Dear Members,

The concept of “South-South” cooperation between developing countries and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) has been in practice for the last few decades, but now with increasingly scarce financial resources globally, and the need for greater aid effectiveness, it is gaining more supporters.

Simultaneously, there is also a shift in countries that are generally regarded as being “developing countries” as detailed in the Human Development Report 2013, with the rise of some emerging Southern powers such as Brazil, China, India and South Africa. Launching this report, Helen Clark observes that several countries in the South have seen unprecedented rapid development, and they are “already sources of innovative social and economic policies, and are major trade, investment, and increasingly development cooperation partners for other developing countries.”

From Karen Bernard, Disaster Risk Reduction and Recovery, United Nations Development Programme, Pacific Centre, Suva, Fiji
Posted 10 June 2013
common geographical challenges and social characteristics of small islands. The solutions through SIDS South-South cooperation programme are documented in a publication, and it is showcased in the annual Expo.

In this query, I would like to explore what others think of South-South cooperation and how this works in the Pacific and beyond and to gain some insights from experiences and lessons learned.

- **What kind of South-South projects or collaborations have you personally been involved with?** Can you elaborate on that?
- **What do you think are the priority areas for potential collaborations?**
- **When implementing South-South cooperation projects, what kind of challenges do we face and how do we overcome these?** Specifically we encourage you to share lessons learned – the setbacks as well as the successes.
- **For collaborations, usually the first step is “knowledge-sharing” then the second step is “transfer” – Could you share examples of transferrable programs that you have (transferred from one to another country)?**

The feedback you provide will be used for input to an Issues Brief being prepared by the UNDP Pacific Centre, which will include success stories, pitfalls and opportunities. This will subsequently also guide the upcoming second phase of the “South-South Cooperation between Pacific and Caribbean SIDS on Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management” project (termed the “South-South SIDS Project”) that is targeted at strengthening climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction capacity in SIDS, based on the transfer of appropriate “Southern” expertise and technologies.

---

**Responses were received, with thanks, from**

1. **Taito Nakalevu**, Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme, Apia, Samoa.
2. **Litia Mawi**, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Suva, Fiji
4. **Litea Biukoto**, Applied Geoscience and Technology Division (SOPAC), Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Suva, Fiji
5. **Roger Rivero Vega**, International Society for Agricultural Meteorology (INSAM), Havana, Cuba.
6. **Williams Worwor**, Vanuatu Meteorology and Geo-Hazards Department, Port Vila, Vanuatu
7. **Paula Holland**, Applied Geosciences and Technology Division for the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Suva, Fiji.
8. **Sakiusa Tubuna**, International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Suva, Fiji.
9. **Philip Malsale**, Vanuatu Meteorology and Geoscience Department, Port Vila, Vanuatu.
Summary of Responses
Comparative Experiences
Related Resources
Responses in Full

Summary of Responses

The query sought member feedback of South-South cooperation and how this works in the Pacific and beyond and to gain some insights from experiences and lessons learned. The feedback provided will eventually be used as input to an ‘Issue Brief’ being prepared by the UNDP Pacific Centre, which will include success stories, pitfalls and opportunities. It would also guide the upcoming second phase of the “South-South Cooperation between Pacific and Caribbean SIDS on Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management” project (termed the “South South SIDS Project”) that is targeted at strengthening climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction capacity in SIDS, based on the transfer of appropriate “Southern” expertise and technologies.

Overall members felt that South-South cooperation has been accepted or practiced as the exchange of resources, technology, and knowledge between countries and is being promoted as an essential mechanism to facilitate capacity building, technology and knowledge support activities.

The case studies and experiences provided by the respondents, did demonstrate that there have been several initiatives on South-South projects and collaborations, though there is great potential for expansion in the current sectors as well as the overflow of these experiences and initiatives to other prospective areas. Most of south-south cooperation initiatives from the respondents are in areas of training through exchange of personnel, other forms of capacity building and research through which capacity transfer in terms of skills and knowledge is a major outcome. Few respondents have also stated that south-south cooperation needs the participation of development partners to secure meaningful partnership opportunities and collaborations.

The areas where most respondents provided their experiences in were in areas such as, Disaster Emergency Management Agency e.g. through provision of training, developing initiatives on climate change and disaster risk management including post disaster needs assessment in Fiji and the Caribbean, training enterprises and capacity development in meteorology and hydrology in Vanuatu and Barbados. Others include small scale projects in the area of food security in Fiji and China, capacity development and training in the Agricultural and Meteorology sector in the Pacific and Caribbean and research initiatives on gender and climate change in selected communities from the Pacific and the Caribbean. Two other respondents provided cross pollinate experiences, one from the Caribbean and the other from the Pacific.

Respondents identified potential areas for collaboration such as;

- strengthening of National and Regional Weather Services,
• raising public awareness and climate change capacity building,
• obtaining and introduction of crop varieties better adapted to expected climate conditions,
• exchange of experiences about “hazards, vulnerability and risks studies and programs,
• exchange of experiences and technology sharing in the areas of coastal zone management, water resources, agricultural production and sustainable tourism and funding.

A number of respondents provided succinct areas for potential collaboration e.g. Caribbean moving from mainstreaming programmes to more on-the-ground climate change adaptation projects which include Cost Benefit Analysis. “Transfer” activities, involving socialist and capitalist developed countries claimed one respondent as quite effective as it has helped build a strong national meteorological service as well providing the necessary methodologies and tools to carry out technical work in all areas of weather modification, climatology and climate change impact assessment.

Members highlighted that success of the collaboration centers on a few issues which include:

• Personal contacts - knowing the people on the other side to work out collaborations easily;
• Trust - confidence in ability to keep promises, do our part, and follow through on plans put together;
• Sharing – Seeking spirit to learn and intention to share knowledge
• Institutionalizing of partnership - what starts as collaboration between individuals can grown into an organizational partnership where structures, activities, joint funding or sourcing, contact points can been appointed.

Many respondents asserted that a key challenge is the sustainability aspect of these types of cooperation particularly the lack of anchoring these initiatives in national institutional systems either way. Few respondents also stated that the irrefutable factor to this challenge in South-South cooperation is financing through which such cooperation could be made sustainable. They opined that these challenges are also opportunities for exploring further areas of cooperation with development partners and explore more innovative financing strategies that emphasize ownership by communities as resource owners if there are to be more sustainable social governance structures. Another challenge is the need to shift the PSIDS (Pacific Small Island Developing States) mindset away from a focus on vulnerability into more positive and alternative visions for the Pacific in approaches to development, governance, environmental sustainability, security and social cohesion that would ensure inclusiveness and self-sufficiency amongst all PSIDS communities. In addition to this, discussants stressed on preparing to deal with the “funding competition syndrome” which on many occasions, national and even international institutions compete for funding in a similar way in which private companies compete in the market. It is also very important that when the technology or knowledge is being shared, the process of social adaptation is included to it being adopted by that audience. The documentation of experiences, lessons learnt and knowledge is critical in this whole South-South Cooperation process.

Finally respondents recognized that the relationships established via the South-South Project are still relatively new and will require time to mature. While one can establish initial relationships
around a specific activity, its sustainability remain to be realised. Resources are needed to nurture these relationships over the years until such a time that they become natural and are fully embedded in the development activities of the country. It is also critical that governments be actively involved in collaboration efforts in order to guarantee that results are achieved and implementations of successive actions are sustainable. Political will must be asserted, or successes will soon be forgotten and will not be expanded at country or regional level.

Comparative Experiences

Pacific

“Inter personal relationships led to official institutional partnerships” (from Taito Nakalevu, Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change Project Manager, Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), Apia, Samoa)

In 2004, the Pacific and Caribbean participated in a joint partnership of two inter-related initiatives. The Caribbean learnt from on-the-ground adaptation community engagement experiences from the Pacific and the Pacific learnt from the mainstreaming work from the Caribbean. This has led into a strong organizational partnership where structures, activities, joint funding or sourcing, contact points have been appointed.

Fiji

“Look within and then look out” (from Litia Mawi, Roving Ambassador to Pacific Island Countries, Ministry of Foreign Affairs – Suva, Fiji)

Between Fiji and her Pacific Small Island Developing States (PSIDS) neighbors, South-South cooperation has been accepted as the exchange of resources, technology, and knowledge between them and is being promoted as an essential mechanism to facilitate capacity building and technology support activities by Fiji to other smaller PSIDS. Under the Fiji Volunteer Scheme, some volunteer teachers have been dispatched to smaller nations to fill the skills gap in the education sector.

South-South Cooperation between Pacific and Caribbean Small Island Developing States on Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management Project (from Litea Biukoto, Senior Adviser Risk Reduction, Disaster Reduction Programme, Applied Geoscience and Technology Division (SOPAC), Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Programme – Suva, Fiji)

The experiences by the agencies and countries involved in the Caribbean and the World Bank helped shape the direction of the Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative. A disaster risk assessment component of the work covered all 15 countries to quantify risks in monetary terms and casualties. This work established the basis for discussions with countries on the catastrophe risk financing and Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) interventions related to rapid post disaster assessments, urban planning and maintenance of a risk information system.

Vanuatu

Vanuatu-Barbados and Jamaican share same weather patterns
Through provision of technical training and exchange of personnel, weather officials from Vanuatu were able to learn from the Caribbean counterparts on the latest information and technology regarding up-to-date systems on meteorology and hydrology to better their national weather prediction capabilities. This was made possible through exchange and formal partnership in an initiative that started way back in 2009.

Caribbean

Cuba

CARICOM (Caribbean Community)  (from Roger Rivero Vega, Vice President, International Society for Agricultural Meteorology, Havana, Cuba)

People were trained in the general subject of creation and use of climate change scenarios, climate change impact assessments and adaptation options. Specialized training course were provided on creating climate change scenarios, assessing impacts of climate change on the agriculture and water resources sector and discussion of adaptation options. Specialized knowledge and tools were used to impart knowledge to local communities in developing countries.

International Network of Edible Aroids  (from Vincent Lebot, Project Scientific Coordinator, CIRAD, Valerie Tuia, Genetic Resources, Land Resources Department, Secretariat of the Pacific Community)

SPC, the lead organization of the International Network of Edible Aroids (INEA), has provided over 100 selected taro (Colocasia esculenta) varieties (breeding lines and Asian lines) consisting of more than 6,500 plantlets to INEA member countries in Africa, the Caribbean, Asia, the Pacific and Europe in just six months, from June to November 2011. This was achieved through its Centre for Pacific Crops and Trees (CePaCT), a Pacific genebank based in Fiji.

South America

Brazil

UNDP International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth  (from Leisa Perch, Policy Specialist, Centro Rio +, Ilha do Fundao, Cidade Universitaria, Brazil)

Identifying knowledge and tools to support climate-smart agriculture (CSA) in Africa through the Brazilian model by facilitating the transfer of knowledge and experiences of addressing food security.

Related Resources

Recommended Documentation

Barbados Programme of Action  (from Litia Mawi, Roving Ambassador to Pacific Island Countries, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Suva, Fiji)
Document available online at [http://www.sidsnet.org/docshare/other/BPOA.pdf](http://www.sidsnet.org/docshare/other/BPOA.pdf)
The Mauritius Strategy (from Litia Mawi)

The Mauritius Strategy is the current United Nations sustainable development strategy for Small Island Developing States for the period 2005 to 2015.

Mass Crowd Events Guideline (from Dawn French, Director of National Emergency Management Organisation, Castries, Saint Lucia, West Indies)

These Mass Crowd Event Guidelines is a system for Emergency Services, Property Owners and Event Organizers into the way the partners will handle a disaster.

Applied Agro-Meteorology (from Kees Stigter, Agro-climatologist, visiting Professor in Africa and Asia, For Agro-met Vision, Indonesia and the Netherlands)

The report shows how well the research efforts of M.Sc. and Ph.D. students could be used to find answers to development questions in agriculture, with emphasis on such subjects as agricultural extension to poor farmers and their adaptation to climate change.

Social Technologies for Sustainable Development (from Leisa Perch, Rio+ World Centre for Sustainable Development, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil)

Includes examples of South-South Cooperation between Brazil and other countries

The Role of South-South Cooperation in Inclusive and Sustainable Agricultural Development (from Leisa Perch, Rio+ World Centre for Sustainable Development, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil)
http://www.ipc-undp.org/pub/IPC PovertyInFocus24.pdf

A paper showing clear differences when Argentina and Brazil were compared in relation to South-South Cooperation

Recommended Contacts and Experts

Ms. Cynthia Jones (from Leisa Perch, Rio+ World Centre for Sustainable Development, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil)
World Food Programme, Brazil; http://www.wfp.org/centre-of-excellence-hunger

She is the WFP Deputy Director and Senior Policy Officer who can be contacted for more information on the PAA Africa implemented in 10 countries.

Recommended Organizations and Programmes

Capacity Building for the Development of Adaptation Measures in Pacific Island Countries Project (from Taito Nakalevu, Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change Project Manager, Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme, Apia, Samoa)
Executed by SPREP; Tel.: +685 21929; E: sprep@sprep.org; www.sprep.org; Information on the project is available online at http://www.adaptationlearning.net/project/capacity-building-development-adaptation-measures-pacific-island-countries-cbdampic
The project was executed by SPREP for three-years (January 2002 to March 2005) and involves four countries: Cook Islands, Fiji, Samoa and Vanuatu.

**Mainstreaming Adaptation to Climate Change** *(from Taito Nakalevu)*
Executed by the Caribbean Community; Tel.: (592) 222 0001-75; E: registry@caricom.org; www.caricom.org; Information on the project is available online at http://www.caricom.org/jsp/projects/macc%20project/macc.jsp?menu=projects

The executing agency is the CARICOM Secretariat located in Georgetown, Guyana. In-kind participants include the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States of America through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

**Regional Programme for Food Security** *(from Sakiusa Tubuna, Sub-Regional Coordinator for Pacific Islands, International Fund for Agricultural Development, Suva, Fiji)*
Implemented by Food and Agricultural Organisation; E: FAO-FJ@fao.org; http://www.fao.org/countryprofiles/index/en/?iso3=FJI

The programme was a three year project from 2004 to 2007 and Fiji was part of the 14 FAO member countries where the RPFS was implemented.

**Pacific Island Farmer Organisation Network** *(from Sakiusa Tubuna)*
Koko Siga currently serves as its Secretariat located at 16 Goodenough Street, Suva, Fiji; Tel.: (679) 3305844; info@kokosiga.com; http://www.kokosiga.com/

The Network serves as an umbrella organization for national farmer organisations to coordinate capacity building, share success stories and lessons learnt, support regional exchanges of expertise between farmer organisations and their associated private sector and donor agency partners.

**Foundation for Rural Integrated Enterprises and Development** *(from Sakiusa Tubuna)*
Tuvu, Kings Road, Lautoka, Fiji; Tel.: (679) 666 3181; admin@fijifriend.com; http://www.friendfiji.com/

FRIEND is a registered non-government organisation supporting the efforts of communities towards development through social and economic empowerment.

**Tei Tei Taveuni** *(from Sakiusa Tubuna)*
Waiyevo, Taveuni, Fiji; Tel.: (679) 888 0420; http://www.teiteitaveuni.com/

Tei Tei Taveuni is an NGO formed by a group of farmers with an interest in sustainable farming, soil regeneration, food security, conservation, and environmental awareness.

**International Network of Edible Aroids** *(from Vincent Lebot, Project Scientific Coordinator, CIRAD, Valerie Tuia, Genetic Resources, SPC LRD)*
Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Centre for Pacific Crops & Trees, Suva, Fiji; T.: (679) 370 733; http://www.ediblearoids.org

The Network as provided over 100 selected taro varieties member countries in Africa, the Caribbean, Asia, the Pacific and Europe from June to November 2011.

**Centre for Pacific Crops and Trees** *(from Vincent Lebot)*
Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Centre for Pacific Crops & Trees, Suva, Fiji; T.: (679) 370 733; http://www.spc.int/lrd/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=649&Itemid=107

CePaCT set up by the Heads of Agriculture in the Pacific islands to share and conserve crop genetic resources in order to strengthen food security.

**Caribbean Risk Management Initiative** *(from Jacinda Fairholm et al, CRMI, UNDP Regional Service Centre, Panama)*
A UNDP project which has been actively facilitating a regional South-South Cooperation initiative that spans for five years 2009 – 2013.

**UNDP Team works** (from *Jacinda Fairholm et al*)
www.undp.unteamworks.org

Knowledge platform established for UNDP Focal Points with all forms, information and reports available.

**UNDP’s International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth** (from *Leisa Perch*)
http://www.ipc-undp.org/

Has experience in moving from the exchange of information to the transfer of good practice and important technologies.

**World Food Programme Center of Excellence on Hunger** (from *Leisa Perch*, Rio+ World Centre for Sustainable Development, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil)
http://www.wfp.org/centre-of-excellence-hunger

It facilitated the adaptation of a Brazilian model for addressing food security and purchasing food from farmers for school-feeding to countries in Africa.

**Climate-Smart Agriculture** (from *Leisa Perch*, Rio+ World Centre for Sustainable Development, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil)
http://www.climatesmartagriculture.org

The climate-smart agriculture approach is an entry point for essential information on how to make agriculture, forestry and fisheries part of the solution to the negative impacts of climate change.

**Recommended Tools and Technologies**

**Post Disaster Needs Assessments** (from *Paula Holland*, Resource Economist, Applied Geosciences and Technology Division for the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Suva, Fiji)
SOPAC/SPC, Suva, Fiji; http://www.sopac.org/

Countries in the Pacific region are now being supported to conduct Post Disaster Needs Assessments (PDNAs) following severe events. The Fiji experience has been viewed as so valuable by Cabinet, that the Ministry of Planning is even incorporating PDNAs to its Standard Operating Procedures following a disaster event.

**The Cuban Model of Risk Reduction Management Centres** (from *Jacinda Fairholm et al*)

Initiated in 2005, it was identified as a best practice in the area of risk reduction, operating as an instrument of local governments focused on risk reduction.

**Comprehensive Training Kit** (from *Jacinda Fairholm et al*)
Conducted under the Caribbean Risk Management Initiative;

A training kit that includes operational guides, video tutorials and methodologies developed for pilot implementation.

**The Brazil Model** (from *Leisa Perch*)
From UNDP IPC-IG http://www.ipc-undp.org/

Model used in Brazil to effectively transfer a number of good practices to many countries in three areas (1) agriculture (2) social protection and (3) reducing hunger.

‘Two-Way Street’ (from *Leisa Perch*)
A tool for development that involves a broader set of actors; it is horizontal in nature as in a ‘two-way street’ that creates learning opportunities on both sides.

**Recommended Training Courses**

**Training in Meteorology and Hydrology, at Caribbean Institute for Meteorology and Hydrology, Barbados** (from Kathy-Anne Caesar, Chief Meteorologist Ag., Caribbean Institute of Meteorology and Hydrology, Barbados)

http://www.cimh.edu.bb/?p=training&c=meteorology

The meteorology program is conducted at the four WMO classified levels. The hydrology program is offered at the two WMO classified levels. The programs are designed to upgrade the skills of personnel working in the field of water resources at the operational level. The Institute also offers a number of short specialised courses and workshops aimed at upgrading the skills and expertise of experienced meteorologists and hydrologists.

**Sensitization and Technical Workshops** (from Jacinda Fairholm et al)

Conducted under the Caribbean Risk Management Initiative;


Training provided to meet the needs of the actors in the South-South Cooperation process.

**Recommended Upcoming Events**

**2014 Third International Conference on Small Island Developing States from 1 – 4 September 2014, Apia, Samoa** (from Litia Mawi, Roving Ambassador to Pacific Island Countries, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Suva, Fiji)

Information on the Conference is available online at


The Conference will focus the world’s attention on a group of countries that remain a special case for sustainable development in view of their unique and particular vulnerabilities.

**Pacific Islands Development Forum, Inaugural scheduled from 5 – 7 August 2013, Sheraton Resort, Denarau, Fiji** (from Litia Mawi)

Information on the Forum is available online at http://pacificdf.org/

It is the first platform for leaders from the public and private sector and civil societies in the Pacific to focus specifically on green economies/sustainable development issues in the series of Rio+20 Global Agenda on Sustainable Development and South-South Cooperation.

**Responses in Full**

Taito Nakalevu, Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change Project Manager, Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme, Apia, Samoa.

My first experience of being engaged in a South-South partnership was in 2004 with a Caribbean colleague Dr. Neville Trotz now a Science Advisor for the Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC). It was facilitated through a Canadian funded climate change project we each managed. The Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) implemented the Capacity Building for the Development of Adaptation Measures in Pacific Island Countries
(CBDAMPIC) project and I was the Project Manager. Neville was the Project Manager for the Mainstreaming Adaptation to Climate Change (MACC) project and he was based in Barbados. Discussions on the establishment of the CCCCC were progressing at the time and I believe in 2005 or so it started in Belize. Neville and the MACC project crossed over to Belize. The focus of the SPREP CBDAMPIC project was on demonstrating adaptation measures on the ground whilst the Caribbean MACC project focused on mainstreaming climate change adaptation strategies into the sustainable development agendas of the small islands and low-lying states of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM). A South-South cooperation component was added to the two projects aimed at encouraging the sharing of lessons between the two projects.

Whilst the SPREP project was fully funded by the Canadian Government through the Canadian International Development Assistance (CIDA), the Caribbean MACC project was partly funded by Canada, World Bank and other partners. Joint activities carried out at the time included:

- Sharing of lessons from our various projects (CBDAMPIC and MACC);
- A team from the Pacific CBDAMPIC project attended a Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Disaster Risk Management (DRM) meeting in Barbados to share lessons learnt;
- Neville Trotz and then Kenrick Leslie (Director General of the CCCCC) also visited the Pacific and SPREP under the joint programming to share their experiences on the climate change activities in the Caribbean.
- Joint Side Events at the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Conference of Parties (COP) etc.

Collaboration with the CCCCC steadily grew over the years. There is a Memorandum of Understanding in place between the two organizations agreeing to work together on various issues common to the two regions.

I guess the success of the collaboration centered on a few issues (among others) which include:

- Personal contacts - knowing the people on the other side. Working out collaborations was easier;
- Trust - confidence in our ability to keep our word, do our part, and follow through on plans put together;
- Sharing - we had things to share. The Caribbean wanted to learn from on-the-ground adaptation community engagement experiences from the Pacific and the Pacific wanted to learn more from the mainstreaming work that the Caribbean was carrying out.
- Institutionalizing of partnership - what started as collaboration between individuals has now grown into an organizational partnership where structures, activities, joint funding or sourcing, contact points have been appointed.

Roadblocks:

- Funding to continue the collaboration ceased when the projects were completed and the sharing of lessons was limited to emails and other meetings where the team met on an ad hoc basis.
- Competing priorities on the time of officers as they were carrying other workloads.
- If there are no common activities to be carried out, the partnership will recede. For the SPREP and CCCCC partnership, we continued to work together, carrying out joint Side Events at the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Conference of Parties (COP) and providing technical backstopping support to our negotiators as and when needed.
I guess if we reference the collaboration between the two projects, an example of transferable programs, I can say that it is of the Caribbean moving from mainstreaming programmes to more on-the-ground climate change adaptation projects which include Cost Benefit Analysis whilst the Pacific is going a big way in mainstreaming climate change. I do not claim that all these developments were because of our partnership, but it may be a small part of it.

Litia Mawi, Roving Ambassador to Pacific Island Countries, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Suva, Fiji

By way of a brief background, Fiji has hosted Engaging with the Pacific Meetings since 2010 in her commitment to remain productively engaged in the Pacific. Fiji fully contributes to development initiatives and aspirations through targeted Development Cooperation that is customized to the felt and expressed needs of her neighboring Pacific Small Island Developing States (PSIDS).

In keeping with the original South-South philosophy for development, Fiji has slowly but surely gained momentum over the past three years by contributing to the Pacific spirit of "collective self-reliance as an engine of growth". Under the theme of Strengthening Partnerships amongst PSIDS, Fiji's collaboration is in pursuit of global development agendas i.e. specific frameworks in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS), such as the Barbados Plan of Action and the Mauritius Strategy which determine the priority areas for emphases by developing states in all the Oceanic Regions of the world. Priority themes for SIDS Cooperation currently are: Response and Resilience to Natural Disasters, Climate Change Adaptation, Sustainable Development, Maritime Resources (Fisheries and Deep Sea Minerals), Investment and Public-Private Partnerships, People-to-People Exchanges and Capacity Building.

Since 2010, Fiji has signed Memorandum of Understandings (MOUs) with six PSIDS, namely Kiribati, Tuvalu, Solomon Islands, Nauru, Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia for three years with options to extend. These MOUs record nine areas of development cooperation, namely Trade/Investment, Fisheries, Immigration, Education, Labor, Health, Transport, Tourism and Youth Development. These MOUs also highlight the replicability of development experiences amongst PSIDS resulting in partnership/solidarity for self-reliance rather than the old-style notion of aid.

This year Fiji’s drive and focus in the Pacific Oceanscape is Regional Cooperation through the new Pacific Islands Development Forum (PIDF). It is the first platform in the Pacific focusing specifically on green economies/sustainable development issues in the series of Rio+20 Global Agenda on Sustainable Development and South-South Cooperation. The inclusion of the private sector and civil society in the PIDF dialogue guarantees explicit commitment and civic ownership to green economic growth in PSIDS. PIDF will also contribute to a greater harnessing of the region's preparations for the SIDS Global Conference in 2014 and the ongoing dialogue on the MDG Acceleration towards 2015 and the Post 2015 Global Development Goals.

The undeniable challenge in South-South cooperation is financing. Like all challenges, however, it is also the greatest opportunity for exploring triangular cooperation with development partners. Secondly, it is also an opportunity to explore more innovative financing strategies that emphasize ownership by communities as resource owners if there are to be more sustainable social governance structures.
Another challenge is the need to shift the PSIDS mindset away from a focus on vulnerability into more positive and alternative visions for the Pacific in approaches to development, governance, environmental sustainability, security and social cohesion that would ensure inclusiveness and self-sufficiency amongst all our PSIDS communities.

Between Fiji and her PSIDS neighbors, South-South cooperation has been accepted as the exchange of resources, technology, and knowledge between them and is being promoted as an essential cross-cutting mechanism to facilitate capacity building and technology support activities by Fiji in smaller PSIDS.

Any specificities for individual PSIDS under the standard MOUs are facilitated under separate Memorandum of Agreements (MOA) such as the Fiji Volunteer Scheme and any other emerging modes of Technical Assistance that capitalizes on Human Resources Capacity Building being the most impactful and sustainable feature of building a resilient Pacific Community. Twelve Fiji volunteer teachers have been dispatched to the Marshall Islands since August 2012 and another seven to Nauru.

The “perfect fit” of Fiji’s skills and technologies in these PSIDS arises from a number of reasons, including: (i) backdrop of similar factor endowments e.g. labour abundance and relative capital scarcity; (ii) solutions are more labour intensive rather than automated technology; (iii) similar state of basic infrastructure; (iv) expertise attuned to similar geo-climatic tropical conditions e.g. for food preservation in Pacific tropical settings; (v) technologies and expertise are scaled down to size of markets in smaller PSIDS rather than mass production skills in larger industrialized countries; (vi) technologies and expertise available are cost effective having been adapted in view of low income consumers in PSIDS; and (vii) lower costs and appropriateness of skills and expertise available in Fiji can achieve much greater effectiveness per unit of resources spent compared to neighboring locations e.g. a capacity building program for PSIDS officials conducted in Suva or Nadi would be far more cost effective than if conducted in Tokyo, Sydney or Auckland.

---

Dawn French, Director of National Emergency Management Organisation, Castries, Saint Lucia, West Indies

Good day,

I have been personally involved with two aspects of the South-South Cooperation i.e. (1) Technical Assistance in the areas of training and writing National Plans, and (2) Response.

Firstly, I am a trained instructor with the Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA), Red Cross and the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA), and so I have had the honor to work in many sister islands in the Caribbean to build capacity in areas such as Damage Assessment and Needs Analysis (DANA), Shelter Management, and Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (VCA).

As a writer I also bring with me my skills in writing National Plans to Saint Lucia, Haiti, Antigua, Dominica and Barbados.

Then there is the Deployment for Response, an area we train for and pray we don’t get to use. I have been deployed by CDEMA to Grenade (Hurricane Ivan), Turks and Caicos Island (Hurricane Ike) and Haiti (Earthquake).

Without having to consult my fellow National Disaster Coordinators, I would say that a recurrent area is Training. A modicum of sustainability is achieved through the training of Instructors.
Another area Disaster Risk Management (DRM) aggressively needs to move into is mitigation. We need to reduce the vulnerability of communities and in doing so reduce the impacts of hazards. The “sexiness” associated with response needs to be broken and the obsession of policy makers to only deal with the ‘after the fact’ needs to be eliminated as we cannot afford the knee jerk reaction that has dominated for centuries.

The popular definition of insanity is ‘repeating the same action over and over with the expectation of a change in outcome’, and despite the advice of disaster managers, despite the mountain of evidence in a multitude of reports and despite the suffering witnessed we continue to regard disaster management and its practitioners as a botheration and are there to be blamed when disaster happens and the weaknesses emerge.

Timing is always a challenge when implementing South-South cooperation projects. The coordination of a visit may take longer for some than others for a variety of reasons.

Cultural Heritage – as strange as this may seem on the surface but the National Cultural Calendar does impact planning. Community workers will take it a step further and agree that the Community Calendar is a strong factor, a point many outsiders have ignored and learned the hard way.

Because the disaster management community in the Caribbean is a relatively small one, many of the regions achievements are based on interpersonal interactions. DRM is no different. When I go to a country to assist I am not seen as a stranger walking in but a friend known for years, such a bond is priceless and cannot be measured.

In regards to transferable programs, a classic example of what happens in the Caribbean is the Mass Crowd Events (MCE) Guidelines. Ten years ago, Saint Lucia borrowed (with permission) the MCE Guide of Barbados and over the course of six years and with many consultations, Saint Lucia (SLU) finally adopted an MCE Guide. You may view the results at http://archive.stlucia.gov.lc/mce/

Barbados recently asked for a copy of the SLU MCE Guide and after reminding Barbados that SLU used their Guide, they answered, “Yes we want to see what you came up with as we are reviewing ours.”

It doesn’t get any better than that.

Litea Biukoto, Senior Adviser Risk Reduction, Disaster Reduction Programme, Applied Geoscience and Technology Division, Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Suva, Fiji

Ni sa bula vinaka,

No doubt there have been a number of projects over the years promoting South-South collaboration between the Pacific and other regions. I was involved in one managed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Pacific Centre called the ‘South-South Cooperation Between Pacific and Caribbean Small Island Developing States (SIDS) on Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management’ Project. The project began in 2010 and ended in December 2012 (I’m anticipating that there will be a follow up phase). Regional organisations involved included the Secretariat of the Pacific Community through its Applied Geosciences and Technology Division (SOPAC) and Land Resources Division (LRD), Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme and the University of the South Pacific.
Rather than getting into some of the specifics of the project I’d like to share a few experiences I had when participating in the project and the opportunities presented as a result.

In 2009, the Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management (DRM) welcomed for the first time Caribbean partners to participate and share their experiences. The timing was opportune as the World Bank and Asian Development Bank were supporting a feasibility study to establish a catastrophe risk pool much like the Caribbean Catastrophe Risk Insurance Facility here in the Pacific. The experiences by the agencies and countries involved in the Caribbean and the World Bank helped shape the direction of the Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative. A disaster risk assessment component of the work covered all 15 countries to quantify risks in monetary terms and casualties. This work established the basis for discussions with countries on the catastrophe risk financing and Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) interventions related to rapid post disaster assessments, urban planning and maintenance of a risk information system. Though this work was not directly linked to the South-South project, further exchanges that took place between the Caribbean and the Pacific was made possible through it.

The South-South project has facilitated exchanges between Caribbean and Pacific national and regional agencies to share experiences and lessons learned in implementing Climate Change Adaptation and DRM initiatives. The sheer distance between our regions means that many of our colleagues who participated in this had to endure long haul flights across several time zones and in at least one instance a language difference, which didn’t stop any of us at all from enjoying a good talanoa (story telling). Aside from the professional exchanges we also had cultural exchanges. We have, on at least one occasion, managed to get a colleague from the Caribbean wearing a sulu vakataga (pocket sulu for men).

Having been closely involved in the project one of the things that partners often forget is the work required to pull off these activities. The success of the project rests not just with the energy of the partners involved but it also relies heavily on the dedication of the project manager - vinaka vakalevu (thank you very much) Karen Bernard, UNDP PC.

From the experiences during the South-South, a few points to take note of for the next phase:

- Regional organisations to identify counterparts in other regions to work with and work within their own networks to collaborate better
- More virtual meetings between South-South partners noting that this will not replace the need for face-to-face discussions
- Interactions around thematic areas e.g. early warnings, risk assessments, urban planning and infrastructure design, damage and loss assessments.
- Dedicated project management staff and resources

Roger Rivero Vega, Vice President, International Society for Agricultural Meteorology, Havana, Cuba.

This is to share with colleagues details of my work and tasks fulfilled in other developing countries during 1999 – 2013.

During that period I was involved in collaborative work with CARICOM (Caribbean Community) countries as a collective body on six different occasions - workshops held in Guyana, Trinidad Tobago, Jamaica and Barbados and with individual countries such as Saint Lucia, Guyana, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Haiti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Paraguay, the Pacific Community (as a whole) and Iran.

I carried out three different kinds of tasks in these countries:
- As part of an international team, I trained people in the general subject of creation and use of climate change scenarios, climate change impact assessments and adaptation options. These trainings were very general in nature, covering all fields.
- As a team leader for a specialized training course on creating climate change scenarios, assessing impacts of climate change on the agriculture and water resources sector and discussion of adaptation options. These trainings were very specialized, covering basic and special knowledge and tools which are practically unknown by local communities in developing countries.
- As an external consultant, dedicated to assessing the impact of climate change and making recommendations for adaptation options in the forest and agricultural sector for a given country.

This kind of consultancy has been solicited many times by countries and organizations, with the main objective of getting assistance to comply with duties acquired to prepare the National Communications report for UNFCCC (United Nations' Framework Convention on Climate Change). In only a small fraction of cases, this collaboration has been solicited with the objective of training people and building national capacity for actual implementation of climate change adaptation in agriculture.

**Priority areas for potential collaborations:**

I am certain that Cuba would be willing to share experiences in all aspects discussed here.

- **Strengthening of National and Regional Weather Services**

I am deeply convinced that no sustainable adaptation in developing countries can be achieved without doing things in harmony with climate, such as I discussed in the 11th Meeting of the World Meteorology Organization (WMO) Agricultural Meteorology Commission held in Havana, 1995. In fact, the original title of my speech there was “Sustainable Agriculture in Cuba: With Climate or Against Climate?” But I have found that meteorological services in many countries are underdeveloped, lacking whole areas of knowledge such as climatology and agro-meteorology. There are countries which do not have a national meteorology authority, and even in that context I had to undertake an assessment of climate change impacts on agriculture, forest, water resources, health and tourism. National and regional weather services must have the necessary capacity for forecasting and monitoring extreme climate conditions such as meteorological, agricultural and hydrological droughts, floods, tropical storms (including hurricanes) and other climate hazards that disrupt the normal economic activities of countries and kill our people through their direct or indirect impacts on societies. Such essential climate services should be implemented everywhere.

Using the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) National Food Security activities as an analogue, I do think that developing countries should achieve a relative national security (independent) status in many fields, including weather services and agricultural activities. To me, it doesn’t seem healthy that a simple question posed in one of our countries to a local institution cannot be answered there without first consulting with the regional center of power located in a developed Annex I country.

- **Raising public awareness and climate change capacity building**

The general public is constantly bombarded with news and information about climate change. Sorrowfully, that’s also true with other potential hazards such as catastrophic meteorite impacts, super volcanoes, conspiracy theories related with “chemtrails” or allegedly biased conclusions
reached in Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Reports, super tsunamis and other real or somewhat fictional hazards. The result of all this is that people tend to look at these issues as alien ones, as things that could happen to others but have no relation with them. This point of view is especially shared by urban dwellers living in artificial human-made environments with no direct relationship to farms, fishing activities, glaciers and strong climate-dependent environments. And we must be convinced that climate change adaptation is not going to be undertaken at the COP (Conference of Parties) discussion table, but rather by the concerted actions of human communities living in developing countries. In spite of a lot of work already being done in our countries under the sponsorship of concerned Non-Government Organisations (NGOs), the problem of how adaptation issues of particular communities and ecosystem dependent communities can be addressed at national level without the involvement of farmers’ and governmental institutions remains unsolved.

- **Obtaining and introduction of crop varieties better adapted to expected climate conditions**

It so happens that tropical crops such as maize, potatoes and tomatoes were originally taken by colonial countries and transferred to actual developed countries from the year 1500s to the 1900s. For many years, varieties after variety of these crops were obtained there in order to improve their suitability to middle latitudes temperate climates. And now those (already modified) varieties are exported as seed material to our tropical countries where they are no longer adapted to our typical high temperatures, high levels of solar radiation and erratic precipitation regimes (too much or too little available soil moisture). A wide and very rich area for South-South collaboration work is available here for at least two important reasons: (1) the introduction of new crop varieties is one of the most promising adaptations to climate change in agriculture, and (2) obtaining and reproducing those seeds in national environments would be an important supporting action for achieving national food security.

- **Exchange of experiences about “hazards, vulnerability and risks studies and programs”**

By mid-century and the second half of this century, expected changes in temperature and precipitation are expected to achieve truly harmful levels. But currently and in the near future, climate change is probably most clearly expressed as a rise in climate variability and the increasing probability of extreme climate conditions such as droughts, floods and hurricanes. Exchange of experiences and sharing of results in this area would be most helpful, given the level of security that has been obtained in some of our countries, particularly in Cuba.

- **Exchange of experiences and technology sharing in the areas of coastal zone management, water resources, agricultural production and sustainable tourism**

Coastal zone management, water resources, agriculture and tourism are the most important economic sectors in many of our countries, while at the same time the sectors that we expect will be most affected by climate change and sea level rise.

Among the issues in which there are many experiences to share and transfer in these sectors, we could list: the restoration of mangrove ecosystems; the hydraulic system and programme developed in Cuba since 1965; the fast and effective development of urban agriculture in our country; the nationwide rice production program that solved the scarcity of water in reservoirs used for the traditional flooded rice technology; and the rapid development of aquaculture as an important protein source. As an example, we could note that application of Vietnamese rice production system has shown very good results in Cuba.
As we think about food production, we should be aware that the usual farmers’ traditional knowledge will progressively lose value, as climate change shifts normal historical climate patterns. With noticeable changes in climate patterns and seasonality, previous historical practices will no longer be useful.

Tourism is a very important economic sector in many countries, but it may also be an aggressive activity menacing our natural resources and ecosystems. The task of maintaining and even increasing current tourism levels without the destruction of our natural resources is a big challenge for many of our countries. Exchange of experiences and concerted actions will be necessary in order to diversify tourist options so as to limit the most common “sun and beach tourism” that rely heavily on intense human actions on fragile coastal ecosystems.

**Challenges faced and overcoming them:**

I did participate in collaboration projects with Annex I countries prior to 1990, so that experience will somewhat be reflected in my general ideas.

Probably the most challenging issue in these kinds of cooperation projects is to establish an appropriate working atmosphere in which none of the participants (countries, organizations, and research teams) assume a superior role. It should be a given that all counterparts have the effective capacity to understand and to play an active, creative role, contributing to the success of collaboration among equals. It is also critical that governments be actively involved in collaboration efforts in order to guarantee that results are achieved and implementation of successive actions keep (sustainably) going once the necessarily time-limited collaboration project is finished. Political will must be asserted, or successes will soon be forgotten and will not be expanded at country or regional level.

In addition to this, we must be prepared to deal with the “funding competition syndrome”. On many occasions, local nationals and even international institutions compete for funding in a similar way in which private companies compete in the market. In this kind of social environment, local entities (and even resource persons) try to receive the maximum possible amount of funding and benefits, conceal information to other competing institutions and not collaborate among themselves in order to maximize social results and not institutional development. Sadly, I have witnessed this syndrome at all national and international level since 1978.

The last decade or so has witnessed the proliferation of new groups of countries, regional bodies and political and trade agreements. Now in the Latin American/Caribbean region we have regional bodies such as the Bolivarian Alternative for the Peoples of the Americas (ALBA), the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR), the Community of States of Latin America and the Caribbean (CELAC) and other international arenas where South-South collaboration projects can be planned and executed in an environment of political will and equity among participants.

I think that concerted actions addressing climate change in these new political and collaborative international spaces will rapidly evolve from assuming a common position in climate change international negotiations (COP and related fora) to that of adopting regional strategies for mitigation and adaptation to climate change. As I said in 1998 during an IPCC meeting in Costa Rica, I’m convinced that adaptation to climate change will have to evolve from adaptation at local levels to country, regional and global levels if human kind wants to be preserved.

Additionally, we could find a common and very harmful problem in any South-South collaboration effort, because our countries in many cases lack the capacity to establish work teams that keep a stable developing line of work during many years. On many occasions you start working today
with a collaborative team – transferring knowledge, methodologies and tools, only to find that two years later members of that team have ceased to work in the field, institution or country because they have changed places and even countries, searching for better salaries, livelihoods conditions or any other personal advantages. Many of them sometimes re-appear working in developed countries, international agencies, NGOs or elsewhere, except in planned collaboration activities to which many persons and funding agencies have dedicated a lot of effort and resources. My own personal conclusions about this fact can be expressed as ‘never the same people at the next workshop’.

**Examples of transferrable programs:**

I have very little to say at this point because in relation with South-South Cooperation as I have always participated in the field of “knowledge and technology transfer” about the nature of climate change, impact assessment and design of adaptations options, without actually implementing them.

But I can say that “transfer” activities, involving socialist and capitalist developed countries have been quite effective in my field of work and helped to build a strong national meteorological service as well as supplied me with the necessary methodologies and tools to be able to fulfill my duties in relation to all areas of weather modification, climatology and climate change impact assessment.

There are no obvious reasons why these transfer activities cannot be successful among developing countries. In fact, we can see that there are already complex and large ongoing collaboration activities among our countries in the field of health, education and sports.

---

1*Parties include the industrialized countries that were members of the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) in 1992, plus countries with economies in transition (the EIT Parties), including the Russian Federation, the Baltic States, and several Central and Eastern European States.*

---

**Williams Worwor, Principal Training Officer, Vanuatu Meteorology and Geo-Hazards Department, Port Vila, Vanuatu**

My previous Involvements with South-South projects include:


Priority areas for potential collaborations would be:

- a. Funding provided to the Caribbean and the Pacific region to assist in expanding the lessons learned to the last mile in communities. There have been a lot of exchanges visits and trainings between the two regions and I am sure a lot has been gained from this by individuals concerned. But how far have these lessons learned being implemented on the ground or passed around/on within the community concerned? If some sort of evaluation can be done on this and assistance provided in areas where there is a need to go further.
- b. Expand collaborations to work with the regional Meteorology (Met) Directors meetings and funding/addressing some of the issues faced by the Met communities in the Pacific and the Caribbean especially with regards to Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Climate Change. In the Pacific, we have more personals in Met compared to National Disaster Management Offices (NDMOs). And while the NDMOs and Met in the offices are both
working on DRRs, I personally think that we in the Met (Pacific) can be very instrumental in sustaining a lot of the projects in terms of Human Resources and Finance.

The challenges for me include:

a. Pacific. This makes it very difficult in sharing our lessons learned to the last mile. In the Caribbean it is not too much of a problem as most of their countries are one of two island countries. This raises the importance of more funding assistance if we want to share the knowledge to others.

b. With our governments limited budget especially in the Pacific, very limited or no funds are allocated to run trainings internally to share that knowledge to our other colleagues.

c. Last but not least, in Vanuatu we are utilizing some of the climate change and DRR funding that are coming into the country to address climate change adaptation and DRR in Vanuatu including traditional knowledge.

An example of transferable programs within Vanuatu is us doing something on traditional knowledge. Our aim is to revive the traditional knowledge within each community then later exchange (common knowledge) these knowledge with other communities in Vanuatu. And hopefully exchange this knowledge with other countries if need be to address climate change adaptation and DRR.

Paula Holland, Resource Economist, Applied Geosciences and Technology Division for the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Suva, Fiji.

My involvement in the South-South Cooperation is related to the recent project conducted by the United Nation Development Programme (UNDP) Pacific Centre to support cooperation between Pacific and Caribbean Small Island Developing States (SIDS). My specific activity in this was sharing work conducted in the region to value disasters and inform on Disaster Risk Management (DRM). However, I have also been involved in some activity planning and assessments of the achievements of the project.

The Pacific South-South Project was aimed at establishing initial relationships and creating awareness of what other regions are doing. This is a critical step to enable countries to work in a more hands-on sense later on.

Now that these relationships are being established, I would love to see more functional and formalised relationships and support occur between countries. As an example, some countries in the Pacific region are now being supported to conduct Post Disaster Needs Assessments (PDNAs) following severe events. Samoa and Fiji have each conducted these. The Fiji experience has been viewed as so valuable by Cabinet, that the Ministry of Planning is even incorporating PDNAs to its Standard Operating Procedures following a disaster event!

Nevertheless, Fiji and Samoa will need on-going support and training to be able to conduct PDNAs themselves. There would be a great benefit in securing Caribbean training and mentoring to do these for the Pacific since our cousins there have so much experience to share. I would love to see Caribbean experts form part of our pool of expert in PDNA for the region (an activity to start later this year, God willing). But even without a formalised pool, I would love to see Caribbean experts assigned for the medium term to help progress this work as one island region to another.

Additionally, the World Bank is presently piloting in the Pacific catastrophe financing (specifically a form of catastrophe insurance) to see if this is feasible for our specific region. We see the experience that the Caribbean has in this area and would dearly love to learn from our more
experienced Caribbean cousins to get their views on what works and how best to develop this opportunity.

In terms of challenges, we need to recognize that the relationships established via the South-South Project are still relatively new and will require time to mature. While one can establish initial relationships around a specific activity, these relationships can fade once the activity is finished. We need to have the resources to nurture these relationships over the years until such a time that they become natural. Presently, it is unlikely that NDMOs or DRM practitioners in the region will reflex to other institutions or practitioners outside the region to seek advice and support. The next phase of the South-South Project will provide benefits if it identifies, establishes or promotes operative channels for Pacific Islanders to identify when to seek SIDs support, for what activities and how (e.g. whether directly, via UNDP or via the DRM platform) from now on.

Sakiusa Tubuna, Sub-Regional Coordinator for Pacific Islands, International Fund for Agricultural Development, Suva, Fiji

Dear members,

A South-South project I was formerly involved with was the Regional Programme for Food Security (RPFS) implemented by Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) and funded by the Italian Government. It was a three year project from 2004 to 2007 and I was then working for the Fiji Ministry of Agriculture.

Fiji was part of the 14 FAO member countries where the RPFS was implemented and it consisted of three projects i.e. (1) Small Scale Poultry Project (2) Support to Small Scale Dairy Farmers, and (3) Rice Improvement Project.

Under the Rice Improvement Project we brought in technicians from China that included two agronomists, a water expert and an agriculture engineer to support farmers and to train the Ministry of Agriculture staff in rice cultivation. We provided logistical support from organizing their flights from China to getting them settled in their accommodation. These Chinese technicians mainly worked in the field and they were located in Dreketi, Vanua Levu – the northern island of Fiji.

A challenge we faced was the cultural differences and the language barrier, a good lesson learned for us from this experience was to have a cultural orientation for foreigners that come to work in the country ensuring also the people we hire speak English fluently and are respectful to other cultures.

In terms of transferrable programs, an example would be the Chinese technicians’ knowledge on rice planting and the technology they brought from China that they transferred to the local people via training. We had pilot sites where farmers were taught on the methods of rice cultivation. The technology introduced was similar to the ones used locally but because many farmers cannot afford the seeds and fertilizers, these technologies were not able to be sustained. Furthermore, labour availability at Dreketi was a constant problem besetting farmers and hence contributed to the high cost of cultivating rice. So the lesson learnt is that we should be mindful of other social and economic factors that affect the farmers before we make decisions as these policies should be synergized with other Government macro and sectoral economic policies.

In knowledge-sharing, the International Fund for Agriculture Development is funding a Pacific Island Farmer Organisation Network (PIFON) launched in mid-April of this year. It will serve as an umbrella organization for national farmer organisations to coordinate capacity building, share
success stories and lessons learnt, support regional exchanges of expertise between farmer organisations and their associated private sector and donor agency partners. National farmer organisations from around the Pacific responded positively to the launch of the Network. Koko Siga Fiji (www.kokosiga.com) currently serves as its Secretariat.

In regards to the priority areas, it would be the transfer of technology from farmer to farmer. This is an area that has not been considered in the past and often times we look outside the Pacific for technology when they are available here in the region. For example, the Foundation for Rural Integrated Enterprises N Development (www.friendfiji.com) in Lautoka, Western Fiji utilizes a Non-Government Organisation called the Tei Tei Taveuni (www.teiteitaveuni.com) that was formed by a group of farmers, to teach them about sustainable agriculture. We will soon be getting the pineapple farmers in Nadi to teach Samoan farmers on how to produce off-season pineapples or Sabeto farmers in Nadi teaching Cook Island farmers on producing breadfruit seedlings using new breeding techniques. This type of knowledge sharing between farmers in the Pacific will be much more practical and will be promoted through PIFON.

Philip Malsale, Acting Manager, Climate Services, Vanuatu Meteorology and Geoscience Department, Port Vila, Vanuatu

Dear members,

Here are my few insights regarding the South-South cooperation.

Firstly, I attended a three week Agricultural Meteorology (Agro-Met) workshop in Nadi, Fiji way back in 2010 and this was facilitated by two Agro-Met specialists from Cuba. This workshop has actually helped me realize the importance of combining both climate services and the work of farmers which is under the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Department. It is then after the workshop that the Agro-Met activities is developed into job descriptions for officers within the Climate Division and since then the officers have worked very closely with the Agriculture Department to realize needs of farmers especially on Climate Early Warnings and decision making at farm level.

While this service has been around for two years, there are still areas that need strengthening especially in Agro-Met sectors and particularly crop modeling specific to the Pacific or Vanuatu. I believe there are no specific crop models developed for the Pacific region and it is very difficult to make yield projection with the different climate scenarios to inform farmers. So this is one area that needs further funding or collaboration should there be any research that currently looks into this area. The other area is on crop climate threshold such as rainfall and temperature where specific climate threshold for each stable and cash crop are researched so these thresholds can be included in early warning systems and allow production of specific Agro-Met bulletins to target specific crops. I believe that this will really help with Agro-Met services in Climate Divisions not only in Vanuatu but in the whole Pacific region and most importantly moving climate services up another step in providing specific advice for certain sectors. On a farm scale, it is important to run climate field schools that take meteorological services and agricultural experts to certain locations in communities to deliver best agricultural practices that are appropriate for certain climate conditions such as El Niño–Southern Oscillation related events i.e. drought and extreme rainfall, so farmers can carry out on their farms. In Vanuatu, there is a need to upgrade farmers’ skills on best agricultural techniques and at the same time provide awareness on climate related events that can impact their yield so they can make better decisions at their level. So these are some areas where I believe this Cooperation can look into.
While there is progress on the ground since the Agro-Met workshop, there are still challenges that exist especially on the continuation of activities this South-South cooperation is engaging with in this region. One in particular is continuous support during the span of the project. While there is one organized regional workshop, I believe it will have a greater impact if there is a follow-up in-country workshop that will target a wider audience. So it is important to have follow-ups in-country visits to build that interest and continuity.

Kathy-Anne Caesar, Chief Meteorologist Ag., Caribbean Institute of Meteorology and Hydrology, Barbados

Dear Members,

The Caribbean Institute of Meteorology and Hydrology (CIMH) is a recognized World Meteorological Organization (WMO) Regional Training Center (RTC). In 2011 to 2012, the CIMH was involved in a South-South exchange with the South Pacific Islands coordinated by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in which the CIMH provided training to staff drawn from several National Meteorological Services in the South Pacific. The training was provided at the Supervisory Observer Level or the Mid-Level Meteorological Technician’s (MLMT). The training provided CIMH with the opportunity to:

- Demonstrate and inform the South Pacific of the capabilities of the CIMH training, research and development programmes;
- Support technology and know-how to the South Pacific where the weather and level of development in some cases is similar to that in the Caribbean;
- Build relationships with the National Meteorological Services in the South Pacific;
- Support cultural exchanges with the South Pacific.

The following students participated in the training:

- Williams Worworkon (Republic of Vanuatu);
- Konny Nato (Papua New Guinea);
- Wilson Va’aua (Samoa); and
- Wilson Sagea (Solomon Islands)

In addition to the eight months spent in the training programme, the students spent an additional two months at CIMH participating in an on-the-job training exercise in thematic areas that would best serve their respective National Meteorological Services when they returned home. These thematic areas included:

- Climate data collection and analysis;
- Instrument maintenance;
- Observer course training;
- Training module preparation

Based on feedback from the CIMH staff and students, the South-South exchange was viewed as a rewarding opportunity and an activity that should be continued into the future.

Based on the exchange and the institutional strengths of CIMH, the following priority areas have been identified for future collaborations and technical exchanges:

- Training in Meteorology at the Entry-, Mid- and Senior-Level Meteorology Technician Levels (http://www.cimh.edu.bb/?p=training&c=meteorology);
- Training in Hydrology at the Hydrology Technicians and Diploma Level (http://www.cimh.edu.bb/?p=training&c=hydrology) In particular, the CIMH has been made aware of the significant deficiency of operational hydrologists in the South Pacific.
Islands and the increasing risks posed by hydrological phenomena such as flash floods; and

- Training in Aeronautical Meteorology has especially given WMO's implementation of competency standards in Aeronautical Meteorology. Over the last three years, the CIMH has built up significant competence in this area of training by being participants in the development of the standards.

- Continued Professional Development. The CIMH has developed an online continuous professional development programme for Meteorological Forecasters in the Caribbean. The aim of this course is to ensure that meteorological forecasters in the region remain competent through a review of their knowledge and an upgrading of their skill. This course can be transferred to the South Pacific because the meteorological environment is the same and all that will be required would be specific examples or case studies from the South Pacific to provide the appropriate context for the modules in the courses.

During the 2011 to 2012 training exchange, the significant commonalities between the South Pacific and the Caribbean were explored leading to various new perspectives to support future exchanges. This was reinforced by several technical exchanges between staff from Regional Institutions in the Caribbean and the South Pacific during the South-South programme. In fact, the technical exchanges will continue in July 2013 with delegations from the Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA) and CIMH visiting Fiji to participate in 2013 Joint Meeting of the Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management and the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable.

---

Vincent Lebot, Project Scientific Coordinator, CIRAD, Valerie Tuia, Genetic Resources, SPC LRD.

Dear Members,

A major project started by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) in April 2011 has made huge strides in a remarkably short time.

SPC, the lead organization of the International Network of Edible Aroids (INEA), has provided over 100 selected taro (Colocasia esculenta) varieties (breeding lines and Asian lines) consisting of more than 6,500 plantlets to INEA member countries in Africa, the Caribbean, Asia, the Pacific and Europe in just six months, from June to November 2011.

This was achieved through its Centre for Pacific Crops and Trees (CePaCT), a Pacific genebank based in Fiji. CePaCT, within the Land Resources Division of SPC, was set up by the Heads of Agriculture in the Pacific islands to share and conserve crop genetic resources in order to strengthen food security.

Dr. Vincent Lebot, CIRAD/INEA, Scientific Coordinator, assisted by Dr. Grahame Jackson commented: "This is an amazing achievement by SPC; not many germplasm centres on this planet could have done such a fantastic job in so short a time. Congratulations and thanks to SPC".

INEA, a collaborative crop network backed by the EU, is a worldwide consortium of scientists and growers who are using edible aroids as a model to improve tropical crops that are propagated vegetatively – that is not by seed. SPC’s mandate in this is to improve both food security and income generation for the world’s poorest people. In order to do this, it has supplied new varieties to each of the 16 INEA member countries and regional organisations. The purpose is to
broaden the genetic base of the crops through breeding with the local varieties, thus producing hardier and healthier plants.

INEA members are: Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Madagascar, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Philippines, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, South Africa, Trinidad and Tobago and Vanuatu; in addition there are four European research institutes in Germany, France, Portugal and Slovenia and Biodiversity International

These taro distributions show a remarkable example of south-south collaboration. As we all know, SPC donor funded taro improvement program based in Samoa in collaboration with the University of the South Pacific and Samoa, has been breeding taro using Pacific and Asian genotypes for tolerance to a devastating disease called taro leaf blight which halted taro production in that country in 1993.

In 2009, the same disease arrived in West Africa for the first time, and has caused similar devastations. Epidemics of the disease have occurred in Ghana, Nigeria and the Cameroon, and now the disease is moving eastwards across Africa. Under INEA, researchers and farmers in the affected countries are testing tolerant varieties. We know from our observations that the plants bred in Samoa are standing up well to the disease in Africa.

Whether or not the farmers will receive the new varieties as such or hybrids from crosses with the local types, we are not sure. Countries will decide that in consultation with growers. But if breeding is required, INEA is there to assist.

There is another way that INEA is helping. Countries that are not members of the Network are coming to SPC asking for taro varieties, especially those tolerant to taro leaf blight. To date, taro has been sent to Bangladesh, Cameroon, Haiti, Mauritius, Congo and discussions are on-going with Guadeloupe. This is an unexpected outcome of the project, but one that is pleasing to report.

Of course, the sharing within INEA is underpinned by formal arrangements in respect to regional and international agreements and treaties. Members of SPC have agreed to place their collections of crops stored at CePaCT in the Multilateral System of the International Treaty for Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA). In June 2009, the Samoan Agricultural Minister Honorable Taua Kitiona Seuala signed the agreement at the 3rd Session of the Treaty Governing Body on behalf of Pacific Ministers of Agriculture and Forestry. In return, CePaCT receives funding in perpetuity from the Global Crop Diversity Trust.

The exchange of material is facilitated by the ITPGRFA which enables countries to access plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (PGRFA) that countries inter depend largely on important for sustainable agriculture and food security, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of their use, in harmony with the Convention on Biological Diversity.

CePaCT has already distributed a wide range of improved taro varieties to the Pacific region for evaluation. Some TLB tolerant varieties have revived the taro export market for Samoa; some are being integrated in current breeding programs in Cook Islands, Tonga, Fiji and both Samoa for building resilience to climate change under the AusAid International Climate Change Adaptation Initiative.

Most importantly new diverse varieties and relevant technology expected from EU INEA will be shared by all project partners including the Pacific through CePaCT. EU INEA is also working closely with project partners in sourcing new crops that would benefit the Pacific. Already SPC has received a yellow-fleshed xanthosoma from Nigeria that may have resistance to root rot. This is needed for the breeding program of this crop in Vanuatu.
Kees Stigter, Agro-climatologist, visiting Professor in Africa and Asia, For Agro-met Vision, Indonesia and the Netherlands

Dear Members,

I am a visiting professor in Africa and Asia in the field of Agro-climatology and Agro-meteorology since 1975, while my first visit as an agricultural climatologist to Madagascar, Africa was in 1969 for Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) project. The main field we cover these days is assistance to farmers in adapting to climate change. I am presently working in Ghana, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Zambia and Sudan (in Africa) and Indonesia and Iran (after many years in China ending in 2011) (in Asia). I retired nine years ago to work for a Dutch University and continued for more than nine years with “Agro-met Vision”, my one man company based in the Netherlands where we reside.

- **What kind of South-South projects or collaborations have you personally been involved with? Can you elaborate on that?**

I am an affiliated professor at the University of the Free State in Bloemfontein, South Africa, where I spend one to two months a year. This University has students from all over southern and eastern Africa. My contacts with the University started in 2006 when I was assigned to make an evaluation of the agro-meteorology. One of my advices in my evaluation report was to make the thesis subjects more relevant to the countries where these students come from, including South Africa itself. This advice was followed up and I was invited to be part of this effort. One other aspect here is to use external examiners of other African countries for the South African theses.

In the other African countries I am presently serving, no components of South/South collaboration are involved. However, I am using experience gained in one country for the benefit of the other countries, but this is not South/South collaboration but “cross pollination”. All together I spent about 15 years of my life in Africa and I use that experience as external examiner for various African countries and in my present work for these Universities. Relevancy of thesis subjects for the development of Africa is a subject I have tried to promote throughout my years in Africa.

Neither in China nor in Indonesia and Iran was I involved in any South/South collaboration. In Iran this is politically impossible, in Indonesia the level of some of the larger state Universities can be assessed as sufficient for such collaboration but language problems (English is a real problem in Indonesia) as well as problems in getting research permits as a foreigner make it difficult. The same applies in China as to language and there freedom of movement of foreigners is restricted.

- **What do you think are the priority areas for potential collaborations?**

Priority in University collaborations or in creating places for foreign students from other developing countries should be the relevance of the research for development. In my recently published compendium “Applied Agro-meteorology” (Springer, Heidelberg etc., 2010, xxxviii + 1101 pages) I have again tried to show how well the research efforts of M.Sc. and Ph.D. students could be used to find answers to development questions in agriculture, with emphasis on such subjects as agricultural extension to poor farmers and their adaptation to climate change.
When implementing South-South cooperation projects, what kind of challenges do we face and how do we overcome these? Specifically we encourage you to share lessons learned – the setbacks as well as the successes.

We firstly have to assess the strengths and weaknesses of potential South/South partners. It is important to know what under-industrialized countries have to offer to other such countries and which countries are particularly in need of what. What they have to offer must be assessed from visible accomplishments (like in medicines in Cuba, in agro-climatology in China, in agriculture in South Africa, in climate education in the Philippines, and in orchard management in Iran etc. etc.). Subsequently, decisions on implementation depend on political conditions and perspectives of freedom of research/movement/speech, difficulties in obtaining visa (like for Iran, Sudan) etc.

For collaborations, usually the first step is "knowledge-sharing" then the second step is "transfer" – Could you share examples of transferrable programs that you have (transferred from one to another country)?

I am the inventor of the so called "Picnic" model of research education/training, as an alternative to the "Sandwich" model, in the eighties and the nineties. In our model, African Ph.D. students started their research endeavors in their own country with local supervisors and me as co-supervisor. That first visit was also used for the establishment of a priority thesis subject relevant to local development and for discussing the approach to this research subject ("knowledge sharing"). The name of the project was the "Traditional Techniques of Microclimate Improvement (TTMI) Project (1985 – 2001). We used African and Dutch M.Sc. students as supportive researchers for the Ph.D. candidates. After a write-up phase in the Netherlands, all African students got their degrees from their own African Universities.

I had prepared this model in Tanzania (1975 – 1984), introduced it there and transferred it to Kenya, Sudan and Nigeria. The project had two phases, both funded by the Netherlands Government, and the first student graduated in Sudan in 1991 and the last one in Tanzania in 1999. In the years after this project we continued "knowledge transfer" to publish on the relevant results till I retired in 2005. In my above mentioned book, the collection of agro-meteorological services developed for African farmers in that TTMI-Project were used as examples together with what I collected in China (1997-2011) and with the results of a contest that we organized with the International Society for Agricultural Meteorology (INSAM) of which I am the founding president. The Netherlands Fellowship programme introduced the Picnic-model as an alternative for the Sandwich-model around 1995.

Aliti Vunisea, Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Northern Pacific

Dear Members,

My involvement has been brief and on a very specific area i.e. research on gender perspectives on climate change from communities. The study involved two communities from the Pacific, Lomawai in Fiji and Kitti in Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia, and two from the Caribbean. The research preparation involved knowledge exchange and was a very useful exercise highlighting similarities in organization of communities, societal perceptions and approaches to development, people’s worldview, barriers and challenges, general gender perceptions, and traditional norms/cultural thinking on gender.

This was a great start for a gender focused analysis and discussions setting the preliminary foundation for gender and climate change work across the two regions. Potential future collaboration could focus on a wider set of parameters, having a wider set of cases studies from both regions, working with specific on-going projects on Climate Change and Disaster Risk
Management to include gender analysis and assessments. Information exchange on gender and climate change can also be easily strengthened at International meetings where cases can be discussed across regions.

The challenge in conducting research is more related to trying to gather information on something people have little understanding of. Climate Change is minimally understood at community level and trying to get people’s perception on something they are not comfortable to talk about is not easy. Differentiating gender roles is also not very easy in situations where people play complimentary roles or work in household units.

The write up on this work took a while and the challenge was having the team leader stationed in one region and pulling everything together.

Because this was a research based work, it was more focused on knowledge sharing, working with actual projects on the ground e.g. conducting gender analysis or assessments of projects that may enable transfer of skill and lessons learnt.

Jacinda Fairholm et al[1], Caribbean Risk Management Initiative, United Nations Development Programme Regional Service Centre, Panama

Dear Members,

South-South Cooperation: Adapting Risk Reduction Approaches across the Caribbean

Thanks to the Pacific Exchange for providing the opportunity to share some of the South-South Cooperation (SSC) experiences in the Caribbean. The Caribbean Risk Management Initiative (CRMI) is a UNDP project which has been actively facilitating a regional SSC initiative that spans now five years; related activities started in 2009 and will be finishing at the end of 2013. The SSC initiative involves transferring the best practices of a Cuban model of Local Governance and Disaster Risk Reduction to five countries in the Caribbean.

As a contribution to the discussion, please find here the key steps that we have taken in implementing a SSC initiative, and some of the lessons that we have learned to date.

Background

Initiated in 2005, the Cuban model of Risk Reduction Management Centres (RRMC) was identified as a best practice in the area of risk reduction, operating as an instrument of local governments focused on risk reduction; specifically, the RRMC facilitates the management of hazard, risk, and vulnerability information in a given territory, through studies, analysis and disaster risk planning in coordination with key actors in the territory, such as transport, public health, agriculture, industry, public works, etc. The RRMC presents compiled information and recommendations to the local authorities, for improved risk reduction decision making for the protection of human life and livelihoods.

Step One: Systematization of the Cuban model

CRMI worked with Cuban authorities to document the RRMC, resulting in “Cuba: Best Practice in Risk Reduction”. This document led into a two-day national workshop which brought together different municipal RRMC units to share their application of the model and resulted in a distillation of optimal conditions and key components for successful implementation of the model. These were published in a guide, aimed at providing an outline to municipalities interested in
utilizing the model. This systematization process demonstrated a high-level of support for the RRMC model by mayors, decision-makers and local authorities in Cuban municipalities.

**Step Two: Engaging the Region**

The tools of the systematization were shared with the Caribbean region through workshops and conferences, generating interest. Cuban authorities expressed interest in providing guidance and training to countries in the region, with CRMI well-positioned to facilitate the process. The guide was circulated with the purpose of increasing the understanding of the model as well as allowing countries to assess their context and conditions for involvement in a SSC initiative.

Five countries in the Caribbean and the accompanying UNDP Country Office considered themselves prepared to participate in the south-south initiative, to learn from, adapt and support the replication of the Cuban Risk Reduction Management Centre model to the local context: The British Virgin Islands, The Dominican Republic, Guyana, Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago.

UNDP-CRMI plays a role of guiding and facilitating the SSC process, as the triangulating actor.

**Step Three: Transferring the Experience**

The transfer of knowledge and practices has occurred using various different mechanisms:

Training Workshops: Sensitization and technical workshops were provided to meet the needs of different actors in the SSC process, including UNDP Country offices, national disaster management agencies, local authorities and technical specialists. Coherency in understanding the model and its application/relevance at all levels is crucial for successful implementation, as each level has a specific and distinct role to play.

- Two awareness raising workshops: one directed at the head of NDMA and UNDP Focal Point; the other directed at the local and ministerial/national political authorities who would be the direct beneficiaries of the pilot. The workshops provided an overview of the model, field visits to RRMC and early warning points in different municipalities in Cuba, allowing for discussion with Civil Defense, mayors, municipal authorities and different local actors on the coordination and information required for effective risk reduction.

- A two-week technical training: directed at the individual responsible for RRMC SSC implementation. This training addressed vulnerability and hazard studies, risk analysis, GIS mapping, working with a multi-disciplinary group, setting up a community-based early warning system, methods for compiling key information for decision-makers, and database management.

Ongoing technical assistance: Specific and punctual technical assistance is offered by Cuban specialists to pilot countries.

Comprehensive Training Kit: includes operational guides, video tutorials and methodologies was developed for pilot implementation.

**Step Four: Implementing the Transfer**

Each country submitted baseline information document, which informed the Cubans of the context, vulnerabilities and structure in which the pilot RRMC would be implemented. This baseline document will also be utilized to measure the changes resulting from the SSC.

National and Local authorities submitted an implementation plan, outlining how the RRMC model will be adapted to local context, cost-sharing agreements, and key activities. The pilot
implementation period will last for 9 month period (April – Dec 2013).

**Step Five: Sharing the Experience**

CRMI has established several mechanisms for implementing actors to share their experience through Facebook, Twitter and the CRMI website.

A one-stop UNDP Teamworks (knowledge platform) site has been established for UNDP Focal Points, with all forms, information, and reports available.

In addition, each country has committed to writing a mid-term article and a final case study, in addition to quarterly reporting, which will be published for Caribbean-wide dissemination.

At the end of the RRMC SSC pilot, all countries will come together to share these case studies and lessons learned in a project wrap-up meeting. These lessons will be published, for the benefit of the wide development community working in SSC.

**Lessons Learned to Date**

- High-level of support for the SSC initiative is required by both host country officials/actors and recipient country.

- It has been useful for the facilitating partner (in this case, CRMI) to be familiar with the model and the primary actors, in this case Cuba – particularly in the case of working across diverse language, political and economic structures. Part of the process involved articulating the components of the model, so it could be understood to the wider region.

- The model will be adapted to local realities, structures and capacity. The methodology of SSC and transfer should provide ample space and support for this adaptation.

- Funds, technical assistance, tools and monitoring were available to support the piloting of the RRMC in the recipient countries. This continuum allows the SSC go beyond transfer of knowledge to its application.

- Training needs to be assessed to understand the needs of recipient countries – and respond to them.

- With a regional project such as this, strong coordination at a regional level between multiple countries and actors is necessary; the UNDP role at a country office level is also critical to implementation, as information sources and conduits, on-the-ground support, follow-up and assistance with procurement. UNDP Country Office also plays a crucial role in coordinating between local units, municipal government, national disaster agency, ministries (particularly in countries where municipal government and disaster management fall under different ministries) and regional UNDP.

- A national-level project coordinator, who has good technical background, can provide substantial support for the pilot, and ensure its alignment with in-country DMA structures.

**Best Practices (identified by implementing partners)**

- RRMC offers an example of good synergies between model and recipient countries’ needs.

- MOUs between national and local actors are tools for successful implementation, particularly if they are from different Line Ministries.
• There is extensive sharing among the countries participating in the initiative, using social media, webinars and through workshops.

• Communication, Monitoring and Support by regional team with countries thru quarterly reports, Skype calls with each country team, webinars, social media tools and web site.

• Diversity of tools available for knowledge transfer addresses diversity of needs.

I hope this is helpful to other countries considering engaging in SSC initiative. We anticipate updating and analyzing the lessons learned and best practices related to the SSC as we continue with the RRMC implementation in the five countries.

For more information on the UNDP Caribbean Risk Management Initiative and the initiative, please see http://crmi-undp.org/  

This was a collaborative response from Margaret Jones-Williams (UNDP Jamaica), Rosemary Lall (UNDP Trinidad and Tobago), Georgina Michelen (UNDP Cuba), Alejandro Iberico and DR team (UNDP Dominican Republic), and Jacinda Fairholm, CRMI, UNDP Regional Service Centre, Panama.

Leisa Perch, Rio+ World Centre for Sustainable Development, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Dear All,

I would like to just follow up on a point made by Sakiusa regarding transferability particularly for technologies. This point "So the lesson learnt is that we should be mindful of other social and economic factors that affect the farmers before we make decisions as these policies should be synergized with other Government macro and sectoral economic policies" is absolutely pivotal to deeper South-South Cooperation (SSC) beyond information exchange and is fundamental to the real and sustained adoption by the recipient. This is sometimes not given the attention it should but time and again, it is identified as the 'cement' or 'glue'.

I worked at the United Nations Development Programme's International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth for 3.5 years and this was one of the issues which arose, time and again, in terms of moving from the exchange of information to the transfer of either good practice or important technologies. Once the interest was established - the more detailed questions of those learning from the Brazil model tended to be focused on those issues. Brazil, for example, has been able to effectively transfer a number of good practices to many countries and in three major areas: (i) agriculture including agribusiness, (ii) social protection and (iii) reducing hunger. There is now a World Food Programme Center of Excellence on Hunger – based in Brazil. One of the things they have done is to facilitate the adaptation of a Brazilian model for addressing food security and purchasing food from farmers for school-feeding to countries in Africa. Called, PAA Africa it is being implemented in 10 countries I believe. More information on this can be accessed from the Deputy Director of the World Food Programme (WFP), Cynthia Jones. Their website is http://www.wfp.org/centre-of-excellence-hunger.

What I have been involved specifically is trying to identify specific knowledge and tools that could help to support climate-smart agriculture (CSA) in Africa. What we have done there is:

- First to understand the situation in Africa as best as we can as well as understand what CSA means broadly and therefore what types of tools and knowledge would be useful. We did that through a research paper and also through an online e-group discussion
where we worked hard to have researchers, policymakers, Non-Government Organisations and farmers involved.

- In the above, we sought to identify specific lessons also from Brazil that might be useful to African countries.
- The next step will be the development of a community of practice to make the connections between those who have questions and those who have answers more obvious.

We haven't picked any one model as yet since the needs are very diverse. As more detailed analysis is still ongoing, one of the key steps will be to seek to match the needs with an existing model and then arrange/facilitate more detailed discussions and exchanges on those and seek then to arrange for appropriate mechanisms for transfer. One of the things we have also considered is the need to see where examples may already exist within countries already part of the project so as to facilitate South-South in that context. For example, our research reinforced that Zambia would be a good place to develop and document on models of conservation agriculture.

More generally, I would say that what I learned in observing/researching SSC in action is the following:

1. Whatever the technology or knowledge that is being shared, there is always a process of social adaptation in presenting it to a different audience and it being adopted by that audience. This means:
   a. Understanding the circumstances which enabled the technology to be developed and approved in the first place
   b. And how those circumstances match and don't match with the situation in the other country. More on this perspective is available in this paper we wrote: [http://www.ipc-undp.org/pub/IPCPolicyResearchBrief25.pdf](http://www.ipc-undp.org/pub/IPCPolicyResearchBrief25.pdf) as well as the references therein. This also includes some examples of SSC between Brazil and other countries which may be useful. A very interesting paper (also referenced in the paper noted above) highlights some key factors for the process of transferring any type of technology as is usually the case in SSC. Chatterjee (1990) notes, for example, that any transfer of social technology must take into account and reconcile issues of adaptability and replicability. He concludes that the transferability of social technology from one context to another is easier when there is similarity between the two.

2. Tackling socio-cultural factors is particularly relevant. For disaster risk reduction more so, I would imagine. Risk perception is diverse within household moreover different countries and also in the context of agriculture. The role of agriculture can differ in small ways in terms of its social, economic and environmental role and therefore how behavior change would need to be adapted so would taking a Disaster Risk Reduction approach in the agricultural sector. Landownership and titling in the Caribbean share similarity but also important differences with the Pacific. And amongst the reasons maybe the socio and socio-economic drivers – one being slavery and the role of land as an important proxy and engine for economic equality. Even despite this focus, titling is still an issue and has proven to be problematic in the post-disaster context. In post-Ivan Grenada (2004/2005), the lack of appropriate titling became a critical hindrance to access to some types of support for housing repair, for example, and the types of repairs that would have strengthened houses and reduced risks in the long-term.

3. There are different models out there on this. In a paper which compared Argentina and Brazil, some clear differences were visible ([http://www.ipc-](http://www.ipc-))
undp.org/pub/IPCPovertyInFocus24.pdf), pages 20-22. There is also available on SSC experiences in a number of contexts. The Chinese and India models have also been somewhat different from those of Brazil. New entrants: South Africa, Indonesia and Malaysia may also expand the thinking and the ways in which it is done.

4. As a tool for ‘development’ and not just development cooperation, SSC needs to consistently involve a broader set of actors, particularly civil society organizations. It should also be horizontal (as in a two-way street) and should ideally create learning opportunities on both sides. The Small Island Developing States SSC model seems closest to this than some of the others. Pathways to learning also require a mutual basic knowledge.

5. For true learning to take place, basic background knowledge of each side seems critical. I have been in some meetings where things cannot go below the surface because everyone is just learning about each other. Something that seems to help is having some background documentation exchanged before a face-to-face visit so that the actual face can really dig into the issues almost from Day 1. That would help study tours really maximize their potential.

6. Some approaches, like that of WFP and the International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth, also include follow-up visits. WFP has incorporated Action Plans also as well as priority countries in defining a specific programme of action. And they note that countries are now demanding more and more individualized responses. The latter I think will become increasingly a core of SSC, and tools for doing that still need to be created.

7. Documentation, documentation and documentation. In many cases, when the discussions are going on and an interesting idea comes up, the documentation is often not available, readily available or in a common language. Documentation and translation have to be key elements of SSC planning, programming and delivery. For the transfer, in particular, this becomes very important.

Thank you for the opportunity to share.

Best regards.

______________________________

Dear Karen and et al,

I had the pleasure of accompanying a group of visiting disaster risk managers and development professionals from the Caribbean on a field visit to the Island of Naviti in Fiji. The visiting delegates were from various parts of the Caribbean and worked in different areas of Disaster Risk Management (DRM) in the Caribbean including - the Institute of Meteorology, Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, UNDP-Caribbean Risk Management Initiative and the Red Cross. The main reason for their visit to Fiji was to attend the 2010 Pacific Platform for DRM in Suva. The trip was supported by the UNDP’s Special Unit for South-South Cooperation and the UNDP-Japan Partnership Fund.

We were accompanied by several people from the Pacific Community Focused Integrated Disaster Risk Reduction (PCIDRR) programme as well as the District Officer for Lautoka/Yasawa. We were warmly welcomed and hosted by the Village of Gunu in the Yasawa Islands.

The visit to the Yasawas gave the visiting delegation a greater sense of the challenges and resilience of island communities in the Pacific. In my opinion, priority areas for collaboration
should emphasise formal knowledge, experience and technology sharing and transfer between countries, but also ensure informal field visits to communities form the basis of South-South cooperation, provide important context of the challenges and resilience of Pacific/Caribbean island communities with regard to DRM, and foster greater community engagement with DRM projects.

It was an excellent opportunity to foster a sense of affinity between the two regions and encourage further cooperation in the future. With limited and often obscurely designed funding opportunities, South-South cooperation projects can provide interregional and international benefits from a unified funding stream. I believe that there are self-reinforcing benefits associated with capacity building between developing countries that are arguably more effective, sustainable, and appropriate than traditional North-South capacity building projects. In other words, continued South-South cooperation has the potential for mutual capacity building between participating developing countries facing similar development challenges.

Many thanks to all who contributed to this query!

If you have further information to share on this topic, please send it to Solution Exchange for the Climate Change and Development Community in the Pacific at ccd-pc@solutionexchange-un.net with the subject heading "Re: [ccd-pc-se] QUERY: South-South Cooperation between Developing Countries. Additional Reply"

Disclaimer: In posting messages or incorporating these messages into synthesized responses, the UN accepts no responsibility for their veracity or authenticity. Members intending to use or transmit the information contained in these messages should be aware that they are relying on their own judgment.
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Solution Exchange is a UN initiative for development practitioners in the Pacific. For more information please visit www.solutionexchange-un.net/pacific/