





donors (e.g. water, agriculture and food security, river transportation, natural resources exploitation); rests more on valuable mutual sovereign relationships; fewer missions, less transfer pricing and transaction costs; etc. This new DC modality needs to be better understood and integrated fully into new global DC architecture than condemned entirely. There are good as well as bad examples of implementation just as under N-S development cooperation. We need to objectively identify, understand and capitalise on comparative advantages of all forms of DC cooperation in a mutually inclusive way to ensure 'win-win' situations.

- Urge for the urgent need to critically re-examine existing aid modalities/transmission agencies, including PIUs; to identify strengths and weaknesses and relevance in the context of the positive developments taking place in recipient countries in terms governance and fuller democratisation, civil society consultations and oversight, project management, donor coordination and alignment, country ownership and political leadership, and fiduciary responsibilities ; e.g. funding modalities – budget support, global/sector trust funds, fragmented multilateral/bilateral modes, etc); with experience, perhaps, sector wide funding, properly coordinated, is the preferred option; even for capacity building support; non state actors/NGOs are not always effective (times have changed and perhaps the good ones/workers are no more). Some even now go for profit maximisation.
- Aid effectiveness needs to be considered in terms of results orientation, strong policy dialogue, coherence, transparency and mutual accountability. There is however need to urge for less intrusive and ad hoc conditionality/triggers; where necessary, donor conditions need to be dramatically reduced

and IATA for aid effectiveness and transparency; subject themselves to joint PEER reviews on aid effectiveness, etc.

○