



# SYNTHESIS REPORT ON EU-LAC SOCIAL RELATIONS

DEVELOPING NEW AVENUES OF COOPERATION

**Date:** 08.2019

**Document No:** 5.4

**Version:** 1

**Status:** Final

**Deliverable No:** 5.4

**Task Leader:** ZSI



## DOCUMENT INFORMATION

<b>Title</b>	Synthesis report on EU-LAC social relations - Developing new avenues of cooperation
<b>Lead Author</b>	Wolfgang Haider (ZSI), Barbara Glinsner (ZSI), Carolina Stefoni (U. Chile), Cristian Lopez Raventos (UNAM) Irene Azócar (UChile), Jaquelin Morillo (U. Chile), Martina Lindorfer (ZSI), Silvana Vargas (PUCP), Wolfgang Haider (ZSI) , Debbie Emamdie (UWI), Fernanda Stang (Uchile) Jessica Byron Reid (UWI), Juan Ansion (PUCP), Sergio Tirado (PUCP), Vladimir Zárate Nava (UNAM), Silvia Fernández Martínez (IILA)
<b>Internal quality control</b>	Ramon Torrent, Peter Birle
<b>Contributors</b>	
<b>Distribution</b>	PU
<b>Document No</b>	5.4

## DOCUMENT HISTORY

Date	Revision no	Prepared by	Approved by	Description
30.06.2019	1	Wolfgang Haider, Barbara Glinsner		First Draft Version
30.08.2019		Wolfgang Haider, Barbara Glinsner		Revised Version
08.10.2019	2	Peter Birle, Ramon Torrent, Jessica Byron		Feedback and comments
25.10.2019	3	Wolfgang Haider	Ramon Torrent, Peter Birle	Final revision

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

EULAC FOCUS Focus has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under Grant no 693781.

## DISCLAIMER

This document reflects only the authors' views and not those of the European Union. This work may rely on data from sources external to the EULAC-FOCUS project Consortium. Members of the Consortium do not accept liability for loss or damage suffered by any third party as a result of errors or inaccuracies in such data. The information in this document is provided "as is" and no guarantee or warranty is given that the information is fit for any particular purpose. The user thereof uses the information at its sole risk and neither the European Union nor any member of the EULAC-FOCUS Consortium is liable for any use that may be made of the information.

## CONTENTS

Document Information .....	2
Document History .....	3
Acknowledgement .....	3
Disclaimer.....	3
Contents.....	4
Summary .....	5
1 Introduction .....	6
2 Setting the Scene – The Social Dimension of EU-LAC relations .....	8
2.1 The implication of EU treaties for external relations.....	8
2.1.1 The commercial pillar (trade) – relevance for the social dimension .....	9
2.1.2 The pillar of Development Cooperation – relevance for the social dimension .....	9
2.1.3 The pillar of Political Dialogue – relevance for social dimension of EU-CELAC relations	12
2.2 The legal and institutional background of (CE)LAC.....	14
2.3 How do legal rules impede/make common actions possible .....	15
3 Social issues in the regions – Converging Trends and challenges.....	17
3.1 Mobility – a prominent issues in both regions .....	17
3.1.1 Migration policy in forums of regional integration in LAC.....	17
3.1.2 Migration policy in the EU.....	18
3.1.3 Common areas of interest of migration policy .....	19
3.2 Social protection mechanisms – Reforming welfare systems .....	20
3.2.1 Conditional Cash Transfer Programmes (CTPs) .....	21
3.2.2 Minimum Income Schemes (MIS) .....	22
3.2.3 Converging and Diverging Aspects and Elements of Cooperation .....	23
4 Implementing common actions – Cooperation on Social Issues between EU and LAC .....	27
4.1 EUROSOCIAL.....	27
4.2 SOCIEUX .....	28
4.3 Caribbean: CRIP and NIPs.....	29
4.4 Programmes for territorial cohesion .....	31
5 Final conclusions and recommendations.....	34
6 Literature .....	38

## SUMMARY

---

Across the globe nations and regions have to deal with increasingly complex societal issues and are faced with the challenge of finding new avenues and means to an inclusive and just society. In a globalised world, bi-regional cooperation has become more important than ever before to find adequate answers to social inequality. Despite their importance, societal and social issues have only played a minor role in bi-regional cooperation between the European Union and LAC countries so far. Therefore, strengthening EU-LAC relations in the social dimension is one of the key aims of the EULAC-Focus project.

In the framework of the EULAC Focus Project, WP5 was dedicated to the “social dimension” of EU-(CE)LAC cooperation. In a first step, the research trajectories of the social dimension were analysed by depicting the different notions and concepts, elements and instruments of social policy in both regions. The aim of this analysis was to develop a common understanding of potentials for up-scaling (see chapter 2 of this report as well as D 5.1 of the EULAC Focus Project). In this regard, it was highly important to go beyond a narrow definition of social policy and to adopt a holistic understanding of EU-LAC relations and their possible impact on the social dimension (see chapter 4 and D5.2 and 5.3). In a second step, the analysis dived deeper into selected fields of social policy that were deemed highly relevant, namely migration, social protection and territorial cohesion (chapter 3 of this report highlights the first two; for the whole analysis see Deliverable 5.3). Within these fields, trends and patterns of social policy reforms were investigated to explore future avenues for bi-regional cooperation. The present report summarises and synthesises the outcomes and findings of WP5 on the social dimension of EU-(LAC) cooperation.

To invigorate the bi-regional cooperation between (CE)LAC and the EU and to contribute to a more inclusive, sustainable and just societal development in accordance with the Sustainable Development Goals, it gives the following seven recommendations:

- I. Update the discourse on development and social issues at the bi-regional level to adopt a holistic and universal perspective and to overcome the outdated north-south divide
- II. Establish a bi-regional platform on social development monitoring
- III. Establish a very ambitious EU cooperation programme to exchange welfare experiences between EU and LAC
- IV. Strengthen the social dimensions of joint research programmes in the field of social policy between EU and LAC
- V. Build up joint Training and Research Programme(s) on social inclusion policy
- VI. Revive the bi-regional Dialogue on Migration
- VII. Introduce reciprocity regarding protection of migrant workers in bilateral agreements

# 1 INTRODUCTION

The EULAC Focus project focuses on different dimensions of the relations between the European Union (EU) and Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) and tries to deliver analytical insights contributing to the exploitation of the dormant potential that lies in these relations. This report is part of the project's work package that deals with the "social dimension" of EU-(CE)LAC relations. The analysis of EU-(CE)LAC social relations faces two main challenges: (1) the comparison of two very unequal entities: a very established EU and a very unstable (CE)LAC community and (2) a meagre knowledge base, as EU-(CE)LAC social relations generally remain rather vague. As a result, the work on the "social dimension" of EU-(CE)LAC relations takes a multi-level approach, gathering empirical data and analytical insights on the bi-regional, but also on the sub-regional and the national level. Thus, a comprehensive overview on the historical development and current significance of the social dimension of EU-(CE)LAC relations, and its potentials for creating renewed, sound bi-regional social cooperation agendas is called for.

This manifold approach is reflected in all the three different reports that have been produced as part of the work package on social relations of the EULAC Focus project and that cover different levels and granularities of the bi-regional relations. The first report focused on research trajectories in LAC and the EU and elaborated general social issues in the regions as well as future challenges and (common) social agendas<sup>1</sup>. A second one carried out a comparative analysis of the respective approaches to social inclusion in the two regions, mainly focusing on national and regional policies, but also taking into account the bi-regional dimension and its influence on the aforementioned policies<sup>2</sup>. To complement these previous studies, a third report examined the main programmes of EU-(CE)LAC cooperation in the social area, compared main reform features in respect to welfare regimes and identifies mutual interests and common areas of collaboration<sup>3</sup>. Taken together, the different reports contribute to a better understanding of the facets of the social dimension of EU-(CE)LAC relations, and shall ultimately feed into a renewed vision for EU-(CE)LAC relations.

While the reports elaborated in the framework of WP5- "Social Dimension of EU-LAC relations" all stand on their own and have each gathered different data regarding diverse nuances of the bi-regional relations, it is essential to create a synthesis connecting them. Therefore, the present report "Synthesis report on the Social Dimension" brings together the insights of the three different thematic reports and highlights the institutional framework, key instruments, programmes and conclusions that characterise and can reinvigorate the social dimension of EU-LAC relations. It does so by synthesising the information gathered in the three reports highlighting the following three focus areas:

- **Setting the scene – State of the Art of EU-LAC relations in the Social Dimension**

The first focus area (see chapter 2) reflects on the legal and institutional basis of the social dimension in EU-(CE)LAC relations. To understand the outcomes and the content of bi-regional relations, they need to be scrutinised regarding their capability to create norms and binding obligations for the

<sup>1</sup> EULAC-Focus (2018): Deliverable 5.1. *Research trajectories on social issues in the EU, (CE)LAC and beyond.*

*How the social dimension of the EU and (CE)LAC frame EU-(CE)LAC social relations.* See: [http://eulac-focus.net/private/Modules/Tools/EUPProject/documents/66/D5.1\\_WP5-DI-66\\_Social-Issues\\_v13\\_1.pdf](http://eulac-focus.net/private/Modules/Tools/EUPProject/documents/66/D5.1_WP5-DI-66_Social-Issues_v13_1.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> EULAC-Focus (2019): Deliverable 5.3.-*Report on differences and convergences in EU and CELAC social inclusions policy approaches. Comparative Analysis of respective approaches to social inclusion.*

<sup>3</sup> EULAC Focus (2019): Report on common interests for the implementation of EU-CELAC cooperation in social cohesion policies.

parties involved. For this reason, the report elaborates the internal institutional and legal dynamics that shape the different aspects of the relations in the two regions. It looks into the various spaces of cooperation and how these spaces constitute a specific EU-LAC cooperation regime. On the basis of a comprehensive understanding of the very basic notions of what the “social dimension” of bi-regional relations entails, the further parts of the synthesis report focus on the thematic peculiarities gathered in the course of the work of WP5.

- **Social Issues in the region- Converging trends and challenges**

The second focus area (see chapter 3) of this report is delineating the state-of-the art of current social relations between the EU and (CE)LAC in order to identify opportunities for enhanced cooperation on social issues in the future, based on the identification of converging trends and challenges. In the EULAC Focus project it is hypothesized that the full potential of the EU-(CE)LAC relationship has not been exploited in the last decades, or, put differently, that the bi-regional relations were marked by a relative ineffectiveness or at least the inability to meet expectations. Therefore, this section aims at giving a better understanding of certain aspects of the social dimension of EU-(CE)LAC relation. In particular, the text investigates two main topics that are of great relevance in both regions. First, trends and challenges regarding the topic of mobility are highlighted by analysing current trends and regulations and looking at opportunities for mutual learning and interexchange between the two regions. Second, the focus is put on social protection mechanisms that shape the social policy landscape in the two regions. This part tries to assess the effectiveness of the different social protection mechanisms in place and looks to identify common trends in their design and implementation.

- **Common Actions – Implementing cooperation on social issues**

To conclude the synthesising review of the elaborated fields, the third focus of this report gives an overview of different implementation mechanisms that are relevant to the social dimension of EU-LAC relations. Since there are no specific bi-regional measures on social policy cooperation between LAC and the EU, this part has to look beyond policy reforms in the regions in order to assess whether actual effective cooperation on social issues is ongoing. It is crucial to deal with various facets of cooperation mechanisms that have impact on social issues in the regions. Therefore, this section looks at development cooperation programmes between the two regions promoted by the EU. However, the analysis conducted in the course of WP5 goes beyond the focus on cooperation programmes and takes a cross-institutional perspective looking at a variety of programmes in place, transcending the typical nature of programmes associated with social issues in order to get a full picture of what kind of mechanisms exist and can be used in order to increase the societal impact of EU-LAC relations towards a more inclusive and just society.

After diving into the different aspects of cooperation on social issues – the legal and institutional basis, the common challenges and trends and the implementation instruments – the last chapter of this report presents a synergetic conclusion that draws connections between the elements elaborated in the course of the project. At the same time, these conclusions already point to a set of recommendations that are targeted at strengthening the relations between the EU and LAC countries and that will feed into the final output of the EULAC – Focus plan, the Common Vision and Action Plan for reinvigorated EU-LAC relations.

## 2 SETTING THE SCENE – THE SOCIAL DIMENSION OF EU-LAC RELATIONS

To understand the outcomes and the content of bi-regional relations (e.g.: political declarations, trade agreements, joint projects...) they need to be scrutinised regarding their capability to create norms and binding obligations for the parties (i.e., the EU; EU Member States – MS -; CELAC; individual countries) involved. This means that it is necessary to take a look at the internal institutional and legal dynamics that shape the different aspects of the relations.

### 2.1 THE IMPLICATION OF EU TREATIES FOR EXTERNAL RELATIONS

The definition and implementation of policies within the EU's framework (including towards CELAC) follows three different (though interrelated) paths or approaches.

1. First, the Treaties can impose obligations to Member States with which they must comply when developing their own policies. This approach covers mainly relations between Member States and does not cover the relations with third countries.
2. Second, the Treaties can confer competences to the European Union (and before to the European Community) to define their own policies. When this is the case, these policies can be administratively implemented by Member States (as in the case of the two traditional main European Community policies, i.e. Agricultural and Commercial Policies) or the European Commission can be given implementing powers (as in the case of Research or Development Policy).
3. Third, Member States have always been able to exercise their own competences in common, without “communitarising” them. When the European Union was created by the Treaty of Maastricht in 1993, one of the main ideas underlying this creation was that of favouring this “common action” by Member States creating a framework (the Union) distinct from that of the Community. The result was an additional possibility that still complicates the analysis: Member States could act in common outside the framework of the Union (possibility 3b) or could act in common within the framework of the Union, (possibility 3a) in the area of Foreign and Security Policies or in the area of Home Affairs and Justice.

As a consequence, the EU (alone or accompanied by its Member States following the possibilities 3a and 3b analysed in the previous paragraph) can sign International agreements with LAC countries (not with CELAC because, CELAC does not have acquired an international legal personality). It can also participate in meetings and agree to common declarations with LAC countries or groups of countries (or with CELAC, because in order to participate in a meeting and/or agree to a joint Declaration no international legal personality is needed).

When it comes to the external relations of the EU with LAC (or any other region) it is important to note that the underlying legal basis is not a mutual agreement between the EU and the other party in question. Instead they are often only internal provisions which allow the EU to act (see the case of EUROsociAL). The underlying legal basis is not that of the “development or cooperation pillar” of any international agreement between the EU and Latin American countries but a purely internal EU



regulation: The main one is Regulation (EC) N° 1905/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council, of 18 December 2006, establishing a financial instrument for development cooperation, and in particular Article 22 thereof<sup>4</sup>.

Relations between the EU and LAC take place on various levels and follow the different logics of supranational legislation. Generally, the following levels can be distinguished (Gratius 2015: 5):

- I. Inter-regional relations (e.g. political EU–CELAC dialogue)
- II. Sub-regional relations with Central America, the Caribbean, the Andean Community and Mercosur;
- III. Bilateral relations; including cooperation between EU institutions and LAC countries (e.g. in development cooperation);
- IV. EU–LAC cooperation on global governance. Social issues in this cooperation appear, if anything, in the context of the topics migration, security, development or climate change.

To give a more specific framework to the multiple forms these relations can take, the categorisation in three pillars – political dialogue, trade, and (development) cooperation – is frequently used (Bodemer 2010, Coral 2014, Gardini and Ayuso 2015).

### **2.1.1 The commercial pillar (trade) – relevance for the social dimension**

In terms of creating binding norms, the commercial pillar (trade) of EU-(CE)LAC relations is the most important one. Commercial policy has always been an exclusive competence of the European Community (now the EU); successive reforms of the treaties, including the Treaty of Lisbon, have enlarged its scope. Therefore, EU institutions can engage in negotiations and sign binding treaties that imply the creation of norms for both regions. So far, the EU has negotiated bi-lateral trade agreements (some of them larger: Association agreements) with Chile, Mexico, Central America, Peru and Colombia (extended to Ecuador) and, of course, the Caribbean (CARIFORUM). Even when these agreements cover the so-called “three pillars” of trade, cooperation, and political dialogue, their core is the trade related area. Only in this area does the EU has an exclusive competence and can therefore directly implement regulations. Although these (free-trade) agreements do not directly tackle social issues, they have an effect on social policy systems, for example, through regulations regarding labour standards. However, the relevance of these treaties for social issues is rather limited.

### **2.1.2 The pillar of Development Cooperation – relevance for the social dimension**

Actions of development cooperation are based on non-exclusive competences that are implemented either by the EU or the MS. As there is an obligation to collaborate between the EU and its MS, topics in development cooperation should be selected departing from a European perspective. On the EU side the logic of this cooperation mode does not work according to the principles stated in international agreements but rather follow the course of European internal regulations as for example the decision regarding the establishment of one of the most prestigious development programmes between LAC and the EU in the social dimension – EUROsociAL - show<sup>5</sup>. This is certainly also true for

<sup>5</sup> This decision does not refer to any of the agreements made in international agreements but has its basis in the Regulation (EC) N° 1905/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council, of 18 December 2006, establishing a financial instrument for development cooperation.

[https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/aap-financing-latin-america-region-commission-decision-20101206\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/aap-financing-latin-america-region-commission-decision-20101206_en.pdf).

all other cooperation projects: they are developed in the framework of thematic regulations like the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR), the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP), Partnership Instrument (PI) or geographic ones like the Instrument for Development Cooperation (DCI), the European Development Fund (EDF) -for ACP countries- or the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance II (IPA). Agenda setting regarding international development cooperation is hereby taking place through cooperation between the European Commission, the European External Action Service and partner countries and regions, but always within the framework established by those regulations (the basic acts). A broad range of social issues are covered by development cooperation including conflict resolution, peace and security, youth and social inclusion, sustainable trade and investment, fight against illicit drugs, effective education for employment, adaptation to climate change, democracy, participation and institutional strengthening or health.<sup>6</sup> Currently, development aid and cooperation cannot be considered as a dialogue of equal partners where positions on certain social issues are negotiated in a process of flat hierarchies but rather are realisations of European concepts in the Latin American context. Obviously, the planning and implementation of development cooperation always includes a process of negotiating positions and concrete tasks. Hereby, the Sustainable Development Goals, explicitly set up as global development goals and not only focused on the global south, provide a framework in which the partnership component of development could and should be highlighted. In line with the opportunities for bi-regional cooperation identified by the recent report of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and DG DEVCO of the European Commission (2018), the EULAC Focus project looked at different development cooperation programmes and scrutinised them regarding their impact on a number of social issues in LAC.

More concretely, **Development cooperation between the EU and LAC** is designed within the framework of some key instruments, such as the European Consensus for Development, the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI), the EU's Agenda for Change and the EU-CELAC Action Plan. The Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) is the main financial instrument in the EU budget for funding aid to developing countries. Its primary objective is to alleviate poverty, but it also contributes to other international priorities in social and environmental development. The DCI is divided in geographical programmes (including support to regional cooperation programmes which are open to all LA countries with an indicative geographical programme allocation of €2 500 million for 2014-2020), thematic programmes and a Pan-African Programme. The DCI is one of six<sup>7</sup> EU cooperation instruments that, concerning their budgetary implementation, are all governed by Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action. While the DCI is the biggest developing funding instrument in the EU budget, the European Development Fund (EDF) is also very large and is also managed by the Commission, but standing outside the EU budget. The EDF is mainly aimed at the ACP region and the overseas countries and territories (OCTs) of the EU.

From EULAC Focus perspective, one of the most prominent development cooperation programmes between LAC and the EU is the EUROsociAL programme<sup>8</sup> which seeks to contribute to improving social

<sup>6</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/ebook\\_pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/ebook_pdf).

<sup>7</sup> The other 5 being the above mentioned IPA, the European Neighbourhood Instrument, PI, EIDHR, IcSP.

<sup>8</sup> The EUROsociAL programme will be further analysed in other deliverables of the EULAC Focus project.

cohesion in Latin American countries, and deals with issues such as employment policies, social protection, health, democratic governance and social dialogue.

The Multiannual Indicative Regional Programme for LA (the current one covers the period 2014 – 2020<sup>9</sup>) establishes the framework for the different annual programmes. In accordance with it, **cooperation has a stronger regional approach** (EU bilateral cooperation programmes with LA will diminish in relative importance) and shall “clearly demonstrate added value” (understood as e.g. common solutions for challenges common to several or all countries in the region). In the future, EU cooperation for development will be based upon a new paradigm which sees development rather as an ongoing process which implies that all countries (independent of their GDP) face challenges of development. In addition, the SDGs make development everybody’s business.

Regional programmes are playing a significant role in EU-LAC relations 2014-20. Five priority sectors for support are defined in the Multiannual Indicative Regional Programme for LAC for the period 2014-2020: (1) The security-development nexus (indicative allocation EUR 70 million) which includes strengthening the rule of law, human-rights based drug policies and migration and border management. Specific objectives related to migration are the facilitation of labour migration, strengthening migrants’ rights, control of irregular migration and promotion of the migration-development linkage. Human rights protection and gender equality are cross-cutting issues; (2) Good governance, accountability and social equity (indicative allocation €42 M) which has a focus on high quality public services (including public policies for reduction of social inequalities); (3) Inclusive and sustainable growth for human development (indicative allocation €215 M) which aims at poverty reduction through more inclusive and sustainable growth. This priority has a strong nexus to economic issues, such as trade facilitation, SME competitiveness, employability and environmentally sustainable investments; (4) Environmental sustainability and climate change (indicative allocation €300 M) and (5) Higher education exchange and cooperation (indicative allocation €163 M).

According to the European Commission’s Directorate General for Development Cooperation -DG DEVCO- “support for **the promotion of social cohesion** is an important common thread running through these priorities” (EC 2015: 19). Social cohesion is considered to be a leitmotif in EU-CELAC relations and will therefore be addressed in all priority areas and specific social cohesion targets will be defined during the implementation phase.

Besides, there is a **specific sub-regional programme for Central America** with an indicative budget of €120 M for 2014-2020. In Central America, the EU is the main donor of regional cooperation. Meanwhile, new cooperation agreements have been signed and new areas of cooperation (such as migration and counter-terrorism) were included. Currently, the security-development nexus is defined as a specific area of cooperation between EU and Central America in the Development and Cooperation Instrument. The EU-CA programmes’ second focal sector for 2014-2020 is security and the rule of law. The implementation of the Central American Security Strategy (ESCA) is also supported by the EU. Other priorities covered in the Programme CA are Regional Economic Integration and Climate change and disaster management.

<sup>9</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/dci-multindicativeprogramme-latinamerica-07082014\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/dci-multindicativeprogramme-latinamerica-07082014_en.pdf).

The EU has its own development cooperation policies towards the African, Caribbean and Pacific region (ACP). Most of development programmes for this region are financed through the European Development Fund (EDF). The Cotonou Partnership Agreement is the legal framework ruling relations between the EU and ACP and is one of the oldest and most comprehensive frameworks of cooperation between the EU and third countries. As the Agreement expires in 2020, EU and ACP are negotiating a new cooperation agreement, which shall have a strong focus on the SDGs and common challenges such as climate change, migration and peace and security.

Thinking about the **future of EU-LAC relations in the mode of development cooperation** recent developments imply that the historically grown hierarchical relations are in flux. As indicated in the “Agenda for Change”, EU development policy is undergoing a change process resulting in a concentration of EU aid on a reduced number of topics and countries.<sup>10</sup> Middle income or emerging countries are preferably seen as potential partners to tackle global challenges. Sanahuja et al. (2015) argue that the EU-LAC partnership can play an important role in shaping the post-2015 agenda by contributing their vision on and governance of democracy and social cohesion, complemented by pushing the topics regionalism and integration, higher education and STI and climate change; all of which can have positive impact on equity and social development. The 2030 Agenda could give a new impetus to cooperation on social issues between EU and CELAC. The recent report of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and DG DEVCO of the European Commission (2018), already mentioned, can give an overall justification for this change of approach.

### 2.1.3 The pillar of Political Dialogue – relevance for social dimension of EU-CELAC relations

Although the political dialogue on the bi-regional level does not create binding legal norms (e.g. it has no binding competencies) and is not able either to provide the required “legal basis” for EU action, it still has a relevant role in the agenda setting process and can potentially bring new (social) topics to the table. In terms of actual cooperation on social issues, the most important level is the bilateral one, as concrete exchange mostly takes place on this level.

The political pillar mainly consists of joint declarations on topics where the participating countries potentially have a common interest, reflecting not a common European approach but rather aligned interests of MS under a common umbrella (EU) (Coral 2014: 68). The same holds true for the LAC counterparts at the EU-CELAC Summits where LAC States participate under the common framework of CELAC without attributing any relevant competences to the common institution. Although those summits do not produce any legally binding declarations and often treat delicate issues, this format serves as a forum for addressing common interregional challenges in a coherent way that allows to channel resources and address societal demands (Gardini and Ayuso 2015: 16–17).

In the case of association agreements, the pillar of political dialogue can be considered as a product of internal power struggles between the Commission, the Council, and the Member States (Torrent, 2005: 34). By including the MS in the Agreements they are able to claim to be a vital part of the relations and the Commission was assured of its predominant role in trade related issues. The same

<sup>10</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/policies/european-development-policy/agenda-change\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/policies/european-development-policy/agenda-change_en).

structure is reproduced in the bi-regional summit dialogue, if even on a weaker institutional basis than in the association agreements (Torrent 2005: 34-39).

A special focus has to be put on the Caribbean as it played a significant role in the constitution of CELAC and CELAC's political dialogue with the EU, putting emphasis on the benefits of South-South cooperation (SSC). Without getting into detail of the historical evolution of EU-Caribbean dialogue, the importance of Caribbean countries in CELAC, and especially in its formation as a global actor, should not be underestimated. The Declaration of the First CELAC Summit in Santiago de Chile in January 2013 recommended the creation of a Working Group on International Cooperation that would include SSC in its remit ([www.minrel.gob.cl/](http://www.minrel.gob.cl/)). In July 2014 in San Jose, Costa Rica, the Second Meeting of this Working Group adopted a Conceptual Framework which documents the normative history and spells out the principles for SSC in the CELAC region (Marco Conceptual de la Cooperacion Internacional para el Desarrollo en la CELAC, 2014).

These guidelines state that in the present phase of CELAC's evolution, not just bilateral relations but also regional and sub-regional institutions and programmes will be the major vehicles of cooperation with the main goal being to address asymmetries across the countries of CELAC and inequalities within the societies. The guidelines emphasize island developing states, landlocked states and the most vulnerable sectors across CELAC populations.

However, for the Caribbean to fully engage in CELAC, several challenges are prevalent (see Byron and Laguardia Martinez 2019 for a more detailed elaboration): For one, there are already many mechanisms that exist, promoting regional – at LAC, LA or South American level- (CELAC, ALBA, Unasur) subregional (CARICOM and CARIFORUM; as well as ACS) and sub-subregional (OECS) cooperation. Second, CELAC's agenda has a broad scope and intensive high-level meeting, but lacks consolidated institutional structures or medium-term leadership. In addition, in Latin America there are differing levels of interest in the Caribbean region – higher in Central America, Colombia, Venezuela and Brazil while possibly lower in the southern cone. Therefore, the extension and intensity of Latin American-Caribbean relations is uneven.

On the other hand, the Caribbean states can take over a very important linking role in the relations between CELAC and the EU, and this is due to various reasons: First, there are several European jurisdictions in the Caribbean, that can serve as a familiar starting point for concrete cooperation actions. Second, 16 of the 33 Member States that comprise CELAC, are CARIFORUM members. Therefore, the Caribbean accounts for almost half of the members of CELAC. Third, Caribbean countries are recognised as Small Island Developing States (SIDS), which puts them in a favourable position to reach out to other small countries and gives them a legitimate voice when raising concerns about sustainable development and development vulnerabilities in multilateral fora. This could strengthen CELAC's capacity to build alliances in the multilateral arena.

In conclusion, CELAC as a political forum has had significant potentials for promoting and operationalising bi-regional cooperation with the EU, especially if it had also been used to strengthen the voice of smaller states, such as the SIDSs or some Central American countries. However, in order to do so, it would have been necessary to equip this political forum with the adequate institutional body and decision making power.

## 2.2 THE LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL BACKGROUND OF (CE)LAC

The information given above about the legal foundation of the EU demonstrates that the EU can act as a regional player equipped with the power to sign legal binding documents (in the commercial pillar and other areas covered by EU competence, albeit non-exclusive). In contrast to that, regional integration projects in Latin America and the Caribbean are not equipped with the legal or institutional background to create binding norms for their members. The latest instrument of integration in the LAC region, CELAC, can be characterised as a summit diplomacy system as well as by the will of being represented as a bloc on the global stage.

In order to keep CELAC advancing through topics and issues, three main instruments have been developed. They are meant to help when organising the process and the political dialogue held in the summits.

**Political Declarations.** These are the first product of the summits. These documents detail the positions, commitments, and agreements made by the Heads of State. They also define CELAC's approach to different topics as education, culture, migration, etc. The Declarations not only explain policies, guidelines, and actions, but also serve as diplomatic tools to salute events, decisions, achievements, or to express discomfort with events of global scale as a regional block.

**Action Plans.** They organise the executive aspects of the summits. These products are meant to express the immediate actions, policies, and guidelines to be adopted after the meeting. Actions Plans are prepared annually and define the course of CELAC for the year to come.

**Planning Agendas.** These are instruments meant to define the mid- and long-term policies, commitments, and guidelines of CELAC, and also make the CELAC goals explicit in the long term. These documents also determine the indicators by which the progress to these goals can be measured, and points out the guidelines of how policies will be financed.

Although CELAC was only formed some years ago, it has produced several Action Plans and the latest Planning Agenda to 2020. This Agenda contains four convergences between CELAC states of what the region should accomplish by 2020. These convergences are the Reduction of extreme poverty and inequalities; Investment in education, science, technology and innovation; Promotion of sustainable development and actions against climate change; and Investment in infrastructure and connectivity.

While CELAC is an important instrument of integration in the LAC, region it is not the only one. Latin America and the Caribbean have had significant initiatives and examples of continental, plurilateral, subregional lateral organisations with the aim of fostering progress. Nonetheless, these initiatives often were born as mechanisms to incentive trade and commerce or, on the other hand, to leverage the influence of the most powerful countries in the region. Among them are the Organisation of American States (OEA), Common Market of the South (MERCOSUR), Andean Community, Union of South American Nations (UNASUR), Caribbean Community (CARICOM), Pacific Alliance, and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC). However, they have very limited relevance for the social dimension of EU–LAC relations as they lack the necessary decisionmaking powers in areas relevant to the social dimension.



### 2.3 HOW DO LEGAL RULES IMPEDE/MAKE COMMON ACTIONS POSSIBLE

The analysis of the social dimension of EU-LAC relations has shown that it is crucial to identify the respective actors and parties that are involved in the elaboration of international treaties, agreements and declarations. Only in doing so the social issues on the agenda can be scrutinized regarding the possible impact that they can create in each of the two regions. Especially for the EU it becomes obvious that the different internal regulations and instruments determine the shape and outcome of its international relations much more than provisions in international agreements and political declarations empty of any binding commitment.

Development cooperation projects between the EU and LAC targeting social issues are implemented following an internal EU logic and are not (legally) founded in any of the international agreements or declarations on social issues. This highlights the fact that social issues tackled in declarations of bi-regional summits or in the bi-regional dialogue on development cooperation are to be considered as a declaration of will or as an expression of common interest and not as a foundation for the relations in general. Furthermore, it should be noted that social issues are in themselves treated as a cross-cutting issue in bi-regional relations which means that they appear in various areas of the relations. They can, directly or indirectly, be found in all of the so-called “three pillars” (political dialogue, development cooperation, commercial and trade-related matters) of the relationship. This is related to the specific structure of the European Union which evokes a division of competences in the social realm between the institutions of the Union and the Member states themselves. Social issues remain to a huge extent under competence of MS, while only some competencies are at EU level.

This complicates the situation of EU-LAC relations as it inhibits the process of finding common, mutually beneficial objectives and especially the translation of these common objectives into concrete and tangible actions and results, preventing common actions and the formation of a real “strategic partnership” in the social dimension. This is also due to the variety of interests, actors and social models both in the EU and LAC. We must insist on the fact that the only area that stands out in terms of concrete results is the commercial area. Here the exclusive competence of the EU allows producing concrete actions in (mostly) bilateral agreements with LAC states. However, this is the area where social issues are hardly tackled explicitly but remain as a subordinated by-product of economic growth and development, such as the attempt to acknowledge minimum labour standards.

While the interrelation of competences between the EU and its MS adds complexity to the relations (welfare provision remains essentially in the hands of MS), a similar phenomenon is visible in the case of LAC, even though on a different level. Regional integration projects in LAC are hardly equipped with the legal or institutional background to create binding norms through international agreements or contracts. Therefore, the specific states have to be part of these documents and remain the main (or only) signatories of international agreements. A conclusion, therefore, is that even though considerable efforts have been undertaken to strengthen LAC integration projects, often under strong reference to the EU model, the main channel of the relations remains the bilateral one when it comes to the creation of binding norms. A consequence of this lack of a legal and institutional framework of LAC integration projects is that soft-law instruments are predominant in the area of bi-regional social relations. Looking for example at the declarations of the EU-CELAC summits it is obvious that no legally binding norms are created through them. However, through instruments of soft law the participating

states commit themselves to the achievement of set goals and objectives and signatories can thus be held accountable, at least in a political way.

In spite of their limitations compared to binding legal instruments, soft law approaches seem to be the most promising perspective for the social dimension of EU-LAC relations, especially taking into account the lack of competences regarding social issues on a regional level in LAC (in CELAC as well as in other integration projects), but also in the EU. The growing importance of soft law in the EU context (see e.g. Open Method of coordination described in chapter 2) is hereby connectable to the commitments of e.g. CELAC to foster cooperation on social issues. Therefore, a common procedure of soft law implementation should be found that focuses on social issues in the two regions and on strategies and concrete actions to tackle them. In doing so, transcontinental learning process would be enabled and a mutually beneficial bi-regional relationship could be fertilized. While these bi-regional soft-law procedures could take an example in the way that the Open Method of Coordination is implemented in the EU, it should as well be based in LAC experiences regarding social challenges and south-south cooperation. Thus, the reproduction of patterns of one-sided power-asymmetries that often shape EU-LAC relations as a way of exporting EU concepts to LAC could be avoided.

Another important factor on the way to an equal relationship could be to strengthen the role of civil society and social partners in the framework of the relations. In the case of the EU the principle of promoting social dialogue has always been included in the Treaty. The internal EU procedures could serve as a point of departure for further strengthening the role of social dialogue in the bi-regional relations. Nonetheless, it must be stated that at EU level the understanding of social dialogue is a very narrow one, reducing social partners to employers' and employee associations. While the EU-CELAC summits already encompass reunions of civil society representatives, a way to properly include them in the framework of the relations has yet to be found. A transcontinental soft law approach could strengthen the position of civil society actors and additionally help to create leverage for EU-LAC relations in the broader public. Only by acknowledging the significance of civil society, the EU-(CE)LAC dialogue can produce substantial outputs that gather the support of the population in both regions.



### 3 SOCIAL ISSUES IN THE REGIONS – CONVERGING TRENDS AND CHALLENGES

---

Social inclusion policies target a wide range of societal issues they want to solve. The analysis on differences and convergences in the EU and in (CE)LAC regarding the social inclusion policies (D.5.3.) dived deeper into three policy areas which are at the heart of social inclusion, namely: migration, anti-poverty programmes and territorial cohesion. The first two are presented in the present report, since their connection to social inclusion is the strongest and important conclusions for mutual learning can be drawn from analysing those fields.

#### 3.1 MOBILITY – A PROMINENT ISSUES IN BOTH REGIONS

Migration is as old as humanity itself and has always played a vital role in forming the cultures and societies. Historically, in Latin America and the Caribbean overseas immigration mainly<sup>11</sup> but not exclusively through the arrival of people from Europe in the mid-nineteenth century marked an important migration movement. The emergence of totalitarian regimes in the 20s and 30s in Europe also triggered the migration of a significant number of people from that region. Nowadays migration patterns in Latin America and the Caribbean can be best described as extraregional emigration and intraregional migration (J. Martínez & Orrego, 2016). With regard to the former, the United States stand out as the main destination for Latin Americans, with Spain being the second most important destination country. Intraregional migration within the LAC region has experienced one of the most significant intercensal increases (32% between 2000-2010), particularly in South America (Stefoni, 2017). However, in terms of overall figures, Latin America and the Caribbean continue to be, as has been the case for the last 70 years, a region of emigration rather than immigration. Globally, the migration corridor from Latin America and the Caribbean to the United States is the most important, but the Europe-Europe corridor ranks second. Hence, migration in Europe is mostly an intra-regional phenomenon. Migration from Italy to the other founding states of the European Economic Community shaped decisively the EEC Treaty, obliging to introduce in it far-reaching provisions on migrant workers. And Russia, Ukraine, Poland and Romania<sup>12</sup> are at present the most prominent countries of origin. In Europe, migration from Latin America and the Caribbean plays a minor role, since only 7,5% of non-European migrants living in Europe stem from a Latin American or Caribbean country or territory (IOM, 2017). They mostly migrate to Spain, Italy, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands. Migration from LAC countries and territories to Europe mostly took place in the early 2000s and only grew little towards the end of the decade to even decrease after 2010.

##### 3.1.1 Migration policy in forums of regional integration in LAC

Migration has become one of the most prominent topics in politics. Therefore, regional forums for integration in LAC as well as in Europe are dealing with issues of migration on a regular basis. The following tables presents the most important forums for regional integration in LAC countries as well as their foci and agreements on migration. They all put a strong emphasis on the human rights of migrants.

---

<sup>11</sup> The arrival of Chinese migrants, from the Middle East and logically from Africa, are part of the development of Latin America.

<sup>12</sup> United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, estimates in December 2017.

Forum	Foci/paradigms/agreements
Regional Conference on Migration (RCM)	Human rights of migrants human smuggling and migrant trafficking important role of civil society organisations reintegration of migrations
South American Conference on Migration (RCM)	Migration governance (safe and orderly migration) human rights of migrants human smuggling and migrant trafficking
Central American Integration System (SICA)	Human rights of migrants unaccompanied migrant children and adolescents human trafficking and migrant smuggling irregular migration elaboration of a comprehensive regional migration policy
MERCOSUR	Agreement on residence for Citizens of Mercosur member states (free movement and legal residence for the citizens of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay)
Andean Community of Nations (CAN)	Andean Labor Migration Instrument (2003) (Decision 545) free movement and residence rights of Andean nationals in the sub-region (for labour purposes) Andean Social Security Instrument (2004) (Decision 583) to guarantee adequate social protection for labor migrants (Martínez and Stang, 2004; Stang, 2009).
Union of South American Nations (UNASUR)	Objective: consolidation of a South American identity that progressively moves towards a South American citizenship harmonisation of public policies
Caribbean Community (CARICOM)	Irregular migration and human trafficking Emigration of professionals, especially from the health sector (Mejía, 2017); Article 45 of the Treaty ensures free transit of nationals among the Member States of the community, (limited to the search for employment for workers in specific occupations) Agreement on Social Security

### 3.1.2 Migration policy in the EU

Intraregional migration between EU member states was already intense in the 50s of the past century and was one of the reasons why the European Community Treaty contained a chapter on free movement of workers. In the 90s, the Schengen agreement allowed for the elimination of controls on people at intra-EU borders, and the Treaty of Amsterdam introduced the Schengen agreement into the European Union Treaties. After the Schengen treaty was introduced in the EU Treaties, the EU began to develop a migration policy towards non-EU nationals. This policy can be defined as being

based on three central axes: 1) the control policy; 2) the integration policy; and 3) the cooperation policy for the development of the migration-sending countries (Garcialoro, 2008).

To advance in the control and security axis, a series of provisions have been adopted. Olesti (2008) highlights, among others: i) the common visa policy, ii) the establishment of an integrated system for managing the external borders, in particular the creation in 2004 of the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders (FRONTEX), and iii) controls on people crossing the external borders.

The central aspects that Europe defines in order to address the integration of migrants in host societies are: i) family reunification, ii) third-country nationals who are long-term residents and iii) the integration of foreign workers into the labour market (Garcialoro, 2008: 28). With respect to third-country nationals who are long-term residents, the EU considers that their integration is essential and their rights must be duly guaranteed<sup>13</sup>. However, national legislations can weaken this principle of equality. In other words, although the statute establishes that the long-term resident is entitled to all benefits under the same conditions as nationals, the same regulation indicates that a Member State may limit these rights (for example, a migrant might have to prove they can speak the language to access employment).

In relation to the link between migration and development, one of the flagship programmes established under this guideline was the AENEAS Cooperation Programme, which provided financial and technical assistance to third countries in the fields of asylum and immigration. Although Latin America was not the main recipient of these funds, the priorities defined were to contribute to the development and strengthening of interregional dialogue, to finance projects aimed at reducing remittance costs, and projects that improve national legislations in human trafficking and the development of information systems (Martinez, 2006).

### 3.1.3 Common areas of interest of migration policy

In order to identify future possibilities of cooperation in questions concerning migration, the literature review, document analysis and expert consultation conducted in the course of the EULAC Focus project revealed the following main issues that are addressed at the regional and bi-regional levels in LAC and Europe, including the EU-LAC structured Dialogue on migration<sup>14</sup>. Although they are shared, they are treated nevertheless with different emphases and perspective in both regions. These topics are:

- The centrality of the human rights perspective in the approach to migration and the need to incorporate this approach regardless of the migratory status of the person.
- Human smuggling and trafficking. The increase in the number of people smuggled and trafficked, the violence of organised crime, and the difficulties in prosecuting these crimes have contributed to the perpetuation and aggravation of the vulnerability of many migrants seeking a life opportunity in a foreign country. The transnational nature of smuggling and trafficking networks raises the need to think about coordinated responses between different

<sup>13</sup> A long-term migrant is considered a person who has been a resident for more than five years after having obtained his or her permanent residence.

<sup>14</sup> See: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/european\\_migration\\_network/glossary\\_search/eu-lac-structured-dialogue-migration\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/european_migration_network/glossary_search/eu-lac-structured-dialogue-migration_en)

countries and regions, in order to make the identification, report and punishment of these crimes more efficient.

- Unaccompanied minors. In the United States, Latin America and Europe, the arrival of unaccompanied minors shows the complexity of migration movements when borders are forcefully closed. This situation requires, like the others previously mentioned, coordinated and deeply humanitarian measures by the recipient countries.
- The emergence of xenophobic and racist discourses in countries of destination is an area of constant concern. These anti-immigration discourses can influence government programmes and policies, providing support for restrictive migration measures.
- The link between migration and development and the need to adopt measures to strengthen the positive aspects of this relationship. Some of the specific aspects mentioned refer to the validation of educational degrees, the timely integration in labour markets, access to health, education and the social protection system, the reduction of the costs of sending remittances, facilitating the transference of pensions, among others.
- LAC countries, mostly in the Central American and Caribbean regions, are also faced with reintegrating some of their citizens who return to their home country after being involuntarily repatriated through for example deportation or detention. Undoubtedly this is a matter that creates tension between LAC and the EU. Building a bi-regional consensual agenda will require great effort of mutual understanding and of negotiation. It is also related to the concern for irregular migration, which, as seen, generates dissimilar emphasis in both regions.

In the European case, an issue that is of greater relevance than in the Latin American and Caribbean region is that of irregular migration and the measures necessary to control and reduce it. In the case of Latin America and the Caribbean, this issue, although present in some of the agendas of the sub-regional organisations and forums of integration, does not acquire the same relevance. Probably this emphasis is due to the greater weight of the securitisation approach in the EU countries, and its character as a migrant-receiving destination. These differences in profile – as a receiving, sending or transit region of migrants, as well as the different prevalence of concerns regarding security and control, or human rights - are indeed a source of tension in the search for a consensus between both regions. Explaining these latent or potential conflicts is an important step towards achieving a consensus.

The different perspectives also become apparent during the EU/LAC and EU/CELAC Summits throughout the last twenty years. Whereas the EU focused on the reduction of irregular immigration from a securitisation point of view, the (CE)LAC countries rejected the criminalisation of irregular migration and all forms of discrimination and racism. Hence, during the Fourth CELAC Summit the migrant was recognised as a subject with rights, regardless of their immigration status.

### 3.2 SOCIAL PROTECTION MECHANISMS – REFORMING WELFARE SYSTEMS

Poverty reduction and social inclusion have been important destinations of state resources in Latin America, the Caribbean and the European Union. The most frequently used strategies in both regions have been monetary transfers (Gough & Geof, 2004; Jenson, 2010; Thorp, 1998). This approach originates from the perception of poverty as the lack of means of support on an individual level; however, this approach is complemented by other non-monetary aspects such as health care,

education and labour market integration strategies, which are essential in the process of overcoming poverty and indigence (Chiodi, 2016; Arriba, 2014; European Social Network, 2012).

In the two regions in question we find two different approaches to monetary transfers aimed at combatting poverty: Conditional Transfer Programmes in LAC and Minimum Income Schemes in European countries. Conditional Cash Transfer Programmes are based on delivering a monthly or bimonthly amount of money to households that commit themselves to complying with pre-established conditions such as ensuring school attendance of their children and, for those with children who are not yet of school age, to submit to health checks. Over time, these types of programmes have transformed the region's social policy by promoting the use of tools such as targeting indexes, impact assessments and strengthening services in remote areas (Tejerina & Pizano, 2016). In the EU, monetary transfers in the form of minimum income schemes are strategies of last resort aimed at overcoming and preventing individuals from finding themselves in a situation of poverty; securing a minimum essential standard of living to individuals and their dependents when they lack other means or financial support is otherwise insufficient (ESPN, 2016). The two approaches will be briefly presented in the next two sections and followed by a short comparative analysis.

### 3.2.1 Conditional Cash Transfer Programmes (CTPs)

Conditional cash transfers programmes in Latin America and the Caribbean are aimed at reducing prevailing poverty while at the same time developing human capital, in an attempt to break the intergenerational transmission of poverty (Stampini & Tornarolli, 2012). Conditions are fundamental axes of cash transfers with short-term and long-term effects, providing income to the neediest households by encouraging consumption of basic goods and investing in human capital of children in order to break intergenerational poverty (Cruces, Moreno, Ringold, & Rofman, 2008). The ultimate hope, although never explicitly stated in these terms, was that conditions would allow the accumulation of sufficient human capital to drive the next generation out of poverty, so that, in the future, social assistance would no longer be needed.

The implementation of CTP in the Latin American region originates from Mexico and dates back to 1997 with the launch of the PROGRESA programme (Education, Health and Food Program) aimed at poor rural communities. From then on, the concept of conditional monetary transfers was introduced in other countries in the region and has spread to 18 countries and covered as many as 135 million beneficiaries (e.g. Chile Solidario programme, Brazil Bolsa Familia programme, PATH in Jamaica, Peru Juntos, Republic of Bolivia: Juancito Pinto Bond, Juana Azurduy Mother and Child Bond, Uruguay). Until the 1990s, social protection in Latin America and the Caribbean was mostly organised around work-related social insurance, which included health coverage and pensions. These schemes reduced formal workers' vulnerability to life cycle events. However, given the high prevalence of self- and informal employment, they failed to reach a large part of the population. Coverage was low and the impact in terms of poverty reduction weak. The need for complementary social assistance programmes became evident when the region was hit by structural crises that further increased the rates of unemployment and informality.

The structure of CTP is based on the delivery of monetary and non-monetary resources. In contrast to previous social assistance programmes, benefits are paid in cash rather than in kind to acknowledge that households are better positioned than the public administration in deciding how to allocate available resources (Fonseca, 2006; CONEVAL, 2014). The payments are conditioned on compliance with co-responsibilities that require the participation of beneficiaries in social services and discourage people from applying formal strategies like reducing health care or school non-attendance. Although

these informal strategies might help families to save money in the short-time, they exacerbate present vulnerabilities and, at worst, perpetuate the intergenerational cycle of poverty (Holzmann & Jorgensen, 2009). In this sense, the monetary transfer is not only considered a tool to overcome poverty, but also a stimulus for a greater development of human capital through school attendance of all children of school age, regular medical attention or the active search for jobs. Conditionalities would ensure that beneficiaries obtain the optimum level of human capital investment that not only improves their individual situation but also allows population to achieve maximum social benefits (Rodríguez Enríquez, 2011). In addition to monetary transfers, several programmes provide in-kind transfers, such as food supplements and backpacks with school supplies, seeking to strengthen and complement resources for complying with previously agreed conditionalities (Cecchini & Madariaga, 2011). Other non-monetary components complementary to the monetary transfers can take the form of specific accompanying programmes in psychosocial or labour integration areas, or act as access mechanisms to the social services network.

The benefit is granted to families, whose children are usually minors and who experience poverty or extreme poverty<sup>15</sup> (Cecchini & Madariaga, 2011). Often, transfers are assigned to mothers, under the assumption that women direct a higher share of expenditure to types of goods and services that benefit children, including food, schooling and health. However, bearing the responsibility for this money can also have an empowering effect for women.

In conclusion, it has to be underlined that CTP have become the backbone of social assistance, replacing previous ineffective transfers and working in synergy with complementary programmes focusing on key areas of human capital development, such as child nutrition and early childhood development. Thanks to the accurate registries of beneficiaries, far-reaching executing agencies and institutionalised interaction with the supply of education and health services, CTP have become the basis for the organising of social services networks. Although CTP have a common structure, one can find large variations in their implementation in various LAC countries. CTPs differ in definitions of target population, benefits offered and the enforcement of conditionalities (Cecchini & Madariaga, 2011). Inter alia, these differences arise from a lack of a common regional framework to define poverty lines which marks a difference to the European Union and the MIS where poverty lines are defined as a percentage with common measurement indicators for the region.

### 3.2.2 Minimum Income Schemes (MIS)

In EU member states, Minimum Income Schemes (MIS) are the primary instrument to prevent poverty and support labour market integration. They guarantee that the income of all citizens or families is sufficient to meet their needs, provided they meet certain conditions. Eligibility is typically determined by citizenship, a means test and the availability for the labour market or a willingness to perform community service (George, 2010; Moreira, 2008; Nelson, 2010). MIS can take different forms in accordance with the different models of European welfare states (Esping-Andersen, 2002; Gough I., 1979; Thane, 2016). Hence, Minimum Income Schemes differ in the composition and type of expenditure, political priorities and the sources of funding among the Member States. Some countries emphasize universal policies; others focus on specific targets and vulnerabilities such as the elderly, single mothers and ethnic minorities. It must always be kept in mind that, in the EU framework, any member state can address social problems with a different mix of instruments and measures, with special attention to the provision of services and benefits in kind (European Parliament, 2017; Figari, Matsaganis, & Sutherland, 2013; Van Parijs, 2004).

<sup>15</sup> National definitions of poverty are based on national poverty lines, which vary by country.



Overall, most programmes have a monetary component, some low intensity conditionalities and lack strong enforcement mechanism. For example, in the programmes “Rentas Mínimas” in the “Comunidades autónomas” in Spain, beneficiaries have to sign an agreement committing to using the money to meet basic necessities. With the “Reddito di Inclusione” in Italy, the conditionalities are stronger and involve recommendations for family members that cover areas such as frequent contacts with the multidisciplinary team of the social service provider managing the respective cases, search for a job, participation in training or job inclusion projects, acceptance of 'relevant' job offers, regular attendance to courses and commitment to school obligations. Although conditionalities only affect individual beneficiaries of the program, social services are obliged to follow-up with the whole family. Concerning the value structure, some MIS understand that labour inactivity of individuals below the poverty line is not a passive attitude or a consequence of their unwillingness to work. Labour market (re-)integration is encouraged by the MIS, avoiding blaming the beneficiaries for lack of employment produced by various reasons, among others, shortage of demand in the labour market (Chiodi F., 2015; Figari, Matsaganis, & Sutherland, 2013; Standing, 2003).

Finally, in most cases and in parallel to CTP, MIS consider social investment as one of the fundamental tools to overcome poverty, focusing on interventions mainly at the individual level. This element has emerged in the context of the discussion of new social risks, transitions in the course of life and the need to invest soon after the hardship has occurred. The objective is to prevent risk and have a mechanism for quickly detecting situations of social crisis (Dhéret & Fransen, 2017). Access and rights are based on an evaluation of assets and means, and therefore benefits vary according to existing income and individual circumstances.

### 3.2.3 Converging and Diverging Aspects and Elements of Cooperation

In order to analyse converging and diverging aspects between CTP and MIS schemes, this section of the report discusses four elements that will help to reach conclusions on good practices and possibilities for international cooperation.

#### 3.2.3.1 Poverty Concept

Poverty is a common concern of Latin America and the Caribbean and Europe, although it has been addressed from different perspectives given the needs and requirements of each region. From the definition of poverty lines to the design and implementation of programmes to overcome it, they differ not only at the cross-regional level, but also within regions themselves. While the EU has been pushing integration on regional level and Member States are designing policies for more equitable societies, Latin America is far more heterogeneous, and some countries still seek to guarantee basic elements such as housing, drinking water and health, among others.

The European Commission and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) understand that an individual or family is in a situation of poverty when "their resources are so scarce as to exclude them from the minimum acceptable standard of living of the Member State in which they live" (European Commission & OECD, 2006). Therefore, the most commonly used methodology for measuring poverty is generally based on disposable income and absolute poverty. However, in order to fight poverty and social exclusion from a more holistic perspective, new indicators have been developed contributing to a multidimensional understanding of poverty, creating the notion of “People at risk of poverty or social exclusion” (AROPE). This poverty concept includes three different indicators for measuring poverty and hereby broadens the formerly narrow approach focused on disposable income (Jessoula et.al. 2014): a) “at risk of poverty” (AROP), i.e. the classic poverty measure

based on disposable income; ii) “severe material deprivation” (SMD; iii) “joblessness”, that is people living in households with very low work intensity (LWI). All measures developed and fleshed out in the course of the Europe 2020 strategy are focused on combating poverty by addressing these three components.

As far as Latin America is concerned, the criteria for defining poverty are somewhat different. Although there have been efforts towards measuring poverty from a multidimensional perspective during the last decade, the most common conceptual definitions of poverty used in LAC countries are those based on the lack of ability to reach minimum consumption levels. According to the approach used by ECLAC to estimate poverty, a person is classified as poor when the per capita income of that person's household is below the poverty line, that is, the minimum income needed to meet a person's basic needs. Poverty lines expressed in national currency reflect the cost of a basket of basic goods and services, using the cost-of-basic-needs method. In general, indigence in Latin America is understood as households and individuals whose income, if they were to use it in its entirety for this purpose, is not sufficient to acquire a basic food basket, (Social Capital Initiative & United Nations, 2003). On the other hand, total poverty is conceived as households and individuals whose income is insufficient to purchase a basket of goods and services. In both definitions, the baskets vary from country to country. More recently, definitions and indicators that take into account vulnerable groups that no longer live in poverty, but have not reached middle-class status yet, have been developed.

Therefore, contrasting the poverty definitions of both regions, it is apparent that the European definition has advanced by taking the concept towards social and labour inclusion, with income being only one element under consideration. However, in LAC, poverty is still defined in relation to the coverage of basic needs. Although some LAC countries are moving towards multidimensional measures, the income indicator is still the most used in the region.

### *3.2.3.2 Target Group and Coverage*

In general, the programmes focus on individuals or families considered as living in actual poverty. However, as elaborated previously, poverty can be defined in different ways depending on the situation, country and region. While some countries deploy a means-testing approach to determine eligibility, others have set up categories that define eligible target groups. The main difference regarding the target groups for CTPs in LAC and MIS in the EU lies in the eligibility of migrants. It is worth noting that European countries emphasize the inclusion of foreigners residing in the country. This is the case in Italy, where the target groups are families living in poverty, including immigrant families, with at least one minor or disabled child and pregnant women. Likewise, LAC countries have faced new challenges due to the arrival of migrant population. To deal with this new scenario social programmes are slowly being adapted and have gradually included foreign citizens who meet the selection criteria to access benefits.

In general, it can be said that the programmes in both regions face challenges in defining whether or not to target specific populations and how to achieve it. There are important challenges regarding the institutional responsibility for the programmes and the scope of the attributions of local governments, in other words, who decides on the eligibility criteria of programme. Another relevant challenge has to do with the registration systems and their ability to correctly identify who meets those criteria.



### 3.2.3.3 Policy Typology, Objectives and Programmatic Orientation

Social programmes can be universal, targeted or mixed. In this sense, universal programmes are those whose target group is not selective. Targeted are those that are dedicated to supplying certain monetary or non-monetary needs of a specific group of people (e.g. women, children, indigenous people, etc.). Finally, mixed programmes target the whole society, but provide extra benefits to a specific group. In both regions we can find examples for universal (e.g. Bolsa Familia in Brazil), targeted (e.g. Juntos programme in Perú) and mixed programmes (e.g. CC.AA in Spain).

Another difference between the programmes studied is their programmatic orientation and objective as well as their satisfactory element. The satisfactory element is defined as the adequacy of the means to solve the problem or meet the need. They concern mainly the operational mechanisms, including access to the social protection system and measures to improve income-generating capacity. As mentioned above, both the MIS and the CTP have two general elements: the transfer of cash to the beneficiaries and the conditionality of meeting certain requirements.

Although the programmes in question show great variation, they share one common approach; that is the need to involve the beneficiary in solving the problem. This has been done through the conditionalities that beneficiaries must meet to receive the benefits. However, the beneficiaries are involved to a different extent in the respect programmes. Whereas it might be sufficient for the beneficiaries in one country to actively seek employment, the involvement demanded in other programmes is more encompassing. In many CTPs, beneficiaries are asked to increase their general level of consumption of social services. This may include regular health check-ups and continuous children's attendance at school.

On a general note, it has to be mentioned that minimum income schemes and cash transfer programmes all focus on improving the living conditions of the population and helping them to overcome poverty. Their respective role within the socio-political framework is different. While they can be conceived as the last resort of social protection (e.g. Austria) or provide the base of the social protection system (e.g.), they may also serve to fight extreme poverty on a broad basis.

### 3.2.3.4 Measures of Success

The design of any public policy, and especially of those related to poverty reduction, aims at real and measurable results. In general, the evaluation mechanisms of these programmes are either not properly implemented or do not have sufficient tools or resources to carry out the relevant evaluations. Although important efforts are being made in both regions to evaluate the programmes reviewed in this document, it is also true that there is a large space to improve instruments in order to be able to conclude with greater precision whether the objectives for which they were created have been fulfilled or not. Regarding the findings of the programmes and the evaluations carried out, there are some common elements in terms of results and challenges. Among others: there is no evidence regarding their specific contribution to overcoming poverty, however, progress is observed in the areas related to the conditionalities. The findings of this study suggest that targeting and allocation of benefits require much more sophisticated and integrated information systems; constant feedback is required to ensure that the incentives are working correctly, that is why it is essential to have good monitoring and evaluation systems.

**In conclusion, it can be said that in both regions minimum income schemes and conditional cash transfer programs constitute viable instruments to fight poverty. However, in the future both regions will have to put more emphasis on policy instruments that not only fight absolute poverty, but that also tackle the growing income and wealth disparities. Especially, the European Union will**

**have to find ways to deal with this challenge. As pointed out in the previous section, globalisation and migration flows raise the question of how to include migrants into those schemes without petrifying existing inequalities.** Moving forward, the next section of this report presents findings of the different tasks of WP5 of the EULAC Focus project that deal with the actual instruments of cooperation that have relevance to the social dimension, going beyond the typical notion of social policy issues.

## 4 IMPLEMENTING COMMON ACTIONS – COOPERATION ON SOCIAL ISSUES BETWEEN EU AND LAC

---

We can only make conclusions about the effective functioning of actions/programmes that we have analysed in more detail within the research activities of the EULAC Focus project (WP5). While chapter 2 has comprehensively delineated what “social dimension” in the institutional and regulatory framework in the two regions means, this perspective is not sufficient to assess the broad scope of practices creating social impact in the two regions. Therefore, this section synthesises the work done in WP5 of the EULAC Focus project that looks at different cooperation projects that go beyond the notion of social policy as delineated in the previous chapter and are governed by different institutional actors in the framework of the EU.

### 4.1 EUROSOCIAL

EUROSociAL can be considered one of the most ambitious EU-LAC development cooperation projects. It started in 2005 (-ongoing) and was designed to explicitly affect regional policy making, particularly in the social field. To this end, this initiative prioritised major challenges such as vulnerability, inequality and poverty. It aimed at consolidating social cohesion in LAC through supporting the design, reform and implementation processes of public policies with emphasis on gender, governance and social policies.

The first phase of the EUROSociAL Programme (2005-2010) reached important goals for the implementation of policies that improve social cohesion. EUROSociAL I contributed to the formulation of new public policies, to the introduction of innovations within the framework of existing policies, and to strengthening the institutional capacities of the government agencies responsible for these policies (Cerritelli and García, 2010). The methodology used was the presentation of the best practices in the field of social cohesion in Europe to LA’s policy makers. The first phase also supported the establishment of important international commitments from the perspective of social cohesion and demonstrated the relevance of peer-to-peer exchange as an institutional cooperation tool.

The demand-driven approach and the flexibility of the programme have facilitated the participation and a greater ownership of the processes by LA countries (Cerritelli and García, 2010). Peer to peer exchange of experiences is, by definition, a flexible instrument that is based on dialogue in order to elaborate a joint analysis of the problems and search solutions based on the learned lessons of EU countries. The objective is to avoid the transposition of the EU models without taking into consideration the social, political and institutional reality of LA countries. Due to its flexibility, peer-to-peer exchange has enabled EUROSociAL to work in “sensitive” areas where countries are eager to not lose any freedom to act independently.

The implementation of EUROSociAL I allowed the mobilisation of a large number of key public institutions in various Latin American and European countries: at the end of October 2009, in the 387 activities carried out by the programme, 1,887 institutions (1,369 Latin American and 518 EU) and 10,707 persons (8,939 from Latin-American and 1,723 EU) had been involved. The intermediate internal and external (ECLAC) evaluations of EUROSociAL have shown that the beneficiary institutions have been very satisfied with the Programme and the global appreciation has been positive. EUROSociAL I has revealed that in many Latin American countries there is a necessity to learn more

about policies and institutional procedures that can lead to increasing social cohesion. It also pointed out a need for improving the communication with European counterparts and reinforcing the links among the countries within the region. EUROsociAL I has contributed to the achievement of these purposes. In EUROsociAL II from 2011 to 2015 the programme initiated 90 policies, 80 change processes and 752 policy tools (e.g., methodologies, protocols, commitment letters, communication tools, etc.)

EUROsociAL has been highly relevant for developing complementary and specific cooperation agreements at the national level, which are aligned to national objectives and, at the same time, are part of a regional policy. Furthermore, EUROsociAL emphasised the institutional impact by having an approach that mainly relied on the complementarity among European cooperation, LAC national policies and collaboration among multiple actors. Regarding the perceptions of experts and scholars about EUROsociAL, in 2008 EUROsociAL had contributed significantly to a great number of changes that were taking place in LA region. However, as this was only the case for some reform processes, the impact of EUROsociAL remained marginal in other cases. While in 2010 EUROsociAL was considered a modest initiative, in the opinion of some scholars the program has matured and gained a considerable brand image with recognised prestige in the region in recent years. This image is identified with its aim, namely social cohesion, and with its multi-dimensional and flexible approach while assertively supporting real, effective changes in public policies. According to different scholars, the most important feature of the programme was its innovative design as a peer to peer cooperation instrument, which is adequate to the needs of middle income countries (Tassara and Zuluaga, 2013).

There is an important debate about the Euro-Latin American cooperation and particularly on the usefulness of promoting social cohesion as its main axis. Many researchers consider this approach as an added value in the fight against poverty (Alacqua, 2011; Morazán et al., 2011; Chiodi, 2013; Sanahuja, Tezanos, Kem and Perrotta, 2015), while others consider it as inopportune and even “neocolonialist” (Sánchez Parga, 2007; Larrea and Martinez, 2012). Particularly, Pedreschi (2015) is very critical about EUROsociAL and argues that the program uses a mechanism to colonize and to transfer to LA countries the old practices of the market in order to continue with the neoliberal model. One of the limits of EUROsociAL concerns the fact that up to now the programme has only worked with public administrations. In the future, if the programme envisages to contribute more significantly to the reform of public policies and public institutions, it is necessary to include other actors in the networks created by EUROsociAL (employers, civil society, trade unions, political parties) (Cas Granje, 2009).

## 4.2 SOCIEUX

SOCIEUX was established to support partner countries and institutions to better design and manage inclusive, effective, and sustainable employment policies and social protection systems. SOCIEUX provides access to short-term high-quality European expertise from peers to peers. A technical assistance facility is not a classical cooperation programme. It is demand driven and aims to mobilise expertise in a flexible, ad hoc manner. Its objectives and results are overarching, and its purpose drives its work and strategic directions. Implemented actions are independent micro-projects, for which objectives, results and deliverables are set by requesting organisations in partner countries. The SOCIEUX Facility, by design, did not have the technical resources to design detailed activities or implement large-scale cooperation programmes on its own.

The purpose of SOCIEUX was to enable the prioritisation and rapid mobilisation of technical expertise from public administrations and mandated organisations responsible for social protection in EU through facilitation of expert-based micro-projects (actions). A broad range of European expertise was thus made available to organisations in some 145 countries worldwide, to contribute to the development and expansion of inclusive social protection systems in partner countries in the medium and long term.

The establishment of SOCIEUX was seen as a key action in supporting social cohesion, employment and decent work in partner countries.

The purpose of SOCIEUX was to enable the prioritisation and rapid mobilisation of technical expertise from public administrations and mandated organisations responsible for social protection in EU through facilitation of expert-based micro-projects (actions). A broad range of European expertise was thus made available to organisations in some 145 countries worldwide, to contribute to the development and expansion of inclusive social protection systems in partner countries in the medium and long term.

It was expected that the mobilised experts' missions would empower partner institutions in the design or reform of inclusive, effective and sustainable social protection systems. This required the transfer of know-how and capacity building as a focus to expand and improve the effectiveness of social protection coverage in the long term. Such a transfer also required the trust and confidence of partner countries in the added value brought by collaboration with social protection experts from EU institutions. SOCIEUX also had the objective of complementing the effects of large-scale and long-term programmes financed by the EU and other key international partners.

### 4.3 CARIBBEAN: CRIP AND NIPs

While regional programmes have been promoted for LA, such as EUROsocial, the development cooperation landscape takes a different form when looking at the situation in the Caribbean, especially regarding social issues. In the case of the Caribbean, the overarching framework for design and strategic orientation of cooperation efforts is the **Caribbean Regional Indicative Programme (CRIP)** funded by the European Development Fund (EDF). Between 2007 – 2013 the overall amount allocated to this programme was 165 million Euros. The major part of these funds (143 million Euros) was designated for Regional Economic Cooperation and providing support for the EU-CARIFORUM Economic Partnership Agreement priority areas. The latter included Institutional Capacity Building and capacity building for various productive sectors (46.5 million Euros). The remaining 10-15% of that CRIP was allocated to addressing environmental vulnerabilities and social issues. One significant area of funding concerned capacity building for regional public health and the consolidation of the Caribbean Public Health Agency (1.5 million Euros).

In the programming period between 2014-2020, the regional programme has 3 main focal areas: 1) regional economic cooperation and integration; 2) climate change, environment, disaster management and sustainable energy; 3) crime and security. The CRIP 2014 - 2020 envisages the allocation of 102 million € to focal area one: Caribbean Regional Cooperation and integration, which includes EPA's (Economic Partnership Agreement) continued implementation and private sector development, investment facilitation, trade capacity-building; 61.5 million € for focal area two: disaster management, the environment and sustainable energy development, climate change

adaptation; and 44 million € for focal area three: crime prevention and security building. Comparing to EDFs 9 and 10, the quantum of resources allocated to the regional programme, as opposed to the national development cooperation programmes, has increased substantially with each round. The Regional Indicative Programme (the first) under EDF 9 was approx. 57 million €. The CRIP for EDF 10 was 165 million€.

Social issues are not included specifically among the focal areas of CRIP and therefore only 10-15% of the overall budget can be considered as money allocated towards social issues. However, the three focus areas touch different aspects of the social dimension. For this reason, the research conducted by EULAC Focus concentrated on the actions promoted by **NIPs (National Indicative Programmes)**, particularly in **Jamaica** and **Dominican Republic**, as in the NIPs of these two countries social policies play a central role. Of course, the relations between the EU and those countries remain framed by the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement (“Cotonou Agreement”, respectively the ongoing negotiations for a “Post-Cotonou Agreement”), the EU-CARIFORUM Economic Partnership Agreement and the Joint Caribbean-EU Partnership Strategy.

In the case of the Dominican Republic, the **11th National Indicative Programme (2014-2020) for cooperation between the European Union and the Dominican Republic** has a total budget of 72 million €. The EU Delegation to the Dominican Republic pursued a continued policy dialogue with the Government of the Dominican Republic in order to elaborate the NIP. In this process, the Dominican Republic National Development Strategy (NDS), approved in 2010 and adopted as a law in 2012, was taken as a point of reference. Strengthening the sectors of technical and vocational education and training is an essential part of the NDS. Vocational training is considered as a key measure for the fight against poverty and to obtain a sustained and sustainable growth and it is considered a priority by the Dominican Republic Government besides other ongoing initiatives undertaken to achieve the national and international development targets.

The analysis conducted in the course of EULAC Focus showed that the national agenda regarding education was smoothly aligned with the NIP and found solid support in the financing from the EU. The conducted expert consultation highlighted the fact that the EU is the donor with the greatest understanding that the national criterion should prevail in negotiations. In line with this notion, one of the sectors in which EU support in the NIP is focused is “inclusive productive development and capacity building for quality employment”. The indicative amount of budget allocated by the EU is 32 million €. The objective of EU support in this area is to increase efficiency, investment and productive capacity of MSMEs and to improve employability of the population by consolidating the work-oriented training system to support the productive sector. This means that more or less 50% of the NIP total budget is dedicated to employment. There are two specific objectives: to increase the quality of production of micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs) to promote a better position of them both in national and international markets; to strengthen the national system of vocational education and training and its relationship with high-value chains.

During the last ten years, the EU has built a solid cooperation relationship with the MINERD (Ministry of Education of the Dominican Republic). A significant part of the achievements in terms of transparency and accountability achieved by MINERD are attributable to this strategic alliance. This places the EU in a preferential position to catalyse complex sector reforms. According to consulted experts, the main objective of EU support remains empowering the government of the Dominican

Republic by offering the instruments to solve the problems of the country on its own. However, one of the main problems of EU cooperation is the lack of continuity. The EU should try to set up a structure that allows the institutions to continue working on the topics of cooperation, even when the cooperation programmes are finished. Otherwise, the risk is that the work stops when EU support ends.

In the case of Jamaica, the **11<sup>th</sup> National Indicative Programme (2014-2020) for cooperation between the European Union and Jamaica** has a total budget of 46 million €. Social policy in Jamaica is guided by the Medium Term Socio-Economic Policy Framework (MTF) 2015-2018, which is a three year programme that supports the implementation of the National Development plan (NDP) of Vision 2030. The priority areas for the Jamaican government are taken from this document and it is understood that anything under 11<sup>th</sup> EDF would be based purely on the MTF. The 11<sup>th</sup> EDF started in 2014 but was designed from 2012. Jamaica's MTF was used as the country programme and, as a result, no new specific country programme was designed. The main strategic areas for the MTF include a Poverty Reduction Programme (PRP) as well as issues regarding individual rights and justice and security. Regarding the Poverty Reduction Programme, the objectives were pursued mainly providing major financial and technical assistance towards sustaining macro-economic stability, in particular by addressing the key challenge of public debt; reducing crime and violence and promoting social cohesion and inclusion.

According to the results of the expert consultations conducted in the course of EULAC Focus, this process is emblematic of empowering donor-recipients in the determination of priority areas for national (and regional) development goals. 95% of the funds allocated to Jamaica in the 11<sup>th</sup> EDF is budget support, which speaks to how aligned Jamaica's NIP is to the government's policies and strategies. In the case of Jamaica, budget support is used to contribute to the implementation of strategies and policies as defined by the country itself and not by the EU. According to consulted experts, the negotiation between the EC and the government is not easy but, at the end, reaches consensus not only on the topics but also on the indicators and targets. It is regarded as a considerable strength of the EU development cooperation efforts with Jamaica that, unlike other donors, the EU aligns itself with Jamaica's policies and priorities and doesn't support areas that have not been identified as a priority by the Jamaican Government first.

While the national cooperation programmes in the Caribbean as well as the regional programmes in LAC have a clear focus on social issues, there are also other cooperation programmes that tackle social issues in LAC, which are not (fully) part of the development cooperation framework. The next chapter will highlight territorial cooperation programmes funded by different instruments of the EU portfolio such as Regional Development Funds (DG Regio).

#### 4.4 PROGRAMMES FOR TERRITORIAL COHESION

In the last decade, the territorial dimension of cohesion has gained importance in cooperation. The bi-regional EU-CELAC Summit in Brussels in 2015 stated that "sharing of experiences and knowledge on national policies of regional development, in pursuit of greater territorial cohesion within their countries" (EU-CELAC Summit, 2015: 14) should be an important goal for regional relations, especially as urban and sustainable regional development is positioned prominently in the Summit's Declaration. Arguably, the declarations produced in these summits lack real effect in terms of policy changes in



specific countries. Nonetheless, they reflect topics that are already of importance, or can gain it, in development cooperation or other projects managed by the competent European Commission's Directorates General.

A notable initiative in this area is “URBELAC: Urban European and LAC cities”, implemented since 2011, which works towards sustainable urban development and exchange of experiences in the field of regional (urban) development. This initiative and the role of territorial cohesion in it will be further analysed below. Additionally, regional innovation systems, as institutional frameworks that support innovation in the productive structure of a region (Navarro, 2007: 6), are an aspect that can be of key importance in future EU-CELAC cooperation. Regional innovation systems aim at reducing spatial disparities through addressing territorial cohesion topics such as multi-level governance systems, marginalisation of rural and border areas and also territorial development in post-conflict situations (Hall & Lopez Sanchez, 2015: 7). These regional innovation systems projects have a strong component of cross-border and transnational cooperation. Since 2011, European Commission's DG REGIO has supported several projects in Latin America (Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Peru) to exchange experiences between Latin American and European regional authorities and specialized agencies in policy setting, implementation and management with respect to clusters and SME innovation inducing policies.

These projects mostly try to make the experience of European institutions in regional innovation systems or cross border cooperation available to LAC counterparts. Hereby the EU integration model serves as a role model to enable similar process in LAC countries. However, as an increasing number of LAC countries adopt policies with a territorial approach, new experiences show the necessity to adapt these policies to LAC context. In this matter, LAC countries have a diversity of institutional contexts that leads to a difference in the emphasis of some strategies of these policies (Buitelaar et al., 2015: 12).

**URB-AL.** In 1994 URB-AL was the first initiative to promote social cohesion with a territorial approach through the creation of networks and decentralised cooperation between European and Latin American actors. The program, which ended in 2013, emphasised the dynamics and potential of urban spaces. The criteria for working in these areas were related to the fact that URB-AL recognised the intensity of mobility trends among cities, as well as the need to provide better opportunities for the population settling there. This approach is clearly observed in the different aspects the program prioritised during its different stages, including urban productivity, drug consumption, urban environment, urbanisation control and management, cross-border cooperation, reduction of urban poverty and security. The program strengthened decentralised cooperation mechanisms and encouraged the participation of different governmental levels – national, regional, and local. Moreover, the program also included Regional Dialogues aiming at documenting experiences and good practices. The program explicitly sought to influence policy by involving subnational governments (e.g., cities, municipalities, states, regions, provinces) both from the EU and LAC and created long-term networks and partnerships between them to develop innovative solutions to the issues that emerged in each territory. This had an important policy impact as program outcomes allowed to develop policies agendas around sustainable urban cities from a regional perspective. In sum, the program helped to create 131 local public policies in more than 500 Latin American municipalities and validated models to foster social cohesion dynamics

**URBELAC.** This program (2010-2013) aimed at fostering sustainable urban development through the creation of networks and the exchange of experiences among the various public actors of the EU and LAC. Similarly to URB-AL, it was committed to promote better opportunities for the urban population based on the recognition of effects of migration, lack of opportunities and increasing urbanisation



processes. The strategic goals of the program consisted in the long-term planning of Latin American cities, the formation of bilateral agreements between LAC and EU cities, and the identification of collaboration and financing opportunities with participant institutions. Moreover, the program had intercultural mobilisation as a goal from start. As such, the EU-LAC coordination, as well as the model of establishing collaboration networks at the national, regional and local levels was instrumental to address heterogeneity. In this sense, the explicit use of ICT, workgroups and field visits helped facilitating communication among participants, as well as involving the different social actors that were targeted by the program. Furthermore, the program included an explicit aim to promote policy reforms and to establish common indicators and tools to support an urban sustainable development. The impact was later seen in the agendas that several cities that were part of the program were able to develop.

**CESCAN.** The program, which ran from 2010 to 2015, put its emphasis on the improvement of economic and social cohesion in the Andean Community (CAN) through supporting CAN members in the design of a regional policy of economic and social cohesion and territorial development, with emphasis in cross-border cooperation. This program explicitly promoted territorial social cohesion in LAC through policy instruments that included studies to generate new knowledge, technical assistance and experience exchange. To this end, differences among urban and rural settings were included through the use of a territorial approach that strongly emphasised cross-border rural development. CESCAN emphasized local strategies and resources, e.g. taking into account local production and consumption processes to increase food availability. In addition, it contributed to consolidating institutional tools for collaboration, accounting for previous experiences, promoting the alignment to political/policy priorities and consolidating a regional discussion about cohesion. Consequently, the discussion was scaled-up at the national, regional and local level. Moreover, the program actively pursued the elaboration of a regional policy of social and economic cohesion in the framework of the Andean Community. It facilitated 4 border development projects and 17 rural development projects. However, discussions and impacts at the local level are not yet fully in place.

**EURO-SOLAR.** Given its focus on promoting better rural livelihoods through the provision of renewable energy, the program (1995-2012) took into account the vulnerability associated to the limitations rural areas face in terms of access to services, market liability, increasing urbanisation and lack of opportunities. The strategic goals encompassed access to services by providing 300,000 individuals of isolated rural communities access to electric energy; the promotion of basic services (education, health and telecommunications) and new models of sustainable production as well as the strengthening of public policies at local and community institutions level. The strategic actions included the promotion of decentralised cooperation to facilitate the involvement of local authorities, enhancing community involvement in equipment management provided by the programme, and developing services such as education, telecommunication and sanitation. These actions contributed to the ownership of the programme and, to some extent, added up to its sustainability. Although few mechanisms were developed to include communities' voice, it deployed different strategies used to involve civil society and local authorities with emphasis on the existing community organisation strategies that were in place, such as the creation of Local Community Organisations for the management and maintenance of the equipment supplied and coordinating with the community the activities that would take place. Although this intervention was eager to explore mechanisms through which population could access electrical energy by using renewable sources, there were constraints for scaling-up this experience at the national level. Therefore, it had limited policy influence. Nevertheless, the program developed sustainability mechanisms, such as technical training to community members and self-sufficient strategies for equipment maintenance.

To conclude, the main contribution of these EU interventions in promoting territorial cohesion in LAC has been to explicitly address policy formulation from start. As a result of these efforts, the initiatives have positively affected social policy reforms in the region during the past years. Furthermore, this has been particularly relevant for setting up the conditions for including EULAC cross cutting issues – mobility, diversity, inequality and sustainability – as policy priorities in the context of territorial cohesion. As part of the approach, mobility is currently regarded not only as a demographical challenge but as a socioeconomic and spatial one (i.e., URB-AL and URBELAC), diversity and inequality are considered social dimensions linked to critical aspects such as discrimination and poverty (i.e., EURO-SOLAR and EUROSociAL) and sustainability is regarded as a process to promote institutional conditions and collaboration to endure positive impacts (i.e., EUROSociAL and CESCAN). Nonetheless, despite progress made, LAC still shows weaknesses that remain unsolved such as insufficient institutional leadership, limited efforts to scaling-up results, unsatisfactory communicational mechanisms and scarce effective tools to promote sectoral coordination.

## 5 FINAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Strengthening EU-LAC relations in the social dimension is one of the aims of the EULAC-Focus project. To do so, WP5 of the project looked at different elements and instruments that shape the social dimensions of these relations. This meant first clarifying the nuances of different notions and concepts of social policy in both regions in order to get to a common understanding of potentials for up-scaling (see chapter 2 of this report as well as D 5.1 of the EULAC Focus Project). After getting a clear picture of which kind of institutional and legal base is in place regarding social policy in the two regions, the focus was put on investigating the different trends and patterns of social policy reforms by comparing policies targeted at two specific fields, namely in the field of migration and social protection (see chapter 3 of this report and Deliverable 5.3). However, in order to assess the potential impacts of EU-LAC relations on social issues in the two regions, the investigation also went beyond a narrow definition of social policy concepts, contributing to a holistic understanding of EU-LAC relations in the social dimensions (see chapter 4 and D5.2 and 5.3). By taking this approach, were identified new pathways to address existing gaps in the cooperation framework and making it more able to contribute to a more inclusive, sustainable and just societal development in accordance with the Sustainable Development Goals. In the following, some recommendations on how to get going on these new pathways are presented.

### **Recommendation I - Completely update the discourse on Development and social issues at the bi-regional level**

The underlying approach to EU – LAC relations in the social area has been based on two implicit assumptions: The EU and its member states have solved their development problems while LAC countries have not; and, in terms of social policy, the European model of welfare state (or its different models) have given rather satisfactory solutions to the main issues, which can be offered as a model, or transferred, to LAC countries. These two assumptions, whatever their validity in the past, do not hold at present.

First, the processes that have taken place in the last two decades in the two regions (EU enlargement to Central and Eastern countries; economic growth in some LAC countries; the deep and persistent

effects of the economic crisis, in particular in the EU) all run against the two assumptions. Secondly, at the global level, a new approach to development has emerged. This can be illustrated well by the Sustainable Development Goals differing from the previous Millennium Development Goals in that they depart from the logic of rich donors aiding poor recipients, but instead are universal goals aiming at combatting inequality within and across regions<sup>16</sup>.

The very timely publication in September/October 2018 of the report *“Emerging Challenges and Shifting Paradigms. New perspectives on International Cooperation for Development”*<sup>17</sup> offers the opportunity for, and creates the need of, changing the discourse. The report is the joint effort of an international organization whose leadership in the areas of development and social policies has always been recognized by the EU and its member states (OECD), an organization both multilateral and regional as ECLAC/CEPAL, and the EC Directorate that has taken at its charge most EU – LAC programmes on social policy /DG DEVCO). Therefore, it has all the legitimacy to become the basis for the needed change of approach: Development and social policy reform are, and must be considered, a common EU – LAC challenge and not issues that concern only LAC countries and “to be taught” by EU member states.

### **Recommendation II – Establish a bi-regional platform on social development monitoring**

As mentioned several times in the report, there is no permanent bi-regional forum that focuses on any kind of social issues. Even those closer to the EU perspective like social inclusion, protection or cohesion have not been made relevant in bi-regional forums. Creating a dedicated forum for social issues is therefore an absolute need. The purpose of such a forum should be to monitor and evaluate ongoing social trends in both regions and to formulate common positions on global issues relevant to both regions in order to strengthen the weight of both LAC and the EU in the multilateral/global policy environment. Furthermore, establishing such a forum dedicated to these topics would not only allow LAC countries to formulate positions and common needs, but it would also contribute to raising awareness of LAC social progress in the EU.

This forum could also contribute to strengthened relations through clustering ongoing cooperation efforts and identifying existing synergies in the cooperation framework. This means serving as a platform that connects different actors of bi-regional cooperation such as projects embedded in the EU funded research programmes (DG Research), development cooperation programme (DG Development Cooperation) and regional development initiatives (DG Regio).

### **Recommendation III – Establish a very ambitious, but not necessarily very costly, EU cooperation programme to exchange welfare experiences between EU and LAC**

In the next EU financial period 2021-2026, the establishment of a very ambitious cooperation programme to exchange welfare experiences between the EU and LAC is also an absolute priority and is the best means to implement the previous two recommendations. It is perfectly possible on the basis of the previous EUROsociAL II and EUROsociAL + programmes. It simply requires enlarging its budgetary allocation (but within limits that perfectly fit the MFF lines for internal social policies and external action). The programme should remain demand-driven as the two last phases of EUROsociAL,

<sup>16</sup> <https://advocacy.thp.org/2014/08/mdgs-to-sdgs/> 23.09.2019

<sup>17</sup> *Emerging challenges and shifting paradigms: new perspectives on international cooperation for development* (LC/PUB.2018/16), Santiago, 2018.

but promote also an active involvement of all the EU countries, particularly Eastern European countries, and not only the ones that traditionally have a well-established relationship with LAC.

A parallel programme for the Caribbean should also be established, “sub-regionalizing” the past NIPs. As these programmes would allow, like EUROsocial, for South-South exchanges of experiences, they could also be used to strengthen EU’s, and EU -LAC’s, role and presence within the multilateral/global framework and their cooperation with multilateral agencies (World Bank, UN specialized agencies, ECLAC/CEPAL...). This would also strengthen the role of the European Commission as a promoter of policies at the EU level, in conformity with the EU Treaties since the Treaty of Rome.

#### **Recommendation IV – Strengthen the social dimensions of joint research programmes in the field of social policy between EU and LAC**

Within the EU’s Research Framework Programmes, including Horizon 2020, the topic of EU – LAC relations has not been sufficiently addressed (EULAC Focus is rather an exception). This should change: A wide range of projects (perfectly fundable within the MFF lines for research and external relations) should address, from a bi-regional perspective and involving experts on internal policies, the issues prioritized in the new ECLAC-OECD-EC/DEVCO paradigm for development and in the Social Investment paradigm. This is also one of the best ways to implement the first three recommendations.

While some specific areas of the research programmes which have relevance for the social dimension are already targeted at cooperation with LAC countries (e.g. sustainable urbanisation), there is still potential for doing more. Identifying further fields for increased participation of LAC countries regarding social issues in the framework of the EU Research programmes, for example in collaboration with an EU-LAC social policy making platform, would add considerable value to the bi-regional cooperation. Joint cooperation projects funded by the EU through its framework programmes, joint calls by EU and LAC funding agencies as well as innovative forms of Public-Private partnerships that include business and civil society actors hereby are the foundation for bi-regional cooperation not only in the scientific dimension, but also in the social realm.

#### **Recommendation V - Build up joint Training and Research Programme(s) on social inclusion policy**

The global framework of EU-LAC relations has changed considerably in the last decades, culminating in the formulation of the Sustainable Development Goals, which emphasise mutual cooperation and try to break up the classic North-South knowledge divide. This has also relevant implications for exchanging experiences of social inclusion policy approaches. Instead of following old paradigms of transferring knowledge from North to South, a mutually beneficial framework for interchange, knowledge-sharing and capacity building should be set up. In line with the recent joint efforts by the OECD, CEPAL and the DG DevCo, already mentioned, and the re-structuring of the External Actions envisioned in the MFF 2021-2027, this framework could include a Joint EU-LAC Training and Research Programme and/or Facility on social inclusion policy.

This programme could be set up on the intersection between external actions, the Research Framework Programme and the Erasmus + programme for cooperation in higher education. It would provide the possibility for training professionals, academics, administrative personnel and public officials to strengthen strategic and operational capacities around topics such as territorial cohesion (supporting positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas, SDG #11), intercultural components in rural development, continuous exchange and sharing of good practices in policies of integration and inclusion policies (ending poverty, SDG #1). Again, implementing this programme would be a key asset in positioning EU and LAC as an influential

coalition on a global scale and strengthen not only the bi-regional relations but also capacities for implementing policies in the two regions themselves.

### **Recommendation VI - Revive the bi-regional Dialogue on Migration**

The bi-regional dialogue on migration between EU and LAC has stalled in the last couple of years. Even though the bi-regional dialogue as it was implemented in recent decades can by its nature not produce binding agreements, it can still be an important forum to set forward priority agendas in both regions. Working jointly on a migration agenda between both regions requires strengthening those forums that bring together the representatives of the states involved, even though those forums might lack the necessary legal competencies to spark actual change.

In this sense, multilateral policymaking is a privileged space in which to shape the agenda on migration issues and to lay the basis for moving forward with concrete actions. This means strengthening existing forums and organisations, despite the fact that one of the problems pointed out in the literature is the low impact of regional institutions in Latin America and the Caribbean when it comes to policy-making. Reinvigorating a strong partnership on migration issues could not only be a possibility to contribute to the SDGs, but could also reinstate trust in multilateral agendas that have come under scrutiny not at last due to the recent tensions surrounding the UN Global compact for migration.

### **Recommendation VII - Introduce reciprocity regarding protection of migrant workers in bilateral agreements**

In order not to remain only on a bi-regional level, which implies remaining on the level of non-binding dialogue due to missing legal competencies in the LAC side, there are also concrete measures that can be taken up to affect the lives of EU-LAC migrants in both regions positively.

The EU should bring to the fore, at the expert and political levels, much more forcefully the “Right to equal treatment” of foreign workers that constitutes one of its basic principles from the very beginning. It could and should emphasize that, restricted at first to workers from other member States, it has been extended to migrant workers from non-EU countries.

As no entity exists in LAC that could provide such legal provision, other ways need to be explored in order to secure reciprocity of workers’ rights between EU and LAC countries. Introducing reciprocity of workers’ rights into bilateral agreements between EU and LAC countries would ensure that social rights and access to social protection which is granted to one group in the receiving country (e.g. LAC workers in an EU member state) are also applicable vice versa. This action would also be in line with sub-target 8.8 of the SDGs on protecting labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments for all workers, including migrant workers. Here again, this would also strengthen the role of the two regions (and mainly the EU) at the global level.

This measure would not only create direct benefits for citizens of both regions but also be operational without the need for further legal adaptations on the regional level. Such agreements could cover issues like mutual responsibilities, working conditions and social security, hereby stipulating the equality of LAC citizens in the EU and vice versa.

## 6 LITERATURE

- Arriba, A. (2014). *El papel de la garantía de mínimos frente a la crisis*. Madrid: FOESSA, Documento de Trabajo 5.7.
- Buitelaar, Rudolf et al (2015): Estrategias y políticas nacionales para la cohesión territorial. Estudios de caso latinoamericanos. Santiago de Chile: Naciones Unidas.
- Byron, J.; Laguardia Martinez, J. (2019): EU and Caribbean: Towards the Reconfiguration of the Inter-Regional Landscape. In: Mori, Antonella (2019): EU and Latin America: A stronger partnership. Milan: Ledizioini. Available under: [https://www.ispionline.it/sites/default/files/pubblicazioni/americalatina\\_web.pdf](https://www.ispionline.it/sites/default/files/pubblicazioni/americalatina_web.pdf).
- Cecchini, S., & Madariaga, A. (2011). Programas de transferencias condicionadas: balance de la experiencia reciente en *América Latina y el Caribe*. Santiago de Chile: Cepal.
- Chiodi, F. (2015). La estrategia europea de inclusión activa. In P. EUROSOCIAL, *Las perspectivas de la protección social e inclusión productiva en Centroamérica y República Dominicana, en el marco de las tendencias latinoamericanas*. San Salvador: Secretaría de la Integración Social Centroamericana (SISCA).
- Chiodi, F. M. (2016). Enfoques conceptuales y programáticos de las políticas contra la pobreza en España y Chile: una mirada comparativa. *OPERA (18)*, 203-227.
- Cruces, G., Moreno, J., Ringold, D., & Rofman, R. (2008). *Los programas sociales en Argentina hacia el bicentenario*. Buenos Aires: Banco Mundial.
- Dhéret, C., & Fransen, L. (2017). Social Investment first! A precondition for a modern Social Europe. EPC Issue Paper No. 82.
- EU-CELAC summit (2015): Brussel declaration. Available at : <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2015/06/11-eu-celac-summit-brussels-declaration/>.
- European Social Network. (2012). Active inclusion policies in Europe 2008-2012: The impact of European Commission's 2008 Recommendation. ESN Policy Review.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (2002). Why we need a new welfare state. OUP Oxford.
- ESPN. (2016). Minimum Income Schemes in Europe. A study of national policies 2015. European Social Policy Network.
- European Commission, & OECD . (2006). Eurostat-OECD Methodological Manual on Purchasing Power Parities,. Paris: OCDE.
- European Parliament. (2017). Minimum Income Policies in EU Member States. Directorate General for Internal Policies.



- Figari, F., Matsaganis, M., & Sutherland, H. (2013). Are European social safety nets tight enough? Coverage and adequacy of minimum income schemes in 14 EU countries. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 22(1), 3-14.
- Fonseca, A. (2006). Los sistemas de protección social en América Latina: Un análisis de las transferencias monetarias condicionadas. Seminario de Transferencias Condicionadas y Seguridad Alimentaria: Puertas de Salida a la Pobreza Extrema a través del Combate al Hambre. Santiago de Chile: FAO.
- Garcialoro, G. (2008). Los ejes de la política migratoria en la Unión Europea. *papeles del Este*, 17, 21-38.
- George, H. (2010). *Our Land and Land Policy, National and State*. . p. 230.
- Gough, I. (1979). *The political economy of the welfare state*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gough, I., & Geof, W. (2004). *Insecurity and welfare regimes in Asia, Africa and Latin America: Social policy in development contexts*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, Ronald; Lopez Sanchez, Ramon (2015): *Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean. Sharing experiences in regional development policies*. Luxembourg: Publications Office.
- International Organization for Migration OIM. (2018, febrero). *National Migration Trends in South America*. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.
- Jenson, J. (2010). Diffusing ideas for after neoliberalism: The social investment perspective in Europe and Latin America. *Global Social Policy*, 10.1: 59-84.
- Holzmann, R., & Jorgensen, S. (2009). Manejo social del riesgo: un nuevo marco conceptual para la protección social y más allá. *Facultad Nacional de Salud Pública*, 21(1).
- Martínez, P. (2006). La política de inmigración de la UE. En CELARE (Ed.), *Migraciones: Experiencias en América Latina y la Unión Europea* (pp. 33-40). Santiago, Chile.
- Martínez, J., & Orrego, C. (2016). *Nuevas tendencias y dinámicas migratorias en América Latina y el Caribe* (Población y Desarrollo No. 114). Santiago, Chile: CEPAL, OIM.
- Moreira, A. (2008). *The activation dilemma: reconciling the fairness and effectiveness of minimum income schemes in Europe*. Policy Press.
- Navarro, Mikel (2007) *Los sistemas regionales de innovación en Europa: una literatura con claroscuros*. Consulted: July 16th, 2017.  
[http://eprints.ucm.es/7978/1/59\\_-07.pdf](http://eprints.ucm.es/7978/1/59_-07.pdf)
- Nelson, K. (2010). Social assistance and minimum income benefits in old and new EU democracies. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 19(4), 367-378.
- Olesti, A. (2008). Las políticas de la Unión Europea relativas al control en las fronteras, asilo e inmigración. *ReDCE*, 10, 13-48.

- Rodríguez Enríquez, C. (2011). Programas de transferencias condicionadas de ingreso e igualdad de género: ¿Por dónde anda América Latina? Serie Mujer y Desarrollo, CEPAL, N°109.
- Standing, G. (2003). International Labour Organization. Minimum income schemes in Europe.
- Stampini, M., & Tornarolli, L. (2012). The growth of conditional cash transfers in Latin America and the Caribbean: did they go too far? Bonn Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA).
- Stefoni, C. (2018). Panorama de la migración internacional en América del Sur. Documento elaborado en el marco de la Reunión Regional Latinoamericana y Caribeña de Expertas y expertos en Migración Internacional preparatoria del Pacto Mundial para una Migración Segura, Ordenada y Regular. (No. Serie Población y Desarrollo 123). CEPAL/OIM.
- Social Capital Initiative, & United Nations. (2003). Capital social y reducción de la pobreza en América Latina y el Caribe: en busca de un nuevo paradigma. Economic Commission for Latin America. United Nations Publications.
- Tejerina, L., & Pizano, V. (2016). Programas de transferencias monetarias condicionadas e inclusión financiera. Inter-American Development Bank.
- Thane, P. (2016). The foundations of the welfare state. Routledge.
- Thorp, R. (1998). Progress, poverty and exclusion: an economic history of Latin America in the 20th century. IDB.
- Van Parijs, P. (2004). Basic income: a simple and powerful idea for the twenty-first century. *Politics & Society*, 32(1), 7-39. <https://advocacy.thp.org/2014/08/mdgs-to-sdgs/>