Chile as a lead SSC provider and TrC strategic partner.

3. Chile as a Lead SSC Provider and TrC Strategic Partner

In Chapter 3, for the purposes of setting up our comparative analysis of the U.S.-Chile and Spain-Chile TrC partnerships, we will present Chile’s background and role as a lead SSC provider and proponent of TrC. First, we will look at Chile’s emergence as a provider of development cooperation. Then, we will examine Chile’s commitment to quality and knowledge generation in its development cooperation activities, introducing its criteria for TrC best practices. Finally, we will give a brief overview of its main Southern and Northern TrC partners before evaluating its partnerships with the U.S. and Chile in Chapter 4.

3.1. Chile’s Emergence as a Provider of Development Cooperation

Chile, a non-DAC member of the OECD since 2010, is considered one of the top SSC providers and proponents of TrC in Latin America today. During the past two and half decades since transitioning back to democracy in 1989, Chile has experienced remarkable levels of socio-economic development, while at the same time emerging into a provider of

⁷⁹ USAID/SOUTHERN AFRICA (2013b): *Fact Sheet: Trilateral Assistance Program*. Pretoria

⁸⁰ AGCI (2014b): *Cooperación Chile-España*. AGCI. Santiago. October.

development cooperation. Chile's development cooperation activities were first institutionalized in a dedicated agency in 1990, when the AGCI was established by Law No. 18,989 of 19 June. Although the AGCI was initially dedicated only to managing the ODA received in Chile, in 1993 the TCDC Program and the Horizontal (or South-South) Cooperation Program was created within the agency. These two programs seek to support Chile's foreign policy and strengthen relations with neighbors from Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC). Responsible for coordinating Chile's SSC and TrC, their creation marked Chile's transition into a dual role as both a provider and receiver of development cooperation.⁸¹ The structure of AGCI was modified in 2005, with the agency being moved to be under the direct supervision of the President of the Republic, through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.⁸²

As mentioned in Section 2.1.2, according to the SEGIB, Chile is among the most active SSC providers in Ibero-America in terms of total initiatives carried out. While not the top provider in the region, with Brazil, Mexico, and Argentina consistently participating in more projects, its participation is consistent on a year-to-year basis.⁸³ Chile's bilateral SSC takes the form of technical assistance to Latin American and Caribbean countries of similar or lower development. Scholarships for post-graduate studies in Chile and international courses also figure prominently. Finally, contributions to and through multilateral organizations are a large share of Chile's development cooperation spending, with a marked increase in 2012. Overall, Chile's cooperation flows have been increasing overtime. Total concessional flows for 2012 were US\$43 million based on OECD's calculations, and the AGCI estimated 2013 totals at US\$57 million.⁸⁴

⁸¹ SANCHEZ, F. (2010): *Análisis de la actuación de Chile en la Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo en sus modalidades Sur-Sur y triangular*. Documento de Trabajo No. 8. Instituto Universitario de Desarrollo y Cooperación. Universidad Complutense de Madrid

⁸² AGCI & AECID (2010): *Programa de Cooperación Triangular Chile-España: Una Asociación de Cooperación en Desarrollo*. AGCI and AECID. 13 December. Santiago de Chile.

⁸³ SEGIB (2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2014). NOTE: In its 2010 report, SEGIB began distinguishing between projects (longer, more costly, and more complex) and actions (shorter and less costly).

⁸⁴ OECD (2014), AGCI & UNDP (2014a), and AGCI's annual report *Balance de Gestión Integral* corresponding to the years 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013. NOTE: Chile does not report to the OECD, but included this last calculation in their Special Review, where they specified that the 2012 number is lower due in part to the OECD not having evaluated some of Chile's multilateral contributions for ODA criteria and thus did not include those figures.

Along with bilateral SSC, scholarship programs, and multilateral contributions, Chile has been prominently incorporating TrC into its development cooperation since 1998.⁸⁵ TrC is given priority in the AGCI's policies, being recognized as a way to support its SSC with regional partners. Chile also views TrC as a way to strengthen NSC, through collaboration with traditional DAC donors in implementing their ODA.⁸⁶ According to the SEGIB, Chile is the predominant strategic partner for TrC in Ibero-America, having participated as a provider in more projects in the region than any other country between 2006 and 2012.⁸⁷ It is worth mentioning that based on total financial contribution to TrC projects, Chile is not necessarily the biggest spending strategic partner in the region. As an example, this was the case in 2010, when Brazil spent more on TrC despite participating in fewer projects.⁸⁸ Nevertheless, Chile's role as a world leader in TrC is widely recognized.

3.2. Chile's Dedication to Quality and Knowledge Generation

Along with being a leader in terms of total SSC and TrC initiatives carried out, Chile is also dedicated to effectiveness, efficiency, and quality in its cooperation activities. In regards to leveraging its comparative advantages, Chile's bilateral and triangular interventions focus on areas in which Chile has had successful experience and possesses strong institutional capacity. These sectors notably include: trade and agriculture; health and social protection; the environment, energy, and natural resources; disaster prevention; and governance, including institutional capacity building and modernization of customs agencies, justice systems, and other public offices.⁸⁹ In these areas, Chile places emphasis on technical

⁸⁵ AGCI & UNDP (2012a)

⁸⁶ AGCI (2014c), AGCI's annual *Balance de Gestión Integral* reports, and OECD (2014).

⁸⁷ Based on a review of all of SEGIB's annual Reports on South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America published as of the time this paper was written (SEGIB 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2014). Mexico, Argentina, and Brazil are also consistently active participants. Chile was the top strategic partner for TrC projects in all years consulted except 2006 (when Mexico participated in one project more than Chile) and 2011 (when Argentina carried out the most projects). When considering projects and actions combined, Chile often remains the most active strategic partner in numerical terms. However, making definitive conclusions in this regard is difficult, as this ranking is not consistently tracked as such in the SEGIB reports after 2010. Nevertheless, being the most active country in projects is indicative of Chile's commitment to longer term cooperation. As mentioned in the notes in Section 2.1.2, SEGIB's rankings only consider projects in Ibero-America. Chile is also a consistently active TrC partner in Haiti, although not the most active.

⁸⁸ SEGIB (2011).

⁸⁹ OECD (2014), Sanchez, F (2010), SEGIB (multiple years), AGCI and UNDP (2012a and 2012b), and AGCI (2015b)

cooperation, and in 2009 the AGCI put together a catalogue of various Chilean public agencies' capacities for providing technical cooperation, product of a study done in conjunction with Spain's AECID.⁹⁰ In addition to emphasizing complementarity, policy coherence, reciprocity, and the active participation of all actors, the AGCI views its development cooperation interventions as characterized by knowledge transfer, seeking to leave capacities installed in the receiving countries (capacity building), as opposed to simply providing financial resources, or merely acting within modalities that differ from traditional NSC. The agency considers this to be an important contribution to defining international development cooperation, and an incentive for Chile's increased participation in current international debates about the new aid architecture.⁹¹

In 2013, Chile requested that the OECD-DAC conduct a special review of its development cooperation and the AGCI. This was the first DAC review of a SSC provider, and its 2014 report recognized that the spirit of SSC is the foundation of Chile's development cooperation and its role as a leading proponent of TrC. The review also highlighted Chile's "Modernization Plan (sic)" and its concerted efforts to strengthen and improve management of the AGCI and implementation of its projects and programs.⁹²

Chile actively shares knowledge and best practices from its experiences in TrC. In 2012, the AGCI published a four part study carried out in conjunction with the UNDP, analyzing the evolution of Chile's TrC from 1998 to 2010, defining criteria for best practices, and analyzing cases where best practices were exhibited.⁹³ Below, Box 1 summarizes these criteria for identifying best practices in TrC, as defined in AGCI & UNDP (2012c):

⁹⁰ AGCI (2009): *Catálogo de Capacidades Nacionales de Cooperación*. Estudio de Capacidades y Oportunidades de Cooperación Sur-Sur. AGCI. Santiago.

⁹¹ AGCI and UNDP (2012c): *Buenas prácticas en cooperación Sur-Sur triangular de Chile: criterios y metodología de selección de casos*. AGCI. Santiago

⁹² OECD (2014). *Special Review of Chile*. OECD, Paris.

⁹³ AGCI and UNDP (2012a, b, c, and d)

Box 1: Chile's Criteria for Identifying Best Practices in TrC

The AGCI has identified eight criteria for identifying best practices for TrC, summarized below:

1. Institutional Framework

This criterion considers the possibility that a project is able to install increased institutional capacity in the recipient country, and therefore be considered successful. It takes into consideration the preexisting institutional capacity and political conditions of the recipient country, i.e. if the technical and institutional conditions are sufficient and stable, and if there is a high degree of political will in project development areas. For this, the following aspects are examined:

-**Appropriation**, or country-ownership, measuring the recipient country's leadership in defining national public policies.

-**Governability**, which refers to the level to which the recipient country's actions are based in legality, legitimacy, participation, transparency, social cohesion and integration, democratic responsibility, and change management.

-**In-Country Counterparts**, which refers to the existence of clearly identified institutions, agencies, organizations, and/or professionals in the recipient country that are capable and prepared for project management.

-**Knowledge Generation**, referring to the existence of civil society organizations and academic institutions that produce knowledge and monitor public policies in a systematic way.

2. Comparative Advantages

This criterion addresses the degree to which a triangular project or initiative clearly identifies and capitalizes on all three partners' comparative advantages, working within and maximizing their knowledge, expertise, and other strengths. For this, the following aspects are examined:

-**Prior Successful Experience**, where either the traditional donor or the strategic partner has prior experience and success in the project area, either through prior bilateral cooperation initiatives or through successful public policies in their own country.

-**Trust and Confidence** between the partners, which is indicated by prior experience working together, the existence of formal agreements, social and political stability, or sustainability in public policies.

-The **Abilities** of each partner are identified and incorporated, which depends on sufficient horizontality in the working structure.

3. Pertinence

This criterion refers to the adequacy of the projects' results and objectives to the context. For this, the following aspects are considered:

-**Diagnosis** and assessment of needs and problems is done by the recipients themselves.

-**Alignment** of the triangular partners' actions with national, regional, or local development policies related to the sector.

-**The Concept of "Development"** itself that is held by each partner is taken into consideration so as to mitigate ethnocentric differences that can hinder a project's pertinence.

4. Horizontality

This criterion refers to the structure of the partnership, based on collaboration between equal partners as

opposed to vertical assistance from donors to recipients. This is interrelated with other criteria, namely the institutional framework and the harnessing of comparative advantages, and can also be related to cost sharing. A project is considered to have good horizontality when the three partners fully and willingly participate in project design and implementation.

5. Effectiveness

This criterion refers to the degree to which an initiatives' desired outputs and outcomes have been achieved, for a group of beneficiaries in a specified time period, without considering the costs incurred.

6. Efficiency

According to this criterion, a TrC project, like other projects, is considered to exhibit best practices when the objective has been achieved while optimizing resources, in a context where the other criteria mentioned above have been articulated.

7. Sustainability

For Chile, TrC presents favorable conditions for project sustainability, due to the additional resources it offers that are not available in a bilateral SSC context. In determining if a project results in the sustainable transfer of knowledge and capacities in the recipient country, in such a way that it could be replicable, Chile examines the following aspects:

-**Sustainability in Public Policies**, that there is a legislative and political possibility that the project can continue without the triangular partners after the TrC initiative ends.

-**Organizational and Financial Aspects**, that there are resources assigned in the recipient country for the project and continued operation.

-**Social Sustainability**, which refers to impact of the projects on socially vulnerable groups and the environment.

8. Results-Based Management

This criterion looks for positive changes produced by the project on the context in which it intervened. Specifically, it looks for:

-**Positive Changes on Development**

-**Positive Institutional Changes**

-**Positive Changes for Innovation**

-**Positive Social Changes**

Source: Elaborated by the author, adapted from AGCI & UNDP (2012c)

Along these lines, one of the DAC's recommendations from its 2014 review is that Chile document best practices and lessons learned from its experiences, because "sharing this experience would help to improve this form of co-operation and strengthen Chile's leading position as an active player in triangular co-operation (sic)."⁹⁴ Chile has continued to be active in this area. 2014 saw the publication of a working paper by the AGCI on Chile's role

⁹⁴ OECD (2014)

as a TrC partner,⁹⁵ as well as the evaluation of the Chile-Spain-Paraguay project mentioned in Section 2.3.⁹⁶ Also in 2014, Chile hosted a seminar on evaluating TrC projects, and in 2015 published that seminar's working document describing Spain, Germany, and Japan's evaluation methods.⁹⁷ Most recently, Chile hosted a regional conference on TrC in Santiago on April 16-17, 2015, which was attended by Chile's TrC partners from Latin America, Europe, North America, and Asia. Co-organized by the Chilean Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the AGCI, and Germany's Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), the purpose of this conference was to "deepen dialogue about including state and non-state actors in triangular cooperation."⁹⁸ The conference coincided with AGCI's publication of a report on Chile's experiences in and conceptual framework for TrC, used as the brochure for the event.⁹⁹

3.3. Chile's Main TrC Partners

As mentioned in Section 2.1.3, the AGCI uses the terms *triangular partner* and *South-South partner* to describe its partners in TrC. According to the AGCI, Chile has 14 triangular partners¹⁰⁰, including a wide range of DAC members, the EU, international organizations such as the World Food Programme (WFP), and other SSC providers.¹⁰¹ Japan is Chile's oldest triangular partner, with the two countries consistently working together on projects since 1998.¹⁰² Germany began participating in 2004, and has remained one of Chile's most important and active partners. Spain first joined Chile in TrC in 2009. The two countries have established the Chile-Spain Joint Fund for Triangular Cooperation,¹⁰³ and Spain remains an important partner for Chile, although not carrying out as many projects as other top partners. The United States worked with Chile to develop triangular scholarship funds

⁹⁵ AGCI (2014b)

⁹⁶ MAEC (2014)

⁹⁷ AGCI (2015d): *Evaluando Proyectos de Cooperación Triangular*. Documento de trabajo. Unidad de Prensa de AGCI. Santiago. March. http://issuu.com/agci/docs/v.f._abril_documento_de_trabajo_-_.

⁹⁸ Quote translated from Spanish by this author. AGCI (2015b): "Chile cumple un rol activo como socio de cooperación triangular en América Latina y el Caribe." *Noticias*. AGCI. 16 April. <http://www.agci.cl/index.php/noticias/1383-chile-cumple-un-rol-activo-como-socio-de-cooperacion-triangular-en-america-latina-y-el-caribe>

⁹⁹ AGCI (2015c): *Cooperación Triangular de Chile: Marco Conceptual y Experiencias*. Unidad de Prensa de AGCI. Santiago.

¹⁰⁰ AGCI (2015b)

¹⁰¹ AGCI (2015c) and AGCI (2014c)

¹⁰² AGCI & UNDP (2012a)

¹⁰³ AGCI (2014b):

between 1999 and 2004. In 2010, the U.S. began participating in TrC projects, and in 2012 replaced Germany as Chile's top triangular partner in terms of the number of projects carried out that year.¹⁰⁴ Numerous other DAC donors have participated in TrC with Chile, but to a lesser extent than the others mentioned above. In regards to TrC with other SSC providers, Chile's main triangular partner is Mexico, under the Chile-Mexico Joint Cooperation Fund,¹⁰⁵ and its newest partner is Brazil, with a new partnership agreement signed on April 17, 2015.¹⁰⁶

Central American countries, the Dominican Republic, and Paraguay are Chile's most frequent South-South recipient partners, along with Colombia, Bolivia, and Peru.¹⁰⁷ In regards to cost sharing, Chile provided 28% of the total funding for its TrC initiatives in 2013 through the AGCI, with the remaining 72% being paid by its partners (not distinguishing between provider or recipient countries).¹⁰⁸

Many of Chile's main TrC partners have also been some of its most important providers of ODA, as the DAC observed in its 2014 review. TrC is "providing a natural evolution in Chile's relationship", with these traditional donors, and many DAC members "have progressively reduced and some have phased out their ODA to Chile." However, they continue to support Chile as it transitions from being only an ODA recipient to its dual role as both a recipient and provider of development cooperation. By "building on their effective relations with the AGCI, these countries have supported the AGCI's efforts to become a provider of development co-operation in its own right." In this regard, carrying out TrC projects in Chile's areas of expertise and comparative advantage plays an important role.¹⁰⁹

4. The United States and Spain's TrC with Chile

¹⁰⁴ AGCI (2015c) AGCI (2014b), AGCI (2014c), AGCI & UNDP (2012a and 2012b), OECD (2014), and SEGIB (2011, 2012, 2014)

¹⁰⁵ AGCI (2015c)

¹⁰⁶ AGCI (2015a): "Brasil y Chile subscriben acuerdo para cooperar en terceros países." *Noticias*. AGCI. 17 April.

¹⁰⁷ AGCI (2015c) and SEGIB (multiple years)

¹⁰⁸ AGCI (2014): *Balance de Gestión Integral Año 2013*. AGCI. Santiago.

¹⁰⁹ OECD (2014) p. 22

Today, Spain and the United States are two of Chile's most important partners for TrC. Spain and Chile enjoy a close collaborative partnership between AECID and AGCI, as well as a commitment to evaluation and knowledge sharing. The United States and Chile are dedicated to carrying out an increasing number of projects, with Chile working with the US on more triangular projects than any other partner in past several years. However, as observed in the previous section, Spain and the United States' TrC partnerships with Chile are newer than Chile's other main partners, Japan and Germany. Thus, their involvement was not evaluated for best practices in the previously cited study by AGCI and UNDP (2012a, b, c, d), which only examined the period from 1998 to 2010.¹¹⁰ The rest of this paper, therefore, will focus on Spain and the United States' involvement in TrC with Chile. In Chapter 4, for each traditional donor, we will look first at their general backgrounds and experiences in TrC. Then, we will look at the origins, policies, and institutional frameworks of their respective partnerships with Chile, and examine the initiatives carried out. Finally, to the extent possible based on available information,¹¹¹ and considering space and time limitations, we will attempt to make an initial assessment of each partnerships' use of best practices for TrC, based on the criteria defined by AGCI and UNDP (2012c) and summarized in Section 3.3, Box 1.

4.1. The United States and Chile

4.1.1. The United States' Experience in TrC: Background

As mentioned in Section 2.2, the United States first forayed into TrC in the 1950s.¹¹² However its activity was sparse throughout the 20th century, and in contrast to Japan and Germany, it did not begin prominently forming TrC partnerships until the past decade. Now, despite not being an active voice for SSC and TrC in the international fora outlined in Section

¹¹⁰ AGCI & UNDP (2012a, b, c, and d)

¹¹¹ We will base our study on press releases, memoranda of understanding, partnership agreements, available project documentation, SEGIB's annual reports, and working papers and reports from AGCI, AECID, and USAID. The lack of available, detailed project documentation is a limitation on the extent of this paper's analysis, especially of U.S. TrC initiatives, since only one project evaluation exists publicly (the Chile-Spain-Paraguay project).

¹¹² Chaturvedi, S. (2011)

2.3, the U.S. is one of the traditional donors that participate most in TrC initiatives.¹¹³ Agreements to execute development cooperation activities in third countries are known by this author to have been signed with Chile,¹¹⁴ Brazil,¹¹⁵ Mexico,¹¹⁶ Colombia,¹¹⁷ South Africa,¹¹⁸ Thailand,¹¹⁹ and Indonesia.¹²⁰ However, terminology regarding TrC is varied and inconsistent, with the terms *trilateral cooperation*, *trilateral assistance*, and *triangular cooperation* all being used in different USAID documents.

Strategic planning for TrC appears to be weak and inconsistent, with the U.S. addressing TrC in some individual Country Development Cooperation Strategies (CDCS) but not in others. TrC is most prominently featured in Indonesia's CDCS, where "GOI [Government of Indonesia] South-South and Triangular Cooperation Expanded" and "Triangular Cooperation with USG [U.S. Government] Expanded" figure as an intermediate and sub-intermediate result respectively under Development Objective No. 3.¹²¹ The CDCSs for South Africa and the Southern Africa region briefly mention the Trilateral Assistance Program,¹²² and Colombia and Mexico's CDCSs address the MOUs for TrC that USAID has signed with each country.¹²³ In the rest of the Latin American CDCSs, only Paraguay's mentions TrC, in one sentence, alluding to the U.S.-Chile partnership.¹²⁴ TrC is not mentioned at all in the CDCSs for Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Nicaragua, or Peru,¹²⁵ and the topic is not addressed in USAID's FY 2014-2017 Strategic Plan.¹²⁶ Furthermore, in

¹¹³ SEGIB (2014)

¹¹⁴ AGCI & USAID (2011): *Memorandum of Understanding between the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Chilean International Cooperation Agency (AGCI) for the Implementation of Development Cooperation Activities in Third Countries*. Asunción, Paraguay. 23 February.

¹¹⁵ U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE (2012): "The United States and Brazil: Trilateral Cooperation." Fact Sheet. Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs. 9 April

¹¹⁶ USAID/MEXICO (2014): *Country Development Cooperation Strategy FY 2014-FY 2018*. Mexico City.

¹¹⁷ USAID/COLOMBIA (2014): *A Path to Peace: Country Development Cooperation Strategy 2014-2018*. Bogotá.

¹¹⁸ USAID/SOUTHERN AFRICA (2013b)

¹¹⁹ USAID (2013): *Fact Sheet: USAID Regional Trilateral Collaboration with TICA*. Washington

¹²⁰ U.S. Department of State (2014a)

¹²¹ USAID/INDONESIA (2013): *Investing in Indonesia. USAID Strategy for Indonesia 2014-2018*. October.

¹²² USAID/SOUTHERN AFRICA (2013a): *Country Development Cooperation Strategy Fiscal Year 2013-2017*. Pretoria

¹²³ USAID/COLOMBIA (2014) and USAID/MEXICO (2014)

¹²⁴ USAID/PARAGUAY (2014): *Country Development Cooperation Strategy FY 2014-2018*. April.

¹²⁵ USAID/EL SALVADOR (2013), USAID/DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (2013), USAID/GUATEMALA (2012), USAID/HONDURAS (2014), USAID/JAMAICA (2013), USAID/NICARAGUA (2013), USAID/PERU (2012).

¹²⁶ USAID & U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE (2014): *Strategic Plan FY 2014-2017*. Washington, D.C. 2 April.

the research conducted, no general, agency-wide USAID guidelines or strategic policies specific to TrC were found to exist publicly.

Along with inconsistency in country-level strategic planning, there is also an apparent lack of agency-wide strategic guidelines and policies specific to TrC and its use, and the modality does not appear in the current FY 2014-2017 Strategic Plan. As suggested by Connie Veillette, this lack of agency-wide guidelines can lead to misunderstanding of TrC in the U.S. Congress, which could threaten to “derail the approach before it can be evaluated.”¹²⁷

TrC appears only briefly in USAID’s Automated Directives System (ADS) operating policy, which defines *trilateral assistance* in Chapter 220 as “where USAID finances development activities implemented or financed by a development assistance recipient country for the benefit of another development recipient country (220.6).” As an operational guideline for USAID-funded trilateral assistance, the ADS states that USAID “relies on the trustee’s [*strategic partner’s*] assessment, oversight, and management of the partner government’s [*recipient country’s*] implementation (220.3.3.2b(1)(a))”, as opposed to following its PFMRAF risk management process that is required when considering bilateral Government to Government (G2G) assistance. Although not expressly addressing principles, concepts, or strategies for the modality, this guideline does imply a certain distinction between traditional NSC and TrC, and possibly indicates an understanding that this distinction should affect funds and project management. Per 220.3.3.2b(1)(a), the policies and procedures of ADS Chapter 351 (“Agreements with Bilateral Donors”) apply to trilateral assistance. However, nowhere in Chapter 351 is TrC specifically addressed, which may indicate that partnerships with SSC providers are not necessarily conceived of as being different than partnerships with traditional donors, at least as far as ADS principles for operational management are concerned.¹²⁸

¹²⁷ VEILLETTE, C. (2012): “USAID Needs to Develop Guidelines for Trilateral Cooperation.” *Rethinking US Development Policy*. Center for Global Development. 8 February. <http://www.cgdev.org/blog/usaids-developing-guidelines-for-trilateral-cooperation-1/4>.

¹²⁸ The USAID ADS can be found at <http://www.usaid.gov/who-we-are/agency-policy>

4.1.2. The United States and Chile's TrC Partnership: Origins and Framework

Chile and the United States have long maintained close relations, especially since Chile's return to democracy. The US sees Chile as a "reliable but independent ally,"¹²⁹ with President Obama commenting in 2011 that Chile is one of the U.S.'s "closest and strongest partners."¹³⁰ The two countries cooperate closely in a wide range of areas. They are close trade partners, having established the US-Chile Free-Trade Agreement in 2004, and cooperate on small business promotion, visa and customs agreements, energy, and global issues including democracy and human rights.¹³¹

The two countries are also close partners for development cooperation. Chile has previously been a major recipient of U.S. ODA, but because of Chile's "relatively high economic development" assistance received is now minor,¹³² and USAID does not have a CDCS for Chile published on its website.¹³³ The first Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for development cooperation between the U.S. and Chile was signed on April 16, 1998.¹³⁴ As noted in Section 3.3, the United States and Chile began carrying out TrC initiatives, through joint contributions to "triangular scholarships" from 1999 to 2004 for post-graduate programs in Chile.¹³⁵ The US-Chile Trilateral Development Cooperation Initiative was launched in 2009,¹³⁶ with the existing MOU being updated on January 12, 2010, expressing intentions to develop a TrC partnership. This partnership was solidified with a new MOU between USAID and AGCI signed on February 23, 2011, which established the framework for carrying out "development cooperation activities in third countries" with a regional focus on LAC.¹³⁷ Building on these prior agreements, an MOU to expand TrC to other regions and a

¹²⁹ MEYER, P. (2011): *Chile: Political and Economic Conditions and U.S. Relations*. CRS Report for Congress. Congressional Research Service. Washington, D.C. 9 November.

¹³⁰ THE WHITE HOUSE (2011) "Remarks by President Obama and President Sebastian Piñera of Chile at Joint Press Conference," Office of the Press Secretary. 21 March.

¹³¹ THE WHITE HOUSE (2014): "The United States and Chile – A Strategic Partnership." Fact Sheet. Office of the Press Secretary. 30 June. <http://www.whitehouse.gov>

¹³² Meyer, P. (2011)

¹³³ <http://www.usaid.gov/results-and-data/planning/country-strategies-cdcs>

¹³⁴ AGCI & USAID (2011)

¹³⁵ AGCI & UNDP (2012a and 2012b)

¹³⁶ THE WHITE HOUSE (2014)

¹³⁷ AGCI & USAID (2011)

Declaration of Intent to expand TrC activities in the Caribbean was signed on June 30, 2014.¹³⁸

In the 2011 MOU, USAID and AGCI expressed their intent to “make full use of best practices in implementing trilateral development cooperation.” Activities were originally planned to focus on areas such as institutional capacity building, citizen safety programs, health and social protection systems, food safety, agricultural production and exports, public-private partnerships, poverty reduction, and socioeconomic development in general.¹³⁹ Monitoring and planning is conducted by an Executive Committee that meets semiannually, alternating between Santiago de Chile and Washington, D.C. The funding structure was not outlined.¹⁴⁰ In the next section we will look more closely at the projects carried out under the U.S.-Chile partnership and then attempt to assess the use of best practices.

4.1.3. The United States and Chile’s TrC Initiatives

According to SEGIB, the first U.S.-Chile TrC projects were initiated in 2010,¹⁴¹ and the AGCI confirms that a total of 15 initiatives have been carried out since 2011.¹⁴² These initiatives include courses ranging from one to four weeks in lengths (classified as “actions” by SEGIB), and projects that last between one and three years. In 2010 and 2011, initiatives were carried out with Paraguay and El Salvador. 2012 saw a marked increase in activity and the U.S. becoming Chile’s main TrC partner in terms of total initiatives carried out that year. The partnership had 11 active projects that year, working with Paraguay, El Salvador, Guatemala, Panama, and LAC as a region.¹⁴³ At the time this paper was written, SEGIB’s reports for 2013 and 2014 had not been released, but according to the AGCI and USAID, the U.S. and Chile have since worked with Honduras and the Dominican Republic.¹⁴⁴

¹³⁸ AGCI (2015c) and U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE (2014b): “Remarks: Secretary Kerry and Chilean Foreign Minister Muñoz at Signing Ceremony.” Texts & Transcripts. Washington, D.C. 30 June.

¹³⁹ AGCI & USAID (2011)

¹⁴⁰ AGCI (2015c)

¹⁴¹ SEGIB (2011)

¹⁴² AGCI (2015c)

¹⁴³ AGCI (2015c) and SEGIB (2011, 2012, 2014).

¹⁴⁴ AGCI (2015c), AGCI & USAID (2014)

In terms of the projects' sectoral profile, the SEGIB highlights an emphasis on trade and agriculture. Specifically, 72% of active projects in 2012 (8 of 11) dealt with either plant health or trade. Social protection, governance and law enforcement, citizen security, and employment for at-risk youth are other action areas.¹⁴⁵ Projects in El Salvador were carried out under a Declaration of Intent signed between the U.S., Chile, and the El Salvador Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG), and were focused on pest prevention, food security, animal health, and agriculture market intelligence systems. With Paraguay, the partnership has addressed institutional strengthening, capacity building, transparency, and improved targeting of social protection policies and programs, working with three institutions: the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, the National Customs Agency, and the Social Cabinet of the Presidency. With Honduras, a project has been implemented providing training to police, judges, and prosecutors for improving criminal investigation in homicide cases. In Panama, a training project with police, judges, and prosecutors was carried out that dealt with investigating and prosecuting corruption.¹⁴⁶

Currently, the partnership has five active initiatives. With the Dominican Republic and the Caribbean Basin Security Initiative (CBSI), the U.S. and Chile are working on a program focused on increasing employability and formal labor market insertion of at-risk youth. With Guatemala and Honduras the partnership is working on improving agricultural inspection and certification systems through public-private partnerships. Regionally, two ongoing courses are held annually through the International Law Enforcement Academy in El Salvador, where Chilean experts share best practices and conduct trainings for law enforcement officers in the region. One course is focused on public corruption and the other on violence against women.¹⁴⁷

Looking ahead to 2015-2018, the partnership intends to deepen its involvement in Central America, particularly with the Northern Triangle countries of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, in support of their joint Prosperity Plan. As per the Declaration of Intent mentioned in the previous section, the partnership intends to expand in the Caribbean, by

¹⁴⁵ SEGIB (2014) and AGCI (2015c)

¹⁴⁶ AGCI (2015c), SEGIB (2014), and AGCI & USAID (2014): *U.S.-Chile Trilateral Cooperation Fact Sheet*. 4 June.

¹⁴⁷ AGCI (2015c) and AGCI & USAID (2014)

finishing the current project with the Dominican Republic, working with Haiti to evaluate public investments, and working with Jamaica on gender-based violence awareness.¹⁴⁸ The U.S. and Chile will also begin looking to expand their partnership to other regions, particularly Asia-Pacific.¹⁴⁹

4.1.4. Evaluating U.S.-Chile TrC Initiatives for Best Practices

Unlike some Chilean TrC projects carried out with Spain, Germany, and Japan,¹⁵⁰ no evaluation of a U.S. TrC project exists, at least publicly on the USAID website, with Chile or with any other partner. There is also no publicly available, specific documentation of planned TrC project outcomes, outputs, and activities. This limits the extent to which conclusions can be drawn regarding the overall use of best practices. However, based on available information, and following the criteria for best practices defined by AGCI & UNDP (2012c) and summarized in Box 1, we will attempt to make an initial assessment and draw preliminary conclusions.

Box 2: Evaluating U.S.-Chile TrC Initiatives for Best Practices

1. Institutional Framework

A brief, general survey of the projects carried out indicates a sufficient institutional framework in U.S.-Chile TrC initiatives.

In-country counterparts and professionals are clearly identified, with projects being carried out with specific agencies in the recipient countries. For example, in agricultural projects, the involvement of MAG and its various agencies in El Salvador¹⁵¹ and the Secretary of Agriculture and Livestock (SAG for its acronym in Spanish) in Honduras is clearly visible.¹⁵² In Paraguay, the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, the National Customs Agency, and the Social Cabinet of the Presidency are key actors.¹⁵³

Weak **governability** and public trust of institutions such as the police is a problem in some of the partnership's recipient countries. However, many U.S.-Chile initiatives, with the active participation of local recipient country institutions, seek to improve citizen safety, homicide investigation, prosecution of public corruption, and other areas, which would hopefully improve legitimacy, accountability, transparency, and social cohesion. Future support of the Northern Triangle's joint Prosperity Plan as mentioned in Section 4.1.3 will continue to support these areas.

¹⁴⁸ AGCI (2015c)

¹⁴⁹ AGCI & USAID (2014)

¹⁵⁰ AGCI (2015d)

¹⁵¹ MAG (2014): "USAID, AGCI y MAG presentan logros de cooperación triangular." *Noticias*. 28 August.

¹⁵² MORAZÁN, F. (2014): "SAG, Chile y USDA revisan avances para implementar sistema de certificación de frutas y vegetales." *Periódico Digital de Honduras*. 4 September

¹⁵³ SEGIB (2014)

The public endorsement of initiatives by Salvadoran and Honduran agencies¹⁵⁴ suggests **appropriation** of the initiatives. However, a lack of publicly available project documentation prevents us from assessing the degree to which the recipient country's representatives take leadership in on-the-ground project management and implementation.

2. Comparative Advantages

A general survey of projects and framework agreements suggest that the U.S.-Chile TrC partnership exhibits best practices in the use of comparative advantages.

In regards to **prior successful experience**, we can conclude that the partnership seeks to work within the partners' areas of expertise. Both the U.S. and Chile have robust agricultural export industries, and consequently many of their joint projects have focused on agriculture and trade. Specifically, projects focused on the quality and safety of agricultural projects draw from the Chilean Institute of Public Health's accumulated experience, and Guatemala has adopted Chile's successful public-private partnership model for agricultural inspection and certification. In Paraguay, a project focused on export promotion and systems strengthening drew from Chile's successful "Pro Chile" program.¹⁵⁵ Finally, initiatives in Central America focused on anti-corruption, law enforcement, and citizen security rely on the knowledge and experience of Chilean experts.¹⁵⁶

Our research indicates high levels of **trust and confidence** between the partners. As mentioned in Section 4.1.2, the two countries have a long history of cooperation in many areas, including through U.S. bilateral ODA to Chile, and partnership is based on formal agreements between the two countries specifically regarding TrC. Formal agreements are also often made with the recipient partners, such as the 2011 Declaration of Intent with El Salvador to carry out four TrC projects.¹⁵⁷ Finally, both the U.S. and Chile have bilateral, NSC and SSC experience with their recipient partners.¹⁵⁸

All of the above, as well as the apparent horizontal nature of the initiatives (see below), indicates that each partner's **abilities** are well-identified and utilized in the projects. However, the lack of publicly available project documentation prevents us from assessing the degree to which the recipient partner's prior experience, knowledge, and abilities are utilized.

3. Pertinence

Without detailed project planning documentation, we are unable to determine the degree to which the recipient partner conducted the initial needs assessment and **diagnosis**, but the involvement and endorsement of recipient country institutions suggests that projects are in **alignment** with national development priorities. Initiatives related to policing and justice systems seem to be particularly relevant to the context and local needs, considering the high levels of crime and citizen insecurity present in Central American countries. However, USAID's lack of agency-wide strategic guidelines specific to TrC, and the fact that TrC is not mentioned in the CDCs of any of the partnership's recipient countries except Paraguay, could inhibit coherence and coordination of TrC initiatives with other USAID activities.

4. Horizontality

The open participation and endorsement of recipient country public agencies, the institutional framework of partnerships, and the use of comparative advantages suggest a good degree of **horizontality** in U.S.-Chile

¹⁵⁴ MAG (2014), Morazán, F. (2014).

¹⁵⁵ SEGIB (2014)

¹⁵⁶ AGCI & USAID (2014), AGCI (2015c)

¹⁵⁷ SEGIB (2014) and MAG (2014)

¹⁵⁸ SEGIB (multiple years), AGCI (2015c), <http://www.usaid.gov/results-and-data/planning/country-strategies-cdcs>

TrC initiatives. In regards to cost sharing, as noted in Section 3.3, Chile provides 28% of the funding for its TrC projects overall.¹⁵⁹ All three partners appear to have contributed to funding the four agricultural products carried out in El Salvador,¹⁶⁰ although the exact breakdown is unknown. Without detailed project documentation and evaluations, it is not clear to what extent projects are designed for mutual learning and benefit, and for the recipient countries to share their knowledge and experiences. El Salvador has indicated improved relations between the partners, which could be considered a mutual benefit.¹⁶¹ Considering the public endorsement and involvement noted in this section, we can infer that all partners willingly participate in the initiatives.

As observed in Section 4.1.1, USAID's ADS operative guidelines suggest a relatively hands-off approach to funds and project management in TrC, by relying on the strategic partner's assessment, oversight, and management.¹⁶² This could positively impact the horizontality of U.S. TrC projects, at least insofar as the U.S. relates to its strategic partner. In-depth project evaluations are necessary to assess horizontality between all three partners.

5. Effectiveness

In publications and press releases from AGCI, USAID, and recipient country partners, several successful projects are highlighted, which suggests effectiveness in carrying out projects. Some of these include developing an online Agricultural Market Intelligence System (SIMAG, for its acronym in Spanish),¹⁶³ providing training as planned for agriculture and justice systems in several countries, and improving container scanning in the Paraguayan National Customs Agency.¹⁶⁴

However, without detailed project documentation and evaluations, we are unable to assess the degree to which U.S.-Chile TrC initiatives are effective in achieving project outputs and outcomes.

6. Efficiency

Without available project evaluations, we are unable to assess whether or not U.S.-Chile TrC initiatives are efficient in the use of time and resources.

7. Sustainability

Since the projects carried out are technical in nature and emphasize the installation of institutional capacity in recipient countries, it appears that projects were designed with an end goal of sustainability. However, since no project documentation or evaluations are available, and considering that most projects just recently closed, assessing **public policy**, **social**, and **organizational and financial** sustainability is difficult.

At least in one project in El Salvador, which developed the SIMAG system, appears to have sustainability issues. At the time of writing this paper, the SIMAG website is out of date and seemed to not be in use. It had not been updated since December 8, 2014, and prices for all products showed as \$0.¹⁶⁵

Further study and project evaluation is needed so as to determine the initiatives' overall sustainability.

8. Results-Based Management

Chile and the U.S. have claimed some successes to date. In Paraguay, they assert that initiatives have contributed to strengthening the social protection system, including through designing a new public

¹⁵⁹ AGCI (2014)

¹⁶⁰ MAG (2014)

¹⁶¹ MAG (2014)

¹⁶² USAID ADS 220.3.3.2b(1)(a)

¹⁶³ MAG (2014)

¹⁶⁴ AGCI & USAID (2014), AGCI (2015c)

¹⁶⁵ <http://www.simag.mag.gob.sv/>. Accessed 6 May 2015.

assistance program for the country's poorest families. They also suggest that efforts to boost Paraguayan exports have contributed to increasing family incomes. Through training 360 public officials from LAC countries in citizen security and good governance, AGCI claims to have made an impact on reducing insecurity and corruption, thus positively affecting quality of life and foreign investment. In Guatemala and Honduras, improved agricultural safety systems are said to benefit farmers and their families by enabling access to key markets. Finally, AGCI claims that the new SIMAG system in El Salvador has equipped Salvadoran exporters to improve decision making through access to up-to-date information.¹⁶⁶ However, the apparent disuse of the SIMAG website sheds doubt on that projects' sustainability and thus capacity to have positive impact.

Further study and evaluation is needed in order to know the overall results and impact of these initiatives.

Source: Elaborated by the author based on sources referenced in the footnotes

Overall, U.S.-Chile TrC initiatives appear to generally exhibit best practices, although not all criteria are able to be assessed due to lack of available information. An area of potential concern is sustainability, and thus the projects' capacity to have impact on producing positive changes in the local context. Further study and the publication of complete project evaluations are necessary in order for best practices to be fully identified and to extract lessons learned.

4.2. Spain and Chile

4.2.1. Spain's Experience in TrC: Background

As mentioned in Section 2.4, Spain is a leading Northern supporter of SSC, through active participation in various fora (most prominently through the SEGIB), as well as channeling ODA to directly support SSC. In regards to TrC specifically, Spain began its involvement in 2005.¹⁶⁷ That year, Spain carried out one initiative, with four initiatives in 2007 and more than seven in 2008.¹⁶⁸ Framework agreements for TrC partnerships have been signed with Chile, Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay.¹⁶⁹ In regards to short-term actions as defined by the SEGIB, Spain and Costa Rica have a very active TrC partnership, carrying out 27 joint trainings and other initiatives throughout Central America in 2011 and 2012.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁶ AGCI (2015c), AGCI & USAID (2014)

¹⁶⁷ AGCI & AECID (2010). Also Gómez Galán, M. et al. (2011), and Bancet, A. (2011)

¹⁶⁸ AGCI & AECID (2010)

¹⁶⁹ MAEC (2012): *Plan Director de la Cooperación Española 2013-2016*. MAEC. Madrid.

¹⁷⁰ SEGIB (2012 and 2014)

In contrast to the United States, Spain has developed specific geographical, sectoral, and strategic priorities for TrC. It also explicitly addresses TrC in its general operational policies and strategic planning, considering the modality as a useful strategy for achieving development cooperation objectives.¹⁷¹ TrC first appeared in the II Master Plan for Spanish Cooperation (2005-2008),¹⁷² which referred to SSC and TrC as modalities to explore in deepening its cooperation with Latin America as a priority region, particularly with MICs. The III Master Plan (2009-2012)¹⁷³ begins to consider promoting SSC and participating in TrC in more detail, viewing them as instruments for consolidating aid effectiveness principles. Specifically, it sees promoting SSC as a complementary action to NSC, in that it strengthens partner countries' technical capacity as both receivers and providers of development cooperation.¹⁷⁴ This is in line with Spain's "doctrine"¹⁷⁵ of providing different forms of cooperation to countries based on their level of development, with support to SSC being a priority of Spain's cooperation strategy for MICs, especially its Ibero-American partners. TrC partnerships are formed to carry out joint initiatives with the MIC strategic partner taking the lead in coordinating the activity. Spain thus views TrC both as a tool for achieving development objectives in recipient countries as well as a means of supporting SSC itself.¹⁷⁶ The IV Master Plan (2013-2016) continues to deepen Spain's commitment to supporting SSC and TrC, placing special emphasis on Spain being a leader in knowledge sharing and systematization of TrC and SSC experiences.¹⁷⁷

4.2.2. Spain and Chile's TrC Partnership: Origins and Framework

Chile and Spain's close relations have their origins in the General Treaty for Cooperation and Friendship, signed in 1990 during Chile's transition to democracy. This treaty established guidelines for bilateral development cooperation between the two countries, which has focused on priority areas of democratic governance, justice, health, decentralized

¹⁷¹ AGCI & AECID (2010)

¹⁷² MAEC (2005): *II Plan Director de la Cooperación Española 2005-2008*. MAEC. Madrid

¹⁷³ MAEC (2009): *III Plan Director de la Cooperación Española 2009-2012*. MAEC. Madrid.

¹⁷⁴ AGCI & AECID (2010) and Gómez Galán, M. et al. (2011)

¹⁷⁵ AGCI & AECID (2010)

¹⁷⁶ Gómez Galán, M. et al. (2011), and ALONSO, J.A., AGUIRRE, P. & SANTANDER, G. (2011): *La Cooperación Triangular Española en América Latina: Un Análisis de dos Experiencias de Interés*. Fundación Carolina. Madrid. Also SEGIB (2009), AGCI & AECID (2010), AGCI (2014b), and MAEC (2005, 2009, 2012).

¹⁷⁷ MAEC (2012)

administration, social protection, gender equality, human capacity building, and culture and development.¹⁷⁸

In 2006, intentions to develop a Triangular Cooperation Program were declared at the V Chile-Spain Joint Commission for Cooperation.¹⁷⁹ Subsequently, a joint study was carried out between AGCI and AECID on the Chilean public sector's technical capacities and opportunities for expanding development cooperation based on successful public policies and prior cooperation experiences. This study, completed in 2009 as we mentioned in Section 3.2, was important for setting Chile's strategic priorities for its TrC program.¹⁸⁰ The same year, the first MOU was signed to officially establish the Triangular Cooperation Program whose main goal is to achieve the Millennium Development Goals in LAC.¹⁸¹ The complete strategy and guidelines of the Triangular Cooperation Program were developed in 2010,¹⁸² which considers two general lines of work: 1) carrying out TrC projects in LAC, and 2) institutional capacity building of AGCI.¹⁸³ In terms of sectoral distribution for TrC projects, the Program was designed to work in the areas of social development, institutional capacity building and modernization, disaster prevention, and local and territorial development.¹⁸⁴

The Program is financed by the Chile-Spain Joint Fund for Triangular Cooperation, established in 2010 and is administered by AGCI. Initially, 70% of funds were contributed by AECID while AGCI contributed 30%. In 2014, a new MOU was signed to further consolidate the two countries' cooperation relationship both bilaterally and through TrC, seeking to expand in the areas of science and technology. A significant aspect of this MOU is a new financing structure of the Joint Fund, where both countries are now responsible for financing 50% of the Fund for the next four years.¹⁸⁵

¹⁷⁸ AGCI & AECID (2010) and AGCI (2014b)

¹⁷⁹ AGCI & AECID (2010)

¹⁸⁰ AGCI (2009) and AGCI & AECID (2010)

¹⁸¹ AGCI & AECID (2009): *Memorandum de Entendimiento Entre la República de Chile y el Reino de España para una Asociación de Cooperación Triangular*. AGCI and AECID. 20 October. Madrid.

¹⁸² AGCI & AECID (2010)

¹⁸³ AGCI (2014b)

¹⁸⁴ AGCI (2015c)

¹⁸⁵ AGCI (2015c)

4.2.3. Spain and Chile's TrC Initiatives

According to the AGCI, Chile and Spain began their first TrC initiative in 2009,¹⁸⁶ although SEGIB indicates a joint project was carried out in Haiti prior to 2009. Not including the Haiti project, AGCI indicates that four TrC projects lasting more than two years have been carried out to date under the Chile-Spain Triangular Cooperation Partnership.¹⁸⁷ Of these initiatives, two projects have been completed. The first project was with Paraguay regarding institutional strengthening and modernization, focusing on talent management and professional development of public-sector officials,¹⁸⁸ and the other was with Caribbean Community (CARICOM) member countries regarding disaster risk reduction and emergency response.¹⁸⁹ Two projects are currently in progress. One is with Bolivia regarding capacity building of the public health system in transfusion medicine management,¹⁹⁰ and the other is with Paraguay regarding capacity building in department and district-level development management.¹⁹¹ Additionally, a profile of a project in the formulation stage with El Salvador has been made available by the AGCI. This project, regarding labor information systems and apprenticeship support, was set to take place in 2013 and 2014 pending final planning.¹⁹² However, its omission in AGCI's April 2015 publication indicates that the project has not been launched.¹⁹³

Along with carrying out TrC projects, an important feature of the Spain-Chile partnership is direct institutional capacity building of AGCI carried out bilaterally under the framework of the Joint Fund. In this area, the AGCI and AECID have conducted activities oriented towards the professional development of AGCI personnel, supporting management systems, and improving TrC project planning and evaluation. Along the lines of this last element, the

¹⁸⁶ AGCI (2015c)

¹⁸⁷ SEGIB (2009)

¹⁸⁸ AGCI (n.d. c): *Ficha de Proyectos de Cooperación: Fortalecimiento de la Gestión y el Desarrollo de las personas del sector público al servicio a la ciudadanía de Paraguay*. Fondo Mixto de Cooperación Triangular Chile-España. Santiago.

¹⁸⁹ AGCI (2015c)

¹⁹⁰ AGCI (n.d. b): *Ficha de Proyectos de Cooperación: Formación en medicina transfusional [Bolivia]*. Fondo Mixto de Cooperación Triangular Chile-España. Santiago

¹⁹¹ AGCI (2015c) and AGCI (2014b)

¹⁹² AGCI (n.d. a): *Ficha de Proyectos de Cooperación: Buenas Prácticas de Intermediación Laboral para Trabajadores Aprendices y Sistemas de Información Laboral en El Salvador*. Fondo Mixto de Cooperación Triangular Chile-España. Santiago.

¹⁹³ AGCI (2015c)

Spain-Chile partnership is dedicated to project evaluation and knowledge management, believing that sharing lessons learned from successful experiences is fundamental.¹⁹⁴

Looking ahead to 2015-2018, along with completing their current projects Spain and Chile plan to strengthen their TrC in LAC, particularly in science and technology, as per the 2014 MOU mentioned in the previous section.¹⁹⁵ However, no specific new projects or partner countries have been announced, and it is not clear whether or not the project in El Salvador mentioned above will be carried out.

4.2.4. Evaluating Spain-Chile TrC Initiatives for Best Practices

As mentioned previously in this paper, an evaluation of the first Chile-Spain-Paraguay was published in 2014, itself planned as the fourth project output.¹⁹⁶ This evaluation analyzed the project with two main objectives. The first was to evaluate the project itself, using the DAC's criteria of pertinence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. The second objective was to evaluate the TrC modality, to "identify strengths and weaknesses in the Chile-Spain Joint Fund's management of the project," and to conclude if the use of TrC "had a particular effect on the projects' end-result and, therefore, if Triangular Cooperation was the best way to achieve it." For this second objective, the evaluation analyzed technical procedures and resources on one hand, and roles and relationships between actors on the other.¹⁹⁷

Based this evaluation as well as other publications from AGCI, in Box 3, we will attempt to make an assessment of the general use of best practices in Spain-Chile TrC initiatives, according to the criteria defined by AGCI & UNDP (2012c):

¹⁹⁴ AGCI (2014b and, 2015c and 2015d)

¹⁹⁵ AGCI (2015c)

¹⁹⁶ AGCI (n.d. c)

¹⁹⁷ Quotes translated into Spanish by the author from MAEC (2014) and AGCI (2015b)

Box 3: Evaluating Spain-Chile TrC Initiatives for Best Practices

1. Institutional Framework

Spain-Chile TrC initiatives exhibit a solid institutional framework in regards to clearly identified **in-country counterparts** and **appropriation** or ownership of the initiative by the recipient partner and its institutions. There are also adequate levels of **governability** and **knowledge generation** in recipient countries, with Bolivia scoring well on both in a best practices assessment of a previous TrC project between Bolivia, Chile, and Japan.¹⁹⁸ Further, projects in Paraguay specifically work within these areas. In the first Paraguay project, the Public Function Secretariat (SFP for its acronym in Spanish) of Paraguay took leadership in determining the project's focus and selecting the capacity building and professional development activities based on its interests and self-identified needs, being responsible for coordinating the technical assistance activities it received. However, on the project management level, the evaluation consulted suggests institutional deficiencies for adequately carrying out all project aspects as planned.¹⁹⁹

In Bolivia, the transfusion medicine project is lead and directed by the Bolivian Ministry of Health and Sports' National Blood Program in conjunction with the HEMOCENTRO Blood Bank in La Paz in line with the national "Hacia la Salud Universal" sectoral development plan. In CARICOM, the disaster risk reduction project is carried out with the Caribbean Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA), and the current Paraguay project involves creating 100 district and department-level Development Councils in line with the national "Sembrando Oportunidades" poverty reduction plan.²⁰⁰

2. Comparative Advantages

Spain and Chile carry out TrC initiatives based on Chile's **prior successful experience** in project areas.²⁰¹ For example, the CARICOM project built on Chile's prior successful experience in disaster risk reduction, and the transfusion medicine project in Bolivia builds on Chile and Spain's relevant prior experience in health systems management.²⁰² Initiatives also feature **trust and confidence** between partners. Formal agreements are made and partnerships are formed with recipient countries with whom Spain and Chile have prior bilateral cooperation relationships (NSC and SSC respectively), with LAC being a priority region for the cooperation provide by both countries. For example, both Spain and Chile have prior experience as a provider of cooperation to Paraguay, with bilateral agreements in place since the early 1990s in both cases.²⁰³ All projects identify and incorporate the **abilities** of Spain and Chile, but use of recipient country knowledge and capacities was lacking in the first Paraguay project. The evaluation highlighted the need for in-depth assessment and subsequent incorporation of all partner's capacities (especially the recipient country) in order to maximize effectiveness, efficiency, horizontality, and comparative advantages.²⁰⁴

3. Pertinence

As mentioned under the institutional framework criterion, Spain-Chile TrC initiatives are planned and organized based on the interests and needs identified locally by the recipient country partners, in alignment with national development plans and strategies. However, the Paraguay evaluation suggests that the project may have been based simply in Paraguay's interests as opposed to an in-depth identification phase analyzing the context and actor's capacities. Also, there was no coordination between the project and other technical cooperation activities provided to the SFP.²⁰⁵

¹⁹⁸ AGCI & UNDP (2012b)

¹⁹⁹ MAEC (2014)

²⁰⁰ AGCI (2014b)

²⁰¹ AGCI (2009) and AGCI & AECID (2010)

²⁰² AGCI (2014b) and AGCI (2009)

²⁰³ MAEC (2014)

²⁰⁴ MAEC (2014)

²⁰⁵ MAEC (2014)

4. Horizontality

Spain-Chile TrC initiatives seem to exhibit a good degree of horizontality, especially between Spain and Chile themselves. Describing the 2009 MOU, both countries have regarded their TrC relationship as a new “association between equals” compared to their previous traditional cooperation relationship. This is evidenced by the funding structure of the Chile-Spain Joint Fund, to which Chile originally contributed 30% of the funds, but as of 2014 contributes 50%.²⁰⁶

The evaluation of the first Paraguay project indicates a lack of conditionality along with willing and active participation by all three partners in the identification and design phase. Paraguay maintained leadership in initiating and designing, with the formal role of determining and coordinating the technical activities to be carried out. However, there remains significant room for improvement in regards to maintaining horizontality and consensus throughout the execution phase. Although each partner contributed financially, they contributed in different amounts, and the roles of “donors” (Spain and Chile) and “recipient” (Paraguay) were clearly manifested in practice. There were times when Spain “required” compliance with rigorous procedural norms associated with AECID funded projects and Chile subsequently “passed” the responsibility to Paraguay in a traditionally vertical management system driven by donor requirements and project management models. This verticality was also seen in regards to knowledge creation and transfer. A clear vertical flow of technical assistance from Spain and Chile to Paraguay was observed, without mutual learning taking place where Paraguay would contribute knowledge and share its experiences. This, combined with Spain and Chile providing their assistance in separate sessions instead of jointly, resulted in the partnership “failing to take advantage” of the potential collective knowledge that could be gained from a TrC project, which is one of TrC’s potential comparative advantages over bilateral cooperation schemes.²⁰⁷

Without detailed monitoring or evaluation documentation for the other three projects, we are unable to determine if horizontality is maintained throughout the project cycle.

5. Effectiveness

The Paraguay evaluation indicates a good degree of effectiveness in project execution, highlighting a direct relationship between activities, outputs, and outcomes. Various workplace manuals and plans were created successfully. However, the evaluation suggests that on-the-ground circumstances surrounding project execution were not sufficiently considered beforehand, with many challenges arising for effective coordination. As a result, at least one element of the project was unable to be completed. However, the evaluation concluded that the effectiveness of elements that were completed was greater than what is normally seen in projects aimed at strengthening public administration.²⁰⁸

Without detailed project documentation of the other three projects, we are unable to determine the degree of effectiveness in achieving project outputs and outcomes.

6. Efficiency

The first Paraguay project was very efficient in the management of financial resources, with savings deriving from in-kind contributions from Chile and Paraguay, as well as the fact that no outside consultants from the private sector needed to be hired. However, the project presented inefficiencies in coordination and time management, with delays and distortions of planned activities arising, related to the issues highlighted under the horizontality criterion. As an example, common operational procedures were not established, which caused delays in 2012 when requirements for accounting procedures, technical reporting, and timeframes in line with Spanish regulations governing public grants were imposed on the project, unbeknownst to the other partners, particularly Paraguay.²⁰⁹

²⁰⁶ AGCI & AECID (2010) and MAEC (2014)

²⁰⁷ MAEC (2014)

²⁰⁸ MAEC (2014)

²⁰⁹ MAEC (2014)

Without detailed project documentation of the other three projects, we are unable to assess their efficiency in resource management.

7. Sustainability

Initiatives are planned with a focus on installing technical capacity that can make long-term impact. However, sustainability was one of the biggest challenges for the Paraguay project. The evaluation indicates that there was insufficient upfront consideration of how project outputs would fit within SFP's structure after the project cycle, and thus result in achieving the desired outcome. In the end, however, SFP did ratify the application of project outputs through the legal process. The evaluation asserts that project wrap-up could have been better planned, in coordination with AECID's overall cooperation strategy with Paraguay, so as to ensure continuity of activities and expansion in the action area.²¹⁰

Follow-up and further study of all four projects is needed to assess overall sustainability.

8. Results-Based Management

The CARICOM project was designed to improve disaster preparedness and response, which could have a positive impact on mitigating the negative consequences disasters can have on countries' development. The Bolivia project seeks positive institutional changes in transfusion medicine management, which could have positive social, development, and innovation impacts. The current Paraguay project is oriented towards positive institutional changes in local development management, which could have positive impacts on communities and their development. The first Paraguay project was focused on positive institutional changes in public service agencies, and as mentioned under the effectiveness criterion, there was a direct relationship between activities, outputs, and the desired outcome. However, the evaluation notes that the project formulation did not permit detailed assessment of the degree to which the project outcome was achieved, which is to say, how much SFP's management of its personnel's professional development really was strengthened for long-term impact. Also, despite having planned a system for results-oriented monitoring, this method was not used to the extent it could have been.²¹¹

Follow-up on the four projects, and impact evaluations, are needed in order to assess their effects on producing positive changes in local contexts and institutions.

Source: Elaborated by the author based on sources referenced in the footnotes

More information regarding the CARICOM, Bolivia, and second Paraguay projects are needed, but upon reviewing the Paraguay evaluation, we can reasonably conclude that TrC initiatives involving Chile and Spain are generally set up according to criteria for best practices in TrC with strong points in all areas. However, significant room for improvement has also been found under each criteria. These weaknesses are mostly related to coordination between the partners and maintaining TrC principles during the execution phase, and also the need for thorough and flexible planning carried out jointly that allows for best use of comparative advantages while pursuing sustainability and positive impact. The evaluator called the experience a "forced" learning process, or trial by fire, given the

²¹⁰ MAEC (2014)

²¹¹ MAEC (2014)

newness of the TrC modality for the partners. In regards to the effectiveness of TrC itself, the evaluation concluded that important contributions were made to aid effectiveness principles of appropriation and alignment, but that the jury is still out regarding results-oriented management and mutual accountability in TrC compared to other forms of cooperation. Important lessons for the partners were learned through the evaluation process, and monitoring and follow-up on current projects, especially the one with Paraguay, is necessary to see if those lessons are being applied in efforts to improve TrC and better assess its usefulness.

5. Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats

Upon examining the U.S.-Chile and Spain-Chile TrC partnerships and evaluating their use of best practices, we can assess and compare their strengths and weaknesses, and also consider opportunities for and threats to their expansion and/or improvement.

Table 1: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats		
	U.S.-Chile TrC Partnership	Spain-Chile TrC Partnership
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong institutional framework based on formal agreements (MOUs) that are reviewed and updated periodically. In-country, recipient partner counterparts are clearly identified. • Appropriation and endorsement of initiatives by recipient country partners. Projects are in alignment with national development priorities. • Partnership based on long-standing, progressively evolving relationship of economic, political, and development cooperation between the U.S. and Chile. • Steady and consistent activity with a high number of projects, which capitalize on Chile’s strengths, expertise, and prior successful experience, as well as build a strong base of experience upon which to build in future initiatives. • Despite the lack of specific, agency-wide planning and strategies for TrC, the lone reference in USAID’s ADS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TrC and support of SSC are featured in AECID’s strategic planning, as explicitly identified strategies for Spain’s development cooperation with MICs in LAC. • Strong institutional framework based on formal agreements (MOUs, the Chile-Spain Joint Fund) that are reviewed and updated periodically. In-country, recipient partner counterparts are clearly identified. • Conceptualized as a horizontal partnership of equals, evidenced by equal funding responsibilities in the Chile-Spain Joint Fund (50%-50% as of 2014). • Appropriation and endorsement of initiatives by recipient country partners. Projects are in alignment with national development priorities. • Partnership based on long-standing, progressively evolving relationship of cooperation between Spain and Chile. • Projects capitalize on Chile’s strengths, expertise, and prior successful

	<p>suggests U.S. deference to the strategic partner's leadership in assessing, overseeing, and managing projects.</p>	<p>experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High value for transparency: policy and planning documentation are published, as well as one evaluation to date that highlights weaknesses as well as strengths. • Emphasis on knowledge sharing and evaluation of both project results and TrC itself, so as to disseminate best practices and improve future initiatives. • Institutional strengthening and capacity building of AGCI is a key feature of the partnership. • Spain is a prominent and active promotor of SSC and TrC in international fora and multilateral organizations, especially SEGIB.
Weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of agency-wide USAID strategic guidelines and policies for TrC, and the absence or sparse mention of TrC in individual CDCSs. • Low transparency: lack of publicly available project planning and strategy documentation, as well as project evaluations, makes it difficult to assess the effectiveness and overall quality of U.S. TrC (with Chile and with other partners), as well as identify best practices. • The U.S. does not prominently participate in international fora regarding SSC and TrC. • Concerns for sustainability of implemented projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spain participates in fewer projects than other traditional donors that partner with Chile for TrC. This could correspond to drastic reductions in overall Spanish ODA observed over the past few years.²¹² • Rigorous project management and reporting standards related to Spanish public funds imposed on TrC projects, which weakens horizontality and recipient country leadership in the project execution phase. Common operational procedures not established beforehand. • Lack of rigorous identification and diagnosis of needs and capacities in the project planning phase. • Concerns for sustainability of implemented projects.
Opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership expanding to work with new recipient countries and deepen cooperation with existing partners. • Future U.S.-Chile TrC initiatives will focus on Northern Triangle countries in Central America, with U.S. plans to drastically increase total ODA to the region to over \$1 billion in FY 2016, pending congressional approval. Opportunity to more prominently incorporate TrC into broader USAID strategy for the region, although no 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of Chile-Spain-Paraguay project highlights lessons learned that, if applied, provides the opportunity to learn from mistakes and improve TrC initiatives. • Opportunity to impact broader international conversation on TrC and aid effectiveness through knowledge dissemination. • Planned expansion of TrC initiatives in the area of science and technology.

²¹² For analysis of Spanish ODA flows, see: Larrú, J. M. (2014)

	<p>specific mention is made in the FY 2016 budget request.²¹³</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad base of experience accumulated through carrying out 15 projects, and Chile’s leadership in evaluation and systematization, provides opportunity to improve TrC initiatives and disseminate best practices, if evaluations are conducted and experiences are shared. • Potential for strengthened foreign relations and interregional cooperation between the U.S. and its Latin American neighbors, if TrC’s potential is recognized by USAID leadership and overall strategic guidelines are crafted. 	
<p>Threats</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misunderstanding of TrC among U.S. politicians, exacerbated by the lack of guidelines and low information sharing, which could “derail the approach before it can be evaluated.”²¹⁴ • Changing leadership in USAID and its potential effect on strategic planning, with current nomination process underway for selecting a new Administrator and continued leadership rotation possible after upcoming 2016 elections. • Uncertainty as to whether or not new USAID leadership would make TrC a priority. • Instability in Central American countries that are recipient partners of U.S. and Chile TrC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volatile public funding for Spanish development cooperation. • General elections in 2015 and potential political instability affecting development cooperation strategic planning. • Uncertainty as to whether or not a new new AECID director would maintain (or improve) current strategies. <p style="text-align: right;">Source: elaborated by the author</p>

The Spain-Chile partnership’s greatest weakness, as observed in the Chile-Spain-Paraguay project evaluation, is the imposition of Spain’s own procedures for project management and reporting, without taking into consideration the contexts, capacities, and procedures of the recipient partner. For TrC to truly be a support to SSC, Southern-led systems and priorities must be recognized and promoted, and common operational procedures need to be mutually agreed upon beforehand by all partners. However, the partnership’s biggest

²¹³ U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE (2015): *Congressional Budget Justification: Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs. Fiscal Year 2016*. U.S. Department of State.

²¹⁴ Veillette, C. (2012)

strength, a demonstrated commitment to project evaluation and transparency, presents an opportunity to overcome these weaknesses, provided that lessons learned are applied and ongoing monitoring of progress is conducted with the same rigor as the initial evaluation. The partnership's opportunity to continue positively impacting the advancement of knowledge in SSC and TrC is most threatened by uncertainty in Spanish politics and subsequent possible impact on AECID's policies and priorities, as well as continued volatility in Spanish ODA funding. However, this threat can potentially be mitigated by Spain's other strengths, such as the Spain-Chile relationship's strong institutional framework, as well as SSC and TrC's consolidated prominence in Spain's existing development policies.

For its part, the U.S.-Chile partnership's greatest weakness is the lack of U.S. transparency and strategic planning in its use of TrC, as well as the lack of evaluations of U.S. TrC projects. As pointed out in Table 1, this could further exacerbate one of the greatest threats to U.S. TrC, which is a political misunderstanding of its nature and potential to be both an effective and efficient development cooperation strategy, as well as an instrument for strengthening foreign relations and interregional cooperation with its Latin American neighbors. However the partnership's greatest strengths, if taken advantage of, provide opportunity for the partnership to overcome its weaknesses and mitigate its threats. The partnership's broad base of accumulated experience provides a good foundation upon which to build, and the proposed increase of U.S. ODA to Northern Triangle Central American countries (one of the partnership's priority regions for 2015-2018) could strengthen the partnership's impact and expand its initiatives in the region. Further, Chile's commitment to evaluation and best practices provides opportunity for Chilean leadership and influence in systematizing U.S.-Chile experiences. This systematization could play a significant role in crafting overall U.S. strategic guidelines and policies for TrC, and thus aid in promoting political understanding of the modality and its potential impact on aid effectiveness. This is necessary for consolidating the long-term role of the U.S. in TrC and the aid effectiveness agenda, as well as TrC's potential positive impact on strengthening U.S. foreign relations and interregional cooperation with Latin America.

6. Conclusions

The general purpose of this project has been to compare and evaluate the involvement of traditional donors and development actors from the North in supporting SSC through TrC, keeping in mind Adbenur & Fonseca's (2013) precaution that "bridging" in TrC must be a two way street. For this, we first sought to map the rise of SSC and TrC and understand their roles in the context of the aid effectiveness agenda. For this conceptual and historical background on SSC and TrC, we consulted studies, reports, and policy documents produced by leading researchers and international organizations. We have concluded that, especially over the past 15 years, SSC has grown to be a force in shaping the present and future of development cooperation. Regarding aid effectiveness, we have seen that many of SSC's principles are line with PD principles, including country ownership (appropriation), alignment, horizontality, and others, and that promoting SSC advances the aid effectiveness agenda. Along these lines, TrC is a space that provides opportunity for Northern and Southern partners to work together in innovative partnerships in pursuit of development objectives. In this way, if set up as a two-way street, it can support and complement SSC as well as contribute towards improving NSC through the application of SSC principles, which in turn advances PD principles. Further, TrC has the potential to be an effective cooperation modality in itself, with more and more actors beginning to use TrC as a prominent part of their development cooperation strategy.

As a case study, we set out to compare the experiences of the United States and Spain in their support of SSC through TrC, by evaluating the use of best practices in their respective TrC partnerships with Chile. To accomplish this, we started by looking at Chile's background as a lead SSC provider and TrC strategic partner. Through consulting policy documents and other publications from AGCI, researchers, and international organizations, we have seen how Chile is committed to improving its institutional capacity as a provider of development cooperation, strives for quality in its interventions, and emphasizes knowledge sharing regarding the identification and use of best practices. In this regard we recommend that Chile continue to embrace and consolidate its role as a leader and proponent of TrC, by promoting evaluations and systematizations of experiences, and seeking to improve coordination of traditional donors' development cooperation activities in LAC. We then

examined Chile's TrC partnerships the U.S. and Spain, by studying the background, institutional framework, policies, and initiatives carried out. Finally we made an initial evaluation of the use of best practices, according to Chile's own criteria. For this, we consulted available reports, project documentation, press releases, and evaluations from the AGCI, AECID, USAID, and other sources.

From our analysis we have concluded that the United States, despite its relative silence in international fora promoting SSC and TrC and its lack of strategic guidelines and policies, is now one of the most active traditional donors in TrC in terms of projects carried out. Today, its partnership with Chile is perhaps the most vibrant in Latin America, working in multiple sectors in which Chile has experience and expertise, with a variety of recipient country partners. Using Chile's self-defined criteria, the U.S.-Chile partnership appears to orient its initiatives according to best practices for TrC, although sustainability is a potential concern in at least one project with El Salvador. With apparent recipient-country leadership in identifying priorities, and the provision of technical assistance that relies on Chile's expertise, it appears that Southern partners do have agency in influencing the partnership and its initiatives. However, a major weakness is the lack of available project evaluations and detailed project documentation that identify and share lessons learned. This prevents us from making a complete assessment on the partnership's use of best practices in setting up a two-way street of mutual learning, and therefore our conclusions in this regard are tentative. The U.S. needs to publish evaluations of its TrC projects with Chile and other partners so that experiences can be shared which contribute to knowledge generation, and so lessons learned can be identified and applied in efforts to improve project effectiveness. Also, the U.S. needs to develop general guidelines, policies, and strategies for its involvement in TrC.

Spain, as we have seen, is one of the most active Northern voices for promoting SSC and TrC, through participation in international platforms, fora, and multilateral organizations, most notably SEGIB. Supporting SSC, including through TrC, is a priority for Spain as a development cooperation strategy in Latin America. Like the United States, Spain's partnership with Chile is particularly noteworthy. Although responsible for fewer projects than the U.S.-Chile partnership, Spain and Chile have already made important contributions

towards advancing understanding of TrC in the international debate through a commitment to knowledge sharing and evaluation. The public release of the Chile-Spain-Paraguay evaluation, as well as detailed strategy and strategic planning documentation related to the Chile-Spain Joint Fund, is what most differentiates the Spain and the United States in their partnerships with Chile and their approaches to TrC in general.

From studying this evaluation as well as the limited information available about other projects, we have seen that Spain-Chile TrC initiatives generally exhibit best practices based on Chile's defined criteria, although with significant weaknesses in several aspects related to efficient project coordination and maintaining horizontality throughout the project cycle. The Spain-Chile-Paraguay project evaluation found instances of AECID imposing its project management procedures and standards, which in practice limited the ability of its Southern partners to exercise leadership in project implementation. In light of this finding, we recommend that Spain modernize its operative guidelines for public grants management to make them more flexible for use in TrC projects to allow mutually designed operational procedures to be established between all partners. This is necessary to avoid both additional bureaucratic complexity, as cautioned by Fordelone (2009) and McEwen & Mawsdley (2012), and ensure that Spain does not keep a "foothold" on its influence (and thus reinforce the donor/beneficiary dynamic) as warned against by Abdenur & Fonseca (2013). Keeping these weaknesses in mind, Spain's transparency is encouraging as it presents the opportunity for improvement as long as lessons learned are applied and continuously reviewed based on TrC principles, and Spain should continue being proactive in sharing knowledge and publishing evaluations. Further study of Spain's development cooperation will be needed, to monitor the application of lessons learned from its experiences, both in its TrC initiatives as well as the NSC it provides bilaterally.

Future research that follows up on the U.S.-Chile and Spain-Chile partnerships' progress in implementing best practices would be a valuable continuation of this project, as would further study of Chile's potential for growth as a facilitator for better coordination and harmonization of development cooperation provided to LAC by the U.S., Spain, and other donors such as Germany and Japan. Additional projects that continue seeking to fill research gaps highlighted by Abdenur & Fonseca (2013) would make particularly important

contributions to the field, for example by examining how Northern donors reshape and improve their bilateral cooperation (NSC/ODA) after prior successful experience in TrC. Also, although we have based our evaluation on Chile's own criteria, its OECD membership would suggest a certain level of DAC influence on its standards and priorities for development cooperation, despite not being a DAC member and identifying itself as a South-South actor. In this regard, additional comparative studies analyzing traditional donors involved in TrC partnerships with non-OECD South-South providers, such as Brazil, would make a valuable contribution to understanding how Northern and Southern actors interact in TrC. Other valuable lines of research could focus more specifically on the United States' overall use of TrC both as a strategy for achieving specific development objectives and as a support to SSC. This is needed so as to better understand the still relatively unknown role of the world's largest bilateral donor, USAID, and advance towards the creation of sorely needed U.S. strategic guidelines and policies for TrC.

Bibliography

ABDENUR, A. E. & FONSECA, J. M. (2013): "The North's Growing Role in South-South Cooperation: keeping the foothold." *Third World Quarterly* 34, pp. 1475-1491.

ALONSO, J.A., AGUIRRE, P. & SANTANDER, G. (2011): *La Cooperación Triangular Española en América Latina: Un Análisis de dos Experiencias de Interés*. Fundación Carolina. Madrid.

AGCI (Chilean Agency for International Cooperation) (2009): *Catálogo de Capacidades Nacionales de Cooperación*. Estudio de Capacidades y Oportunidades de Cooperación Sur-Sur. AGCI. Santiago.

AGCI (2011): *Balance de Gestión Integral Año 2010*. AGCI. Santiago.

AGCI (2012): *Balance de Gestión Integral Año 2011*. AGCI. Santiago

AGCI (2013): *Balance de Gestión Integral Año 2012*. AGCI. Santiago.

AGCI (2014a): *Balance de Gestión Integral Año 2013*. AGCI. Santiago.

AGCI (2014b): *Cooperación Chile-España*. Unidad de Prensa de AGCI. Santiago. http://issuu.com/agci/docs/brochure_20chile-espan_cc_83a.compr_f9fbe2ec4fab8c/1?e=13004118/10615294

AGCI (2014c): *Draft Working Paper: Chile's Role as a Triangular Partner for Development Cooperation*. Unidad de Prensa de AGCI. Santiago. http://issuu.com/agcichile/docs/web_agci.

AGCI (2015a): "Brasil y Chile suscriben acuerdo para cooperar en terceros países." *Noticias*. AGCI. 17 abril. <http://www.agci.cl/index.php/noticias/1386-brasil-y-chile-suscriben-acuerdo-para-cooperar-con-terceros-paises>.

AGCI (2015b): "Chile cumple un rol activo como socio de cooperación triangular en América Latina y el Caribe." *Noticias*. AGCI. 16 April. <http://www.agci.cl/index.php/noticias/1383-chile-cumple-un-rol-activo-como-socio-de-cooperacion-triangular-en-america-latina-y-el-caribe>.

AGCI (2015c): *Cooperación Triangular de Chile: Marco Conceptual y Experiencias*. Unidad de Prensa de AGCI. Santiago. http://issuu.com/agci/docs/brochure_20seminario_20triangular.c.

AGCI (2015d): *Evaluando Proyectos de Cooperación Triangular*. Documento de trabajo. Unidad de Prensa de AGCI. Santiago. http://issuu.com/agci/docs/v.f_-_abril_documento_de_trabajo_-_.

AGCI (n.d. a): *Ficha de Proyectos de Cooperación: Buenas Prácticas de Intermediación Laboral para Trabajadores Aprendices y Sistemas de Información Laboral en El Salvador*. Fondo Mixto de Cooperación Triangular Chile-España. Santiago.

AGCI (n.d. b): *Ficha de Proyectos de Cooperación: Formación en medicina transfusional [Bolivia]*. Fondo Mixto de Cooperación Triangular Chile-España. Santiago.

AGCI (n.d. c): *Ficha de Proyectos de Cooperación: Fortalecimiento de la Gestión y el Desarrollo de las personas del sector público al servicio a la ciudadanía de Paraguay*. Fondo Mixto de Cooperación Triangular Chile-España. Santiago.

AGCI & AECID (2009): *Memorandum de Entendimiento Entre la República de Chile y el Reino de España para una Asociación de Cooperación Triangular*. AGCI and AECID. 20 October. Madrid.

AGCI & AECID (2010): *Programa de Cooperación Triangular Chile-España: Una Asociación de Cooperación en Desarrollo*. AGCI and AECID. 13 December. Santiago de Chile.

- AGCI & UNDP (2012a): *La cooperación Triangular de Chile; 1998-2010. Características, fondos e instrumentos*. AGCI. Santiago.
- AGCI & UNDP (2012b): *La cooperación triangular en América Latina y Chile; 2006-2010. Tendencias, actores y prioridades*. AGCI. Santiago.
- AGCI & UNDP (2012c): *Buenas prácticas en cooperación Sur-Sur triangular de Chile: criterios y metodología de selección de casos*. AGCI. Santiago.
- AGCI & UNDP (2012d): *Buenas prácticas en cooperación Sur-Sur triangular de Chile: análisis de casos*. AGCI. Santiago.
- AGCI & USAID (2011): *Memorandum of Understanding between the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Chilean International Cooperation Agency (AGCI) for the Implementation of Development Cooperation Activities in Third Countries*. Asunción, Paraguay. 23 February.
- AGCI & USAID (2014): *U.S.-Chile Trilateral Cooperation Fact Sheet*. 4 June. [http://www.agci.cl/attachments/article/1240/Chile%20Trilateral%20Cooperation%20Fact%20Sheet%20\(1\)%20sin%20control%20de%20cambios.pdf](http://www.agci.cl/attachments/article/1240/Chile%20Trilateral%20Cooperation%20Fact%20Sheet%20(1)%20sin%20control%20de%20cambios.pdf).
- AYLLÓN, B. (2009a): "Cooperación Sur – Sur: innovación y transformación en la cooperación internacional." *Nombres propios*, Fundación Carolina. 18 de diciembre.
- AYLLÓN, B. (2009b): South-South Cooperation (SSC) and multilateral governance of the aid system: The implications for Spanish aid. *Comments*, June. FRIDE. Madrid.
- AYLLÓN, B. (2013): "El debate sobre la eficacia de la ayuda: reflexiones sobre su aplicación a la cooperación Sur–Sur en el caso latinoamericano." *Revista Perspectivas do Desenvolvimento*, 1(1), pp. 126-142.
- AYLLÓN, B. (2013b): *La cooperación sur-sur y triangular ¿Subversión o adaptación de la cooperación internacional?* Primera edición. Editorial IAEN. Quito.
- BANCET, A. (2012): *Análisis de la Cooperación Triangular: Discursos y prácticas de los países del CAD/OCDE sobre una modalidad en construcción*. Documento de Trabajo. IUDC-UCM. Madrid.
- CHATURVEDI, S. (2011): *Characteristics and Potential of Triangular Development Cooperation (TDC): Emerging Trends, Impact and Future Prospects*. UNDESA. New York.
- CUTS-CITEE (Centre for International Trade, Economics & Environment) (2005): "Trilateral Development Cooperation: An Emerging Trend." *Briefing Paper*, No. 1/2005.
- DOMÍNGUEZ, R. (2013): "Desmitificando la Cooperación Sur-Sur", *Centro de Información sobre la Cooperación Internacional. América Latina y el Caribe*. http://eficacia.info/doc_detalle.php?id=834
- ECOSOC (UN Economic and Social Council) (2008): *Trends in South-South and Triangular Development Cooperation*. Background Study for the Development Cooperation Forum. April.
- FORDELONE, T. (2009): "Triangular co-operation and aid effectiveness." OECD. Paris.
- GARRANZO, R. (2013): Interview with IDB-INTAL. *Trade and Integration Journal*, 36 (17), pp. 153-156.
- GÓMEZ GALÁN, M., AYLLÓN, B. & ALBARRÁN, M. (2011): *Reflexiones prácticas sobre cooperación triangular*. CIDEAL. Madrid.

HYNES, W. & SCOTT, S. (2013): "The Evolution of Official Development Assistance: Achievements, Criticisms and a Way Forward", *OECD Development Co-operation Working Papers*, No. 12, OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5k3v1dv3f024-en>.

KILLEN, B. (2013): Interview with IDB-INTAL. *Trade and Integration Journal*, 36 (17), pp. 149-151.

LARRÚ, J. M. (2014): "La contribución de la cooperación española al desarrollo global: Balance del período 2005-2013." *VII Informe sobre exclusión y desarrollo social en España*. Fundación FOESSA. Documento de trabajo 8.5.

LOPES, M (2010): Prática comentada da cooperação internacional. Entre a hegemonia e a busca de autonomia. Brasília.

MAEC (Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation) (2005): *II Plan Director de la Cooperación Española 2005-2008*. MAEC. Madrid.

MAEC (2009): *III Plan Director de la Cooperación Española 2009-2012*. MAEC. Madrid.

MAEC (2012): *IV Plan Director de la Cooperación Española 2013-2016*. MAEC. Madrid.

MAEC (2014): *Evaluación final del proyecto triangular Chile-España-Paraguay: Fortalecimiento de la gestión y el desarrollo de las personas del sector público al servicio de la ciudadanía de Paraguay 2009-2013*. Informe sintético. Madrid.

MAG (El Salvador Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock) (2014): "USAID, AGCI y MAG presentan logros de cooperación triangular." *Noticias*. 28 August. http://www.mag.gob.sv/index.php?option=com_k2&view=item&id=599:usaid-agci-y-mag-presentan-logros-de-cooperaci%C3%B3n-triangular&Itemid=168.

MCEWAN, C. & MAWDSLEY, E. (2012): "Trilateral Development Cooperation: Power and Politics in Emerging Aid Relationships." *Development and Change*, 43, pp. 1185–1209.

MEYER, P. (2011): *Chile: Political and Economic Conditions and U.S. Relations*. CRS Report for Congress. Congressional Research Service. Washington, D.C. 9 November.

MORAZÁN, F. (2014): "SAG, Chile y USDA revisan avances para implementar sistema de certificación de frutas y vegetales." *Periódico Digital de Honduras*. 4 September. <http://www.teleprensa.com/honduras/sagchileyusdarevisanavancesparaimplementarsistemadecertificaciondefrutasyvegetales.html>

OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development) (2013a): *Triangular Co-operation: What Can We Learn from a Survey of Actors Involved?* Report prepared by the OECD Development Cooperation Directorate. Paris.

OECD (2013b): *Triangular Co-operation: What's the Literature Telling Us?* Literature review prepared by the OECD Development Cooperation Directorate. Paris

OECD (2014): *Special Review of Chile*. OECD, Paris.

OJEDA, T. (2010): "La cooperación sur-sur y la regionalización en América Latina: el despertar de un gigante dormido." *Relaciones Internacionales*, 15, pp. 91-111.

PIFCSS (Ibero-American Program for the Strengthening of South-South Cooperation) (2014): *Cronología e historia de la Cooperación Sur-Sur: Un aporte desde Iberoamérica*. Working document No. 5. PIFCSS. Madrid.

ROSSEEL, P., DE CORTE, E., BLOMMAERT, J. & VERNIERS, E. (2009): *Approaches to North-South, South-South and North-South-South Collaboration*. Catholic University of Leuven. https://lirias.kuleuven.be/bitstream/123456789/229636/1/POLICY_PAPER_VLIR_UWC_NSS.pdf

SANCHEZ, F. (2010): *Análisis de la actuación de Chile en la Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo en sus modalidades Sur-Sur y triangular*. Documento de Trabajo No. 8. Instituto Universitario de Desarrollo y Cooperación. Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

SCHULTZ, N.S. (2010): "Implementing Accra: South-South Cooperation in the Context of Aid Effectiveness." Concept Note. *Boosting South-South Cooperation in the Context of Aid Effectiveness: Telling the Story of Partners Involved in More than 110 Cases of South-South and Triangular Cooperation*. TT-SSC. Bogotá, pp 91-104.

SEGIB (Ibero-American General Secretariat) (2007): *Informe de la Cooperación en Iberoamérica*. SEGIB. Madrid.

SEGIB (2008): *II Informe de la Cooperación Sur-Sur en Iberoamérica*. SEGIB. Madrid.

SEGIB (2009): *Report on South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America 2009*. SEGIB. Madrid.

SEGIB (2010): *Report on South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America 2010*. SEGIB. Madrid.

SEGIB (2011): *Report on South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America 2011*. SEGIB. Madrid.

SEGIB (2012): *Report on South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America 2012*. SEGIB. Madrid.

SEGIB (2014): *Report on South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America 2013-2014*. SEGIB. Madrid.

SHEARER, M. & TRES, J. (2013): "South-South and Triangular Cooperation in Latin America and the Caribbean: Much Ado about Nothing?" *Integration and Trade Journal*, 36 (17), pg. 1-10.

SOUTH CENTRE (2009): *South-South Cooperation Principles: An Essential Element in South-South Cooperation*. South Centre. New York.

THE WHITE HOUSE (2011) "Remarks by President Obama and President Sebastian Piñera of Chile at Joint Press Conference." Office of the Press Secretary. 21 March. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2011/03/21/remarks-president-obama-and-president-sebastian-pinera-chile-join-press>

THE WHITE HOUSE (2014): "The United States and Chile – A Strategic Partnership." Fact Sheet. Office of the Press Secretary. 30 June. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/thewhitehouse/2014/06/30/factsheetunitedstatesandchilestrategicpartnership>

TT-SSC (Task Team on South-South Co-operation) (2010): *Bogotá Statement – Towards Effective and Inclusive Development Partnerships*. High Level Event on South-South Co-operation and Capacity Development. Bogotá. 25 March

UN (United Nations) (1999): *Press Release, DEV/2214* 4 June. <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/1999/19990604.DEV2214.html>

UN (2003): *Report of the International Conference on Financing for Development*, Monterrey, Mexico, 18-22 March 2002. A/CONF.198/11.

UN (2009): *Doha Declaration on Financing for Development: Outcome Document of the Follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development to Review the Implementation of the Monterrey Consensus*. Doha, Qatar, 29 November-2 December 2008. A/CONF.212/L.1/Rev.1

UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY (2000): *United Nations Millennium Declaration, Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly*, 18 September, A/RES/55/2

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) (2009): *Enhancing South-South and Triangular Cooperation*. Special Unit for South-South Cooperation. New York.

UNDP (2014): *Human Development Report 2014: Sustaining Human Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience*. United Nations Development Programme.

UNOSSC (United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation) (n.d.): "What is South-South Cooperation?" UNDP. Accessed February 2015. http://ssc.undp.org/content/ssc/about/what_is_ssc.html.

UN SPECIAL UNIT FOR TCDC (1978): *The Buenos Aires Plan of Action*. Reissued November 1994. United Nations. New York.

USAID (United States Agency for International Development) (2013): *Fact Sheet: USAID Regional Trilateral Collaboration with TICA*. Washington

USAID (2014). *Automated Directives System (ADS)*. <http://www.usaid.gov/who-we-are/agency-policy>.

USAID/COLOMBIA (2014): *A Path to Peace: Country Development Cooperation Strategy 2014-2018*. Bogotá.

USAID/EL SALVADOR (2013): *Country Development Cooperation Strategy 2013-2017*. San Salvador.

USAID/DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (2013): *Country Development Cooperation Strategy FY 2014-2018*. Santo Domingo.

USAID/GUATEMALA (2012): *Country Development Cooperation Strategy 2012-2016*. Guatemala.

USAID/HONDURAS (2014): *Country Development Cooperation Strategy 2015-2019*. Tegucigalpa.

USAID/INDONESIA (2013): *Investing in Indonesia. USAID Strategy for Indonesia 2014-2018*. Jakarta.

USAID/JAMAICA (2013): *Country Development Cooperation Strategy FY 2014-FY 2018*. Kingston

USAID/MEXICO (2014): *Country Development Cooperation Strategy FY 2014-FY 2018*. Mexico City.

USAID/NICARAGUA (2013): *Country Development Cooperation Strategy FY 2013-FY 2017*. Managua.

USAID/PARAGUAY (2014): *Country Development Cooperation Strategy FY 2014-2018*. Asunción.

USAID/PERU (2012): *Country Development Cooperation Strategy 2012-2016*. Lima.

USAID/SOUTHERN AFRICA (2013a): *Country Development Cooperation Strategy Fiscal Year 2013-2017*. Pretoria.

USAID/SOUTHERN AFRICA (2013b): *Fact Sheet: Trilateral Assistance Program*. Pretoria.

USAID & U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE (2014): *Strategic Plan FY 2014-2017*. Washington, D.C. 2 Abril.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE (2011): "The United States and Chile: Trilateral Development Cooperation." Fact Sheet. Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs. 20 March. <http://www.state.gov/p/wha/rls/fs/2011/158618.htm>.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE (2012): "The United States and Brazil: Trilateral Cooperation." Fact Sheet. Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs. 9 April. <http://www.state.gov/p/wha/rls/fs/2012/187613.htm>.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE (2014a): "United States and Indonesia Sign South-South and Triangular Cooperation Memorandum of Understanding To Support Developing Countries." Media Note. Office of the Spokesperson. 17 February. <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2014/02/221712.htm>.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE (2014b): "Remarks: Secretary Kerry and Chilean Foreign Minister Muñoz at Signing Ceremony." *Texts & Transcripts*. Washington, D.C. 30 June. <http://translations.state.gov/st/english/texttrans/2014/07/20140701303081.html#axzz3Xg5yBvLr>.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE (2015): *Congressional Budget Justification: Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs. Fiscal Year 2016*. U.S. Department of State.

VEILETTE, C. (2012): "USAID Needs to Develop Guidelines for Trilateral Cooperation." *Rethinking US Development Policy*. Center for Global Development. 8 February. <http://www.cgdev.org/blog/usaid%ADneeds%ADdevelop%ADguidelines%ADtrilateral%ADcooperation1/4>.

WORKING PARTY ON AID EFFECTIVENESS (2011): *South-South and Triangular Cooperation: Unlocking the Potential of Horizontal Partnerships for Better Development Outcomes*. Building Block Proposal presented at the 4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan, South Korea, 29 November to 1 December.

XALMA, C. (2013): "The New Boom in South-South Cooperation: The Experience of Ibero-America." *Integration and Trade Journal*, 36(17), pg. 25-38. Inter-American Development Bank.