Ibero-America and Bilateral South-South Cooperation

This second chapter of the *Report on South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America 2019* is dedicated to the systematization and analysis of projects and actions in which Ibero-American countries participated under one of the three modalities recognized in this space: Bilateral South-South Cooperation. This modality, as shown in Chart II.1, is the one which has registered, throughout the last decade, a larger relative importance. Consequently, it can be argued that 8 out of 10 of the more than 8,200 South-South Cooperation initiatives which were exchanged by the countries of the region in the 2007-2017 period, have been implemented under this modality.

In this sense, and taking advantage of the accumulated information the region currently has after twelve editions of the *Report of South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America*, the chapter addresses the analysis of this modality combining a double temporal perspective: on the one hand, that related to what occurred with the initiatives which were under execution in 2017 (this being the last year of which there is available data); and, on the other hand, the perspective that affects the historic evolution of this modality up to 2017, considering 2007 as the starting point, year in which the first edition of this report was published. The combination of this double perspective significantly enriches not only this analysis but also its results, as it broadens the possibility of its contextualization.

According to the aforementioned, the chapter analyzes Bilateral South-South Cooperation in which Ibero-American countries participated in 2017 and, considering, when necessary, what occurred during the last decade, makes emphasis on relations between countries, on the way in which specific capacities were strengthened and, especially, on the possible and potential alignment of South-South Cooperation to the 2030 Agenda, boosted to guide countries’ efforts to achieve Sustainable Development.
The work that since 2007 has been led by the Ibero-American General Secretariat (SEGIB), along with the Ibero-American Program for the Strengthening of South-South Cooperation (PIFCCS) and with its member countries, has enabled an accumulation of knowledge on South-South Cooperation, in its different recognized modalities, which is unprecedented for a developing region. Proof of this are, without any doubt, the twelve editions of this report, together with the commemorative book “A decade of South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America”. However, there are other important and equally relevant milestones which are worth highlighting, among which is, since 2015, the design and implementation of the only existing online data platform on South-South Cooperation in a developing region: the Ibero-American Integrated Data System on South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SIDICSS by its Spanish acronym).

In fact, and although its implementation is more recent, an exercise of data migration has enabled SIDICSS to gather all the initiatives that, since 2007, coinciding with the first edition of this Report, Ibero-American countries have registered and validated to explain South-South Cooperation in which they have participated throughout this period. This data accumulation enables the reconstruction of this cooperation’s most recent history and is summarized in the number shown in the first graph which disaggregates, by modalities, the 8,208 SSC actions, projects and programs which have been under execution in at least one of the years of the 2007-2017 period.

As is illustrated in the graph, the larger part (8 of every 10) of South-South Cooperation exchanges which took place in the considered period where developed under a Bilateral modality, followed by the boost to Triangular Cooperation initiatives (more than 1,000, equivalent to a 13.6% of the total executed), arranged by relative importance, while almost 375 initiatives (4.5% of the total) were executed under a Regional modality.

This data accumulation also enables the reconstruction of the 2007-2017 period historical series, which is displayed in the second graph. In fact, this image reveals the evolution of actions, projects and programs which, year after year, were under execution, not only under each of the three SSC modalities which are recognized in this space (Bilateral, Triangular and Regional) but also in its aggregated total. Indeed, and as the graph shows, the total of initiatives under execution throughout 2017, more than 1,300, represents a number...
which is 11.8% higher than the one registered in 2007, when total exchanges climbed to 1,171. This increase, equivalent to 139 initiatives, has followed an irregular trajectory: an intense increase in the 2007-2013 period, when an average growth rate of 8.6% enabled the total of programs, projects and actions to reach a historical maximum close to 1,900; a deceleration, between that same year and 2017, when a negative average growth rate of -8.8% again caused a downfall in total exchanges, reaching the already mentioned figure of 1,310 SSC initiatives.

Finally, it is worth adding that, the increase of basically 140 exchanges registered in the total amount between 2007 and 2017 was explained, mainly, by Triangular Cooperation’s growth dynamic. In fact, 62.2% of this growth responded to the increase of initiatives executed under the Triangular modality: from 88 registered in the first year to 175 in 2017. Another 25% of this final growth was explained by the increase of the Regional SSC executed programs and projects from 50 in 2007 to 105 at the end of the period. As a result, Bilateral SSC variation (from 1,013 to 1,030) hardly explained a 12.2% of the final registered variation.

Source: SEGIB based on Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation
Consequently, the present chapter is structured as follows:

a) The first section focuses the analysis on the projects and actions which Ibero-American countries were executing, at least at some moment, in 2017. From a regional perspective, this approach enables the dimension of what occurred during that year, the understanding of how many exchanges took place and the identification of their main characteristics. In addition, and to contextualize what happened in 2017, a historical series is designed that reveals which was the registered dynamic for this type of initiatives in the 2007-2017 period.

b) The second, combines the regional and country focus and analyzes the participation of each one of these in the total of 2017 Bilateral SSC: how intense was their activity and under which role (provider or recipient) was more likely to be executed. In order to illustrate the main results, this section includes some maps (different according to the exercise of each role) in which different colors are assigned to all 19 Ibero-American countries which participate of this modality and the color intensity varies as varies their level of participation.

c) The third section analyzes the type of relation between Ibero-American countries when developing exchanges under this modality of Bilateral SSC; it shows who exchanged with whom, under what role and with what intensity. Results offered by this analysis, combined with a historic perspective, shed light on to what extent relations between countries have tended to diversify or if, on the contrary, there is a certain preference and even dependence profile between each other.

d) This chapter then addresses an essential issue, given the technical nature of South-South Cooperation with which this report is developed: the identification of those capacities that were strengthened as a result of countries’ exchanges between each other. In fact, and given de adopted perspective, this fourth section enables the analysis not only of strengthened capacities as a result of added efforts, but also of the profile strengthened by each country through its exchanges with the rest of its partners.

e) The chapter closes with an exercise that goes beyond capacity strengthening and which intends to identify how, through this, the Bilateral SSC in which the region is participating can potentially contribute to advance in the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. This is an exercise that continues what has already been done in previous editions of this Report and is supported by the application of a methodology that has been collectively developed by Ibero-American countries, together with SEGIB and the Ibero-American Program for the Strengthening of South-South Cooperation (PIFCSS).

Over the last decade, Bilateral SSC is the modality which has registered a greater relative importance
II.1

BILATERAL SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION PROJECTS AND ACTIONS IN 2017

Throughout 2017, the 19 Ibero-American countries which participate in South-South Cooperation in the Bilateral modality, exchanged, with the rest of their partners of the region, a total of 733 projects and 160 actions which, aggregated, added up to 893 initiatives.

This is suggested in Graph II.1, plotted to depict the evolution of SSC initiatives which were annually being executed by the countries of the region between 2007 and 2017 (first and last years for which data is available). In fact, this Graph also shows similar figures for 2017 and 2016, which would apparently suggest that projects and actions were under execution for more than one year. A deeper analysis of the available data, however, confirms that the region’s dynamism is still noticeable and responds, to a large extent, to the boost countries gave, in 2017, to the execution of new projects and actions. Specifically:

a) In 2017, the total of 893 Bilateral SSC initiatives which were under execution in the region barely presented a slight increase (of 1.9%) compared to those of the previous year (876). This small variation is explained, in turn, by the also low increases registered in the number of projects (2.1% which would raise the final figure from 718 in 2016 to 733 in 2017) and actions (1.3% from 158 to 160).

b) However, and as was anticipated, these slight variations do not mean that Bilateral SSC in 2017 has not shown a renewed dynamism. Graph II.2 was designed to illustrate this. It differentiates projects and actions that were under execution in 2017, according to the year in which they started: 2017 or before. Its analysis confirms that 95.4% of the 160 actions registered in 2017 were initiated during that same year and that just 4.6% of these were launched some moment before. In relation to projects, approximately 4 out of 10 were also new initiatives, launched in 2017, while 6 out of 10 were extensions of others dated from 2016 (28.2% of the 733 projects) and even from previous years (a remarkable 34.0%).
Given the aforementioned, that change dynamic is much more intense in terms of actions rather than of projects coincides with the fact that the latter require longer periods of time to achieve their complete execution. In this sense, Graph II.3 distributes 2017 projects and actions according to the elapsed time between the beginning and the end of its execution (measured in days). Its analysis (based on the available sample) suggests the following:

- 50% of the projects which were under execution in 2017 correspond to initiatives which implementation period was of between 450 (1 year and 2 months) and 840 days (2 years and 3 months). The other 50% would register significantly variable durations which could oscillate between minimum values of 2-5 days and maximum values of 1,408 (almost 4 years). In addition, and however, incidentally, we could also come across projects which duration is larger, up to 9 years. Given these periods, the average time required to ensure a project’s complete execution would be of 796 days (slightly more than two years and two months).

- In contrast, periods of time required for the implementation of actions oscillate between ranges of much lower values than the ones registered for projects. In this sense, and as is shown in Graph II.3, actions’ usual duration frequency fluctuates between 1 and 29 days. The possibility however that these actions exceptionally coexist with others of a larger duration (training courses or workshops which count as such, but continue for one or more than one year), explains that these initiatives’ average duration rises and is situated above, in 77 days, equivalent to 2 months and a half.

---

1 This distribution is presented through a “boxplot” or a “box and whisker plot”. This type of graph enables the distribution of analyzed values in ascending order on the vertical axes, where the minimum (lower horizontal bar) and maximum (upper horizontal bar) values are connected. A “box” is plotted on the vertical line in order to depict the data by quartiles: the first 25% of values is situated between the minimum value (lower bar) and the bottom of the box; the second 25% is situated between the bottom of the box and the value that corresponds to the median, which divides the box into two; the third quartile is situated between the median and the top of the box; and the fourth and last 25%, is situated between the top of the box and the upper horizontal bar (that is, the maximum value). In addition, a number of dots can appear above and/or below the upper and lower bars. These values are considered outliers. Additionally, one of the values situated on the vertical line, marked with a cross, represents the arithmetic mean.

2 In order to estimate the duration of an initiative, it is necessary to count with initiatives’ starting and ending dates, simultaneously. Regarding 2017, both dates are available for 90% of SSC actions and 70% of SSC projects.
In this sense, the existing distance between projects and actions, in terms of their duration, confirms something that has already been suggested in previous editions of this Report: these two instruments present different dimensions.

An analysis of these 2017 same actions and projects, but in this case considering the required financial resources for their execution, confirms this same idea, which is illustrated in Box II.2.

**BOX II.2**

AN APPROACH TO BILATERAL SSC PROJECTS AND ACTIONS COSTS

Even today, and in spite of the efforts made in the last years, Ibero-American countries’ Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation are still facing enormous difficulties to account for the associated costs of SSC activities in which they participate. Problems to register these costs are evident in the first graph, which was plotted to discriminate between projects and actions and associate each of them with up to 12 different costs’ items, depending on the combination that results of differentiating budgeted and executed costs; what corresponds to the year of the execution (2017) or to the whole initiative cycle; and whether costs are covered by the provider, the recipient or both partners.

Its analysis confirms that the availability of this information is still low and it is even lower for actions (more specific) than for projects (with a larger duration or importance). In fact, the highest available figure would correspond to 32% of a total of 160 actions registered in 2017 and would refer to the cost the provider destined to its execution in that same year. Meanwhile, and in terms of projects, the best-case scenario would enable the identification of the Budgeted Cost (also by provider) in 27% of the 733 exchanged projects during 2017.
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DATA AVAILABILITY IN TERMS OF THE DIFFERENT VARIANTS OF PROJECTS AND ACTIONS COSTS. 2017

Percentage over the total of projects and actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BUDGETED COST 2017</th>
<th>TOTAL BUDGETED COST</th>
<th>EXECUTED COST 2017</th>
<th>TOTAL EXECUTED COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the aforementioned, low data availability limits the possibility to analyze SSC in terms of costs. Nevertheless, one of the existing options to approach this matter is to develop an analysis of frequencies which considers those figures that are usually repeated in a larger number of occasions. This way, taking 2017 Budgeted Cost as a reference (which is mainly available for projects), and as shown in the graph that was plotted for this purpose, it can be argued that: in 2017, one half of the 23% of Bilateral SSC projects for which this figure is available, had a total budgeted cost of between 18,309 and 109,122 dollars, covered by the provider. Meanwhile, the other half of this 23% registered lower or higher values than this range, however hardly ever higher than 227,000 dollars. On the other hand, 50% of the total of actions (almost 30) for which this same figure is available, were executed with a total budget of between 495 and 13,310 dollars, covered by the provider. The rest of the values varied and, only very exceptionally, situated over the barrier of 19,275 dollars. The amounts between which these values oscillate, also suggest projects and actions different dimension, a higher one for the former. This supports the fact that the average total budgeted cost, by provider, had climbed to 333,234 dollars in case of projects and to just 30,643 dollars in terms of actions.

Source: SEGIB based on Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation
Finally, the analysis of 2017 must be completed by the contextualization of what occurred during that year, considering a longer period of time; specifically, the one that begins more than a decade ago, in 2007, corresponding with the first year for which SSC records are available. For that purpose, it is worth turning on again to Graph II.1 and highlight the following:

a) The total of initiatives which were exchanged in 2017 (893) was 21.0% higher than the one registered 11 years before (738). This outcome results from the combination of two opposite dynamics: on the one hand, the remarkable increase (96.5%) of the number of projects, which almost duplicates the final value from 373 in 2007 to 733 in 2017; and, on the other hand, the significant fall undergone by actions (-56.2%), which explains their reduction to more than a half in a period of 11 years (365 to 160).

b) In aggregated terms, the different behavior is also reflected in different average growth rates: while projects augmented an average annual rate of 8.3%, actions registered an average reduction pace of -0.4%. This changes the relative importance of both instruments in total exchanges. Indeed, and as it is portrayed in Graph II.1, during these last years, projects have consolidated as the preferred instrument for the implementation of Bilateral SSC: more than 80% of the initiatives in 2017 were SSC projects, while only 20% were actions. This distribution in terms of both instruments contrasts with values registered in the beginning of the analyzed period, 2007, when exchanged initiatives (738) were evenly distributed (50%) around both instruments.

c) Analysis of the graph also suggests that projects and actions trends have not been stable throughout all the period. In fact, Graph II.1 enables the distinction of, at least, three stages in relation to projects: an intense growth between 2007 and 2011, when the average annual increase was of a high 22.6%; a relative stagnation until 2015; and a progressive fall (-4.4%), until 2017. Meanwhile, changes in terms of actions were even more irregular, with maximum values (115.3% in 2013) which resulted in figures over 400 initiatives. This contrasts with the lowest figure (-57% in 2015) which, during the last 3 years, provokes actions to oscillate between 150 and 160.

II.2
BILATERAL SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION IN 2017: A GEOGRAPHICAL PERSPECTIVE

Maps II.1 and II.1.2 were designed to depict the distribution of each of the 19 Ibero-American countries’ participation in the 733 Bilateral SSC projects which were exchanged in the region throughout 2017: in the first case, from the providers’ perspective, and in the second, from the recipients’ standpoint. For this purpose, in each Map, a color is assigned to each country. The color intensity increases as the percentage of participation is in a band with a higher range of values.³

The total number of initiatives exchanged in 2017 was 21.0% higher than that of 2007, a result influenced by the remarkable increase in the number of projects.

³ As explained in the legend, participation percentages are distributed in seven bands of different values which go from 0.0% up to percentages higher than 12.6%, every 2.5% percentage points.
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II.1.1. By provider

MAP II.1

Legend: Intensity bands, according to percentage of provided cooperation projects in 2017

- More than 12.5%
- Between 10.1% and 12.5%
- Between 7.6% and 10.0%
- Between 5.1% and 7.5%
- Between 2.6% and 5.0%
- Between 0.1% and 2.5%
- No projects registered

Source: SEGIB based on Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation
GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF COOPERATION PROJECTS, BY ROLE. 2017

II.1.2. By recipient

Total: 733

Legend: Intensity bands, according to the percentage of received cooperation projects in 2017

- More than 12.5%
- Between 10.1% and 12.5%
- Between 7.6% and 10.0%
- Between 5.1% and 7.5%
- Between 2.6% and 5.0%
- Between 0.1% and 2.5%
- No projects registered

Source: SEGIB based on Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation
Consequently, on the one hand and in terms of the intensity with which Ibero-American countries participated as providers in the 733 projects during 2017, analysis of the Map suggests that:

a) For the second consecutive year, Mexico was the country which participated as provider in a larger number of occasions: in a total of 158 projects, corresponding to 1 out of 5 projects executed in 2017. In terms of relative importance, Chile, Argentina and Brazil followed, the first two with more than 100 projects under execution (127 and 105 respectively), and the third with a close figure (94). Anyhow, these 3 countries relative shares fluctuated between 12.8% and 17.3%; values which, added to Brazil’s, result in these 4 countries being responsible for 2 out of 3 of the total of 733 exchanges finally executed in 2017 under this role.

b) Meanwhile, Colombia and Cuba were providers in a total of 66 and 61 projects, in each case. Their aggregated contribution explained more than 17.3% of total exchanges. In this sense, roles played by countries such as Uruguay (with almost 50 projects as provider) and Peru (with a total of 25) were also important. Together, the participation of these other 4 countries explained slightly more than a quarter (27.7%) of the total of projects which were under execution during some moment in 2017.

c) Considering the aforementioned, the remaining 11 countries were responsible, to different extents, for the remaining 6.7% of the projects exchanged in 2017 (almost 50). Countries such as Costa Rica, Paraguay and Ecuador stand out in this group. With 10, 11 and 13 projects respectively, these countries increasingly combined the recipient and provider roles in Bilateral SSC. This also occurred with other Andean and Central-American countries that have traditionally been recipients, which in 2017 burst as providers in 6 projects (Bolivia), 3 (Honduras) and 2 (El Salvador and Guatemala), together with 2 projects executed by the Dominican Republic. In addition, during 2017, only 3 countries (Nicaragua, Panama and Venezuela) were not Bilateral SSC providers.

On the other hand, regarding what occurred with country’s participation under the recipient role, and according to Map II.1.2, it can be argued that:

a) As it has been uninterruptedly occurring since 2013, El Salvador was the country which, in 2017, participated in a larger number of projects under the recipient role: specifically, in 82, corresponding to 11.2% of the total exchanges during this year. Four other countries followed El Salvador with about 20 initiatives more. These four had a significant role both under the provider and the recipient roles: Colombia, Mexico, Uruguay and Argentina, each one of them with between 63 and 58 projects which, aggregated, account for a third part of the 733 projects which were under execution in 2017.

b) Meanwhile, basically 3 out of 10 projects registered in 2017, were received by Honduras together with the other 4 countries which, from north to south, would shape a strip in the western part of the continent (Peru, Bolivia, Paraguay y Chile). In fact, each one of them would participate in a number of exchanges which would fluctuate between 40-50.

c) Another fifth of the total of the 733 projects under execution in 2017 is explained by the participation, under the recipient role, of 6 countries: Cuba, Guatemala, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic and Panama, in the Central-America and Caribbean regions; together with Ecuador, in the Andean region. The number of projects in which each of these participated, under the recipient role, would fluctuate between Panama’s 19 and 33 of the largest of the West Indies’, corresponding, in turn, to a relative share between 2.6% and 4.5%.

d) According to the above, the 16 countries that have been mentioned up to this point would be responsible for more than 95% of the total exchanges in which countries participated under the recipient role. The remaining 4.5% would be completed with contributions from Nicaragua (14 projects), Venezuela (10) and Brazil (9). In addition, there would be 3 projects (vaguely 0.4% of the total) in which several countries (Central-American and Andean) would simultaneously share the recipient role.4

4 The recipient role would be shared in 2 projects in which Colombia is the provider; Guatemala and Costa Rica would be recipients in the former while Bolivia, Honduras, El Salvador and Peru would be in the latter; and in a third project in which Mexico would be the provider and Costa Rica and Panama would be the recipients.
II.4.2. Countries with a predominantly recipient role

- El Salvador
- Uruguay
- Peru
- Bolivia
- Honduras
- Paraguay
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- Costa Rica
- Dominican Republic
- Ecuador
- Panama
- Nicaragua
- Venezuela

*Source: SEGIB based on Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation*
In addition, the intensity through which these 19 countries participated in 2017 in Bilateral SSC, acting as providers and/or as recipients, can be also analyzed from another perspective: one which enables the understanding of how each country has combined both roles. For this purpose, Graphs II.4.1 and II.4.2 were plotted; they portray in how many projects each country participated as recipient (bars situated to the left of the vertical axis), and in how many as provider (bars to the right). In fact:

a) The first (II.4.1) assigns and distributes that total of projects in the 6 countries (from Mexico to Cuba) which participated of Bilateral SSC predominantly as providers, which also means that the provider-recipient ratio was equal or higher than 1.

b) The second (II.4.2), does the same with the 13 countries (from El Salvador to Venezuela) which were predominantly recipients. In this case, the proportion is inverse and the value which is equal or higher than 1 is the recipient-provider ratio.

An analysis of Graphs II.4.1 and 2 reveals the following:

a) With reference to the six countries which participated in a larger number of projects under the provider role, and for which, in addition, this role was predominant (Graph II.4.1), the developed provider-recipient ratio enables the distinction of several behavior patterns:

- First, Colombia's, a country with a clear dual role, for which the proportion between what it provided (66) and what it received (63), is almost equivalent and equal to 1;
- Second, Cuba's and Argentina's, in which what was provided (61 and 105 respectively) hardly duplicated (1.8) what was received (33 and 58, in each case);
- On the other hand, Mexico and Chile would stand out, which provider-recipient ratio would raise from 3 to 1 (158 and 127 under the provider role, respectively, compared to 63 and 43 as recipients);
- Finally, the most distinctive pattern was Brazil's, for which the proportion of the number of projects in which it acted as provider (94) and as recipient (9), climbed from over 10 to 1.

b) Meanwhile, for those countries which predominantly participated of Bilateral SSC in 2017 under the recipient role (Graph II.4.2), recipient-provider ratios oscillated between Uruguay’s minimum value (of 1.3, close to 1, when combining 62 and 48 projects under each role respectively) and El Salvador’s maximum value (main recipient in 2017 with 82 projects which had a proportion of 41 to 1 together with the 2 initiatives in which this country started acting as provider). Several behavior patterns can be situated in these extremes’ margins:

- On the one hand, Peru, Costa Rica and Ecuador were, together with already mentioned Uruguay, the countries which mostly committed to performing a dual role, with relatively low recipient-provider ratios, between the already mentioned 1.3 corresponding to Uruguayan cooperation up to around 2, corresponding to the other three countries. Meanwhile, for those countries which predominantly participated of Bilateral SSC in 2017 under the recipient role (Graph II.4.2), recipient-provider ratios oscillated between Uruguay’s minimum value (of 1.3, close to 1, when combining 62 and 48 projects under each role respectively) and El Salvador’s maximum value (main recipient in 2017 with 82 projects which had a proportion of 41 to 1 together with the 2 initiatives in which this country started acting as provider). Several behavior patterns can be situated in these extremes’ margins:

- On the other hand, the rest of the countries which were predominantly recipients, can be grouped as the difference in the number of received and provided projects increases. The first group would be formed by Paraguay and Bolivia. The number of projects in which these two countries participated as recipients (around 40 each) tended to multiply the projects in which they participated as providers (9 and 6) between 4.3 and 7 times. The second group would be formed by the Dominican Republic, Guatemala and Honduras, with between 24 and 39 projects received and hardly 2 or 3 specific initiatives provided. This rises the proportion between both groups up to 12 or even 16.5 to 1. Finally, it is worth mentioning Nicaragua, Panama and Venezuela, which, as already mentioned, only counted from the recipient role.
The intensity with which Ibero-American countries participated in the total of Bilateral SSC projects which were under execution in 2017, both acting as providers and recipients, as well as the manner in which each of them combined the exercise of both roles, results of a process of years throughout which SSC has tended to be more diverse and inclusive: more countries uniting efforts and exchanging with others capacities that, undoubtedly, contribute not only to their own strengthening but also to the reinforcement of the whole region. At the very least, this is suggested in Box II.3, which contextualizes what occurred in 2017 in a broader period of time, which beginning is set in 2007, first year for which data is available. In order to determine the changes that could have occurred, the exercise recurs to concentration and dispersion indicators, already used in previous editions of this report, with which it is possible to draw interesting conclusions regarding trends followed by countries’ shares.

**BOX II.3**

**TOWARDS A MORE DIVERSE AND INCLUSIVE PARTICIPATION: THE 2007-2017 PERIOD**

When comparing the 2007-2017 period data regarding the way in which the Ibero-American countries participate in executed Bilateral SSC projects, both as providers and as recipients, relevant changes can be noticed. More specifically:

a) On the one hand, countries which are capable of being providers are increasing: 10 in 2007 compared to 16 in 2017. In fact, countries which were originally recipients and could hardly perform a second role during the first years, are providers with a rising significance today. The following examples illustrate the former appreciation well enough. In 2007, Uruguay acted as provider in only 1 project, while in 2017 it promoted up to 48 projects. Also, Costa Rica and Peru, both with only 1 project as providers in 2007, promoted up to 13 and 25 projects respectively, 11 years later.

b) On the other hand, countries which in 2007 already led the Bilateral SSC list as providers (such are the cases of Argentina, Mexico, and Chile, just to mention some of them), but hardly registered participation as recipients, demonstrated their strength in 2017 combining a growing dual role. Particularly as recipients, in 2007, Argentina participated in only 3 projects, Mexico in other 3 and Chile in 2. In contrast, in 2017, the number of these initiatives for each of these countries had significantly increased up to 58, 63 and 43, respectively.

c) Additionally, there seems to have been a reduction in the distance between countries’ relative share in each year, in the total number of projects, both as providers and as recipients. In fact, in 2007, the minimum provided by one country represented 0.0% in a total of 321 registered projects, while the maximum was a high 30.0%. The country which received the least represented a 0.6% of the total and the one which received the most, represented 12.8%. Data regarding the 733 exchanged projects in 2017 showed a smaller gap: between 0.0% and 21.0% for the first case (9 points less than 11 years before); and between 1.2% and 11.2% for the second case (2.1 percental points less).

d) The aforementioned data also confirms another trend: in terms of provision, the existing distance between the minimum and the maximum share is always higher than in the reception.
Intuitively, the former suggests Bilateral SSC is more concentrated among countries when they perform the role of providers rather than recipients. It also reveals the tendency that this difference becomes increasingly less remarkable, given that Ibero-American countries are diversifying the way (and the role) in which they participate in Bilateral SSC. The application of an indicator is needed to verify this rigorous assumption: the Herfindahl Index (HI) is an indicator which measures the degree of concentration and dispersion of international trade or a country’s share in this. When adapted to SSC, the HI synthesizes two types of information in a unique value between 0 and 1: 1) what happens with “concentration” in terms of the number of countries (more or less) which took part in the exchanges both as providers or recipients; and 2) the “dispersion” shown by the values of these participations (between very distant minimums and maximums, or between very close values). The value range in which this index varies, determines its interpretation:

a) A value lower than 0.1000 indicates that SSC is “diversified” (more countries are participating and their relative shares in the total are relatively close).

b) Values between 0.1000 and 0.1800 reveal a “moderate concentration” of SSC (a smaller number of countries are participating in SSC with an increasing dispersion between maximum and minimum shares).

c) If higher than 0.1800, SSC is “very concentrated” (an increasingly reduced number of countries with relative share values which are progressively far away from each other).

**Evolution of the Degree of Concentration and Dispersion of Bilateral SSC Projects, by Countries’ Role. 2007-2017.**

Herfindahl Index, with four decimals

![Graph showing the evolution of Herfindahl Index from 2007 to 2017, with data points for both projects provided and received.](Image)

Source: SEGIB based on Cooperation Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation
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Finally, Maps II.2.1 and II.2.2 were designed to show the intensity with which Ibero-American countries participated in the 160 Bilateral SSC actions that were under execution during some moment in 2017, both under the provider and recipient roles. The graph confirms what data intuitively suggested:

a) First, during the whole 2007-2017 period, the line linking the annual values of the HI for provided projects is situated in the upper part of the graph while the line of the HI calculated for the received projects is situated in the bottom. This, together with the constant gap between both lines suggests, as expected, that countries’ participation in annually exchanged Bilateral SSC projects is always more concentrated from the providers’ perspective (less countries with relative shares which are more apart) than from the recipients’ perspective (more countries participating and with relative shares which are nearer).

b) Second, both lines’ trend is descendant and this descent is even more remarkable when the HI is measured for providers. This should confirm countries’ progressive participation in Bilateral SSC in the exercise of both roles. In fact, in 2007, HI values suggested a high concentration among a few providers (0.1894) and a diversified SSC between recipients (0.0754). In 2017, countries’ progressive participation in Bilateral SSC in both roles and with an increasing number of projects, justifies the reduction of both values: providers’ HI to 0.1348 (a value which can be associated with a “moderate concentration”) and recipients’ HI to 0.0670.

Source: SEGIB based on Cooperation Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation

Finally, Maps II.2.1 and II.2.2 were designed to show the intensity with which Ibero-American countries participated in the 160 Bilateral SSC actions that were under execution during some moment in 2017, both under the provider and recipient roles, respectively. Their analysis suggests the following:

a) Bilateral SSC actions offered in 2017 were significantly concentrated in 4 countries: Peru, Colombia, Mexico and Chile which, under this role, participated in 38 and 21 actions, respectively. Their aggregated contribution explained more than two thirds (68.8%) of the 160 registered actions. Another fifth resulted from the contributions of Costa Rica, Guatemala and El Salvador (5-7 actions in each case) on the one hand, and Ecuador’s and Argentina’s, on the other hand. In addition, the remaining 11.9% of the actions (a total of 19) is explained by specific exchanges of up to 9 countries: Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama in Central-America, Cuba and the Dominican Republic in the Caribbean; and Bolivia, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay in South-America. Meanwhile, the only country which did not act as provider of Bilateral SSC actions in 2017 was Venezuela.
b) On the other hand, the fact that the second Map combines less intense colors than the first one (II.2.1), suggests that received actions were less concentrated than provided ones. This way, Peru was again the most dynamic country, participating in 34 actions, corresponding to 21.3% of the 160 registered. Three countries with more uneven relative shares followed: Guatemala, with 32 initiatives, corresponding to another 20% of the total; Colombia and Ecuador, with 20 and 15 actions which represented 12.5% and 9.4%, in each case. When Bolivia (recipient in 10 actions) is added to these 4 countries, 2 out of 3 of 2017 total actions (160), are explained.

The remaining third adds the contribution of up to 12 countries: on the one hand, contributions of Honduras, El Salvador, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic and Chile, with between 5 and 7 exchanges respectively, which, aggregated, represent 18.8% of the total; on the other hand, inputs from Mexico, Panama and Cuba, together with Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay and Brazil, which, with between 1 and 4 specific exchanges, add another 11.9%. In addition, other 3 actions must be considered as part of these exchanges, in which several countries shared the reception, including Nicaragua and Venezuela which, in 2017, only acted as recipients in Bilateral SSC actions that were shared between more than one country, but did not individually acted as recipients.

c) Finally, and considering the way in which Ibero-American countries combined both roles in terms of provided and received actions, it is worth highlighting the way in which Peru participated in the exchanges, performing a dual role and explaining the highest number of actions both as provider (38) and as recipient (34), ratio which is very close to 1 (1.1). Another remarkable country was Colombia (second provider and third recipient, in terms of relative importance) which combined the exercise of both roles in 27 and 20 occasions, respectively, with a ratio of 1.4. Although there were other countries which had similar provider-recipient ratios (around 1.4 and 1.5), their share always considered a much lower volume of actions which, aggregated, were no higher than 10-12. For example, Costa Rica, Argentina and Uruguay, with a ratio provider which favors the provider, as well as El Salvador, with a predominantly recipient profile.

---

5 In fact, calculated Herfindahl Indexes for the way in which countries participated, both under the provider and the recipient roles, augmented, respectively, to 0.1341 and to 0.1228. This means that, in both cases, Bilateral SSC was “moderately concentrated” but, in any case, was slightly higher in terms of providers (Map II.2.1) than in terms of recipients (II.2.2).

6 In order to illustrate, Costa Rica combined 7 actions as provider and 5 as recipient and El Salvador does inversely (5 and 7, respectively).
MAP II.2

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF COOPERATION ACTIONS, BY ROLE. 2017

II.2.1. By provider

Total: 160

- **Peru**: 38 Actions (23.8%)
  - Costa Rica: 7 Actions (4.4%)
  - El Salvador: 5 Actions (3.1%)
  - Brazil: 2 Actions (1.3%)
  - Nicaragua: 1 Action (0.6%)

- **Colombia**: 27 Actions (16.9%)
  - Guatemala: 7 Actions (4.4%)
  - Bolivia: 4 Actions (2.5%)
  - Panama: 2 Actions (1.3%)

- **Mexico**: 24 Actions (15.0%)
  - Argentina: 6 Actions (3.8%)
  - Honduras: 3 Actions (1.9%)
  - Dominican Republic: 2 Actions (1.3%)

- **Chile**: 21 Actions (13.1%)
  - Ecuador: 6 Actions (3.8%)
  - Uruguay: 3 Actions (1.9%)
  - Cuba: 1 Action (0.6%)

- **Other countries**: 38 Actions (23.8%)
  - Venezuela: 0 Actions (0%)
  - Paraguay: 1 Action (0.6%)

Legend: Intensity bands, according to the percentage of provided cooperation actions in 2017

- More than 12.5%
- Between 10.1% and 12.5%
- Between 7.6% and 10.0%
- Between 5.1% and 7.5%
- Between 2.6% and 5.0%
- Between 0.1% and 2.5%
- No actions registered

Source: SEGIB based on Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation
GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF COOPERATION ACTIONS, BY ROLE. 2017

II.2.2. By recipient

**Total: 160**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one country</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:** Intensity bands, according to the percentage of received cooperation actions in 2017
- More than 12.5%
- Between 10.1% and 12.5%
- Between 7.6% and 10.0%
- Between 5.1% and 7.5%
- Between 2.6% and 5.0%
- Between 0.1% and 2.5%
- No actions registered

Source: SEGIB based on Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation
II.3

COOPERATION AND EXCHANGE RELATIONS BETWEEN COUNTRIES: A CHARACTERIZATION

Matrixes II.1 and II.2 were designed for a further understanding of the way in which Ibero-American countries participated in the 733 Bilateral SSC projects and 160 actions exchanged in 2017. These matrixes are an appropriate instrument to organize each country by income category, in their double role of provider (upper row) and recipient (left column), as well as to identify associations between them, the combination of roles and exchange volumes. This information is synthesized in each of the cells where rows and columns intersect. Additionally, the sum of the different cells, for each row and each column, reveals, respectively, information regarding the total of initiatives in which each country took part as provider (last column) and as recipient (last row). The sum of all the cells of these last row and column coincides with the total of all the initiatives exchanged between the countries of the region in 2017; that is, 733 projects (Matrix II.1) and 160 actions (Matrix II.2).

This way, and regarding projects, analysis of Matrix II.1 suggests the following:

a) On the one hand, when considering that all 19 Latin American countries participated in Bilateral SSC, and all of them could play either role, these matrixes show that each exchange can be associated with 342 possible combinations of partners and roles. In 2017, however, and as shown in Matrix II.1, not all possible combinations took place, but just 139 were different, corresponding to 40% of the total.

b) The above mentioned occurs due to the fact that not all countries are capable of exchanging cooperation with the other 18. In fact, the maximum possible associations, with each and every Latin-American partner, only occurred in Brazil's and Cuba's cases, as recipients. Meanwhile, under the provider role, Colombia registered the maximum number of possible combinations with other countries, associating with up to 14 partners.

c) In terms of exchanges' intensity, a third (almost 50) of all associations was achieved through specific exchanges (1 or 2 projects). The rest (almost 90) fluctuated between the simultaneous execution of 3 projects, and a maximum of 30, which resulted from the association of Mexico and El Salvador as provider and recipient, respectively.

d) Finally, Matrix II.1 highlights another association: the one established between Mexico and Chile, which exchange a total of 27 projects. This value's singularity relies on the fact that it matches in either one of the two cells which combine these two countries, regardless which country is the provider and which is the recipient. This can be explained due to the fact that 26 of those 27 projects (in parentheses) are "bidirectional": this is, initiatives in which, according to definitions adopted within the Ibero-American space, both countries indistinctively participate both as provider and as recipient, which ensures reciprocity and shared responsibilities. In fact, for more than one decade, Mexico has been implementing its cooperation with Chile, and also with Uruguay (15 "bidirectional"), through the so-called Mixed Cooperation Funds, developed to facilitate the compliance of these conditions. Box II.4 describes these experiences and further details on their procedures and results.

---

7 As is signified on both matrixes' footnotes, countries are arranged according to World Bank's criteria, dated July 1st, 2019, and their resulting classification as Lower Middle-Income Country (LMIC), Upper Middle-Income Country (UMIC), and High-Income Country (HIC) and, within these categories, in alphabetical order.

8 Each of the 19 countries can associate with the other 18, as either provider or recipient. In this sense, the different possible combinations of partners are calculated by multiplying 19 by 19, then subtracting the 19 combinations in which the country would associate with itself (342 in total). This number coincides with the total number of inner cells which make a "basic" Matrix. It is worth highlighting that, as occurred in 2017, the possibility that one provider can associate with more than one recipient at a time, must be considered, which would further broaden the margin of possible options.
### MATRIX II.1

**BILATERAL SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION PROJECTS. 2017**

In units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVIDERS</th>
<th>LMIC</th>
<th>UMIC</th>
<th>HIC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6+1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4+1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td></td>
<td>1+1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican R.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1+9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

| LMIC | 42 | 82 | 39 | 14 | 58 | 9 | 63 | 26 | 33 | 20 | 33 | 63 | 39 | 51 | 24 | 10 | 43 | 19 | 62 | 3 | 733 |

Note: a) According to World Bank’s criteria, dated July 1st, 2019, countries were arranged considering their classification as: Lower Middle-Income Country (GNI per capita between 1,026 and 3,995 dollars), Upper Middle-Income Country (between 3,996 and 12,375 dollars), and High-Income Country (more than 12,376 dollars). b) Projects that were reported by countries as “bidirectional” are in parentheses. Both countries which take part in these projects are providers and recipients at the same time. Source: SEGIB based on Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation.
MEXICO AND THE INSTRUMENT OF MIXED FUNDS: PROMOTING A "BIDIRECTIONAL" SSC

According to the definition that was adopted in the Ibero-American space, "bidirectionality" when exercising Bilateral South-South Cooperation, implies various things. On the one hand, it indicates participation is "simultaneously under the recipient and the provider role". On the other hand, it represents a commitment to comply with the principles which allegedly should characterize SSC practice: among these, horizontality, reciprocity, the search for mutual benefits and shared responsibilities, all these having an impact on projects’ design, implementation and even financing. (SEGIB, 2011).

In order to achieve this, for more than a decade Mexico has been identifying strategic partners and designing, together with them, instruments that enable the execution of their SSC exchanges from the “bidirectional” perspective. This way, in 2008 and 2009, respectively, Mexico signed agreements with Chile and Uruguay to launch two mixed cooperation funds. As explained in the Mexican Agency for International Cooperation for Development (AMEXCID) website, the parties’ shared objective is to promote an innovative model to “develop higher impact projects, based on cooperation modalities which transcend traditional SSC practices, at the same time with solid and flexible financing, with positive effects on both countries’ development”.

Both Funds were created in the framework of Strategic Association Agreements previously signed by the corresponding parties. They are implemented through public applications, destined to public official institutions, and count with a stable annual budget of 2 million dollars (Mexico-Chile Mixed Cooperation Fund) and of 500,000 dollars (Mexico-Uruguay Fund), both partners always contributing with financial resources in equal shares. Bilateral SSC initiatives are financed with these budgets, but also triangular associations between both partners and a third party. In any case, these are projects which must be jointly designed between the executing counterparts and must be coherent with the objectives that were established in the Association Agreements. In terms of governance, the coordination of these Funds lies on the respective Cooperation Agencies (AMEXCID and AGCID in the former, AMEXCID and AUCI in the latter).

In addition, since the beginning of its implementation until the end of 2019’s first semester, Mexico-Chile Mixed Cooperation Fund would have financed 143 projects, with an aggregated economic cost of approximately 24 million dollars. On the other hand, Mixed Cooperation Fund Mexico-Uruguay would have executed, to the same date, 40 projects, which budget is almost 3.5 million dollars.

According to the above, the availability of these mechanisms enables the financial viability of projects which promote the exchange of respective national capacities and ensure mutual strengthening and progress towards established development goals. In fact, considering only Uruguay’s case, up to 80 institutions have taken part in the execution of the already mentioned 40 projects and around 555 specialists have participated, from different sectors. Additionally, as was stated, the added value of these Funds resides, not only in the results they promote, but also, in the procedures they ensure, which are aligned to those practices that must characterize SSC.

In this sense and, illustratively, a graph was designed to portray the distribution, by partner, of the total budgeted costs for SSC projects in which Mexico participated in 2017. This information is incomplete given that during this year Mexico participated in 106 projects as provider, in 11 as recipient and in 26 under both roles; and that information about costs is only available for 20 projects, corresponding to less than 15% of the total. The mentioned graph arranges these 20 projects’ budgets from top to bottom, from their maximum value (220,000 dollars) to the minimum one (6,600), placing amounts covered by providers to the left of the medium vertical axis and, amounts covered by recipients, to the right.

---

1 https://www.gob.mx/amexcid/acciones-y-programas/fondo-conjunto-de-cooperacion-mexico-uruguay
3 https://www.gub.uy/agencia-uruguaya-cooperacion-internacional/sites/agencia-uruguaya-cooperacion-internacional/files/documentos/publicaciones/Acta%2Fv%2Comis%C3%B3n%2Cooperaci%C3%B3n%2Cr%C3%A9tica%2Cy%2Cient%2C%2Adfica%2UyMx.pdf
4 https://www.gub.uy/agencia-uruguaya-cooperacion-internacional/sites/agencia-uruguaya-cooperacion-internacional/files/documentos/publicaciones/Acta%2Fv%2Comis%C3%B3n%2Cooperaci%C3%B3n%2Cr%C3%A9tica%2Cy%2Cient%2C%2Adfica%2UyMx.pdf
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Analysis of the graph suggests the following:

a) In basically 65% of those projects, the provider-recipient ratio is exactly equal to 1, which, in other words, means that both partners were equally responsible for the financing.

b) In 13 projects, costs were covered by each partner in equal parts. Of these 13, 10 were initiatives executed in the framework of the Mixed Cooperation Funds Mexico-Chile (8) and Mexico-Uruguay (2). The other 3 were implemented through other mechanisms: projects exchanged by Mexico with Panamá (2) and with Peru (1), all with budgets lower than 30,000 dollars.

c) Regarding the remaining 7 projects, it is possible to identify several provider-recipient ratios in terms of costs. Specifically, ratios 1.5 favorable to recipients were registered in 2 exchanges with Costa Rica and even with Chile, with budgets over 120,000 dollars. In other 2, with budgets of between 15,000 and 150,000 dollars, the provider covered between 1.2 and 1.4 times what corresponded to the recipient; and in the other 3 cases, 2 projects with Honduras (between 43,000 and 121,000) and 1 with Costa Rica (a maximum value of 220,000), the provider-recipient proportion in terms of costs would triple or quadruple the other value.

Source: SEGIB based on Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation and AMEXCID (Mexico), AGCID (Chile) and AUCI (Uruguay) websites.
Flow Diagrams II.1 and II.2 were plotted, for Mexico and El Salvador respectively, in order to illustrate with further detail the exchanges of these two countries with other partners. Mexico was the most important provider during 2017 and El Salvador was the main recipient. As is portrayed, these diagrams distribute the total of projects according to their origin (provider/s, to the left) and destination (recipient/s, to the right), and its visualization shows the following:

a) In Mexico’s case (Diagram II.1), the 158 projects in which, throughout 2017, this country participated as provider, were distributed in a total of 15 partners. As is shown, basically 20% of these projects were destined to El Salvador, its most relevant partner that year. Another 17% of the projects in which Mexico participated is explained due to its cooperation with Chile and both countries’ commitment to “bidirectionality”, as has been already explained. That same commitment explains 15 out of 18 projects which were under execution with Uruguay which, added to the former, would explain almost 48% of Mexico’s cooperation. The other half, corresponds to countries which participated in between 1 and 11 exchanges: Guatemala, Costa Rica, Honduras and Panama, together with Cuba and the Dominican Republic, in Central-America and the Caribbean sub-regions; and Bolivia, Colombia and Peru, together with Argentina, Paraguay and Brazil, in the Andean and Southern part of the continent, respectively.

b) On the other hand, the 82 projects in which El Salvador took part, as recipient, throughout 2017 (Diagram II.2), were originated in its relation with up to 12 different partners. Their distribution, however, is slightly more polarized than Mexico’s. In fact, 50% of that cooperation was explained by the exchange with merely 2 partners, again Mexico and Brazil, which initiatives (30 and 11, in each case) had, in turn, a 3 to 1 proportion. In contrast, the other 50% of the exchanges is explained by 10 countries with which El Salvador had between 2 and 7 projects under execution. Geographically, these countries also showed a remarkable dispersion: Costa Rica and Cuba in
Note: a) According to World Bank’s criteria, dated July 1st, 2019, countries were arranged considering their classification as: Lower Middle-Income Country (GNI per capita between 1,026 and 3,995 dollars), Upper Middle-Income Country (between 3,996 and 12,375 dollars), and High-Income Country (more than 12,376 dollars). b) Projects that were reported by countries as "bidirectional" are in parentheses. Both countries which take part in these projects are providers and recipients at the same time. Source: SEGIB based on Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation.
the Central-America and the Caribbean sub-regions, Colombia, Ecuador, Bolivia and Peru in the Andean zone, and Argentina, Paraguay, Chile and Uruguay, in the Southern Cone.

Finally, Matrix II.2 illustrates the relations between countries for those cases in which exchanges were implemented through actions. Specifically, the analysis would be the following:

a) On the one hand, and as occurs with projects, the 19 Ibero-American countries which participate in Bilateral SSC can relate, at least, through 342 possible combinations of partners and roles. In 2017, in which 160 Bilateral SSC actions were under execution, up to 65 different associations were developed. This is basically the fifth part of the 342 possible combinations.

b) In addition, in terms of actions, there was no country that established exchanges with the other 18 partners. Chile and Guatemala developed the maximum possible associations (the former with 12 countries, as provider; the latter, 10, as recipient). Peru had similar results. This country was the most dynamic when exchanging actions, both from the provider (38 initiatives) as from the recipient role (another 34), and it associated, in each occasion, with other 11 and 10 Ibero-American countries, respectively.

c) All the above, together with the fact that the number of exchanged actions was relatively low (160 in 2017, compared to 733 projects), coincides with the information portrayed in Matrix II.2: this is, 75% of the associations (around 50) were developed to implement 1 or 2 actions, while the remaining 25% is associated with a relatively higher number of actions, never higher, though, than Colombia’s and Peru’s maximum of 12. This case is again particular, given that, in any of the two combinations of roles, 10 actions were identified as “bidirectional”.

**DIAGRAM II.2**

**DISTRIBUTION OF EL SALVADOR’S BILATERAL SSC PROJECTS FLOWS, BY RECIPIENT. 2017**

In units

Source: SEGIB based on Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation
II.4
SECTORAL ANALYSIS OF BILATERAL SSC IN 2017

A better understanding of Bilateral SSC developed by the Ibero-American countries throughout 2017 requires the analysis of one of its purposes: capacity strengthening. Indeed, the possibility to strengthen mutual capacities through the exchanges between countries has special relevance in this document, in which the technical dimension of South-South Cooperation is, precisely, what prevails. In this sense, this section is dedicated to identify the capacities that were strengthened in the region through these exchanges, and how these were related to the strengths of predominantly provider countries and to recipients' need to receive assistance in order to overcome particular gaps. As a guideline for this exercise, the analysis considers the sectoral classification that has been defined and agreed throughout these years in the Ibero-American space, which is illustrated in the Table and Figure of this Report’s final section, as a Methodological Note.

II.4.1
PROFILE OF COOPERATION PROJECTS AND ACTIONS

Diagram II.3 was designed to illustrate the way in which Bilateral SSC projects exchanged between the countries of the region throughout 2017 (left flow)

contributed to strengthen each of the 30 sectors which are recognized in the Ibero-American space (right flow). The Diagram also enables to display this distribution in terms of the area of action. For this purpose, the 30 sectors are grouped and associated with the areas of action, and this distribution is depicted between the left and the right flows.

In this sense, a preliminary analysis shows that more than one third of the projects (277, corresponding to 35.5% of the total) were destined to strengthen capacities in the Social area. Another third (34.0%) addressed financial purposes. Within these, however, those which aimed at the strengthening of Productive Sectors (more than 150, corresponding to 24.4%), tended to prevail over the support to the generation of Infrastructure and Economic Services (an aggregated total close to 10%). In terms of relative importance, more than one hundred projects (16.1%), which objective was Institutional Strengthening, are also worth highlighting. The remaining 14.1% is explained by the contribution of projects which tackled the Environment area (8.1%) and Other areas of action (5.9%).

More than one third of the projects were focused on strengthening capacities in the Social area and another third addressed economic purposes.

In a wider temporal analysis, however, this distribution of projects in terms of sectoral priorities has suffered some changes. In fact, a comparative analysis on how this distribution has evolved between 2007 and 2017, summarized in Box II.5, suggests that the Social and Economic areas are still a priority, but also that there is a significant decrease in their relative importance (especially in relation to social projects), which is counterweighed by the increase of other areas. Among these, those related to the strengthening of governmental institutions, environment and other areas of action such as culture and gender, stand out. Further details can be found in the mentioned Box.

*It is important to bear in mind that, unlike what occurs in the analysis by evolution or by country, in the sectoral analysis, “bidirectional” projects are only considered once. This explains the difference between the total considered under execution in 2017 (733) and the total considered for the sectoral analysis (639).
DIAGRAM II.3

DISTRIBUTION OF BILATERAL SSC PROJECTS FLOWS, BY SECTOR AND AREA OF ACTION

In percentage

Source: SEGIB based on Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation
In the 2007-2017 period, priorities in which Bilateral SSC has focused on, have been changing. In this sense, the first graph shows, for each of the years considered, which part of the total of projects under execution, was destined to strengthen each of the 6 areas of action recognized in the Ibero-American space. Additionally, the designed time sequence enables the analysis of the evolution of these areas of action, which is depicted through colored lines, each color associated with a different area. Based on this graph, it can be argued that:

a) During the entire considered period, the largest part of the projects was directed to capacity strengthening in the Social area. Nevertheless, this area has been increasingly less prioritized, since its relative importance over the total has decreased in almost 8 percentage points: from 43.4% in 2007 to 35.5% in 2017.

b) On the other hand, support to Productive Sectors has been constant as the second area in terms of relative importance, its share being stable and slightly higher towards the end of the period (24.4% in 2017, compared to 23.6% in 2007).

c) The remaining sectoral areas all share dissimilar trends. First, remarkable increases in the importance of projects destined to Institutional Strengthening and Environment are worth highlighting, these two areas having basically doubled: from 7.6% and 3.8% in the first year, respectively, to 16.1% and 8.1%. Second, the importance of initiatives grouped in the Other areas also increases, in a smaller proportion of 2 percentage points, though: from 4% in the first year up to almost 6% in the last one. Finally, projects dedicated to strengthen Infrastructure and Economic Services show an important loss of relative importance, decreasing from 17.6% to 9.9%.

**EVOLUTION OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF BILATERAL SSC PROJECTS, BY SECTORAL AREA OF ACTION. 2007-2017**

In percentage

Source: SEGIB based on Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation
The aforementioned suggests some changes in terms of how the region is prioritizing the strengthening of some capacities over others; these changes underlay those areas of action and are clearly revealed when the analysis focuses on the 30 activity sectors recognized in Ibero-America. The second graph was plotted for this purpose. It arranges the 30 sectors in bars around a vertical axis, in a decreasing manner, considering each sector’s contribution to the registered change in the total number of projects (in percentage); that is, according to each sector’s share when explaining a difference of 270 projects between 2017 (639) and 2007 (369).\

In this sense, as stated in the legend, apart from arranging sectors in a decreasing manner, a color is assigned to each sector and these colors are associated with the areas of action. Its analysis reveals important trends:

a) Between 2007 and 2017, the sector which shows a higher increase in the total number of projects under execution (36) and which explains, consequently, the main part of the finally noted change (13.3%), is Other services and social policies. The fact that this coincides with an increase in the total of projects and with a decrease in the relative importance of the Social area, suggests another fact: an important redistribution when classifying projects that are executed in this area. In fact, efforts in this field start prioritizing Other services and social policies.

CONTINUOUS ON P. 69
Furthermore, a disaggregated analysis by sector sheds light on further details regarding the type of capacities the region has strengthened through Bilateral SSC in 2017. Specifically:

a) Regarding Bilateral SSC projects launched in 2017 to strengthen the Social area, more than one hundred (44.5%) were explained by the sector which was also the most representative one: Health, which explained 15.8% of total projects. Despite being SSC initiatives which addressed health in considerably different fields, some of the aspects they specifically tackled are worth highlighting. In this sense, there was a group of projects destined to improve nutrition, which includes different initiatives which go from the promotion and expansion of maternal Milk Banks to the development of nutritional components in basic and massive consumption products such as oil. Moreover, a second group of projects could be identified, dedicated to the prevention and treatment of specific diseases, such as oncolgical ones, through immunotherapies and with special attention to childhood. In addition, numerous initiatives would be destined to strengthen the whole system, through its universalization, the improvement of attention and medical and hospital services’ management, professional training, the provision of medical arbitration instruments and mediation techniques, the generation of statistics for better decision making, the inclusion of ICTs to broaden the scope of remote health services, among others. Finally, there would be projects with highly specialized focuses on specific sanitary sub-sectors, such as the ophthalmologic, those associated with medications, donations and transplants, or blood or blood-derived products, just to name some.

b) In addition, countries are, once again, increasing their bids for SSC that prioritizes Institutional Strengthening (75 projects). It is not surprising, then, that basically one fourth of the registered change in all these years in Bilateral SSC is explained by contributions made to the sectors of Legal and judicial development and Human Rights (13.0% of the change) and the one linked to Strengthening institutions and public policies (10.4%).

c) In addition, it is important to highlight the importance that has been given, during these last years, to environmental projects, these being the third sector which increases the most: from 11 exchanges in 2007 to 45 in 2017, which explains the fact that this sector is responsible for 12.6% of the final change.

d) Meanwhile, in relation to what occurs with the strengthening of Productive Sectors, the fact that Agriculture and livestock is the sector which effect is more significant in the change, indicates how its relative importance is still augmenting in this area of action. However, the increasing priority given to Tourism and Industry, is also relevant. Together, these two explain basically another 10% of the 270 new regional projects.

e) Finally, it is worth noting the loss of relative importance of projects directed to Infrastructure and economic services, which sectors are situated, with no exception, at the bottom of the graph, with contributions fluctuating between -4.1% in Energy, and a maximum of 3.0%, corresponding to Transportation and storage.

Source: SEGIB based on Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation
b) On the other hand, and still within the Social area, the fourth part of 2017 projects was destined to the strengthening of the Other services and social policies sector, around 60 projects, which would add efforts to advance in the promotion of social inclusion. This explains the fact that this kind of SSC tends to combine the focus on specific groups, considered especially vulnerable (early childhood, adolescents, people with some form of disability, older adults, among others), with interventions which are more macro (strategies to overcome and eradicate poverty, social housing policies, or the development of social security and pension systems) and with more micro ones, in the search for specific solutions to achieve this inclusion (the integral improvement of a specific neighborhood, or destining resources to art and sports in specific interventions that improve integration and coexistence options).

c) Cooperation focused on Education (36 projects) and Water supply and sanitation and (31), would complement the above. These two sectors’ relative shares in the total, and specifically in the Social area, would fluctuate, in each case, around 5% and 15%. A project destined to sexual education and classified in the Population and reproductive health sector, must also be considered. This way, and regarding the two main sectors:

- The education area would include projects destined to the system’s more formal issues (curricular developments, title recognition, accreditations, implementation of evaluations); training and strengthening professional competencies; the progressive application of ICTs (technological classrooms and the development of digital contents); and to support alphabetization and new and innovative learning methods that would use instruments such as chess or folkloric dance, especially focused on early childhood.

- In terms of exchanges related to water, projects that address the different stages of its management, could be identified. From its collection to its supply, including aspects relative to treatment, sanitation, reuse, the establishment of information systems, the differentiation of policies for rural and urban areas, and systems for pricing and management with citizen participation, to name a few.

d) Meanwhile, and from an economic perspective, it is important to highlight that almost one half (46.8%) the efforts destined to the strengthening of productive activities are explained by the second sector of 2017, in terms of relevance: Agriculture and livestock, with almost 75 projects, which explain more than a tenth part of the total of Bilateral SSC projects which were exchanged in the region during this year.

Within this sector, exchanges would have mainly focused on agriculture and livestock, and more specifically, on apiculture and sericulture. Considering this sector is highly focused on the first stages of production, which are less related to products’ final transformation and processing, such as harvests, projects would have been oriented to these processes improvement, for example: fertilization, irrigation technification, seed management, phytosanitary systems (plague control, genetic improvement, regulations related to Genetically Modified Organisms -GMOs-), and to advance towards a model which progressively respects the environment (enhancing organic crops and measuring ecological footprint). In addition, there would have been a significant number of projects which would focus on family activities as well as on crops which are typical in the region, such as corn, soy, cocoa, beans, coffee, rice, tropical fruits, and bovine and ovine meat, to name a few.

e) Another 25% of the projects which were destined to the Productive Sectors would be explained, in similar proportions, by efforts made in the Industry and Tourism sectors (around 20 initiatives, in each case). This way, projects associated with Industry, would take a further step and would be concentrated on improving and ensuring quality in the processing of secondary products such as food, textiles, leather or wood, as well as on improving their final presentation, and promoting progress towards cleaner and environmentally respectful production formulas. In the same sense, a cross-cutting environmental perspective would affect part of the projects relative to one of the region’s sectoral commitments in development promotion: Tourism. In this sense, it is worth highlighting, on the one hand, projects destined to sustainable management; and, on the other hand, those that exchange experiences to take advantage of varied touristic natural and cultural resources which, occasionally, are also shared between border countries that are cooperation partners.

f) Finally, the remaining 25% of productive projects, would consider exchanges of a
very different nature, classified in up to 5 activity sectors: Fisheries, Forestry, Trade and Extractive (around 10 projects in each case) and Construction (only 3). In order to illustrate what has been done within these sectors, it is worth highlighting projects dedicated to the strengthening of aquaculture techniques; forestry management; market analysis and the creation of national institutions to foster foreign trade; the improvement of information systems for mining exploitation data interpretation, and the exchange of experiences relative to regulations of extractives; as well as the construction of road infrastructure; to name a few.

g) Still from an economic perspective, more than 60 initiatives were registered in 2017 (a tenth part of the total), destined to improve the operation of national economies, through the strengthening of different types of Infrastructures and services. In fact, these initiatives were classified in up to 7 activity sectors: Enterprises, Energy, Science and Technology, and Transportation and storage (between 10 and 15 projects, depending on the case); Employment, Communications and Banking and finance (between 2 to 6 projects, depending on the case). Illustratively, this SSC was mainly focused on: the promotion and support to small and medium-sized enterprises; the creation of entrepreneurial environments; fostering a more sustainable use of energy; the search for eco-efficiency and renewable energies, especially hydraulic; the transfer of technical and scientific innovations applied to economic and industrial development; the design of mobility plans (bicycle lanes, roads, fluvial ports); the revision of costs’ systems, tariffs and investment financing, associated with transport infrastructure; as well as projects conceived to strengthen institutions associated with employment, either through the support to the respective Ministries of Employment or to inspection mechanisms and the accreditation of occupational competencies, among many others.

h) On the other hand, with reference to more than a hundred projects (16.1% of the total) which in 2017 were destined to Institutional Strengthening, several types of initiatives can be identified, in terms of the specific purpose they addressed. More specifically:

- Basically 44% of these exchanges were explicitly dedicated to Strengthening institutions and public policies. In this context, there were projects to improve governments’ management and planning, as well as a clear bid for matters that combine information and decision making, through the intervention in information systems, the generation of statistics and indicators, national accounts, and even in the follow-up and monitoring of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). In terms of other public policies, there were also numerous exchanges specifically dedicated to International, SS and Triangular Cooperation planning, negotiation and management.

- Meanwhile, almost another 40% of these projects addressed Legal and judicial development and Human Rights. Considering this sector’s denomination, it is important to identify, first, projects which are more oriented to the implementation and strengthening of regulatory and judicial frameworks. At this point it is worth highlighting some experiences focused on adolescents and on the necessity to work in penitentiary systems which reconcile penal responsibility with reintegration and social inclusion. Second, it is imperative to mention exchanges dedicated to Human Rights, including, among these, the fight against different types of traffic and discrimination, and projects about historical memory, which include, among other initiatives, the building of memory museums, the transference of forensic practices that facilitate the search and identification of victims of enforced disappearance and the boost of Genetic Information Banks.

- Finally, some of the registered projects were specifically dedicated to Management of public finances (4) and to the fostering of Political participation and civil society (only 1), and a relatively higher number of exchanges (more than ten), to matters which are classified in the sector of Peace, public and national security and defense. In fact, a large part of the exchanged experiences addressed the prevention and fight against all types of crimes, drug-trafficking standing out, money laundering and the illegal possession of fire arms. Due to its particular features, it is interesting to highlight an initiative implemented by Argentina and Uruguay in the subject of “cybercrimes”, which details are outlined in Box II.6.
BOX II.6

ARGENTINA AND URUGUAY: EXCHANGE OF EXPERIENCES FOR THE FIGHT AGAINST CYBER-CRIMES

Globalization has been, among other things, a synonym of a worldwide progressive interconnection phenomenon. This phenomenon would not have been possible without the simultaneous expansion and massification of information technology services by which it was accompanied, which, in turn, explain from the digitalization of the economy to new forms of governmental management and the revolution of communications and transport, to name a few. Globalization has resulted in a series of opportunities, advantages and potential benefits, but also in new risks, threats and dangers. The latter would include the emergence of new and sophisticated illegal activities, some of which could be classified with the term “cybercrime”.

With great concern, in November 23rd, 2001, around 30 countries signed the First Convention (international) on Cybercrime, in Budapest. As is described in its Preamble, through this Convention, the countries, mindful of the need to ensure a proper balance between the fight against crime and the protection of Human Rights, pursue the articulation of “a common criminal policy, aimed at the protection of society against cybercrime, inter alia, by adopting appropriate legislation and fostering international co-operation” (Council of Europe, 2001; p.1). Although this Convention was signed in the framework of the Council of Europe, by 2019, around 60 countries from different continents, had already adhered to it.

The increasing importance with which Ibero-American countries are considering this matter, manifests through several scopes of action: the international one, on the one hand, as suggested by the progressive adherence to the Budapest Convention (Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Spain, Mexico, Dominican Republic, Panama, Peru and Uruguay, have already ratified it or are in process); the regional one, on the other hand, highlighting the increasing cooperation and exchange of experiences between partners, as well as, in 2016, the launch of the Ibero-American initiative CiberRed, in the framework of the Ibero-American Association of Public Ministries General Assembly (AIAMP by its Spanish acronym), and which purpose is to intensify the relation between Ibero-American Prosecution Offices in the area of cybercrime; and also, on the national one, since countries are committing to the promotion of specific laws which have the international framework as a reference.

In this context, the two countries which stand out for their performance in this matter are Uruguay and Argentina. In fact, Uruguay has been fostering national initiatives for the fight against cybercrime for years, while Argentina has been one of the most active countries when it comes to the generation of a legal regulation which, since 2008, has its most evident expression in the approval of Law N°26,388, of Computer Crimes, Argentina being one of the only countries which has one. In addition, both countries have been leaders in the exchange of experiences in this matter: specifically, through the Bilateral SSC project “Capacity strengthening in cybercrime matters”, under execution in 2017.

In this sense, and according to the project’s document, its main purpose combined three elements: one relative to the training of security forces and justice officials in the investigation of computer crimes and in legal-forensic matters; another, to address the legal principles of action against diverse technologic crimes; and a third element which combines the analysis of practical cases in the investigation of Technological Crimes with the understanding and adoption of new resources and instruments.

The project was executed in a 12-month period and was implemented in three stages. Although there was mutual capacity strengthening, among its main results, the following, stand out: the training of around 30 Uruguayan officials, who could learn about the internal organization and the fundamentals of Argentina’s Superintendence of Technologic Crimes; the basic action principles for diverse technologic crimes; and, concepts and practical cases in cyber-patrol and cybercrimes against childhood and adolescence.

2 https://comjib.org/portugal-acoge-la-xxiv-asamblea-general-ordinaria-de-la-asociacion-iberoamericana-de-ministerios-publicos-alamp/

Source: SEGIB based on Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation and on the Council of Europe (2001)
i) It is worth to specially mention more than 50 projects classified in one of the areas which has registered the highest increase during these last years: Environment. In this area of action, basically 9 out of 10 exchanges were specifically destined to the preservation and care of nature, while the remaining 10% is related to experiences which affect Disaster Management phases. In order to illustrate, it is important to highlight:

- Projects conceived for the fight against climate change: initiatives to tackle the focuses of greenhouse gases emissions (transport), to improve the quality of those gases measurement and quantification (inventories); as well as those that strengthen forest management and improve their capacity as carbon sinks, and contribute to advance in the achievement of the Paris Agreement commitments, explicitly quoted in several occasions. Given that the need to join efforts for the preservation of the environment does not end here, experiences (many of them focused on shared borders between partners, as the Amazonia) relative to the protection of natural areas and natural resources management, but also waste management, must be mentioned.

- In addition, and as was anticipated, Bilateral SSC projects launched in 2017 in the Disaster management sector (1.1% of the total), were related to the different phases of the cycle, those relative to prevention (Early Warning Systems and vigilance techniques in the presence of volcanic events), and those which address the most immediate response (fire-fighting, techniques for search and rescue in collapsed structures, action in case of earthquakes), standing out.

j) The remaining 5.9% of Bilateral SSC projects which were under execution in 2017, is constituted of around 40 initiatives with a very different sectoral focus: in fact, 7 out of 10 were dedicated to Culture; 3 out of 10, to Gender equality; and there was only 1 intervention under the sector Others. Considering the purposes they addressed, several types of initiatives should be highlighted:

- On the one hand, those which were intended to improve cultural management (archeological, documentary, bibliographic); the strengthening of sectoral public institutions (art institutes); the progress towards the formalization of some specializations (Bachelor’s Degree in Library Sciences); efforts to link crafts’ development with entrepreneurship and with quality certifications which improve the market insertion of these products; as well as various projects relative to music (chorus systems) and Culture management (Satellite accounts).

- On the other hand, those which purpose is to advance towards a higher Gender equality, and which included the exchange of experiences that provide countries with instruments to fight violence against women, in terms of prevention and action as well as of attention to victims; the progress towards institutions and policies which include a gender perspective; and efforts to link entrepreneurship with the access of women to the same opportunities and development benefits.

Finally, Ibero-American countries also contributed to the strengthening of capacities through the exchange of actions. Diagram II.4 reproduces the distribution of the total of actions which were under execution in 2017 (origin flow), according to their area of action (middle flow), and activity sector (destination flow). Its analysis suggests that:

---

Environment has been one of the areas that has registered a higher growth in recent years in terms of the number of projects

---

10 Once again, due to the way in which “bidirectional” actions are considered, the total number of actions for 2017 (160) will not coincide with the total number of actions registered in the sectoral analysis (131).
a) The largest part of the actions (46, corresponding to 35.1%) were boosted to strengthen the Economic field. In this area, and in a 5 to 1 proportion, those dedicated to Productive Sectors prevailed again, compared to those which supported the generation of Infrastructure and Economic Services, much more incidental. In terms of relative importance, actions destined to Institutional Strengthening (almost 30% of the total), followed. An also significant proportion (close to 25%), is explained by cooperation focused on the Social area. Less important were those actions dedicated to Other areas (11 actions, corresponding to 8.4%), and even to Environment (5 actions, 2 of which were in the Disaster management sector).

b) This distribution by areas was determined by the incidence of actions in the different activity sectors. In this sense, basically two thirds of this Bilateral SSC in 2017, is explained by barely 6 sectors, in which a maximum of 21 and a minimum of 10 actions were exchanged: in Tourism, Peace, public and national security and defense, together with Strengthening institutions and public policies; Education and Other services and social policies; and Culture. If Agriculture and livestock and Industry are added (7 in each case), 75% of all the exchanged Bilateral SSC actions are explained.

c) Considering these are specific actions, which implementation is executed through workshops, training courses and exchange of experiences and good practices, the issues that could be tackled differ from those identified in the projects and can respond to a more specific profile. For example, countries participate in actions to learn how others manage and promote tourism; the administration of taxes and income associated with this activity, or the way in which they relate the availability of certain resources (crafts, bird-watching) with its promotion, especially in communities which need an economic alternative.

In addition, in the security field, training courses would address Human Rights and police activity, the planning of operations against drug-trafficking and the treatment of synthetic drugs; while, in terms of institutional strengthening, actions would be dedicated, for example, to the design of SS and Triangular Cooperation technical assistance catalogues. Others worth mentioning would be initiatives related to technical assistance to transfer capacities regarding social bonuses for families in extreme poverty or those to learn how to execute a plan to safeguard non-material cultural heritage.
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II.4.2
COUNTRY PROFILE

It is not possible to dissociate the way in which the region’s capacities were strengthened through Bilateral SSC, with the contribution made by each of its protagonists. In this sense, the regional result is merely a reflection of the combination of transferred strengths, by countries that were predominantly providers, and the gaps or necessities which countries that were recipients accomplished to cover.

Given the aforementioned, the present section is dedicated to identify those capacities that, with a higher frequency, were associated with the action of each Ibero-American country during 2017, especially of those countries which acted as providers and/or recipients in a higher number of occasions.

II.4.2.1. PROVIDERS

As was mentioned before, Mexico and Chile were the two Ibero-American countries which, throughout 2017, participated in a higher number of projects from a provider role: in fact, a total of 285 projects aggregate explained 40% of 733 exchanged by the region. In this sense, Graphs II.5 and II.6, were plotted to show the type of capacities which both countries tended to share with their partners. Each of these graphs, which represent Mexico and Chile respectively, illustrate these capacities through a sunburst chart (see Methodological Note) which enables the distribution of the total of projects in which each country participated (158 and 127), by activity sector (outer ring) and area of action (inner ring). Its is possible to state, through its analysis:

a) In the case of Mexico (Graph II.5), projects which addressed the strengthening of economic capacities were the majority. Within these, however, those destined to Productive Sectors (80%), prevailed over those related to the generation of Infrastructure and Economic Services (20%). Additionally, exchanges that strengthened the Social area (close to 25%) were also relevant, as well as those projects which objective was the Institutional Strengthening of its partners (13.4%). Projects with Environmental purposes closely followed, which explained another 12% of the initiatives finally provided by this country. The remaining 5% was explained by the exchanges which affected Other areas of action.

The intense activity displayed by Mexico in the Agriculture and livestock (22 projects, corresponding to more than 14% of the total) and Environment sectors (18, which explain another 11.6%) was decisive in this capacity profile. Other capacities in which Mexico showed its strength were those destined to Strengthening institutions and public policies, Water supply and sanitation, and Education; sectors which, aggregately, explained, in similar proportions, slightly more than 30 projects.

Specifically, these projects were mainstreamed by innovation, information management and the application of technologies. This way, Mexico shared with its partners numerous phytosanitary techniques which included genetic handling, plague control and the development of biofertilizers, among others. In the Agriculture and livestock sector, there were many examples of information management and research to, for instance, promote the sector’s adaptation to climate change and to mitigate its worst effects. In fact, the fight against climate change was also the focus of Mexico’s SSC related to Environment. However, within this field, there were also projects related to the management of protected areas and waste. Management, once again, in this case of information to be used in evaluations regarding water resources availability, was also the focus of Mexico’s shared experiences. The generation of indicators and statistics, together with better access to information, constituted another main objective of Mexican support to other governments. Finally, ICTs were much present in terms of Education, along with the expansion of digital classrooms and education contents.
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b) In Chile’s case, and as is suggested by the contrast between Graph II.6 and II.5, the most distinctive difference with respect to Mexico is the different distribution of priorities within the same socio-economic field. In fact, when analyzing Chile, the Economic, Productive Sectors (a fourth part of the 127 projects in which it participated as provider) and Infrastructure and Services (11.0%) areas must be aggregated in order to catch up with the importance of the Social area itself: 31.5%. Meanwhile, the rest of the areas show a very similar sequence in terms of relative importance: this way, Institutional Strengthening explains 15.7% of 2017 execution; Environment, a tenth part; and Other areas, 6.3%.
Additionally, the two sectors which showed the highest significant importance in the total, belong to the Social area: *Other services and social policies* (15%), and *Health* (12.6%), closely followed by *Environment*, addressed by up to 12 projects, corresponding to 9.5% of 127 finally registered. Moreover, in the Economic area, contributions of the *Agriculture and livestock* and *Tourism* sectors were also significant and, in connection with Institutional strengthening, contributions of *Legal and judicial development and Human Rights* and *Institutional strengthening and public policies* were also relevant, four sectors related to 8 projects in each case, which, aggregately, accounted for another 25% of the total.

In order to illustrate, Chilean SSC took advantage of some of its recognized capacities in the social policy area, specifically in the development of programs especially destined to specific groups, such as early childhood (strategies and pedagogic guidelines for integral attention), young people (programs in which sport is an instrument for inclusion), older adults (residences management) or disabled people (specialized government institutions), to name a few. In the same way, Chile would have shared its progress in some medical treatments (child oncology and neuromuscular diseases), as well as its experience in the strengthening of this sector’s institutions and its sub-systems (donation and transplants, health networks, and institutions for health surveillance). The fight against climate change and the Paris Agreement commitments would be recurring in Chile’s Environmental SSC, labor for which it has been acknowledged by the United Nations. In this sense, projects dedicated to the protection of marine areas and oceans, should also be highlighted.11

Meanwhile, Argentina’s and Brazil’s aggregated importance in the 733 Bilateral SSC projects which were exchanged in the region throughout 2017, is higher than 25%. These two countries cooperation was based on the exchange of those capacities in which they have been and are a reference. Indeed:

a) 43.5% of the 105 projects in which Argentina participated as Bilateral SSC provider were related to productive activities and to important capacities this country has developed in the *Agriculture and livestock* (27 projects which explain 1 out of 4 of Argentina’s exchanges in 2017) and *Industry* sectors (other 12 initiatives). This cooperation is very diversified and specialized, and is almost always related to agriculture, livestock and the transformation of derived products. In this sense, projects shared by Argentina would address food security and the work with small peasants; phytosanitary issues (plague control, genetic modification and the identification of bovine germplasm); and, regarding the transformation process, investigation in bio-conservation and development of advanced techniques to improve food nutritional quality (meat, dairy and milk-based products), as well as to ensure their safety, among others.

Other areas in which Argentina would have demonstrated capacities would be Institutional Strengthening and Social (an aggregated total close to 40% of the 105 final exchanges). It is worth highlighting the importance of projects classified in the *Legal and judicial development and Human Rights sector* (around 20), and that enable Argentina to share its renowned experience in historical memory, genetic profile banks and the development of legal frameworks and forensic sciences, supporting other countries in the search and identification of victims of enforced disappearance, as well as in the progress towards the search for truth, justice and repair. In addition, an important part of the experience the country has shared with its partners in the *Health* area is related to organs, cells and tissues donation and transplant.

---

11 The Chilean Agency for International Cooperation for Development (AGCID by its Spanish acronym), has been a leader in relating the fight against climate change with cooperation, becoming the first cooperation Agency in Latin-America to have been accredited by The Adaptation Fund, the United Nations initiative for the adaptation to climate change. Through this, in 2017, Chile could access resources to execute projects to improve its resilience to climate change. In addition, Chile is internationally recognized for being a leader in ocean protection, since 43% of its economic zone is shielded with marine protected areas and the country has unprecedentedly designed an ocean policy, as well as an update of its Antarctic policy (AMEXCID and GIZ, 2018).
Meanwhile, basically one half (48%) of the 94 projects in which Brazil participated as provider in 2017, addressed purposes in the Social area, especially in the Health (25.5% of total exchanges) and Water supply and sanitation sectors (13.8%). Complementary, more than a fifth part of Bilateral SSC projects executed by Brazil was destined to the strengthening of Productive Sectors, its experience in agriculture being very significant. Moreover, 15% of exchanges addressed matters related to Environment, and the remaining 15%, in identical proportions, to the areas of Infrastructure and Economic Services.

Brazil’s profile reveals the important development this country has had in some very specific areas. In this sense, the way in which Brazil has shared with almost all the countries of the region its experience in the implementation and expansion of maternal Milk Banks, stands out. This policy has been a reference due to the way in which it contributed to reduce childhood mortality and to advance in the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), associated with the 2015 Agenda. This experience accounts for great part of Brazilian’s SSC in the Health area which, nonetheless, is complemented by projects dedicated to the strengthening of blood and blood-derived products systems and health surveillance and regulation. In addition, Brazil would have been very active in joining efforts with other countries in their improvement of their water resources management process and, related to the agricultural and environmental areas, in the transference of farming and phytosanitary techniques for special crops (tropical fruits, corn, beans, cocoa, soy…) and the management of protected areas, respectively.

Colombia, Cuba and Uruguay should have a special analysis, three countries which, as providers, participated in a reasonably significant number of projects: 66, 61 and 48, in each case. The distribution of their respective initiatives by sector and area of action reveals significant differences between the profiles of the capacities shared by each of them. Specifically:

Two thirds of Bilateral SSC which Colombia had under execution in 2017 addressed, in the same proportion, the Social and Institutional Strengthening areas. In fact, the relative importance of these two sectors was conclusive in this profile: Other services and social policies and the one dedicated to strengthen institutions and public policies, both with 15 projects, which aggregately explain up to 45% of the 66 exchanges in which Colombia participated in 2017. Within these areas of action, projects through which this country shared its experience to promote coexistence and peace in conflict zones, through programs which foster sports and art, prevailed; as well as those initiatives to improve public services management, to strengthen cadastre services, the digitalization of the public agenda and SS and Triangular Cooperation itself, showing, for example, its progress in terms of valorization. On the other hand, it is worth adding the significant importance that Bilateral SSC projects destined to Culture had (8, corresponding to 12.1% of the total) and which main subjects were, among others: crafts development, reading promotion, the curricular design of a Bachelor’s Degree in Library Sciences and the management of archeological heritage.

In turn, Cuba and Uruguay shared a relatively similar number of projects, but their profile was different, almost opposite: extremely specialized, in the former; very diverse and versatile, in the latter. More specifically:

- More than 90% of the 61 Bilateral SSC projects in which Cuba acted as provider in 2017 are explained by its renowned level of development in the Social area: in fact, 39 projects (corresponding to almost two thirds of the total) were related to Health; slightly more than a fifth part (13), to Education; and the remaining 8.2%, to Other services and social policies, where all matters regarding sports as an instrument for social inclusion, in which Cuba is also reference, are considered. Within these projects, those relative to the integral training of Education or Health professionals stand out; some with a long trajectory and that are a reference for its partners (Yo Sí Puedo alphabetization program—which method was, already in 2006, acknowledged by UNESCO, or Operación Milagro, dedicated

---

to facilitate the access of people with scarce resources to ophthalmologic surgeries); but also others more innovative, as those which purpose is the development of alternative treatments and medication, based on ancestral traditions and botanical resources.

- Meanwhile, the 50 Bilateral SSC projects in which Uruguay participated as provider are associated with up to 16 activity sectors (more than one half of the 30 which are recognized in the Ibero-American space) and with all 6 areas of action. In this sense, and as was already anticipated, Uruguay showed a highly versatile profile, in which attention to Social (almost one third of the total exchanged) and Economic purposes (an aggregated 27.1%), was combined with Institutional Strengthening (25%) and Environment (12.5%), together with, although very occasionally, Other areas (the remaining 4.2%). In order to illustrate, Uruguay supported its partners in matters such as the recognition of degrees and certifications related to professional and teacher training (Education); the development of capacities in meat sciences, classification and characterization of commercialized meat, and the application of strategic intelligence in the Agriculture and livestock sector; as well as all matters related to including a rights-based perspective in public management and to the exchange of better practices regarding territorial equity (Strengthening institutions and public policies).

Finally, during 2017, there were other 8 Ibero-American countries which acted, at least in one occasion, as Bilateral SSC projects’ providers. As was mentioned, the intensity with which they participated was variable and fluctuated between the minimum of 2 projects, provided by El Salvador, Guatemala or the Dominican Republic, and the maximum of 25 projects registered by Peru. In this sense, and opposite to what could be presumed, in terms of providers, the participation in a lower number of exchanges is usually associated with a much-defined profile, given that participating under this role requires the existence of highly renowned strengths. This way, and considering the volume of exchanges, two groups can be identified:

- The first group would be composed of Peru, Costa Rica, Ecuador and Paraguay, all them with increasing importance as providers and with more than 10 projects under execution in 2017. The specializations through which each of them would be acting in this role are diverse: to name a few, Peru would stand out due to its support to harvest techniques of typical products of its region such as potato and cocoa, as well as to its experience in relating cooking with entrepreneurship development; meanwhile, environmental issues, relative to protected areas and resources management, would stand out in those capacities shared by Costa Rica; social matters, especially the inclusion of disabled people, would be characteristics of Ecuador’s cooperation; and, regarding energy, especially, issues related to water resources, would be remarkable in Paraguay’s case, as is portrayed in Box II.7

- The second group would be composed of Bolivia, Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala and the Dominican Republic, which interventions as providers would be more incidental (between 2 and 6 projects in 2017). Still, experiences shared in Tourism must be highlighted (the boost to cultural destinations in the case of Bolivia and the management of the hotel industry, in case of the Dominican Republic); also those related to the Agriculture and livestock sector and, especially, to the role of women (Guatemala) and to the management of reciprocal guarantees systems (Honduras); as well as those relative to port and airport services and its tariffs and costs, matters on which El Salvador’s provided cooperation was focused.
PARAGUAY: TOWARDS AN INCREASING PROVIDER ROLE IN A BID FOR A DIVERSE AND INCLUSIVE SSC

Between 2007 and 2017, Paraguay has participated in 190 Bilateral South-South Cooperation projects. In 9 out of 10 of these initiatives, Paraguay has participated in a predominantly recipient role. However, in these last few years, and especially since 2016, this South-American country has begun to participate as provider also. In fact, the table below shows the 9 projects in which Paraguay participated under that role, in 2017. As can be appreciated, this cooperation is characterized for being diverse and inclusive, considering Paraguay associated with up to 4 different partners (Colombia, El Salvador, Dominican Republic and Uruguay) and that its associations enabled the transference of capacities and the exchange of experiences in up to four sectors which include different areas such as the economic (Agriculture and livestock, Energy and Tourism), social (Health and Other services and social policies), cultural and institutional strengthening ones (Legal and judicial development and Human Rights).

According to this diversity, Paraguay shows its capacity to share some of its widely renowned sectoral strengths. In fact, the 2018 edition of this Report, already dedicated a specific section to Project SIMORE, a computer instrument which facilitates follow-up, monitoring and evaluation of the country’s level of accomplishment in terms of Human Rights recommendations in the framework of the United Nations and the Organization of the American States (OEA by its Spanish Acronym). As was outlined in that Report (SEGIB,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Activity sector</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Agriculture and livestock</td>
<td>Strengthening livestock competitiveness in Colombia and Paraguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Knowledge and best practices transfer for the strengthening of musical capacities (harp) to San José del Guaviare and Puerto Carreño</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Training for public management with an intercultural perspective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                     | Energy                           | • Creating a plan of action to define a road map for Hydroelectric Projects in Río Paz.
|                     |                                   | • Exchange of experiences in the development of Cimarrón Hydroelectric Project: hydroelectric power plants construction, operation, maintenance and management of environmental and social aspects |
|                     | Tourism                          | Fostering young tourism entrepreneurship for the strengthening of peace culture |
|                     | Other services and social policies | TEKOPORA Program: Strengthening social protection project management |
| Dominican Republic  | Legal and judicial development and Human Rights | Technical Cooperation Program for the implementation of a system to follow-up International Recommendations on Human Rights (SIMORE by its Spanish acronym) |
| Uruguay             | Health                           | Latin-America unites against forgotten diseases (Leishmaniaisis)         |

Source: SEGIB based on Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation
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Throughout 2017, El Salvador was the country which participated as recipient in a larger number of Bilateral SSC projects (82). Graph II.7 was designed in order to understand how these exchanges contributed to strengthen some of its capacities. It shows the relative importance of those projects by sector and area of action. Its analysis indicates the following:

a) The largest part of Bilateral SSC projects which El Salvador received in 2017 (36, corresponding to a remarkable 43.4% of the 82 registered) were destined to the strengthening of the Social area. The relative importance of the projects which addressed this area tripled the one corresponding to areas which followed (in terms of projects): Productive Sectors and Other areas of action, each of them with 12 projects which respectively explained 14.5% of the total exchanged. Meanwhile, contributions to Infrastructure and Economic construction and maintenance of hydroelectric power plants, as well as in everything relative to the management of all their environmental and social aspects. In addition, this is also outlined, since 2016, in its Technical Cooperation Catalogue. This document has resulted in several exchanges, among which, as the table depicts, those executed with El Salvador in 2017 stand out, which were specifically dedicated to support the development two Hydroelectric Projects, such as Cimarron and the one of Rio Paz.

1 https://www.itaipu.gov.py/es/energia/energia-hidraulica
2 http://www.stp.gov.py/v1/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Cat%C3%A1logo-de-Oferta-de-Cooperaci%C3%B3n-T%C3%A9cnica.pdf

Source: SEGIB based on Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation, SEGIB (2018) and Itaipú website
**GRAPH II.7**

**DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS IN WHICH EL SALVADOR PARTICIPATED AS RECIPIENT, BY ACTIVITY SECTOR AND AREA OF ACTION. 2017**

In percentage

- AREAS OF ACTION:
  - 43.4% SOCIAL
  - 14.5% PRODUCTIVE SECTORS
  - 14.5% OTHER AREAS
  - 12.0% INFRASTRUCTURE AND ECONOMIC SERVICES
  - 9.6% INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING
  - 6.0% ENVIRONMENT

- SERVICES:
  - Health (15.7%)
  - Other services and social policies (10.8%)
  - Education (9.6%)
  - Water supply and sanitation (7.2%)
  - Agriculture and livestock (8.4%)
  - Culture (10.8%)
  - Environment (6.0%)
  - Energy (4.8%)
  - Science and technology (3.6%)
  - Banking and finance (4.8%)
  - Enterprises (1.2%)
  - Transportation and storage (1.2%)
  - Peace, public and national security and defense (1.2%)
  - Trade (1.2%)
  - Construction (1.2%)
  - Tourism (3.6%)
  - Gender (3.6%)

b) Coinciding with the above, when the analysis focuses on the sectors, the most remarkable activities were precisely those which addressed Social purposes: Health (15.7% of the total received), Other services and social policies (10.8%), Education (9.6%), and Water supply...
and sanitation (7.2%). Cooperation in these areas materialized, for example, through the reception of support to extend the National Network of maternal Milk Banks and to advance in the process to certify their quality; as well in the strengthening of El Salvador’s national blood and blood-derived products system and in the promotion of the associated donation mechanisms. In addition, both in the Health sector as well as in Education, some of the identified projects were destined to strengthen institutions associated with its related sectors. This was combined with a bid to learn about innovative education experiences, which favor, not only children insertion and continuity, but also progress in their learning processes, through resources such as dance and chess. Art, together with sports, were also the focus of other projects that were intended to improve social coexistence and inclusion. There was also a commitment to prioritize, in the public national agenda, all matters related to childhood and young people development. Finally, El Salvador seized the opportunity to learn about other partners’ experiences in order to improve sanitation and water treatment processes.

c) There were other two relevant sectors regarding Bilateral SSC received by El Salvador throughout 2017, however, both of a very different nature: Culture (slightly more than a tenth part of the total exchanged) and Agriculture and livestock (7.2%). It is worth highlighting the commitment to include an intercultural perspective in public management, coinciding with El Salvador’s national rich reality; to learn about processes which will enable the creation of a quality seal that identifies indigenous products; and an effort to link musical pedagogy with a peace culture. In terms of Agriculture and livestock, cooperation focused on food security and small producers, especially through the introduction of growing and irrigation techniques to improve the harvest of basic products such as corn and beans. Meanwhile, throughout 2017, Colombia, Mexico, Uruguay and Argentina were recipients in around 60 Bilateral SSC projects. Participating in these exchanges enabled each of them to continue strengthening some of their capacities, as well as to close some sectoral gaps. More specifically:

a) Graph II.8 was designed to show the case of Colombia (63 projects). As its analysis suggests, one half of the total projects this country received, were destined to the strengthening of its Institutional (27.0% of the total exchanged) and Productive Sectors (23.8%) areas. The other half was distributed in areas such as Social (20.6%), Environment (14.3%) and the generation of Infrastructure and Economic Services and Other areas of action (6.3% and 7.9%, respectively).

In fact, this profile responds to the strong relative importance of the projects destined to strengthen the Agriculture and livestock (11 exchanges, corresponding to 17.5% of the total), Legal and judicial development and Human Rights sectors (other 9 initiatives which explained 14.3% of the total), and, to a lesser extent, to strengthen institutions and public policies and environment matters (6 projects in each case which, aggregately, represented a fifth part of 63). In terms of specific exchanged experiences, in the productive field, those destined to enhance agricultural production through, for example, the development of bio-fertilizers and the adoption of new furrow techniques and phytosanitary progress to mitigate plagues, must be highlighted. Meanwhile, in the institutional field, there was an emphasis on matters related to historical memory, the search, identification and localization of missing persons, including efforts to incorporate the Human Rights perspective in legal medicine and forensic science; as well as judicial security to consolidate social peace. In this sense, much cooperation was referenced to Peace Agreements, having effects in all areas, not only in institutional or social ones. This way, for example, in the environment field, projects for the management of protected areas were combined with more extraordinary ones, such as those dedicated to the negotiation and resolution of socio-environmental conflicts, as a contribution to the construction of peace in protected areas.
b) In contrast, basically two thirds of Bilateral SSC in which Mexico participated as recipient (other 63 projects) had a clear socio-economic orientation: in fact, around 40% of the exchanges were destined to strengthen different aspects of the economic area (7 out of 10 focused on productive activities); while the remaining almost 25% was explained by the support to social areas, together with an important bid for environment matters, which, on their own, explained a remarkable 17.5% of the total exchanged. Consequently, areas such as Institutional Strengthening and Other areas had a smaller importance (11.1% and 7.9%, in each case).

In fact, this cooperation was disperse and distributed in a significant number of sectors (more than one half of those recognized in the
Ibero-American space), provoking that the number of projects associated with each of the sectors was relatively low. Only two sectors registered more than ten exchanges: Agriculture and livestock and Environment. This analysis must also consider the particular case of Mexico, in which many of these projects were classified as "bidirectional". In these situations, Mexico was both recipient and provider, seizing the exchange of experiences to strengthen its capacities as well as its partner’s. In any case, the way in which all this contributed to improve specialization in terms of traceability and bio-security in livestock practices, as well as the competitiveness of associated production chains, must be highlighted, together with the support to fight against climate change, the adoption of techniques to monitor and mitigate soil degradation, and those applied in waste management, to name a few.

c) In the case of Uruguay, Bilateral SSC reception was highly oriented to strengthen certain specialized areas in the Social (basically 4 out of 10 of the 62 projects in which this country participated in this role) and Institutional fields (slightly more than 21%). In fact, the three sectors in which a higher number of exchanges were registered were related to the above-mentioned areas: Health, Education, and Institutional Strengthening and public policies, with 8-9 projects in each case. The Economic area, in turn, aggregatedly explained a remarkable 26.2% of the final projects, the proportion dedicated to Infrastructure and Economic Services also being higher, with a relative importance of 16.4%, which duplicated the Productive Sectors area (8.2%). This is actually a total of 16 projects, classified in up to 6 different sectors, with a maximum number of 5, associated with Agriculture and livestock. In addition, Environment and Other areas registered a lower relative importance, of 9.8% and 3.3%, respectively.

As was anticipated, this cooperation enabled Uruguay to further strengthen capacities which it had already developed. For example, through SSC, Uruguay broadened the scope of its national donation and transplant, and disability policies, through the approach to other experiences related to tissue banks and donor registers, as well as in prosthesis design, production and repair systems. In the education field, the country made efforts to advance in the processes of evaluation, accreditation and recognition of official education certifications. In addition, and in terms of public policy strengthening, contributions were made for Uruguay to make a better use of prospective as a long-term planning instrument and, in line with the debates on which the international development agenda is currently focusing, it received contributions to strengthen the monitoring and follow-up of the SDGs and the analysis of the consequences that graduation can have in High Middle-Income and High-Income countries.

d) In line with this, Argentina seized the exchange of experiences to strengthen areas in which it is already a reference, as suggested by the fact that the Bilateral SSC it received was concentrated in the Agriculture and livestock and Tourism sectors (9 out of 7 projects in a total of 58, corresponding, aggregatedly, to more than a fourth part). In fact, projects related to the Economic area, explained basically 45% of the final exchanges in a proportion in which Productive Sectors clearly prevailed (4 initiatives for each 1 of those dedicated to the generation of Infrastructure and Economic Services). Meanwhile, the Social area (Health prevailing) explained another 25.9% compared to 8.6% and 3.4% relative to Environment and Other areas of actions.

In terms of specific experiences, teacher training in technical-agricultural education, the identification of cooperation opportunities between institutions specialized in agriculture and livestock, and the search for alternative instruments such as apiculture, must be highlighted. Exchanges related to border tourism best practices also stood out. In fact, several projects were identified destined to seize natural cross-border resources, to design a common strategy for both partners and favor, not only the promotion of binational tourism but also the consequent development of communities.
In addition, Peru, Chile, Bolivia and Paraguay, in the Southern part of the continent, together with Honduras in Central-America, participated as recipients in a similar number of projects, which fluctuated between 40-50 exchanges. According to their necessities, very diverse sectoral profiles were identified, despite the similarities in the intensity of their participation. Specifically:

a) Bolivia concentrated almost 45% of the total received projects in two sectors: Health (23.3%) and Agriculture and livestock (20.9%). The former includes experiences related to medical interventions (childhood oncology and ophthalmology for families with scarce resources), and strengthened institutions associated with the sector (medical arbitration and Telehealth). With respect to Agriculture and livestock, projects oriented to the transfer of irrigation, harvesting, and phytosanitary techniques, mostly applied to some specific Amazonian products, such as potato, rice, soy and corn, stood out.

b) In a similar way, slightly more than 40% of Bilateral SSC projects in which Paraguay participated as recipient in 2017, were related to other two Social sectors: Health (23.1% of the total) and Other services and social policies (17.9%). In both cases, those experiences which enabled the strengthening of institutional aspects prevailed. Concerning this, it is worth highlighting the following: training of physicians; the implementation and expansion of health networks and maternal Milk Banks; the support to the National Direction for Health Surveillance or to the Secretary for Disability; the development of food and nutrition national surveys; and the approach to methodologies to consider football as a social inclusion instrument; among others.

c) Meanwhile, Bilateral SSC received by Chile stands out for the way in which its main areas of action were interrelated: Environment (16.3% of the projects), Agriculture and livestock and Other services and public policies (9.3% each). In fact, it is easy to identify, for example, projects destined understand how to measure the carbon footprint generated by certain harvests; how to cultivate table grape while contributing to the mitigation and adaptation to climate change; or how to provide sowing with a perspective which integrates productive objectives with social inclusion; among others.

d) On the other hand, there would be three sectors which would especially stand out in the cases of Peru and Honduras: Health, Other services and public policies and Environment, with aggregated proportions which, in each case, would explain around 40% of the received cooperation. In both cases, priorities would have focused on: the strengthening of specialized sanitary institutions (donations and transplants or blood and blood-derived products, respectively), the training of physicians (general and specific, for example, in field epidemiology —Peru— or in mental health —Honduras—), or the expansion of maternal Milk Banks. Both Peru and Honduras would also have seized this cooperation to strengthen capacities related to the management of protected areas.

Finally, it is important to analyze the cases of Cuba, Guatemala, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador and Panama, which received around 20 to 30 projects; as well as Nicaragua, Venezuela and Brazil, none with more than 15 exchanges. With further detail:

a) As is frequent, Cuba combined the transfer of its experience in the Social area with the strengthening of Economic capacities, especially concentrated in the Agriculture and livestock (15.2% of exchanges), Extractive (12.1%) and Industry sectors (9.1%). Projects worth mentioning are: phytosanitary, those related to Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO); those with an agriculture and livestock and bio-ecological perspective; those related to the processing of cartographic information; as well as those destined to the development of mining regulatory frameworks.

b) For Guatemala, cooperation received to strengthen its institutions and public policies was especially relevant (basically 1 out of 4 projects received). Those which combined government management with its modernization through the introduction of new technologies, stood out. In addition, Box II.7 summarizes the experiences in which this country participated in 2017 which purpose was the promotion of Gender equality in a population which is doubly discriminated such as indigenous women.
c) Costa Rica and the Dominican Republic, in turn, showed a very diversified profile, since basically one half of the projects received (around a dozen) were distributed, in each case, in up to 5 different sectors. In Costa Rica’s case, cooperation strengthened areas such as Health, Industry, Environment, Culture and even Transportation and storage. In the case of the Dominican Republic, strengthened capacities affected various sectors such as Trade, Culture, Education, Health and Strengthening institutions and public policies.

d) Regarding Ecuador and Panama, both with around 20 projects, exchanges which strengthened, in each case, different areas, prevailed: the Social area in Ecuador’s case (Health and Other services and social policies) and the Economic area in Panama’s case (Agriculture and livestock and Fisheries). Specifically, in Ecuador’s case, projects implemented in 2017 were focused on medications, maternal Milk Banks and early childhood; and, in Panama’s case, on school and family gardens, animal and plant health and aquaculture.

e) Finally, more than one third of the projects received by Nicaragua, Venezuela and Brazil, was destined to strengthen these countries capacities in the Health sector. In the case of Nicaragua and Venezuela, there was also an important participation of other projects related to the Social area (Water supply and sanitation in the case of Nicaragua and Other services and social policies in the case of Venezuela); while in Brazil’s case, projects received in the Agriculture and livestock sector, complemented the final number.

---

**BOX II.8**

**GUATEMALA: INTEGRATING SSC WITH THE DEFENSE OF INDIGENOUS WOMAN**

In 2013, the Economic Commission for Latin-America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) published a report which is currently still the reference to learn more about the situation of indigenous women in our region. This way, always considering this report, it is estimated that there is a population of more than 23 million indigenous women which belong to more than 670 villages, in Latin-America and the Caribbean. In this sense, as is summarized in the table designed to these effects, Mexico, Guatemala and Peru would be the countries of the region in which the highest number of indigenous women would live (8.7 million in the first case, around 3.3 in the other two). These figures would explain between 15.3% and 23.8% of the total of women that live in these three countries. Meanwhile, in Colombia, Ecuador and Brazil, indigenous women would be around 70,000 and 400,000 and, their relative importance over the total of women would fluctuate between 0.4% in Brazil, and 7.1% in Ecuador. Nicaragua, Panama, Uruguay and Costa Rica, in turn, would register absolutely lower figures (between 50,000 and 200,000), but with a more variable and higher relative importance, up to 12.1% in Panama (ECLAC, 2013) (World Bank, 2016).

In this scenario, there are numerous studies which further examine how this double condition of being woman and indigenous increases this group’s vulnerability, generating permanent inequality and discrimination gaps with respect to men and to non-indigenous population in terms of, for example, access to education, health, the labor market or to political decision-making spaces, to name a few. Counterbalancing, these same reports also reveal the capacity indigenous women are demonstrating to overcome this situation and its long-lasting challenges. This becomes evident through their increasing leadership in indigenous political and social organizations, as well as in the way in which they are assuming responsibilities in social and political spaces which are key.1

Guatemala is the second Latin-American and Caribbean country with the highest total indigenous population and indigenous women. In this sense, given the country’s awareness of this reality and the challenges it generates, especially in a context guided by the will to achieve the 2030 Agenda, it is easy to understand why this group is

---

1 http://www.filac.org/wp/comunicacion/filac-informa/situacion-de-la-mujer-indigena-en-america-latina-y-el-caribe/ CONTINUES ON P. 90
With all the above, Guatemala intends to promote indigenous women empowerment, to facilitate their full inclusion in the economy and in decision-making processes, as well as to ensure their rights and, ultimately, that they can take advantage of national development, in equal conditions. National efforts to face these challenges are accompanied by a commitment to exchange experiences and strengthen its capacities through South-South Cooperation. In 2017, this was materialized in the construction of the National Development Plan K’atun: Our Guatemala 2032.2

In its own National Development Plan, ratified, together with the Central-American country, its purpose to create a cooperation agreement to share experiences and strengthen joint actions in favor of indigenous women. This agreement, named “Knowledge transfer on public policies and indigenous women”, was conceived in an integral manner, proposing actions that include all matters which contribute to the eradication of all violence against women and to broaden their opportunities of political and social participation, among others. This way, and in relation to 2017, Mexico’s and Guatemala’s cooperation materialized in one project named “Exchange of experiences in the framework of the attention and prevention of Violence against Women”.

For the purpose of this cooperation agreement, both countries decided to explore technical assistance through South-South Cooperation. In 2017, Guatemala received technical assistance from Colombia, in a project conceived to design a road map which would enable Guatemala’s institutions to have better strategies and mechanisms for the attention and repair of indigenous women victims of violence, and which should contribute, in turn, to the strengthening of the Office for Indigenous Women Protection, created after the Peace Agreements of 1996.3

Finally, in a specific action, the National Civilian Police of El Salvador presented, in Guatemala, its Network of Women Human Rights Defenders, a mechanism for the defense and promotion of women’s rights within the police corporation, which was one of the steps in which its Institutional Policy for Gender Equity and Equality in National Civilian Police, materialized.4

---

1, 2 https://lac.unwomen.org/es/donde-estamos/guatemala
3 http://www.pnc.gob.gs/portal/page/portal/informativo/novedades/noticias/Presentaci%F3n%20de%20Red%20de%20Mujeres%20Defensoras%20de%20Derechos%20Hu#.XfdVvIJKiUk
4 http://www.pnc.gob.gs/portal/page/portal/informativo/novedades/noticias/Presentaci%F3n%20de%20Red%20de%20Mujeres%20Defensoras%20de%20Derechos%20Hu#.XfdVvIJKiUk

Source: SEGIB based on ECLAC (2013), World Bank (2015) and UN Women

---

### INDIGENOUS WOMEN IN LATIN-AMERICA, BY COUNTRY

Total population of indigenous women and percentage in the total of women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Indigenous Women</th>
<th>Weight over total women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>8,683,462</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>3,322,797</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2,356,859</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>689,577</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>517,797</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>410,584</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>222,049</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>205,098</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>87,162</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>51,709</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: SEGIB based on ECLAC (2013), World Bank (2015) and UN Women*
II.5

BILATERAL SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

Ever since its approval in the United Nations General Assembly in September 2015, the Ibero-American space has shown a firm commitment to the 2030 Agenda and to everything which results in the progress towards a development that “leaves no one behind”. This commitment has materialized through South-South Cooperation, in the search for instruments which contribute to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In line with the aforementioned, since 2016, Ibero-American country’s institutions responsible for SSC Cooperation have the mandate to advance, together with SEGIB and PIFCSS, in collectively developing a methodology to identify the possible contributions of those South-South Cooperation projects which are being executed, to the SDGs. This methodology is not intended to evaluate or measure the impacts of these contributions, it is only an instrument to further understand the potential contribution these projects are having to the countries’ —and, ultimately, the region’s— efforts to achieve Sustainable Development.

This Report’s last edition already anticipated the main characteristics of this methodology,\(^{13}\) in which the countries, together with SEGIB and PIFCSS, have been working throughout 2019 and which main results will be systematized in a final document that will be published in 2020. Figure II.1 was designed to summarize the steps that have been taken in the development of this methodology, as well as the logic on which it is based. Specifically:

\(^{13}\) Refer to Box II.10 in SEGIB (2018, p.79)
a) As shown in Figure II.1.1, the designed methodology originates in a previous exercise developed by SEGIB since the 2016 edition of this Report on South-South Cooperation in Ibero-America. Countries' inclusion to the collective work was done at two levels: through a Working Group (with reduced members and formed by Argentina, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Spain and Uruguay), and through the participation of PIFCSS 21-member countries. An important instrument to ensure the participation of all the countries in this exercise was the development of two workshops, co-organized with PIFCSS, the first one in Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic), in September 2018, and the second one, in Montevideo (Uruguay), in April 2019. The final approval of the methodology by all countries and its systematization and public presentation will be based on these workshops, on consultations and on a preliminary testing. A document, which development is still pending, is estimated to be available by mid 2020.

b) On the other hand, Figure II.1.2 synthetizes, in a very succinct and indicative manner, the basis of this methodological proposal which must facilitate the identification of the possible contribution of the region's SSC projects to the SDGs. In this sense, the methodology requires the definition of a process to "transit" from SSC projects "across" the 30 activity sectors into which the same projects are classified in the Ibero-American space, arriving to the 169 targets associated with the 17 Development Goals, and, through these, identify the SDG to which these projects better "contribute".

The developed methodology, in its most definite version, was applied in this 2019 edition of the Report, to the analysis of Bilateral SSC projects which were exchanged by the countries of the region throughout 2017. In this case, a total of 641, due to the way in which, as in the sectoral analysis, "bidirectional" projects are considered. Graph II.9, plotted to portray the results, is a radial column chart in which the 17 radial dividers (axes) correspond to each of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). SDG 1 is placed in the most vertical axis, as if twelve o'clock, and the rest of the variables (the other SDGs) are correlative arranged clockwise, on the circle’s perimeter. Columns (bars or segments) are plotted inside each radial divider (axis). Its dimension depends on the number of projects which would be potentially aligned with the corresponding SDG, moving away from the center of the circle as the number of projects increases.

Analysis of Graph II.9 shows the following:

a) A large part of the projects, 4 out of 10, could contribute to the achievement of three SDGs: SDG 3 about "Good health and well-being" (105 projects, corresponding to 16.4% of the total), SDG 16, dedicated to "Peace, justice and strong institutions" and SDG 8 "Decent work and economic growth" (94 and 75 exchanges which explained, respectively, 14.7% and 11.5% of the total projects registered in 2017).

b) There was another 30% of the exchanges which could be oriented to support the achievement of up to 5 different SDGs: SDG 2 "Zero hunger", SDG 9, dedicated to "Industry, innovation and infrastructure", SDG 4 and 10, relative in each case to "Quality education" and "Reduced inequalities"; and SDG 6 regarding "Clean water and sanitation". The number of projects related to each of these SDGs fluctuated between 35 and 45, with relative shares between 5% and 7.5%.

c) Finally, the remaining 30% of Bilateral SSC projects exchanged in the region throughout 2017 would be oriented to:

- On the one hand, the achievement of three SDGs with an environmental component (SDGs 11 “Sustainable cities and communities”, 13 “Climate action” and 15 “Life on land”) and to which SDG 17 “Partnerships for the goals”, must be added. Around 25 projects would have been registered related to each of these Goals.

- On the other hand, advancing in the achievement of another five SDGs: SDG 1 “No poverty”, SDG 5 “Gender equality”, SDGs 7 and 12, relative to “Affordable and clean energy” and “Responsible consumption and production”; and SDG 14 regarding “Life below water”. Despite action related to these would be lower, exchanges associated with each of them would not have been less than 10.
A more detailed analysis of the specific contents of the projects which were implemented throughout 2017, enables a better understanding of the purposes through which SSC could actually be supporting the achievement of the SDGs. More specifically:

a) As was anticipated, more than one hundred projects could be contributing to "ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages", purpose on which SDG 3 concentrates. All literal references to the contents of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) are based on https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/es/objetivos-de-desarrollo-sostenible/
with SSC developed to support the Health sector, not only its institutions, but also the cooperation that combines addressing diseases from their prevention to their treatment, as well as the improvement of life quality in general. It is worth mentioning some examples: those developed to control and reduce tobacco consumption; those relative to improving nutrition (especially, in early childhood and older adults); those dedicated to special treatments (child oncology and neuro-protective medications to reduce pain); or those registered to strengthen donation and transplant systems. However, by the way in which the methodology is conceived, some of the SSC projects which are identified are classified, initially, in sectors which are different from Health, such as Agriculture and livestock, Population and reproductive health, and Other services and social policies, including Environment.

In order to illustrate, it is appropriate to make a reference to that cooperation which, through phytosanitary management, pursues, as its main aim, the improvement of health by restraining communicable diseases. This cooperation promotes the universal access to health services, with a focus on migrants; promotes the improvement of quality of life by fostering sports and exercise; and positively improves health by acting in the reduction of air, water and soil pollution.

b) On the other hand, considering the enormous importance that the strengthening of the public sector has in SSC developed by the region, it is not surprising that another almost one hundred projects are related to SDG 16, conceived to "promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development", which requires, in turn, to "build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions". In this sense, alignment with this purpose is achieved through very diverse projects, classified in up to 9 different activity sectors. To name a few which prevail: those which improve statistics and indicators, or those which strengthen public planning, evaluation and management systems through the inclusion of ICTs to improve access to information, decision making and accountability to citizens; also projects which contribute to countries’ legal and judicial development, as well as to stop any discrimination form. In this sense, it is important to highlight all cooperation that promotes access to justice: the one which focuses in how to facilitate the reinsertion of youth in conflict with law; and the one which addresses, from different perspectives, the respect for Human Rights; the one which contributes to the fight against traffic of all people or that promotes the development of measures to eradicate child labor; as well as all SSC that, using sports or art as instruments, promotes coexistence, social inclusion and peace in communities which are in conflict.

c) Meanwhile, a great part of the projects which in 2017 were intended to strengthen the different productive sectors, infrastructures and services which ensure a correct economic operation, including the promotion of other industries (such as Culture), could have been focused on SDG 8, which addresses not only aspects relative to growth and its sustainability, but also those which promote "employment and decent work". In this context, projects which were classified in the Employment and Enterprises sectors, as well as in those related to Agriculture and livestock and Tourism, were especially relevant. Some examples would address the recognition and certification of labor capacities and the promotion of entrepreneurship and micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises. It is also worth highlighting all cooperation through which irrigation and harvesting techniques are shared, the one which develops new fertilizers or strengthens the processing chains of some of the region’s common agriculture products; as well as the one which transfers experiences related to fostering tourism as a local development engine. In all these cases, worthy of mention is the cross-cutting perspective that emerges when focusing on families and employment alternatives; as well as on the application of management techniques which enable all economic activity to advance towards a model which is as much sustainable as possible.
d) Again, the Agriculture and livestock sector, but also Fisheries, would be related to projects which intended to strengthen SDG 2 and through that “achieve food security and improved nutrition”. In order to illustrate, projects which combine food production, also focusing on self-consumption, should be mentioned, as well as those dedicated to improve the access of populations with nutritional shortages to food. SSC projects classified in the Health sector or in Other services and social policies, would also share this purpose, since this cooperation is conceived to fight against chronic malnutrition, to develop food rich in specific nutrients (oil and omega 3), or to promote school lunchrooms and gardens, to name a few.

Once again, the Agriculture and Livestock sector, but also Fisheries, would be associated with projects aimed at strengthening SDG 2 and, through that, “achieve food security and improved nutrition”

e) “Availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all” would be another purpose which would conduct some of the projects which address SDG 6, mainly classified in the sector Water supply and sanitation and, occasionally, in Environment. All projects related to water resources management, to ensuring access to them and to sanitation, tariffs systems and attention to rural areas, among others, would be included.

f) A similar number of projects, preferably related to the Industry and Science and technology sectors, are oriented to another SDG, 9, with a similar relative importance, in the search for “resilient infrastructure”, “inclusive and sustainable industrialization” and the fostering of “innovation”. Some of these would enable the exchange of experiences regarding scientific and technological progress applied to economic processes, especially productive ones, sometimes adding the double aim to do this in a more environmentally sustainable manner. In order to illustrate, projects which promote the reutilization of waste to design and develop new products (banana baskets), deserve highlighting.

g) SSC which in 2017 was destined to advance in the achievement of SDG 4 “Quality education” and 10 “Reduced inequalities”, merits a special reference. These two SDGs are strongly interrelated. As should be expected, there would be an intense correlation between projects classified in the Education sector and SDG 4, as well as between those relative to Other services and social policies and SDG 10. Diverse projects would be identified which would include from training of trainers to the digitalization of classrooms and curricular contents, considering also pedagogic innovations such as turning into chess or art to teach little children. Moreover, cooperation which strengthens the most integral social policies, conceived to promote social inclusion and which focus its action on the most vulnerable groups, such as early childhood, young people, older adults or disabled people, should be highlighted.

h) Progress towards making “cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable”, according to what SDG 11 pursues, would be contemplated in projects of a very different nature. Those oriented to the integral improvement of neighborhoods and the strengthening of housing policies which promote, in turn, inclusion (classified in Other services and social policies sector) would be evident; as well as those which foster the protection and safeguard of cultural and natural heritage, especially that of indigenous people (related to the Culture sector). More specific projects which intend to foster the use of public bicycles in big cities (Environment), must also be mentioned.

i) Meanwhile, projects mostly classified in the Environment, Disaster management, Forestry and, occasionally, Agriculture and livestock, sectors would be those which would have the purpose to advance in SDG 13 “Climate action” and 15 “Life on land”. This cooperation would focus on: control of carbon dioxide emissions; diagnosis and prevention of the most extreme effects of climate change, but also on the adaptation and mitigation of these; biodiversity management and the sustainable management of forests, which use as carbon sinks is key when facing this phenomenon global challenge.
With reference to SDG 17, much focused on the means that should enable the implementation of the 2030 Agenda as well as the development of a "global partnership for sustainable development", two types of projects could be identified. A first group related to, for example, the introduction of tariffs systems in sectors such as Transportation and storage and Energy, contributing to the improvement of tax revenues which should contribute to Development financing. The second group, related to the development of associations and collective efforts, through the strengthening of International, South-South and Triangular Cooperation, as well as through the exchange of experiences to improve the indicators which will allow each of the countries to develop a better monitoring and follow-up of the SDGs.

Finally, there are more than 50 projects, a lower but not less important number, which aggregately would tend to be aligned with SDG 1 "No poverty"; SDG 5 "Gender equality"; SDG 7 "Affordable and clean energy"; SDG 12 "Responsible consumption and production"; and SDG 14 "Life below water". In order to illustrate, these projects would be focused on: strengthening national strategies for poverty eradication; advancing in the fight against violence towards women; promoting renewable energies and their efficient use; and in all matters related to waste management, especially that derived of economic activities such as extractive; as well as those related to sea and ocean management. Box II.9 was designed to illustrate this last case. It contains information regarding the 12 projects which should contribute to preserve one of humanity’s most precious goods: water and its biodiversity. It also details between which countries these projects were exchanged and how.

**BOX II.9**

**JOINING EFFORTS FOR THE CONSERVATION OF OCEANS, SEAS AND MARINE RESOURCES**

When the United Nations presents SDG 14, conceived to "conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources", it raises an alarm on the importance of these resources for planet Earth to be habitable, as they are an essential part of the food we eat and the oxygen we breathe. This idea is emphasized through a remainder of the key role oceans and seas have historically had in the world’s economy, as they are considered "vital conduits for trade and transportation". In addition, it is firm when warning that "careful management of this essential global resource" is necessary if we expect Sustainable Development for the future.¹

This reality is especially critical to our region. Latin-America and the Caribbean have a coastal line of almost 70,000 kilometers and, along these, most urban settlements are located. Fisheries, tourism and port activities are key in the economy of the great majority of our countries. There is information to illustrate this. In 2012, Chile, Mexico and Peru explained more than 11% of the world’s total fishing, these countries being part of the 18 which concentrate 80% of all fishing in the world. In addition, the region explains basically the tenth part of the world’s container traffic by sea; and 45% of the world’s cruise travel, is developed in the Caribbean (ECLAC; 2019).

However, these economic, but most importantly, biodiversity and life resources —7% of the world’s coral reefs are concentrated just in the Caribbean— are facing strong threats, partly because of their increasing deterioration. Plastic accumulation, agrochemicals and domestic residual waters, are the

¹[https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/es/objetivos-de-desarrollo-sostenible/](https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/es/objetivos-de-desarrollo-sostenible/)
BILATERAL SSC PROJECTS POTENTIALLY ALIGNED WITH SDG 14. 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina/Chile</td>
<td>Cooperation for the appropriation and awareness recreational fishing sustainability in school education in Futaleufu and Palena communities, through the experience of the Province of Chubut (Argentina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil/Mexico</td>
<td>Exchange of experiences for professional and technical training in the areas of fisheries and aquaculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil/Peru</td>
<td>Capacity strengthening to improve aquaculture production in Bajo Yavari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil/Peru</td>
<td>Capacity Strengthening to improve aquaculture production in Madre Dios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile/Costa Rica</td>
<td>Cooperation in mariculture between Chile and Costa Rica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile/Mexico</td>
<td>Institutional capacity strengthening for the sustainable use of oceans and seas, with emphasis on protected marine areas and adaptation to climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile/Mexico</td>
<td>Development and strengthening of the aquaculture industry between Jalisco and Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba/Mexico</td>
<td>Biological and fishing investigation of the red grouper epinephelus morio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico/Panama</td>
<td>Capacity strengthening in the aquaculture and fishing sectors for clusters creation and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico/Panama</td>
<td>Evaluation and conservation of the population levels of sea snails Strombus (Lobatus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico/Panama</td>
<td>Creation of a committee for the strengthening of the fishing sector and its value chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru/Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Exchange of experiences between the Dominican Fishing and Aquaculture Council (CODOPESCA) and the Technological Production Institute of Peru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table, a total of up to 9 Ibero-American countries were implied in promoting this kind of exchanges: Mexico did in up to 6 occasions; Brazil, Chile, Panama and Peru, in 3; while Argentina, Costa Rica, Cuba and the Dominican Republic, participated in 1 Bilateral SSC project each. This cooperation was destined to advance in the achievement of SDG 14, through a double formula: on the one hand, by acting on fishing activity and aquaculture, implementing improvements to achieve a more sustainable use of resources; on the other hand, by fostering the development of Protected Marine Areas, a practice which is aligned with the Convention on Biological Diversity, ratified by the majority of Ibero-American countries, and through which many of them will achieve, in 2020, the goal to protect 10% of marine coasts resources.

Source: SEGIB based on Agencies and General Directions for Cooperation, ECLAC (2019) and United Nations website for SDG (www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment)