



LAC Section 22.05.2024

# Closing event – Celebrating 60 years of Swiss cooperation with Latin America & the Caribbean

## Slido questions and answers

SLIDO QUESTION	RESPONSE SDC
What was the stake of Swiss economic Development during all those years - and is, or was there a interlinkage with the CH international cooperation?	<p>The Meta-Analysis provides a summative/descriptive presentation of SDC's bilateral cooperation with LAC, main results achieved and historic lessons learned. It did not focus on a specific sector.</p> <p>The Deep Dive Report for Honduras on "Economic Development" focused on SDC's engagement in this sector (over the past 20 years) and identified sectoral and institutional lessons learned. In the case of Honduras, it can be ascertained that SDC's desired impact was increased productivity and competitiveness, increased income for Micro and Small enterprises, employment creation and socio-economic insertion of young people at risk in the labor market.</p> <p>SDC-Honduras projects in the sector show an important internal coherence (synergies and interrelationships with other SDC projects) and external coherence (complementarity and coordination with others).</p>
Why agricultural / Rural development is hardly mentioned bearing in mind that SDC invested a big junk of money	<p>Agriculture and rural development is very much present in the published reports (see SDC's website: <a href="#">Historical Impact Capitalization</a>), for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Meta-Analysis Report (187 individual references to "agriculture" and "rural development")</li><li>▪ Deep Dive Report Bolivia "Rural Development"</li><li>▪ Deep Dive Report Honduras "Economic Development" (strong focus on agriculture value chains)</li><li>▪ Summary Meta-Analysis &amp; Capitalization Report: Numerous lessons learned refer to agriculture and rural development.</li></ul>
Where the effects of specific instruments, ie NGO programs also assessed within this review?	<p>The reports did not focus on a potential difference between NGO-led programs and other modalities.</p>

Did you go to Honduras to evaluate the impact of the territorial econ dev?	The Historic Impact Capitalization was not an evaluation, but an analysis embedded in SDC's comprehensive institutional knowledge management accompanying the gradual phasing out of SDC's bilateral cooperation activities LAC. IN the context of the sectoral Deep Dive "Economic Development" the consultants went to Honduras
How did the analysis of systemic sustainability take into consideration the changes of policy by the partner government	<p>The guiding questions for the OECD-DAC criterion "Sustainability" included, amongst others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Guiding question: To what extent are the benefits of the programmes, including closed ones, likely to continue after SDC funding ceases (for closed programmes : did the benefits actually continue?)? What were/are the successes and hindering factors? Assessment criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Exit strategies were defined and implemented (e.g. discontinuation or reduction of measures when targets were reached or transfer of responsibility to national structures).</li> <li>○ Projects concepts generally consider national capacities necessary in order to build on project achievements.</li> <li>○ National (governmental and non-governmental actors) were closely involved in project implementation as partners/beneficiaries with a high level of ownership.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Guiding question: Did SDC's bilateral cooperation interventions lead to scalable or replicable results (for closed interventions : Were those actually up-scaled or replicated?)? Assessment criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project approaches were scaled-up in the priority regions.</li> <li>○ Project approaches were replicated outside the priority regions</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Please see the reports on SDC's website <a href="#">Historical Impact Capitalization</a> for details.</p>
Are there specific lessons learned in the health sector?	No, there is no specific lessons-learned for the health sector. It was not a thematic focus in the Deep Dives, and was rarely touched upon in the Meta Analysis as not being a priority sector for SDC in the region
What lessons on impact can be contributed from LAC to other regions in the world?	Difficult to answer given the multitude of sectors, countries and scenarios. We invite you to look through the published reports on SDC's website <a href="#">Historical Impact Capitalization</a> and search for the key word that interests you.
Apart from missing supranational institutions for anchoring achievements on policy level, what were the reasons for failure of regional approach in CA?	<p>The final report concluded that with regards to the <b>Regional Approach in Central America</b>, the benefits are possibly more theoretical than real.</p> <p>SDC's justification for a Regional Approach has evolved over time, however the basis seems to be the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Existence of global/regional challenges, problems or risks.</li> <li>2. Regional integration dynamics where regional organizations/associations play an active role (political, economic).</li> <li>3. Additional flexibility offered by a regional program compared to a country program, including the possibility of entering a new country - Allows for more efficient risk management (entering/ leaving countries)</li> <li>4. Joint analysis of the regional context leads to the conclusion to opt for a regional program from an effectiveness/relevance point of view.</li> </ol>

	<p>The assertion that these four points were actually reality in Central America is not shared by all the interviewees.</p> <p>For more details please see the Meta Analysis Report (chapter 3.4 Central America)</p>
What are lessons learned from regional programs / approaches that can be taken up for regional programs in other regions or for the Americas in the future?	<p>With regards to the Regional Approach in Central America, the benefits are possibly more theoretical than real, at least if “regional” is to be understood as the effort to contribute to the solution of supra-national problems, strengthening of regional institutions and facilitating access to regional markets and investment opportunities. It could be argued that if the latter conditions are not reality, a Regional Approach is potentially not efficient.</p> <p>For more details please see the Meta Analysis Report (chapter 3.4 Central America)</p>
The scope of the historical capitalisation was huge, how did the consulting group and DDC made it possible, and how much participatory was it?	<p>The pre-tender concept paper was developed in a participatory way on SDC's side. During implementation, regular exchanges with SDC country offices took place, and during field missions focus groups (amongst others) were conducted.</p>
What estimated resources do you intend to invest in LAC in the next years ?	<p>The resources will be defined within the new International Cooperation Strategy 2025-28 that has to be approved by Parliament in 2024. SDC will maintain humanitarian initiatives in countries with major humanitarian crises (e.g. Haiti, Colombia, Venezuela) and activities of global programs (Climate change/DRR, Water).</p>
What is your "management response" to the key lesson learnt that CH is well placed to continue? How?	<p>As the Historic Impact Capitalization was not an evaluation, no *management response" will be developed. Some of the key lessons learned will be used by SDC for the strategic planning of programs in other regions.</p>
Peace and human rights being a focus kof swiss sdc. Is there an assessment of lessons learnt in this? Given the resurging authoritarian govt.	<p>Peace and human rights are an important priority of Swiss foreign policy. Some experiences of SDC in LAC (e.g. Cuba, Nicaragua) will be taken into account in the political dialogue. The capitalization of CSPM and psychosocial approach in LAC provided useful material.</p>
Which best practices are important and can be replicated?	<p>Some of the most important best practices are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We co-created with a long-term perspective</li> <li>We worked with a participatory and trust-based approach and were close to the population</li> <li>We strived for quality and innovation</li> <li>We invested in people</li> </ul>
Which failures can we keep in mind to avoid facing them again?	<p>What we could have done better:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Invest in coherent data for strategic steering (evaluation, monitoring)</li> <li>Define a regional approach which addresses regional (supra-national) problems</li> <li>Choose the right entry point for inclusive economic development (market development approach)</li> </ul>
If you have to highlight one major impact of the SDC after 60 years in South	<p>Findings of the Historic Impact Capitalisation showed that the relevance and effectiveness of SDC' programs were high in all countries analyzed.</p>

America, which one could it be?	
Is FDFA aware of the cost of loosing decade-long institutional relations and political capital?	The FDFA is well aware of the important legacy of 60 years of successful cooperation with LAC. In future, it will employ different instruments to maintain good relations and contribute to the region's development in a spirit of partnership. These include trade and economic measures, political dialogue, participation in multilateral organisations, human rights policy, democracy and peace promotion, humanitarian aid, and areas where Switzerland can add value with its expertise, such as climate change, water management and disaster risk management.
is there such a thing as a project/ program running too long when building local ownership and being systemic does not happen and turns into co-dependence....?	In general, the Historic Impact Capitalisation showed that long-term partnerships brought positive results. This conclusion does not exclude that in some cases projects/programs could have been closed earlier in order to avoid dependence and increase sustainability.
If rural development seems a big success in all mentioned dimension what future for the right to food in sdc's future work?	<p>SDC has a human rights based approach to projects and the right to food is recognized in the 1966 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights as an essential human right (not just for rural contexts): <a href="https://www.shareweb.ch/site/Conflict-and-Human-Rights/startpage-tools/human-rights-based-approach">https://www.shareweb.ch/site/Conflict-and-Human-Rights/startpage-tools/human-rights-based-approach</a>. There is enough food on the planet (quantity) but hunger remains mainly a consequence of structural inequality of access to food and lack of participation in the governance of vulnerable and marginalized communities. SDC has been supporting the <a href="#">strengthening of the right to food (with FIAN)</a> for many years as well as <a href="#">the mandate</a> of the <a href="#">Special Rapporteur Right to Food</a> (currently Michael Fakhri) and plans to continue this support. The right to food goes beyond rural areas in its application – it is about people's agency to choose which food is produced by whom and for whom (<a href="#">"agency" is recommended as a new food security dimension</a>). Switzerland (in Rome) is a member of the "Friends of the Right to Food" for policy dialogue and is in close exchanges with the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) for example to celebrate the 20 years of the Right to Food voluntary guidelines and encourage more uptake of those guidelines in countries. Switzerland / SDC is also in contact with <a href="#">the FAO Right to Food section</a> for capacity building of government officials and empowering of civil society on the realization and implementation of the right to food voluntary guidelines to support just and equal food systems transformation.</p> <p>In terms of rural areas, one of the most important framework beyond the right to food is actually the <a href="#">UNDROP - United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas</a>. Switzerland has supported this declaration from the beginning and has adopted it for Switzerland. SDC supports some projects to encourage the realization of the rights from UNDROP such as the right to seeds, to land, to education or gender equality. One such project supported by the SDC food systems section is the RAISE project: <a href="https://agroecology-coalition.org/raise/">https://agroecology-coalition.org/raise/</a>. As SDC supports various <a href="#">seeds rights</a> and land rights projects and networks (such as the <a href="#">International Land Coalition</a>), it is likely to continue to do so.</p>

<p>What are the reasons of the phasing out of DDC ?</p>	<p>This decision forms part of the overarching International Cooperation Strategy 2021–24, adopted by Parliament in 2020. The strategy calls for a more focused use of resources in four priority regions: North Africa and the Middle East, sub-Saharan Africa, Central, South and South-East Asia, and Eastern Europe. This geographical focus is in line with international trends and recommendations aimed at optimising the efficiency and effectiveness of development cooperation.</p>
---	--