

IDS

EVIDENCE REPORT

No 40

Rising Powers in International Development

Learning Event on the Rising Powers for DFID
Advisors, April–May 2012

Jennifer Constantine

November 2013

The IDS programme on Strengthening Evidence-based Policy works across seven key themes. Each theme works with partner institutions to co-construct policy-relevant knowledge and engage in policy-influencing processes. This material has been developed under the Rising Powers in International Development theme.

The development of this material has been led by IDS who holds the copyright.

The material has been funded by UK aid from the UK Government, however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK Government's official policies.

AG Level 2 Output ID: 177

LEARNING EVENT ON THE RISING POWERS FOR DFID ADVISORS, APRIL–MAY 2012

Jennifer Constantine

November 2013

This is an Open Access publication distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are clearly credited.

First published by the Institute of Development Studies in November 2013
© Institute of Development Studies 2013

IDS is a charitable company limited by guarantee and registered in England (No. 877338).

Contents

1	Summary	2
2	Objectives	3
3	Introductory session	4
	3.1 Challenges: Programmatic, political, and philosophical	5
	3.2 Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation: What next?	5
4	Knowledge and evidence	7
	4.1 Learning from the BRICS	7
	4.2 Understanding Social Change	7
5	DFID plenary session	8
	5.1 Group A: International development cooperation policy	8
	5.1.1 Post-Busan implementation group	8
	5.1.2 Post-2015 agenda	8
	5.2 Group B: Learning from the BRICS: Implications for successful policy transfer to LICs	9
	5.3 Group C: Understanding the Rising Powers' development footprint in Africa	10
6	Key insights for policy	12
	Annex 1 DFID perspectives on engaging with the Rising Powers	14
	Annex 2 Questions and comments	21
	Annex 3 Complete participant list & biographies	22

1 Summary

The Learning Event brought together colleagues from DFID, IDS, and the BRICS, and aimed to facilitate the sharing and learning of experiences in international development and policy, from and amongst the BRICS, and to set out a framework and broad parameters for engaging with the Rising Powers in the future.

Presentations from DFID colleagues in the BRICS countries and London office showed that DFID policymakers are concerned with finding structures that allow the UK to address the challenges of working with new development actors – e.g. non-DAC donors and the BRICS countries – particularly in the post-Busan context, where the OECD Development Assistance Committee is seen to no longer hold the same sway. At the same time, DFID seeks to share its extensive experience and expertise as a donor and partner in technical development cooperation. How do we capitalise on the good relationships the UK has with other nations to implement development processes and action in a new and as yet undefined space?

The feedback from participants from the BRICS showed similar concerns exist, particularly in terms of the need for wider and more transparent domestic consultation processes, as their countries (re)engage in international development. The consensus was that DFID may achieve greater impact in future development coordination and cooperation with the BRICS if the focus is primarily on technical and thematic engagement. This would provide an entry point for working towards an eventual consensus around the role and place that political issues such as governance, democracy, and human rights should take in development assistance.

The proposed Future Policy Development Network was discussed as offering an intermediary – and much more politically neutral – space for some of these issues to be discussed by policymakers, academics, researchers, and civil society from the Rising Powers, the UK, and other development actors.

Two key points emerged during the week-long RPID workshop; and in particular during the DFID Learning Event: the need for the BRICS and other Rising Powers to **manage inequality**, and the need to **systematise learning** from their experiences in development and poverty reduction.

2 Objectives

The Learning Event aimed to facilitate the sharing and learning of experiences in international development and policy, from and amongst the BRICS; and to set out a framework and broad parameters for engaging with the Rising Powers in the future. Specifically, the objectives were to:

- familiarise IDS Fellows and Rising Powers' researchers and policy analysts with key areas of DFID/HMG interest ahead of the UK G8 Presidency;
- help key DFID policy leads to identify areas where engaging with Rising Powers can help to deliver departmental priorities;
- identify key areas for future DFID–FDPN dialogue, both globally and in specific countries/policy sectors;
- frame the scoping, evidence review and policy analysis work that IDS and partners will be undertaking under the Accountable Grant 'Engaging with Rising Powers' component [*formerly 'Emerging Powers'*].

3 Introductory session

The DFID Learning Event was opened by Lawrence Haddad (IDS Director), Richard Manning, (Chair of the Rising Powers in International Development [RPID] Advisory Council), and Anthony Smith (Director of the DFID International Relations Division).

Lawrence Haddad presented some of the challenges posed by the Rising Powers, representing a great power shift in the world, and which give rise to a number of fundamental questions:

- There is a need to reconsider the metrics that we use to think about the 'Rising Powers'.
- Indicators such as GDP per capita are not necessarily the most important.
- *How* did these countries emerge as powers?
- Was this consistent with conventional notions and discourses on development?
- What are the mutual learning opportunities for international and national development processes?
- What does this multipolar distribution of power offer as an opportunity for:
 - Multilateralism
 - Cooperation around global public goods, and
 - For collective action?

He concluded that answering these and other questions requires collaborative and sustained inquiry, adding that IDS is very pleased that DFID has engaged in this process, which will contribute to rethinking international development.

Richard Manning focused on the way forward within this changing global context. The world is in the midst of a rapid economic and social transformation, in which the role of the BRICS countries is fundamental, but rising influence and rapid transformation taking place elsewhere in the world must also be considered. He pointed out that the transformations in Africa are particularly relevant: rapid economic growth is accompanied by rising inequality, which poses a difficult challenge in tackling extreme poverty. He sees this as the real issue to be considered: how to tackle the problem of inequality? How can we make progress and advance towards a sustainable future? Richard Manning highlighted themes of potential interest, as well as priorities for learning, research and policy:

- governance and accountability;
- articulation of markets;
- agricultural development;
- conflict resolution;
- shifting development paradigms.

He concluded that as new actors engage in international development cooperation, other actors must also begin to think of the ways in which the new dynamics and spaces for cooperation will work. This will require a lot of work on policy, but also on implementation, which could come from a constructive collaborative partnership with DFID.

DFID Director **Anthony Smith's** speech is transcribed below.

It is a very exciting time to be involved in this work, as we are living through a period of paradigm shifts, a time of changing power, roles and responsibilities, and evolving leadership. Countries are following different paths for development, and playing different roles in the international arena, changing structures and frameworks (for

example moving from G8 to G20). DFID is at the right moment to understand, adapt and take advantage of these changes. However, in many aspects, it still functions through a traditional structure, centred on bilateral programmes largely with low-income countries (LICs), grant instruments and work based on targets around the Millennium Development Goals. While DFID has clear knowledge of [this] changing [global] architecture, there is still no clear guideline on the direction to take. DFID has to evolve and adapt. While it's good that DFID has a specific strategy and programme in relation to the role of the Rising Powers, its ownership and impact across its work is not clear, nor is the operationalisation of these changes. The crucial thing for DFID at present is to learn and understand the significance of the shift we are experiencing, identifying the relationships which will be important, the frameworks to be used, and the central challenges to consider. Managing partnerships and learning to work with each other will be fundamental. While we may have formed good relationships working with G20 countries, we haven't established structures and processes to structure these relations and take action. This is an opportunity to establish these formal spaces.

3.1 Challenges: Programmatic, political, and philosophical

Laura Kelly (DFID) presented a general overview of the UK's perspectives on engaging with the Rising Powers, which was followed by teleconference presentations from DFID colleagues in the China, India and South Africa country offices. They gave an overview of the development cooperation work they do, describing priority issues, the main challenges and key questions for discussion. The workshop participants from the BRICS countries did the same, and the floor was then opened to a group discussion with IDS, DFID and other colleagues present.

A detailed table of all the issues discussed during the Learning Event is given in Annex 1.

3.2 Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation: What next?

The discussion often returned to what – if anything – the new Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation means for the future of development cooperation and the inclusion of new actors (e.g. the BRICS) in development cooperation. It is hoped that the formation of the Busan Partnership's secretariat and working groups will make advances towards establishing a new *modus operandi* that can reconcile the differences between how 'traditional' OECD DAC and non-traditional, non-DAC donors operate. In the meantime, DFID policymakers are concerned with finding structures that allow the UK to address the threefold challenge of working with non-DAC Donors such as the BRICS: programmatic, political, and philosophical, as Chris Chalmers (DFID China) put it. At the same time, the new partnership seeks to share its extensive experience and expertise as a donor and partner in technical development cooperation. How do we capitalise on the good relationships the UK has with other nations to implement development processes and action in a new and as yet undefined space? In the vision of Anthony Smith, Director of DFID's International Relations Division, 'the Rising Powers in International Development programme can help establish these formal spaces'.

The feedback from BRICS participants showed that similar concerns exist, particularly in terms of the need for wider and more transparent domestic consultation processes, as their countries (re)engage in international development. The consensus amongst the BRICS participants seemed to indicate that DFID may achieve greater impact in broaching future development coordination and cooperation *with the BRICS* countries if this is done primarily in terms of technical and thematic engagement, and used as a platform and entry point for working towards some manner of consensus around political and 'philosophical' issues such

as governance, democracy, and human rights, for example. In the meantime, the proposed Future Policy Development Network could offer an intermediary – and much more politically neutral – space for some of these issues to be discussed by policymakers, academics, researchers, and civil society from the Rising Powers, the UK, and other development actors.

All the participants agreed that the main challenge was learning/sharing lessons on development widely. While it is evident that DFID has considerable expertise in facilitating the sharing of technical ‘models’ or practices, this is only a small part of learning from a country’s experience, be it in social protection, agriculture or industrial upgrading.

4 Knowledge and evidence

Two key points emerged during the week-long RPID workshop; and in particular during the Learning Event: the need for the BRICS and other Rising Powers to **manage inequality**, and the need to **systematise learning** from their experiences in development and poverty reduction. These two challenges permeated discussions ranging from policy diffusion mechanisms through to sustainable practice in private sector investment in Africa.

The BRICS and other Rising Powers play a fundamental role in the current rapid economic and social global transformation, where double-digit growth is frequently accompanied by rising poverty and inequality. Managing this inequality is seen as one of the key challenges to policymakers in 'emerging economies'. Countries such as Brazil, China and India have made significant advances in reducing poverty domestically through the implementation of social protection programmes, although results are still highly uneven, as outlined in many participants' presentations (Huo Jianguo, CAITEC; Rajesh Tandon, Advisory Council/PRIA; Rômulo Paes, Advisory Council/RPID Senior International Associate; and Zhang Xiulan, Beijing Normal University). Furthermore, there is often mixed support for international development given significant development challenges at home, as highlighted by Sachin Chaturvedi (RIS India), Yuriy Zaytsev (HSE), and Huo Jianguo.

4.1 Learning from the BRICS

As the BRICS become more active players in international development cooperation, it is increasingly evident that a systematised approach is required in what is variously called 'policy transfer', 'policy diffusion', or even the 'exporting' of social policy 'models'. As Rômulo Paes described, the learning gap is partly technical, but also political – understanding the interests behind coalitions building support for financing of universal health systems, or social protection programmes, is an entirely different process from the solid monitoring and evaluation systems required to learn from the design and implementation of the initiatives.

The country presentations from the DFID Policy Advisers (Brazil, India, China and South Africa) showed a number of shared challenges and areas of work, focused on the comparative advantages of being a bilateral partner, and how to best support policy dialogue for international development as well as knowledge transfers, 'emphasising the evidence of practice and bringing it into policy-making' (Karen Mahy, DFID India).

4.2 Understanding Social Change

As pointed out by many of the participants (Zhang Xiulan, Rosalind Eyben, and Rajesh Tandon), taking a historical approach is also key to understanding the confluence of factors that led the BRICS to be classed as 'emerging' or 'rising' powers and actors in international development. What were the roles of decentralisation, civil society, grassroots activism, political actors, and market forces in building a context that allows for Brazil's *Bolsa Família*, or India's National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA), South Africa's Treatment Action Campaign, or the Western China Development Project? Bianca Suyama (*Articulação Sul*, Brazil) and Anuradha Chenoy make it clear that understanding the multifaceted roles of civil society in challenging and influencing the establishment is key when studying policy formation and diffusion.

5 DFID plenary session

The DFID Plenary Session was chaired by Richard Manning, chair of the RPID Advisory Council, and concluded the half-day learning event held with DFID and other partners on 3 May 2012. Further to the morning's opening session, presentations and discussion on the 'view from the BRICS' via DFID offices and the RPID workshop participants, three parallel discussions were set up, covering the following themes. Summaries of each session were presented by the chairs of the three groups and can be found below.

- Group A: International development cooperation policy.
- Group B: Learning from the BRICS – implications for successful policy transfer to low-income countries.
- Group C: Understanding the Rising Powers' development footprint in Africa.

5.1 Group A: International development cooperation policy

Chaired by Richard Manning, this session asked how we should look at the current changes in international development cooperation architecture.

- Some formal spaces and some 'limbo' spaces outside of these were identified.
- Within the formal spaces, important changes are being pressed, notably at the 2012 BRICS Summit in Delhi, where the BRICS committed to important global architectural changes.
- Other changes include the recent appointment of the new head of the World Bank.
- The relevance of the G77 was debated with some uncertainty as to how movements in the system should be read.
- Concerns were expressed over getting environmental/development actors to move towards a more coherent approach and shared agenda at Rio+20.
- There was some discussion around whether the green economy is an end in itself or a means towards genuinely sustainable development?
- The G20 was mentioned but did not figure greatly in the discussion, although it's importance to the broader debate is clear.

5.1.1 Post-Busan implementation group

The discussion on the Post-Busan Implementation Group led to some emergent observations, questions and recommendations.

- Emphasis should be on country-level work with international work carried out by a ministerial group every two years.
- Work on building block activities, promoted by a 'coalition of the willing'.
- There should be flexibility in proposed architecture.
- Are the Rising Powers/BRICS participating sufficiently in the process?
- The international development community should take advantage of the New Deal for Fragile States and the BRICS Summit to confirm the BRICS' interest in the security agenda

5.1.2 Post-2015 agenda

The post-2015 scenario was debated in the context of it potentially becoming an important area for cooperation among Rising Powers. Karen Mahy (DFID India) suggested India is not really focused on this debate, raising some concerns regarding which actors are actively involved and invested in the post-MDG space.

The group discussed how the quality of the BRICS international cooperation efforts might be leveraged and agreed pressure from the OECD DAC was not the best way of addressing this issue. Other points included:

- the need for some form of peer review among Rising Power donor countries;
- potential cooperation among Asian donors like Japan and Korea;
- the importance of considering other donors, such as Malaysia, Taiwan, and Middle Eastern countries;
- better impact evaluation and knowing whether/how development cooperation programmes work is key.

There was much interest as to whether civil society organisations in the Rising Powers will become involved in international cooperation activities. This is currently not the case since national CSOs are principally focused on the domestic context. There is a forthcoming study from Oxfam India that examines this issue in depth.

The group stressed the need for some kind of position paper from Rising Power governments which would form the basis for development cooperation. The DAC-produced [Effective Aid Management – 12 Lessons from DAC Peer Reviews](#) document was cited as a useful source when thinking about the design and implementation of a legislative framework for development cooperation. Andrew Norton (ODI) focused on how the economic crisis in the northern hemisphere has been an important factor in shifting these North–South dynamics.

5.2 Group B: Learning from the BRICS: Implications for successful policy transfer to LICs

This session was chaired by Gerry Bloom (IDS), and opened with Zhang Xiulan, Beijing Normal University:

Why are we all here today? This is a golden moment in China, which is creating a welfare state which offers opportunities to be involved in the process and contribute actively to the discussion.

Dr Zhang then summarised some of the points the BRICS have in common. These countries have experienced rapid social and economic change, but face major problems in inequality and high expectations from populations wanting a share of this growth. Changes in social policy have essentially been focused on meeting these demands. The problem is how to operationalise universal entitlement in countries with such shortfalls. Another aspect that characterises the BRICS is the heavy pressure on national governments, analysts, and researchers, who are all exclusively focused on solving these problems.

What way forward? Professor Zhang suggests the first step is to look for synergies, and share experiences with other countries where the government is already engaged domestically. The speed of change has been so great that there's been no time to reflect on what has been done, be it in Brazil, India or China. The partnerships proposed through the RPID programme provide the opportunity to reflect on these processes and share lessons learned and cases of good practice.

How do we bring together civil society, academics and government? If these processes go through official channels the pace of change is likely to be slow, thus it's important to find mechanisms such as the space offered by RPID, which might allow for this sharing to take place.

While there has been much discussion of general issues of global governance, the BRICS are focused on their internal problems, so it may be best to focus on these as entry points, based on similar perceptions and interests. For example, there are practical issues in extending coverage on health that could be a more effective basis for building mutual understanding on a given issue.

5.3 Group C: Understanding the Rising Powers' development footprint in Africa

Chaired by Merle Lipton, member of the Advisory Council, the session opened with participants discussing the impact of BRICS involvement in international development in Africa, and how this is measured. How do we address the often poor availability and quality of data available on Africa? Addressing this gap is key in seeking to understand the Rising Powers' development footprint in Africa.

In relation to impact, the moral authority of the Rising Powers' presence in international development would rest on what they achieved in the African continent. The Rising Powers' offer of international development cooperation to African countries gives them greater leverage that may have broken with the 'aid cartels' of traditional donors in the region.

How differently do the BRICS and Rising Powers operate when compared to the OECD DAC countries? In this question of comparative performance, it was immediately pointed out how heterogeneous each country is. At the same time, this raised the question of similarities between some of the BRICS and OECD countries. There is evidently a need to analyse each actor separately:

- Which of the relationships are marginal and which were important?
- How are they important to each other? This needs to be broken down by industry, sector and geography.

The role of private capital from the BRICS was discussed in light of the criticisms levied by Mozambique against certain aspects of corporate behaviour from Brazil and China, seen as similar to the behaviour of OECD countries. This led to wider questions regarding the accountability and codes of conduct for businesses, large and small.

The fear of the BRICS being seen as a neo-colonialist presence was debated in the context of the debate in South Africa about the need to train the labour force and build infrastructure to develop in-country processing capacity, ensuring profits remain in South Africa, rather than simply exporting raw materials to China, for example.

Li Xiaoyun highlighted the importance of considering the political aspects of the BRICS' engagement in Africa, as well as the technical. This led to Janis van der Westhuizen arguing for outside pressure on the South African government on its legislation on media and the judiciary – 'the UK and other "Western" countries have taken a highly politicised stance which has in turn generated resentment in South Africa'. This raises the wider question of what unites and divides BRICS: united in relation to non-interventionism and sovereignty, but divided on human rights, as seen in Zimbabwe.

Finally, each of the BRICS is very important in its own region, and is keen to strengthen and assert its regional footprint and institutional structure – this was particularly striking in the presentation from DFID South Africa.

DFID concluded that much has been learnt on good and bad practice, but more work is needed on learning from these lessons in order to avoid past mistakes.

Concurring that many of these issues are familiar to those who work on the Rising Powers, Laura Kelly (DFID) outlined some interesting points to consider:

Post-Busan agenda: the Rising Powers have made a lot of effort to engage with this, and all agree about the importance of a more coherent development policy.

Post-MDG/Post-2015 agenda: this space is going to be fundamentally shifted, and key players will be very different.

- Engaging with Rising Powers will be crucial.
- Can DFID help them constructively engage, even if Rising Powers are currently not interested?
- BRICS don't have clear development policy engagement structures.
- How to learn systematic lessons and share them?
- How to put research into action?
- The focus of the work through the Accountable Grant is research into action and policy, and uptake and dissemination of the experience and lessons.
- The role of the private sector is absolutely essential.
- BRICS will have a bigger impact on Africa through private investment, not aid.

Richard Manning concluded the session, and highlighted a number of interesting ideas that merit further consideration.

- Sharing public policy experiences is key (engaging the Rising Powers in technical partnerships/conversations).
- Extract lessons for LICs (e.g. Brazil's experience on social protection).
- Better understanding is needed of the impact of the new dynamics generated by the Rising Powers in the LICs.
- The same applies to the impact/dynamics of the New Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (Busan HLF4).
- The BRICS are investing in infrastructure, natural resources, and trade relationships (Brazil, China) all of which are transformational.
- Focus on data: there are questions of fact, not of opinion, for which we need concrete data.
- Researchers must establish where the knowledge gaps and identify research needs: e.g. the impact of China's rising demand, Africa-China exports – significant ramifications.
- Private sector: Africa is moving from being an aid destination to an investment destination.
- Be wary of comparing and contrasting investment from different countries.
- No evidence of any vast difference in the way different companies operate.
- International cooperation – be it from the Rising Powers or not – will have an increasingly limited scope due to Africa's rapid growth and its increasing dependence on its own tax revenue.
- Countries are going to become less aid-dependent.
- There is still a space for the post-Busan process to produce positive results.
- This allows for a focused agenda with a manageable number of immediate objectives and deliverables for the short term.
- Others will deliver benefits in the future, which will lead into longer-term conversations in the BRICS and G-20.
- There are longer-term issues about the transformational agenda within the Rising Powers and the rapid rate of change in the BRICS and beyond.

6 Key insights for policy

The workshop and learning event both demonstrate that the main concern is understanding what does and doesn't work in development, systematising the why and how, and learning how to apply this to different contexts. Listed below are some of the key insights for policy gained from the sessions with participants from the BRICS countries, IDS and DFID.

Use a historical approach to understanding those political, economic and social processes and actors that led to development gains in a national context. How did the interplay of design and implementation work out?

Example: Understand how Bolsa Família went from being a municipal conditional cash transfer under one president, to a national programme reaching 11 million-plus families under the next president.

There is never a single solution but rather a combination of solutions, hence the need to work collaboratively across contexts/sectors/geographies.

Example: Poverty and inequality were reduced in Brazil through a combination of minimum wage, cash transfers, formal jobs, etc.

Use this as basis for understanding 'what works'. Develop case studies of lessons learnt and good practice for policy diffusion/transfers in international development, working with the policymakers and activists involved in the original process.

Collaborate with diverse stakeholders in this process and not necessarily only those currently close to the centres of debate and decision-making: civil society, grassroots activists, decentralised, regional, and national governments, academics, researchers.

Innovations often take place at the periphery – in decentralised contexts – look for innovation at local and municipal levels where change is often more easily achieved.

Systematically evaluate, monitor, collate and manage evidence from partnerships and programmes that have been 'successful' – this has both domestic and international application, particularly since lack of systematic monitoring and evaluation (M&E) may mean knowledge is lost with political party changes – knowledge is in people and not systems.

Take an equally systematic approach to analysing South–South cooperation (SSC) and/or triangular/trilateral development cooperation (TDC) – little is yet known about the impact of SSC and TDC and they are not necessarily currently fit for purpose.

Stimulate national public debate in the BRICS on their role in international development.

Consider learning and policy transfer a two-/multi-way process: if managing inequality and poverty are the greatest challenges in the face of rapid growth, what applications might there be to 'developed' countries in crises?

Help build peer review capacity for systematic monitoring and evaluation, and learning.

Ensure that this learning process receives adequate investment and financing.

As far as learning from the BRICS is concerned, work with the BRICS as a bloc where possible: development is likely to grow as an area for confluence due to reciprocal interest and mutual benefit rather than competition among the BRICS.

Use DFID's existing capacity and long support to the private sector, an area where the BRICS are more homogenous in their interests if not necessarily practices – this area offers opportunities to engage with business and BRICS on a common level.

Engage with the BRICS across sectors/actors at the *technical level*, rather than the political level. This is particularly relevant given the BRICS possible preference for engaging with multilateral institutions/cooperation channels rather than bilateral organisations.

Work more closely through country office policy advisers in the BRICS to clarify DFID's role, motivations, objectives, and desired outcomes – this is not always clear, as transpired in conversations with senior figures in different institutions in the BRICS.

This may also help the BRICS to modify their stance in terms of formal participation as more than observers in formal spaces for global development cooperation policy and coordination (i.e. Busan, the post-2015 MDG debate, etc.).

Seek to engage BRICS partners in collaboration and co-construction of global aid structures and policies – what would a 'good' (and acceptable) policy/structure look like, from the perspective of the BRICS?

Note that governments in the BRICS (and civil society) are frequently more focused on their domestic politics and needs – which extends to foreign policy but not necessarily to aid in the way it is treated by the 'North' – hence lack of prioritisation on global development agenda items such as the post-MDG space.

Use international meetings/summits as opportunities to engage with BRICS on different levels – thematic, geographical, political, diplomatic, etc.

Example: Working with BRICS at Rio+20 – are green growth and climate change part of the mainstream development agenda, or a 'sector/agenda' in their own right? These are areas where North and South should be working closely together – green economy has an important role in sustainable development.

When talking and thinking about BRICS, consider the important role civil society has had in social change – this is generally much more significant in Brazil or India than in the UK or the US, for example. Their influence, reach, and understanding of the national context and needs must be taken into consideration.

These policy insights will be developed further in the 'Policy Brief' document RPID will produce for DFID.

Annex 1 DFID perspectives on engaging with the Rising Powers

	Brazil	Russia	India	China	South Africa
DFID contact	Laura Kelly (GPD)	No DFID office in Russia	Karen Mahy (India)	Chris Chalmers (Beijing)	Will Hines (South Africa)
Summary			<p>India still major focus for DFID, as it still has a bilateral aid programme (unlike in China). Relating DFID policy priorities with India is very important, e.g. in climate change negotiations, Busan, or G20 dialogues.</p>	<p>DFID aims to develop a partnership with China and seek new ways to work together on development issues and related policy matters in countries they are both working in.</p> <p>No bilateral aid from DFID for China – focus is on collaboration abroad.</p> <p>Given China’s impact on development, DFID is seeking to explore and link shared objectives and develop new collaborations.</p> <p>Many elements of China’s approach are of interest (beyond development) and could evolve in future.</p> <p>UK can be one of many models of cooperation policies, and China could adapt ways of working as well.</p>	<p>There is much overlap with DFID in China and India. Bottom line is there is an enormous opportunity to develop new national and international development institutions and global policies.</p> <p>Similarly to the other country offices, DFID South Africa is managing programmes as a bilateral donor and as a development partner for the region.</p> <p>DFID’s wide range of partners requires an open dialogue on our development cooperation model.</p> <p>The emergence of the new South African partnership provides opportunities to interact in new ways, opening talks on how to form partnerships with business, academia and the civil society sector.</p>

(Cont'd.)

Annex 1 (cont'd.)

	Brazil	Russia	India	China	South Africa
DFID priorities/ Key areas of collaboration		N/A	<p>India's role in the world and region</p> <p>Climate change</p> <p>Food security</p> <p>Global public goods</p> <p>India's role in technology and innovations</p> <p>With respect to the private sector, DFID is interested in the developmental impact of private sector investment in other countries (e.g. access to medicine).</p>	<p>Global public goods</p> <p>Climate change</p> <p>International health</p> <p>Regional cooperation (e.g. China in Africa or South Asia)</p> <p>International policy</p> <p>Collaboration post-Busan</p> <p>MDGs post-2015.</p>	<p>South Africa's importance in Africa as the largest economy and its influence in terms of regional trade, integration, and infrastructure.</p> <p>South Africa's political role in BRICS and G20 as sole African voice in those spaces.</p> <p>DFID's priorities are related to this in our bilateral and regional programmes:</p> <p>Support regional integration and trade (N-S corridor, free trade with UK, and role within international development institutions)</p> <p>Climate Change</p> <p>Health (HIV, access to medicine, role of private sector).</p>

(Cont'd.)

Annex 1 (cont'd.)

	Brazil	Russia	India	China	South Africa
Challenges/ Issues	Limited public debate on development. Brazil has significantly increased its international technical cooperation, but there is limited national debate about these policies.			The challenges faced are threefold: Programmatic: DFID systems don't necessarily fit comfortably with developing partnership programmes with China; Political: many sensitivities around development agenda; Philosophically different perspectives on aid: (UK separates it from other agendas, while for China it is part of a package that includes commercial interests).	All of this is underpinned by the need to work together to strengthen South Africa in G20 and the potential of BRICS in developed and developing countries. However, there are many gaps in understanding this aspect and how DFID can support it.

(Cont'd.)

Annex 1 (cont'd.)

	Brazil	Russia	India	China	South Africa
Future work/ questions	How can we stimulate domestic debate about its impact in the region?		<p>How we can draw on this to take experience to other countries, for improving policies, private sector investment, and trade?</p> <p>Some questions to explore are: What can India and the UK offer in terms of comparative advantage in development and cooperation experiences? What can India offer on issues of international development? What experience does DFID have that could be shared?</p> <p>This group could be used to build on our policy dialogue and to take advantage of knowledge transfer from India, bringing change to policy and practice. In this respect, it is important to emphasise the evidence of practice and bring it into policymaking.</p>	<p>In terms of research, financing and networks there is much that is specific to China, but much less attention on the BRICS as a group. Other very important groupings include the middle-income countries of the G20. What is their common interest? Areas of potential collaboration?</p> <p>It is often said that there isn't much in common between these Rising Powers, and that issues of power significantly reduce possibilities of collaboration, but from a sectoral or thematic level, there are many shared interests and commonalities that are interesting to explore. In this respect, one may consider the UK's value and DFID's role in understanding and relating to this reality.</p>	<p>A better understanding is needed on South Africa's role with other BRICS and in multilateral and bilateral policy, the potential of forming a new development agency, and South Africa's impact with neighbouring countries (good and bad). It is also necessary to improve, collate and manage evidence of the types of partnerships that are constructive, and evaluate the impact of programmes and their attribution to DFID role. DFID can share models on a technical level, and initiate dialogue in a broader set of issues, but it still has much to learn.</p>

(Cont'd.)

Annex 1 (cont'd.)

	Brazil	Russia	India	China	South Africa
Participant from the BRICS	Bianca Suyama (Articulação Sul, Brazil)	Yuriy Zaytsev (HSE Russia)	Anuradha Chenoy (JNU India)	Huo Jinguo (CAITEC, China)	Janis van der Westhuizen (Stellenbosch University)
Country context overview	<p>Brazil has increased SSC, first with Latin America and more recently in Africa, sharing with the world the policies that contributed to the reduction of poverty and vulnerability. However, there is a problem of lack of a domestic policy for international cooperation, and the definition between being receiver or provider of aid. It has proven necessary to create a public debate and form a constituency inside and outside government to influence these changes. (cont'd.)</p>	<p>International cooperation for development in Russia is uncertain. After the demise of the Soviet Union, there was a system of international cooperation and in the 90s the country became an official recipient of cooperation in the context of social and economic reforms. With the presidency in G8, in 2007 the government attempted to establish mechanisms for international development cooperation regionally and sectorally. (cont'd.)</p>	<p>Since the 1990s, there has been a complete shift from the central role of the state in development. This has been accompanied by a refocus on growth, an increased middle class, an increase in GDP and investment. But this has led to massive inequalities and uneven development. In this context, civil society in India has made efforts to reform this paradigm, achieving growth and equitable development. New open democratic spaces have allowed civil society to influence these issues (from legislative changes on the right to information and right to food, to new rights-based frameworks for policies). With this in mind, one must consider the kind of intervention in India's international development programmes and increasing aid flows. (cont'd.)</p>	<p>China is seen as a Rising Power from the outside, but this is based on high economic growth rates. This analysis centres on numerical indicators, disregarding that in other aspects China still has many challenges and is comparatively not as strong. Consider it 'rising' but not yet in 'power'. Market system – historic in UK – only started in 1992 in China, as the country turned gradually towards market-oriented reforms; after 10 years, China has barely started to build pure market conditions. More recently, problems in the Chinese economy required strong government intervention. (cont'd.)</p>	<p>Janis focused on the specific issue of the context of frail democracy in South Africa and the impact and implications of this. This is related to the growing restraints on freedom of media and press as a result of corruption and fragile state powers. Civil society is attempting to act against this (for example through the Right to Information Law), but these issues are still there.</p>

(Cont'd.)

Annex 1 (cont'd.)

	Brazil	Russia	India	China	South Africa
Country context overview	<p>(cont'd.)</p> <p>In this respect, it is necessary to have a good presence of civil society, working on macro-level issues but also grassroots problems.</p> <p>In the case of Brazil civil society was a basic influence on social policy: a lot of public policies that took place in Brazil were possible precisely because of interaction with and the involvement of various civil society actors.</p> <p>Cooperation on the municipal/local level is now much more feasible and has proven to be an easier avenue for achieving changes.</p>	<p>(cont'd.)</p> <p>Priority sectors include: energy, health and education.</p> <p>However Russia is in a very controversial position, as it needs to develop its own international development strategy and at the same time adapt to a new paradigm of international cooperation for development.</p>	<p>(cont'd.)</p> <p>India's cooperation strategy has rejected tied aid, as not self-sustainable.</p> <p>Thus, they are seeking a different form of aid from what was received. This aid can be one of two models:</p> <p>One based on dependency, another on social transformation. The first is strategic, based on the interests of the giver and receiver; the second is a people's agenda. The first is elite-driven, and the other is based on a broader dialogue.</p> <p>If we want the second set of parameters, we need civil society to influence the establishment of policies and development programmes.</p> <p>What is required is not aid, it is partnership: decentralisation, accountability and synergy are important and we can learn from the UK in these aspects.</p>	<p>(cont'd.)</p> <p>Aware that while there are many difficulties for China, it is still big and has influence around the world. China is looking for ways to do more work globally, reducing poverty and increasing foreign aid.</p> <p>For example, nearly half of loans were invested in Africa through foreign aid, for agriculture, education, and housing. But this process is just starting. BRICS now have more common concerns and represent a greater share of global GDP.</p> <p>China is attempting to advance towards this balance; but is also criticised for having a surplus and not investing enough.</p> <p>So China has stimulated imports, trying to keep them balanced, and promoted foreign direct investment, pressing for private sector responsible investment.</p>	

(Cont'd.)

Annex 1 (cont'd.)

	Brazil	Russia	India	China	South Africa
Opportunities for engagement with DFID	<p>The central question is if it is possible for Brazil to scale up this development cooperation and what can DFID do to support it.</p> <p>Understanding the complexity of social change seen in the role and the influence of civil society on social policy would be useful for DFID.</p> <p>Another key area in which DFID works is innovation. However it has focused on the federal level, while much has been done on the local, municipal level that is valuable and could be shared.</p>	<p>UK programmes in Russia are focused on Climate Change, Global Partnerships, and substantial work with academia.</p> <p>Oxfam and the British Council are contributing to expand the agenda of international development agenda in Russia, on poverty issues and support to educational and cultural programmes.</p>	<p>While the UK has interest in open markets, trade and investment, it must also look at other aspects of India's experience:</p> <p>Social policies within national context of uneven development; Contribution to global development spaces (while Indian ministries are not open, there are possibilities for engaging with actors in other spaces);</p> <p>Sharing Indian expertise in non-communicable diseases and conditional cash transfers and exploring vast scope for cooperation, transferring and sharing these policies.</p> <p>Any process should be on an equal, horizontal, basis and seen from a heterodox approach, involving not one model, but various approaches.</p>	<p>International cooperation is difficult given the current economic context, but we all know that in order to end the recession we need to cooperate.</p> <p>At present, China pays special attention to BRICS for cooperation.</p> <p>The world needs to discuss how to advance towards new governance – China and other G20 countries must seek a fairer organisation of the world.</p>	<p>This is an appeal to cease the identification of South Africa as a Rising Power, disregarding the lack of democracy in the country.</p> <p>A refocus is needed on how we can strengthen domestic institutions, civil society and support the media.</p> <p>Think beyond terms of economic: 'wellbeing' means speaking of democracy: holding leaders accountable, strengthening media, enhancing the capacity of the judicial sector, among others.</p> <p>Anything in relation to these will have spillover into other kinds of development for cooperation.</p>

Annex 2 Questions and comments

Gerry Bloom (IDS): Is it possible to speak of mutual, shared interests of BRICS? Or perhaps focus on different areas and sectors where there is interest and greater possibilities for cooperation?

Rajesh Tandon (Advisory Council): Two issues were not sufficiently included in the work plan. First, there is an assumption that what worked in India will work elsewhere: it is necessary to understand the political context and institutions that influenced this process, it is not possible to simply transfer policies.

Second, while the BRICS have a strong civil society, it is not active in promoting domestic debates on these global issues; nor has it questioned the role of the Rising Powers externally. Little is known/studied of Indian civil society presence in international events.

John Humphrey (IDS): Rising Powers are very heterogeneous, so what is the advantage of working on them simultaneously?

The central potential is in private sector investment, an area where DFID has done a lot of work, for example with EITI (Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative). IDS (with ODI and DFID) can mobilise resources to engage with businesses and BRICS on a common level.

Richard Carey (Advisory Council): On the issue of science, technology and innovation, what is the impact of Rising Powers in low-income countries?

How do LICs see it? The dynamics for LICs are very different now: there are new paradigms for thinking of economic development, effective states, governance issues.

Lizbeth Navas-Alemán (IDS): It's extremely important to champion the private sector's successful experiences beyond the national level, identifying experiences of successful clusters that are more able to adapt.

Rosalind Eyben (IDS): When comparing BRICS' international cooperation policy to the UK's, it is important to remember the UK's role as a colonial power, a very different position from BRICS today.

Merle Lipton (Advisory Council): What will the rules of international governance look like? All BRICS countries agree on the need for reform of global institutions. But are these going to be transformed? Or is it going to be an anarchic situation, of power moving to regional organisations?

Richard Manning (Advisory Council): Are South African DFID officials pulling strings in different directions, from regional/bilateral?

Li Xiaoyun (Advisory Council): What is the incentive for DFID to take such an active role in engaging with the BRICS? It has to do with balance: incentives are different and based on different interests. Another question is whether to seek cooperation on a political or technical level. The political level is very difficult; the technical is much more possible/feasible. DFID may find most BRICS prefer multilateral, institutional and micro-level cooperation.

Annex 3 Complete participant list & biographies

Name	Institution
Partners	
Bianca Suyama	Articulação Sul
Laura Trajber Waisbich	CEBRAP – Brazilian Centre for Analysis and Planning
Marina Larionova*	IORI-HSE (International Organisations Research Institute – Higher School of Economics) (<i>participated via tele-conference</i>)
Yuriy Zaytsev	HSE (Higher School of Economics) (<i>participated via tele-conference</i>)
Mark Rakhmangulov*	IORI-HSE (International Organisations Research Institute – Higher School of Economics)
Sachin Chaturvedi	RIS (Research & Information System for Developing Countries)
Anuradha Chenoy	JNU (Jawaharlal Nehru University)
Zhang Xiulan	BNU (Beijing Normal University)
Janis Van der Westhuizen	SUN (University of Stellenbosch)
Chris Alden	SAIIA (South African Institute of International Affairs)
Qi Gubo	CAU (China Agricultural University)
Huo Jianguo	CAITEC (Chinese Academy of International Trade & Economic Cooperation)
Advisory Council	
Gabriele Koehler	Advisory Council
Richard Manning	Advisory Council
Romulo Paes	Advisory Council
Merle Lipton	Advisory Council
Li Xiaoyun	Advisory Council
Rajesh Tandon	Advisory Council
KY Amoako*	Advisory Council (<i>participated via tele-conference</i>)
Richard Carey	Advisory Council
IDS BRICS	
Alex Shankland	Research Fellow, RPID Co-convenor, Civil Society / Brazil Country Lead
Anu Joshi	Research Fellow, India Country Lead
Deepta Chopra	Research Fellow, India Country Lead
Gerry Bloom	Research Fellow, Health Lead
Hayley MacGregor	Research Fellow, South Africa Lead
Jenny Constantine	Rising Powers Research and Communications Consultant
Jeremy Allouche	Research Fellow, Global Policy component
John Humphrey	Professorial Fellow, Africa Footprint Lead
Linda Waldman	Research Fellow, South Africa Lead
Lizbeth Navas-Aleman	Research Fellow, RPID Co-convenor, Business / Brazil Country Lead
Marc Berenson	Research Fellow, Russia Country Lead
Matthew Lockwood	Research Fellow, Climate Change Team Leader, Climate Policy lead
Robert Nurick	Director of Teaching, Development Studies Learning Partnership Lead
Rosalind Eyben	Research Fellow, Global Policy Lead
Stacey Townsend	Globalisation Team Administrator / Rising Powers Workshop Organiser
Xavier Cirera	Research Fellow, Africa footprint component

(Cont'd.)

Annex 3 (cont'd.)

Name	Institution
IDS Fellows (Other Participants)	
Ammar Rashid	MA Candidate / Research Assistant
Felix Rottmann	MA Candidate / Research Assistant
Georgina Powell-Stephens	Accountable Grant Coordinator
Ian Scoones	Research Fellow, Future Agricultures Consortium Co-convenor
Jaqueline Berumen	MA Candidate / Research Assistant
Jim Sumberg	Research Fellow, Accountable Grant Director
Jixia Lu	Visiting Fellow (STEPS)
Lawrence Haddad	Director, IDS
Maria Persson	MA Candidate / Research Assistant
Mark Davies	Research Fellow, Centre for Social Protection Manager
Melanie Punton	MA Candidate / Research Assistant
Richard Jolly	Honorary Professor and Research Associate
Sneha Palit	MA Candidate / Research Assistant
External Invitees	
Andrew Norton	ODI (Overseas Development Institute)
Giles Mohan	OU (Open University)
Gordon McGranahan	IIED (International Institute for Environment & Development)
Laura Collins	University of Cambridge
Lila Buckley	IIED (International Institute for Environment & Development)
Michel Carton	EADI (European Association for Development Institutes)
Robin Hart	Wilton Park
Stephany Griffith-Jones	University of Columbia
DFID	
Aishah Afzal	Economist – Global Development Partnerships
Anthony Smith	International Relations Director
Chintán Makwanda	Policy Support
Elinor Wakefield	Rising Powers Policy Advisor
Ella Carpenter	Transparency Adviser
Fran Drugan	Africa Policy Adviser
Karen Mahy	DFID India
Laura Kelly	Head of Global Development Partnerships Programme
Paul Wafer	Senior Policy Adviser (post-2015 interest)
Peter Gordon	Policy Division (responsible for IDS Accountable Grant)
Ranil Dissanayake	Economist – Strategy Unit
Chris Chalmers	DFID China
Billy Stewart	DFID India
Mike Ellis	DFID Brazil
Will Hines	DFID South Africa



Brighton BN1 9RE

T +44 (0)1273 606261

F +44 (0)1273 621202

E ids@ids.ac.uk

www.ids.ac.uk



UKaid
from the British people