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<tr>
<th>Acronyms and Abbreviations</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APWINC</td>
<td>Asia-Pacific Women’s Information Network Centre at Sookmyung Women’s University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPPENAS</td>
<td>Ministry of National Development Planning of Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>OECD’s Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGLC</td>
<td>Canaan Global Leadership Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIST</td>
<td>Gwangju Institute of Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoI</td>
<td>Government of Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPEDC</td>
<td>Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HACT</td>
<td>Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGU-IIEI</td>
<td>Institute of Entrepreneurship and Innovation, Handong Global University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYU</td>
<td>Hanyang University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICD</td>
<td>International Cooperation for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JITC</td>
<td>UNITAR CIFAL Jeju / Jeju International Training Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEMENDESA/MoV</td>
<td>Ministry of Village, Development of Disadvantaged Region and Transmigration, Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRPD</td>
<td>Regional Work Plan, Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>Ministry of Science and ICT of the Republic of Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAM</td>
<td>Non-Aligned Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>National Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Official Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCARO</td>
<td>Regional Cooperative Agreement Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
<td>Research and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoK</td>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoK-UNOSSC Facility</td>
<td>Facility/Programme for Capacity Development for Poverty Reduction through South-South and Triangular Cooperation in Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAP</td>
<td>The UNOSSC's Regional Office for Asia-Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPJMN</td>
<td>National Medium-Term Development Plan, Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPJMD</td>
<td>Medium-Term Regional Development Plan, Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNU-TEMEP</td>
<td>Seoul National University - Technology Management, Economics and Policy Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>South-South Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSTrC</td>
<td>South-South and Triangular Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEPI</td>
<td>Science and Technology Policy Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STI</td>
<td>Science, Technology and Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToTs</td>
<td>Training of Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TrC</td>
<td>Triangular Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>The United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>The United Nations Office for Project Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOSSC</td>
<td>The United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Executive Summary

To promote Triangular Cooperation (TrC) at the political level and make it more effective at the operational level, the 2nd High-Level Meeting of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) established the Global Partnership Initiative on Effective Triangular Co-operation (GPI)\(^1\).

Following its mandate, in March 2019, the GPI issued a set of nine Voluntary Guidelines "to ground the modality in effectiveness and to provide support in implementing impactful projects"\(^2\). The Voluntary Guidelines (presented at Box 1) were advanced throughout a comprehensive consultation process with GPI members and generated a framework to foster the co-creation of development solutions.

**Box 1. Voluntary Guidelines for Effective Triangular Cooperation**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Country ownership and demand-driven cooperation</strong>: Triangular cooperation should be undertaken with the ownership of partner countries and aligned with their national priorities, as well as those of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Shared commitment</strong>: Partners agree to participate and share responsibility with regard to identification, design, implementation, contribution, monitoring, and evaluation;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Focus on results-oriented approaches and solutions</strong>: All partners commit to achieving agreed-upon results, as well as to demonstrating and systematising results;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Inclusive partnerships and multi-stakeholder dialogues</strong>: Responding to the needs and objectives of all parties, partners aim to involve multiple actors with a view to foster knowledge-sharing; and to find sustainable development solutions;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Transparency and mutual accountability</strong>: All partners are accountable for commitments made and agreed. They agree to share information on their triangular cooperation activities in accordance to the standard to enable monitoring, evaluation and accountability;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Innovation and co-creation</strong>: Through new and existing partnerships, intelligent risk-taking, evidence-based policy and programming, technology, and flexible approaches to locally-driven innovative solutions, with a view to improving development results;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Joint-learning and knowledge-sharing for sustainable development</strong>: Through horizontal exchanges and co-creation of development solutions, all partners mutually benefit from sharing their knowledge, capabilities and strengths;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>Advance gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls</strong>: Triangular cooperation should contribute to gender equality in its multiple dimensions as a way to accelerate sustainable development progress;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>Leaving no one behind</strong>: Triangular cooperation furthers inclusive multi-stakeholder partnerships, including those that provide support to the most vulnerable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source**: GPI on Effective Triangular Co-operation. 2019. Voluntary Guidelines for Effective Triangular Cooperation. Available at: https://triangular-cooperation.org/voluntary-guidelines/

The Voluntary Guidelines underpin GPEDC’s Action Area on TrC Work Programme for the 2020-2022 biennium. The Action Area’s work plan intends to "increase instances of implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines" as a way "to build greater awareness of, and mainstream engagement for effective triangular cooperation within the GPEDC network".

Global Affairs Canada commissioned this country study to assess the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines in existing triangular cooperation practices. The study attempts to understand the state of the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines and identify best practices and lessons from one TrC programme selected with South Africa’s Technology Innovation Agency. Two overarching questions framed the enquire:

(i) To what extent do partners engaged in triangular cooperation adopt the Voluntary Guidelines, at both the operational and policy levels? and (b) What practices enable, in fact, the adoption of the Voluntary Guidelines?

The study counted with the support of the Government of Indonesia, throughout its Ministry of National Development Planning (BAPPENAS), which has volunteered to pilot the voluntary guidelines. The selected programme was the Facility for Capacity Development for Poverty Reduction through South-South and Triangular Cooperation in Science and Technology, also known as the RoK-UNOSSC Facility.

The RoK-UNOSSC Facility has a long history that goes back to 2009 when the Republic of Korea (RoK) graduated and became a member of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC/OECD). Its original design was drawn with the support of the UNDP Country Office and the UNOSSC and helped to channel Korea’s ODA, resulting in the Facility’s First Phase (2011-2015).

After successful completion, the programme was continued through a Second Phase (2016-2020) and had a year of extension (2021) due to the rise of the Covid-19 pandemic. The Second Phase adopted an innovative partnership model pivoted and funded by Korea’s Ministry of Science and ICT (MSIT) and was facilitated by the UNOSSC.

The Facility’s coordination was shared among Korea, UNOSSC and beneficiary countries. The Facility has benefited 13 Asian countries, besides Korea itself, through three different components (see Figure 1):

(i) The Knowledge Platform, that was designed to facilitate information and knowledge sharing among participants, develop communities’ capacities, and raise awareness on the Indonesian and Cambodian societies about ICT related topics. The Korean Science and Technology Policy Institute (STEPI), the Seoul National University - Technology Management, Economics and Policy Programme (SNU-TEMEP) and the UNITAR CIFAL Jeju/Jeju International Training Centre (JITC) were responsible for implementing the knowledge platform’s activities.

(ii) Based on Korean’s experience in village development, the Project Consortium component aimed to foster sustainable community development in Cambodia and Indonesia. In the case of Indonesia, the Consortium targeted the Cisolok Subdistrict (Sukabumi District, West Java Province). The consortium component alone mobilised at least six areas led by six Korean institutions: (i) Women & ICT (at APWINC’s leadership); (ii) Smart farming (CGLC); (iii) Safe drinking water (GIST); (iv) Health and sanitation (HYU); (v) Renewable energy (solar panel and biogas) (SNU-ISD); and (vi) Entrepreneurship mindset and skills (HGU-IEI). And


5 Beneficiary countries are Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka and Thailand.
(iii) The **Scaled-up Project**, which intended to upscale a successful project from phase 1: the “Electron Beam Application for Value Addition to Food and Industrial Products and Degradation of Environmental Pollutants”. This component involved the Korea Atomic Energy Research Institute (KAREI) and other national project coordinators that take part at the Regional Cooperative Agreement Regional Office (RCARO). At the country level, Indonesia engaged with the research on the application of chitosan for plant growth promoters, plant elicitor and animal feed supplements, besides training events on radiation processing and polymer modification\(^6\).

**Figure 1.** Phase 2 Implementation Structure

---

With the objective to assess Indonesia’s implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines throughout the RoK-UNOSSC Facility, this study focuses only on the Consortium component, a TrC programme implemented by Korea, the UNOSSC, and the GoI. At the Consortium, partner roles were established in 2018 when the GoI joined the Steering Committee. The UNOSSC undertook the role of facilitator, responsible for financial management, supervision, monitoring, and evaluation of programme implementation and facilitation of the Steering Committee work7.

The pivotal role fell to the Korean MSIT and STEPI. STEPI represented the Ministry in interactions with UNOSSC, coordinated the Korean’s institutions and provided leadership in advising the programme’s implementation under the Indonesian National Development Plan. However, at the Consortium component, coordination meetings in 2019 established the Canaan Global Leadership Centre (CGLG) as the component facilitator.

On the beneficiary side, the GoI’s leadership assured the country ownership of the Programme. BAPPENAS and KEMENDESA were the two institutions mandated for coordinating the implementation at the beneficiary side. While BAPPENAS served as a focal point at the SC, the KEMENDESA was the bridge to Sukabumi district’s implementing offices (West Java Province)8. In Sukabumi, the community development activities were conducted within Cisolok District and included the following communities: Karangpapak, Cikelat, Cikahuripan, Pasir Baru, Cicadas and Wangunsari9. Sharing the coordination, BAPPENAS and KEMENDESA also facilitate the programme implementation at the Sukabumi District by ensuring positive impacts upon village development, especially considering the mobilisation of Indonesian Village Funds.10 Jointly, BAPPENAS and KEMENDESA were able to (i) align the Facility’s projects and activities to national development plans, mainly Indonesia’s Village Innovation Programme (VIP); (ii) facilitate its implementation, bridging Korean’s experts and local governments; (iii) integrate results and outcomes from different sectors; and (iv) communicate (upstream and downstream) problems, challenges, and potential adjustments.

Key Message 1: Strengthening Governance Arrangements – Shared Coordination

At the beneficiary side, Shared Coordination enables its active participation in policy and operational levels weighting its demands, enhancing local ownership, and increasing the partnership legitimacy. At the policy level, beneficiary representation at the TrC project coordination and its active engagement with decision making processes, planning, monitoring and evaluation activities is key to promoting transparency and mutual accountability. At the operational level, shared coordination with line ministries or sectoral agencies may facilitate the integration of TrC activities into national and local development plans ensuring the beneficiary ownership over the programme in its different stages.

Considering the multi-sectoral and cross-institutional nature of the Consortium, the coordination of numerous and heterogeneous stakeholders across various sectors became a significant challenge. In such a context, the leadership of beneficiary partners (BAPPENAS and KEMENDESA) was a critical variable both to integrate results and outcomes from different sectors and to recommend adjustments during the programme implementation.

---

7 While UNOSSC was responsible for budget approval, financial management, and reporting to donors, its Regional Office for the Asia Pacific (ROAP) processed disbursements, prepared progress, monitoring and evaluation reports, and acted as the Secretariat to Steering Committee.
Upstream, while Korea mobilized technical expertise, the UNOSSC made it available for beneficiary countries. The GoI, as a beneficiary, channeled such expertise to national and local levels, feeding the villages development agenda. Downstream, the consortium enabled intersectoral exchanges and knowledge sharing to perform specific tasks or assemble thematic working groups. Korean institutions often partnered with local counterparts to reach local governments and stakeholders, conducting consultations or gathering information on local community systems, villages and schools. Whenever necessary, the CGLC, as the consortium leader, could mobilize other institutions to share their expertise through training activities. Furthermore, the programme enabled the interaction between various institutions from different sectors, including Small and Medium Enterprises (SME) from women farmers and home-based food entrepreneurs.

Key Message 2: Implementation instruments – Multi-Sectoral Consortia as co-creating platforms

Multi-sectoral consortia enabled a complementary dynamic among pivotal and beneficiary agents across policy silos generating a significant exchange of information and knowledge among partners. Furthermore, multi-sectoral teams foster innovation and co-creation. Connecting implementers and beneficiaries, multi-sectoral consortia may create an innovation prone ecosystem where partners could co-create locally-driven development solutions.

The multi-sectoral nature of the programme demanded the co-creation of working groups per component. Thus, each programme component had at least one Korean institution responsible to enhance liaison among other Korean institutions and other partner countries’ players. This structure contributed to maintain, strengthen and/or expand the institutional networks, both on the Korean and the Indonesian side. For example, the CGLC promoted the formation of a local task force that would oversee their project, integrating beneficiaries and local government. Additionally, the Biogas project with SNU-ISD also takes advantage of the consortium partnership with CGLC. Because of CGLC, a learning centre was provided for local farmers, and since activities were taken in the same territory, institutions have coordinated joint activities and workshops, especially on training sessions.

Key Message 3: Generating and Outreaching Knowledge - The Centre of Excellence

In the long-term, Centers of Excellence can build collaboration and trust throughout the years, lowering transactional costs and facilitating the exchange among developing countries. The Indonesian “South-South Centre of Excellence on Village Innovation and Development” is an initiative that could promote knowledge sharing with countries in similar situations. Through a collaboration with UNOSSC, the GoI aims also to pivot initiatives when it comes to Village Innovation and Development, raising its influence and expertise among other development actors.

---

11 At the consortium, six organizations organized themselves into three working groups, considering their technical expertise: GIST (water supply) and Hanyang University (health and hygiene); CGLC (agriculture), SNU-ISD (Biogas) and the Sookmyung Women’s University (Women/ICT); and the Handong Global University (Entrepreneurship and Innovation).
As a programme output, Indonesian government has designed the creation of a “South-South Centre of Excellence on Village Innovation and Development”. This Centre is a result of the leadership coming from Indonesia and its Ministry of Villages. Since 2015, the GoI has been changing its fiscal policy to enhance the Indonesian rural economy through the Village Fund Instrument, a fund that is governed by a regulation of the Ministry of Villages to encourage sustainable village practices by lying “outside of what has traditionally been considered central-to-regional fiscal transfers”12. The main goal is to align the village investments to national blueprints. In this regard, UNOSSC has supported the Ministry to develop a concept note and they are documenting some of the case studies that could be filtered for the Centre creation, by gathering approximately six studies – one of them from the Consortium experience at Sukabumi.

2. Methodological Note

This country study on the Voluntary Guidelines for Effective Triangular Cooperation was designed to answer two questions:

- To what extent do partners engaged in triangular cooperation adopt the Voluntary Guidelines, at both the operational and policy levels?
- What practices enable, in fact, the adoption of the Voluntary Guidelines?

The choice for framing country studies around single programmes or projects presents clear limits. Case studies’ contextual boundaries may turn it impossible to generalise conclusions for the whole set of TrC practices adopted by a given country. Nevertheless, a single project/programme study illuminates what principle or rule guides TrC practices in the field and the meaning they acquire for practitioners. In any case, to avoid the risk of over-generalisation, the research team conducted validation meetings with key stakeholders and the findings and conclusions presented here are submitted to their scrutiny. The case study may provide information and valuable insights on TrC initiatives, contributing to nurture the GPEDC knowledge base. Furthermore, this study aims to identify lessons and provide recommendations for helping partners to streamline the Voluntary Guidelines implementation.

The **Indonesia case study** was built around interviews and desk reviews. The interviews were based on the assessment matrix (see Annex I) and follow-up questions were tailored considering a qualitative perspective on the interviewee’s position within the programme (such as beneficiary, facilitator, pivotal or dual), aiming to supplement the data collected with specific and inductive questions. The desk review comprised both document analysis and literature review. The documents under consideration consisted of Memorandum of Understanding (MoUs), Terms of Reference (ToRs), Minutes of the Meetings (MoMs), monitoring reports, progress reports, reviews, and evaluations or assessments. The literature review supported the general analysis and provided insights on existing TrC ecosystems in the countries targeted.

In this study we adopt the concept of TrC as defined by the Global Partnership Initiative, understanding the modality as a collaboration that requires at least three interchangeable roles being represented, with each partner potentially playing more than one role (see Box 1). Regarding Indonesia’s role at RoK-UNOSSC Facility, we acknowledged that the programme supported the “capacity building of civil servants, academia, community leaders, women entrepreneurs, and youth towards realising the benefits of science and technology application in development through practical technical solutions and mindset transformation”13. During this Second Phase, at least 10 Korean Institutions participated as programme implementers delivering their knowledge and technology to local partners. The RoK-UNOSSC Facility Phase 2 attempted to create

---


synergies among its different components. Two of the three programme components (namely the Knowledge Platform and the Consortium), worked exclusively to support two countries: Cambodia and Indonesia.

Nevertheless, with the objective to assess the engagement with the Voluntary Guidelines throughout TrC initiatives, this study chooses to focus only on the triangulation between Korea, the UNOSSC, and the Government of Indonesia. Additionally, since our objective is to assess Indonesia’s implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines throughout the RoK-UNOSSC Facility, this briefing relies mainly on the second component of the programme: the Consortium between the six projects led by six Korean institutions in Sukabumi District, West Java, Indonesia.

It is worth noting that most of the informants reported that this programme was quite successfully executed in Indonesia, especially when compared to its execution in Cambodia. Since there is no substantial evidence of direct or previously designed exchanges between the two beneficiary countries, the study did not consider the Cambodia counterpart. The choice to focus on the Facility’s Consortium was previously agreed upon in consultation with Indonesia’s National Development Planning Agency (BAPPENAS) and UNOSSC Asia-Pacific Office.

**Box 2. How is the Triangular Cooperation operated?**

According to the Global Partnership Initiative’s website, Triangular Cooperation is a North-South-South development cooperation modality with growing influence. While it was traditionally a government-to-government cooperation model, the contemporary approach recognizes the importance and emergence of private sector, CSOs, philanthropic institutions, academia, and sub-national actors as potential partners.

The TrC mobilizes multiple stakeholders (from the Global North and South), with a qualified involvement in three different roles as described below:

- **Pivotal partner** often has proven experience and shares its resources, knowledge and expertise through triangular co-operation. It can sometimes provide a bridge between South-South and North-South.

- **Facilitating partner** helps to connect countries and organizations to form a triangular partnership and gives financial and/or technical support to the collaboration.

- **Beneficiary partner** seeks support to tackle specific development challenge in line with their national development priorities and needs. It is responsible for ensuring that results are sustainable.

There can be one or more stakeholders in any of these roles, and stakeholders may change roles throughout the implementation of the initiative.

This is a flexible model whereby all partners work together in a horizontally way, being recognized for the value of their distinct expertise and resources. On this modality, stakeholders are better able to share knowledge, often encouraging innovation and co-creation through mutual learning.

**Source:** GPI Website, https://triangular-operation.org/about/
3. The Indonesian Ecosystem for International Development Cooperation

Since the Asian Financial Crisis in the late 1990s, Indonesia has achieved notable economic growth, which made it one of the world’s 10 largest economies. Nonetheless, the country still faces significant development challenges, and to address them, the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals has been adopted through the mainstreaming of indicator and targets within Indonesian National Medium-term Development Plan (RPJMN). The RPJMN 2015-2019 development vision is based on Nawacita, a national program towards development that is also referred to as "the nine visions of hope" and states its goals as: “ensuring the safety of all citizens, developing good governance, developing peripheral regions, reforming law-enforcement agencies, improving the quality of life, increasing productivity and competitiveness, developing strategic sectors of the economy, overhauling the character of the nation, and strengthening the spirit of Indonesia’s ‘unity in diversity’ and social reform”\(^\text{14}\). It was first proposed, operationally, in Indonesia’s "National Medium-Term Development Plan" (RPJMN) 2015-2019 and executed in the latter Government Work Plan (RKP). Furthermore, the SDGs are presented towards its implementation in some documents, among others: Presidential Regulation and Minister for National Development Planning’s Regulation as the legal basis\(^\text{15}\), communication strategy, and SDGs dissemination to all stakeholders. Are also considered by subnational policymakers, as reflected in the Medium-Term Regional Development Plan (RPJMD) and Regional Work Plan (KRPD)\(^\text{16}\).

Indonesia has also integrated principles of international cooperation into its national strategy\(^\text{17}\), having subscribed to international agreed development strategies and partnerships such as the Paris Declaration for Aid Effectiveness, Accra Agenda for Action, and the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation. Beyond their role in G20, the nation is also a member of the list of Official Development Assistance\(^\text{18}\).

Regarding the South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTrC), the country is actively involved in projects that include training, workshops and events, expert dispatch, scholarships, knowledge sharing and equipment.

---


\(^{15}\) REGULATION OF THE MINISTER OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING. Available in: https://www.BAPPENAS.go.id/files/renstra-BAPPENAS/RENSTRA_Bahasainggris-V2.pdf


\(^{17}\) GIZ. Available in: https://www.giz.de/en/worldwide/43007.html

Poverty alleviation, development of small and medium enterprises, health, agriculture, environment, and information and communication technology are the main thematic areas. Indonesia’s main developing partners in SSTrC programs are Tanzania, Namibia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Algeria, and Sudan in Africa; Laos, Nepal, Bangladesh, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Afghanistan, Myanmar, Timor Leste and Cambodia in Asia. The triangular arrangements include developed countries like Germany, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America.

Country Profile

Indonesia is an archipelago nation located between the Indian Ocean and the Pacific Ocean, at the brink of Southeast Asia. The country has more than 300 ethnic groups and 273,523,621 inhabitants (2020) – mostly concentrated in the island of Java –, which makes it the world’s third most populous democracy and largest Muslim-majority nation. It’s a presidential republic administered by President Joko WIDODO, first elected in October 2014 and re-elected in April 2019.

The nation is considered an upper-middle-income country, with a GDP per capita of USD 3,869.588 (2020) and a Gini Index estimated at 0.382. The country also has a Gender Inequality Index of 0.480 and an HDI of 0.718 – however, its inequality-adjusted HDI is 0.590. Indonesia is a global economy – a member of the G-20 and ASEAN Economic Community – whose main economic partners are China, the United States, Japan, Singapore and India. In 2019, their direct foreign investments net inflows are USD 24.994 billion and their outflows USD 4.462 billion.

Sources: World Bank, UNDP and WITS databases.

Over the last couple of years, Indonesia has committed to expanding the funding of SSTrC projects, therefore increasing their scope and number. The country not only raised the tally of activities from 26 in 2014 to 59 in 2018 but also made them more diverse – including government, philanthropy organisations, private sector, academia, civil society entities and media.

Following its commitment to the 2030 Agenda, the GoI also acknowledges the role of multi-stakeholder partnerships (MSP) as a part of its strategic efforts to ensure a “leave no one behind” approach. In that sense, the reinforcement of MSP is considered as an essential mean of implementation that requires “a practical guidance and a wide range of tools to navigate a complex development landscape and to realize the ambitions embedded in the SDGs”. At least three guidelines orient the GoI initiatives to accelerate, localize and implement the 2030 Agenda’s targets. They represent the aim to (i) provide accessible guidance to all stakeholders, (ii) provide a dynamic resource that will inspire stakeholders to build new partnerships and further develop existing partnerships, and (iii) support the capacity building for localizing the SDGs at the local, national and global level.

Therefore, since the launch of the 2030 Agenda, the GoI is striving to implement the SDGs as described in the following documents: National Guidelines for SDGs Action Plans (RAN) 2017-2019; the SDGs Action Plans.

---

23 Idem.
developed by 19 of the 34 provinces (RAD); the SDGs indicators metadata\textsuperscript{24}; the Voluntary National Review of Indonesia (2017)\textsuperscript{25}; and Voluntary National Review of Indonesia (2019)\textsuperscript{26}. An example of it is the mainstreamed of the SDGs into the RPJMN 2015-2019 capturing 94 out of 169 targets\textsuperscript{27}.

BAPPENAS has numerous attributions and acts simultaneously as a policymaking body and think-tank. In terms of organisational structure, the agency consists of Ministry Secretariat, the Head Inspectorate, nine Deputies and five expert staffs to the minister. Bappenas mission is to support the achievement of national development vision in RPJMN 2015-2019: “the realised Indonesia that is sovereign, self-reliant, and having a solid identity, based on the mutual-help (Gotong-Royong) philosophy”. Bappenas align its vision to be a national development planning agency that has quality, synergic and credible. It includes formulating evidence-based policy and upholding good-governance principles. Finally, BAPPENAS has its Priority Program a multi-dimensional vision, covering industrial zones, tourism zones, food security, energy security, maritime and marine matters, connectivity among regions and attainment of the SDGs\textsuperscript{28}. It is important to give attention to the Regulation of the Minister of National Development Planning on the Strategic Plan of the Ministry of National Development Planning/National Development Planning Agency of 2015 – 2019\textsuperscript{29}, which is the document that guides the agency.

Established in 2017 by a Presidential Decree, the SDGs National Coordinator Team (SDGs NCT) has an institutional framework composed of: a Steering Committee, an Implementing Team, a Technical Working Group and an Expert Team. In that context, BAPPENAS is responsible for designing and coordinating the country’s strategy for development cooperation, occupying the position of SDGs Implementing Coordinator in the Steering Committee, which is led by the President of the Republic of Indonesia.

The agency also constitutes the National Coordination Team (NCT) on STStrC – established in 2010 is an initiative that came even before the SDGs NCT – together with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Kemenlu), the Ministry of Finance (Kemenkeu) and the State Secretariat (Kemensetneg)\textsuperscript{30}. Although Indonesian ministries and agencies are able to draft their own cooperation agreements with development partners, the NCT offers support and facilitation to these processes. NCT’s tasks include coordinating programmes, drafting cooperation arrangements with development partners, and monitoring and evaluation\textsuperscript{31}, being the focal point to STStrC initiatives. Other government branches are also involved in specific STStrC projects, such as the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs, Ministry of Public Works and National Population and Family Planning Board (BKKBN). Each ministry and/or agency formulate its five-year strategic plan based on RPJMN, but several other government regulations, national plans and presidential instructions can also guide Indonesia’s IDC\textsuperscript{32}. Beyond the government branch, Indonesia has also tried to involve academia, the private sector and civil organisations to make a holistic STStrC.

27 Idem.
30 OECD. Available in: Indonesia’s Development Co-operation - OECD
32 Available for access in: https://www.BAPPENAS.go.id/files/renstra-BAPPENAS/RENSTRA_Bahasa%20Inggris-V2.pdf
## Table 1. Triangular Cooperation Projects with Indonesia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Project Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Development for Indonesia Village Development Innovation Programme</td>
<td>Indonesia, Korea, UNOSSC</td>
<td>Social Infrastructure and Services</td>
<td>Between USD 1.000.000 and 5.000.000</td>
<td>2016-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia-Africa and Middle East Technical Cooperation Program on Good Governance</td>
<td>United States (USAID Indonesia Office), Indonesia, Gambia, Iraq, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Egypt, Mozambique, Palestine, Sudan, Tunisia, Yemen</td>
<td>Government and Civil Society</td>
<td>&lt; USD 100.000</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Training on Agriculture for Middle East countries</td>
<td>Indonesia, Tanzania, Non-Aligned Movement Centre for Technical Co-operation (NAM CSSTC)</td>
<td>Agriculture and Food Security</td>
<td>&lt; USD 100.000</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Training Workshop on Disaster Risk Management for IORA Member Countries, Southern America and Caribbean Countries</td>
<td>United States, Indonesia, Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Management</td>
<td>&lt; USD 100.000</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Training Workshop on Disaster Risk Management for Southern American Countries</td>
<td>United States, Indonesia, Southern American Countries</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Management</td>
<td>&lt; USD 100.000</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Training Workshop on Quality Control &amp; Management for the Fisheries Industry of Sudan</td>
<td>UNIDO, Indonesia, Sudan</td>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>&lt; USD 100.000</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Workshop on Democracy and Innovation in Good Governance</td>
<td>The United States, Non-Aligned Movement Centre for South-South Technical Cooperation (NAM CSSTC), Transparency International (Indonesia Office), Corruption Watch (Indonesia Office), Indonesia, Egypt, Jordan, Palestine, Iraq, Libya, Tunisia, Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Cambodia, Thailand, Viet Nam, Fiji, Vanuatu, Timor-Leste</td>
<td>Government and Civil Society</td>
<td>&lt; USD 100.000</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Workshop on Democracy and Sharing Experiences between Indonesia and Arab Countries</td>
<td>United States (USAID Indonesia Office), Indonesia, Egypt, Somalia, Sudan, Yemen, Jordan</td>
<td>Government and Civil Society</td>
<td>&lt; USD 100.000</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Workshop on Tourism and Antiquities for Palestine</td>
<td>Indonesia, Palestine, Non-Aligned Movement Centre for Technical Co-operation (NAM CSSTC)</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>&lt; USD 100.000</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse linkage on the Strengthening of Artificial Insemination of Livestock with Suriname</td>
<td>Indonesia, Islamic Development Bank (IsDB), Suriname</td>
<td>Agriculture and Food Security</td>
<td>Between USD 1.000.000 and 5.000.000</td>
<td>2018 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar on Conflict Types and Management</td>
<td>ASEAN Institute for Peace Reconciliation (AIPR), Netherlands, Indonesia, Advisory Board AIPR members</td>
<td>Government and Civil Society</td>
<td>&lt; USD 100.000</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Experiences on Planning and Budgeting Between the Government of the Republic of Indonesia and the Government of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar</td>
<td>Indonesia, Myanmar, Norway, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)</td>
<td>Government and Civil Society</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Indonesia-Morocco-Tunisia Development Cooperation Through Reverse Linkage Programme: Knowledge Sharing on Vaccines Management</td>
<td>Indonesia, Morocco, Tunisia, Islamic Development Bank (IsDB)</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>2018 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Selected Programme: The RoK-UNOSSC Facility

The "Facility/Programme for Capacity Development through South-South and Triangular Cooperation in Science and Technology" (RoK-UNOSSC Facility - Phase 2) was launched in 2016 and was expected to be fully implemented in 2020. Due to the Covid-19, it had a six-month extension and activities were completed in 2021. Nevertheless, the project is still on its handover phase.

Korea, UNDP and UNOSSC implemented the “Facility Phase I” from 2010-2016. Korea’s experience as a South-South cooperation provider underpinned the programme, executed with the structure inherited from the Korea/UNDP South-South project of 2005-2009. With its accession to the DAC in 2010, Korea redesigned the programme, with UNOSSC’s support, as a triangular cooperation initiative. For this programme, Korea is not represented by KOICA, the Korea International Cooperation Agency, but from implementing institutions attached to the Ministry of Science and ICT (MSIT) – which has funded and implemented the RoK-UNOSSC Facility Phase 2 under a direct implementation arrangement with UNOSSC.

The project has 3 components, namely: the Knowledge Platform, the Consortium and the Scaled-up Project.

The Knowledge Platform aims to share Korea’s experience and knowledge throughout (i) the preparation of case studies; (ii) policy support; and (iii) capacity development (see figure 2). Such tasks were led, respectively by the Seoul National University Technology and Economic Management (SNU-TEMEP), Science and Technology Policy Institute (STEPI), and UNITAR CIFAL Jeju (JITC).

Figure 2. Knowledge Platform Group Structure

---

34 See https://www.asia-pacific.unsouthsouth.org/our-work/the-korean-facility/
36 See https://www.asia-pacific.unsouthsouth.org/our-work/the-korean-facility/
The Consortium aims to mobilize Korea’s experience in village development to improve the conditions of life in Cambodia and Indonesia (host countries). The goals asserted for this component were: "holistically transform local communities; integrate the essential expected needs for local communities with agriculture, Women/ICT, Water, Health, Energy and Entrepreneurship; bring innovation to the core of community development with the experience of Korean institutions"\(^3^7\). In Indonesia, BAPPENAS was the project focal point and worked along with two key partners: the Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration (Kemendesa) and the Sukabumi Regency. The project was implemented at the Cisolok Subdistrict, in Sukabumi District, located in West Java Province. According to the 2010 census (OCHA, 2014), 65.69% of the province’s population were living in urban settlements. The consortium also mobilized several local agents in a variety of sectors, namely: Canaan Global Leadership Centre (CGLC) on Agriculture issues; Asia Pacific Women's Information Network Centre (APWINC) of Sookmyung Women’s University (Women/ICT); Gwangju Institute of Science and Technology (GIST) on water issues; Institute for Health and Society, Hanyang University on health issues; Asian Institute for Energy, Environment & Sustainability (AIEES) on energy issues; Institute for Entrepreneurship and Innovation, Handong Global University on entrepreneurship issues (HGU-IEI) \(\text{(see Figure 3)}\).

\(^{37}\) See https://www.asia-pacific.unsouthsouth.org/our-work/the-korean-facility/
The Scaled-up Project’s goals were to "improve the quality of the environment and living conditions of the Asia-Pacific region through facilitation of the application of Electron Beam Technologies; apply Electron Beam for Value Addition to Food and Industrial Products and Degradation of Environmental Pollutants in the Asia Pacific region." The RCA Regional Office implemented the component, drawing upon the "Electron Beam Application for Value Addition to Food and Industrial Products and Degradation of Environmental Pollutants" project (see Figure 4).

Figure 4. Scaled-up Project Structure

---

38 Idem.
39 Idem.
5. Key Findings

At the RoK-UNOSSC Facility, the Government of Indonesia (GoI) has played a **beneficiary role**. Many informants emphasised that the GoI ownership and commitment were critical for the successful implementation of the Facility. Currently, the programme is in its handover stage, with the last output still to be delivered: the South-South Centre of Excellence on Village Innovation and Development. The centre will gather and document six successful case studies that will support Indonesia’s international development cooperation by disseminating its best practices among southern countries.

Based on its previous experiences, the Second Phase of the RoK-UNOSSC Facility established a strategic agenda where the demand-driven approach was highlighted\(^40\). The new agenda included the following guidelines: (i) “building an Innovation Platform, to consolidate the dissemination of knowledge and learning from Phase 1; (ii) eliminating any ‘silo effect’ for the institutions directly involved in poverty reduction by encouraging them to work more effectively in a consortium; (iii) scaling up the projects that had demonstrated excellent results so far; and (iv) selecting partners on a demand-driven basis while selecting the participating Korean Institutions on a competitive basis”\(^41\).

When assessing to what extent the Voluntary Guidelines were being adopted by Indonesia and its development partners at the RoK-UNOSSC Facility, this study could gather the following comprehensive findings.

### A. Country ownership and demand-driven cooperation

| Triangular cooperation should be undertaken with the ownership of partner countries and aligned with their national priorities, as well as those of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. |

In assessing beneficiaries’ ownership of the Facility, we referred to (i) the GoI engagement and leadership in all phases of the programme; (ii) the level of engagement of local beneficiaries.

Such understanding suggested the following assessment questions:

- If and how beneficiary countries were involved in the conceptualization of the project?
- How were beneficiary countries engaged with the different stages of the project implementation?
- Was the project consistent with the government strategies?
- Was the implementation process flexible and adaptable to local needs?
- Did the project facilitate the exchange with other sectors or areas beyond its original scope?

**The GoI’s leadership assured the country ownership of the Programme.** Jointly, BAPPENAS and KEMENDESA were able to (i) align the Facility’s projects and activities to national development plans, mainly Indonesia’s Village Innovation Programme (VIP); (ii) facilitate its implementation, bridging Korean’s experts and local governments; (iii) integrate results and outcomes from different sectors; and (iv) communicate (upstream and downstream) problems, challenges, and potential adjustments.

A1 The RoK’s MSIT, STEPI and UNOSSC led the programme design. Following the guidelines for the 2\(^{nd}\) phase, the UNOSSC surveyed countries in the region, identifying their demands. Through the survey, Indonesia was pre-selected as a beneficiary partner. The SC conducted further consultations with the GoI counterparts (BAPPENAS and KEMENDESA) before the final confirmation (2018). Meanwhile, on the

---


pivotal side, implementing Korean institutions were selected on a competitive basis to match the GoI’s demands.

A2 Initially composed of the RoK’s MSIT, STEPI and UNOSSC, the SC was responsible for designing the framework. As far as beneficiary countries were selected, the SC was enlarged, sheltering these new partners. The GoI joined the consortium in 2018 and became part of SC in the following year. **GoI’s seat at the SC strengthened its ability to align the programme to national development plans and** enabled the mobilization of domestic resources (Village Fund / Dana Desa) to further support village development through science, technology, and innovation.

A3 Considering the cross-sectorial and cross-institutional nature of the Consortium, the coordination of numerous and heterogeneous stakeholders across various sectors became a significant challenge. In such a context, the leadership of beneficiary partners (BAPPENAS and KEMENDESA), as suggested by many informants, was a critical variable both to integrate results and outcomes from different sectors and to recommend adjustments during the programme implementation.

A4 The programme implementation was flexible and adaptable to local needs and conditions. Even joining the consortium only when its framework was already designed, informants reported that, after getting its seat at the SC, the GoI suggested changes and adjustments in the Facility’s activities. According to these informants, the **SC workshops were critical opportunities for communicating problems, presenting alternatives and adjustment proposals.**

A5 Finally, the programme enabled the interaction between various institutions from different sectors, including Small and Medium Enterprises (SME). Furthermore, implementing and beneficiary institutions enhanced their efforts with the Governments to launch a pilot project in Sukabumi, aligned to Indonesia’s Village Innovation Programme (VIP). Their efforts resulted in the Indonesian commitment to establish a **Centre of Excellence on Village Development and Innovation at Sukabumi District**, which aims to share the lessons learned, in terms of policy, strategy, know-how and practical experiences, with other countries in the Global South.\(^42\)

**B. Shared Commitments**

| Partners agree to participate and share responsibility with regard to identification, design, implementation, contribution, monitoring, and evaluation. |

While assessing the shared commitments among the Facility partners, we aimed to identify their roles and contributions along the programme cycle and raised the following questions:

- What was the contribution and value-added by each partner to the design, implementation, and evaluation of this project?
- How do partners coordinate their activities?
- How do partners manage the resources?
- How is knowledge circulated among partners?

**The consortium enabled a complementary dynamic among projects generating a significant exchange of information and knowledge among partners.** On the pivotal side, the Korean MIST provided funds and, on its behalf, STEPI mobilized and coordinated Korean implementer institutions. As the facilitator, UNOSSC supported the SC, managed the programme funds and, finally, monitored and evaluated its activities. At the
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Beneficiary side, BAPPENAS represented the GoI at the SC while KEMENDESA facilitated the implementation at the local level.

B1 Reports estimate the Korean contribution for the programme at USD 3,829,547.40 (for 2016 to 2020)\(^{43}\). The UNOSSC was responsible for the programme's financial management. During this period, it had disbursed resources to implementing institutions through instalments of USD 330,000.00\(^{44}\).

Partner roles were established in 2018 when the GoI joined the consortium. The UNOSSC undertook the role of facilitator, responsible for financial management, supervision, monitoring, and evaluation of programme implementation and facilitation of the Steering Committee work\(^{45}\). The pivotal role fell to RoK’s MSIT, represented in the programme by STEPI. STEPI represented MSIT in interactions with UNOSSC, coordinated the Korean’s institutions and provided leadership in advising the programme’s implementation under the Indonesian National Development Plan. BAPPENAS and KEMENDESA were the two institutions mandated for coordinating the implementation at the beneficiary side. While BAPPENAS served as a focal point at the SC, the KEMENDESA was the bridge to Sukabumi district’s implementing offices (West Java Province)\(^{46}\). In Sukabumi, the community development activities were conducted within Cisolok District and included the following communities: Karangpapak, Cikelat, Cikahuripan, Pasir Baru, Cicadas and Wangunsari\(^{47}\). Together BAPPENAS and KEMENDESA facilitate the programme implementation at the Sukabumi District and ensure positive impacts upon village development, especially considering the mobilisation of Indonesian Village Funds\(^{48}\).

B3 UNOSSC switched from the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) to adopt the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT)\(^{49}\) during the project cycle. Although UNOSSC provided a training session on the HACT approach to its personnel and the Korean institutions, most partners reported delays in disbursements and related activities at the programme first quarter due to the new financial and accounting mechanism. Nevertheless, HACT allowed other stakeholders to follow and review targeted activities beyond this adjustment phase, enhancing coordination. Furthermore, with the new reporting system, implementing institutions could "document their project activities reflecting progress achieved and challenges faced while planning for upcoming initiatives incorporating lessons learned from the quarter"\(^{50}\). UNOSSC also monitored the Facility with the support of both local and central government counterparts, "through field visits and spot checks; review meetings, evaluation and visibility throughout 2019"\(^{51}\). Only in 2019, Indonesia had received at least three visits from the UNOSSC\(^{52}\).

B4 The Consortium Group was responsible for enhancing "the quality of life for all community members (civil servants, farmers, women, youth, etc.) by strengthening multidisciplinary capacities to create inclusive and sustainable villages"\(^{53}\). Although STEPI had the role in coordinating Korean institutions at the

---


\(^{44}\) See *Minutes of the Meeting*. Jakarta, Indonesia, 2018, p. 4. wasn’t any data found about 2021 expenditure, but the 2019 Annual Report (published in August 2020) declared that with the advent of COVID-19, "the resource cuts have not affected the achievement of outputs" (See UNOSSC; STEPI. *Annual Report 2019*. The RoK-UNOSSC Facility Phase 2. August 2020, p. 18).

\(^{45}\) While UNOSSC was responsible for budget approval, financial management, and reporting to donors, its Regional Office for the Asia Pacific (ROAP) processed disbursements, prepared progress, monitoring and evaluation reports, and acted as the Secretariat to Steering Committee.


\(^{48}\) See *Minutes of the Meeting*. Jakarta, Indonesia, 2018.


\(^{51}\) Idem.


programme level, at the consortium, the CGLG served "as the project facilitator to enhance liaison among Korean institutions and other partner countries' players" until early 2019. In this context, a systematic communication framework was developed around key national and local development policy, as Indonesia's Regional Medium-term Development Plan (2020-2024), to "avoid miscommunications and better assess needs of the local communities that are also aligned with national priorities."

Despite initial difficulties (see A2), all the six implementing institutions could design and adjust their projects in consultation with local partners, jointly establishing their roles and the scope of their participation. These institutions worked together to identify target communities, modalities, and management procedures during the implementation. Informants reported that different groups could meet and comment on each other projects during evaluation.

According to informants and the documentation available, the consortium enabled a complementary dynamic among projects generating a significant exchange of information and knowledge among partners. In Karangpapak village, the SNU-ISD's Biogas facility used waste from goats raised in CGLC model farm; at least in three schools, GIST's purified drinking water system was installed together with the HYU's sanitation programmes, and through their projects, the community had access to safe water, resulting in the improvement of their health condition. In Cikelat village, APWINC's women entrepreneurs association could "focus on marketing approaches using ICT and social media platforms for better product package and promotion." Finally, in Sukabumi, the GoI determined the creation of the Centre of Excellence on Village Development and Innovation. The Centre will draw upon the experiences and lessons learned from the Facility integrating the knowledge produced into a toolkit. The Centre will aim to showcase the Facility's successful projects, the lessons learnt, and the monitoring and evaluation indicators on the village's development programmes. The Centre of Excellence is the last and remaining output to be delivered.

Evaluation reports and informants assert in unison that the support of governments (national and local) is paramount for the success and sustainability of the projects. That is why informants considered a "common understanding" and the government's effective support from the onset as "absolutely necessary." In the absence of such common ground, partners should endeavour to attain effective government buy-in. In the consortium case, implementers engaged either with governments or community organisations with similar missions and goals. In the former case, institutions brought government officials to project sites, presented results and impacts on villages and households and engaged with local policies. In the latter, they worked with local organisations to identify beneficiaries and use local systems.

C. Focus on results-oriented approaches and solutions

All partners commit to achieving agreed upon results, as well as to demonstrating and systematizing results. The research team assessed the use of results-oriented approaches at the Facility design and implementation throughout the following questions:

- How does the project record its activities and assess their impact?
- How do partners assess and address the project risks?

---

58 Idem.
59 Idem.
Did the Covid-19 pandemic affect the project implementation and results?
How were the results used to drive country ownership?

The partners jointly established common goals and solutions. Through the implementation phase, all stakeholders were involved, and a series of monitoring, evaluation and planning exercises were conducted annually, helping partners to achieve expected results. Stakeholders at the local level were also considered since the Consortium component also established an agreement with the Government of Sukabumi to synergize the implementation of activities.

C1 The RoK-UNOSSC Facility Phase 2 was not designed through a logical framework or a theory of change, which constrains evaluation activities, particularly impact assessments. The absence of such a framework limits the assessment to the output level rather than outcomes. According to the mid-term evaluation, the lack of logical frameworks is due to the "pilot nature of the project and its need for an iterative and responsive process which the Platform Group should document to facilitate adaptation of methodology"60. Partners also had identified that such a framework would help design the third phase, especially if based on the lessons learned in Phase 2.

C2 Despite these limits, mid-term evaluations, annual reports, regular workshops and field visits conducted by UNOSSC helped monitor the programme activities and reflect on its achievements. Furthermore, the workshops helped delineate tasks, coordinate different initiatives, and ensure that the projects would achieve their intended results. Informants highlighted how all those activities also assured the participation of the local government at the Sukabumi District, preserving the maintenance of a strong channel of communication between different stakeholders at different levels. As the 2019 Annual Report emphasised, the full-day workshops in Indonesia gathered all partners together and turned their attention to planning the annual village’s development work plans. With meetings coordinated between BAPPENAS, KEMENDESA and the implementing Korean institutions, the workshops produced the review of lessons learnt from 2018 activities and recommendations for a joint work plan for the following year61. It also provided an open space to (i) allow the GoI to express their expectations and needs to the implementing institutions and (ii) clarify the organisations’ roles and implementation structure among the distinct partners involved.

C3 Since this project had many stakeholders, objectives, and target countries, the SC identified, anticipated, and addressed risks. Among the risks considered were (i) the fear that the variety of institutions could generate a challenging environment; (ii) the lack of experience, for some institutions, to work on the selected countries; (iii) the re-design of activities with the late entrance of beneficiaries into the Facility62; (iv) the short-term for the implementation63; (v) eventual changes on personnel64; (vi) budgetary constraints, after the Republic of Korea’s cut of its own pledges; and (vii) the lack of engagement of direct beneficiaries.

C4 To overcome some of these challenges, all projects had to offer affordable and straightforward solutions to solve the risk of unsustainable maintenance after completion. As informants have reported, from 2020 until 2021, with the Covid-19 outbreak, the remaining activities were handled online. At this period, most of the projects were finished, and the KEMENDESA also seconded two staff members to work together with UNOSSC in the mission to support the Centre of Excellence initiative. This evidence shows how the GoI has been committed to this programme implementation in a very well-organised, active way.

63 Idem.
D. Inclusive partnerships and multi-stakeholder dialogues

Responding to the needs and objectives of all parties, partners aim to involve multiple actors with a view to foster knowledge-sharing; and to find sustainable development solutions.

Partnership’s inclusivity was assessed considering decision making and communication procedures, through the following questions:

- Which actors are involved in the decision-making and consultation processes?
- Does the project contribute to maintaining, strengthening or expanding partners’ institutional networks?

Beyond the SC coordination procedures, implementing institutions created alternative routes to facilitate communication on the ground. Several channels were created to enhance participation: workshops, task forces and learning activities.

D1 The RoK-UNOSSC Facility is a complex programme and, due to the wide variety of stakeholders involved, had to face a series of coordination and communication challenges. The programme's coordination was distributed across its components and leading institutions: STEPI headed the knowledge platform, CGCL, the Consortium, and RCARO, the scale-up project. The UNOSSC took the administrative coordination, while local coordination relied on beneficiary governments, which, in the case of Indonesia, was represented by the BAPPENAS. The Facility established firmer cooperation among stakeholders through annual development work plans for Indonesia's villages to follow up the STI capacity building plan and ensure a feasible timeframe.

D2 Several types of channels were created to enhance communication. There were joint workshops where participating institutions could share their progress, experiences and demands. Furthermore, Korean Institutions met twice a year and the Steering Committee to exchange partners' ideas at least once. Through these channels, partners could adopt the necessary adjustments for securing the programme implementation, especially considering that the implementing institutions were not represented in the SC or included in the whole design process. Beyond the SC coordination process, implementing institutions created alternative routes to facilitate communication on the ground.

D3 The programme contributed to maintaining, strengthening and even expanding participants' institutional networks. On the Indonesian side, the programme was implemented using the Multi-Stakeholder Partnership (MSP) approach, relying on three main principles: namely convergence of interest, complementarity of resource, and shared value. Downstream, all the consortium institutions reported establishing connections with local governments and communities. The following activities are examples of such ties: (i) the CGLC promoted the formation of a local task force that would oversee their project65; (ii) the Biogas project with SNU-ISD also took advantage of the consortium partnership with CGLC; (iii) a learning centre for local farmers was created, where consortium institutions coordinated joint activities and training sessions.

65 The creation of the task-force was evaluated by the beneficiaries as a sustainable and self-supported measure, "where teamwork would be stronger rather than relying on a single staff member or coordinator from the organisation". See UNOSSC; MSIT. Mid-term Evaluation Report. The RoK-UNOSSC Facility Phase 2. January 2019, p.16.
UNOSSC is working, with BAPPENAS and KEMENDESA, on an exit strategy, setting up a South-South Centre of Excellence on Village Innovation and Development. But due to the KEMENDESA administrative restructuring, BAPPENAS is taking the lead on the GoI side to keep working directly on villages necessities.

E. Transparency and mutual accountability

All partners are accountable for commitments made and agreed. They agree to share information on their triangular cooperation activities in accordance to the standard to enable monitoring, evaluation and accountability.

In assessing transparency and mutual accountability, we referred to (i) reporting, monitoring and evaluation practices; and (ii) the level of engagement of partners. Such understanding suggested the following assessment questions:

- How have partners engaged with monitoring and evaluation activities during the project cycle?
- Does the project have a potential for self-financing?

Partners active participation at the SC and monitoring, evaluation and planning activities enhanced the programme transparency and contributed to keeping partners accountable.

E1 Although the phase 2 implementation started from bilateral exchanges between Korea and UNOSSC, the third SC’s meeting, in August 2019, “made important decisions including formally adding representatives of Cambodia and Indonesia into the Steering Committee membership”\(^66\). Representatives from both countries kept their positions at the SC until the end of the programme implementation. From informants’ perspective, the formality did not affect the Indonesian engagement, since the GoI was already very active and interested in discussing the implementation process. The same could not be affirmed regarding Cambodia participation.

E2 The GoI confidence in its partners at the Facility seems to be evident. On the one hand, KEMENDESA co-designed with partners village’s development plans, incorporating the technology available at the Facility. On the other hand, BAPPENAS has demonstrated a strong interest in continuing the partnership through a Third Phase whenever possible and set up a South-South Centre of Excellence on Village Innovation and Development. Since the agreement signature, the GoI expectation was that the programme could generate a toolkit for monitoring and evaluating the Village Development Programme to replicate it to other regions inside the country in future initiatives\(^67\).

E3 Since the Mid-term (2019) and Annual Evaluation (2020) were conducted, the partners could enjoy better communication and collaboration, which was crucial to overcoming challenges such as the funding disbursement procedures and their consequent delays\(^68\). At the time, the biggest impact was on those institutions that were unable to wait for the disbursement, and that had to borrow money in advance, increasing transactional costs\(^69\). Furthermore, the budget was divided into four payments to be released


annually. The mid-term report and the informants stressed the difficulties that implementing institutions faced with financial management.

F. Innovation and co-creation

| Through new and existing partnerships, intelligent risk-taking, evidence-based policy and programming, technology, and flexible approaches to locally-driven innovative solutions, with a view to improving development results. |

While assessing such guidelines, the research team will try to understand whether and how the project enables co-creative arrangements towards locally-driven innovative development solutions. Such assessment includes the following questions:

- Which innovations were created along the project cycle?
- Which expertise has been brought in by partners to create innovative solutions?
- Are the project’s components easily added and complemented by each partners’ expertise?

The Consortium’s multisectoral structure and its ability to connect pivotal and beneficiary partners generated an innovation prone ecosystem, where each partner could contribute to producing locally driven solutions according to its capacities.

F1 Informants suggested that the most innovative solution was the consortium itself. As a partner from Korea summed up: "I don't think it is enough to be innovative, but it was pretty innovative working together with different institutions with backgrounds from different sectors: health, women, ICT". The consortium created an innovation prone ecosystem where each partner could contribute to producing locally driven solutions according to its capacities.

F2 Upstream, while Korea mobilized technical expertise, the UNOSSC made it available for beneficiary countries. The GoI, as a beneficiary, channelled such expertise to national and local levels, feeding the villages development agenda.

F3 Downstream, the consortium enabled intersectoral exchanges and knowledge sharing to perform specific tasks or assemble thematic working groups. Korean institutions often partnered with local counterparts to reach local governments and stakeholders, conducting consultations or gathering information on local community systems, villages and schools. Furthermore, whenever necessary, the CGLC, as the consortium leader, could mobilize other institutions to share their expertise through training activities.

F4 The South-South Centre of Excellence on Village Innovation and Development project is a noteworthy innovation in the making. The GoI, through BAPPENAS and KEMENDESA, leads the project with UNOSSC’s support. It aims to disseminate Indonesia’s village innovation experiences (including those of the Facility) to other developing countries.

---

70 At the consortium, six organizations organized themselves into three working groups, considering their technical expertise: GIST (water supply) and Hanyang University (health and hygiene); CGLC (agriculture), SNU-ISD (Biogas) and the Sookmyung Women’s University (Women/ICT); and the Handong Global University (Entrepreneurship and Innovation)
G. Joint-learning and knowledge-sharing for sustainable development

Through horizontal exchanges and co-creation of development solutions, all partners mutually benefit from sharing their knowledge, capabilities and strengths.

Joint-learning and knowledge-sharing assessment refer to the project's abilities to enable peer learning, facilitate exchanges between partners and disseminate lessons beyond the original partnership. Assessment questions include:

- Does the program facilitate knowledge exchanges and joint learning processes?
- Does the program help to disseminate local experiences and good practices at the regional or global level?
- Does the program impact the ways triangular cooperation is designed or implemented?

The Consortium yielded a prolific environment for knowledge exchange between pivotal and beneficiary partners. Yet, as demonstrated in a few cases, the programme could also facilitate exchanges among beneficiaries. The GoI has conceptualized a centre of excellence to systematize and share the lessons learned with the Facility among other developing countries. UNOSSC supported the dissemination of lessons learned at various international events.

G1 During the implementation, Indonesian villages were able to adjust the project to their own needs. That was how the Biogas project, led by the SNU-ISD, was scaled to a bigger size expanding its uses beyond the original scope. Besides improving their cooking, the biogas was also used to provide lighting in the streets. According to an informant report, looking at the results achieved at Karangpapak, neighbouring villages are also studying the implementation of the biogas relying on their budget.

G2 According to the Mid-term Evaluation Report, for the Consortium and Platform members, the value added by the Facility was the fact that "They could learn from other members of their respective groups and achieve goals that would not have been possible".

G3 Even though Cambodia and Indonesia were Facility's beneficiaries, they had only a few contacts during the implementation. Nevertheless, Indonesia wanted to share their experiences with Cambodia, especially for the Platform and Consortium components. This initiative was aligned with the Indonesian International Development Framework, the Mid-Term Development Plan and the National Village Act/Village Fund.

G4 The programme offered one training session for community leaders from both beneficiaries countries. Despite the difficulties, such a session generated an opportunity for knowledge exchange among beneficiaries: "Even though there is a language barrier because the community leaders cannot speak English very well, they can speak a little. They could use the Google translator, so they shared what they were doing and how (...) they did. (Korean informant)"

G5 The GoI has conceptualised a Centre of Excellence to document their case studies and good experiences to help other southern countries work with intergovernmental organisations on growth development in rural villages. Regarding this matter, the UNOSSC has flagged that they could extend their support to Indonesia in pursuing new funds for the Centre of Excellence.

G6 In terms of the exchanges promoted with UNOSSC support, many side events were organised at different global initiatives, with the aim to outreach the Facility experience. The RoK-UNOSSC Facility experience

---

was presented at many events, such as (i) the Global South-South Development Expo in 2018; (ii) the BAPA +40, in 2019; and (iii) the High-Level Committee on South-South Cooperation under the UN General Assembly (at the core of Korea’s Permanent Mission to the UN).

H. Advance gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls

Triangular cooperation should contribute to gender equality in its multiple dimensions as a way to accelerate sustainable development progress.

Advance gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls was assessed considering beneficiary groups and expected outcomes, through the following questions:

- Does the program have girls and women as beneficiaries?
- Does the program improve girls and women’s living conditions?

Even though the Consortium has successfully implemented one project on entrepreneurship for women, the programme did not mainstream gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls across its multiple projects.

H1 Within the Consortium, only one project had women and girls as beneficiaries. The project jointly conducted by APWINC and CGLC aims at disseminating an entrepreneurship culture among women with the support of ICT. Entrepreneurship activities and ICT training for farmers and home-based food entrepreneurs were directed to women and achieved nearly 50% of their participation, configuring a real effort to empower women and girls.

H2 However, the other projects under the Consortium did not have activities designed to focus on gender equality or mitigate existing inequalities. As a result, women participation was not always secured. The programme did not mainstream across multiple projects, instruments or procedures to promote gender equality and empower women and girls. Hence, even generating improvements in people’s quality of life, including women and girls, the Consortium did not tackle structural gender inequalities.

H3 The project conducted by APWINC and CGLC generated visible outputs. In 2019, their efforts spearheaded an integrated pilot project to train women farmers to produce and process agricultural products. As a result, “the women entrepreneurs under the Project received the Food Production Certificate (Home Industry) from the local government (Sukabumi Regency, West Java) legally allowing them to manufacture home-made food within the national safety and nutrition standards” 72. Such achievement increased the visibility and credibility of their products, allowing them to sell in local supermarkets 73. At the Cikelat Village, APWINC’s women entrepreneurs’ association also “focused on marketing approaches using ICT and social media platforms for better product package and promotion” 74. In that sense, the two institutions successfully linked their projects for providing proper technology and promoting entrepreneurship and ICT among women.

74 Idem.
I. Leaving no one behind

Triangular cooperation furthers inclusive multistakeholder partnerships, including those that provide support to the most vulnerable.

While assessing Leaving no one behind, we aimed to identify the project impacts upon the most vulnerable and raised the following questions:

- Does the project impact/improve the lives of the most vulnerable and underprivileged people?
- Does the program/project offer actionable knowledge and practices to achieve the UN's Sustainable Development Goals?
- Do you see a way in which the program/project could help to reach regional and global Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)?

Since its design, the Facility has embedded the SDGs in its expected outcomes. The Consortium’s multi-sector structure fed into Indonesia’s Villages development plans, supporting vulnerable communities. However, there is neither information about the programme’s impacts on the most vulnerable nor its contribution to achieving the SDGs.

I1 The Facility involved many sectors that aimed to tackle water problems, food issues, energy, health, entrepreneurship, education and women’s partnership in rural areas. In that sense, the programme activities mobilized different sectors to feed into Indonesia’s Villages development plans, reaching vulnerable communities.

I2 The Sustainable Development Goals were foreseen in the Facility’s design, with both the Consortium and Platform components aiming “to deliver project outcomes aligned with local and national policies and plans in Cambodia and Indonesia, which in the long run will contribute to achieving SDGs”. However, although some results directly relate to the SDGs and their targets, most of the institutions involved could not inform precisely how they measure their contribution to the 2030 Agenda implementation.

---

6. Lessons Learned

The **RoK-UNOSSC Facility** is a vast and complex programme. It is a systematic transfer of Korea’s bilateral ODA to other 13 countries in the Asia-Pacific region. Within the Facility, the Consortium component enabled a triangular partnership among the Korea, the UNOSSC and the GoI.

As the consortium was launched in 2016, **no partner could adopt the Voluntary Guidelines for effective TrC**. Nevertheless, as the findings presented above indicated, the GoI’s engagement as a beneficiary in such a triangular arrangement **in practice adopted most of the nine Voluntary Guidelines**.

Moreover, regarding four guidelines\(^{76}\), the GoI and its partners adopted a series of procedures that can illuminate the road ahead for the Voluntary Guidelines implementation by development partners.

The following lessons (see Table 2), learned while assessing the ROK-UNOSSC Facility experience, may pave the way for mainstreaming the Voluntary Guidelines.

---

\(^{76}\) Namely, “Country ownership and demand-driven cooperation”, “Shared Commitments”, “Innovation and co-creation”, and “Joint-learning and knowledge-sharing for sustainable development"
### Table 2. Key Findings and Lessons Learned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voluntary Guideline</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>Lessons Learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country ownership and demand-driven cooperation</strong></td>
<td>The GoI’s leadership assured the country ownership of the Programme. Jointly, BAPPENAS and KEMENDESA were able to (i) align the Facility’s projects and activities to national development plans, mainly Indonesia’s Village Innovation Programme (VIP); (ii) facilitate its implementation, bridging RoK’s experts and local governments; (iii) integrate results and outcomes from different sectors; and (iv) communicate (upstream and downstream) problems, challenges, and potential adjustments.</td>
<td>#1. Integration of TrC programme activities into national and local development plans ensures ownership. #2. On the beneficiary side, shared coordination with the involvement of a line ministry or equivalent may reinforce the programme demand-driven orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Commitments</strong></td>
<td>On the pivotal side, the Korean MIST provided funds and, on its behalf, STEPI mobilized and coordinated Korean implementer institutions. As the facilitator, UNOSSC supported the SC, managed the programme funds and, finally, monitored and evaluated its activities. At the Beneficiary side, BAPPENAS represented the GoI at the SC while KEMENDESA facilitated the implementation at the local level. The consortium enabled a complementary dynamic among projects generating a significant exchange of information and knowledge among partners.</td>
<td>#3. The proper support of partner governments, manifested in a transparent distribution of responsibilities, is paramount for the success and sustainability of projects. #4. Inclusive programme coordination creates opportunities for communicating problems, presenting alternatives, and adjusting proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus on results-oriented approaches and solutions</strong></td>
<td>The partners jointly established common goals and solutions. Through the implementation phase, all stakeholders were involved, and a series of monitoring, evaluation and planning exercises were conducted annually, helping partners to achieve expected results. Stakeholders at the local level were also considered since the Consortium component also established an agreement with the Government of Sukabumi to synergize the implementation of activities.</td>
<td>#5. Monitoring, evaluation, and planning activities are essential to keep partners’ focus on achieving planned results. When conducted in an inclusive and participative way, these activities create opportunities for identifying challenges, promoting adjustments, and finding development solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusive partnerships and multi-stakeholder dialogues</strong></td>
<td>Beyond the SC coordination procedures, implementing institutions created alternative routes to facilitate communication on the ground. Several channels were created to enhance participation: workshops, task forces and learning activities.</td>
<td>#6. Effective coordination of implementing and beneficiary teams and liaisons between them enables a co-creative dynamic driven by the beneficiary’s demands. #7. Monitoring, evaluation and planning activities enhanced the programme transparency and contributed to keeping partners accountable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transparency and mutual accountability</strong></td>
<td>Partners active participation at the SC and monitoring, evaluation and planning activities enhanced the programme transparency and contributed to keeping partners accountable.</td>
<td>#8. Beneficiary representation at the TrC project coordination and its active engagement with planning, implementation, and evaluation is key to promoting transparency and mutual accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation and co-creation</strong></td>
<td>The Consortium’s multisectoral structure and its ability to connect pivotal and beneficiary partners generated an innovation prone ecosystem where each partner could contribute to producing locally driven solutions according to its capacities.</td>
<td>#9. Multisectoral teams connecting implementers and beneficiaries may create an innovation prone ecosystem where each partner could produce locally driven solutions according to its capacities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint-learning and knowledge-sharing for sustainable development</strong></td>
<td>The Consortium yielded a prolific environment for knowledge exchange between pivotal and beneficiary partners. Yet, as demonstrated in a few cases, the programme could also facilitate exchanges among beneficiaries. The GoI has conceptualized a centre of excellence to systematize and share the lessons learned with the Facility among other developing countries. UNOSSC supported the dissemination of lessons learned at various international events.</td>
<td>#10. In the case of multiple beneficiaries, the project can benefit from exchanging knowledge and experiences. #11. When systematized, the beneficiary can disseminate local experiences among developing countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls</td>
<td>At the Consortium level, the implementation of entrepreneurship activities and ICT training for farmers and home-based food entrepreneurs were directed to women and achieved nearly 50% of their participation, configuring a real effort to empower women and girls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving no one behind</td>
<td>Since its design, the Facility has embedded the SDGs in its expected outcomes. The Consortium’s multi-sector structure fed into Indonesia’s Villages development plans, supporting vulnerable communities. However, there is neither information about the programme’s impacts on the most vulnerable nor its contribution to achieving the SDGs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#12. At the Consortium level, the implementation of entrepreneurship activities and ICT training for farmers and home-based food entrepreneurs were directed to women and it configured a real effort to empower women and girls. The GoI already mainstreamed SDGs indicators and targets within its RPJMN. TrC partners must then also mainstream their commitment to gender equality as a cross-cutting guideline and integral part of all projects.

#13. Evaluation processes must incorporate gender-equality concerns into the evaluation criteria.

#14. TrC projects should maintain and reinforce their outcomes in light of the SDGs and their targets.

#15. Beyond engaging with various stakeholders including the local communities, whenever possible, TrC projects should incorporate QGGAD (five disaggregations – income Quintile, Gender, Geography, Age and Disability) along the project cycle - from design to evaluation).
### Annex I. Assessment Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voluntary Guidelines</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Country ownership and demand-driven cooperation** | 1. How did the program/project idea come about? How was the program/project conceived?  
2. When/in which phase of the program/project did you/your institution get involved?  
3. What role did your institution/organisation play in this program/project? [Beneficiary/Pivotal/Facilitator - If you choose more than one, please justify.]  
4. Was the program/project consistent with the government strategies? [Yes/No - Give examples.]  
5. Was the implementation process adaptable and flexible to local needs? [Yes/No - Give examples.]  
6. Did the project facilitate exchanges with other sectors/areas beyond its original scope? Which areas? |
| **Shared Commitments** | 7. How did your institution contribute to the program/project?  
8. Were there any budgetary gaps? [Yes/No - Give examples.]  
9. How were the resources managed? Were there any coordination mechanisms (i.e., Steering Committee/Supervisory board etc.)?  
10. What was the value added by each partner to the design, implementation and evaluation of this program/project?  
11. Did your institution seek to get advice and/or transfer of knowledge from other partners? Did the other partners seek the same from your institution? [Yes/No - Give an example] |
| **Transparency and mutual accountability** | 12. Did your institution mobilise resources to monitor and evaluate the program/project's activities? [Yes/No - How much was mobilised?]  
13. Does the program/project have a potential for self-financing?  
14. Do you think this program/project could be scaled up? [Yes/No - If yes, is the cost of scaling up low? Here, consider financial contribution but also transactional costs.] |
| **Focus on results-oriented approaches and solutions** | 15. Did the program/project record its impact? How?  
16. Is impact easily attributed to the program/project?  
17. Were the impacts assessed / will they be assessed in the near future?  
18. How did the partners assess the program/project risks?  
19. Did the Covid-19 pandemic affect the program/project implementation and results? How? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusive partnerships and multi-stakeholder dialogues</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>How did the partners develop and communicate the project’s decisions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>How many actors are involved in the decision-making processes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>How many decision points are required for implementing the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>How many agents take part in implementing the project and need to be consulted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Does the project contribute to maintain, strengthen and/or expand your institutional network? [Yes/No - Give examples.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>How were the networks, platforms or individual exchanges institutionalised during the program/project (or after activities ended)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and co-creation</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Which program/project solutions do you consider most innovative? How were they developed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Which expertise has been brought in by which partner, to finding the program/project’s solutions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Are the projects’ components easily added and complemented by each partners' expertise? [Yes/No - Give examples.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Does the project provide relative advantage or cost reduction compared to other existing practices? [Yes/No - Give examples.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint-learning and knowledge-sharing for sustainable development</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Looking back, what was the most valuable experience for each partner in learning from the others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Does the program/project impact how triangular cooperation is formulated or implemented in your sector/country/region? [Yes/No - Give examples.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Does the program/project facilitate cooperation exchanges in other areas (e.g., foreign policy, trade, environment)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Does the program/project help to disseminate local experiences and good practices at the global level? [Yes/No - Give examples.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Does the program/project have girls and women as beneficiaries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Does the program/project improve girls and women’s living conditions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Do you see a way in which the program/project could contribute to gender equality? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving no one behind</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Does the project impact/improve the lives of underprivileged people who are most vulnerable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Is it possible to observe complementarity between the original idea of the program/project and the LNOB approach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Does the program/project offer actionable knowledge and practices to achieve the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Do you see a way in which the program/project could help to reach regional and global Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>