



UN
DP

*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

United Nations Development Programme

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT GROUP



BRAZILIAN TRIANGULAR COOPERATION IN SOCIAL PROTECTION: CONTRIBUTION TO THE 2030 AGENDA



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

BRAZILIAN TRIANGULAR COOPERATION IN SOCIAL PROTECTION: CONTRIBUTION TO THE 2030 AGENDA

October 2016

Copyright © October 2016
United Nations Development Programme
Bureau for Policy and Programme Support
One United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017, USA

Web site: www.undp.org/ssc

Copyright 2016, UNDP.
Cover Image: UNDP Brazil

Disclaimer:

The views expressed in this document are those of the authors. They do not necessarily represent the official views of the United Nations Development Programme

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgement	6
Acronyms and abbreviations	7
1. Executive Summary	8
2. An overview of Brazilian triangular cooperation	9
3. Brazilian trilateral cooperation in social protection: learning from practice	11
a. Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour	12
b. Purchase from Africans for Africa Programme	15
c. World Without Poverty Platform	19
4. Conclusion	21
References	25
Annex – List of Interviewees	29

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This publication was developed by Bianca Suyama, Marina Caixeta and Gustavo Macedo from the South-South Cooperation Research and Policy Centre (Articulação SUL). The authors acknowledge the contribution of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) for commissioning the study. The authors further acknowledge Daniel Martins for his research support and Luara Lopes for revising the case studies and final version of the paper. Previous research and discussions with Melissa Pomeroy, Iara Costa Leite and Mariana Santarelli also provided crucial inputs to this paper.

Intellectual insights and analytical contributions were provided by Xiaojun Grace Wang and Shams Banihani (UNDP Bureau for Policy and Programme Support); Nan Collins (UNDP Regional Service Centre for Asia and the Pacific); Pablo Basz and Fernando Galindo (UNDP Regional Service Centre for Panama); and Orria Goni and Lore Declercq (UNDP Regional Service Centre for Africa). Their contributions are thankfully acknowledged. The team is thankful for the intellectual leadership of Simona Marinescu, Director of the Development Impact Group, UNDP Bureau for Policy and Programme Support. Administrative and operational support received from Donington Soro, also from UNDP, are thankfully acknowledged.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ABC	Brazilian Cooperation Agency
CGFome	General Coordination for Humanitarian Cooperation and Fight against Hunger
CONAB	National Food Supply Company
CONSEA	National Council of Food and Nutrition Security
CPLP	Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries
DFID	Department for International Development, United Kingdom
GIZ	German Agency for International Cooperation
IBSA	India, Brazil, South Africa
ILO	International Labour Organization
IPC-IG	International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth, UNDP
IPEA	Institute of Applied Economic Research
IPEC	International Program on the Elimination of Child Labour
MDA	Ministry of Agriculture Development
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MDS	Ministry of Social Development and Fight against Hunger
NGOs	Non-governmental Organizations
P4P	Purchase for Progress
PAA	Purchase From Africans to Africa Programme
PALOPs	Portuguese-speaking African Countries
PNAE	Brazilian National School Feeding Programme
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
TrC	Trilateral Cooperation
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Cooperation
WFP	World Food Programme
WWP	World Without Poverty

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper aims to analyse how can trilateral cooperation (TrC) initiatives sharing Brazilian experiences in social protection contribute to the 2030 agenda. In the last decade, social protection has gained the spotlight in development cooperation. The boundaries of social protection has expanded from a narrow understanding of safety nets to potentially encompassing a broader set of policies aimed at increasing social justice and as a redistributive measure that reaffirms the social contract of the state with its citizens. Countries across Africa, Asia and Latin America have introduced regular cash transfers and other programmes to assist poor and vulnerable citizens, with positive impacts on a range of well-being indicators for millions of people.¹

International organizations have played a crucial role in this process by supporting the diffusion and transfer of social protection policies. However, the role of South-South Cooperation partners cannot be underestimated. Brazil's development trajectory in the last decade has drawn the world's attention to the country's social protection and food and nutritional security policies. The country became an international reference in the context of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), eradicating extreme poverty and hunger before the final deadline in 2015 (FAO, 2014). As a result, TrC on social protection among Brazilian government and multilateral and bilateral donors has increased significantly, particularly in the first decade of the 21st century. In this paper, we understand TrC to mean any initiative that brings together the Brazilian government, bilateral or multilateral providers of development cooperation, and Southern countries to share knowledge and implement projects that support a mutually agreed goal.²

To explore the lessons learned through the Brazilian TrC in social protection, the research team carried out a literature review and developed a trilateral projects database, using information from the Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC) website.³ Three initiatives were further explored by reviewing publicly available documents and carrying out semi-structured interviews with different partners (see Annex I for list of interviewees). Unfortunately, the team was able to interview partners in other developing countries in only one case. As a result, the paper lacks a stronger analysis based on the perspective of Brazil's Southern partners. The first

¹ Social protection covers a wide array of instruments and objectives. In particular, we find useful the four types of social protection described by Devereux and Sabates-Wheeler (2004:9): (1) Protective social protection, cash or in-kind transfers or fee-waivers to provide for basic consumption needs such as food and health care; (2) preventive social protection, insurance schemes such as pensions, or risk-pooling mechanisms such as health and unemployment insurance, in order to prevent a drop in living standards during crises; (3) promote social protection, productive transfers, insurance and credit schemes, labour market interventions, investment in public assets and access to education or skills training; and (4) transformative social protection, which aims to change discriminatory laws and practices, such as employment guarantees, redistribution of land to poor, price controls and the protection of women's inheritance and employment rights

² The concept, however, remains disputed in the literature. The term trilateral, for instance, is employed by government agencies discourse in the United States, Brazil and China, albeit with different meanings (Li and Bonschab, 2012). Triangular is more common among international organizations such as the Ibero-American General Secretariat (SEGIB), the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Cooperation Directorate (OECD-DAC) and the UN. For Ayllon (2013) the main similarities among definitions relate to their reference on complementarities, co-funding agreements, potential synergies and exchange of knowledge and experience. Differences mainly focus on the origin of the cooperation and which "logic" guides the intervention (South-South or North-South).

³ The database includes cooperation defined as 'trilateral cooperation', 'trilateral cooperation with international organisations', and 'bloc cooperation'. See: www.abc.gov.br/projetos/pesquisa

section of the paper gives an overall picture of Brazilian TrC. The second section presents the three initiatives: the Purchase for Africa from Africans, the World Without Poverty Platform and the Programme to Eradicate Child Labour. The final section presents possible contributions of Brazilian TrC in social protection to the 2030 agenda.

2. AN OVERVIEW OF BRAZILIAN TRIANGULAR COOPERATION

The Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC) is subordinated to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and coordinates both received and provided technical cooperation. It is estimated that the agency coordinates actions implemented by 170 government agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), universities and local governments (Brasil, 2013). Brazilian engagement in technical cooperation is deeply influenced by the country's national institutional framework, as well as by decision-making processes in foreign policy, which are permeated by a variety of domestic interests. The increasing role of Brazil in technical cooperation has not, however, been accompanied by institutional reforms or the design of a national legal framework establishing priorities, mechanisms, competences and due processes. This system has been built by relying on transitory arrangements in which the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) became the main agent in operationalization of technical cooperation in Brazil.

On the one hand, this highly fragmented structure may impose serious challenges to coordination and effective implementation. On the other, it can be argued that the distinctive feature of Brazil's development cooperation is that it is implemented by those with the practical experience of designing and implementing policies and programmes being shared. Technical cooperation initiatives of the many implementing agencies can be seen as extensions of the programs and projects developed at home and therefore they represent international insertion of domestic public policy communities (Esteves, Fonseca and Gomes, forthcoming; Esteves and Assunção, forthcoming).

The ABC's budget and the number of new cooperation initiatives rose almost continuously under the two administrations of President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva (2003–06 and 2007–10), but this trend reversed under President Dilma Rousseff. The reduction of the agency's budget for technical cooperation was accompanied by an increase in funding through trilateral cooperation with international organizations, from US\$2.7 million in 2010 to \$16.9 million in 2014. Based on information available of ABC's website, Table 1 illustrates the evolution of trilateral funds with international organisations and bilateral donors.

AN OVERVIEW OF BRAZILIAN TRIANGULAR COOPERATION

Table 1 – Evolution of trilateral funds in USD

Partner	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	TOTAL
FAO			375.691	769.234	1.637.674	2.098.286	3.937.450	9.371.033	18.189.368
Japan			492.687	1.245.532	10.273.726	1.242.009			13.253.954
ILO			160.897	1.278.330	1.155.361	1.057.420	3.557.217	3.238.029	10.447.254
WFP					800.000	2.000.000	2.700.000	2.100.000	7.600.000
Germany				954.867	507.112	6.063.636			7.525.615
USA			54.993	4.329.267	694.847	68.177	194.215		5.341.499
UNESCO				130.354	562.977	30.644	1.399.390	888.143	3.011.508
UNODC				544.680	624.764	611.126	194.139	434.950	2.409.659
Italy			518.072	837.393	14.866	23.250		18.300	1.411.881
UNDP						488.044	520.403	213.799	1.222.246
France		49.600		261.312	170.348				481.260
Canada		238.729		157.058					395.787
WIPO								170.000	170.000
Norway				146.179					146.179
UNFPA								79.926	79.926
UNICEF								45.500	45.500
Australia						34.480			34.480
Egypt				29.572					29.572
UK					24.535				24.535
Israel				20.650					20.650
Spain	12.252								12.252
South Korea					9.640				9.640
Total	12.252	288.329	1.602.340	10.704.428	16.475.850	13.717.072	12.502.814	16.559.680	71.862.765


Source: authors based on ABC website⁴

There is very little information available regarding the origins and destination of multilateral funds, but they are directed from ministries to multilateral organizations and are often restricted to specific activities. Trilateral cooperation with bilateral donors is different in that respect, as these donors tend to fund a significant part of project costs. What is clear is that multilateral organizations and bilateral donors have become essential players in Brazilian technical cooperation, taking up roles that national structures currently cannot fulfil.

The database on ABC's website also gives a glimpse of the focus on the concluded and continuing initiatives. However, the information available is too restrictive for an in-depth analysis. The graph below represents the main sector of projects that fall under the following categories of ABC's website database: trilateral cooperation with international organizations and trilateral cooperation. It does not include the 21 projects categorized as 'bloc cooperation,' the great majority projects related to Mercosur.

⁴ See: www.abc.gov.br/Gestao/TrilateralOrganismo and www.abc.gov.br/Gestao/TrilateralPaíses

Graph 1 – Sector of Brazilian trilateral cooperation projects



Source: authors based on ABC database⁵

ABC is currently developing specific guidelines for Brazil's TrC. Brazil has established a strategic framework for trilateral arrangements with some partners, like the German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ), the US Agency for International Cooperation (USAID) and UNICEF (the Manual of Operation for Trilateral Cooperation Brazil-Germany, the Strategic Framework for Trilateral Development Partnership and the Guidelines for South-South Trilateral Cooperation, respectively). Brazilian trilateral partnerships put great emphasis on governance structures, which usually includes technical and high-level joint committees that meet periodically to make decisions collectively and monitor progress. (NEST Brazil, forthcoming).

3. BRAZILIAN TRILATERAL COOPERATION IN SOCIAL PROTECTION: LEARNING FROM PRACTICE

Brazilian TrC in social protection involves a variety of actors: Brazilian coordinating agencies, the ABC and the General Coordination for Humanitarian Cooperation and Fight against Hunger (CGFome); Ministries, such as Health and Education, and the former Ministry of Social Development and Fight against Hunger (MDS), Ministry of Agrarian Development (MDA), Ministry of Labour and Employment (MTE) and the Ministry of Social Security (MPE)⁶; public enterprises, such as the National Agency for Industrial Learning (SENAI) and Oswaldo Cruz Foundation (Fiocruz); universities and NGOs; multilateral organizations, such as International Labour Organization (ILO), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), World Food Programme (WFP), UNICEF

⁵ See: www.abc.gov.br/projetos/pesquisa

⁶ As this paper was being finalised an interim government had taken over, after president Rousseff was withdrawn from power as the Senate opened an impeachment process against her. The interim government introduced a series of reforms, such as dissolving and joining ministries

and the World Bank; and bilateral organizations, such as the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID) and USAID.

Moreover, new centres within multilateral organizations with Brazil as a key partner have been created to support Brazilian TrC in social protection: the International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth (IPC-IG), the Centre for Excellence against Hunger and the World Centre for Sustainable Development (RIO+ Centre). The IPC-IG and the RIO+ Centre were established as partnerships between the UNDP and the Government of Brazil, and the Centre for Excellence against Hunger is a World Food Programme (WFP)-Government of Brazil partnership. These arrangements were a result of opportunities that emerged from the interaction between domestic constraints, international coalitions and agendas and changes in the development cooperation scene that led traditional donors to turn to South-South cooperation (Leite et al, 2015).

A crucial point to mention, which emerged from research that systematized the main SSC initiatives in social protection (Caixeta and Suyama, 2014), is that Ministries emphasize that a significant part of their engagement with Southern countries is participation in regional and global policy networks, as well as engagement in regional integration of other alliances, such as IBSA Dialogue Forum (India, Brazil, South Africa) and Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries (CPLP). Although it is beyond the remit of this paper to discuss those in detail, the participation in such networks and groups play an important role in the diffusion of Brazilian social protection and food security policies.

This section unpacks the lessons learned in the implementation of three trilateral partnerships: the Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour, the Purchase From Africans to Africa Programme (PAA Africa) and the World Without Poverty Platform. The case studies involved document and literature review as well as semi-structure interviews with key stakeholders (see Annex I for list of interviewees). The objective of comparing initiatives is to analyse the different motivations, structures, outcomes, potentialities and challenges of TrC. They will explore the complementary roles between partners and how these impact the quality of relationships and perceived project results.

a. PROGRAMME ON THE ELIMINATION OF CHILD LABOUR

The ILO/Brazil Partnership Programme to Promote South-South Cooperation to Prevent and Eradicate Child Labour was approved in 2009. The programme has five strategic pillars: (1) development of knowledge about the problem; (2) development of legislation; (3) development of institutional capacities; (4) raising public awareness regarding negative aspects of child labour; and (5) development of direct activities to protect children and adolescents. It prioritizes its engagement with National Eradication of Child Labour Commissions and participation of all relevant stakeholders. Twelve projects have been approved from 2009 to 2014, adding to a total of more than \$11 million (Brazil and ILO, 2015).

From the Brazilian side, the partnerships involve the ABC, the former Ministry of Labour and Employment and the National Committee for the Eradication of Child Labour (CONAETI); and internationally, ILO and the US Department of Labor (and the initiative counted with ad hoc support from other bilateral donors). Additionally, the role of regional integration groups, as well as alliances, such as Mercosur, CPLP and IBSA, has been pivotal. Particular areas of interest have included labour inspection, creation of tripartite forums, social accountability mechanism, child labour monitoring systems and conditional cash transfer, labour legislation, among others. The main mechanisms to support the programmes are listed in Table 3 below.

Table 2 – Mechanisms, modalities and examples of the Child Labour Programme

Mechanism	Modality	Examples
Knowledge exchange	Technical visits	Joint technical visits made by tripartite delegations Bolivia, Ecuador and Paraguay to Brazil focused on cash transfer, work inspection, child health
	Exchange groups	Exchange groups by areas of interest established between institutions of Tanzania and Brazil
	Study missions	Missions to Brazil study conducted by tripartite delegations of East Timor, Tanzania, Haiti
	Brazilian experts missions	Technical assistance missions of Brazilian experts
	Events to share knowledge	CPLP child labour focal points meeting, conference United Mercosur against child labour
	Horizontal capacity-building	Building the capacity of work inspector in Mozambique and East Timor
	Systematisation of knowledge	Virtual platform implemented by the Third Global Conference on Child Labour, publication Good Practices in Social Protection and Child Labour
Collective actions	Comparative research	Studies comparing legislation on child labour made by Mercosur and CPLP
	Common instruments to apply rules	Common protocol of child labour inspection adopted by Mercosur
	Collective awareness-raising campaigns	Campaign united Mercosur against child labour Child Labour Free Caravan Africa
	Mobilising political support	CPLP technical meetings with unions and the private sector, mobilization through the IBSA Forum, III Global Conference on Child Labour

Source: adapted from ILO (2015) and ILO and Brazil (2014)

The cooperation program between ILO and the Brazilian government for knowledge diffusion and technical assistance started in 1987. The passing of the prevention of the child labour law in Brazil precedes ⁷ the ILO program but it became a prominent agenda with contributions to the organization. In 1992, Brazil became part of the first six countries to join the International Program on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC).⁸ The partnership between ILO and the Brazilian government significantly impacted the national agenda for the promotion of decent work in all of its forms.

In 2005, dialogues for prevention and elimination of child labour in Portuguese-speaking African countries (also known as PALOPs, in the Portuguese acronym)⁹ took place. Between 2007 and 2008, two additional memorandums of understanding were signed between Brazil and ILO regarding SSC. At the IBSA forum in 2007, the Country Technical Advisers of ILO projects on child labour met in Brasilia; and in 2008, the Ministers of Labour of Brazil and India announced a cooperation initiative to combat child labour. ILO signed the IBSA Declaration in 2010 to support the forum in this initiative. The year before, an agreement was established to promote cooperation with Latin American and African countries. All these agreements were intensified and new partnerships were established in the region with the countries of Mercosur and CPLP. In 2011, the government of the United States joined the initiative for the implementation of two projects in Haiti and in the PALOPs.

⁷ See Decreto nº 1.313, of 31 January of 1981

⁸ See: <http://www.ilo.org/ipecc/Regionsandcountries/latin-america-and-caribbean/lang--en/index.htm>

⁹ See: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---exrel/documents/event/wcms_182879.pdf

Partners' dynamics and comparative advantages¹⁰

The relevance of the ILO-Brazil partnership to eradicate child labour is recognized by all stakeholders interviewed and in examined documents. It is considered mutually beneficial, as the ILO, after 10 years of support through IPEC, was reflecting on its exit strategy and Brazil, as an emerging country, wanted to change its status with the organization. Brazil became the first Southern country to support financially ILO's technical cooperation and helped attract other resources from traditional donors. The legitimacy that Brazil has, due to its accumulated knowledge, is complemented by ILO's capacity to organize demands, systematize knowledge and support follow-up, as well as support to the administrative and financial side of the projects.

The programme is also seen as strategic to Brazilian foreign policy strategy, through strengthening its relationships with the Global South, its institutional capacity to carry out technical cooperation and by producing document practices that are considered successful internationally. National and international partners also recognize the importance of the programme for Brazil itself. Accordingly, given the difficult conditions of combatting child labour in the North and Northeast regions of its own territory, it is important for Brazil to identify new approaches in other countries that could be adapted to its own country. The ILO initiative was built on an already existing dialogue within Mercosur and CPLP, institutions "where countries have voice" and control over the decision-making process and implementation of cooperation.

A frequent comparative advantage ascribed to triangular partnerships is the cost-sharing of such arrangements. Although Brazil often receives invitations to share its accumulated experience, it does not have the resources to cope with the number of requests. Similarly, both ILO and Brazil work together to produce and translate materials, such as guidelines and policies, which help the knowledge exchange process. Finally, Brazil is a key partner to advocate for decent work for ILO.

Results and lessons learned

The documents published by ILO and the Brazilian government and interviews demonstrate significant results for each of the 12 projects. Policies and programmes have been launched or revised, capacity-building programmes carried out, better systems to identify and monitor child labour were put into place, and services for children and adolescents at risk or suffering from child labour were improved. One main reason the programme has been able to contribute to significant achievements seems to be its coordination and alignment with particular policy spaces, such as Mercosur, CPLP and IBSA. These spaces allow for political and technical horizontal dialogue, which enables countries to build common positions and political commitment.

The fact that the programme established the first Brazilian South-South technical cooperation regional initiative also led to numerous lessons that could be replicated in other sectors. The acknowledgement and inclusion of civil society as a key actor, due to its participation in Brazilian child labour policies, programmes and the creation of multistakeholder institutionalised spaces, such as committees and forums, were also noted as important results to the programme. Awareness-raising campaigns were also pivotal to ensure political and societal buy-in to the issue. Finally, the interviewees stressed that the programme has allowed mutual learning, as Brazil has also benefitted from partners' experiences and brought home new ideas and practices to improve their own.

¹⁰The following sections were elaborated from the analysis of the interviewed institutions involved in the Initiative, being: Brazilian Ministry of Labour, ILO office in Brazil, CPLP, Mercosur, and focal points in Uruguay and Cape Verde (Instituto Cabo-Verdiano da Criança e dos Adolescentes), between 23 October and 23 November 2015.

Nonetheless, a number of challenges were raised. On the one hand, it is stated that the greatest difficulty is the limited commitment. When countries sign agreements but do not ratify them, it creates an environment of uncertainty and instability for the agreement itself, which forces projects to be postponed. The reasons for disruptions are many: changes in internal policies, alternating governments, discontinuation of policies, lack of resources and problems in communication. Another issue is sustainability once the project ends. ILO was identified as a strong ally to overcome this obstacle, given its experience in fund-raising.

b. PURCHASE FROM AFRICANS FOR AFRICA PROGRAMME

Purchase from Africans for Africa, known as PAA Africa, is a TrC arrangement between Brazil and five African countries, Ethiopia, Malawi, Mozambique, Niger and Senegal, supported by two international organizations, the WFP and FAO, the Centre of Excellence against Hunger and a bilateral donor, DFID. Inspired by the successful Brazilian experience, Food Purchase Programme, PAA Africa aims at promoting food and nutrition security through pilot technical cooperation projects. PAA Africa works at operational, programming and policy levels with the objective of: improving food availability by encouraging institutions to procure from local smallholders' farmers; enhancing farmers' production methods through training; providing support to carry out assessment of local context and developed country specific proposal to upscale the project; advancing knowledge-building and sharing through seminars, workshops and exchange visits (FAO, n/d). PAA Africa was designed to support smallholder farmers in Africa in one of the most difficult aspects of the productive process: gaining market access when food crops have been mainly driven by commodities stocks negotiated in financial markets. The program allows farmers to sell their produce to local public institutions such as hospitals, community canteens, food banks, orphanages and charities, without needing a public bidding process.

The PAA was instituted in Brazil in 2003 so that family-farmed products would be purchased by public authorities to provide for public policies of social assistance and populations in food insecurity, and for providing public stocks and price regulation. The program focuses on food availability by supporting production and access through agricultural market options. By purchasing products without a tendering process, it allowed smallholder farmers to participate in public procurement. The institutional framework of PAA in Brazil is based on an intersectoral approach, a key characteristic that guarantees the programme's scope, outcomes and impacts. The programme is jointly executed by the Ministry of Social Development and Fight against Hunger (MDS) and the Ministry of Agriculture Development (MDA), in partnership with states, municipalities and the National Food Supply Company (CONAB). Its legislation ensures multi-level participatory and social accountability mechanisms, highlighting the role played by the National Council of Food and Nutrition Security (CONSEA),¹¹ decentralized Food Security Councils, Social Assistance Municipal Councils, Sustainable Rural Municipal Councils and School Feeding Councils.

The PAA Africa partnership was first proposed by Brazil amid the African food crisis in 2008 that resulted in the 'Dialogue Brazil-Africa on Food Security, Fight against Hunger and Rural Development,' held in Brasilia in May 2010, in which 45 African countries attended. At that moment, Brazil had already identified common interests with significant potential for knowledge- and experience-sharing and was committed to supporting African countries to develop their own public purchase mechanisms, to better address the food crisis without

¹¹ CONSEA has a consultative role to the Presidency in forming public policies and the definition of guidelines so that Brazil guarantees the human right to adequate and healthy food, included in the Federal Constitution in 2009. More info at: <http://www4.planalto.gov.br/consea>

depending on food imports, through systematic assistance to national small-scale farmers.

Interviewees explained that the selection of the countries was based on the following criteria: having in place some kind of family agriculture and school-feeding programmes or governmental commitment to such; countries' geographical location to start piloting in different African regions with potential to reach those regions; having proper conditions to evolve from a pilot project to a national public policy, concerning their potential to scale up or sustain the efforts. PAA Africa went through diplomatic consultations, so that countries should have presented officially their interest in these partnerships proposed by Brazil in previous multilateral forums.

PAA Africa brought together three different aspects of sustainable food assistance: humanitarian cooperation through local purchase of food to guarantee the human right of food for farmers and students; participation of partner countries' government in implementation and monitoring to allow learning that can support the design of national policies; and regional dialogue between participating countries' and other actors whose strategies, challenges and institutional capacity can contribute to ownership and scale-up. Additionally, social accountability and civil society mobilization, which are key determinants for PAA's success in Brazil, are also important aspects of its international delivery. CONSEA and other actors engaged in food security in the country are active in PAA Africa,¹² building a stronger constituency. Brazilian civil society involvement in international dialogue and negotiation forums regarding FNS can also contribute to a more informed and empowered engagement of civil society.

PAA Africa is intrinsically linked to two other programmes: Purchase for Progress (P4P), led by the WFP, and the dissemination of the Brazilian National School Feeding Programme (PNAE), supported by the Centre of Excellence against Hunger. Through P4P, WFP incentivizes the government to invest in its own agricultural production, as it can sell to a reliable buyer (public institutions) and receive a fair price, due to public procurement mechanisms. PNAE invests exclusively in school meals to promote food security, keep children enrolled and performing in school and to strengthen smallholder farmers' agriculture, besides paying attention to the cultural values and local and fresh food ingredients.

*Partners' dynamics and comparative advantages*¹³

PAA Africa is funded mostly by the Brazilian government through earmarked contributions to FAO (\$1.575 million) and WFP (\$800,000); funds are transferred from the operating budget of CGFome as voluntary contributions for humanitarian emergency and recovery assistance. ID is also providing funds mainly dedicated to learning, monitoring and evaluating activities. MDS provides technical support and shares expertise drawn from PAA, while CGFome coordinates PAA Africa partners' network and is responsible, in consultation with local partners, for formulating policy guidelines. FAO contributes with technical expertise in nutrition-related and agricultural production issues; provides seeds, fertilizer and agriculture tools and inputs; and fosters the exchange of knowledge supporting partnerships and inter-institutional dialogue among project stakeholders. WFP organizes food purchase and delivery, linking smallholder farmers to farmers' organizations to procure food items for use in school feeding policies, supported by the P4P.

¹² CONSEA has participated in PAA missions, receives international delegations for experience exchange and integrates the Monitoring Committee of PAA Africa.

¹³ The following sections were elaborated from the interviews' analysis and other documents that the research team had access to during the ground research. The interviews were carried on from 28 October 2015 to 3 November 2015 with four of the institutions involved with PAA Africa: Center of Excellence against Hunger, DFID, MDS International Office and FAO coordinator.

The comparative advantages brought into PAA Africa by all the participating institutions play a key role in responding to the successful results achieved so far. Interviewees have spoken enthusiastically about comparative advantages of each institution. It was raised that FAO has significant expertise in working with local farmers and rural development in Africa, with innovative techniques to increase productivity in poor and small economies. WFP also had considerable experience and consolidated knowledge with food purchase (especially due to P4P) in Africa and, as a major humanitarian agency, is present in more than 70 developing countries and provides good logistics. Moreover, WFP and FAO project coordination in Rome provide valuable support to project implementation and coordination through constant dialogue and technical assistance with the support of their field offices in each of the African countries.

Interviewees pointed out that DFID has a recognized experience in the implementation of international cooperation projects in the field and their support to PAA Africa's monitoring and evaluation has been valuable. The Centre of Excellence against Hunger is strengthening technical support mainly on public policy designing and implementation, through its work in partner countries, mainly its support to building school-feeding public policies. The Centre and other Brazilian partners have political legitimacy with other developing countries, which allows them to establish horizontal dialogue with African partners and influence processes, even though financial resources were relatively small. Additionally, MDS has technical expertise and experiential knowledge of how the program developed in Brazil.

Motivations to engage in such programmes vary. The Centre of Excellence against Hunger reported that PAA Africa was a complementary initiative for its work in Africa, once the Centre was in charge of supporting countries to create public policies for school feeding. DFID mentioned adjustments in their work with the Brazilian government when Brazil left FAO's Hunger Map in 2014 and its social policies were internationally recognized, shifting to an investment in Brazil as a means to strengthen social development in other Southern countries, mostly African and Asian.

The FAO also showed that besides its mandate with the United Nations (UN) system to promote food security, especially concerning food crises in Africa, it had also been monitoring Brazilian experience with public policies in food and nutrition security, supporting Brazilian efforts to evaluate PAA in the past. Thus, it was able to recognize the capacity of local purchase from small-scale farmers programmes to boost food productivity and economic growth, positively impacting the social protection field, according to its 2014 report of The State of Food and Agriculture.

Results and lessons learned

The 2016 programme brochure states that it has supported the provision of meals to 75,589 students with locally produced food procurements from 13,239 small-scale farmers (PAA, 2016). So far, PAA Africa results point to several contributions to all five participating African countries. Some common results were observed in all of the countries in terms of supply (capacity development and activities and partnerships with farmers' organizations) and demand (local procurements and school feeding). But the progress in each country is a result of singularities (PAA, 2015; PAA, 2016). Some of the countries have also demonstrated leadership in taking the programme further: Senegal reported that it is starting to discuss national strategies for local purchase and to create a specific budget line item to ensure its implementation. Ethiopia is building on results from pilot experience in the southern region to elaborate a National Programme on School Feeding.

Some of the positive results concerning social participation in PAA Africa highlight cooperation with Mozambique, where its National Union of Smallholder Farmers (UNAC, in Portuguese) has had a continuous involvement throughout the whole project as a member of the consultative group; in other countries, dialogue forums with civil society are being promoted by FAO and WFP, due to nonexistent recognition and involvement of civil society groups as actors in the public policy domain. However, the effectiveness of the programme in supporting social participation was limited because of resource issues and contextual factors. The latter refers to challenging enabling environments for civil society participation in recipient countries, as well as the nonexistence of institutional mechanisms for civil society participation in Brazilian South-South cooperation (PAA, 2015).

One interviewee pointed out that the main achievement of PAA Africa has been the cultural shift of awareness of the importance of family farming for development. There were also some unexpected results, as indicated by the interviewed institutions. For instance, increased political commitment towards turning family farming into a more dynamic, organized activity with government support. Additionally, the importance the subject of family and small-scale farmers gained in FAO mandates and work agendas globally after PAA Africa, with FAO getting more staff involved, producing materials, investing in case studies and in studying the Brazilian experience as a good practice to inspire other countries. Nonetheless, CONSEA representatives think that FAO and WFP have not fully incorporated their commitment to local procurement and tensions exist between support to farmers and agribusiness (PAA, 2015:9-16).

Although home-grown feeding and support to smallholder families are aligned with national strategies, specific policy, programming and implementations tools are not always in place (PAA, 2014). In Mozambique, there are doubts over the political commitment to continue it, particularly if international funds were to stop. Moreover, the programme's focus on family farming may collide with governmental commitment to the promotion of a large-scale commercial agriculture (Milhorance et al, 2015).

Local availability of and access to agricultural inputs, along with limited presence of input traders, were important challenges. Capacity constraints of decentralised extension services were also stumbling blocks. Local institutional food procurement entails adaptations to target small-scale farmers' organizations and their diversity. Ensuring that mechanisms are suitable for farmers to be able to fully respond to supply requirements in terms of quantity, quality and regularity is essential. Locally procured food in school meals also requires the development of adapted menus and school capacities to handle this food (PAA, 2014).

The main challenge raised by interviewees is to find funding alternatives for the continuity of PAA Africa, so that countries can scale up ownership of activities provided through the programme's two phases so far. Another challenge concerning evaluation is the lack of baseline data, preventing an evidence-based impact evaluation at the end of the second phase, financed by DFID. However, they expected to have a case study demonstrating qualitative data and consolidating the partnership memory and learning experiences. The programme lost some political engagement from its initial phase from the part of the Brazilian government, which is challenging the current goal of keeping this partnership with the same institutions for the future or finding a different arrangement with the interest of FAO and WFP through their field offices, in providing continuity to PAA Africa, as such.

Brazil's experience with PAA Africa may be regarded an important achievement for Brazilian SSC, since it involves sharing experience about a program that is the result of a key lesson learned from the National Food

and Nutrition Security Policy. This achievement is precisely related to its capacity to bring together production and access to food and involve other stakeholders, such as civil society. This gain is even more important when it is analysed as part of the effort by the CGFome to renew Brazilian humanitarian cooperation. CGFome aims to combine emergency and structural actions, which translate into a new model denominated 'sustainable humanitarian cooperation.' This hybrid of technical and humanitarian cooperation is taking shape in projects that can be differentiated from other humanitarian initiatives by local purchasing.

c. WORLD WITHOUT POVERTY PLATFORM

Created in March 2013, the Brazil Learning Initiative for a World Without Poverty (WWP) is a triangular cooperation arrangement involving multilateral actors: UNDP and the World Bank, Brazilian governmental institutions - the Ministry of Social Development and the Fight against Hunger (MDS) and the Institute of Applied Economic Research (IPEA), IPC-IG and several countries as third parties, both developing and developed ones. Its main idea is to support systematic learning and innovation after a decade of Brazilian poverty reduction programs, especially Bolsa Família and Brasil Sem Miséria, facilitating knowledge-sharing and learning between Brazil and other countries. WWP fosters the development of knowledge tools with lessons learned from implementation to help answer the demand in a more focused and cost-effective way, and not necessarily involving field missions and transatlantic visits.

The WWP initiative was officially created in March 2013 with the signature of a memorandum of understanding during the official visit of the World Bank president, Jim Yong Kim, to Brazil. It was clear to all interviewees that the cooperation project was a World Bank initiative: the main idea was to apply the 'how-to' approach to Brazilian social protection policies, facilitating its adaptation and dissemination, under World Bank's renewed focus on the systematization of global development solutions, known as science of delivery.

In 2014, the WWP team made a survey with participants from three different international seminars hosted in Brazil to pinpoint the most interesting subjects on social protection. According to this survey, partners wanted to learn from the Brazilian experience but through short, evidence-based studies and reference materials rather than lengthy documents. Subjects considered most interesting were the Unified Social Registry; Productive Inclusion; Bolsa Família and its conditions; federative coordination in social policies; and Brasil Sem Miséria.

Partners' dynamics and comparative advantages

The World Bank initiated the triangular arrangement investing resources (covering most of WWP budget) and methodological expertise to foster the development of knowledge-sharing outputs adapted to the needs of policymakers, especially in developing countries facing similar problems. For the bank, the triangular cooperation can be a way of maintaining the relationship with a country graduated from the list of aid-receiving countries.

Although the social protection and fight against hunger agenda that started with the first Lula administration mobilized numerous governmental institutions, its management was mainly concentrated in MDS, responsible for program management and implementation. Therefore, they were responsible for sharing knowledge related to implementation of social protection policies, in the 'how to' perspective advocated by the World Bank.

For MDS, WWP is a World Bank validation of Brazilian policies, which can be used to leverage internal political discussions, and an opportunity to increase visibility and access to social protection policies and practices. It also develops materials in different languages, helping to answer the growing demand from developing countries seeking to learn from the Brazilian experience. From 2011 to 2014, 345 delegations from 92 developing countries visited MDS.

IPEA is the government institution responsible for evidence-based research of Brazilian public policies, and it was also in charge of assessing the country performance in the MDGs. It works closely with MDS on many projects and was took part in the WWP initiative, contributing knowledge on Brazilian social protection programs and adapting it to a more accessible format and language.

The IPC-IG results from a cooperation agreement between Brazil and UNDP to serve as a global forum for South-South dialogue on innovative development policies and to promote the production and dissemination of studies and policy recommendations. Created a decade ago, and involving virtually the same institutions as the WWP, it is hosted by IPEA and has published numerous papers and research featuring not only Brazilian policies but also experiences and best-cases form other Southern countries. The IPC-IG joined WWP due to its similar mandate and consolidated network of governments and development practitioners; despite the apparent duplicity, interviewees seemed to see the IPC-IG mandate as wider than WWP, and that it could strengthen the South-South edge of the triangular arrangement, which would justify its engagement.

Developing countries interested in the Brazilian experience represent the third vertex of the triangle. At first, they participate with a growing demand for technical visits, presentations and reference materials to help them adapt Brazilian development practices into their national realities. However, partner institutions expect WWP to become a platform for mutual learning in the near future, where both developing and developed countries could share their experiences in social development.

Results and lessons learned

So far, WWP is focusing on capturing and consolidating knowledge on social assistance and poverty reduction based on the Brazilian implementation experience, as stated in its work plan. It has published fact and data sheets on the Unified Registry on Social Programs, Bolsa Família, (conditions, relationship with beneficiaries); the Unified System for Social Assistance; the Child Labour Eradication Program; Food and Nutrition Security (the Food Purchase Program and the Cisterns Program); and Brazil Sem Miséria, etc. Moreover, it has organized several events and seminars on monitoring and evaluation social policies and poverty eradication, and put together webinars and virtual Q&A sessions with short video messages (the WWP Quick Question).

Interviewees from partner organizations raised the point that no clear indicators exist to measure WWP's results, apart from the number of accesses and downloads. One of the questions posed was, what constitutes success for this type of initiative? However, it was stressed that the project has allowed reflection on how to improve MDS' internal processes and is more willing to share not only the successful side of implementation but also its challenges and pitfalls.

A limitation regarding its impact is that all its activities have been virtual. A representative of the platform pointed out that there is a need for technical material to be produced so that in the next phases, the focus can be shifted to sharing them with other countries. Nevertheless, many foreign delegations come to Brazil to find

out more about its social protection system, but there are no means to distinguish the demands coming due to the existence of WWP Platform from the common demands that has always arrived at MDS. The current work plan also underlines the need for a more effective knowledge exchange within Brazil, between practitioners and policymakers at national and subnational levels, and between Brazil and other countries (South-South exchanges) until 2017.


Since WWP is a relatively new initiative, website access is its main available indicator, and data from earlier 2015 shows ambiguous results: although most products were designed for countries from the South, viewers come mainly from the United States, United Kingdom and China. From the 20 countries with most viewers, only six are developing ones. This can indicate difficulties to engage developing countries in web-based initiatives, but it can also be a sign of interest from other multilateral development organizations (mostly located in the North) interested in the Brazilian experience, potentially driving further triangular cooperation. However, as we do not know the profile of viewers (country of origin, type of organization they work for, etc.) it is not possible to provide a concrete analysis on this issue.

The partnership between government agencies and international organizations can also be considered a positive achievement. Although the World Bank initiated it, the WWP counts on a horizontal decision-making process among partner institutions that seeks consensus in every strategic decision. The projection for a second phase that would allow mutual learning is also in line with South-South cooperation principles, and it could influence positively the new development cooperation agenda. The focus on evidence-based research and a how-to methodology may, however, technicalize an agenda that is, as any other policy area, extremely political.

4. CONCLUSION

The case studies analysed in this paper show initial reflections on the relationships being established through TrC, the comparative advantage of the partners and some results and lessons learned. Although further research is needed, both in terms of deepening the analysis of the three cases and expanding to other projects and programmes, the initiatives provide insights on the potentialities and challenges of TrC. One clear message is that Brazil sees the role of international organizations as positively contributing to its South-South Cooperation efforts. Defining how successful TrC initiatives are, however, depend on a number of aspects. During the research process, interviewees were asked what they considered a successful TrC. Their answers related both to the process: how the cooperation was done, and the results, or what was achieved (see Figure 1 below).

Figure 1 – Main characteristics of a successful TrC initiative



Source: Authors illustration

Regarding the process, a crucial lesson that cannot be overstated is the need to establish horizontal partnerships. That entails shared leadership and management of projects and actions that respond to the demands and needs of the partner in which the initiative is being implemented, from the planning phase up to results' monitoring and evaluation. Although this may seem straightforward, interviewees pointed out that this dynamic is very different from most North-South cooperation initiatives. A second lesson is the need for political commitment, which can be achieved through the buy-in and support of senior politicians but also by ensuring TrCs linked to other initiatives such as Mercosur and CPLP. These spaces are led by developing countries and promote political and technical horizontal dialogue, which allow for countries to build common positions and political commitment.

As Figure 1 shows, what is considered a positive result of TrC depends on the position of the partner and the perception of what it is 'gaining' from it. In this sense, visibility and legitimacy in the international sphere is seen as an important outcome for Brazil and Northern partners. Increased political and commercial relationships between countries is also a key objective in TrC. Changes in policy and practices are significant to all partners, including changes in behaviour of multilateral and bilateral donors. More research is needed to explore how

these changes are actually contributing to sustainable development. However, the lessons analysed so far suggest potential contributions that Brazilian TrC in social protection can make to the 2030 agenda.

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is one of the most comprehensive, internationally agreed-upon commitments. While social protection is only one of many strategies needed to achieve such vision, it is linked to other policy areas and it can contribute to many SDGs.¹⁴ Devereux et al. (2015) in the report 'Where Next in Social Protection,' revealed that there are multiple paths to achieve social protection, all highly context-specific and subject to change over time. Moreover, the nature of the country's political regime emerged as the most fundamental determinant of which policies will be adopted (p.6). Thus, pushing ahead on such transformative reforms requires political will and not merely technical tools. It also depends on a number of coordinated actions from various government agencies, as well as civil society and the private sector.

In this sense, Brazilian cooperation in social protection can contribute to international social protection efforts in three different aspects, by: (1) inspiring leaders, government officials and civil society; (2) providing principles and approaches to establish more horizontal partnerships; and (3) sharing policies, programmes and tools based on its experience in setting-up and scaling-up social protection systems. The inspirational factor of Brazilian cooperation should not be undermined. Partners see Brazil as a more legitimate partner and example, both because it belongs to the Global South and its economic development in the last decades. The initial analysis on the PAA Africa and the Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour indicate that Brazilian cooperation can support political mobilization by engaging in dialogue through regional integration initiatives and networks. Such spaces seem crucial, as they engage both political and technical counterparts, which allow for countries to build common positions and political commitment and have led to cultural shifts; for instance, raising the importance of family farming and civil society engagement in partner countries.

Secondly, TrC principles and processes can contribute to better partnerships. The actual success of a TrC, apart from achieving its results, relate to the ability of the relationships established and the learning and benefits of each partner. The case studies showed a variety of roles played by trilateral partners: administrative, supporting the set-up and implementation of projects; funding, mobilizing the resources needed; learning and monitoring and evaluation (M&E), facilitating the systematization of lessons and results to improve projects and disseminate information; technical support, based on practical experience of implementing programmes and policies in Brazil; technical support, based on experience in development cooperation; political, mobilizing political support and ensuring commitment to see agreements through. Such roles need

¹⁴ Goal 1 of the 2030 Agenda commits to "end poverty in all its forms everywhere," and SDG 1.3 focuses on social protection pledging to "implement nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all, including floors, and by 2030 achieve substantial coverage of the poor and the vulnerable." This is further expanded by SDG 3.8, on health care, to "achieve universal health coverage, including financial risk protection." If we take the transformative social protection perspective, social protection is not only an essential tool in combating poverty (SDGs 1.1 and 1.2), and are the basis for appropriate health care, food security and housing, especially for vulnerable groups (SDGs 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 3.4, 3.8 and 11.1). They also have an impact on inequality (SDGs 10.1. and 10.4) and promote social cohesion (SDG 10.2). They make an important contribution to helping people back into work (SDG 8.5 and 8.6), establish a basis for more gender equality (SDGs 4.5, 5.1 and 5.4) and are a prerequisite in enabling parents to send their children to school (SDGs 4.1. and 8.7) (Kaltenborn, 2015).

to be collectively negotiated, and openness about each partner's motivation is also necessary.¹⁵ The creation of steering committees with representation from all partners is also essential. Such spaces ensure decisions and monitoring is done collectively, which can improve the ownership and horizontality of projects. The figure below synthesizes the main success criteria from the literature review and interviews.

Finally, Brazilian social protection policies, programmes and tools can be adapted in different contexts, hopefully leading to actual impact on the ground. However, to truly promote endogenous solutions, a longer and deeper process of reflection around the main building blocks – social, political and cultural dynamics – as well as technical tools need to be unpacked and discussed, bearing in mind the local reality. In order to do that, agencies involved need to reflect on how to establish dynamic and effective multistakeholder cooperation to ensure political buy-in and provide the technical and financial resources needed to expand knowledge-sharing and to support autonomous policy adaptation.

The scope of dissemination of specific policies and programmes depends on the capacity and legitimacy of the actors who promote it to: create evidence for the effectiveness of the proposed solutions, provide funding for projects or directly to the partner country, provide technical support to cooperation initiatives (South-South and North-South) and politically support the legitimacy of the proposed solutions (Pomeroy and Suyama, forthcoming). The international development cooperation can be seen as a 'market for solutions' that has been dominated by traditional donors. Decisions on which policies and practices will be chosen depend not simply on their effectiveness, but also on the distribution of power in the international system in a given moment and its impact on global governance structures. International organizations and other donors are understood to be bureaucracies that tend to find new strategies when solutions previously defended by them are questioned, thus guaranteeing their existence (Barnett and Finnemore, 2004).

In the case of WWP, which builds on previous support to share Bolsa Família, there has been great effort by various international organizations to create a foundation of evidence and to produce documents explaining its technical aspects. In the case of PAA Africa and the Eradication of Child Labour Programme, various arrangements enable learning-sharing techniques and social and political processes that have enabled their success, and mobilize in different areas political actors. Thus, different arrangements promote strategies that help to legitimize the proposed solutions technically and/or politically. A key implication of this finding for the adaptation of social protection policies lies in its redistributive character. Any adaptation and implementation of policies and programmes have impacts on the distribution of power and resources in society. In this sense, understanding the political agreement/contract between the existing social group or coalition that is in power and how the actors involved in the TrC relate to these is crucial.

¹⁵ The literature demonstrates that motivations vary for different partners. Traditional donors engage in TrC for: substitution of aid programs in third countries for programs by emerging countries; building the capacity of development cooperation agencies in Southern countries; coordination and harmonization of development cooperation; scaling-up development assistance; increased cost-effectiveness; increased legitimacy and comparative advantages of Southern countries (Abdenur and Fonseca, 2013; OECD, 2009; UNDP, 2009; Ashoff, 2010).

Southern providers have other motives to cooperate. Firstly, TrC can be understood as a tool to promote countries' foreign policy and national development, reinforcing their regional leadership and promoting integration. Scaling-up and improving South-South cooperation by involving traditional donors and thereby mobilizing additional resources are also other drivers. Finally, the increased credibility and international visibility can also be seen as reasons to engage (Abdenur and Fonseca, 2013; Mawdsley, 2012; Ayllon, 2013; Ashoff, 2010; OCDE, 2013; SEGIB, 2015; UNDP, 2009).

With respect to partner countries where the project is being implemented, TrC is understood to be providing additional technical and financial support. Also, it facilitates communication and networking with third countries and promotes regional cooperation and integration. Lastly, TrC benefits from the similarities between developing countries' experiences and their own needs as they look for more appropriate solutions to development problems, and from the linguistic and cultural similarities with the Southern partner (UNDP, 2009; OECD, 2009; Ashoff, 2010).

REFERENCES

- Abdenur, A., and Fonseca, J.M.E.M. (2013) The North's Growing Role in South-South Cooperation: keeping the foothold. *Third World Quarterly*, 34 (8): 1475.
- Ashoff, G. (2010) *Triangular Cooperation: Opportunities, risks, and conditions for effectiveness*. Special Report, Oct. Washington DC: World Bank Institute.
- Ayllón, B. (2011). Agentes transformadores de la cooperación para el desarrollo: poderes emergentes y cooperación sur-sur. *Relaciones internacionales*, 40: 99-119.
- Ayllón, B. (2013) *A Cooperação Triangular e as Transformações da Cooperação Internacional para o Desenvolvimento*. Texto para discussão 1845, Rio de Janeiro: IPEA.
- Barnett, M. and Finnemore, M. (2004) *Rules for the world: International Organizations in Global Politics*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Brasil (2013) *Cooperação Brasileira para o Desenvolvimento Internacional: 2010*, Brasília: IPEA and ABC.
- Brasil (2010) *Cooperação Brasileira para o Desenvolvimento Internacional: 2005–2009*. Brasília: IPEA and ABC.
- Caixeta, M.B. and Suyama, B. (2015) *Informativo Setorial: A Cooperação Sul-Sul em Proteção Social*. São Paulo: Observatório Brasil e o Sul. Available at www.obs.org.br/Informativo_Setorial_1. Accessed December 2015.
- Chaturvedi, S. (2012) Development Co-operation: Contours, Evolution and Scope, in S. Chaturvedi, T. Fues and E. Sidiropoulos (eds.), *Development Co-operation and Emerging Powers – New Partners or Old Patterns?* London: Zed Books.
- CGFome (2014) *PAA Africa: global partnerships to local purchase*. Nota Técnica June 2014. Available at: http://paa-africa.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/nota-tecnica_low.pdf Accessed in October 2015.
- Craig, D. and Porter, D. (2005) The Third Way and the Third World: Poverty Reduction and Social Inclusion Strategies in the Rise of Inclusive Neoliberalism. *Review of International Political Economy*, 12(2): 226-63.
- Devereux, S., and Sabates-Wheeler, R. (2004) *Transformative Social Protection*, IDS Working Paper 232. Brighton: IDS.
- Devereux, S., Allister McGregor, J. and Sabates-Wheeler, R. (2011) Introduction: social protection for social justice. *IDS Bulletin Special Issue: Social Protection for Social Justice*, 42(6): 1-9.
- Devereux, S.; Roelen, K. and Ulrichs, M. (2015) *Where next for social development?* IDS Evidence Report 124. Brighton: IDS.

ECOSOC (2008). Trends in South-South and triangular development cooperation. Background study for the development cooperation forum. New York: ECOSOC.

Esteves, P., Assunção, M. (forthcoming). The South-South partnership puzzle: the Brazilian Health Expert Community in Mozambique.

Esteves, P.; Moura Fonseca, J. and Zoccal Gomes, G. (forthcoming). Unpacking Brazilian South-South Cooperation: Policy Networks and Structuring Co-operation in Mozambique.

FAO (2015) The State of Food Insecurity in the World. Rome: FAO.

FAO (n/d) Scaling-up Purchase from Africans for Africa: family farmers supply nutritious meals for school children. South-South Cooperation. http://ssc.undp.org/content/dam/ssc/documents/Expo/2014/concept_notes/SSC_CN_PAAprogramme.pdf . Accessed January 2016.

FAO, WFP and Brazil (2012) Project Document 'Promoting Local Food Purchases for Food Assistance on the African Continent - Purchase from Africans for Africa' (PAA). Unpublished document.

Fordelone, T.Y. (2009) Triangular co-operation and aid effectiveness. Paris: OECD.

Hickey, S. (2010) The Politics of Social Protection in Africa: What Do We Get From a 'Social Contract' Approach? Background paper to the European Report on Development 2010. Florence: European University Institute.

Holzmann, R. and Jørgensen, J. (2000) Social Risk Management: A New Conceptual Framework for Social Protection and Beyond, Social Protection Discussion Paper Series No. 6. Washington DC: World Bank.

HLPE (2012). Social protection for food security. High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition of the Committee on World Food Security Report. Rome: FAO.

IFAD and WFP (2014) The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2014. Strengthening the enabling environment for food security and nutrition. Rome: FAO.

ILO (2015) Innovation coming from the field: systematisation of the ILO-Brazil Partnership Programme for the Promotion of South-South Cooperation. Brasília: ILO.

ILO (2012) South-South and triangular cooperation: The way forward. 313th Session, Geneva, 15-30 March 2012. Available at: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@ed_norm/@relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_172577.pdf Accessed in October 2015.

ILO and Brazil (2015) Brazil's Contribution to the ILO's South-South and Triangular Cooperation Strategy: An Overview June 2015 IX Brazil-ILO Annual South-South and Triangular Cooperation Meeting Geneva, 10 June 2015. Available at: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---exrel/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_374381.pdf Accessed in October 2015.

ILO and Brazil (2014) Brazilian Contribution to the ILO's South-South and Triangular Cooperation Strategy January 2013 to June 2014: An Overview VIII Brazil-ILO Annual South-South and Triangular Cooperation Strategy. Review Meeting Geneva, 9 June 2014. Available at: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---exrel/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_245665.pdf Accessed in October 2015.

ILO and Brazil (2013) Brazil's Contribution to the ILO South-South and Triangular Cooperation Strategy An overview: 2011-2013. VII Annual Review Meeting, 18 June 2013, Geneva. Available at: <http://www.ilo.org/>

- [wcmisp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---exrel/documents/event/wcms_216790.pdf](http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---exrel/documents/event/wcms_216790.pdf) Accessed in October 2015.
- ILO and Brazil (2012) Brazil's Contribution to the ILO's South-South Cooperation Strategy An overview: 2010-2012. VI Annual Review Meeting Brasilia, 17-18 May 2012. Available at: http://www.ilo.org/wcmisp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---exrel/documents/event/wcms_182879.pdf Accessed in October 2015.
- ILO and WHO (2009) The Social Protection Floor: A Joint Crisis Initiative of the UN Chief Executives Board for Co-ordination on the Social Protection Floor. Geneva: ILO and WHO.
- IPC-IG (2013) The Role of South-South Cooperation in Inclusive and Sustainable Agricultural Development. Poverty in Focus 24. Brasilia: IPC-IG.
- Leite, I.C., Suyama, B., Pomeroy, M.E. and Waisbich, L.T. (2014) Brazil's Engagement in International Development Cooperation: The State of the Debate. Sussex: Institute of Development Studies.
- Leite, I.C., Pomeroy, M. and Suyama, B. (2015) Brazilian South-South Development Cooperation: The Case of the Ministry of Social Development in Africa. *Journal of International Development* 27(8): 1446-1461.
- Mawdsley, E. (2012) The changing geographies of foreign aid and development cooperation: Contributions from gift theory. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 37: 256-272.
- Mawdsley, E. (2014) Human Rights and South-South Development Cooperation: Reflections on the "Rising Powers" as International Development Actors. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 36(3): 630-652.
- McEwan, C. and Mawdsley, E. (2012) Trilateral Development Cooperation: Power and Politics in Emerging Aid Relationships. *Development and Change*, 43(6): 1185.
- Merrien, F. (2013) Social protection as development policy: a new international agenda for action, *International Development Policy*, 4(2): 89-106.
- Milhorance, C. (2013) A política de cooperação do Brasil com a África Subsaariana no setor rural: transferência e inovação na difusão de políticas públicas. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, 56(2).
- Milhorance, C., Sabourina, E. and Bursztynb, M. (2015) Potential and limits to diffusing Brazil's Zero Hunger strategy in sub-Saharan Africa: the case of Mozambique. Paper presented at International Conference of Public Policy, July 2015.
- Mounir, M.Z. and Inomata, E.R.T. (2011) South-South and Triangular Cooperation in the United Nations System. Joint Inspection Unit Geneva. Geneva: UN.
- NEST Brazil (forthcoming) Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms for south-south and triangular cooperation: lessons from Brazil for the 2030 development agenda.
- OECD (2013) Triangular cooperation: What's the Literature Telling Us? Paris: OECD.
- PAA Africa (2016) PAA Brochure. Available at: www.paa_africa.org Accessed in May 2016.
- PAA Africa (2015a) PAA Africa Phase I Learning and Results Report. Available at: http://paa-africa.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Report-Phase-I_low.pdf. Accessed in October 2015.

PAA Africa (2015b) PAA e a Participação da Sociedade Civil: visões, limites e caminhos para o futuro. Available at: http://paa-africa.org/pt/wp-content/uploads/sites/6/2015/09/PAA_Africa_Participacao_Social_REvCGFOME_final.pdf Accessed in March 2016.

Pomeroy, M. and Suyama, B. (forthcoming) Transferência de políticas de proteção social e segurança alimentar: Questões emergentes da cooperação Sul-Sul para o desenvolvimento brasileira. Paper presented at the International Seminar on Policy Diffusion, São Paulo, May 2016.

Prado-Lallande, J.P. (2012) The triangular cooperation in Latin America, analysis and proposals. *Latin American Journal of International Affairs*, 4(2): 30.

Santarelli, M., and Suyama, B. (Forthcoming) Brazilian food and Nutritional Security in Africa: Planting seeds in unfamiliar soil. Thematic Report on Social Protection. Rio de Janeiro: Rio+ Center.

SEGIB (2015) Report on South-South Cooperation in Ibero-america. Madrid: SEGIB.

Slater, R., Holmes, R. and Mathers, N. (2014) Food and Nutrition (in-)Security and Social Protection. OECD Development Co-operation Working Papers 15. Paris: OECD Publishing.

UNDP (2009) Enhancing South-South and Triangular Cooperation. New York: UNDP.

UN (1978) Buenos Aires Plan of Action for Promoting and Implementing Technical Co-operation Among Developing Countries, the United Nations Conference on Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries, Special Unit for Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries. New York: UNDP.

UNDP (2011) Mapping Multilateral Support to South-South Cooperation in Latin America and the Caribbean: towards collaborative approaches. Panama: UNDP.

USA White House (2012) The United States and Brazil: Trilateral Co-operation, Factsheet, The United States White House, Washington D.C., 9 April 2012. Available at: www.state.gov/p/wha/rls/fs/2012/187613.htm Accessed October, 2015.

WFP and IPC-IG (2013). Structured Demand and Smallholder Farmer in Brazil: the case of PAA and PNAE. Brasília: UNDP.

ANNEX – LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

Name	Position	Organization
Anna Maria Graziano	Project Analyst	Brazilian Cooperation Agency
Carlos Gonçalves	Cooperation Director	CPLP
Cecilia Malaguti do Prado	Trilateral Cooperation with International Organizations Coordinator	Brazilian Cooperation Agency
Cláudia Baddini	Country representative	World Bank
Daniel Balaban	Director	Centre of Excellence against Hunger
Fernanda Barreto	South-South cooperation coordination	ILO
Israel Klug	PAA Africa coordinator	FAO
Jairson Pereira Gomes	Focal Point for the Child Labour Programme	Cape Verde
João Sigora	International Relations Secretariat	MDS, Brazil
Leonardo Soares	Advisor	Ministry of Labour and Social Security, Brazil
Luis Henrique Paiva	Researcher	IPC-IG
Marilena Catunda Baessa	President	ICCA, Cape Verde
Patrícia Vieira Costa	Adviser	MDS, Brazil
Rafael Osório	Researcher	IPEA, Brazil
Silke Seco	Food and Nutrition Security Adviser	DFID



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

United Nations Development Programme

Bureau for Development Policy

One United Nations Plaza

New York, NY, 10017 USA

Tel: +1 212 906 5081

For more information: www.undp.org/ssc

Copyright 2016, UNDP. Cover Photo by: UNDP Brazil