



## 4 months to New York: (how) can money save the world?

a creative multistakeholder workshop on global sustainable development goals, means of implementation and the opportunities for action in Latvia

2<sup>nd</sup> part of the workshop with an aim to:

- (1) introduce and discuss the **practicality and applicability of non-financial means of implementation** both on global and national level;
- (2) provide space to **construct form and content** for the future development cooperation **work** through non-financial means of implementation

::Janny Ramakers

### OVERVIEW AND CONCLUSIONS

Having received an introduction to the topic of financial and non-financial means of implementation and the indicators that could be used as guidelines for actions in the first part of the workshop, participants moved on to look at the practicality and usage of the non-financial means to reach development aims in practice – in cases of Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Uganda or Iraq, based on interest and previous knowledge about the situations in the countries and based on specific case studies provided to the groups.

Participants chose a case study, read through it and used building blocks to discuss and document what needs to be done by who, where and response to what in order to improve the living situation in the places of choosing.

Along the way discussions led to mostly identifying the obstacles to actions. In all cases the initial problem led to numerous causes of the problem and even more causes of the original causes. In all cases this meant that working on the immediate problem at hand would not be sustainable and would not solve the issue in a long term. For example, poor health needed complex solutions, not only bringing in a doctor who could deal with the issue in a short span.

This illustrated very well the complexity of development cooperation solutions and the need to work across sectors and on a highly political level in order to achieve change. It also showed the space that could be available for EU13 and similar development actors that do not have funding to

provide direct financial solutions.

**Even though the case studies dealt with seemingly different topics, they all ended up requiring very similar solutions (in no particular order):**

**NGOs** should educate government to address this issue (to understand that this is a problem for its people)

**Governments** should carry out visa and migration policy revision to encourage development cooperation

**Governments** should invest more in education

**Governments** should invest in regional development

**Researchers** should research the deeper reasons of migration

**Governments** should work on diplomatic relations, leaving the capacity building to organizations in the field

**Governments** should review policy for sending doctors abroad on exchange programmes and as visiting doctors

**NGOs** should work on public campaigns to increase interest in experience sharing with partner countries in various fields

In order to gain access to countries, **governments** should maintain diplomatic relations based on common history and interests

**Governments** of donor countries should work closely with CSOs to provide a certain cover and back to **CSOs** operating in difficult environments

Where appropriate and necessary **governments** should take a lead on projects, cooperating with CSOs and field organizations in knowledge sharing and employing experienced field agents for carrying out project activities, especially in sensitive cases

**Governments** should base their actions on common memories and offer, f.ex. Children nutrition camps

**Governments** should initiate trilateral cooperation with established partners on strengthening nutrition knowledge

**Governments** should give grants to academic institutions to conduct studies on causes of malnutrition

**Government** should initiate exchange of medical personell

**Government** should strengthen partnerships on development issues between Latvia and recipient states

**NGOs** should spread their message through local civil society (or similar organization)

**Civil society** should put pressure on governments to review Eastern Partnership or other relevant policies.

Interestingly in most cases, the governments were given the most tasks, as they are often

considered the most legitimate actor and the one with the most access. At the same time it is the civil society that can provide the most flexible approach to dealing with the issues and that has also the most field knowledge, since government officials are mostly dealing with bureaucratic and office work.

**Non-financial means of implementation touched upon here:**

- ensuring participation
- ensuring monitoring and accountability systems
- building up PCD systems
- promoting gender sensitive actions
- knowledge transfer and sharing
- cross-sectoral cooperation
- policy review and reform

**Financial means:**

- investing in education system
- investing in regional development
- invest in research

Main ideas to leave with – also NGOs and governments of donor countries need capacity building for more effective aid. This capacity building needs to come from the recipient countries. At the same time willingness to engage is a human factor that can determine success and effectiveness of any development cooperation efforts.