This third chapter of the Report on South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America 2018 focuses on the analysis of Triangular Cooperation; another of the three forms of South-South Cooperation recognized in Ibero-America. To that end, and against the background of the upcoming 2nd High-Level Conference on South-South Cooperation, which will take place in March 2019 to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the approval of the Buenos Aires Plan of Action (BAPA), the countries have initiated a process of reflection on Triangular Cooperation, with a view to analyzing how to strengthen and relaunch this modality, as well as step up its contribution to the 2030 Agenda.

On the basis of the information provided by the Ibero-American countries, this chapter reviews the evolution of this type of cooperation, in particular the data for 2016, which is the year in focus in this Report. Hence, the chapter is structured as follows:

a) Firstly, the trends and developments in Triangular Cooperation since 2006 (the year referred to in the first edition of the Report) are analyzed using the aggregate database of projects and actions that countries have been reporting on for ten years until 2016. The building of this time series will allow visualizing the growth dynamics of Triangular Cooperation and reaffirm with greater clarity and accuracy whether there has been an increased use of this modality, as the data accumulated in the past editions of this Report appear to suggest.

b) Secondly, and delving deeper into 2016, the analysis focuses on the actors involved, to a greater or lesser extent, in each role covered under this modality (first provider, second provider and recipient). Furthermore, from a sectoral perspective, it identifies the capacities strengthened through Triangular Cooperation, both by region and by countries that were most active.

c) As has become customary, a qualitative review of the operational frameworks and financial mechanisms under which this modality operates is provided below. Indeed, a greater and better awareness of how the different actors interact is a major demand of Ibero-American countries, who realize that the efforts of coordination are inevitably more complex, given that they are participating in a cooperation that involves more than two partners.

d) The chapter closes with an analysis of Triangular Cooperation’s contribution to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). This will build on and strengthen an analysis that is aligned with the 2030 Agenda, and was first included in this Report in the 2016 edition.

---

As stated earlier in the second chapter, it should be noted that this time series is constructed on the basis of the consolidated data available on the Ibero-American Integrated Data System on South-South Cooperation (SIDICSS), rather than the data sequence contained in previous Reports.
As already mentioned earlier, the figures used to build this time series were taken from an aggregate regional database for the entire reference period; therefore, the outcome does not fully match the result that would have been obtained had the data sequence included in previous Reports been used.

The fact that this period is shorter than the previous one, and that the degree of decline is 3 percentage points lower than that of growth (13 versus 16), explains why the accumulated drop is not as intense as expected, and the total number of initiatives registered in 2016 is still remarkably high.

The data provided by the countries revealed that Ibero-American countries implemented 137 Triangular Cooperation initiatives in 2016 (100 projects and 37 actions). Graph III.1 illustrates the evolution of the initiatives, projects and actions implemented during each year from 2006 (the year referred to in the first Report on South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America) to 2016. It can be concluded that:

a) In comparing the data from 2006 and 2016, it can be argued that Triangular Cooperation has increased twofold over the last ten years (60 initiatives in 2006 to 137 in 2016). This growth is mainly due an increased number of projects (from 34 to 100), rather than of actions, which grew more slowly (from 26 to 37).

b) The trend analysis clearly differentiates two periods. First between 2006 and 2013, when the total number of initiatives experienced a sustained growth; and the second, between 2013 and 2016, when, conversely, the number of initiatives decreased. More specifically, between 2006 and 2013, the number of initiatives increased at an average annual rate of 16.8%. This dynamic resulted in a threefold increase in initiatives compared to the initial figure (a historical maximum of 212, compared to 60 in the first year). Meanwhile, between 2013 and 2016, the number of initiatives dropped at an average annual rate of 13.5%, bringing the final figure to 137, which nevertheless is higher than 50% of the all-time record.

c) However, this analysis should not ignore the fact that projects and actions behaved differently, which illustrates more clearly the trend followed by Triangular Cooperation. Thus, the gradual decrease in the number of records since 2013 was almost entirely due to the drop in the number of actions, which generated a high aggregate annual decrease rate of 28.4%; a figure far removed from the rate registered by projects, with an annual decrease rate of 3.4%. This appears to suggest that variability is concentrated in activities such as training courses, workshops or internships around which actions take place, while projects consolidated and maintained their role as the main instrument for countries to implement Triangular Cooperation.

---

2 As already mentioned earlier, the figures used to build this time series were taken from an aggregate regional database for the entire reference period; therefore, the outcome does not fully match the result that would have been obtained had the data sequence included in previous Reports been used.

3 The fact that this period is shorter than the previous one, and that the degree of decline is 3 percentage points lower than that of growth (13 versus 16), explains why the accumulated drop is not as intense as expected, and the total number of initiatives registered in 2016 is still remarkably high.
The knowledge that projects and actions correlated with cooperation instruments that vary in terms of type and behavior is further strengthened by analyzing other aspects, including, knowing whether (1) the projects and actions in progress in 2016 started in that same year or whether, on the contrary, they were initiated somewhat sooner or later, and (2) the implementation time of these tools differ significantly.

Graphs III.2 and III.3 were prepared for this purpose. The former shows the distribution of the 137 projects and actions by start year, i.e. in 2013 or before, in 2014, 2015 or 2016. The latter compares projects and actions according to the time elapsed between the start and end date of the activity.\(^4\)

---

**GRAPH III.1**

**PROJECTS AND TRIANGULAR COOPERATION ACTIONS IN PROGRESS. 2006-2016**

Units
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Source: SEGIB, based on reporting from cooperation agencies and/or bureaus
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**GRAPH III.2**

**DISTRIBUTION OF TRIANGULAR COOPERATION PROJECTS AND ACTIONS BY START YEAR. 2016**

Share (%)
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Source: SEGIB, based on reporting from cooperation agencies and/or bureaus
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*Chapter 2 provides details on how to read and interpret this type of graph.

As for the duration, the information for the records is not available in its totality. More specifically, the exact start and end dates of 67.6% of the actions are available, whereas in the case of projects it is slightly less (61%).

---

* As for the duration, the information for the records is not available in its totality. More specifically, the exact start and end dates of 67.6% of the actions are available, whereas in the case of projects it is slightly less (61%).
IBERO-AMERICAN COUNTRIES HAD 100 PROJECTS AND 37 TRIANGULAR COOPERATION ACTIONS IN PROGRESS, WHICH ADDED TO 137 INITIATIVES.

It can be concluded from the graphs that:

a) 41% of the projects (Graph III.2) started their activity in 2016. The remaining 60%, however, were distributed relatively uniformly (about 20% in each case) throughout the other three periods under consideration: 2015, 2014 and 2013 and before. By contrast, and in a manner consistent with what might be expected, all 37 registered actions began during 2016.

b) On the other hand, Graph III.3 compares the varying duration of actions and projects. Indeed, actions tended to last between one day and one month, with an average of about 5.5 days. The duration of projects was far more variable, with more outliers than for actions: from a minimum duration of 169 days (approximately six months) to a maximum of 3,589 days (more than nine years). That gap is bridged somewhat if the analysis focuses only on the 50% of projects closest to the median, whose implementation times fluctuated within a narrower range from 522 (1.4 years) to 1,275 days (3.5 years). In any case, the average duration of all projects was around 2.7 years.
This section reviews how the countries and/or other organizations participated in the 37 actions and 100 projects exchanged in 2016 under Triangular Cooperation. In this regard, it is worth noting that:

a) According to the definition of Triangular Cooperation adopted in Ibero-America, there are three distinct roles (first provider, second provider and recipient) that, in each case, may be exercised simultaneously by several actors. This means that the total number of participants need not be limited to three. By way of example, more than three actors participated in 27 of the 100 projects registered in 2016. The same was true in virtually one third of the 37 actions.

b) Hence, it is also important to highlight that this chapter refers specifically to Triangular Cooperation, in which at least two Ibero-American countries participated as first provider and recipient. Meanwhile, any other actor (Ibero-American or non-Ibero-American country, international organization, or a combination of these) could act as second provider.

From the perspective of the projects executed (Graph III.4.1), it can be stated that:

a) In 2016, slightly more than half (11 out of 19) of the Latin American countries acted as first provider, transferring skills through their participation in at least one of the 100 Triangular Cooperation projects implemented. As suggested by the Graph, participation varied widely. Brazil and Chile stood out with 19 projects each. These two countries accounted for 38% of the projects implemented, which is proof that they were the main drivers of Triangular Cooperation in 2016. These findings corroborate Brazil’s momentum, but even more importantly, it highlights Chile’s leadership, who has been the top first provider of Triangular Cooperation over the past five years. On the other hand, Mexico, Costa Rica and El Salvador, participated in 10 and 15 projects each, which aggregatey represents one-third of the total. The remaining six countries that participated in this role accounted for the last 26% of the projects in 2016. These were in relative order of importance: Uruguay, Colombia, Argentina, Peru, Ecuador and Cuba. The number of projects in which each country ranged between 7 for Uruguay and one project for Ecuador and Cuba.

b) Meanwhile, a score of actors supported 100 Triangular Cooperation projects as second providers. They consisted of 8 countries (three from Ibero-America - Spain, Mexico and Dominican Republic) and 12 international organizations of the United Nations System (FAO, UN Women, WFP, UNFPA, UNDP, UNESCO and UNICEF) and regional organizations (OAS, IDB, CABEI and/or CAF). Regarding the level of participation of these actors, only two countries supported twenty or more projects each: Germany (25 projects, a quarter of the total) and Spain (20 projects, equivalent to one fifth). Luxembourg (for the first time among the top second providers) and the United States were in third and fourth place with 11 and 10 projects respectively, jointly accounting for another 21%. If the FAO (8 projects) is
added to the foregoing, five actors provided three-quarters of the 100 projects finally implemented. Meanwhile, Japan, an actor that has traditionally supported Triangular Cooperation projects in the region, participated as second provider in 6 of the 100 projects carried out in 2016. Finally, it should be noted that several actors shared the role of second providers in four initiatives: Italy with CAF in two projects, and the Dominican Republic and Spain, and FAO and UNDP, in one project each.

Note: The projects and actions in which more than one actor exercised this role are grouped under the heading Various

Source: SEGIB, based on reporting from cooperation agencies and/or bureaus
Finally, concerning the recipients, the data show continuity in some elements identified in previous Reports. It emphasizes that all Latin American countries served as recipients in a Triangular Cooperation project, either individually or jointly with other partners. Indeed, the most common situation found in the 100 projects was several countries simultaneously participating as recipients (18% of cases). The number of participants ranged between 2 and 18. As in the case of Bilateral SSC, El Salvador stood out as the country that acted as recipient in a greater number of projects (16 of the 100 possible), followed by Paraguay, who received 11 Triangular Cooperation projects. In order of relative importance, Bolivia, the Dominican Republic, Honduras and Guatemala also stood out with between 5 and 10 projects. When added to the foregoing, they accounted for 70% of the projects received.

As Graph III.4.2 appears to suggest, the distribution of the different actors’ participation in Triangular Cooperation actions differed from that of the projects. In practice:

a) Twelve countries acted as first providers. Prime among these was Argentina, which transferred skills in almost 30% (29.7%) of actions; and Chile and El Salvador, with shares of 16.2% and 10.8%, respectively. The three countries accounted for 56.8% of the activities. The remaining 9 countries participated more sporadically with 1 to 3 Triangular Cooperation actions in each case.

b) Japan stood out in its role as second provider, accounting for a quarter of the actions (24.3%), mainly in partnership with Argentina. Meanwhile, Germany, the IDB or the World Bank represented one-third of the total actions (32.4%). The rest of the share is explained by sporadic support to one or two actions by 12 actors, including some extra-regional countries that did not participate in projects, such as Canada, Switzerland and the ILO.

c) Peru was the top recipient of actions with a variety of actors, accounting for 40.5% of them. The second most common situation was those cases in which several countries simultaneously exercised this role, partly because these were courses provided by Argentina and Japan to third countries. The list of recipients is completed with Guatemala, Honduras, Uruguay and Peru, with 1 and 4 actions each.

Finally, and to complement the analysis on the participation of different actors in Triangular Cooperation, Box III.1 follows up on an exercise which began in previous Reports, which is similar to what has been done for Bilateral SSC. The aim is to know how concentrated (or not) Triangular Cooperation projects and actions are in a few (or many) actors, and if differences existed between roles. The exercise enables better understanding of what is the relationship between countries and Triangular Cooperation.

---

7 It should be added that El Salvador was one of the few actors that combined active participation as a recipient with meaningful activity as first provider in nearly a quarter of the projects. Costa Rica is in a somewhat similar situation, having participated as first provider in 11 projects and 4 as the only recipient.
Since the 2012 Report, the Herfindahl index, an indicator taken from international trade, has been used to estimate the degree of concentration and dispersion of Triangular Cooperation projects and actions on few or many countries. The results make it possible to determine whether concentration and dispersion around certain actors is dependent upon the role they play in Triangular Cooperation.

A detailed explanation of the calculation method and guidelines on how to interpret the findings is provided in the Box found in Chapter II, where this analysis is also carried out for Bilateral SSC. In the case of Triangular Cooperation, the index is used to calculate concentration and dispersion for each of the three possible roles, differentiating between projects and actions. The graph below shows the findings. The index values are distributed in ascending order along the horizontal axis by role and type of instrument. Furthermore, the size of the element on the graph indicates the number of existing (project or action) records for that type of instrument.

**BOX III.1**

**CONCENTRATION AND DISPERSION OF TRIANGULAR COOPERATION**

When interpreting the results of the graph, it should be remembered that values below 0.1000 suggest diversification; between 0.1000 and 0.18000 moderate concentration; and above 0.1800, higher degree of concentration. The results appear to suggest that:

a) The greatest diversification is found in the distribution of Triangular Cooperation, which is somewhat more intense in the case of actions than in projects. This finding is consistent with the fact that all countries in the region participated in Triangular Cooperation in this role, and several countries acted simultaneously as recipients in a large number of initiatives.

b) Meanwhile, the greatest concentration (albeit, with moderate values) was found in first providers of both projects and actions, which is also consistent with the fact that a handful of countries provide the bulk of technical transfers in Triangular Cooperation.

c) Finally, it also shows a moderate concentration of a few second providers. In this case, the degree of concentration was somewhat lower than for first providers. However, it is also consistent with the fact that only a handful of developed countries and international organizations support Triangular Cooperation as second providers.

**GRAPH**

**CONCENTRATION OF PARTICIPATION IN TRIANGULAR COOPERATION PROJECTS AND ACTIONS, BY ROLES. 2016**

Herfindahl index, to four decimal places

Note: In the case of initiatives in which several actors participate in the same role, the share will be broken down and calculated on the basis of the total share by country, rather than by total number of projects and actions.

Source: SEGIB, based on reporting from cooperation agencies and/or bureaus.
This analysis identifies the main partners of the countries most active in Triangular Cooperation in 2016 and the level of interaction thereof. This, in turn, allows identifying the main partnerships under this form of cooperation.

To that end, the main actors in each role were identified. More specifically, the analysis focused on Brazil and Chile with 19 projects each as first providers; Germany as top second provider in 25 projects; and El Salvador, with 16 projects, as the country that more frequently acted as recipient.

Firstly, Diagram III.1 shows the partnerships Brazil engaged in as first provider. This Diagram shows the number of projects in which Brazil participated with each partner: second providers (central flow); and, through them, with their recipients (right flow). Indeed, it can be concluded that:

a) Brazil concentrated 63.2% of its Triangular Cooperation exchanges in 2016 on two second providers: an international organization, FAO, and a country, United States. Brazil interacted in 7 projects with FAO, with UNDP also participating in one of them. Brazil implemented 5 projects with the United States. Additionally, Brazil partnered with Germany (2 projects), and the tandem formed by Italy and CAF (2 more). Finally, Brazil also engaged with Spain, OAS and UNESCO on one-off triangulations.

b) On the other hand, 7 countries in the region have seen their capacities individually strengthened through Triangular Cooperation with Brazil. In particular, Honduras, who was a recipient of some triangulations with the United States that focused on agriculture and food security, participated in long-term projects (over three years) that have been running since 2013. However, most often than not, several countries shared the role of recipients, as in the cases covered by the Brazil-FAO South-South Cooperation Program, under which both partners promote regional projects.

Meanwhile, Diagram III.2 illustrates the case of Chile, another country that primarily acted as first provider. Indeed, the distribution of the 19 projects in which it participated in 2016 with its second providers and recipients reveals that:

a) As has become customary, Chile’s partnership with Germany, the United States, Spain and Japan in Triangular Cooperation projects accounts for almost three out of four projects implemented by this country, with Germany and the United States as its main partners. In the case of Germany, both countries interacted with up to four different recipients through their partnerships, while the United States focused its triangular activities on two countries, the Dominican Republic and Paraguay. The WFP, FAO, Mexico and Korea complemented these partnerships as second providers.

b) On the other hand, Chile strengthened capacities through Triangular Cooperation in eight countries in the region. Paraguay stood out, with almost one-third (31.6%) of the initiatives in which Chile partnered with Germany, the United States and Japan. In second place are the Dominican Republic and El Salvador, which jointly concentrated almost one third of the projects (31.6%). Finally, Guatemala and Costa Rica also acted as recipients (two projects each), as well as Argentina, Ecuador and Honduras (one each).
As for who acted most frequently as second provider, Diagram III.3 focuses on Germany, which has consolidated, year after year, its position as a major extra-regional actor in this field, working through its Regional Fund for Triangular Cooperation in Latin America. Diagram III.3 shows Germany’s partnerships (central flow) with its first providers (left flow) and recipients (right flow) to implement the 25 projects registered in 2016. It can be concluded that:

a) Germany partnered with 8 first providers. Particularly significant were Mexico and Chile, which accounted for more than half (52%) of Germany’s triangulations, with 8 and 5 projects respectively. Other sporadic exchanges include Costa Rica, Brazil, Ecuador, Peru and Colombia, as well as a number of combinations thereof (Mexico with Chile, Costa Rica and Panama).

b) Germany interacted with 12 recipients, participating in 1 to 3 projects in each case. To these should be added the recipients that participated with others, represented under the heading Various. Indeed, this last option was the most common, given that, in almost a quarter of the projects (24%), several countries participated simultaneously as recipients in Germany-led projects.

Finally, Diagram III.4 shows El Salvador’s partnerships (right flow) with its main partners. The left flow represents the first providers and the second providers appear in the center flow. The 16 projects in which El Salvador acted as recipient in 2016 were implemented through the following partnerships:

a) In 2016, El Salvador received technical cooperation through triangulations with nine Ibero-American countries (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay). These exchanges were highly diverse, since El Salvador interacted with each partner in 1 to 3 projects.

b) By contrast, the relationship with the second providers was highly concentrated in two countries -Spain and Luxembourg- which together accounted for more than half (56.3%) of El Salvador’s triangulations. A particular feature of its relationship with Luxembourg is the instrument used, the Salvadoran Fund for South-South and Triangular Cooperation, through which Luxembourg not only finances Bilateral SSC activities, but also allows El Salvador to participate in Triangular Cooperation activities as both First Provider and Recipient. As a result of this, the Fund is a tool that allows El Salvador to structure its Triangular Cooperation in both directions.

In the case of projects implemented with Spain, worthy of note is a Triangular Cooperation project on gender equality with Peru as first provider, detailed in Box III.2. The other partnerships with second providers are explained by seven separate projects with seven different actors (3 international organizations -OAS, UNICEF and UNFPA- and four countries -Germany, the United States, Japan and Mexico).
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BOX III.2

SUPPORT FOR THE CREATION OF AN IT SYSTEM FOR THE ANALYSIS OF FEMICIDAL VIOLENCE IN EL SALVADOR THROUGH TRIANGULAR COOPERATION WITH PERU AND SPAIN

In November 2010, El Salvador approved the Special Comprehensive Law for a Life Free from Violence for Women (by its Spanish acronym, LEIV), making a commitment to fight against femicide and other forms of violence against women, a major scourge of Salvadoran society. In fact, the Report on the Situation of Violence against Women in El Salvador, drafted by the Salvadoran Institute for the Development of Women (by its Spanish acronym, ISDEMU), revealed that, according to the agreed statistics, 1,705 women suffered violent deaths in the country between January 2012 and June 2016.

Indeed, one of the main challenges faced by El Salvador in this endeavor was to collect accurate qualitative and quantitative data on gender-based violence against women through a single registry of victims of femicidal violence. Up to now, only three institutions (Attorney General of the Republic, Institute of Legal Medicine and National Civil Police) reported data on this matter. Moreover, their data did not coincide. This underscored the need to build a single registry, centralized through ISDEMU. It therefore became imperative to develop this IT system, given that it should contribute to the National Data and Statistics System on Violence against Women, and enhanced management of information on gender-based violence against women, providing an accurate picture of the situation in the country, while serving as a tool for making decisions on public policies for the prevention, care and eradication of this phenomenon.

The Triangular Cooperation project for the "Institutionalization of an Information System in support of a qualitative and quantitative analysis of Femicidal Violence in El Salvador based on the experience of Peru and Spain" was launched against this background, with the support of the Spain-El Salvador Institutional Strengthening Fund, with contributions from both partners and technical support from Peru. Indeed, the project is underpinned by the experience of the Public Ministry of Peru and the policies developed by the Peruvian Ministry of Women and Vulnerable Populations. This project, which is aligned with El Salvador’s Five-Year Development Plan 2014-2019 and its strategic objectives 3 and 5 regarding citizen security and equality, was adopted at the 5th meeting of the Mixed Commission for Technical and Scientific Cooperation between Peru and El Salvador. Likewise, the project is part of the Country Partnership Framework that Spain signed with each of the other two partner countries.

One of the most remarkable features of this project that began in late August 2016, and is still in progress in 2018, has been the multidisciplinary character of the Salvadoran institutions that participate in it. For instance, it involves, inter alia, the Vice Ministry of Cooperation for Development (as the lead entity together with AECID), ISDEMU (as the project’s lead institution), the Executive Technical Unit of the Justice Sector, and the Directorate General for Statistics and Census. The partner countries outlined the responsibilities of each institution in the Action Plan document, as well as the Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability and Impact criteria that would guide the implementation of the project.

Source: SEGIB, based on reporting from cooperation agencies and/or bureaus and ISDEMU (2017)
SOME 75% OF THE TRIANGULAR COOPERATION PROJECTS IMPLEMENTED IN 2016 SOUGHT TO STRENGTHEN CAPACITIES IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC SECTORS

SECTORAL ANALYSIS OF TRIANGULAR COOPERATION IN 2016

III.3

After a thorough analysis to determine the main actors of Triangular Cooperation in 2016, it is now time to identify the areas of activity on which the initiatives focused during that year. To ensure meaningful findings, the analysis focuses on the 100 projects registered in 2016, disregarding the 37 actions.

Through this analysis, it will be possible to identify the sectoral capacities that the region tended to strengthen in 2016 through Triangular Cooperation. Furthermore, and where permitted by available data, it will enable a better understanding of how the specific profile of each cooperating partner affected the outcome.

To understand the methodology applied, it is worth recalling certain issues that were mentioned in Chapter II:

a) The analysis uses the classification by activity sectors recognized in the Ibero-American space. There were 27 sectors until the previous edition of the Report. This edition incorporates a substantive modification in said classification, triggered by the unbundling of the so-called Government sector, which now allows more accurate identification and differentiation of the elements related to strengthening of governmental institutions.

b) The above-mentioned 30 sectors are clustered, in turn, under six areas of action: Social, Infrastructures and Economic Services, Productive sectors, Institutional Strengthening, Environment and a generic Other Multisectoral.

c) The table is complemented with the 30 sectors classified under their relevant areas of action and their definitions, which can be found in the Annexes to Chapter II.

* As will be discussed later, 37 records are too few to provide a meaningful conclusion when the data has to be classified into 30 different activity sectors.
Source: SEGIB, based on reporting from cooperation agencies and/or bureaus
III.3.1 Diagram III.5 shows the distribution of the 100 Triangular Cooperation projects that the Ibero-American countries were implementing in 2016 (left flow), and organizes them according to the area of action (central flow) and the activity sector (right flow) with which they were related. It can be concluded that:

a) The Environment, Social and Economic areas (the latter in its two dimensions -Productive and Infrastructure and services-), together accounted for about 75% of the projects implemented in 2016. Specifically, the Environment represented 27% of the total, Social 26% and Economic 24%. In this latter area, the Productive dimension (16%) prevailed over Services (8%). 23% of the remaining projects consisted of Institutional Strengthening (19%) and Other multisectoral (barely 4%).

b) The projects under Environment were geared more to the defense and protection of the Environment (88.9%) than to Disaster Management (11.1%). Worthy of note, in particular, were the projects targeting adaptation to climate change, and management of protected areas and solid waste. One of these projects was the Ecological Blue Flag Program implemented in Honduras with the support of the Costa Rica-Spain Triangular Cooperation Program. A more detailed description is provided in Box III.3.

c) In the Social context, Health was clearly the predominant sector, accounting for 46.1% of the projects. The bulk of the projects were aimed at improving health services, although food security and communicable diseases, such as HIV / AIDS, were also addressed. Meanwhile, Other services and social policies ranked second in relative importance within the Social area, embracing projects with a clear inclusive approach. Worthy of note were the projects geared towards working with youth and rural communities. Another interesting and significantly different outcome from Bilateral SSC is the absence of triangular projects in Education, given that this sector ranks fourth in importance in Bilateral SSC.

d) As in the case of Bilateral SSC, Economic projects focused primarily on the productive sector, and particularly on agriculture, which positioned itself as the third most important sector in relative terms of the 100 projects implemented in 2016 (10.9%). The largest number of actions sought to strengthen the productive chains of certain crops.

e) Meanwhile, Institutional Strengthening (18.8% of final projects) primarily focused on supporting government institutions and their public policies (57.9%). Some projects aimed at improving knowledge, efficiency and/or management of international cooperation agencies, enhancing management of civil service or training in planning or assessment for public institutions.

f) Finally, only a handful of projects which were geared towards promoting gender equality (nearly 4% of the total), were identified under Other multisectoral. It should be noted that there were no Triangular Cooperation projects in the Culture sector, which is in stark contrast with the situation for Bilateral Cooperation, where Culture was one of the 7 most important activity sectors.

---

* The profile of these priorities is in stark contrast with the one for Bilateral SSC. Thus, under the bilateral modality, there are relatively fewer projects dedicated to the defense and protection of the environment than to the economic or social dimension. By contrast, in Triangular Cooperation, the environment competes in importance with the other two sectors, providing evidence that Triangular Cooperation does not replicate the sectoral structure of other forms of cooperation. Given that Triangular Cooperation is much smaller in volume than Bilateral SSC, it should be pointed out that it cannot be asserted with certainty that Triangular Cooperation strengthens areas that cannot be strengthened with Bilateral SSC. In absolute terms, the bilateral modality continues to have more environment-related projects (33) than the triangular form (24) of cooperation.
The project kicked off in 2016, with a pilot in the municipality of Marcovia, which focused on four categories of the aforementioned Program: Beach, Community, Education and Environmental Management, and Security Services. The project thus not only contributes to the protection of the environment, but also provides an economic benefit to the actors who obtain this award, generating a positive impact in different sectors, such as tourism.

Owing to the success of this program in Costa Rica, it has already been transferred to other countries such as Panama and Peru. It also began to be implemented in Honduras in 2016, through a Triangular Cooperation project between the two Central American countries, with the support of Spain.

This latest Triangular Cooperation project is part of the National Sustainable Tourism Strategy established by the Honduran Institute of Tourism (by its Spanish acronym, IHT), and aims to extend the implementation of the PBAE across the country in the future. The project has been designed to implement four of the categories found in the Costa Rican Program. In particular, it focuses on ensuring sustainability of the beaches, education centers, communities and protected natural areas of the country. To that end, Costa Rica supports the implementation of the program, providing advice and sharing experiences and information, and Spain offers financial support for the execution of the project. This triangulation focuses on six specific goals:

a) Implementing several PBAE categories in Honduras.
b) Reviewing legislation to regulate sustainability, contributing to the environment, human health, community development and adapting and mitigating climate change.
c) Promoting specific criteria on water quality, education and environmental management and security services offered on Honduran beaches.
d) Establishing a training program for local committees.
e) Carrying out an inspection at the Embassy of Costa Rica in Honduras, within the framework of the country’s participation in the Ecodiplomatic Category of the Ecological Blue Flag Program.

The project, which is still in progress, has already won the first awards given in Honduras. For instance, Utila beach won the award thanks to the work of its Local Committee on various aspects such as water quality (both marine and drinking), waste management on beaches and presence and signposting of garbage collection points.

Source: SEGIB, based on reporting from cooperation agencies and/or bureaus

**SECTORAL PROFILE OF TRIANGULAR COOPERATION’S MAIN ACTORS**

**III.3.2**

The sectoral distribution of projects at regional level tends to be explained by the manner in which key players influence Triangular Cooperation. Therefore, to complement the sectoral analysis, the capacity profile of the more dynamic actors in the 100 projects implemented in 2016 is provided below. To ensure meaningful findings, the analysis focuses again on Brazil and Chile as first providers, Germany as second provider and El Salvador as recipient. Graph III.5, and its four variants, show the distribution of the projects in which each of these countries participated in 2016, according to the area of action and activity sector.
III.5.1. BRAZIL, FIRST PROVIDER

III.5.2. CHILE, FIRST PROVIDER
III.5.3. GERMANY, SECOND PROVIDER

---

III.5.4. EL SALVADOR, RECIPIENT

---

Source: SEGIB, based on reporting from cooperation agencies and/or bureaus
It can be concluded that:

a) Brazil stood out for its Social and Productive projects. In particular, those geared towards Agriculture (more than a quarter of Brazil’s projects - 26.3% -) and Health (just over one-fifth of the total - 21.1%-). This profile is closely related to Brazil’s partnerships with FAO and the United States, and more specifically with the projects implemented under the Brazil-FAO International Cooperation Program and the Trilateral Agreement between Brazil, Honduras and the United States, which focused on food security and strengthening of agricultural production. Moreover, Brazil also stood out for its environment-oriented cooperation, linked to regional experiences in partnership with Germany (waste management) and the Amazon without Fire Program, together with Italy and CAF.

b) With regard to Chile, its Triangular Cooperation also focused on the Social and Productive dimensions. These two areas accounted for more than three-fifths of their triangulations (63.2%). However, the sectoral composition differed from Brazil, since the most notable projects were geared towards Other services and social policies (almost one-third of the total, 31.6%). Worthy of note are the projects implemented with the United States in the Dominican Republic that were geared towards youth or the actions aimed at precarious settlements in Paraguay that involved Germany. The social profile is complemented with the Health sector, which is second in relative importance, and with agricultural projects, which fall under the Economic dimension. The latter had a varied composition, which included experiences to strengthen health networks (together with South Korea and Paraguay), improve food security (Germany and Guatemala) or support the rehabilitation of young people from substance abuse (Spain and El Salvador).

c) Meanwhile, as already mentioned in past editions of the Report, Germany’s support to Triangular Cooperation had a strong environmental component, with 40% of its triangulations in this sector. Its partnerships with Mexico and Costa Rica focused, for instance, on several experiences geared towards waste management and recycling or protection of coastal areas. Box III.4 provides a detailed description of the project in which Germany supported Mexico and Bolivia to improve wastewater treatment and facilitate its subsequent reuse for agricultural purposes. The projects geared towards Other services and social policies (exclusively implemented with Chile), and those focusing on promoting sustainable and efficient generation and use of power are also worthy of mention.

d) Finally, the Triangular Cooperation received by El Salvador was highly diversified in terms of sectors. Worthy of note were the projects implemented in the Health sector (a quarter of the total), with the support of its partners from Luxembourg and Spain, which aim to improve health services and transplantations.
According to a World Bank study, the use of untreated wastewater for agricultural irrigation was a common practice in Bolivia in 2015, although more focused in peri-urban areas across the country. Although the use of wastewater is an alternative when access to other types of water sources is limited, the problem stems from the use of untreated water. Moreover, this informal practice also poses a health risk for both farmers and livestock owners, as well as consumers.

Against this background, wastewater treatment provides an extremely useful tool for minimizing health risks, ensures sustainability of agricultural production and helps the country to adapt to climate change. This is how the partnership between Mexico, Germany and Bolivia came about. This three-country initiative stems from a visit by a Bolivian delegation to Mexico in 2009 to learn about the water resource management in Mexico, where they expressed interest in cooperating with the Mesoamerican country. Following several visits and bilateral meetings, the project “Support for reusing and improving wastewater treatment to protect water bodies, with a focus on adaptation to climate change” was presented and approved for financing by Germany’s Regional Fund for Triangular Cooperation in Latin America and the Caribbean. The project, which was implemented between 2012 and 2013, included several technical missions, seminars, courses and internships, as well as a visit to Germany to learn about management. Following the success of this first project, between 2014 and 2016, the project “Reusing wastewater treated for agricultural irrigation” was approved for its implementation by the same actors, with the aim of improving the framework conditions for reusing treated wastewater for agricultural irrigation. The project consisted of three lines of action:

a) Improving and establishing a framework of rules and regulations for wastewater treatment
b) Training and building the capacity of officials involved in wastewater treatment for agricultural purposes
c) Implementing pilot projects in this field

This second project was broken down into three stages, and consisted in the implementation of 28 activities, such as technical missions, courses, workshops and internships, which, according to Mexico, included a total of 439 days of technical assistance by this Mesoamerican country. This assistance included support and advice rendered by Mexico in the three pilot projects carried out in the Municipality of Sacaba and in the community of Patacamaya in the Altiplano. It should also be noted that Mexico and Bolivia participated through different governmental institutions at the national, state or municipal level.

This long-term collaboration, more than four years, also allowed the building of structures for further cooperation between both countries, beyond the projects mentioned above.

Source: SEGIB, based on reporting from cooperation agencies and/or bureaus; World Bank (2015)
III.4

OPERATIONAL ASPECTS OF TRIANGULAR COOPERATION

As has become customary, and in accordance with the decisions adopted by the countries in Buenos Aires in 2013\(^1\), this section of Chapter III seeks to delve deeper into other specific aspects related to the management of Triangular Cooperation. To that end, the analysis focuses on three aspects:

a) The existence or not of regulatory frameworks for structuring Triangular Cooperation, and if so, the identification of the countries involved.

b) The origin of Triangular Cooperation initiatives launched in 2016. The goal is to verify whether this modality effectively takes a demand-oriented approach, given that this is a posited criterion or principle.\(^2\)

c) The identification of partnership frameworks and funding mechanisms for this modality, with special emphasis on the possible existence of funds or mixed funds.\(^3\)

OPERATIONAL FRAMEWORKS OF TRIANGULAR COOPERATION

III.4.1

Ibero-American countries have highlighted, on numerous occasions, that coordinating the various actors involved in the projects is a major challenge for managing Triangular Cooperation.\(^1\) In addition to the cooperation agencies and/or bureaus of the countries involved, each partner’s sectoral institutions also participate in the projects, which implies that coordination and clear definition of roles requires greater efforts. Graph III.6 was created to determine whether the projects and actions implemented in 2016 were governed by some mechanism that regulates triangulation. The graph is based on whether such mechanisms existed or not in the countries. It should be noted that data was obtained for 41.6% of the projects and actions (less than half); therefore, the results shown on the Graph are partial and inconclusive. In any case, it can be argued that:

a) Almost 9 out of 10 initiatives (89.5%) had regulatory mechanisms in place, regardless of whether they were actions or projects. In other words, only 10.5% of the projects and actions analyzed did not have a formal regulatory framework for their implementation.

b) As for the initiatives with a regulatory framework, 62.7% already had a legislative framework prior to their approval and/or start date. In this sense, the countries reported Triangular Cooperation programs with third countries as projects under a regulatory framework, for instance, between Brazil and FAO, Spain and Costa Rica, Spain and El Salvador or Brazil and the OAS, among others. This also included Joint Committees, Tripartite Agreements (such as the one for projects between Brazil, the United States and Honduras) and Memorandums of Understanding for implementing Triangular Cooperation projects, as is the case of Spain’s partnerships with other Ibero-American countries. This is all without prejudice to more specific instruments for regulating, coordinating or defining the roles that will be subsequently developed to implement the activities under these frameworks. Regarding the latter, 37.3% of the initiatives that had regulatory frameworks relied on this type of instruments to define functions, roles and/or regulatory mechanisms. In this context, it involves records of discussions, project documents or statements of intent by participating actors, among others.

---

\(^1\) Against the backdrop of the workshop on the “Questionnaire for the Report on South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America 2013: Review of the Treatment of Triangular and Regional Cooperation”, held in Buenos Aires from March 20 to 22, 2013, and organized by the PIFCSS and SEGIB.

\(^2\) The Guide to the Management of Triangular Cooperation in Ibero-America (PIFCSS, 2015) highlights many of these criteria and principles, previously defined through questionnaires and joint workshops with countries.

\(^3\) Forthcoming editions of the Report shall have a different structure, in response to the workshop on “SIDICSS and the Report on South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America: Building new reporting requirements on Triangular Cooperation and Regional SSC”, held in Lima (Peru) from 24 to 26 October 2017, in which reporting requirements for Triangular Cooperation and SSC were redefined. These changes, however, do not affect the current edition of the Report.

\(^4\) The Guide to the Management of Triangular Cooperation in Ibero-America (PIFCSS, 2015) highlights again many of these elements, collected through questionnaires and joint workshops with countries.
ORIGIN OF TRIANGULAR COOPERATION INITIATIVES

III.4.2

With the aim of understanding whether Triangular Cooperation really takes a demand-oriented approach based on the needs identified by the countries themselves, an analysis focusing on how the participating countries coordinated their communication at the outset of the initiatives was carried out. This also allows to determine whether the initiatives are triangular in nature in origin and design, or, conversely, the developing countries initially agree on a bilateral implementation of a project, and later identify the need for support from a third actor.

For this specific period, information was available for a number of actions and projects very similar to those used to identify regulatory frameworks. That is, there was information available on the origin of 43.1% of the 137 projects and actions in progress in 2016 under Triangular Cooperation (very close to 41.6% from the previous year). Yet again, the results of the analysis correspond to a partial reality and interpretation warrants caution.

However, Graph III.7, which systematizes the three most common cases at the origin of Triangular Cooperation based on statements by Ibero-American countries, was plotted using available data. In this regard, it is worth noting that:

a) Over 80% of the projects and actions (82.7%) were initiated at the recipient’s explicit demand. Different channels were used to do this, including expressed interest in the framework of Mixed Commissions, diplomatic missions or, even, between sectoral institutions. Furthermore, the recipient can identify the strengths or capabilities of the first provider through different channels:

- Recognition of the first provider at the regional level as a leading actor in a specific area. This was the case of CONAMYPE of El Salvador with the MIPYMES (CDEMYYPE) Development Program or Cuba and Health-related strengths.
- Following a diagnostic mission to identify the institution that could become the first provider to fulfill the demand.
- Based on previous Triangular Cooperation or Bilateral SSC experiences, which are expanded with new initiatives. As in the case of the work done on employability by the Dominican Republic, Germany and Chile, the Technical Cooperation Program in Humanitarian Aid that brought together Brazil, the OAS and El Salvador, following assistance by the Brazilian fire department, or the second phase of the social development project articulated in the territory by Chile, Germany and Paraguay, among others.
• Through offer catalogs that allowed some recipients to identify potential areas for joint initiatives with their partners. A case in point is Bolivia’s request to El Salvador to strengthen the institution in charge of consumer protection; a project supported by Luxembourg.

• Through sectoral institutions at the national level with a long track record in cooperation, which allowed applicant countries to acquire robust prior knowledge of the possible areas to be strengthened through Triangular Cooperation.

b) Almost one in ten initiatives (9.6%) originated in forums for dialogue; however, this has not necessarily translated into an explicit demand, but rather a general agreement from which the initiatives emerged. One example could be triangular experiences that originated under regional cooperation programs.

c) Finally, 7.7% of the projects and actions originated through other channels: following an exchange of thematic interests, joint identification between the first provider and the recipient or partnerships between the first and second provider, in which the recipient is invited to participate in a Triangular Cooperation project or action.

It should be finally pointed out that, more often than not, the procedure used to interact with and bring together the different partners, or the channel used to submit the original request for initiatives, is closely related to another aspect: the existence of a partnership framework between at least two partners. It is very important to identify this framework, as the agreements on how to manage the actions and projects are covered therein. These partnership frameworks may become funding mechanisms or sources for the parties, with significant consequences on how the resources needed to implement the initiatives will be managed. Box III.5 shows and exemplifies some of the most common cases in which the procedures stemming from these frameworks are used.
TRIANGULAR COOPERATION: VARIOUS MANAGEMENT FORMS, DIFFERENT PARTNERSHIP FRAMEWORKS

In trying to understand how Triangular Cooperation works, several highly interconnected elements have been identified: the procedure used by the actors to interact; the process for incorporating the actors into the triangulation, and the existence or not of built-in funding mechanisms or Triangular Cooperation partnership frameworks. Indeed, the way in which each of these elements is embodied has to do, moreover, with whether they are interconnected or not.

The following figures illustrate some of the more common articulation procedures used. Some countries and/or projects that showed these dynamics are described below.

COORDINATION METHODS USED IN TRIANGULAR COOPERATION PROJECTS AND ACTIONS

a) The first figure shows the cases in which the recipient requests assistance from the first provider. Once both partners draw up a joint proposal, it is submitted to the second provider who, after accepting the proposal, joins the triangulation as the third actor. This is the case, for instance, of the projects implemented under the framework of Germany’s Regional Fund for Triangular Cooperation in Latin America and the Caribbean.

b) The second figure represents the initiatives in which the recipient submitted the request for an SSC project to the first provider, who had already signed a Triangular Cooperation partnership framework with another partner, and who finally also participates in the project as the second provider. This was the case, for instance, of projects funded by the Spain-Chile Mixed Fund, or the Triangular Cooperation Programs in which Spain partners with Costa Rica and El Salvador.

c) The third figure refers, for instance, to the way in which the Partnership Program between Japan and several Latin America countries works. Through these agreements, Japan and its partner (who will act as the first provider) organize regional training courses and workshops, in which several countries are invited to participate simultaneously. These countries will take on the role of recipients, once they have submitted a formal request.

Source: SEGIB, based on reporting from cooperation agencies and/or bureaus
STRENGTHENING CAPACITIES AND CONTRIBUTING TO THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

III.5

An exercise that sought to align this paper with the then recently approved 2030 Agenda was first carried out in the 2016 edition of the Report on South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America. Two years later, this exercise continues with the analysis of the potential contribution of SSC and Triangular Cooperation projects implemented in the region to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). In that time, however, the Ibero-American space has also been working on building a common methodology that will be implemented in the future for this task, and that will be reflected in each forthcoming edition of the Report. Box II.7 in the second chapter, gives more details about this process.

On this basis, this edition of the Report identifies which of the 17 SDGs benefit from the 100 Triangular Cooperation projects implemented in 2016. Bearing in mind, however, that many projects have a multisectoral content or focus on aspects traditionally considered as cross-cutting, the analysis will also determine whether, in those cases, they could also be contributing to a second SDG. This allows the analysis to distinguish between the cooperation’s contributions to a "main SDG" and its potential contributions to a "secondary SDG". The combination of these two levels enables detailed insight into how the countries implement Triangular Cooperation in the context of the 2030 Agenda.

The results are shown on two graphs:

a) The first one, Graph III.7.1, illustrates the distribution of the 100 Triangular Cooperation projects carried out in the region in 2016 and the main SDG to which they contributed.

b) The second one, Graph III.7.2, focuses on the 64 projects that may have contributed to a secondary SDG.

Graph III.7.1 appears to suggest that:

a) As in previous years, SDGs 2 and 16 appear to have benefited the most from Triangular Cooperation in 2016. This outcome is consistent with the sectoral analysis, given that SDG 2 focuses on issues that are highly relevant to SSC in our region, such as agricultural sustainability and productivity and food security, while SDG 16 is related to institutional strengthening and promoting the rule of law. Not surprisingly, a third of the 100 projects registered in 2016 contributed to these two Goals. In particular:
• 17% of Triangular Cooperation projects in 2016 contributed to SDG 2. Worthy of note are the projects undertaken by Brazil, both in partnership with FAO and with Honduras and the United States, to advance on this issue. Also of especial interest are the experiences promoted by Chile with the WFP, through the Project Against Hunger and Poverty, as well as between Mexico and Argentina to improve seeds, increase the resilience of small-scale farmers and enhance the cocoa production chain.

• Another 17% contributed to SDG 16. In this case, the projects sought to strengthen institutions both by building effective public institutions (implementing digital systems, improving the capacities of the civil service, etc.), and constructing and consolidating the rule of law and promoting peace (defense of Human Rights, peace building, etc.).

b) The third and fourth SDGs in importance were, respectively, 8 (Decent work and economic growth) and 3 (Good health and well-being). Indeed, 11% of the projects were mostly oriented towards access to employment, strengthening of the productive sectors of the economy, support for MSMEs and sustainable tourism, all of which contribute to SDG 8. Meanwhile, another 10% of the projects could contribute to SDG 3. This contribution, in particular, was achieved through initiatives that, in sectoral terms, are classified under Health and Population and Reproductive Health activities, which is especially closely linked to improvement of health services (care and creation of networks), communicable diseases and reduction of maternal mortality.

c) 18% of the projects in 2016 contributed, in equal parts, to SDGs 11 and 13. More specifically, 9% of the triangular exchanges aligned with SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities). The initiatives geared towards urban planning and management and resilience to natural disasters are included here. On the other hand, another 9% contributed to SDG 13 (Climate Action). It should be noted, however, that this Goal is closely linked to SDG 14 (Life below Water) and 15 (Life on Land). Therefore, if the projects that benefited these three SDGs are added to the mix, it can be argued that 16% of the initiatives in 2016 were strongly geared towards the environment. This includes experiences already addressed at the sectoral level, which combined processes for adapting to climate change with protection of areas that sometimes combined maritime, coastal and inland areas.

d) The last 20% of the projects were distributed as follows: 12%, divided into three equal parts (4% each), contributed to SDGs 5 (Gender Equality), 7 (Affordable and Clean Energy) and 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production); another 6%, also in equal parts, focused on SDG 1 (No Poverty) and 6 (Clean Water and Sanitation); while a number of projects revolved around Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure (SDG 9) and Partnerships for the Goals (SDG 17).

Finally, the interpretation of Graphs III.7 and III.8, relating to the contribution of the 100 triangular projects in 2016 to a main SDG, and of the 64 projects that also benefited a secondary SDG, should be complemented by reading Diagram III.6, which illustrates the link established between the main and secondary SDGs of each project.
GRAPH III.7
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Source: SEGIB, based on reporting from cooperation agencies and/or bureaus
GRAPH III.8
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Units

Source: SEGIB, based on reporting from cooperation agencies and/or bureaus
It can be concluded from the combined reading of these graphs that:

a) 11% of projects were not only contributing to the achievement of a single goal, but also to SDG 10 (Reduced Inequalities), which did not appear as the main SDG in any project. For instance, many projects on employment (SDG 8) also focused on youth, and some Health-related projects (SDG 3) simultaneously touched on sparsely-populated places or assistance for adult population. SDGs 1 and 10 were strongly interconnected through projects that revolved around strengthening social protection policies in hard-to-reach or sparsely populated areas.

b) Meanwhile, 10% of the projects had SDG 17 as secondary ODS; an ODS that only appears once as the main SDG in any project. For instance, many projects on employment (SDG 8) also focused on youth, and some Health-related projects (SDG 3) simultaneously touched on sparsely-populated places or assistance for adult population. SDGs 1 and 10 were strongly interconnected through projects that revolved around strengthening social protection policies in hard-to-reach or sparsely populated areas.

c) Another 6% of Triangular Cooperation projects had SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth) as its secondary goal. In this case, the projects were primarily exchanges for improving the yield of certain crops for its ulterior marketing; therefore, SDG 2 (Zero Hunger) was its main SDG. Meanwhile, a similar proportion of projects (another 6%) had SDG 16 (Strong Institutions) as its secondary goal. In this case, it tied in with SDG 17, which, as outlined in the previous point, focuses on strengthening national institutions.

d) Finally, the analysis identified some sporadic and secondary contributions to the remaining SDGs, albeit in relatively few projects, between 1% and 5%. The only exception were SDGs 5 and 6, two instances in which no secondary SDGs were identified.
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SDGS BY NUMBER OF PROJECTS THAT SIMULTANEOUSLY CONTRIBUTE TO BOTH SDGS

Source: SEGIB, based on reporting from cooperation agencies and/or bureaus