PATHS FOR DEVELOPING SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS

JULY 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Monitoring and evaluation practices are in constant transformation and respond to different principles and interests. Evaluating means assigning value. It implies measuring, describing and interpreting. In relation to development cooperation, it also involves negotiating opinions and worldviews and, in the case of South-South Cooperation (SSC) more specifically, such dialogue must be conducted in a horizontal manner. Thus, it is a practice permeated by political conceptions and, as such, it is important to promote transparency and encourage the debate on the elements that underpin evaluations – *i.e.* their objectives, criteria, indicators, methods and uses. Ignoring such elements can compromise the emergence of critical reflection and learning that evaluations can and should generate.

This document is based on the "Dialogues on Brazilian South-South Cooperation" held in Rio de Janeiro, in January 2017. The event was organized by the BRICS Policy Center in collaboration with the Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC) and with the support of the South-South Cooperation Research and Policy Centre (Articulação Sul). It brought together SSC actors from twelve countries, as well as a significant number of Brazilian implementing agencies and international organizations. This document is authored by experts and researchers from Articulação Sul and the BRICS Policy Center. The views contained here do not express the official position of the Brazilian Cooperation Agency nor that of any of the individuals or the institutions they represent, who have actively participated in the "Dialogues". The report, therefore, presents the authors' own reflections on the ongoing debate on how to strengthen SSC Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems so they are capable of accounting for the diversity of practices and contexts that constitute the field of SSC.

The heterogeneity and diversity of experiences of SSC led the authors to adopt a set of strategies that, while limiting the scope of the document, allow addressing the problem of M&E in more depth. The first choice was to focus

on South-South Technical Cooperation (SSTC), especially in relation to one of its main goals of supporting the development of endogenous and autonomous development solutions. Although we acknowledge the fact that SSC can assume different forms and encompass a variety of practices, we also highlight that SSTC is a common denominator among developing countries. Secondly, the document emphasizes one key dimension of SSC: capacity development, which includes knowledge sharing. Unquestionably, the outcomes of SSC initiatives go far beyond these dimensions, however, our choice is justified for three reasons: (i) capacity development and knowledge sharing are constitutive elements of both SSC processes and results; (ii) although such activities are also practiced in North-South cooperation, countries from the Global South understand them as guiding principles of SSC and a key strategy for the promotion of their self-reliance; and (iii) there is a considerable knowledge gap in what capacity development evaluation entails.

In fact, despite the numerous SSC capacity development initiatives, there is still a lack of evidence preventing us from attributing value, generating and sharing knowledge on the theme, or ultimately from improving the practices around it. This lack of evidence, which in turn results from the absence of solid evaluation systems, ends up facilitating the absorption of SSC practices indiscriminately by other development financing flows, as in the case of SDG 17's indicators. In this sense, we believe that SSTC evaluations that contribute to generate relevant evidence on capacity development and knowledge sharing will support the task of distinguishing them from other international development cooperation intiatives. In addition, the construction of more accurate South-South indicators might also contribute to the blossoming of a more favorable environment for capacity development and knowledge sharing practices.

The present document identifies and outlines reflections on SSC M&E. Although our attention is devoted to evaluation processes, the two activities are complementary. Monitoring systems are extremely relevant as they increase the efficiency and effectiveness of SSC implementation processes. In addition, monitoring systems not only provide information for evaluation processes, but can also promote transparency and increase their accountability. Evaluation processes, in turn, tend to emphasize the effectiveness of SSC initiatives. However, this document gives priority to the evaluation of processes and the results, considering the principles of SSC and focusing particularly on capacity development and knowledge exchange.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ACRONYMS

ABC - BRAZILIAN COOPERATION AGENCY
(AGÊNCIA BRASILEIRA DE COOPERAÇÃO)

BRICS - BRAZIL, RUSSIA, INDIA, CHINA AND SOUTH AFRICA

G77 - GROUP OF 77

M&E - MONITORING AND EVALUATION

NGOS - NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

OECD/DAC - ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND
DEVELOPMENT / DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

PRODOC - PROJECT DOCUMENT

SDGS - SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

SSC - SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION

SSTC - SOUTH-SOUTH TECHNICAL COOPERATION

TCDC - TECHNICAL COOPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

TSSC - TRILATERAL SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION

UNGA - UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

1. WHY AND WHAT TO EVALUATE?

1.1 WHY EVALUATE?

Evaluation processes can serve multiple purposes. An evaluation must provide policy-making activities with information on their relevance and effectiveness, and support decision-making and management processes, with the objective of improving performance. SSC evaluation systems should:

Promote learning on the potentialities and limits of SSC practices. These practices, when evaluated and systematized, can provide important input for the exchange between stakeholders, and can facilitate debate and consensus building around actions and paths for improvement.

Promote adaptive management of SSC initiatives, capable of responding to the constantly changing environment that characterizes both its institutions and their social, political and economic contexts. Evaluation processes generate evidence that allows for decisions to correct the route in order to strengthen interventions and improve outcomes.

Promote transparency and improve accountability of the practices and results of SSTC to partners, peers and societies. Transparency can have multiple meanings in the context of SSC initiatives, but tends to respond to accountability imperatives and reinforce horizontal relationships.

Strengthen SSC political capital and its constituencies. Evidence-based processes can help to make the value of SSC approaches visible at the international level. It can also support better dialogue with the population, which may in turn strengthen the domestic constituency for SSC. Moreover, greater evidence on SSC can contribute to the debate on international development and its effectiveness.

1.2 WHAT TO EVALUATE?
FOCUSING ON SUPPORTING CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

Supporting the development or the strengthening of capacities through knowledge sharing is a key SSTC element. The promotion of capacity development through horizontal practices and without the imposition of conditionalities is a decisive step for the construction of national and collective self-reliance among countries from the Global South. National capacities enable the formulation and implementation of endogenous and sustainable development solutions. There are a few considerations to be made regarding the nature of the capacity development in SSC as an object of evaluation:

Capacity development is an endogenous process; it can only be supported by partners, never imposed. In that sense, we emphasize the importance of "demand-driven" cooperation, based on the needs identified by national actors, and that take into account existing capacities as well as possible gaps to be addressed with the support of SSC actions.

Capacities can be considered as either a means or an end. There are different interpretations of the concept of capacity. On one hand, the most common interpretation relies on the assumption that capacities can be defined and therefore measured as performance in certain areas or sectors. On the other hand, capacity can also be an end in itself. In this sense, capacities can be understood as a combination of skills and relationships which allows a system to work towards its immediate development goals and, at the same time, enables its perennial existence by keeping it open to innovation and adaptation to new contexts.

Capacity development is a non-linear, long-term process. The very nature of capacity development makes it difficult to attribute causality to single initiatives. Moreover, capacities can be developed without immediately being translated into results and social impact. Capacities can support future processes, or even processes from other sectors, as is usually the case in initiatives to strengthen planning and management capacities.

Capacity development processes involve interdependent dimensions, and usually encompass changes in individual, organizational, inter-institutional and social levels. The activities supporting capacity development usually include the improvement of professional staff, the strengthening of organizations and of inter-institutional arrangements. Their main goal is to improve legal and institutional frameworks to support the implementation of public policies and the strengthening of various productive processes and sectors that support development. Such dimensions and their linkages should thus be considered in initial diagnoses and during evaluation processes (see table 1).

The quality of knowledge and technology sharing processes depends on the horizontality of their relations. In this sense, the adaptation of approaches and concepts to a partner's specific context, the respect of difference regarding the partner's culture, capacities and skills, are all issues that deserve attention. To increase the scope of South-South initiatives, it is therefore important to design joint strategies to encourage the spillover of knowledge acquired through South-South exchanges, both domestically and internationally.

SSTC encourages collective initiatives and is not guided by a unilateral transfer or through single solutions. The experience achieved and tested in other contexts can generate knowledge about social transformation processes to be shared among partners. Nonetheless, knowledge sharing is not about "one size fits all" approaches: getting it right, making mistakes and learning are the foundation of knowledge sharing. This perspective does not intend to undermine the credibility of previous successes in similar development contexts, but rather help to generate an environment conducive to change and to the introduction of new institutional frameworks and practices.

Cooperation based on capacity development aims to improve the skills in a partner country so they can build and lead their own innovation systems. Innovation, in turn, is understood here as an organized and systematized process of knowledge generation and application, which culminates in the creation of endogenous and sustainable solutions for problems and challenges related to development efforts, in an autonomous manner. In this way, practices of knowledge and technology exchange can encourage self-reliance rather than creating future dependency.

Evaluation should be consistent with the capacity development support in itself, and should encourage learning processes and strategic thinking about institutions, sectors and social contexts. The value of an evaluation lies in its capacity to empower all parties involved by encouraging them to build their own analytical methods and to pursue better results. Domestically-led and participatory evaluations may reinforce capacity development – including evaluation capacities, for both parties.

There should be clarity and consensus over the scope of the capacity development support provided. Evaluation can be useful and relevant if – and only if – connected with realistic and clear expectations about the capacities to be supported and improved, the challenges involved and the time needed to achieve the desired results. To do so, it is important to have clarity about what constitutes short, medium and long-term results, as well as about how the capacities in question can contribute to development goals. A clear Theory of Change and a solid diagnosis of the capacities to be strengthened are both essential steps in this process.

TABLE 1 | CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT DIMENSIONS AND
IMPLICATIONS FOR EVALUATION

DIMENSION	INITIATIVE FOCUS[1]	IMPLICATIONS FOR EVALUATION
INDIVIDUAL	Theoretical and practical trainings that aim to strengthen (formal and non-formal) people's knowledge and skills to act collectively to achieve shared goals within the organizations in which they work.	Dimension related to output. Evaluation would analyze to what extent the contents of the experiences shared were relevant to and onwed by participants, and if/how they were adapted and/or applied by participants in their daily practices.
ORGANIZATIONAL	Improvement of the organizational structure, the human and technical resources, the productive processes, and the management processes that an organization already has at its disposal and uses to offer products and services to a target population.	Dimension related to output and outcomes. Evaluation would analyze to what extent the contents of the SSTC initiative were appropriated, adapted and applied by the target organization (e.g. ministry, school, public research organization, etc.); as well as verify results both in the services offered and in the organization itself.
INTER-INSTITUTIONAL	Inter-institutional arrangements result from the interaction among organizations with the purpose of achieving shared goals. Capacity development processes may be sector-based, sub-sector based, or inter-sectorial. Processes supporting capacity development may focus on the quality of the services offered to the population by the inter-institutional arrangement, or on the improvement of the coordination and communication among the organizations involved.	Dimension related to outcomes. Evaluation would analyze the contribution of the SSTC initiative to the elaboration or improvement of institutional arrangements, as well as achieved outcomes from these arrangements (e.g. construction of endogenous and autonomous development solutions and innovations).
SOCIAL OR CONTEXTUAL	Contextual factors of a society – i.e. political, social, economic, legal, material and financial. It relates to a country's human, scientific, technological, organizational, institutional, economic and environmental capacities.	Dimension related to impacts. Evaluation would analyze the contribution of the SSTC initiative to improvement in the quality of life of the country's citizens. Social or contextual dimensions may also be considered during evaluation in order to analyze possible determinants, either contributing to or hampering the achievement of desired results. This process in itself would improve knowledge about the context of the initiatives.

1. Source: adapted from Brasil. Manual de Gestão da Cooperação Técnica Sul-Sul.
Brasília: Agência Brasileira de Cooperação, Ministério de Relações Exteriores, 2013.

TYPOLOGY OF SOUTH-SOUTH TECHNICAL COOPERATION INITIATIVES

The variety of SSTC practices requires an attentive definition of the purposes and meanings that an evaluation process would acquire in this respect. The diversity of historical trajectories and political contexts of the actors involved points towards the number of different practices and perspectives orienting SSTC initiatives and modalities. Table 2 illustrates a non-exhaustive typology of SSTC initiatives to be evaluated.

TABLE 2 | TYPOLOGY OF SSTC INITIATIVES

TYPE OF INITIATIVE	DEFINITION
AD HOC/ISOLATED KNOWLEDGE SHARING ACTIVITY	Study visits or short-term projects that seek to facilitate knowledge sharing in specific areas, with no ambitions to contribute to capacity development in a direct and planned manner.
PROJECTS	Initiatives that define the specific area(s) for knowledge sharing and technical cooperation, as well as the expected results on individual or organizational capacity development. They can either be short- or long-term projects.
STRUCTURING PROJECTS	Initiatives that seek to contribute to the development of inter-institutional capacities. They are mostly medium- or long-term.
PROGRAMS	Sector-based initiatives that seek to contribute to the development of partners' organizational and/or inter-institutional capacities. They are mostly medium- to long-term projects.
POLITICAL/TECHNICAL DIALOGUES	Engagement in policy spaces and structured dialogue on knowledge sharing (e.g. experiences, programs, and public policies) intended to promote inter-institutional transformation. Despite their definition as isolated activities by management systems, they tend to be continuous processes.

2. SSC: KEY PRINCIPLES AND ELEMENTS

Since the mid-twentieth century, SSC has been strengthened both as a concept and a political practice. It is important to highlight the historical evolution of the theme, which was (and still is) disputed. National, regional and international economic and political contexts have influenced positions, values and priorities related to SSC considerably.

The earliest debates on the theme emerged as part of the liberation struggle and the anticolonial movements. They were influenced by the ten principles proclaimed by the 29 countries participating in the Bandung Conference (Indonesia, 1995). The initiatives resulting from this process have consolidated the relevance of SSC and of South-South sharing of knowledge, technology and technical expertise. In 1978, the *Buenos Aires Plan Of Action for Promoting and Implementing Technical Cooperation Among Developing Countries*[2] brought about the discussion of other notions and principles, such as horizontality and non-interference in domestic affairs. From then on, SSC has been incorporating new and revised elements into its frameworks, conceptions and initiatives. The *New Directives for Technical Cooperation Among Developing Countries* (1995) by the United Nations highlighted the role of trilateral arrangements. Another important reference can be found in the so-called *Yamoussoukro Consensus*[3], the final document by the G77 in 2008, which reinforced SSTC singularities as opposed to aid coming from traditional, or Northern, partners. The various multilateral recommendations produced over more than 40 years of SSC culminated in a wide range of different proposals and perspectives.

In the following section, we discuss the SSC principles as set out by the Nairobi Outcome Document of 2009.

SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION: THE 2009 NAIROBI OUTCOME DOCUMENT AND ITS PRINCIPLES

From 1 to 3 december 2009, the High-Level United Nations Conference on South-South Cooperation was held in Nairobi, Kenya, celebrating the 30th anniversary of the Buenos Aires Plan of Action. The conference centered on the "promotion of South-South Cooperation for development" as well as on two sub-themes: (i) the reinvigoration of the united nations development system in supporting and promoting South-South and triangular cooperation; and (ii) the complementarities, specificities, challenges and opportunities of SSC and triangular cooperation.

The Nairobi Outcome Document[4] acknowledges SSC as an important element of international development cooperation and distinguishes itself from Official Development Assistance (ODA). The outcome document also emphasizes the importance of South-South exchange of experiences, recognizing that developing countries tend to face similar development challenges and, thus, can promote a common view on national development strategies and priorities. In addition, it recognizes that addressing development challenges in developing countries is only possible through the strengthening of local capacity and through self-reliance which, in turn, are both considered as requirements for national development and well-being – SSC's main

2. United Nations. *The Buenos Aires Plan of Action for Promoting and Implementing Technical Cooperation Among Developing Countries (TCDC), 1978.* Available at: http://ssc.Undp.Org/content/dam/ssc/documents/key%20policy%20documents/buenos%20aires%20plan%20of%20action.Pdf

3. G77. *Twelfth session of the intergovernmental follow-up and coordination committee on economic cooperation among developing countries. Yamoussoukro, Côte d'Ivoire, 10-13 june 2008.* Available at: http://www.g77.org/ifcc12/yamoussoukro_consensus.pdf

4. United Nations Organization. Nairobi Outcome Document of the High-Level United Nations Conference on South-South Cooperation, 2009. Available at: http://southsouthconference.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/ga-resolution-endorsed-nairobi-outcome-21-dec-09.pdf

BOX 1 | PRINCIPLES AND ELEMENTS OF SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION

THE NAIROBI OUTCOME DOCUMENT ADOPTED BY THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY ESTABLISHED SIX PRINCIPLES OF SSC...

> RESPECT FOR NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY;

> NATIONAL OWNERSHIP AND INDEPENDENCE;

> EQUALITY (HORIZONTALITY);

> NON-CONDITIONALITY;

> NON-INTERFERENCE IN DOMESTIC AFFAIRS;

> MUTUAL BENEFITS.

... AND EIGHT ELEMENTS THAT SHOULD INFORM SSC PRACTICES:

> COMMON OBJECTIVES AND SOLIDARITY;

> MULTI-STAKEHOLDER APPROACH;

> NATIONAL WELL-BEING;

> PROMOTION OF NATIONAL AND COLLECTIVE SELF-RELIANCE;

> INTERNATIONALLY AGREED DEVELOPMENT GOALS;

> ALIGNMENT TO NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES AT THE REQUEST OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES;

> CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT;

Source: United Nations, UNGA, Resolution 64/222 of December 21, 2009

goals. It is possible to observe that some of the principles and elements established by the Nairobi Outcome Document refer to foreign policy principles shared by developing countries. Among these principles and elements, we find those of a political nature and others that are more operational. It should be noted, however, that SSC evaluation systems do not aim to assess and analyze the foreign policy of partner countries. In this sense, general principles of foreign policy, although they frame and guide SSC practices, do not constitute the source or object of SSC evaluation.

We choose to approach the principles and elements listed in the Nairobi Outcome Document in four different dimensions (see figure 1):

FOREIGN POLICY PRINCIPLES APPLIED TO SSC:

Respect for national sovereignty, non-interference, non-conditionality and horizontality (referred to as "equality");

GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND ELEMENTS OF SSC:

National ownership and independence, mutual benefits, alignment and demand-drivenness, horizontality, non-conditionality, multi-stakeholder approach;

ELEMENTS FOR ACHIEVING SSC ULTIMATE GOALS:

Capacity development and knowledge sharing;

ELEMENTS ESTABLISHING SSC GOALS:

National well-being, national and collective self-reliance, internationally agreed goals.

FIGURE 1 | FOUR DIMENSIONS OF SSC'S GUIDING PRINCIPLES
AND ELEMENTS (AS ESTABLISHED IN NAIROBI)

RESPECT FOR SOVEREIGNTY

ALIGNMENT AND DEMAND DRIVENNESS
NATIONAL OWNERSHIP AND INDEPENDENCE

CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

NATIONAL
WELL-BEING

NATIONAL AND
COLLECTIVE
SELF-RELIANCE

INTERNATIONALLY
AGREED
DEVELOPMENT
GOALS

HORIZONTALITY   NON-CONDITIONALITY

KNOWLEDGE SHARING

MULTI-STAKEHOLDER APPROACH
MUTUAL BENEFITS

NON-INTERFERENCE

Source: elaborated by the authors

3. EVALUATING SOUTH-SOUTH TECHNICAL COOPERATION

The development of SSTC evaluation systems is a complex task. Given the heterogeneity of SSTC practices, the intersections between *processes* and *results* and the key role of capacity development in such agendas that should be considered, this document explores "paths" rather than a single, clear route. For this reason, following the Nairobi final document, a set of principles and elements were identified in order to guide and improve the evaluation of SSTC *processes* and *results*. The final product of this exercise has been reproduced below. In addition, subsection 3.1 has some general reflections outlined regarding the evolvement of these principles in SSTC practices as well as the implications for evaluation. Section 3.2 provides more specific, in-depth reflections on these principles and considers different dimensions of evaluation, that is, it addresses both processes (shared governance and efficiency) and results (effectiveness, results, and sustainability).

BOX 2 | PRINCIPLES AND ELEMENTS FOR SSTC EVALUATION

During the Dialogues, participants were invited to a brainstorming exercise focused on the principles and elements of the Nairobi Outcome Document, paying particular attention to those relevant for SSTC evaluation.

We emphasize that the intention was not to promote a hierarchical arrangement between the principles or to disaggregate them. On the contrary, we sought to establish possible connections between these principles and elements and the two dimensions of evaluation under scrutiny. Moreover, the reflections made on this occasion aimed at identifying areas of convergence, and not necessarily consensus, and sough to create an enabling environment for the exchange of perceptions, experience and knowledge.

We emphasize that both the reflections promoted and the conclusions achieved at the event – which have influenced this document – do not reflect the official position of any government and/or institution.

3.1 REFLECTIONS ON SSTC PRINCIPLES AND ELEMENTS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR THE EVALUATION OF SSTC INITIATIVES

HORIZONTALITY

The principle of horizontality implies isonomy between partners, contributing to their capacities for autonomous formulation and implementation of policies. In this sense, horizontality can be understood as a corollary of the principle of respect for national sovereignty. Patterns of horizontal relationship guarantee SSTC partners' self-reliance and sustain commitments in accordance with the principles of non-interference and non-conditionality. The principle of horizontality implies partnerships based on shared responsibilities, therefore contrasting with the hierarchy that characterizes donor-recipient relationship. In addition, horizontal processes can promote transparency of the potential benefits that each partner may get from SSTC.

The principle of horizontality should guide processes of elaboration, implementation and evaluation of SSTC initiatives and programs. Apart from being demand-driven, the elaboration and coordination of SSTC should be a joint effort ensuring, whenever possible, the participation of stakeholders in the process (see *multi-stakeholder approach* below). Implementation and monitoring mechanisms should enable partners' active participation. Evaluation processes should take into account the degree of influence that the principle of horizontality has in the elaboration and implementation of the SSTC initiative. In addition, the evaluation process is, in itself, a learning and capacity development exercise. Thus, evaluation should be conducted – from the very beginning to the final communication of results – with key stakeholders.

The principle of horizontality can thus be analyzed through qualitative indicators that measure the degree of partners' participation and influence, the existence of shared responsibilities, the quality of communication between partners, and the degree of interest in cooperating shown by the "demanding" partners. This last item also refers to the "inspiration factor", that is, the motivations behind one's will to cooperate. It highlights, among other things, the recognition of a partner's positive development trajectory.

OWNERSHIP

In SSTC, the principle of ownership implies the endogenous construction of innovations and solutions for development, with the support of partners. It encourages the elaboration of policies in accordance with national priorities and national development plans, and not the assimilation of external solutions. Ownership depends on the adaptation of experiences and knowledge shared so that solutions are developed through the partnership

but under the leadership of the partner country. As highlighted previously, this understanding of ownership – together with the principle of horizontality (*i.e.* horizontal ownership) – contrasts with a vertical conception, in which solutions are transposed from one context to another.

In the context of horizontal ownership, being driven by demand occurs within a dialogical process of successive adjustments. In fact, if we consider ownership to be an endogenous process of policy and capacity development, we must take into account that the formulation of demands by partners is also subject to change and adjustments throughout the cycle of their cooperation initiative. A partner's request is conditioned by its knowledge and capacity, and suffers adjustments during the elaboration and implementation of the partnership, responding to new possibilities that might emerge from greater mutual knowledge and from knowledge sharing itself.

Ownership can be enhanced through the participation of multiple stakeholders, according to the arrangement established among partners. A multi-stakeholder approach can contribute to deepen the social roots of SSTC policies and capacities. Multi-stakeholder participation in the elaboration of SSTC initiatives helps build consensus, and the necessary support, while contributing to the sustainability of SSTC results. Implementing a multi-stakeholder approach depends on arrangements previously defined between SSTC partners and should not be a conditionality.

Ownership can be evaluated through qualitative indicators that seek to measure, for instance, the alignment with the partner's national and organizational priorities; the support and political commitment to the process; the degree of leadership in decision-making and management processes; the role and involvement of key national stakeholders during the formulation and implementation of the initiative; the degree of adaptation, feasibility and incorporation of the acquired knowledge into relevant systems and policies and/or the incorporation of new technologies into development processes.

ALIGNMENT AND DEMAND-DRIVENNESS

Alignment to national priorities, upon the request of developing countries ("demand-driven") is a key distinctive element of SSTC and should be at the center of evaluation processes. Demand-driven initiatives are expected to be aligned with national priorities and promote local appropriation of the knowledge shared. Consequently, SSTC should contribute to the sustainability of initiatives and ensure that the results achieved are catalysts for endogenous development processes.

Demand-drivenness is intimately related to the principle of non-interference and the multi-stakeholder approach. In this sense, three key questions should be asked: (i) what is the origin of the demand and how was it initially formulated? (ii) how was the demand received? And, (iii)

were there any procedures or opportunities for adjustment throughout the implementation of the initiative? It is important to notice that the demand-driven principle should be understood within a more general framework, which also includes the principles of respect for sovereignty; non-intervention and non-interference – in connection with a spirit of solidarity and non-indifference. The process of qualification of the demand should not be seen as imposition or conditionality.

MULTI-STAKEHOLDER APPROACH

SSTC partners have different perspectives on the multi-stakeholder approach. For some, SSTC should incorporate consultations with the private sector while, for others, the participation of NGOs and social movements should be privileged. However, the involvement of multiple actors is often subject to procedures adopted in the SSTC process. In that sense, although the multi-stakeholder approach is mentioned in the Nairobi declaration, a number of partners from the south treat this element with caution. A common argument is that the inclusion and participation of other social actors – either governmental or non-governmental – should only occur by invitation of the partner government, and not as an imposition of the initiative in question. Therefore, the considerations proposed in the matrix at the end of this document (section 5) were developed for the initiatives that incorporate a multi-stakeholder approach.

The **multi-stakeholder approach can be a catalyst for resource pooling, increasing the sustainability of the initiative.** In addition to the financial benefits, a multi-stakeholder approach can also encourage increased interactions and dialogue among partners, potentially mitigating problems arising from communication failure. It is important, however, to assess the nature and the conditions of involvement at stake, both throughout the implementation of the initiative and by the end of its cycle. In this sense, another aspect to be considered is that some of the policies and programs shared by SSTC initiatives had a diverse range of actors, whether governmental or non-governmental, as protagonists in their original design and implementation. Thus, it is essential to have those actors somehow included in the process of knowledge sharing and capacity development.

MUTUAL BENEFITS

The principle of mutual benefits relates to the existence of benefits for two or more partners, contributing to increased self-reliance. Benefits can be political (*e.g.* Soft power, greater visibility, strengthening of relationships), technical (*e.g.* Institutional capacities and knowledge), and/or economical. However, mutual benefits are not an SSTC conditionality. Benefits can happen at different levels: among government officials, leaders related to the initiatives' themes, and even academic researchers and practicioners. It is commonly acknowledged that mutual benefits are dependent on the effectiveness of other SSTC principles, such as horizontality and self-reliance. A debated question is whether the idea of mutual benefits comes into tension with the principle of solidarity in the context of SSTC.

The definition of mutual benefits could be declared and accorded among partners at the initial stages of an SSTC initiative, promoting horizontality and greater transparency. Such benefits could then be clearly specified as the goals/expected results of the initiative. However, not all benefits are quantifiable or can be clearly defined at the early stages of an initiative. In addition, listing and specifying expected benefits can be a complex and politically sensitive task for partners.

The extent to which the declared benefits are incorporated into the document supporting the initiative in question will determine how closely the process evaluation will be aligned with the expected results. When benefits are not explicit, the evaluation can still analyze the nature of the gains and knowledge obtained by various partners. The evaluation of mutual benefits should be based on the perspectives of the actors involved, and focusing on how such benefits can also spread out across other political, technical and economic dimensions. It is worth pointing out that evaluation should not be seen as an analysis of the country's foreign policy or of the overall relations among partner countries.

Benefits will not be uniform or evenly distributed among the partners and the different national actors involved in cooperation: coordination and implementation agencies might have different understandings of what constitutes gains and learning from the initiative. The analysis and evaluation of mutual benefits can be based on the answers of key actors to a set of guiding questions – for instance, "have you and/or your institution benefited from the initiative? How?". Alternatively, they could be translated into indicators. In this regard, a possible way to measure and evaluate the strengthening of relations among partner countries in the context of SSTC initiatives could be, for example, better understanding of the partners' realities, their expressed interest and efforts to set-up new initiatives, new trade relations, and cooperation and alignment of policy positions in multilateral forums.

Systematizing the gains from SSTC initiatives can highlight its potential for the institutions and actors involved, and strengthen the constituency supporting SSC in the country. Moreover, it can also consolidate knowledge-based evidence on SSTC and its particularities, especially vis-à-vis North-South cooperation.

3.2 PROCESS EVALUATION

In SSTC, processes and results are interconnected. Considering the principles and elements discussed above, results are largely determined by processes. In fact, horizontal relations and non-conditionality influence the potential of the capacity development support to truly lead to self-reliance. Similarly, the construction of endogenous development solutions depends on the constant adjustment of partners' demands throughout the whole process. **Thus, how SSTC initiatives are implemented (i.e. the processes) will either enable, or fail to enable, the achievement of development results, particularly related to capacity developement.** The evaluation must contemplate all stages of the initiative, and be conducted in accordance with SSC principles.

SHARED GOVERNANCE

Governance institutions strengthen transparency, increase space for dialogue, ensure the clarity and coherence of responsibilities, as well as structure joint work and communication flows. Developing governance bodies and consolidating mechanisms of shared management are key factors in promoting efficient and sustainable cooperation – especially in initiatives involving many partners in which transaction costs need to be reduced. Management mechanisms can help to keep a record of agreements and ensure transparent and effective communication flows.

Evaluating shared governance involves analyzing the arrangements guiding partner interaction. These arrangements should be based on principles such as respect for sovereignty and non-interference, and must be implemented through procedures that promote horizontality and non-conditionality. Governance mechanisms and strategies that put such principles in practice are relevant during the whole SSTC cycle, and an investment in them promotes and strengthens partner self-reliance.

It is necessary to evaluate whether and how governance arrangements have ensured the responsiveness and qualification of the partner's demand during the identification and formulation of proposals. Such process should also take into consideration the main goals of promoting endogenous development solutions aligned with the partner's national development priorities. It is possible to evaluate whether governance arrangements were effective in supporting knowledge and technology sharing among partners.

BOX 3 | SHARED GOVERNANCE IN TRILATERAL
SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION (TSSC)

In trilateral cooperation, the evaluation of governance arrangements should take into account the multiplicity of actors involved. Trilateral technical cooperation is marked by different organizational cultures and, thus, requires new ways of working and openness by all partners to make adjustments. Although the main comparative advantage of this type of partnership is the potential increase in the scope and impact of cooperation in the developing country partner – resulting from a combination of technical, human, material and financial contributions from the three parties –, TSSC challenges management approaches with its considerable transactional costs. It requires time and intense dialogue until agreements are finally established. Similarly, governance arrangements are also central to the negotiation of the key milestones and evaluation mechanisms that should meet the needs and interests of all parties.

TSSC evaluation should consider whether governance arrangements have ensured horizontality. Evidence of **horizontality** in TSSC can be found in the existence of practical and effective tripartite coordination arrangements, as well as of shared management and technical responsibilities ensuring all parties a leading role in strategic and technical decision-making. It is also important to identify and evaluate how active and effective the participation of partner institutions were in all stages of the initiative. Such analysis would include the evaluation of information flows, communication channels and accountability mechanisms operating among the parties.

Another aspect to be evaluated is if such arrangements were flexible to allow adjustments, as well as if they have supported the development of endogenous solutions to the problems that motivated the demand – and if they were aligned with the national development priorities and partners' programme guidelines and priorities. In this sense, the prior existence of common standards of governance and management among partners, or among partner countries, and an International Organization is extremely important for the identification, formulation and implementation of an initiative. These standards allow the establishment of responsibilities and roles of the different actors, giving them visibility and recognition, and making effective use of the **valued added of each party.**

EFFICIENCY

Refers to the optimisation of the financial, material, human or time resources in order to best achieve the outputs during the execution of a project. Efficiency evaluation in the implementation of an SSTC initiative usually addresses aspects related to resource management, execution of activities vis-à-vis the resources employed, and cost-effectivenness ratio.

The ABC's SSTC management manual states that "being efficient is doing things right, avoiding losses and wastes, in the shortest possible time and the lowest possible cost". However, in light of the SSTC's overall context and the particularities of its initiatives, **this definition should be qualified, or relativized by other crucial elements characterizing this specific dimension of** SSC. Some nuance is introduced if we consider, for example, that the negotiation process of SSTC initiatives tends to be longer than that of initiatives adopting a top-down approach, as SSTC prioritizes horizontality and ownership. Shared management can also increase costs and the time spent in SSTC initiatives. However, in contrast with the usual definition of efficiency, these costs should be seen as "investments" if they are indeed required to put SSC principles into practice.

BOX 4 | REFLECTIONS ON TRILATERAL COOPERATION

Considering the premise that TSSC can bring gains in scale and increase impact, it is necessary to develop evaluation mechanisms and indicators for the anaylsis of cost-effectiveness. This, in turn, would allow us to assess whether the transactional costs of trilateral arrangements were in fact surpassed by sustainable positive results, as well as by the benefits arising from their complementary contributions and broadened channels for political and strategic coordination among partners.

The cost-benefit analysis in this case could consider various elements and questions, such as: (i) Was the trilateral arrangement effective in combining and harmonizing the different management mechanisms of each partner without creating supplementary operational procedures that increase transactional costs? (ii) If there were additional transactional costs, what triggered them? (e.g. communication flows, coordination mechanisms, more complex accountability instruments; lack of timely and relevant contributions); (iii) Which were the mutual benefits achieved through trilateral arrangements?

3.3 RESULTS EVALUATION

The evaluation of results addresses the outputs, outcomes and impacts of the SSTC initiative. This section explores the analysis of results, taking the SSC principles as a starting point. Such approach should be seen as complementary to the traditional evaluation of results. The following dimensions are considered for the evaluation of results:

EFFECTIVENESS

Effectiveness refers to the extent that the positive outcomes brought about by the initiative have met the partners' needs, based on their perception, and guided by the problem or situation that originally motivated the initiative. To evaluate effectiveness means to investigate whether what was planned, executed and achieved was, in fact, the appropriate approach to tackling the initial problem, based on the partner's perception. This definition differs from the one proposed by the OECD/DAC, which focuses exclusively on how far the goals have been achieved. In other words, effectiveness from a South-South perspective gives greater focus to the partner's view rather than that of the "donor" or evaluator.

From this perspective, and considering the constant adjustments in partners' demand and implementation strategies adopted, the **evaluation should be flexible with regard to changes in the outputs and outcomes, as they may differ from the ones described in the contractual documents.** In this sense, the evaluation should reflect upon and qualify which results will define effectiveness – which may include results that were not in the original logical framework.

Effectiveness is usually observed when there is complementarity among: (i) prior existing knowledge and capacities in the partner country, (ii) diagnosis of capacities to be strengthened or developed, and (iii) shared inputs and technical resources (*e.g.* knowledge, practices, technical expertise, and technologies). The complementarity between these dimensions nurtures the responses to demand and improves the SSTC's contribution to capacity strengthening that leads to achievement of development goals aligned with national priorities.

OUTCOMES

This refers to the positive and negative changes – directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally – produced by a cooperation initiative. In other words, the main effects arising from initiatives aimed at capacity development in its individual, organizational or inter-institutional dimensions. The changes observed depend on the nature of the cooperation initiative, as well as on the scope of the support of capacity development tackled in the initiative. Impacts related to

development goals are beyond the immediate scope of these initiatives (see discussion on "sustainability" below).

Considering that SSTC should be demand driven, aligned with national development priorities and should promote ownership and self-reliance, **the evaluation of outcomes should be focused on the scope of contribution and synergy**. Thus, contribution analysis can be useful for assessing outcomes – which contrasts with analysis that are aimed at demonstrating causal attribution of results (see box 5).

5. Mayne, John. Addressing attribution through contribution analysis: using performance measures sensibly, **Canadian Journal Of Programme Evaluation, V.** 15, p. 1-24, 2001

BOX 5 | CONTRIBUTION ANALYSIS[5]

Contribution analysis is an approach developed by John Mayne to evaluate the performance of policies, programs and projects. It provides an alternative to the traditional positivist approach to the problem of attribution, which aims to infer causality through a "counterfactual". The task, therefore, is not to prove whether a given element caused the desired result or not, but to broadly explore the contribution that an initiave has made to achieved outcomes. The approach gestures towards a "Theory of Change", bringing together activities, results and implementation context, and collecting evidence from various sources to test the theory. The ultimate goal is to produce a credible "contribution story".

SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability evaluation examines the extent that the benefits arising from technical cooperation iniatives catalyze further development processes. In other words, it investigates the potential durability of the positive outcomes produced through technical cooperation after the conclusion of the activities. The sustainability of technical cooperation relates to internal factors as well as to factors that are external to the initiatives.

The evaluation should explore how far practices were institutionalized and how widespread and rooted the outcomes of an initiative are in the society at stake. In this sense, it gestures towards not only the sustainability of a given initiative, but first and foremost towards the increase of self-reliance among local actors for the reproduction, adaptation and reformulation of development practices over time. SSTC sustainability therefore points to the development of the necessary capacities in order to encourage self-reliance, not dependence.

There are two factors or dimensions of outcomes which are essential to ensure the initiatives's sustainability: the strengthening of the enabling environment and of coalitions of change. An enabling environment refers to the institutional milestones, high level political commitments and changes in behavior that facilitate the consolidation of relevant programs and policies. Another key element in this matter is the political support of several actors, both inside and outside the government, thus creating coalitions that support the process of institutionalization and expansion of development programs and policies. South-South exchanges also help to create enabling environments at the regional and international levels, as they tend to stimulate the consolidation of networks and sectorial communities that support domestic processes.

It is worth highlighting that **SSTC evaluation does not relate to the impact of the policies and projects of partner countries**, but to the contribution of SSTC to their formulation or implementation. Although impact on the well-being of populations, on the SDGs, and on the consolidation of national and collective self-reliance orients South-South partnerships, its evaluation is primarily a partner country's responsibility – since impacts are the consequence of multiple factors that are beyond the scope of cooperation iniatives. That does not mean impacts should not be evaluated. It means instead that they must be evaluated by the partner, within the context of their own national development plans. **In short, the partners should previously state and agree on the scope of the evaluation process as well as on the elements and dimensions which will be the focus of evaluation.**

4. EVALUATION TYPES AND APPROACHES

In the previous sections, possible paths to evaluate cooperation initiatives in the light of the elements and principles of SSC were explored. In this section, methodological considerations are unpacked to stimulate the reflection about SSTC evaluation. The following points are discussed: (i) determining factors in the decisions related to evaluation types and approaches; (ii) types of evaluation, and (iii) systemic approaches to evaluation.

4.1 DETERMINING FACTORS IN EVALUATION TYPES AND APPROACHES

There are different types, approaches and evaluation methods that can be applied to international cooperation iniatives. The decision about which will be most relevant in each situation is intimately related to the partners' intentions as well as their strategic goals. Determining factors in the decision can include the guiding values, the types of initiative, and the internal capacities of partners (which include human resources, effectiveness of the monitoring system and the budget available).

The **guiding values** of evaluation processes are usually found in the very principles of SSC, however, other aspects guiding methodological definitions can also be included in this definition. It might be expected, for example, that evaluation should empower partners and adopt a participatory approach in the entire evaluation process. Table 6 presents the incorporation of a gender perspective on evaluations.

BOX 6 | EVALUATIONS WITH A GENDER PERSPECTIVE

SSTC's evaluations should ensure a gender perspective, even if the thematic focus of the initiative does not explicitly tackles gender issues. Initiatives that do not integrate a gender perspective may lead to adverse impacts that reinforce existing inequalities.

A gender perspective on evaluations implies the need to identify and consider gender-related inequalities throughout the initiative's cycle: design, planning, implementation and achieved results (intended or unintended). This perspective is ultimately a lens that should influence the choices of approaches, methods, processes and the utilization of the results from the evaluations. These choices must allow: (i) the systematic analysis of the effects that a given initiative has on power relations between men and women; (ii) that actions be recommended in order to improve the initiatives and their effectiveness in respect to a greater deal of gender equality and women's empowerment; (iii) the evaluation process in itself to contribute to women's empowerment.

Under this perspective, gender-sensitive indicators must not only monitor the representativeness and participation of both men and women during the implementation of initiatives, but also allow for the advancement of analyses on the effectiveness of these initiatives in promoting women's empowerment and greater gender equality. There is need, however, to deepen the debate on how to operationalize a gender approach to SSTC evaluations, ensuring capacity development processes are analyzed throught a gender

Types of initiatives: as mentioned in section 1, monitoring and evaluation systems must be attentive to the heterogeneous nature of SSTC practices. Thus, the type of initiative – occasional knowledge exchange, projects, structuring projects, programs, and political dialogues – should guide the choice of consistent and relevant approaches and methods.

The internal capacities in co-ordination and implementation agencies relates to the institutional conditions (*i.e.* Material and human resources) affecting the choice of evaluation type and approaches. It should be noted that the internal capacities within these agencies may suffer changes over time, as they are also susceptible to improvement. For instance, human resources can be improved through professional training and awareness raising processes (see box 6 below).

Quality of M&E systems: some of the major difficulties faced by SSTC evaluation stem from the incipient nature of M&E systems of co-ordination and implementation agencies. Challenges include: weak logical frameworks, lack of baselines, insufficient collection of relevant M&E information during the implementation of initiatives, and lack of internal capacity to contract and manage evaluations. For instance, if the logical framework of an initiative does not provide indicators or a baseline, or if activities were not properly monitored during implementation, the final evaluation will be limited to "tracking" and "rebuilding" activities and outcomes and will not be able to assess efficiency. Thus, the quality of the existing M&E systems influences the choice of relevant and realistic evaluation approaches and methods. In the case of large-scale initiatives, conducting evaluability assessments at earlier stages can help to correct the course of M&E during implementation stages.

Available budget: unlike North-South cooperation, SSTC tends not to have substantial financial resources available for evaluation processes. However, it is possible to build robust M&E systems even with a limited budget. The use of inexpensive methods (mostly qualitative methods), the strengthening of the capacities of those responsible for the implementation and use of portfolio evaluations, or evaluation of flagship iniciatives only, are all alternatives that can be explored as possible paths for building SSTC M&E systems.

BOX 7 | EVALUATION CAPACITIES

The debate on SSTC and TSSC evaluation brings to attention the need to build capacities, within the agencies responsible for coordinating and implementing cooperation initiatives, to promote more effective evaluation processes. The following aspects were raised by participants during the Dialogues: (i) the need to create an enabling environment and to encourage the development of an evaluation culture within cooperation institutions; (ii) the evaluation process can create space for training and capacity development for professionals and organizations involved in SSTC initiatives; (iii) the creation of M&E guidelines and systems for implementing agencies. Other suggestions were proposed for future reflections on the issue: (i) use of innovative evaluation methods – as well as coherent and flexible; (ii) favor evaluators who have expertise as facilitators of participatory approaches; (iii) create Theories of Change based on Project Documents or original logical frameworks.

4.2 TYPES OF EVALUATION

Table 3, below, introduces a brief (and non-exhaustive) typology for evaluations. The typology is based on three key axes: the evaluating agent, the phase in the project cycle when evaluation is conducted, and the scope of evaluation. It should be noted that while the types of evaluation detailed here are not exclusive, they might (and should) be combined by the agencies in order to improve learning.

TABLE 3 | TYPES OF EVALUATION[6]

TYPE OF EVALUATION		DESCRIPTION
BASED ON THE EVALUATING AGENT	INTERNAL EVALUATION	Implemented by institutions who are/were directly involved in the formulation, implementation, and/or management of the initiative. The coordinating and/or implementing agency needs installed capacities in order to conduct the evaluation (see section 4.1 on "Internal Capacities"). This type of evaluation encourages a participatory approach that promotes learning and favors ownership and co-responsibility. In addition, internal evaluations do not usually require large amounts of financial resources and rely on stakeholders' knowledge about the context and details of the initiative implementation.
	EXTERNAL EVALUATION	Implemented by external and independent actors (i.e. actors who were not involved in the formulation, implementation and/or management of the initiative). External evaluations are guided by terms of reference previously agreed between cooperation institutions. External actors contribute with their expertise, and provide greater rigor and impartiality to the evaluation.
BY PHASE IN THE PROJECT CYCLE	EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT	Conducted before the implementation of the project/initiative. Its objectives are (i) to assess the adequacy of the selected implementation strategies against the initial diagnosis, hence analyzing the relevance and the internal and external coherence of the initiative, and (ii) to ascertain if the M&E strategy is adequate and make recommendations for improvement. In addition, it should be verified whether the initiative will promote negative externalities regarding the environment, gender and inequalities, among others. Its results should support the implementation planning, as well as an M&E approach that better suits the possibilities and necessities of the project.
	EX-ANTE EVALUATION	Conducted before the implementation, it aims at assisting the planning of the project/initiative itself, as well as the planning of its evaluation. It seeks to consolidate knowledge on the status of the variables that are likely to present changes as a consequence of the implementation of a given initiative, thus allowing for a comparison between the initial and final situations, through ex-post evaluations. This evaluation is particularly valued in case of bigger and/or structuring projects/initiatives. In the field of international cooperation, ex-ante evaluations and evaluability assessments are not usually differentiated clearly, resulting in different countries and international agencies opting for one instrument or the other.

TYPE OF EVALUATION		DESCRIPTION
	MID-TERM EVALUATION	The Mid-Term Evaluation is an exercise undertaken in the middle of the implementation phase of an initiative. It aims at: (i) complementing monitoring efforts to explain "how" and "why" the initiative is (or is not) producing the expected outcomes; (ii) determining whether the proposed solution to the original situation/problem still remains relevant in the perspective and needs of partners; (iii) suggesting technical and operational adjustments.
	FINAL EVALUATION	Undertaken after the completion of all activities, with the aim of evaluating whether the initiative has achieved its main goals, what changes have occurred, and if there were any unintended results and/or lessons learned – including those that may serve to improve future initiatives.
	POST-PROJECT EVALUATION (OR 'EX-POST' EVALUATION):	It usually takes place from six months to two years after the conclusion of the initiative's activities. It has the advantage of providing the conditions for asssessing the long-term success of the initiative. In addition, it can determine whether the expected positive effects were sustainable or not. To carry out a Post-Project Evaluation, detailed information about the conditions prior to the implementation of the initiative should be available (in order to have basis for a comparison).
BY SCOPE (BEYOND INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVES)	CORPORATIVE, PORTFOLIO OR SECTORIAL EVALUATION	The choices regarding the evaluation approach must always take into consideration the size and scope of the initiatives. Small-scale initiatives may not be subject to specific evaluations, due to the technical and financial investment needed. However, they can be included in aggregated evaluations, which can be either corporative, portfolio or sectorial. Within bilateral or regional partnerships, various one-off activities are synergistic and cumulative and, thus, it is important to evaluate them as a whole.

7. Watson, David. "Monitoring and Evaluation of Capacity and Capacity Development". European Centre for Development Policy Management, Discussion Paper n. 58B. April, 2006. ECDPM Study on Capacity Change and Performance.

8. See United Nations Development Programme. Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results. New york, 2009. Available at: http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/handbook/english/documents/pme-handbook.pdf

4.3 EVALUATION APPROACHES

The present subsection discusses evaluation approaches, focusing on two specific sets of approaches: "linear" and "systemic" [7]. The main features, implications and methods of each are described below. Table 4, at the end of the section, presents the advantages and disadvantages of each set of approaches.

Linear approaches assume that changes can be understood through a cause-effect relationship between inputs and outputs. This is the logic behind "results-oriented management" approaches and its instruments, such as the logic framework that guides both planning and M&E processes [8]. A linear evaluation demonstrates that certain results (effects) are directly related to the intervention (cause).

9. See valters, Craig. "Theories of Change: Time For a Radical Approach to Learning in Development". Odi Report. London: Odi, 2015 and Move Social. "Para avaliar impacto social" (memo).

Systemic approaches, on the other hand, assume changes result from multiple inter-related dynamics and causes. In addition, it recognizes that a particular intervention may often generate unanticipated outcomes. From this perspective, M&E processes should prioritize the identification of the changes that took place, predicted or unpredicted, as well as learning about the processes that have generated them. The systemic, more complex approaches to M&E are not aimed at measuring the attribution of a certain intervention to the outcomes, but rather to demonstrate how interventions have contributed to outcomes while taking into consideration other factors that have influenced them. M&E processes inspired by the systemic approach tend to favor stakeholders' participation, and include methods such as program theory, Theory of Change, and outcome mapping[9].

TABLE 4 | LINEAR AND SYSTEMIC APPROACHES:
PROS, CONS AND KEY METHODS

	LINEAR	SYSTEMIC
PROS	Ensure initiatives are focused on outcomes and impacts, rather than inputs and outputs. Effective for implementation management and monitoring.	Ensure that initiatives receive constant feedback with practical information on what works or not, providing a basis for decision-making and strategy adjustment. Enable the identification of unforeseen results/impacts, either positive or not.
CONS	When rigidly conducted, and without a constant update of information, they tend to prevent innovation and adaptation of strategies, and to disregard possible contextual changes. May lead to misunderstandings about the multiple determinants of change, disregarding alternative solutions. May restrict the understanding of the multiple factors influencing long-term development; which, in turn, limit their capacity to assign impact to more specific, occasional interventions. Ineffective in identifying unexpected results.	May result in the construction of extremely complex benchmarks for evaluation, especially in initiatives characterized by a larger number of inter-related factors. Defining clear, precise indicators may be more difficult due to its trend towards overemphasizing the complexity of contexts, and avoiding the adoption of one-dimensional parameters. Stakeholders may disagree on key determinants, and this may be time and energy-consuming.
METHODS	Logical Framework, Randomized Controlled Trials, Productivity analysis, Micro and Macro Methods.	Program Theory, Theory of Change, Outcome Mapping, Contribution Analysis, Most Significant Change.

5. EVALUATION MATRIX: PROCESSES AND RESULTS

The discussions about the relationship between the elements and principles of SSC and the evaluation of processes and results led to a number of reflections on SSTC evaluation. Based on such reflections, a matrix was developed aimed towards the construction of multiple paths for the evaluation of SSTC initiatives with a focus on capacity development.

The axis "**principles and elements of SSC**" includes: mutual benefits, alignment and demand-drivenness, multi-stakeholder approach, capacity development, horizontality, and ownership.

The axis "**evaluation of processes and results**" includes criteria related to (a) efficiency and shared governance in process evaluation, (b) effectiveness, outcomes and sustainability in results evaluation. We emphasize, however, that the criteria represented in the matrix should be considered as input for the elaboration of evaluative questions and indicators, as well as for improving existing ones for future SSTC evaluation efforts[10].

10. For further examples, see annex 1 and 2 of this document.

TABLE 5 | EVALUATION MATRIX FOR SSTC PROCESSES AND RESULTS

	ASSUMPTIONS	PROCESS EVALUATION		RESULTS EVALUATION		
		EFFICIENCY	SHARED GOVERNANCE	SUSTAINABILITY	EFFECTIVENESS	OUTCOMES
CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT	Procedural. Implies long-term non-linear changes. Capacities may be developed at individual, organizational, inter-institutional and/or social levels. Evaluation focuses on synergy, complementarity and contribution. Evaluation processes themselves should contribute to capacity development	Efficiency of the selected capacity development strategies	Representativeness and joint validation in the identification of capacities to be developed and in the definition of the scope of the initiative	Knowledge sharing guarantees ownership and institutionalizes partner's own innovation systems	Complementarity among the existing capacities, the diagnosis made, and the shared technical inputs	Contributions to individual, organizational and/or inter-institutional development observed
				Promotes capacity development in the inter-institutional and/ or social/ contextual dimensions	The strategies adopted are appropriate and respect local culture, context and norms. Local knowledge feeds the process	Institutionalisation and multiplication of shared knowledge, contributing to the generation of new knowledges, practices and technologies

	ASSUMPTIONS	PROCESS EVALUATION		RESULTS EVALUATION		
		EFFICIENCY	SHARED GOVERNANCE	SUSTAINABILITY	EFFECTIVENESS	OUTCOMES
HORIZONTALITY	Ensures equality among partners, and sustains the principles of respect for sovereignty, non-interference and non-conditionality	Analysis of efficiency takes the logic of horizontality into account	Active participation and shared responsibilities among partners throughout the project cycle The quality of communication among actors		Capacity development strategies are horizontally designed, allowing for mutual learning	
OWNERSHIP	Horizontal Ownership: adaptation of shared knowledge in order to create endogenous solutions to alternative policies, and solutions to development under the leadership and in accordance with the partner country's interests	Partners' leadership in management and decision-making processes		Policies and practices are socially rooted and/or institutionalized and promote alternative policies and endogenous solutions to development issues Increased self-reliance of the partner country	Political and technical support and commitment to the process	Adaptation, applicability and integration of knowledge and/or integration of new technology into wealth generation processes
ALIGNMENT AND DEMAND-DRIVEN	The initiative responds to partner country's demands and is aligned with national and/or organizational priorities. Relates to the principles of respect for national sovereignty and non-intervention	Demands were met Qualification of the demand through a dialogical process of successive adjustments		Strengthening of the national priorities that guided the cooperation	Demands were met and translated into appropriate strategies Elaborated demands were adequate to address the initial problem/situation	Existence of synergy between the initiative and national or local policies and/or programs Activities have contributed to the implementation and strengthening of a specific policy and/or program
MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION	SSTC partners have different perspectives in relation to the multi-stakeholder participatory approach. The evaluation of this element should be part of the initiatives adopting such approach in their projects; and/or in cases where external actors have played a central role in the national experience	Analysis of efficiency takes into account the strategic and political value of multi-stakeholder participation	Stakeholders have participated and influenced in the project cycle	Multi-stakeholder participation supports the consolidation of a national support base and enhances ownership The development of capacities among stakeholders created conditions for replication and innovation of endogenous development solutions		Positive results recognized by stakeholders
MUTUAL BENEFITS	Benefits can be political, technical, institutional and financial. Benefits should not be treated as conditionalities. Once openly declared, they contribute to the horizontality of relations and to the generation of support bases			Institutionalisation of knowledge and other benefits in coordination and implementation agencies Political, social and/or economic benefits are rooted, contributing to the partner country's self-reliance and SSC legitimacy	Expected benefits are achieved and recognized by stakeholders	Different degrees of political, technical, social and/or economic gains are observed in both partners

ANNEX 1 | TRILATERAL SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION: EXAMPLES OF INDICATORS FOR THE EVALUATION OF TRILATERAL SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION INITIATIVES

STAGES OF THE PROJECT	SSC PRINCIPLES AND MECHANISMS	EXAMPLES OF INDICATORS
1. IDENTIFICATION OF IDEAS	Demand-driven	The idea of the project is/was presented and jointly analyzed by the parties, meeting the demands and the national development goals and priorities of the partner country.
	Alignment with national priorities and national development plans	Project ideas are/have been aligned with national development priorities: (i) in relation to the programmatic cooperation frameworks of the international organization and the partner countries (Brazil and other partner country), and (ii) in relation to the bilateral sectorial agenda of technical cooperation between Brazil and the partner country.
	Alignment with internationally agreed development goals	The cooperation programs presented by the international organization are/have been aligned with internationally agreed development goals.
	Relevance	The strategic value of technical, human, material and financial contributions to be shared between parties in order to achieve the applicant's development goals is/was taken into account. There were/have been Brazilian practices, knowledge, expertise and technologies relevant to the areas of interest of partner countries.
	Knowledge sharing	It is/was possible to observe complementarity among the original idea of the project (national developments macro-goals reflected in the applicant's requests) and the experiences, practices, knwoledge and technologies to be/ which were shared between partner countries.

STAGES OF THE PROJECT	SSC PRINCIPLES AND MECHANISMS	EXAMPLES OF INDICATORS
2. FORMULATION OF THE PROPOSAL	**Alignment with national development priorities**	The project's strategic framework (expected impacts and outcomes) clearly aligns with the national, subnational and local development plans of the partner country.
	Multi-stakeholder approach and capacity development	The analysis of stakeholders' needs in the applicant country (installed capacities and capacities to be developed) is/ has been/was carried out on the basis of the active and effective participation of both public and private sectors agents in the national, subnational and local levels. The strategic planning of the results matrix is/has been/ was carried out on the basis of the active and effective participation of both public and private sectors agents in the national, subnational and local levels of partner countries.
	Relevance and knowledge sharing	It is/was possible to observe complementarity between both the capacity needed and installed capacities of the applicant and the technical inputs (knowledge, practices, expertise, technologies) to be shared between the parties. This complementarity reflects (or has been/was reflected) in the strategies of action stipulated in the project (action in the field).
3. ANALYSIS AND APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL	**Indicators of South-South cooperation**	The project proposal was analyzed and approved by each partner, in accordance with their own legal and technical frameworks.
4. IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING	**Horizontality**	Presence of functional and effective tripartite coordination arrangements, and of shared responsibilities in management and technical implementation. Collective ownership in making strategic and technical decisions.
	Multi-stakeholder approach	National/subnational/local private and public actors have actively and effectively participated in decision-making procedures related to project's management and strategic goals (Steering Committee). National/subnational/local private and public actors of the applicant country have actively and effectively participated in the technical implementation of activities in the field (National Technical Team).

STAGES OF THE PROJECT	SSC PRINCIPLES AND MECHANISMS	EXAMPLES OF INDICATORS
	Ownership	Degree of participation and representativeness of national/subnational/local public and private actors (from the applicant partner country) in the strategic and technical implementation of the project. Degree of participation of Brazilian cooperation implementing entities in strategic decision-making. Degree of participation (through consultations) of Brazilian cooperation implementing entities in the project's technical specifications.
5. EVALUATION AND LESSONS LEARNED	Knowledge sharing and capacity development	Presence and execution of an effective strategy of knowledge management within the framework of the project, ensuring effectiveness and relevance of knowledge sharing practices to capacity development.
	Knowledge sharing and capacity development	Has the project been able to generate endogenous development solutions, by observing and promoting ownership, through knowledge sharing, practices, technical expertise and technologies?
	Relevance	Have the contributions of the parties effectively promoted capacity development; and were they therefore relevant to the achievement of the expected outcomes (in accordance with local, national, regional and international goals)?
	Mutual benefits	Does/Has the exchange produce/produced relevant knowledge and learning to the benefit of both parties?
	Lessons learned	Has the project developed and applied South-South cooperation mechanisms and strategies? Have such mechanisms and strategies helped strengthen the effectiveness of South-South cooperation through the adoption of results-oriented instruments, as proposed in the 2009 Nairobi Outcome Document? What are the lessons learned for South-South cooperation in general, and for the achievement of Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) 17?

ANNEX 2 | EXAMPLES OF INDICATORS FOR THE EVALUATION OF KNOWLEDGE SHARING AS PART OF CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES

STAGES OF THE KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT CYCLE IN SOUTH-SOUTH EXCHANGES	EVALUATION FOCUS	EXAMPLES OF INDICATORS FOR THE EVALUATION OF KNOWLEDGE SHARING
DIAGNOSIS OF EXISTING KNOWLEDGE AND KNOWLEDGE TO BE DEVELOPED *(as part of the capacity mapping)*	Process	Have the actors and stakeholders involved in the project been mapped, taking into account the principle of inclusion and participation of South-South cooperation (multistakeholder participation)? Have the knowledge and capacity gaps of the partner country been identified through inclusive and participatory methodologies? Has the existing knowledge and installed capacities of the partner country been identified through inclusive and participatory methodologies? Have the contributions of the external partner (e.g. knowledge, experiences, information, practices, technical expertise, technologies and material contributions) been based on the triple convergence between: - relevance in relation to the partner's capacity gaps; - continuous and timely availability throughout the project cycle, from the identification stage to the conclusion; - complementarity between installed capacities and the capacities to be developed in the partner country, in addition to the potential to catalyze the generation of new knowledge and capacities in partner countries?
ADAPTATION AND USE OF KNOWLEDGE INPUTS	Process	Have the external partner's contributions served as relevant, effective and complementary inputs to the generation of knowledge in the partner country? In other words, were they part of a development strategy aimed at enhancing self-reliance, or have they generated dependence on external supply after the end of the cooperation initiative instead (e.g. patented technologies)? Have the technical inputs shared by the external partner been successfully adapted to the context of the beneficiary partner (by the local actors themselves, with only the support of foreign cooperation agents)? Have the external partner's inputs remained relevant in relation to the capacities to be developed throughout the entire project cycle?

STAGES OF THE KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT CYCLE IN SOUTH-SOUTH EXCHANGES	EVALUATION FOCUS	EXAMPLES OF INDICATORS FOR THE EVALUATION OF KNOWLEDGE SHARING
KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND DISSEMINATION *(Knowledge Exchange)*	**Process**	Active and effective participation of actors and stakeholders in the exchange and implementation of actions (e.g. technical visits, courses, workshops). Have the courses, workshops and other training and exchange services been capable of systematizing knowledge? Have they influenced the improvement of teaching materials (e.g. vocabulary, organization and disposition in a didactic way)? Have the values of inclusion and joint participation in knowledge sharing been observed? Has the principle of horizontality been observed and promoted through the use of collaborative learning methods and the creation of effective spaces of dialogue? Are new knowledges effectively disseminated? Do actors and stakeholders have easy access to them?
GENERATION AND APPLICATION OF THE KNOWLEDGE ACHIEVED	**Process**	Have the prior existing knowledges of the partner country been effectively used as input in the capacity development strategy?
	Results	Has new generated knowledge been integrated into the day-to-day activities of individuals and institutions in the partner country? Adoption of an exit strategy: Were there strategies and measures available to guarantee the continuity of developed capacities after the project conclusion, especially in relation to expertise in conducting new cycles of knowledge-innovation in the medium and long-term? Has the knowledge shared and strengthened during the cooperation initiative resulted in the generation of new processes, practices and techniques in the scope of collective capacities (e.g. communities, organizations)?