



PBL Netherlands Environmental
Assessment Agency

PUBLIC-PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION

Motivations and practices of Dutch sub-national public actors in development cooperation in Sub-Saharan Africa

Background Report

Jurre Grupstra, Martha van Eerdt

23 May 2017

PBL

Public-public development cooperation: Motivations and practices of Dutch sub-national public actors in development cooperation

©PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency

The Hague, 2017

PBL publication number: 2765

Corresponding author

martha.vaneerdt@pbl.nl

Authors

Jurre Grupstra and Martha van Eerdt

Graphics

PBL Beeldredactie

Production coordination

PBL Publishers

This publication can be downloaded from: www.pbl.nl/en. Parts of this publication may be reproduced, providing the source is stated, in the form: Grupstra J. and Van Eerdt M. (2017), Public-public development cooperation: Motivations and practices of Dutch sub-national public actors in development cooperation. PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, The Hague.

PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency is the national institute for strategic policy analysis in the fields of the environment, nature and spatial planning. We contribute to improving the quality of political and administrative decision-making by conducting outlook studies, analyses and evaluations in which an integrated approach is considered paramount. Policy relevance is the prime concern in all of our studies. We conduct solicited and unsolicited research that is both independent and scientifically sound.

Contents

SUMMARY	4
1 INTRODUCTION	5
2 DEFINING DECENTRALISED PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION	7
3 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW AND POLICY CONTEXT	9
3.1 National policy context of decentralised public development cooperation	9
3.2 International policy context of decentralised public development cooperation	11
4 MOTIVATIONS	15
5 PRACTICES	17
6 CONCLUSION	27
7 BIBLIOGRAPHY	28
8 ANNEX: OVERVIEW OF PROJECTS BY DUTCH SUB-NATIONAL PUBLIC ACTORS IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA	29

Summary

Over the past years, development cooperation policy in the Netherlands has become increasingly oriented towards facilitating private sector development and public-private partnerships (PPPs). As opposed to PPPs, decentralised *public* development cooperation has received relatively little attention.

The rationale behind decentralised public development cooperation is that public goals are best achieved by public institutions. However, what the potential of this form of cooperation is and where it is best fit has yet to take shape. Hypothetically, the main added value of Dutch sub-national public actors in development cooperation is the sustainable transfer of knowledge through the use of a peer-to-peer approach, involving long-term organisational and individual relationships between civil servants and ensuring a shared problem understanding.

This study explores the potential added value of decentralised public development cooperation, focusing on food security from an international public goods perspective. To this end, it provides an insight into the goals and motivations of Dutch sub-national public actors to engage in development cooperation and the practices that can be distinguished among these actors.

Currently, the main actors in decentralised public development cooperation in the Netherlands are municipalities, public utilities, provinces, regional water authorities, Kadaster and the umbrella organisations of the municipalities, the drinking water companies and the regional water authorities (VNG International, Vewin and Dutch Water Authorities, respectively). Overall, the main motivation for Dutch sub-national public actors to engage in development cooperation is to share knowledge and contribute to capacity building in order to strengthen public institutions in the global South. In their role of public bodies, they are driven by a sense of social responsibility to help perform public tasks in countries where the responsible institutions are not sufficiently equipped to do so on their own.

In general, however, there seems to be a discrepancy between the motivations of Dutch sub-national public actors to engage in international cooperation and the practices as they actually occur in decentralised public development cooperation in the Netherlands. Although the general intention of Dutch sub-national public actors is to develop long-standing partnerships based on equality and reciprocity, this is in many cases not realised in practice.

Going beyond short-term projects and technical interventions, the potential added value of decentralised public development cooperation in contributing to food security lies in long-term, mutually beneficent cooperation based on an integrated approach to the governance of public goods. In order to realise this potential, decentralised public development cooperation should be adapted to its context and aimed at enhancing integrated (environmental) governance, thus stimulating synergies between public goods such as land, water and food security.

1 Introduction

Over the past two decades or so, public-private partnerships (PPPs) have become central to the field of development cooperation, attracting increasing amounts of government funding and being extensively discussed in academic literature. In the Netherlands, development cooperation policy has become increasingly oriented towards facilitating private sector development and public-private partnerships (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2013a; Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2013b). With its current policy, the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs stimulates the development of public-private partnerships in relation to the priority themes water and food security, respectively through the Sustainable Water Fund (FDW) and the Facility for Sustainable Entrepreneurship and Food Security (FDOV).

Research has shown that PPPs in the water sector generally have a clear public objective, but a weak business case, and private parties are generally not keen on entering into such a partnership (PBL 2015). Conversely, PPPs in the area of food security tend to have a strong business case but unclear public objectives. Therefore, public actors are usually less interested in joining a food security-related partnership. This raises questions about the potential of PPPs for achieving public objectives related to food security and the associated implications for *public-public* cooperation in international development¹.

PPPs can be seen to involve the employment of public means to achieve Dutch private goals. Consequently, the question arises if decentralised public development cooperation is needed to achieve public goals in developing countries. Whereas PPPs are typically project-based interventions focusing on short-term results rather than long-term impact, decentralised public development cooperation ideally takes the form of long-term partnerships centred around knowledge exchange and capacity building. The rationale behind decentralised public development cooperation is that public goals are best achieved by public institutions. However, what the potential of this form of cooperation is and where it is best fit has yet to take shape (IOB 2004). Hypothetically, the main added value of Dutch sub-national public actors in development cooperation is the sustainable transfer of knowledge through the use of a peer-to-peer approach, involving long-term organisational and individual relationships between civil servants and ensuring a shared problem understanding.

As opposed to PPPs, decentralised public development cooperation has received relatively little attention, both in the academic literature and in policymaking. The objective of this explorative study is to generate insight into the potential added value of decentralised public development cooperation in international development in general and in achieving public goals regarding food security in particular. To this end, it aims to shed light on the goals and motivations of Dutch sub-national public actors to engage in this form of development cooperation and the practices that can be distinguished in decentralised public development cooperation. The geographical scope of the study is Sub-Saharan Africa.

In this study, food security is considered as not a domain in itself but as affected by multiple domains, including agriculture, water and energy (Candel, 2014). This interrelatedness calls for an integrated, holistic approach in which food security is viewed as an international public good. Although improving food security is technically feasible, progress in Sub-Saharan Africa

¹ Public-public cooperation denotes the collaboration between sub-national public actors in the Netherlands and public actors in developing countries. In this report this form of collaboration is henceforth referred to as decentralised public development cooperation.

in this regard has been limited. At the same time, population growth and economic growth on the continent increasingly lead to competing claims on natural resources and growing demand for food. The combined challenge of increasing pressure on natural resources and limited improvement in achieving food security points to the crucial importance of institutions and institutional developments. Specifically, there is an urgent need for integrated and inclusive governance of natural resources. In this respect, land and water governance are of central importance, because land and water are basic conditions (enabling/constraining conditions) for food security and are thus indispensable for making food systems more sustainable. For this reason, this study includes water- and land-related projects that work towards public goals related to food security.

In line with the main research objective, the study aims to gain insight in the following theoretical question:

What is the potential added value of decentralised public development cooperation in contributing to food security from an international public goods perspective?

In order to do so it aims to provide an answer to the following empirical questions:

What are the goals and motivations of Dutch sub-national public actors to engage in decentralised public development cooperation?

What practices can be distinguished in decentralised public development cooperation related to water, land and food security?

The study has an explorative character and is based on desk research (including academic literature, grey literature, programme evaluations and programme/project documentation) and semi-structured interviews with key informants and representatives of Dutch sub-national public actors that are involved in development cooperation.

This section has introduced the study, presented its objectives and research questions and outlined the methodology. Section two and three define decentralised public development cooperation, describe its historic origins and outline the national and international policy context in which it takes place. Subsequently, section four and five discuss the goals and motivations of Dutch sub-national public actors to engage in decentralised public development cooperation and the practices that can be distinguished in this field. The concluding section discusses the potential added value of Dutch decentralised public development cooperation in contributing to food security in developing countries.

2 Defining decentralised public development cooperation

Since the 1980s there has been a profound shift in institutional forms of governance (Selsky and Parker, 2005). Many hybrid forms of cooperation have developed and changing relationships between governments, businesses and civil society organisations have blurred the boundaries between sectors. Given the development of such novel forms of governance there is a need to critically map the hybrid landscape of the public and the private sector (Bragdon, 2016). Hereby it should be recognised that there are no 'naturally given, a priori boundaries' between public and private and that public and private should rather be seen as situated on a continuum (Boag and McDonald, 2010). The fluidity of different sectors and their boundaries is clearly reflected in the proliferation of public-public partnerships, PPPs and other cross-sector partnerships over the past few decades.

Selsky and Parker (2005) identify several arenas of cross-sector partnerships: private–non-profit partnerships, public–private partnerships, public–non-profit partnerships and trisector partnerships. Partnerships may be transactional – short-term, constrained and largely self-interest oriented – and 'integrative' or 'developmental' – longer-term, open-ended and largely common-interest oriented (*ibid.*: 850). Although strictly not a form of cross-sector collaboration, decentralised public development cooperation can be added to the spectrum. Theoretically, this category can be situated at the end of integrative/developmental partnerships, as public-public partnerships ideally are long-term and common interest-oriented.

Decentralised public development cooperation can be defined as 'collaborative relationships between sub-national governments from different countries, aiming at sustainable local development, implying some form of exchange or support carried out by these institutions or other locally based actors' (Hafteck: 336). The literature describes several types of decentralised public development cooperation. First, there is institutional twinning between local government associations (SEOR 2003). Twinning is aimed at strengthening the capacity of partners, and local governments in general, in developing countries. It is defined by the World Bank, in a general sense, as a 'process that pairs an organisational entity in a developing country with a similar but more mature entity in another country' (Ouchi, 2004). Twinning are characterised by a programmatic approach rather than a project-based approach. Normally they take the form of formalised partnerships for an indefinite period. While they were originally focused on technical interventions and service provision, in recent years twinning have become increasingly oriented towards governance issues as well (Baud et al. 2010).

A second type of decentralised public development cooperation is generally referred to as 'municipal international cooperation'. It includes city partnerships and municipal 'friendship relations' which originated from solidarity movements from the 1960s onwards. In this form of cooperation mainly Western European municipalities team up with local governments in developing countries in order to jointly achieve short-term and longer-term objectives, including service provision, knowledge exchange and institutional strengthening. Municipal international cooperation often aims at creating a broad development partnership by stimulating and facilitating cooperation between the public sector, the private sector and civil society. This type of cooperation normally entails a formalised relationship for a fixed or an indefinite period of time. Even though it is generally based on equality and reciprocity, in practice there often is a power imbalance which makes actual reciprocity unrealistic to attain.

In short, the –stylised– distinction between twinnings and municipal international cooperation is that the former involves technical interventions based on a unidirectional bilateral partnership between local government associations, while the latter is based on reciprocal relationships between municipalities aimed at forming broad development partnerships.

A third type is the network relationship, in which there is no one-to-one relationship but mutual cooperation between local governments worldwide within an existing framework (SEOR 2003). An example of this form of cooperation is UNEP's Sustainable Cities initiative. A fourth type of decentralised public development cooperation is a thematic relationship which only involves cooperation on one or more specific themes. Lastly, there is project-based cooperation in which there is no structural relationship between the sub-national public actors involved.

3 Historical overview and policy context of decentralised public development cooperation

Decentralised public development cooperation has its origins in the period after World War II when Western European cities established city partnerships to develop intercultural ties and build institutional capacity (Boag and McDonald, 2010). From the 1960s onwards, Western European municipalities entered into partnerships with municipalities in developing countries as an exponent of wider solidarity movements. At a later stage, public water companies and other sub-national public institutions became involved in development cooperation through such municipal partnerships. The Dutch regional water authorities, too, initially developed international activities through partnerships of Dutch municipalities. As a result, decentralised public development cooperation concentrated in countries with relative concentrations of municipal partnerships, like Nicaragua, which is still a focal country for the Dutch Water Authorities.

The majority of public-public partnerships were established in the water sector. Decentralised public development cooperation in this sector developed from two main sources. On the one hand, it has its origins in municipal partnerships, as described above (Boag and McDonald, 2010). On the other hand, it developed as an alternative to privatisation models which were a dominant strategy in the water sector in the 1980s and 1990s. One of the first examples of decentralised public development cooperation in the water sector was the partnership between the United Kingdom public water company Severn Trent and Lilongwe, the capital of Malawi, in the 1980s (Hall 2000).

3.1 National policy context of decentralised public development cooperation

Currently, the main actors in decentralised public development cooperation in the Netherlands are municipalities, public utilities, provinces, regional water authorities, the Netherlands' Cadastre, Land Registry and Mapping Agency (Kadaster)² and the umbrella organisations of

² Kadaster is an independent, semi-government organisation (ZBO) under the political responsibility of the Minister of Infrastructure and the Environment.

the municipalities, the drinking water companies and the regional water authorities (VNG International³; Vewin; Association of Dutch Water Authorities).

In current Dutch policy on development cooperation, there is no comprehensive approach or particular funding mechanism to facilitate the involvement of Dutch sub-national public actors in development cooperation. However, the Dutch government has stimulated the involvement of regional water authorities, water companies and sewage treatment plants in development cooperation through the Schokland Agreement and it is believed that cooperation between these Dutch public institutions can enhance the efficiency and impact of their international activities (Dutch House of Representatives 2010). In addition, specific programmes have been set up by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs with Kadaster and VNG International (see Table 1).

Initially there was no support for decentralised public development cooperation at the national level. In 1972 the Ministry of Foreign Affairs first endorsed the involvement of municipalities in international development. However, it lasted until the mid-1980s before there was national policy regarding decentralised public development cooperation, marked by the start of the Programme Municipal Initiatives with VNG in 1986. Subsequently, the launch of the Programme Municipal Cooperation with Developing Countries in 1991 marked the beginning of structural support to decentralised public development cooperation.

During the early 1990's Dutch national policy for decentralised public development cooperation was based on ideals like solidarity and global citizenship (IOB 2004). In this period, the policy was premised on the notion that decentralised public development cooperation has an inherent added value and does not require tangible effects on the short term. As such, the national policy was in line with the rationale behind municipal partnerships and the international activities of VNG. Over the course of the decade, however, the focus of the national policy shifted towards generating societal support for international cooperation. At the same time, development cooperation became increasingly result-oriented and aimed at achieving measurable impact. These shifts took place in the context of decreasing public support for development cooperation and declining parliamentary support for decentralised public development cooperation.

At the turn of the century the national policy focus regarding decentralised public development cooperation shifted again, this time towards reinforcing local government. This shift was reflected in the focus of the consecutive programmes for decentralised public development cooperation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and VNG. While the Municipal Cooperation with Developing Countries programme (GSO) focused on stimulating public support for development cooperation, LOGO South and the Local Government Capacity Programme (LGCP) were primarily aimed at strengthening local government in developing countries. Also, the latter programmes were characterised by a more result-oriented approach.

As a result of the shifting approach towards decentralised public development cooperation at the national level, a discrepancy developed between the national government, municipalities and VNG International. Municipalities remained oriented towards intensifying city partnerships and to a large extent retained the character of solidarity movements. Being still driven mainly by ideological motivations, they were not primarily concerned with strengthening local government in developing countries and achieving measurable results (IOB 2004). VNG International, of which the central objective had consistently been to strengthen local government worldwide, tried to reconcile both approaches.

³ VNG International is the organisation for international cooperation of the *Vereniging Nederlandse Gemeenten* (VNG) and was established in 2001. Until then, development programmes of VNG were implemented by the international department within VNG.

Over time, the programmes of VNG International have undergone significant changes, based in part on lessons learnt from previous programmes. Whereas the Municipal Initiatives programme and the Programme Municipal Cooperation with Developing Countries (GSO) were only open to municipalities, their successors were also accessible to other Dutch sub-national public actors like the regional water authorities, public utilities and provinces. By allowing these actors onto the programme, VNG International and the ministry of Foreign Affairs responded to the trend among Dutch sub-national public actors to engage in development cooperation. Moreover, in the Municipal Initiatives programme, activities were conducted over a long period of time, while the GSO programme involved short-term activities (SEOR 2003).

Over the years, more adjustments have been made to the programmes of VNG International, informed by evaluations of their predecessors. For instance, in order to enhance the institutional embeddedness of the programmes – which was identified as a weak point in the evaluation of the GSO programme –, the LOGO South programme expressly built on existing organisations and the Local Government Capacity Programme makes use of resident programme managers. Moreover, in order to avoid fragmentation, the Local Government Capacity Programme has a narrower focus than its predecessors, both thematically and geographically, as evaluations of previous programmes stated that a lack of clear choices limited efficiency. In addition to enhancing efficiency, a more targeted programme was aimed at fostering understanding of contextual differences and minimising the adverse effects of language and cultural barriers, which were identified as weaknesses in the evaluation of the GSO Programme. Another point that was seen as lacking from the GSO programme, the involvement of the private sector, was introduced in the following programmes but has been found to limit local ownership.

In addition to drawing lessons from weak points, the programmes of VNG International have consolidated their strengths over the years, including the use of the colleague-to-colleague approach, which serves to foster trust, limit bureaucracy and enhance cost-efficiency. Moreover, the programmes have aimed to increase the continuity and institutional embeddedness of cooperation by embedding development initiatives in networks of personal links, which increases motivation and is presumably more sustainable than initiatives emerging from specific time-bound projects and programmes.

The evolution of VNG International's long term development programmes illustrates that continuity in cooperation not only serves to facilitate mutual understanding and trust, but also is quite likely to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of development interventions, as it allows for adaptations to be made based on lessons learnt from previous interventions.

3.2 International policy context of decentralised public development cooperation

Since the 1980s developing countries have increasingly carried through decentralisation reforms, based on the assumptions that decentralisation will lead to more efficient allocation of resources, better service provision and better representation of local needs. The transition towards decentralisation in the global South has been referred to as the 'quiet revolution' (Campbell 2003).

Over the past years there has been increasing recognition internationally for the role of local authorities in democratic reform and local development processes. At the supranational level, the need for decentralised cooperation has been recognised repeatedly from 1992 (United Nations Conference on Environment and Development) onwards, notably at the High Level Fora on Aid Effectiveness in 2003, 2005, 2008 and 2011. The multilateral agreement resulting

from the final Forum, the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation expressly highlights the important role of local governments in achieving sustainable inclusive development (UCLG 2013). Furthermore, following the High Level Forum of 2008 in Accra, the umbrella organisation for local governments and local government associations worldwide, United Cities and Local Government (UCLG), became a permanent member of the OECD/DAC Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (Baud *et al.* 2010).

At the European level, the European Commission has over the past decade or so stressed the importance of strategic, comprehensive policy on decentralised public development cooperation and has aimed to facilitate the involvement of public and non-state actors, in particular through a fit legislative and institutional framework. The start of this approach, and the rising recognition of sub-national public actors in development, is marked by the current general framework for EU development policy, the European Consensus on Development (2006), which states that the EU encourages increased involvement of local authorities in development cooperation. Then, following a European Parliament resolution (2007) in favour of an active role of local authorities in development cooperation, the European Commission initiated the funding programme 'Non-State Actors and Local Authorities'. This was followed in 2008 by the launch of the Platform of local and regional authorities for development (PLATFORMA), which is co-financed by the European Commission.

In the same year, the European Commission ratified the European Charter on international development cooperation in support of local governance. This charter is in accordance with the European Consensus for Development (2006), as well as other international initiatives regarding decentralisation, including the 'UN-Habitat Guidelines on decentralisation and the strengthening of local authorities' (2007) and the 'OECD Principles for international engagement in fragile states' (2007). Recognising local governments as key actors, the Charter outlines principles for improved cooperation in support of local governance. Moreover, identifying democratic local governance as an important catalyst for fighting poverty and stimulating inclusive development, it stresses the need for strengthening the autonomy of local governments.

In addition, the European Commission signed a strategic partnership agreement with five international local government networks in 2015, re-emphasising the potential of local authorities as a catalyst for inclusive development. This seven-year partnership puts into effect the European Commission's Communication 'Empowering Local Authorities in partner countries for enhanced governance and more effective development outcomes'. As such, it signifies an important step forward for the engagement of local governments in international development and the post-2015 development agenda in particular. Through the partnership, the European Commission and the involved local government networks dedicate themselves to taking joint action aimed at strengthening democracy and promoting sustainable inclusive development. The partnership's agenda is premised on the idea that local governments, possessing democratic legitimacy and the capacity to mobilise other local actors, are ideally suited for improving service delivery, enhancing the effectiveness of administration and building democratic institutions.

Table 1: Overview of programmes for decentralised development cooperation funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Organisation	Programme name	Duration	Budget	Target group	Countries (Africa)	Goal
VNG	Municipal Initiatives	1986–1991		Municipalities		
VNG	<i>Programma Gemeentelijke Samenwerking met Ontwikkelingslanden</i> (PGO; Programme Municipal Cooperation with Developing Countries)	1991–1993	EUR 5,728,515 (NLG 12,623,985)	Municipalities		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stimulating Dutch municipalities to employ activities in development cooperation, especially cooperation with local administration in developing countries - Mapping available expertise in Dutch municipalities for supporting local administration in the 'Third World' - Supporting the dispatching of Dutch civil servants to the 'Third World' and facilitating internships in Dutch municipalities for civil servants from the 'Third World'
VNG	<i>Gemeentelijke Samenwerking met Ontwikkelingslanden</i> (GSO; Municipal Cooperation with Developing Countries)	1994–1998		Municipalities, public utilities, provinces, regional water authorities and their umbrella organisations		Strengthening local administration by means of concrete cooperative activities by municipalities, public utilities, provinces and regional water authorities in the Netherlands and their partners in developing countries.
VNG	<i>Gemeentelijke Samenwerking met Ontwikkelingslanden</i> (GSO; Municipal Cooperation with Developing Countries)	1997–2001	EUR 11,435,261 (NLG 25,200,000)	Municipalities, public utilities, provinces, regional water authorities and their umbrella organisations	39 developing countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthening local administration in developing countries by means of concrete cooperative activities between municipalities - Strengthening public support for international cooperation
VNG International	LOGO South Programme	2007–2010	EUR 27,500,000	Municipalities, public utilities, provinces, regional water	Benin, Egypt, Ghana, Indonesia, Namibia,	Strengthening local government in developing countries by means of capacity building and knowledge transfer

				authorities and their umbrella organisations	Nicaragua, Palestinian Territories, South Africa, Sudan, Suriname, Tanzania, Uganda	
VNG International	Local Government Capacity Programme (LGCP)	2012–2016	EUR 22,498,819	Municipalities, public utilities, provinces, regional water authorities and their umbrella organisations	Benin, Burundi, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Mozambique, Rwanda, Uganda, South Africa, South Sudan	Strengthening the capacity of local governments and local government associations in developing countries, enabling them to achieve their development goals (Staatscourant No. 22108)
Netherlands Space Office (NSO)	Geodata for Agriculture and Water (G4AW)	2013–2015	2013–2014: EUR 10,000,000 2014–2015: EUR 30,500,000		Benin, Burundi, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Mozambique, Rwanda, South Africa, South Sudan, Uganda	Sustainably improve food production by large scale, demand-driven, accurate and timely provision of relevant information and services to the agriculture and fisheries sectors, based on satellite data
Kadaster	Partnership LAND (Land Administration for National Development)	2015–2019	EUR 900,000		Benin, DR-Congo, Kenya, Mozambique, Somalia, Tanzania, Uganda	Implement well defined practical actions in order to enhance security of rights on land and property worldwide

4 Motivations for decentralised public development cooperation

Dutch sub-national public actors are to a large extent involved in international (development) cooperation. In 2009, 77% of Dutch municipalities engaged in international activities (VNG 2009). Of these municipalities, 37% had a policy document on international activities. The main motivations of municipalities that were not involved in international cooperation included low priority, lack of political support and lack of capacity for international activities, as well as the conviction that local level development efforts are not a municipal core task and therefore should be left to private initiatives (IOB 2004). In 2015, all Dutch regional water authorities⁴ except two employed activities in development countries, and only one of these did not engage in any international activity.⁵

The main motivation for Dutch sub-national public actors to engage in development cooperation is to share knowledge and contribute to capacity building in order to strengthen public institutions in the global South, based on the experience and specialist knowledge they possess in their areas of expertise. Not being driven by financial objectives, the Dutch sub-national public actors have a profound motivation to contribute to sustainable development, and a strong commitment to strengthening similar institutions, worldwide. In their role of public bodies, they are driven by a sense of social responsibility to help perform public tasks in countries where the responsible institutions are not sufficiently equipped to do so on their own. This particularly applies to areas of governance where public needs are evident, including those related to public goods, such as water and land.

Another motivation for Dutch sub-national public actors is that, as public counterparts, they believe they are the right partner for local governments in developing countries. Relying on a peer-to-peer approach, they assert to 'speak the same language' as public institutions in development countries and hence better understand their interests. In addition to this mutual understanding, a potential strength of a peer-to-peer approach is that – being based on equality and reciprocity – it is an effective and sustainable form of development cooperation (IOB 2004). Yet another advantage of a peer-to-peer approach is that it is cost-efficient, because it focuses on strengthening existing organisations and therefore does not involve setting up parallel structures. This approach involves limited overhead costs, because there are no expenses for expat staff and programme management units, nor is it necessary to hire long-term consultants or establish project offices. Notwithstanding these theoretical advantages, the degree to which a peer-to-peer approach effectively delivers results, largely depends on the overall programme design (DEGE Consult 2015). Among other things, it relies on whether it is integrated within a larger institutional framework.

⁴ In 2015, there were 23 regional water authorities in the Netherlands.

⁵ <http://openbaar.waves.databank.nl/>

Furthermore, Dutch decentralised public development cooperation appears to have been most effective so far in the case of technical and operational issues in the public domain. Dutch sub-national public actors possess considerable technical expertise, but typically have limited knowledge of the institutional context and governance aspects in target countries. In general, these actors indeed seem to rely on their technical know-how in employing development cooperation activities. The strategy of Wereld Waternet⁶, for instance, is to initiate cooperation by means of technical interventions, then gradually get acquainted with the institutional environment and only at a later stage in the relationship get involved in governance issues. Accordingly, it was widely acknowledged by Dutch sub-national public actors that it is essential for cooperation in the field of governance to occur on the basis of a peer to peer approach based on equality and mutual respect. In the case of governance-related development cooperation activities by regional water authorities in general, valuable lessons can be learnt from the Dutch system of water management and water governance,⁷ although the Dutch approach by no means provides a blue print for water governance in Sub-Saharan African contexts.

In addition to altruistic motives, Dutch sub-national public actors, such as Kadaster, regional water authorities and municipalities, are driven by objectives in the sphere of human resources management. Providing the opportunity to work in an international context is considered a strategic means to become a more attractive employer, particularly for young people, to thus prevent ageing within the organisation and to stimulate the personal development of employees. Of the Dutch municipalities engaged in international cooperation in 2009, 20% mentioned international activities as a means to strengthen their own organisation (VNG International 2009). Among municipalities with more than 50.000 inhabitants this share was 50%. Considering these instrumental motivations and the limited experience of Dutch sub-national public actors with working in a development context, international cooperation by municipalities and regional water authorities is sometimes referred to by critics as 'development tourism'.

As described in the previous section, the past few decades have seen significant shifts in Dutch national policy regarding decentralised public development cooperation. In this regard, there has been divergence in policy priorities between the national government and Dutch sub-national public actors. While national policy has become increasingly oriented towards project-based interventions, self-interest and measurable results, sub-national public actors generally have continued to focus on achieving lasting development impact by building long-term relationships based on peer-to-peer approaches. In other words, a discrepancy has developed between the motivations of Dutch sub-national public actors to engage in development cooperation, on the one hand, and the motivations and priorities in Dutch national development cooperation policy, on the other.

In terms of motivations, the involvement of Dutch sub-national public actors in development cooperation can be characterised as integrative/developmental, being common interest-oriented and generally aimed at developing longstanding relationships. Whether these motivations are translated into integrative/developmental activities in practice is explored in the next section.

⁶ Wereld Waternet (World Waternet) is the international department of Waternet, which is the executive agency of the regional water authority Amstel, Gooi en Vecht (AGV) and the Municipality of Amsterdam.

⁷ In a recent report, the OECD (2014) acknowledges the Dutch system of water governance as global point of reference.

5 Practices in decentralised public development cooperation

Bearing in mind the types of cooperation described in Section 2, different practices can be distinguished within decentralised public development cooperation among Dutch actors. The first practice corresponds to the type of non-structural cooperation without a formalised partnership. This practice has the character of consultancy: it is based on short-term projects that are generally acquired by participating in tenders. The main element that distinguishes this consultancy-type public development cooperation from commercial consultancies is an evident motivational difference. Whereas commercial consultancy firms obviously are profit seeking, sub-national public actors that provide consultancy services have no profit motive and are inspired by social responsibility and the fulfilment of their public task.

Among Dutch sub-national public actors, this type of cooperation is most recognisable at Kadaster, which to a large extent engages in short-term, closed-ended projects acquired by participating in tenders. In these instances, Kadaster de facto functions like a consultancy firm, except on the basis of full cost recovery instead of with a profit motive. For this reason, the continuity of interventions is a major challenge in the case of Kadaster. In general, top-down approaches are more susceptible to unforeseen developments as they may lack local ownership and generally are to a lesser extent embedded in institutional frameworks. This also applies to the consultancy-type work of Kadaster, in which the collaboration with partners in developing countries in fact remains a commissioner-client relationship.

The second main practice that can be distinguished is linked to the type of institutional twinnings. This practice is dominant among Dutch regional water authorities, which often have long-term relationships with public counterparts in their focus countries. In some cases, these relationships take the form of Water Operator Partnerships (WOPs), which involve structural and formalised cooperation with water management authorities in developing countries. WOPs basically are long-term, open-ended programmes which serve as a framework for cooperation, in the context of which different short-term projects are executed. Among the Dutch regional water authorities, international relationships are often established via personal contacts. In addition to knowledge exchange and capacity building, institutional twinnings can open doors for the Dutch private sector. A different kind of twinning can be witnessed in the LGCP, in which VNG International has abandoned the approach of individual twinnings and switched to country-specific programmes which involve several local government institutions in programme countries. Such an approach, involving multiple sub-national public institutions, is aimed at enhancing the institutional embeddedness of interventions and therewith their sustainability and local ownership.

A third main practice involves partnerships between Dutch municipalities and municipalities in developing countries. Municipal partnerships are generally long-term partnerships based on a peer-to-peer approach, as the relationship is normally centred around one or more civil servant(s) who maintain contact with civil servants in the partner municipality. In 66% of all Dutch municipalities that engaged in international cooperation in 2009 one or two persons were responsible for international cooperation, while in 12% of the municipalities more than six employees were involved (VNG International 2009).

The ideal type of decentralised public development cooperation would have the character of integrative/developmental partnerships. However, as described above, the practices that occur in decentralised public development cooperation do not always match this theoretical ideal type. This particularly applies to consultancy-type public development cooperation. In spite of being common interest-oriented, this type of cooperation does not correspond to the definition of integrative/developmental partnerships, because it is closed-ended and generally short-term. Indeed, it possesses more of the characteristics of transactional partnerships. On the other hand, institutional twinnings such as WOPs can be characterised as integrative/developmental, because, in addition to being common interest-oriented, these partnerships are normally open-ended and long-term. For the same reasons, many municipal partnerships can also be classified as integrative/developmental partnerships. The type of decentralised development cooperation that corresponds most closely to the theoretical ideal type is that of institutional twinnings.

Overall, there seems to be a discrepancy between the motivations of Dutch sub-national public actors to engage in international cooperation and the practices as they actually occur in decentralised public development cooperation from the Netherlands. Although the general intention of Dutch sub-national public actors is to develop long-standing partnerships based on equality and reciprocity, this is often not realised in practice. One of the underlying reasons for this discrepancy is that Dutch sub-national public actors have limited budgets and capacity. The limited availability of financial means forces Dutch sub-national public actors to opt for short-term interventions or to cooperate with private parties in PPPs. As a result, their practices to a considerable extent do not correspond to their own motivations. In the case of long-term partnerships, for instance, Kadaster would prefer to have local presence, but the consultancy-type of international cooperation on which they largely rely necessarily consists of short field missions without permanent local presence.

By contrast, development efforts by Dutch sub-national public actors are to an increasing extent in line with the policy priorities of the Dutch government. In the first place, international activities of these actors are highly concentrated in the partner countries for development cooperation of the Dutch government. For example, five out of nine focus countries of the Dutch Water Authorities are partner countries for development cooperation (Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya and Mozambique), while two former partner countries (South Africa and Vietnam) recently made the transition from an aid relationship to a trade relationship with the Netherlands. In the case of Kadaster, many projects take place in partner countries as well, since contacts are often established via Dutch embassies in the countries concerned.

In addition to the countries in which they take place, development activities of Dutch sub-national public actors are increasingly aligned to the Netherlands' priority themes for development cooperation. The most striking example of the increasing alignment of decentralised public development cooperation to national policy is the LGCP. In this programme activities are required to both take place in a partner country and cover one or more of the priority themes for development cooperation (see boxed text).

The Local Government Capacity Programme in Uganda

As a result of decentralisation processes in Uganda, local governments play an important role in creating an enabling environment for improved food security in the country (VNG International 2011). In practice, however, there are several factors hindering them in fulfilling their responsibilities. The LGCP Uganda aims to 'enable local governments to fulfil their mandate and to contribute to improving food security at the local level'.

Local governments in Uganda have a well-defined and rather broad mandate with regard to food security; their responsibilities include translating national policies into local development plans, development of by-laws to regulate food security, agricultural planning, implementation of agricultural services and capacity building of farmers (*ibid.*). However, even though local governments play an important role on paper, they often cannot fulfil this role in practice due to limited capacity and a lack of coordination with national sectoral institutions. In addition to poor cooperation between sectoral institutions and local governments, barriers to improved food security in Uganda include limited agricultural productivity, limited public knowledge of nutrition and food security, weak market functioning and inadequate post-harvest processing and storage.

LGCP Uganda aims to increase the capacity of eight local governments and two local government associations (*ibid.*). Specifically, it aims to develop their capacity to i) better analyse the local food security situation and mainstream food security in local development plans; ii) implement local food security services and monitor service delivery; and iii) align with sectoral institutions and develop linkages with public and private stakeholders to enhance the development and implementation of local food security services. With regard to identifying food security priorities, LGCP Uganda supports local governments in collecting and processing information on agricultural production, local food supply and food prices, and household income and expenditures. Furthermore, local governments are supported in interpreting the information, defining the problems and exploring options to use collected data. With regard to service delivery, the programme aims to increase capacity within the dimensions food availability, food access and food use, including, inter alia, improved processing of waste into manure, development of demonstration gardens, and road reconstruction to improve market access. With regard to relating to stakeholders, local governments are supported in engaging with other government institutions at different levels, as well as private stakeholders in the field of food security, including farmers, farmer cooperatives and private businesses.

The LGCP Uganda uses VNG's colleague-to-colleague approach and draws on a variety of activities, including coaching-mentoring trajectories, on-the-job training and workshops (*ibid.*). The thematic focus of the programme is aligned with the multi-annual strategic plan of the Netherlands Embassy in Kampala. Moreover, it corresponds with two of the main objectives of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs regarding food security: i) to provide better access to good nutrition for the poorer population and increase sustainable food production; and ii) to create an enabling environment for producers by removing obstacles, supporting farmers' organisations and providing financial services.

Based on interviews with key informants, the analysis of practices among Dutch sub-national public actors, evaluations of these actors' public development cooperation programmes and the literature, Table 2 presents a SWOT-analysis of Dutch decentralised public development cooperation.

The main potential strengths of decentralised public development cooperation include that it promotes continuity by building on existing institutions and that it involves relatively little bureaucracy and overhead costs, ensuring cost-efficiency. In addition, the peer-to-peer approach that is characteristic of this form of development cooperation enables equal and mutually beneficial relationships, and strong learning effects between peers and the motivational effect of direct relationships greatly contribute to effective knowledge generation.

Among the most important weaknesses of decentralised public development cooperation are the fragmentation of activities, insufficient institutional embeddedness of contacts and the limited involvement of the private sector. In addition, cultural barriers and an inadequate understanding of cultural differences are limiting effectiveness, while a lack of local presence and the dependence on short missions makes achieving continuity a significant challenge. At the same time, however, local governments in target countries often are too weak to play a lead role.

One of the main opportunities provided by decentralised public development cooperation is that mutual trust is set to induce inclusive and sustainable cooperation. Specifically, the method of working with existing organisations and staff could be promoted as an efficient and effective example for other development cooperation programmes. Considering this prospect, anchoring projects within multi-donor funded programmes would assure donor coordination and replication. Moreover, while ongoing decentralisation processes might provide more opportunities for cooperation between local governments, strategic examples, coupled with networking between local twinnings, sectoral associations, and national government, make it possible to up-scale activities and make them effective at the national level.

The main threats to decentralised public development cooperation include funding challenges and lack of coordination with other donors, as well as insufficient expertise among Dutch sub-national public actors for working abroad successfully and adapting knowledge to local contexts. Moreover, knowledge exchange is complicated by cultural differences and language barriers, and there is a fundamental challenge in improving local governance by means of knowledge sharing and capacity building.

It can be concluded that, hypothetically, the main added value of Dutch sub-national public actors in development cooperation is the sustainable transfer of knowledge through the use of a peer-to-peer approach, involving long-term organisational and individual relationships between civil servants. However, even though this continuity potentially is the main strength of decentralised public development cooperation, it is in many cases difficult to achieve because of financial and practical constraints.

Table 2: SWOT analysis of decentralised public development cooperation from the Netherlands based on literature, explorative interviews and evaluations

	Literature	Explorative interviews				Evaluations		
		Wereld Waternet	VNG International	Kadaster	Association of Dutch Water Authorities	GSO (1997–2001)	LOGO South programme (2007–2010)	Local Government Capacity Programme (mid-term evaluation) (2012–2016)
Motivations	<p>Strengthening domestic public support for development cooperation</p> <p>Strengthening local government in developing countries</p>	<p>Knowledge transfer and capacity building out of social responsibility</p> <p>HRM reasons (being an attractive employer, counter ageing of the organisation, stimulating personal development of employees)</p>	<p>Strengthening local government in developing countries</p>	<p>Sharing knowledge out of social responsibility</p> <p>HRM reasons (being an attractive employer, counter ageing of the organisation, stimulating personal development of employees)</p>	<p>Knowledge transfer and capacity building out of social responsibility</p> <p>HRM reasons (being an attractive employer, counter ageing of the organisation, stimulating personal development of employees)</p>	<p>Strengthening domestic public support for development cooperation</p>	<p>Strengthening local government in developing countries</p>	<p>Strengthening local government in developing countries</p>

	Literature	Explorative interviews				Evaluations		
		Wereld Waternet	VNG International	Kadaster	Association of Dutch Water Authorities	GSO (1997–2001)	LOGO South programme (2007–2010)	Local Government Capacity Programme (mid-term evaluation) (2012–2016)
Strengths	Transfer of knowledge and skills present at the local level (Toolsema, 2010)	Reliable partner as public peer	Extensive experience in local government	Mutual trust among public partners	Peer-to-peer relationships: going beyond commissioner-client relationship	Peer-to-peer relationship and continuity lead to trust	Positive multiplier effects	The use of resident program managers ensures better day-to-day interaction between VNG International and stakeholders in the partner country
	Stimulating citizen participation and initiatives at local level (Toolsema, 2010)	Strong in the area of governance	Specialist knowledge	Extensive experience and specialist knowledge	Integral approach to water	Accessibility	Building on existing organisations, ensuring continuity	Peer-to-peer approach ensures equal and mutually beneficial relationships
	Share characteristics, 'speak the same language' → more equal relationship? (Van Ewijk, 2013)	Long-term relationships based on solidarity, equality and reciprocity	Sustainable relationship with public peers	Full-service; varied expertise in one organisation	Used to 'polderen': having profound and constructive dialogue	Direct contact stimulates and motivates	Combination of sectoral and municipal twinnings are important in building thematic partnerships at sectoral level	Cost-efficiency is enhanced by rates that are far below normal international consultancy rates
	Long-term relationship (Van Ewijk, 2013)	Able to open doors for the private sector				Limited bureaucracy / limited overhead costs	Limited bureaucracy/ limited overhead costs	
	Peer-to-peer relationship (Van Ewijk, 2013)	Knowledge sharing among Dutch public partners			Able to open doors for the private sector		Knowledge generation between different levels of government; learning effects between peers are strong	
	Does not add to administrative burden of partner countries' central government (OECD, 2005)						Embedding development initiatives in networks of personal links increases motivation and is more sustainable than initiatives within specific time-bound projects	

	Literature	Explorative interviews				Evaluations		
		Wereld Waternet	VNG International	Kadaster	Association of Dutch Water Authorities	GSO (1997–2001)	LOGO South programme (2007–2010)	Local Government Capacity Programme (mid-term evaluation) (2012–2016)
Weaknesses	<p>Lack of knowledge about local culture and context (Toolsema, 2010)</p> <p>Insufficient expertise for working successfully at the international level (Van Ewijk, 2013)</p> <p>Smaller capacity for institutional learning (Van Ewijk, 2013; Toolsema, 2010)</p> <p>Harder to coordinate and achieve economies of scale (Toolsema, 2010)</p> <p>Risk of fragmentation (Toolsema, 2010)</p> <p>More complicated to organise long-term planning (Toolsema, 2010)</p>	Institutional change is hard to achieve	Cooperation with public partners in the Netherlands is ad hoc and not strategic	<p>Short missions and no local presence: continuity is a challenge</p> <p>Remains a commissioner – client relationship</p> <p>Local partner often lacks knowledge and experience to sustain the intervention</p>	<p>Short missions: continuity is a challenge</p> <p>Learning remains informal</p>	<p>Contacts are insufficiently institutionally embedded</p> <p>No involvement of the private sector</p> <p>Limited understanding of contextual differences</p> <p>Language and cultural barriers limit effectiveness</p> <p>No national goals, but even at the level of city partnerships the contribution to local government capacity is limited</p>	<p>Fragmented</p> <p>No exit strategy</p> <p>Projects involving semi-public companies have limited direct effect on strengthening local government in programme countries if they do not respond to a felt need</p> <p>No monitoring of learning effects within programme as a whole</p> <p>VNG International rarely acts as a catalyst between municipalities looking for support at sectoral level</p> <p>Limited reflection and R&D</p>	<p>Local government associations in programme countries are often too weak to play a lead role</p> <p>Collaboration with local companies diminished local ownership and limited potential policy impact and future sustainability</p> <p>M&E system is mainly used for upward reporting rather than local-level learning</p> <p>Qualitative aspects of capacity building experiences are not well captured</p>

	Time and resources are often limited (Van Ewijk 2013)								
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	Literature	Explorative interviews				Evaluations		
		Wereld Waternet	VNG International	Kadaster	Association of Dutch Water Authorities	GSO (1997–2001)	LOGO South programme (2007–2010)	Local Government Capacity Programme (mid-term evaluation) (2012–2016)
Opportunities		<p>Opportunity to strengthen and extend network, abroad and in the Netherlands</p> <p>Trying to form structural alliances with financiers (e.g. MoFA)</p> <p>In the context of SDGs increasing attention to holistic approach</p>	<p>Pay attention to the role of local government in conflict situations</p> <p>Ensure embeddedness</p>	<p>Cooperation with knowledge institutes, like ITC; graduates are future counterparts in African countries</p> <p>Cooperation with actors that work bottom-up</p> <p>Cooperation with embassies (link with existing projects)</p>	<p>There will be more requests for Dutch Water Authorities in light of the SDGs</p> <p>Working with local NGOs that are present on the ground would enhance local ownership</p> <p>More attention to OECD principles for good water governance (more concrete than SDGs)</p> <p>Use of resident project managers and country coordinators</p>	<p>Mutual trust can be the basis for more freedom in activities, a greater say for the partner in a developing country or a more process-based rather than project-based approach</p>	<p>Ongoing decentralisation processes might provide more opportunities for cooperation between municipalities</p> <p>Learning effects between different partners should be monitored and show the effectiveness in strengthening local government capacity in programme countries</p> <p>Strategic examples, coupled with networking between local twinnings, sectoral associations, and national government, make it possible to up-scale activities and make them effective at national level</p> <p>The method of working with existing organisations and staff should be promoted as an efficient and effective example for other development cooperation programmes</p>	<p>When the project has the intention of “piloting”, it is important to have strong partnerships with relevant institutions that can effectively lead such a process and ensure replication and policy development</p> <p>Anchoring projects within multi-donor funded programmes assures donor coordination and replication</p> <p>A different programme design and attention to strengthening cross-country learning could entail greater synergies among programme countries</p> <p>Linkages between LGCP M&E and existing national systems for monitoring local government performance can be further strengthened</p>

	Literature	Explorative interviews				Evaluations		
		Wereld Waternet	VNG International	Kadaster	Association of Dutch Water Authorities	GSO (1997–2001)	LOGO South programme (2007–2010)	Local Government Capacity Programme (mid-term evaluation) (2012–2016)
Threats		<p>Attracting funding is challenging with respect to governance issues</p> <p>Financial challenges; unsuccessfully participating in tenders where a clear business case is required</p>	<p>Lack of coordination with other donors</p> <p>Clientelism</p> <p>Risk of one-sided relationships</p> <p>Lack of self-reflection, too little attention for effects of a project</p>	<p>Corruption and clientelism</p> <p>Separation between urban and rural cadastre (fragmented bureaucracies)</p> <p>Kadaster mainly works top-down</p> <p>Projects get 'hijacked' by government, shifting priorities</p>	<p>Many African governments are centrally led</p> <p>Hard to access funding for public bodies; policy and financing are focused on PPPs</p> <p>Too little attention to water technology abroad</p> <p>Too little attention to connection with land</p>	<p>Development cooperation is not a core task for Dutch local governments, so the time and money that can be invested are limited</p> <p>Insufficient expertise for working abroad successfully</p> <p>Incapability to translate knowledge to local context</p> <p>Discontinuity at the side of partners, because of high employee turnover and political changes</p>	<p>Policy and public support for decentralised cooperation in the Netherlands is volatile especially at times of financial crisis, already posing a serious threat for some municipal partnerships</p> <p>Changes in (local) political conditions can seriously impact the realization of projects</p> <p>Language barriers and cultural differences can make knowledge exchange and learning difficult</p>	<p>Local institutions are facing significant funding challenges</p> <p>Capacity building alone – without changes in funding availability – may not result in improved local governance in programme countries</p> <p>Impact on policy development is highly influenced by the overall institutional arrangements for the country programmes</p>

6 Conclusion

Theoretically, there is an imperative for sub-national public actors in development cooperation. This specifically applies to international public goods such as food security, water and land, because they involve clear public needs that correspond to evident public tasks. Hypothetically, the main added value of Dutch sub-national public actors in development cooperation is the sustainable transfer of knowledge through the use of a peer-to-peer approach, involving long-term organisational and individual relationships between civil servants and ensuring a shared problem understanding. In practice, however, development activities by Dutch sub-national public actors often do not match this ideal type of decentralised public development cooperation. In other words, there is a discrepancy between the theory and practice of decentralised public development cooperation.

Paradoxically, this discrepancy is caused indirectly by a divergence in motivations and priorities concerning development cooperation between the national government and Dutch sub-national public actors. While national policy has become increasingly oriented towards project-based interventions, self-interest and measurable results, Dutch sub-national public actors generally have continued to strive for achieving lasting development impact by building long-term relationships based on peer-to-peer approaches. However, as government funding has been increasingly directed towards public-private partnerships, Dutch sub-national public actors have had progressively limited means to realise these ambitions. As a result, decentralised public development cooperation from the Netherlands has become increasingly oriented towards national development cooperation policy, reflecting a discrepancy between the motivations and practices in the development activities of Dutch sub-national public actors.

The unique selling point of decentralised development cooperation is the use of a peer-to-peer approach, which is claimed to facilitate mutual trust and understanding and enhance cost-efficiency. However, for the benefits of a peer-to-peer approach to fully materialise, Dutch sub-national public actors would have to maintain structural, open-ended relationships with public counterparts in the global South. If these criteria are not met, partnerships in decentralised public development cooperation do not go beyond a commissioner-client relationship and have more characteristics of a transactional partnership than of an integrative/developmental partnership. This is true in the case of the consultancy-type of decentralised public development cooperation that is based on short-term projects mostly acquired through tenders. Institutional twinings and municipal partnerships, on the other hand, generally do possess the main characteristics of an integrative/development partnership.

In general, Dutch sub-national public actors have limited experience with governance issues and are unfamiliar with the local context in developing countries. This raises the question whether decentralised public development cooperation is mainly effective in the case of technical problems in the public domain. In the experience of Dutch sub-national public actors, such as the regional water authorities, technical interventions are generally uncontroversial and therefore successful, whereas involvement in governance issues is typically much more delicate.

Going beyond technical interventions, the potential added value of decentralised public development cooperation in contributing to food security lies in long-term cooperation based on an integrated approach to the governance of public goods. In order to realise this potential, decentralised public development cooperation should be adapted to its context and aimed at enhancing integrated (environmental) governance, thus stimulating synergies between public goods like land, water and food security.

References

- Baud I, Hordijk M, Van Lindert P, Nijenhuis G, Van Westen G, Van Ewijk E and Bontebal M. (2010). *Towards improved local governance through strengthened local government: Evaluation of the LOGO South Programme 2007-2010*. VNG International, The Hague.
- Boag G and McDonald DA. (2010). A Critical Review of Public–Public Partnerships in Water Services, *Water Alternatives* 3(1): 1–25.
- Bragdon SH. (2016). *Reinvigorating the Public Sector: the Case of Food Security, Small-scale Farmers, Trade, and Intellectual Property Rules*. Colloquium Paper, Global governance/politics, climate justice & agrarian/social justice: linkages and challenges.
- Campbell T. (2003). *The quiet revolution: Decentralisation and the rise of political participation in Latin America's cities*. University of Pittsburgh press, Pittsburgh.
- Candel JJJ. (2014). Food security governance: a systematic literature review, *Food Security* 6(4): 585–601.
- European Commission (2013). *Empowering Local Authorities in partner countries for enhanced governance and more effective development outcomes*. COM(2013) 280 final.
- EU (2008). *European charter on development cooperation in support of local governance*.
- Van Ewijk E. (2013). *Between local governments and communities: Knowledge exchange and mutual learning in Dutch-Moroccan and Dutch-Turkish municipal partnerships*. University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam.
- Hall D. (2000). *Water partnerships – Public–public partnerships and 'twinning' in water and sanitation*. Public Services International Research Unit (PSIRU).
- Hafteck P. (2003). An Introduction to Decentralized Cooperation: Definitions, Origins and Conceptual Mapping, *Public Administration and Development* 23(4): 333–345.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2013a). *A world to gain: A New Agenda for Aid, Trade and Investment*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Hague.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2013b): *Public–Private Partnerships in developing countries. A systematic literature review*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Hague.
- OECD (2005). *Aid Extended by Local and State Governments. Pre-print of the DAC Journal 2005, Volume 6, No. 4*. OECD Publishing, Paris.
- OECD (2014). *Water Governance in the Netherlands: Fit for the Future?* Paris: OECD Publishing, OECD Studies on Water.
- Ouchi F. (2004). *Twinning as a Method for Institutional Development: A Desk Review*. The World Bank Institute, The World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- PBL (2015). *Public–private partnerships in development cooperation. Potential and pitfalls for Inclusive Green Growth*. PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, The Hague.
- Selsky JW and Parker B. (2005). Cross-Sector Partnerships to Address Social Issues: Challenges to Theory and Practice, *Journal of Management* 31(6): 849–873.
- SEOR (2003). *Evaluatie Gemeentelijke Internationale Samenwerking Onderzoek in Nederland*. SEOR BV, Rotterdam.
- Toolsema L. (2010). Het goede doel voorbij, *Bestuur en Gemeente* September 2010: 4–7.
- Dutch House of Representatives (2010). *Waterketen*. Brief van de Minister van Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer. Vergaderjaar 2009–2010, 28 966, no. 23.
- UCLG (2013). *UCLG Policy Paper on Development Cooperation and Local Government*. Capacity and Institution Building Working Group (CIB) secretariat, United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG), The Hague.
- UvW (2011). *Nederlandse waterschappen en het buitenland 2011. Inventarisatie van internationale activiteiten van waterschappen*. Association of Dutch Water Authorities, The Hague.
- VNG International (2011). *Local Government Capacity Programme: Uganda - Improve Capabilities to Facilitate an Enabling Environment for Food Security*. VNG International, The Hague.

7 Annex: Overview of projects by Dutch sub-national public actors in Sub-Saharan Africa

Overview of projects by Dutch regional water authorities in Africa (2011) (UvW 2011)					
#	Regional water authority	Country and theme	Partners	Summary	Relevance
1	Waterschap Aa en Maas	Egypt (Water Operating Partnership) <i>(WOP on water governance (exploratory))</i>	Wereld Waternet, Brabant Water, Stichtse Rijnlanden, HoldingCompany for Water and Wastewater, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation	Improving water quality by introducing an integrated approach and international cooperation Supporting Integrated Water Management Districts in introducing integrated water management	+/- +
2	Waterschap Amstel, Gooi en Vecht (Wereld Waternet)	Egypt (Water Operating Partnership)	Beheira Water and Drainage Company, Fayoum Water and Drainage Company, Waterschap Aa en Maas, Brabant Water, Waterschap Stichtse Rijnlanden	Achieving MDG 7c and capacity building	+/-
3		Morocco (Water Operating Partnership)	ONEP, Kantara Foundation	Sanitation and provision of drinking water	-
4		Mauritania (capacity building)	SNDE		-
5		South Africa (capacity building)	DWA, Cape Town, Tshwane University of Technology		-
6	Waterschap De Dommel	Mozambique (river basin management)	ARA Zambezi (regionale Waterbeheerder) / NWB Fonds	Development into a more professional organisation, development of a water management plan	+

7	Hoogheem- raadschap De Stichtse Rijnlanden	Kenya (access to drinking water and sanitation)	VEI, Cordaid, municipality of Kisumu, KIWASCO, Lake Victoria South Water and Sewerage Board, Sana International	Improved access to drinking water supply and sanitation	-
8	Wetterskip Fryslân	South Africa (capacity building)	Breede Overberg CMA (regional water authority)	Training of management and personnel on integrated spatial planning and innovation, training on water purification and sewage management	+/-
9		Mozambique (sanitation) <i>(Supporting regional water authority ARA Sul (exploratory))</i>	Vitens, province of Fryslân, Frisian municipalities, knowledge institute NHL, DGIS	Improving (municipal management of) sanitation	-
10	Waterschap Groot Salland	South Africa (knowledge exchange)	Inkomati Catchment Management Agency (ICMA), municipalities of Zwolle and Dalfsen, Hogeschool Windesheim, LeAF	Knowledge exchange on water and sanitation with ICMA, capacity building on waste water treatment and developing new sanitation techniques, cooperation with other actors in water management	-
11	Hoogheem- raadschap Hollands Noorder- kwartier	South Africa (algae waste water treatment)	DHV, Makana Local Municipality, Genap	Municipal waste water treatment by means of algae	-
12	Waterschap Hollandse Delta	Ethiopia (governance of sand dams)	RAIN, Waterschap Velt en Vecht, Waterschap Hollandse Delta, municipality of Hardenberg, two Ethiopian municipalities, Unesco IHE, Ripple, HSC/ NWB Fonds	Knowledge exchange and capacity building on Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) and rainwater harvesting, improving rainwater harvesting based on knowledge on multiple use, water quality protection, governance and IWRM	+
13	Waterschap Peel en Maasvallei	Cameroon (water governance)	Municipality of Batouri	Integrated approach towards municipal water governance	+/-
14	Waterschap Reest en Wieden	Morocco (sanitation)	Municipalities of Meppel and Seine-Saint-Denis	Technical support in developing a collective sewage system	-
15		Burkina Faso (governance)	Regional water authority Nakanbé, VEI, Vieval, Ministry of Water, EU	Institutional support, developing water plans by using GIS, introducing water taxes, capacity building at regional water authority Nakanbé and local water committees	+/-

16	Waterschap Regge en Dinkel	Ghana (natural resources recovery)	Safi Sana, municipality of Dinkelland, businesses from Twenthe	Developing scalable, local business models for producing and marketing renewable energy and organic manure in combination with the provision of good sanitation and clean water	+/-
17	Hoogheemraadschap van Rijnland	South Africa (waste water treatment, capacity building)	Municipality of Buffalo City, municipality of Leiden	Developing an integrated waste water treatment strategy	-
18		Tanzania (water cycle)	Dunea, Waterlaboratorium, drinking water company Mwanza, Mwanza regional water authority	Water cycle project aimed at improving water quality, drinking water supply and waste water treatment in Lake Victoria	+
19	Waterschap Rivierenland	Senegal (governance, knowledge exchange)	OMVS, Havenbedrijf Rotterdam, DLG, Rijkswaterstaat, Altenburg en Wymega, Agromisa, Rabobank Foundation, DHV	Capacity building on maintenance management and organisational development, supporting agricultural cooperatives through development credits	+/-
20	Waterschap Velt en Vecht	Tanzania (governance, sanitation, water quality)	AMREF, IRC, Acacia Water	Access to safe drinking water and good sanitation	
21		Swaziland (governance, twinning)	CMAS, German partners Vechtdal, Waterschap Groot Salland	Supporting the Catchment Management Agency Swaziland in establishing a regional water authority	
22	Waterschap Zuiderzeeland	Ethiopia (governance, pollution sources)	VIE, Waterschap Vallei en Veluwe	Capacity building on drinking water supply and water quality protection	+

Overview of projects by VNG International in Africa				
#	Country and theme	Partners	Summary	Relevance
1	Benin, Local Government Capacity Programme (LGCP) 2012-2016 Local Economic Development on the basis of agriculture and food security	21 local governments in 3 districts, local government association ANCB and 3 regional associations	In Benin the LGCP focuses on enhancing local government capacity to better be able to stimulate and facilitate agricultural entrepreneurship in their local government areas	+
2	Benin, Projet d'appui à la gestion foncière au niveau local	LID Management, ANCB, 2 Municipalities	Implementing the institutional framework of the Land Code for integrated land governance at the local level	+/-

3	Burundi and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Restoring the Contract	Center for International Legal Cooperation (CILC), CORDAID	Increasing the performance of public administration, the police and justice system at local level and restoring the interaction between these state elements and society	-
4	Burundi, Local Government Capacity Programme (LGCP) 2012-2016	The association of Burundian local governments (ABELO) and their local governments	Improving food security by strengthening local democracy, capacity building of the association and the affiliated local governments in the area of land registration, family planning and the functioning of local administrators	+
5	Egypt, Improving the Capacity of the Holding Company for Water and Waste Water (HCWW)	CES Consulting, Engineers Salzgitter GmbH, Wereld Waternet	Contributing to the development of sustainable water and waste water service companies in Egypt which will be self-financing, thus supporting the overall economic and environmental development of the country	-
6	Egypt, Modernisation of the Real Estate Tax Administration – Developing Capacities of the Real Estate Taxation Authority	State Enterprise Centre of Registers, Kadaster	Improving the real estate tax system in Egypt within the context of the national reform and EU and international best practices	-
7	Egypt, Support to Public Administration Reform and Local Development	Ecole Nationale d'Administration (ENA)	Supporting the Government of Egypt to develop and apply good governance principles which should be reflected in improved services to the Egyptian citizens and deepened citizens' engagement at local levels	-
8	Ethiopia, Protection of Basic Services: Social Accountability Program	GOPA-Consultants, YEM Consultant, PLC	Strengthening the use of social accountability tools, approaches and mechanisms by citizens and citizens groups, civil society organisations, local government officials and service providers as a means to make basic service delivery more equitable, effective, efficient, responsive and accountable	-
9	Ghana, Consultancy Service for the Preparation of Strategy Papers for Budgeting, Auditing and Reporting at the Local Government Level	AgriConsulting Europe SA AESA	Preparing strategy papers for budgeting, reporting, and auditing at the local government level in Ghana	-
10	Ghana, Local Government Capacity Programme (LGCP) 2012-2016	5 local governments and the national association of local government NALAG	Improving sanitation facilities for the population, enabling local governments to develop and implement sanitation programmes	-
11	Libya and Tunisia, Support to democratic local government	Local governments in the pilot areas	Consolidating democratic local governance towards stability and social peace in Tunisia and Libya	-
12	Mali, Appui à LAMM pour la restauration de la paix et de la sécurité à travers la maîtrise d'ouvrage des communes	Association des Municipalités du Mali (AMM), VNG International, Netherlands Embassy in Mali, Spanish International Cooperation Agency, the Service de Coopération et d'Action Culturelle français (SCAC)	Improving the living conditions of the people by restoring a climate of peace and security in 12 <i>cercles</i> in the regions of Ségou, Mopti, Tombouctou and Gao	-

13	Mali, Support of the Association of the Municipalities of Mali: Aiding the management of the transfer of local skills for sustainable local development in Mali	AMM, SNV-Mali	Strengthening the capacity of the main parties involved in decentralisation and enabling them to carry out their tasks and responsibilities professionally with a view to the effective and practical transfer of skills to Mali for focused governance and sustainable local development	-
14	Rwanda, Local Government Capacity Programme (LGCP) 2012-2016	Local government association RALGA and its members; 31 districts	Improving food security and the local economy, capacity building of the association and the districts in the area of land management and public-private partnerships	+
15	Rwanda, the Formulation of Two Interventions in Support of the Decentralisation Sector in Rwanda	TC, Belgian Technical Cooperation (French: CTB)	Bilateral decentralisation programme. Sustainably enhancing the capacities of the Districts to deliver services and to implement their local economic development in respect of best governance practices	-
16	South Africa, Local Government Capacity Programme (LGCP) 2012-2016	15 local governments, 3 Catchment Management Agencies (CMAs), the national association of local governments SALGA and Dutch Water Authorities	Contributing to social and economic development through stimulating Local Economic Development (LED), enabling 5 local governments and 3 CMAs to design effective policies for LED and water management	+/-
17	South Sudan, Interlinking Peace Building, Decentralisation and Development 2013-2017	PAX, Cordaid	Increasing human security in greater Wau, Malakal and Torit through interlinking and strengthening community-based peace building initiatives, decentralised government services and socio-economic peace dividend	-
18	South Sudan, Local Government Capacity Programme (LGCP) 2012-2016	Civil servants at 2 state ministries and in 2 counties in the state of Eastern Equatoria	Strengthening the capacity of local authorities to provide sustainable water and sanitation services (WASH)	-
19	South Sudan, Programme for the Water Sector between South Sudan and The Netherlands – Water for Lakes State (Prowas/SSN-Lakes)	Mott MacDonald, SNV Sudan and South Sudan	Stimulating economic development in agriculture, livestock and fisheries and reducing the dependency on food aid in Lakes State, through equitable development and management of natural resources	+
20	South Sudan, Support for the Government Accountancy Training Centre Part II	Ecorys Nederland	Developing the internal capacity of the Governance Accountancy Training Centre (GATC) for training civil servants in public financial management, accountancy and procurement	-
21	South Sudan, Technical Assistance for Sub-National Capacity Building in Payroll and Public Financial Management (EU-TAPP)	Ecorys Nederland	Increasing the capacity of local governments to implement and execute existing policies and directives in the fields of payroll and PFM in all 10 states of South Sudan	-

22	Ethiopia, Technical Assistance Unit for the Civil Society Fund II	GOPA-Consultants	Increasing and improving the role of non-state actors in the national development and democratisation process in Ethiopia	-
23	Tunisia, Programme for Support for Democratic Urban Governance and Local Economic Development	CILG	Consolidating democratic local government and local economic development, contributing to the transition to democracy in Tunisia	-
24	Tunisia, Strengthening democracy in Tunisia	GIZ	Strengthening communal democratic structures and the participation of citizens in the process of development in the towns of Tunisia	-
25	Uganda, Local Government Capacity Programme (LGCP) 2012-2016	8 local governments, 2 national local government associations (UAAU and ULGA)	Contributing to local governments being better able to create the conditions for increased food security	+
26	Uganda, Municipal Own Source Revenue and Expenditure Management Enhancement	KEBU consultants Uganda, PBLQ HEC/ ROI	Improve the credit rating of 5 municipalities	-

Projects supported by Netherlands Enterprise Agency (RVO): International Public Cooperation in Africa (2016)				
#	Country and theme	Partners	Summary	Relevance
1	Factfinding mission opportunities GEOdata and Agricultural Development in Angola	Netherlands Space Office (NSO)	Identification of a possible capacity building project and cooperation between the Angolan Ministry of Agriculture (and other relevant stakeholders) and the Netherlands Space Office	+/-
2	Workshops SIAM Fair Morocco	WUR Food and Biobased Research	Mounting discussion and disseminating knowledge amongst Moroccan public and private stakeholders about solutions to limit the food losses in Morocco	+/-
3	Agricultural information in Ghana	Wageningen Economic Research	Stimulating the development of the horticulture sector in Ghana by contributing to the availability of agricultural information, specifically on the horticulture sector	+
4	Improving the seed potato production system in Tanzania	Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (NVWA)	Identifying the possibilities to set-up a seed potato production system in Tanzania, using Dutch seed potato varieties, with the aim to contribute to food security and local economic development	+

5	Water Soil Efficiency for Food Safety in Algerian Agriculture: risk-based land management	The Government Service for Land and Water Management (DLG)	Institutionalising the results from the 2g@there programme by bridging the gap between the practical outputs and the institutional reality of sustainable Integrated Water Resources Management in Algeria	+/-
---	---	--	--	-----

Overview of projects by Kadaster in Africa (2016)				
#	Country and theme	Partners	Summary	Relevance
1	Angola	Mitrelli, Milan Innovincy	Exploring the possibilities to cooperate	-
2	Benin	Dutch embassy in Cotonou, ANDF, VNG International	Supporting ANDF through LAND-initiative, connecting with local land governance project of VNG International	+/-
3	Democratic Republic of Congo	GLTN, Oxfam Novib, evangelical university of Kivu	'Fit for purpose' land registration	+/-
4	EALAN-Niche (East Africa Land Administration Network)	EALAN partners	Contributing to cooperation in and strengthening of network of East African (knowledge) institutes	-
5	Ethiopia	-	Study tour in the context of REILA project	-
6	Ghana	CTK-Geosys	Exploring the possibilities to connect taxation and land registration	-
7	Kenya	Institute of Surveyors in Kenya (ISK)	Preparing a fit for purpose pilot	-
8	Mozambique	The National Directorate of Land (DINAT), Fugro, ITC	Providing program unit support in Terra Segura program	-
9		VNG International, RVO	Developing the port of Beira, preparing land registration, integrating with Terra Segura program	-
10		Dutch embassy in Maputo	Developing the port of Palma, assisting in land consolidation process/greenfield growth process	-
11	Rwanda	Government of Rwanda	Long term cooperation (2007-2015) in the context of the Land Tenure Regularisation Programme and the Land Administration Information System	+/-
12	Tanzania	Dutch embassy in Dar es Salaam, Land Equity	Exploring the possibilities for LAND-initiatives	-
13	South Sudan	Government of South Sudan	Intention to explore the possibilities for cooperation	-
14	Uganda	Government of Uganda	Short mission within the framework of LAND, land registration in relation to food security	+