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1. Historical Background

- Started in 1980s and recent growing
- Emerging new partners including China, India and Brazil
- Important role of emerging countries in Int’l development agenda
- Shift of global architecture for development effectiveness
- Shortage of financing of development

Source: OECD (2013); JICA (2013); Chaturvedi (2012); McEwan & Mawdsley (2012); Ashoff (2010); Schulz (2010); Fordelone (2009); Kumar (2008)
II. Stated and Unstated Motivations for TrC

**Stated Motivations**

- Enhancing effectiveness and efficiency of development
- Ensuring Sustainability
- Developing partnership among donor, pivotal and recipient countries
- Improving development capacity of pivotal countries
- Strengthening regional cooperation
- Enlarging financing of development

**Unstated Motivations**

Source: OECD (2013); JICA (2013); Chaturvedi (2012); UNDP (2009); UNECSOC (2008); Fordelone (2009); Kumar (2008)
### III. Case Study 1: Japan vs. German

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Similarity** | 1) Purpose of TrC: Enhancing development effectiveness and efficiency, Mutual learning among donor, pivotal and recipient countries, Shortage of financing of development, Encouraging South-south cooperation, Strengthening regional cooperation and network  
2) Most projects are national level (high alignment with recipients’ national development policy)  
3) The scale of TrC is relatively small  
4) Written agreement is required to pivotal and recipient countries |  |
| **Pivotal** | · 12 active pivotal countries including Brazil and Mexico through PP(Partnership Program) | · List of pivotal countries exists but not bounded |
| **Funding** | · No special fund for TrC  
· Counted in Bilateral cooperation | · Special Fund for TrC: TriCo Fund, LAC Fund |
| **Sector** | · Agriculture, Health, Capacity Building, Child Labor, Social Issues | · Environment, System management, Bio-diversity |
| **Approach** | · Bottom-up | · Top-down |

## VI. Case Study 2: Korea

### KOICA TrC (1995-2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pivotal</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Duration/Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Asia-Pacific and Africa</td>
<td>Intellectual property right, trade investment policy and FTA, Urban development, sustainable development and so on.</td>
<td>Matching fund 50:50, inviting trainees, onsite training</td>
<td>1995-2013/ Total 94 courses, 1,517 beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isiael</td>
<td>Vietnam, Thailand</td>
<td>Irrigation system development, agriculture in drought area</td>
<td>Matching fund 50:50, inviting trainees, onsite training</td>
<td>1997-2001/ Total 5 courses, 126 beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Information and communication</td>
<td>Matching fund 80:20, onsite training</td>
<td>2007/ 1 course, 9 beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>Aquaculture, E-government</td>
<td>Matching fund, onsite training</td>
<td>2003-2013/ Total 11 courses, 169 beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Latin America (10 countries)</td>
<td>Climate change, Green growth</td>
<td>Matching fund, online training, onsite workshop</td>
<td>2011-2013/ Total 3 courses, 67 beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Manufacturing technology support</td>
<td>2007-2009/ $1.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Caribbean States</td>
<td>Automobile, automation and electronics</td>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td>2011-2013/ $0.3 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: KOICA (2014)
V. Strategies: Pivotal Countries

- Compatibility of language and culture with recipient countries
- Similarities in socio-economic environments with recipient countries
- Former cooperation experience (Partners of bilateral cooperation)
- Containing development experience and unique technology
- Political and diplomatic relations
- Recognition, Accountability, Governance

Source: Honda et al (2014); OECD (2013 a, b); JICA (2013); BMZ (2013); Chaturvedi (2012); UNDP (2009)
V. Strategies : Sector

- Health: 35 projects
- Agri/Forest/Fishery: 55 projects
- Environment & Climate Change: 24 projects
- Education & Science Technology: 17 projects
- Trade & Business Environment: 16 projects
- Social Overhead Capital: 18 projects
- Capacity Building: 28 projects
- Governance: 30 projects
- Etc.: 14 projects

- N = 237
- Japan (112), Germany (52), U.S. (22), Canada (9), France (5), etc. (37)
V. Strategies: Partnership

<Type A>
- Donor
- Pivotal
- Recipient

<Type B>
- Donor
- Pivotal
- Recipient

<Type C>
- Pivotal
- Donor
- Recipient

<Type D>
- Donor
- Pivotal
- Recipient

<Type E>
- Recipient
- Recipient/Pivotal
- Recipient/Pivotal
- Recipient
- Donor
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### VI. Further Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The role of Korea: Donor vs. Pivotal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bottom-up vs. Top-down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Broadening the concept of TrC? Triangular vs. Tetragonal vs. Pentagonal Cooperation ....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Partnership with the emerging countries (China)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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