



UPDATED VERSION OF THE SYNTHESIS REPORT ON CROSS-CUTTING TOPICS

Date: December 16, 2016

Document No: WP02-DI-22

Version: V1.2

Status: Final Draft

Deliverable No: D2.5

Task Leader: IAI



DOCUMENT INFORMATION

Title	UPDATED VERSION OF THE SYNTHESIS REPORT ON CROSS-CUTTING TOPICS
Lead Author	Barbara Göbel
Contributors	Peter Birle, Miriam Boyer
Distribution	Public
Document No	WP02-DI-22

DOCUMENT HISTORY*

Date	Revision no	Prepared by	Approved by	Description
18/11/2016	V1.1	BG/PB/MB		Initial draft
16/12/2016	V1.2	BG/PB/MB		Final draft

* Please note that a previous version of this report may be found under document number WP02-DI-03 (Deliverable No. D2.1, titled “Preliminary Synthesis Report on Cross-Cutting Topics”).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

EULAC 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 Community. 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 Community 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*	2
Acknowledgement	2
Disclaimer.....	2
Contents.....	3
Summary	4
1 Introduction	5
2 Objectives and Methodology.....	10
3 the analysis: Cross-cutting Topics	13
2.1 Mobility	14
2.1.1 Mobility and the Scientific Dimension of Bi-regional Relations between EU and LAC.....	14
2.1.2 Mobility and the Social Dimension of Bi-regional Relations between EU and LAC	20
2.2 Inequality	25
2.2.1 Inequality and the Scientific Dimension of Bi-regional Relations between EU and LAC	26
2.2.2 Inequality and the Social Dimension of Bi-regional Relations between EU and LAC.....	30
2.3 Diversity	34
2.3.1 Diversity and the Scientific Dimension of Bi-regional Relations between EU and LAC	34
2.3.2 Diversity and the Social Dimension of Bi-regional Relations between EU and LAC.....	36
2.4 Sustainability.....	38
2.4.1 Sustainability in the Scientific Dimension of Bi-regional Relations between EU and LAC	39
2.4.2 Sustainability in the Social Dimension of Bi-regional Relations between EU and LAC.....	42
4 Preliminary Conclusions.....	47
5 Bibliography	51
5.1 Primary Sources	51
5.2 EU-LAC/EU-CELAC Declarations (in chronological order)	52
5.3 Secondary Bibliographic Material	53
5.4 Internal Documents of the EULAC-Focus Consortium	54

SUMMARY

A Synthesis Report on Cross-cutting Topics is the main deliverable of Work Package 2 (WP2). The current document presents the preliminary results of the investigation carried out in WP2, consisting of an evaluation of a first analysis of primary and secondary sources, focusing on the social and scientific dimension of bi-lateral relations, to be complemented by the cultural dimension in the following revised version of this report. WP2, 'Cross-cutting pathways' will contribute to a better and more differentiated understanding of EU-CELAC relations. Its two main objectives are: a) to identify significant similarities and differences between EU and LAC in the cultural, scientific and social dimension of their relations through the lens of key cross-cutting topics; b) to identify where and in what sense one region could learn from the other. In this way, an input to the vision building process of Work Package 6 will be provided and lessons learned on trans-sectorial exchange and analysis will be summarized.

This Updated Version of the Synthesis Report on Cross-cutting Topics (Deliverable D2.5) was written on the basis of a) All EU-LAC/EU-CELAC Summit and Inter-Summit Documents between 1999 and 2016; b) bi-annual EU-LAC/EU-CELAC Action Plans which have existed since 2010 as well as assessments of these Action Plans carried out since 2016. Other political documents reviewed included the EU Roadmaps for Science, Technology and Innovation and some of the reports that issued following Senior Official Working Group meetings in the area of Science, Technology and Innovation. In addition, some programme documents were considered, primarily those relating to the scientific dimension and to a lesser extent to the social dimension of bi-regional relations. Other inputs for this analysis include exchanges with other Work Packages within the EULAC Focus consortium, in particular three meetings with the Leader of WP4 as well as discussions during two EULAC Focus consortium meetings in Madrid in July 2016 and in Berlin in August 2016, including the participation of members of the Trans-Sectorial Board. Secondary scientific literature was also considered, including broad political analyses but also assessments of particular programmes.

This report is work in progress. It summarizes the results of a first round of evaluating primary and secondary sources for two out of the three dimensions that have to be taken into account, the scientific and the social dimension. The evaluations presented here are preliminary and can be expected to become more differentiated as the analysis evolves over time. Future versions of this document will also take the cultural dimension into account and will go into greater detail in reviewing and evaluating the content of political, policy and programme documents to the extent that they are relevant for analysing the cross-cutting topics. Thus far, no results from the other working packages were considered, but of course we hope to enrich our analysis through this material in the near future.

The report is structured as follows. In the introduction we outline some of the key aspects of the project, as well as basic characteristics of regional cooperation within Europe and Latin America, which is of great importance for an analysis of bi-regional relations. After the analysis of the four cross-cutting-topics with a view to the scientific and social dimension of the relationships, 12 preliminary conclusions are presented in the final chapter. The conclusions are preliminary. They will become more differentiated as the analysis evolves over time and when the cultural dimension is taken into account.

1 INTRODUCTION

The European Union (EU) and its Member States have had a significant presence in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) since the early 1990s when formal democracy had returned to many countries of the region. A solid partnership developed, based on trans-Atlantic partners recognizing their close historical, cultural and economic ties. In the course of the 1990s, the European Commission (EC) defined an EU-LAC Strategic Partnership based on an interregional approach. With the institutionalization of the EU-LAC relations in 1999 through the first bi-regional Summit of Heads of States and Government, held in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil), the EU and LAC culminated a decade of rapprochement.

During the past decade the context of EU-LAC relations changed considerably. A more fragmented Latin American and Caribbean political space has evolved with diverse, often divergent interests, not only among groups of states but also between individual states. Three important processes must be highlighted. First, the older regional integration schemes in Latin America and the Caribbean (based primarily on commercial issues) stagnated. This process went along with the rise of new regional cooperation and integration schemes such as UNASUR (Union of South American Nations, created in 2008) and CELAC (Community of Latin American and Caribbean States, created in 2011). While the new organisations express a strong desire for regional autonomy in the international system and include a much wider range of topics for regional cooperation, they are also less institutionalised than the older schemes. Second, new alliances of states with divergent and conflicting development models have emerged, including ALBA (Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of our America, created in 2004) on the one hand, and the Pacific Alliance (created in 2012), on the other. Third, there has been a stronger orientation of Latin America and the Caribbean towards Asia, closely related to the growing economic role of dynamic Asian countries such as China, Korea and India in the region. Indicators of this new geopolitical focus include the Pacific Alliance and the Trans Pacific Partnership Agreement, TPP (signed in 2016, but yet unratified).

In the same time period, the EU has experienced a profound internal crisis and a greater diversification of Member State interests through its successive expansion. In addition, stronger pressure for action from its neighbour regions and states emerged, thereby strengthening EU foreign policy towards Eastern Europe, the Middle East and the Mediterranean.

Although relations between the EU and LAC are not burdened by major conflicts, internal developments on both sides of the Atlantic and global transformations have caused a certain bi-regional alienation. The last Summits of Heads of States and Government have shown a gradual fatigue, with consultation mechanisms still unable to produce strong impacts, both politically and on societies in general. At the same time, recent political rifts such as a change in power relations in the United States might reconfigure European ties to other world regions. In the case of LAC, the political weight placed by the EU in maintaining and improving the political dialogue with the region will increase.

If Europe and Latin America and the Caribbean want to shape global developments together, they need to share a common vision. However, such a common vision cannot be taken for granted, but must be designed and produced jointly. Therefore, an analysis of interests, goals, perspectives and challenges between EU and CELAC is urgently needed. This assessment has triggered the

development of the EULAC Focus project, in which, since March, 2016, 19 institutional partners—nine based in the European Union and ten in Latin America and the Caribbean—are working together closely in order to make a contribution to such a bi-regional vision-building process.

The main objective of the EULAC Focus project is that of “giving focus” to EU–CELAC relations. The project pays special attention to the social, scientific and cultural dimensions, proposing a new strategic and more targeted framework for bi-regional relations. For the analysis of these dimensions, three thematic Work-Packages (WPs) have been established in the project: WP3 on the cultural dimension, WP4 on the scientific dimension, and WP5 on the social dimension. They not only aim at determining synergies, fostering cross-fertilization and highlighting opportunities in EU–CELAC bi-regional relations, but also at identifying asymmetries and bottlenecks. As they share common patterns and address similar challenges, the study of the social, scientific, and cultural dimensions of EU–CELAC relations at the bi-regional level overlaps with trans-sectorial research pathways. Therefore, WP3, WP4, and WP5 are complemented by two horizontal Work Packages: WP6 and WP2.

While the overall objective of WP6 is to outline a vision of bi-regional relations between EU and CELAC, WP2 analyses key cross-cutting topics. It fosters the interdisciplinary treatment of trans-sectorial pathways, feeding into the analysis of the cultural, scientific and social dimensions of EU – CELAC bi-regional relations and synthesizing the outcomes regarding the cross-cutting topics provided by the thematic pillars WP3, 4, and 5. Thus, it will promote knowledge exchange, close interconnections and feedback loops between WP3, 4, and 5 in order to mutually reinforce those thematic Work Packages and provide a targeted input to the vision-building process of WP6. Results from the analysis of the cross-cutting topics of the cultural, scientific and social dimensions of the bi-regional relationship will be taken into account in the scenario building process, which addresses key factors, trends and uncertainties that will most probably shape and determine the future of EU-CELAC relations.

In none of the three dimensions of bi-regional relations examined within the framework of the project does the EU have exclusive competence. EU competencies apply only to the following areas: customs union; establishing the competition rules necessary for the functioning of the internal market; monetary policy for the Member States whose currency is the euro; conservation of marine biological resources under the common fisheries policy; and common commercial policy (Treaty of the Functioning of the European Union, TFEU, Article 3).

Nonetheless, there are different possibilities for EU action in policy areas that can be attributed to the three dimensions of bi-regional relations between EU and CELAC. Shared responsibilities between the EU and Member States under Article 4 of the Treaty of the Functioning of the European Union exist in the fields of research, technology, environment and energy (scientific dimension) as well as in social policy (social dimension). The EU may support and promote cooperation among Member States in social policy in order to achieve common objectives such as improving working conditions, a high level of social protection, equal opportunities for women and men and combating all forms of exclusion and discrimination on the labour market (TFEU, Art. 151). The principle of subsidiarity must be respected, meaning that the Union is only allowed to regulate what Member States alone cannot sufficiently address. Furthermore, the competitiveness of the economy may not be affected by EU measures and the EU must also account for the diversity of national social policy

arrangements, such as collective bargaining agreements. Moreover, in the social field, the EU cannot undertake any harmonization of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions applying to the Member States.

In the areas of research, technological development and space the European Union has various competencies, in particular as pertains to developing and implementing programmes but without preventing Member States from exercising their own competence. Furthermore, the EU has additional competencies under Article 6 of the Treaty of the Functioning of the European Union in the areas of health and education (social dimension) and culture (cultural dimension). However, there is no harmonization among the policies of the Member States in these areas.

CELAC is a purely intergovernmental mechanism for political dialogue and concertation between the 33 Latin American and Caribbean countries. It has no supranational competencies vis-à-vis its member countries. CELAC can adopt political declarations if there is a consensus among all member countries, but it does not have exclusive competencies or competences shared with the member countries, as is the case with the EU.

It is not possible at this point to look more closely at the consequences of the different institutional architectures of intra-regional relations in Europe and Latin America as they affect the bi-regional relations between the EU and CELAC. However, it would be useful to pay more attention to this issue in the further course of the project.

An important cornerstone of EU-CELAC relations are the instruments for implementing the bi-regional partnership which include the policy dialogues, common activities and initiatives but, importantly, also funding from the European Union. Funding instruments include the Development Cooperation Instrument, organized at different levels, according to thematic and geographic criteria, as well as the European Development Fund which is the main source of funding for EU development cooperation with Caribbean states. Both of these instruments will expire in 2020. The Partnership Instrument is a third source of funds providing so-called peer-to-peer cooperation with Latin America and Caribbean in areas of mutual interest to both regions. In the area of research in science, technology and innovation, bi-regional cooperation has mainly been supported through the various EU framework programmes, the latest of which is known as Horizon 2020. It is important to keep these cooperation funding schemes in mind due to the important role that they play in shaping bi-regional relations in the sense that these types of programmes tend to underscore a relationship in which the EU comes to expect that funding instruments will elicit a one-sided change in the Latin American region while the EU is not addressed in this context. This asymmetry related to EU funding will be visible in the course of analysing all crosscutting issues in this report.

The scientific dimension of bi-regional relations has been developed by an explicit institutional framework—including mechanisms, instruments and financial commitments—for collaboration in the area of science and technology. Collaboration in the area of Science, Technology and Innovation is long-standing, going back various decades, framed since the 1940s by technological assistance programmes that were later developed into a more equal collaborative partnership in areas such as research projects, joint publications and funding schemes. Among the most prominent of these programmes are the various EU Framework Programmes in existence since 1984. From 2001 onwards, the political backing of collaborative LAC-EU participation became more explicit through regular Senior Official Meetings. Moreover, since the Madrid EU-LAC Summit in 2010, it has been

further institutionalized with the creation of a special chapter devoted to the area of Science and Technology in the joint EU-LAC Action Plan. This Action Plan has led concretely to the implementation of an EU-LAC Knowledge Area; particular working groups on prioritized areas; and at the bi-lateral level through joint calls, scholarship programmes and mobility schemes for students and researchers.

It is noteworthy that the scientific field is seen by the European Union as connecting to the social and cultural fields in ways that the latter two do not connect to one another. According to the Grant Agreement of the EULAC Focus project, “scientific research is closely connected to values in the sense that [it] incorporates cultural and social values in practice through individual researchers... [and that] values emerge from science both as a product and process, and may be redistributed more broadly in the culture or society” (Research Executive Agency of the European Commission 2016: Part B: 11).

The social dimension of bi-regional relations “has no institutionalized framework or an agreed common agenda” at the bi-regional level (EULAC Focus Project. Work Package 5 2016: 20). Nonetheless, the bi-regional relationship is shaped through a series of policy measures and political dialogues addressing issues such as employment, poverty, social cohesion, (primary and secondary) education and fiscal policies. As underlined in the EULAC Focus Grant Agreement it is a field defined by the EU and its interest “to secure international partners around a similar set of social norms and ways to organise society” (Research Executive Agency of the European Commission 2016: Part B: 12) to promote social cohesion, stability, conflict prevention and a minimization of risks or contingencies in the highly interconnected global economic terrain.

The areas of social policy and in particular the promotion of the notion of social cohesion have been important in the EU-LAC relationship since the 2004 Summit in Guadalajara, as reflected in political institutional documents from then onward. Since 2006, the EU and LAC have held four High-Level Fora on Social Cohesion. In addition to this policy level, the social field has been defined by a number of programmes with a strong development focus, the first of which was launched in 2004 and has been expanded twice since then. At the bi-lateral level (understood as relations between the EU and individual Latin American countries), the EU also supported policy dialogues and programmes on employment, migration and drugs.

The importance of culture for European external relations has increased at the political level in recent years. In her study on the external cultural relations of the EU, Lisack refers to the European Commission's believe that the importance of external cultural relations goes beyond the cultural field (Lisack 2014: 14). Cross border cooperation in culture is seen by the EU as “an enabling factor of change and for deepening dialogue and partnership on key issues, creating a sense of community and opening up for the acceptance of other cultures and identities” (Research Executive Agency of the European Union 2016: Part B: 10). Nevertheless, external cultural action of the EU still consists basically in punctual activities with rather limited budgets compared to other policy areas (Lisack 2014: 16).

Foreign cultural policy is a competence of the EU Member States. As a result, the dialogues and bi-regional actions in the cultural dimension are considerably less developed than in the scientific and social dimensions. While culture has not been on the agenda in the bi-regional Action Plans that have existed since 2010, several programmes and initiatives have been implemented at the EU–

CELAC sub regional level. These include cooperation agreements with CARIFORUM and Mercosur. At the EU-CELAC bilateral level there are agreements that include cultural cooperation (policy dialogues and funding instruments) with Mexico, Brazil, Colombia, Peru and Central America (Research Executive Agency of the European Union 2016: Part B: 10-11).

2 OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

Work Package 2, “Cross-cutting pathways” pursues the general goal to contribute to a better and more differentiated understanding of EU-CELAC relations. Its two main objectives are:

- a) To identify through the lens of key cross-cutting topics significant similarities and differences between EU and LAC in the cultural, scientific and social dimension of their relations;
- b) To identify where and in which sense one region could learn from the other.

In this way, an input to the vision building process of Work Package 6 will be provided. In addition, lessons learned on trans-sectorial exchange and analysis will be summarized.

A Synthesis Report on Cross-cutting Topics is the main deliverable of WP2. The final version is planned for completion by February, 2019 (D2.4). A Preliminary Version of the Synthesis Report was drafted in July 2016 (D2.1), circulated and discussed among project members. The present document is the Updated Version of the Synthesis Report on Cross-cutting Topics (D 2.5).

The **time period considered** in the Synthesis Report extends from 1999 until 2018. It starts with the first bi-regional summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1999 and finishes at the end of 2018 when the study will be completed and the final version of the report elaborated. This means that the analysis of the cross-cutting topics will encompass about twenty years.

In addition to its temporal scope, the research design of the Synthesis Report also has a clearly defined **spatial frame**. The analysis of the cross-cutting topics largely refers to the bi-regional level, i.e., to relationships institutionalised and implemented in a specific political and legal setting between the EU and CELAC (and their precursors in LAC).

The **principal sources** of the analysis are:

- a) Primary sources, in particular documents of the EU-CELAC political dialogue as well as antecedent consultation and cooperation mechanisms including the EU-Rio Group meetings or the San José Dialogue between the EU and Central America. This will include documents and reports of the EU-LAC summits (1999, Rio de Janeiro, 2002 Madrid, 2004 Guadalajara, 2006 Vienna, 2008 Lima, 2010 Madrid) and the EU-CELAC summits (2013 Santiago de Chile, 2015 Brussels as well as the next Summit in El Salvador scheduled for 2017 in El Salvador), the first Inter-Summit ministerial meeting in Santo Domingo, 2016, as well as of the regular Senior Officials’ Meetings, specific thematic dialogues and initiatives. Efforts will be undertaken to participate as an observer in the EU-CELAC Summit scheduled for 2017 in El Salvador. In addition, ongoing and finished projects funded by the EC of relevance for the cross-cutting issues may be included.
- b) Scientific literature (studies, books, journal articles, etc.).
- c) Input from WP3, WP4 and WP5 regarding the cross-cutting topics including internal project documents and Deliverables of these Work Packages.

The analysis also relies on the following **instruments**:

- a) Research and inquiries of the WP2 Team. The WP2 Team consists of Barbara Göbel (Work Package Leader, Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut, Berlin), Moacyr Martucci (Work Package Co-Leader, Universidade de Sao Paulo), Peter Birle (Researcher, Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut, Berlin), and Miriam Boyer (Researcher, Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut, Berlin).
- b) Meetings and Workshops with the members of the Trans-Sectorial Board (TSB). The TSB consists of 12 members: the Coordinator, the Leader and Co Leader of WP2, the Leaders of WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6; one representative from the EU-LAC Foundation as an external expert, and up to four further external experts. Meetings of the Trans-Sectorial Board will be held back to back with the project Workshops. (For more details see: see Work Plan of the Trans-Sectorial Board, WP02-DI-02).
- c) Meetings and Workshops with WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6 Leaders and Co-Leaders.
- d) Teleconferences with WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6 Leaders and Co-Leaders.
- e) Teleconferences with external experts of the Trans-Sectorial Board.
- f) Meetings with other experts on EU-CELAC relations.

Thus far, two main **methodological challenges** have been identified. One challenge that has to be addressed in the analysis of the cross-cutting issues is the heterogeneity of research designs in the thematic work packages. WP3, WP4, and WP5 differ from each other considerably with regard to their thematic foci, spatial frame and temporal scope (e.g., some focus on a comparative analysis of issues in both regions, others on relations; some are strictly bi-regional, others take bilateral EU relations with specific LAC countries into account). This heterogeneity makes direct comparison a difficult task. Another challenge for the analysis of cross-cutting issues is that the three thematic dimensions – social, scientific, cultural relations – do not have the same significance for the bi-regional relations. While science has been taken into account from the outset in EU-LAC relations and has gained an increasingly important role over time, this is not the case for the social or the cultural dimension. We must find strategies to deal with both challenges in our analysis.

This **Updated Version of the Synthesis Report on Cross-cutting Topics** (Deliverable D2.5) was written on the basis of the following sources:

- a) All EU-LAC/EU-CELAC Summit and Inter-Summit Documents between 1999 and 2016;
- b) bi-annual EU-LAC/EU-CELAC Action Plans which have existed since 2010 as well as assessments of these Action Plans carried out since 2016.

Other political documents reviewed included the EU Roadmaps for Science, Technology and Innovation and some of the reports that issued following Senior Official Working Group meetings in the area of Science, Technology and Innovation. In addition, some programme documents were considered, primarily those relating to the scientific dimension and to a lesser extent to the social dimension of bi-regional relations.

Other inputs for this analysis include exchanges with other Work Packages within the EULAC Focus consortium, in particular three meetings with the Leader of WP4 as well as discussions during two EULAC Focus consortium meetings in Madrid in July 2016 and in Berlin in August 2016, including the participation of members of the Trans-Sectorial Board.

Secondary scientific literature was also considered, including broad political analyses but also assessments of particular programmes.

This **Updated Version of the Synthesis Report on Cross-cutting Topics (D2.5) is work in progress**. It summarizes the results of a first round of evaluating primary and secondary sources for two out of the three dimensions that have to be taken into account, the scientific and the social dimension. The evaluations presented here are preliminary and can be expected to become more differentiated as the analysis evolves over time. Future versions of this document will also take the cultural dimension into account and will go into greater detail in reviewing and evaluating the content of political, policy and programme documents to the extent that they are relevant for analysing the cross-cutting topics.

3 THE ANALYSIS: CROSS-CUTTING TOPICS

The Synthesis Report analyses the following cross-cutting topics:

- Mobility
- Inequality
- Diversity
- Sustainability

Four criteria guided the selection of these cross-cutting topics:

- a) They are paradigmatic key concepts encapsulating a broader spectrum of themes and problems.
- b) They address significant aspects of the social, the scientific and the cultural dimensions of EU-LAC relations; this means that they are pertinent to all three dimensions of bi-regional relations considered in the project.
- c) They are of strategic relevance for the EU-LAC bi-regional agenda and play also an important role within the UN framework.
- d) There is a need for a systematic and more differentiated analysis of these cross-cutting issues with regard to the social, scientific and cultural dimensions of EU-LAC relations and taken altogether, in order to comprehend their interlinkages better. In this sense the analysis of the selected cross-cutting issues makes a contribution to overcome blind spots in our understanding of EU-LAC relations.

The four cross-cutting topics are not only analysed individually for the cultural, scientific and social dimensions of the EU-LAC bi-regional relations. In addition, overlaps and interconnections between mobility, inequality, diversity and sustainability are explored.

2.1 MOBILITY

We understand mobility as the spatial movement of people and knowledge between Europe and Latin America/the Caribbean. Beyond knowledge, values, worldviews and experiences are mobilized and circulate across the Atlantic. The mobilization of people may be temporary or long-term (e.g. labour migration). When analysing the mobility of people in all three dimensions we will find that depending on the context key groups of actors change (e.g. in the scientific dimension, students, post-docs, senior researchers; or in the social dimension workers carrying out health- or child-care services). We will also see that the digital transformation produces new patterns of mobility beyond institutional and national borders.

In the analysis of mobility we focus on the following key questions:

- a) How is mobility addressed in the social, scientific and cultural dimensions of bi-regional relations? How has this changed in the time period considered?
- b) To what extent and how does mobility have an impact on the cultural, scientific, and social dimensions of bi-regional relations?
- c) What are the main achievements, what are the main challenges regarding mobility in the social, scientific and cultural dimensions of bi-regional relations?
- d) Are the existing funding instruments and formats adequate to foster social, scientific and cultural mobility between the EU and CELAC? Which additional instruments and formats would be necessary to enhance mobility?

2.1.1 Mobility and the Scientific Dimension of Bi-regional Relations between EU and LAC

In the scientific dimension, mobility encompasses primarily people and knowledge. People include university-level students, doctoral students and post-docs, university professors and senior researchers in non-university institutions. Bi-regional mobility has a different impact on each of these groups and follows different patterns depending on the position and career step of each individual. Knowledge in the scientific dimension encompasses data, information, methods, theories, and techniques. It also includes specific scholarly cultures, bureaucratic styles and institutional logics. The production, exchange, transfer and circulation of knowledge in the scientific realm cannot be disconnected from the existing scientific infrastructure. This includes research facilities such as laboratories, equipment, computer- and data centres, libraries, museums, archives, field stations but also infrastructure for teaching and scientific events (e.g. conference centres). Availability and access to infrastructure is important. It also has to be underlined that scientific mobility can be enabled, fostered or hindered by collaborative agreements and legal frameworks (e.g., inter-institutional recognition of academic degrees, specific visa regulations and work permits for researchers).

a) How is mobility addressed in the scientific dimension of bi-regional relations? How has this changed in the time period considered?

Mobility is central to bi-regional relations between EU-LAC in the field of science, technology and innovation. As Gaillard/Arvanitis (2013a) note in a comprehensive study of EU-LAC scientific collaboration, the bi-regional impetus to initiate international collaboration in the area of science and technology is itself motivated by the mobilization of information, knowledge, technologies and researchers. Although the specific motives and drivers for mobility are not necessarily the same on each side of the Atlantic and differ with regard to status groups, disciplines and interests, key factors for mobility include access to cutting edge science and complementary know-how, gaining entry to internationally renowned technology markets, the valuation of skills, information, and insights concentrated in other countries, and access to funds from foreign institutions and foreign funding agencies. Moreover, beyond a motivation for scientific collaboration in the framework of bi-regional relations cooperation in the field of science, technology and innovation shows a positive correlation between increased international collaboration and increasing international mobility of people and knowledge as an outcome (Gaillard/Gaillard/Arvanitis 2013: 151).

Mobility of Science at the Level of the Political Dialogue between EU and LAC

Scientific mobility between the EU and LAC builds on a strong tradition of exchange among researchers from both regions. This dates back to the 1940s, as some LAC countries underwent a period of institutional and professional development in the area of research. Europe responded to this by providing technical assistance that included hiring foreign researchers or the initiation of scholarship programmes (e.g. for students to pursue doctoral studies in the EU). However, in the 1980s this type of developmental or assistance-focus exchange began to shift towards more balanced formats of academic and scientific collaboration. The fourth EU Framework Programme (FP4) (1994-1998) set up clear guidelines for cooperation of the EU with third countries. In response, various governments in Latin America began to set up collaborative, complementary funds with the EU. In parallel, mobility was also encouraged through the fact that several Latin American countries increased funding in order to enable their researchers to participate in international mobility schemes (Gaillard/Gaillard/Arvanitis 2013; Kreimer/Levin 2013). These developments concern Latin America more than the Caribbean.

Since the initiation of a more institutionalized EU-LAC bi-regional relationship in the wake of the first bi-regional Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1999, scientific mobility has been a part of the Summit agenda. Thus, Senior Officials Meetings (SOM) on Science and Technology have taken place regularly since 2001 as a forum for defining joint political priorities for the field of science and technology, including mobility of students, postdocs, senior researchers, university professors, and the development of research infrastructures. Key thematic foci have been climate change or energy diversification. The Guadalajara Summit in 2004 asserted the political will to create an EU-LAC Knowledge Area, a goal that began to be explored through a strengthening of the bi-regional dialogue on science and technology priorities between EU Member states and particular Latin American countries.

A qualitative and strategic change in the EU-LAC relationship with a significant effect on the mobility of knowledge and researchers is marked by the initiation of the Joint Initiative on Research and

Innovation (JIRI), launched between the European Union and LAC in 2010 during the Science and Technology Ministerial Meeting in the context of the Madrid Summit. Via JIRI, research ministries from both regions came together for the first time to establish a governance structure for establishing a “regular bi-regional dialogue on science, research, technology and innovation to consolidate EU-CELAC cooperation and to update common priorities, encourage mutual policy learning and ensure the proper implementation and effectiveness of cooperation instruments” (Roadmap for EU-CELAC S&T Cooperation 2016: 2). Since then, “Science, Research, Innovation and Technology” constitutes an independent chapter of the bi-annual EU-CELAC Action Plans (Roadmap for EU-CELAC S&T Cooperation 2016: 2).

Furthermore, two EU-CELAC Academic Summits have taken place since 2013. The first of these Academic Summits was organized in the context of the 2013 Summit in Santiago de Chile. It was a bottom up initiative coordinated by a consortium of Chilean universities. Its goal was to strengthen the ongoing ALCUE Common Area of Higher Education, launched in Rio de Janeiro in 1999 and subsequent initiatives undertaken by political officials from both regions. The second Academic Summit was held in Brussels in 2015. It emphasized the development of the Common Area of Higher Education, which became known as the Common Research Area, or CRA. At this second summit, the EU commended advances made by JIRI and proposed to create a concrete basis for a Common Research Area or CRA (EU-LAC Action Plan 2015). At the latest EU-CELAC SOM in 2016 in Brussels, consensus was achieved on focusing on the following three strategic pillars of this CRA: (a) Mobility of researchers; (b) International outreach of research infrastructures; and (c) Increased thematic cooperation to address global challenges. Reflecting a tendency to involve the participation of the business and industry sectors in the area of science, technology and innovation, the EU-CELAC Academic Summits are being seen as an opportunity to strengthen relations between the EU-CELAC Academic Summits and the EU-CELAC Business Summits (Assessment of Programmes and Activities 2016: 15).

Mobility of Science in Practice: Exchange at Various Levels

At the multilateral level, science funding agencies from both regions have developed academic and scientific mobility through joint calls, mobility schemes, scholarship programmes as well as common thematic foci. For example, EULARINET was a four-year programme that started in 2008 with the goal of jointly establishing, implementing and monitoring collaboration of mutual interest in science and technology and promoting the participation of LAC countries in the EU’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP7), 2007-2014. Bilateral sub-regional exchange was organized annually in three sub-regions: Mexico and Central America; the Andean countries; and the Mercosur (Southern Common Market) countries, thereby explicitly involving the policymaking, science and industry communities (European Commission 2008: 28-29). Another example is the Latin America, Caribbean and European Union Network on Research and Innovation (ALCUE NET; 2012-2017), a platform for expanding the National Contact Points of EU Framework Programmes in LAC countries that provide information and training in order to increase the participation of researchers from Latin America in EU research and mobility programmes. At the bilateral level, the European Research Council (ERC) has signed implementation arrangements with Argentina and Mexico (2015) and Brazil (2016) in order to enable early-career scientists to join a research team run by an ERC grantee (Roadmap for EU-CELAC S&T Cooperation 2016: 6).

At the level of concrete research projects and concrete exchange among individual researchers or research teams of all academic levels between the two regions, mobility has taken place largely through the funding, infrastructure and thematic priorities of the EU Framework Programmes. Under the EU's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7, 2007-2014) there were 314 projects funded with CELAC countries, leading to 734 participations in the programme (EU contribution: 95.6 million EUR; CELAC contribution: 40 million EUR in total) (Roadmap for EU-CELAC S&T Cooperation 2016: 4). In addition, under FP7, a total of 3,700 researchers from Latin America and the Caribbean were awarded mobility grants through the Marie Skłodowska Curie Actions, entailing over 150 LAC institutions as part of 2005 EU FP7 projects under the same funding scheme (Roadmap for EU-CELAC S&T Cooperation 2016: 4, 6). The Marie Skłodowska Curie Action calls in 2014 and 2015 led to 87 actions entailing mobility from EU to LAC countries, of which 84% were related to research and innovation staff exchanges (RISE) and smaller amounts to innovative training networks. Currently, 138 researchers from CELAC states are participating in Marie Skłodowska Curie Actions within the latest EU Framework Programme Horizon 2020 (2014-2020), including 31 post-docs and 36 doctoral researchers, as well as 71 who are participating in research and innovation staff exchanges (RISE). Moreover, universities and research centres have established networks of inter-institutional cooperation and exchange. On the European Union side these have been supported through the ALFA and Erasmus Mundus/Plus Programmes (EULAC-Focus Project. Work Package 4 2016).

In addition to the importance of the EU Programmes, it is important to note that the increase in the mobility of information, knowledge and people has also been the result of the fact that Latin American countries have enacted policies that encourage the participation of their researchers in European Projects, particularly through increased funding (Kreimer/Levin 2013: 89). The growth of financial means on behalf of certain LAC countries is of key relevance for Trans-Atlantic scientific mobility as the collaboration of non-EU countries in EU research programmes is only partly funded by the EU, thus depending on counterpart funding (Kreimer/Levin 2013: 84). This, however, leads to a significant aspect of scientific mobility between EU and LAC, which is that mobility is not homogeneous within both regions. Rather, it entails the participation of a handful of countries on each side of the Atlantic. This structural inequality between and within the regions is discussed in greater detail under in the part of the report dealing with the cross-cutting issue of inequality as pertains to the science dimension of the EU-LAC relations (see Section 2.2.1). International collaboration and mobility tends to concentrate around a group of four Latin American countries, described as “very active” in the field of international cooperation in the area of science and technology with the European Union: Brazil, Mexico, Argentina and Chile.¹ Collaboration extends to a lesser extent to a second group with more moderate participation: Colombia, Uruguay, Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador and Costa Rica. By contrast, for countries such as Cuba, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay and Venezuela there is little or no mobility vis-à-vis the European Union. Moreover, this pattern of unequal participation in bi-regional scientific cooperation has not significantly changed over time. Despite differences among scholarly disciplines, on the European Union side, the United Kingdom, Italy, France, Spain and Germany are the countries with the highest rate of collaboration with LAC countries (but only after the United States which is the main collaborator with most countries worldwide) (Kreimer/Levin 2013: 83f.).

¹ The term “very active” refers to participation in 50 or more projects during the sixth and seventh EU Framework Programmes (Kreimer/Levin 2013: 90).

These structural inequalities between EU–LAC and within the regions in terms of who can participate in the bi-regional mobility — who can, for example, fulfil the adequate formats in terms of formal requirement, qualifications, thematic foci and which countries and institutions can position themselves as attractive institutions for scientific exchange should therefore be taken into account. When assessments are made that “on the whole, LAC participation in scientific collaboration with the EU has increased significantly, both in terms of number of projects and project funding [during FP6 and FP7]” (Kreimer/Levin 2013: 90) they must be considered with a grain of salt for the reasons just mentioned. The same goes for the growth in co-authorships that can be appreciated in bibliometric studies. These studies show that international co-authored publications with LAC countries have been five times greater in EU countries in the last 20 years, reaching nearly 50% of their national output.² In short, such general assessments must be seen from the backdrop of asymmetries within and among both regions.

On the other hand, some of these asymmetries between both regions may be partly offset by measures that foster better conditions for an increase in scientific mobility in some areas of knowledge. In this context research and communications infrastructure are of particular importance. For example, EULALINK is a joint-venture project established in 2015 that should become operational in 2018. It entails a trans-Atlantic optic fibre cable from Portugal to Brazil with nodes in countries of South America such as Argentina, Chile and Peru. The cable should enhance research in areas such as physics, cultural heritage, biodiversity and carbon cycle. A consortium of twelve European and Latin American education networks known as BELLA (Building European Link to Latin America) will coordinate the extension of the cable to other academic networks in Latin America. It is expected that increased conductivity will expand opportunities for Latin America and the Caribbean to participate as beneficiaries in other infrastructure projects to be defined in the future (Roadmap for EU-CELAC S&T Cooperation 2016: 7).

b) How and to what extent does mobility have an impact on the scientific dimensions of bi-regional relations?

As detailed above, mobility has had a positive impact on EU-CELAC relations in the sense of increasing knowledge exchange, circulation and the co-production of knowledge, the growth of international collaborative experiences, knowledge gain and capacity development of academics and researchers at various levels (students, PhD students, post-docs, professors, established researchers), and the expansion of access and use of infrastructure.

From an European perspective, EU-LAC bi-regional scientific mobility has paid off. In the mid-1980s, the scientific cooperation between US and Canada and LAC was stronger than the one between EU and LAC. For example, European researchers co-authored only 40% of international publications by LAC researchers, compared to 56% with US and Canada. However, by 2007 this trend had been reversed. Considering the period between 1984 and 2007, more research teams from Latin America and the Caribbean co-authored with European partners than with the US and Canada (98,155 and 87,540 publications, respectively). However, regional differences must be taken into account: While

² By comparison, in the US or Japan, co-authored publications only represent 25% of total output (Sebastian, 2009 cited in Kreimer/Levin 2013: 81).

researchers from the Southern Cone favour collaboration with Europe — 54% of internationally co-authored papers versus 44% with the US and Canada —, Mexico and Central America look more to North American partnership, producing 53% of papers with their North American colleagues compared to 45% with European colleagues. This suggests that geographical proximity is an important factor in defining the geographical scope of mobility. The Caribbean follows yet another trend, in which 55% of international scientific collaboration takes place with Europe versus 31% with North America, a fact that suggests the relevance of colonial ties in the choice of international cooperation (Russell/Ainsworth 2013: 63).

A positive effect of increased mobility in the scientific field has been the initiation of other types and formats of scientific collaboration of some Latin American countries. Thus, beyond the most prominent type of Global North – Global South collaboration between EU and LAC, several countries of the Global South have recently initiated bilateral agreements within other countries of the South, strengthen South-South collaboration – or they have initiated cooperation with other partners than the USA and EU as the two strong poles of scientific cooperation. For example, Argentina and Brazil have diversified the scope of their international relationships through bilateral scientific agreements with China, Angola, Mozambique, Israel, Russia and Cuba among others (Feld/Casas et al. 2013: 39).

Transnational scientific mobility can also have ambivalent impacts. This is especially the case with regard to outgoing mobility of post-docs, professors and researchers of countries that are already suffering from brain drain, i.e., from a shortage of researcher and professionals, of scientific knowledge and academic skills (Docquier/Hillel 2012). Brain drain affects countries in differently and in unequal ways. It can have relatively high negative and long-lasting impacts in countries in which “the smaller the national resource base of highly skilled people, the higher the percentage of highly skilled expatriates” (Docquier/Marfouk 2006, cited in Gaillard/Arvanitis 2013b: 9). On the other hand, countries in the Global South with a higher gross domestic product and/or a more developed scientific landscape have also implemented policies to reverse this trend to some extent. For example, countries such as Chile, Mexico or Brazil have launched a series of policies that try to reconnect and mobilize the diaspora of national scientists living abroad towards their countries of origin (Feld/Casas et al. 2013: 39).

[Comment: later versions of this text will analyse in more detail the issue of brain circulation, brain gain and brain drain as it affects both sides of the bi-regional scientific dimension].

c) What are the main achievements and challenges regarding mobility in the scientific dimension of bi-regional relations?

Some of the main achievements regarding the mobility of knowledge and people in the scientific realm include: an increase in scientific mobility as measured by number and types of projects; increasing number of students and scientists at various academic levels and types of institutions; numbers of co-authored publications; institutional agreements.

[Comment: this point will be expanded upon in greater detail in a future version of the Synthesis Report].

One of the major challenges for bi-regional mobility in the scientific dimension is to reduce structural inequalities between EU-CELAC and within the regions, achieve a more balanced relation between brain gain and brain drain, in the sense of a more symmetric knowledge circulation and a less disparate pattern of mobility.

d) Are the existing funding instruments and formats adequate for fostering scientific mobility between the EU and CELAC? What additional instruments and formats would be necessary to enhance mobility?

[Comment: This question will be addressed in a future version of the Synthesis Report, as funding instruments and formats and their development in the last 20 years have yet to be analysed systematically. Nevertheless, the present assessment would suggest that alternate funding formats would be needed to fit the needs of LAC countries that do not have the capacity of co-funding research projects with Europe. On the other hand, such funding formats could also consider a fostering of South-South cooperation which may not only be less costly but also may lead to a different set of research priorities as those that have already been established thus far between the EU and LAC. One such initiative is the Erasmus Plus Project known as CAMINOS (2016). This is a programme that promotes European best practices in promoting the mobility of students and staff, but does not provide funding.]

2.1.2 Mobility and the Social Dimension of Bi-regional Relations between EU and LAC

Mobility in the social dimension of bi-regional relations between EU and LAC comprises several areas of cooperation. These have been defined and configured largely by the priorities, foci and types of social policies that have been developed as a result of the bi-regional political dialogue and cooperation. These include legal and illegal Trans-Atlantic mobility of people, in particular migration and more specifically long-term labour migration, affecting not only individual migrants but also their wider social networks in both, country of origin and country of destination. It includes the transfer of remittances sent by labour migrants from Europe to Latin America and the Caribbean, legal and illegal bi-regional circulation of money, and the illicit trafficking of goods, with an emphasis on illegal drugs. Poverty is also a key issue in this context as a structural cause of labour migration.

a) How is mobility addressed in the social dimension of bi-regional relations? How has this changed in the time period considered?

Mobility and the Social Dimension of Bi-Regional Relations in the EU-LAC Political Dialogue

At the level of the political dialogue between EU and LAC since 1999 labour-based migration and drugs have both been recurring topics. The subject of illicit trafficking of drugs is mentioned in several paragraphs of the 1999 Rio Declaration and continues to be a prominent topic in later years. In 2010, the first joint programme was started in order to coordinate policy efforts to deal with drug problems and exchange experiences. The first Action Plan for bi-regional cooperation defined after the Santiago Summit in 2013, addresses the issue of drugs in Chapter 6. The goal is to strengthen the bi-regional dialogue and to consolidate efforts to tackle the “world drug problem”. In this context

mobility is directly addressed, as trafficking of illicit drugs “carried out by organized crime and criminal organizations” (Santiago Action Plan 2013: Chapter 6: 10).

The subject of migration has been addressed at the bi-regional level since the Second EU-LAC Summit in Madrid (2002). Migration is mentioned as one point amidst a sundry list of other topics and is presented as a positive phenomenon “that has brought and continues to bring great benefits to both [regions]” (Madrid Declaration 2002: Paragraph 31). Until the fifth Summit in Lima (2008), the political dialogue consisted in only two expert meetings and did not give place to a more structured policy framework. However, during the fifth Summit in Lima (2008) the bi-regional political process gave place to the creation of a Bi-regional Structured and Comprehensive Dialogue on Migration as an arena for discussing matters of mutual interest and for collecting information in order to better understand the dynamics of migration, as well as the relationship between migration and development.

After the Lima Summit, bi-regional relations regarding migration were also burdened by the European Union’s Return Directive. Adopted in 2008, the Directive proposes a number of measures that are detrimental to safeguarding the human rights of migrants without a clear legal status in the EU, including a period of detention for up to 1.5 years, a EU-wide re-entry ban for those who have been forcibly returned for 5 years, and the right to detain and return unaccompanied minors. This legislation raised a number of critical voices in Latin America. MERCUSUR issued a statement recalling the hospitality which Latin American countries had given European migrants for centuries and during the past decades in which millions of European migrants were welcome (Acosta Arcarazo 2009). Bolivian president Evo Morales issued a statement recalling that the EU does not manage to achieve a minimum of 0.7% of GDP for development aid, yet the 68 million USD that LAC receives in remittances surpasses total foreign investment in the area and noting that Bolivia receives more than 10% of its GDP in remittances, amounting to 1.1 Billion USD or a third of the revenue in national gas exports (Morales 2008). Morales also noted that while “freedom of movement is promoted for merchandise and finance” the mobility of persons faces repression and illegality (Morales 2008). Despite this tension in bi-regional relations, the Comprehensive Dialogue began in 2009 and during the sixth EU-CELAC Summit in Madrid, 2010, governments from the European Union as well as Latin American and the Caribbean adopted further initiatives. The fourth chapter of the 2010 Madrid Action Plan proposes to facilitate an exchange of information on migration flows, to promote programmes to prevent trafficking and smuggling networks; strengthen policies that connect migration and development; develop measures to make the transfer of remittances less costly and more transparent; and continue cooperation in education and health of migrants (Madrid Action Plan 2010, Chapter 4: 8-9). Further progress on structuring the dialogue was made during the following Summits in Santiago and Brussels.

Despite a total of ten bi-regional High Level Meetings on Migration (as of November 2016) further political development on migration has not taken place. As the 2016 bi-regional Assessment of Programmes and Actions notes, the Action Plan in respect to migration has not achieved all expected results. Each region has a different approach to priorities in terms of migration politics (Assessment of Programmes and Actions 2016: 11). While the EU faces new waves of inter-regional and external migration, there has been no coherent migration policy, nor has it been easy to coordinate national policies which have changed abruptly in the wake of particular political events. This situation also reflects upon the fact that an initiative of the European Parliament to create a Migration

Observatory was not successful (Gratius 2015: 13). Nevertheless, over time, the issue of migration has become somewhat more prominent on the political agenda for several reasons. On the one hand are the interests of the European Union in regulating migration. Thus, the EU's revision of its global migration policy in 2011 is not only a reflection of migratory flows from war but also an attempt to adapt migration to suit the needs of labour markets in the face of ageing European populations (Wölkner 2015). On the other, with regard to the LAC region, after 2010 the tension in bi-regional relations necessitated some attention to concrete issues based on building a true bi-regional agenda, among which has been the regulation of legal migration (Stuhldreher 2015: 109). To the extent that the strategic relationship between EU and Latin America and the Caribbean becomes more important in the context of changing global political cleavages it is possible that the migration issue which is of strong importance to the Latin American states may increase in weight in the context of bi-regional relations.

Mobility of People and Illicit Drugs: EU-LAC Policy Cooperation

The Cooperation Programme on Drug Policies (COPOLAD) between EU and LAC aims at increasing the coherence, balance and impact of drug policies via an exchange of experiences, bi-regional coordination and the promotion of multisectoral, comprehensive and coordinated responses to the trafficking of illicit drugs. The first phase of the programme was launched in 2010 with a total budget of 6.5 million EUR. It was extended in 2014 for the period 2016-2019 with a budget of 10 million EUR expanding the programme's coverage in its second phase to include the Caribbean. Both programmes were financed entirely by the EU.

COPLOAD aims at strengthening capacities and encouraging a different drug policy development processes in Latin American countries. It consists of a consolidation of National Observatories, including a system of collecting comparable drugs indicators on production, consumption, trafficking, associated crime, and policies, in order to reduce supply and demand. It further includes capacity-building in the reduction of demand, including prevention, treatment, rehabilitation and harm reduction related to drug consumption as well as capacity-building in the reduction of supply, entailing coordination in the areas of law enforcement and alternative development with existing initiatives of LAC countries, other donors and related European Commission cooperation programmes. In addition, policy support and consolidation of the EU-CELAC Coordination and Cooperation Mechanism on Drugs are addressed. The latter is a platform for EU and LAC national drug coordination bodies, with the aim of exchanging experiences, good practices and information (COPLOAD 2016). Thus far, the Cooperation Mechanism has held a total of 18 High-Level Meetings between EU and LAC on this topic (Assessment of Programmes and Actions 2016: 12).

The first EU-CELAC Migration Project was launched in 2011. The Migration Project lasted for a period of 48 months and was extended until July 2015. It has not been continued since then. The Migration Project was financed solely by the EU with a budget of only 3 million EUR. The project was implemented by the UN International Organization for Migration (IOM, Geneva, Switzerland) in partnership with the Fundación Internacional para Iberoamérica de Administración y Políticas Públicas (FIIAPP, Madrid, Spain) (Nota Informativa s.a.). In this project, 350 civil servants from 150 institutions of 30 countries were trained on the collection, management and sharing of migration data. In addition, several studies and manuals were developed (European Commission International

Cooperation and Development 2016). Two further projects included public-private partnerships for the maximization of remittances as a development tool in countries such as Brazil, Colombia and Haiti; and a pilot project entailing labour market re-integration in countries such as Mexico, Peru and Guatemala.

b) How and to what extent does mobility have an impact on the social dimension of bi-regional relations?

To understand how the mobility of people has had an effect on the social dimension of bi-regional relations between EU and LAC, it is important to first understand the nature of migratory dynamics between the two regions. Migration from Latin America and the Caribbean towards the European Union is of limited relevance beyond the Iberian Peninsula and Spain in particular, i.e., migration from the LAC region is mainly an Ibero-American issue. And while Spain has been the primary destination of LAC migrants to the EU, this is only a small percentage of migration out of LAC. Thus, in 2010, 70% of LAC migration went to the US, 15% was intra-LAC migration and only 8% went to Spain (Pizzaro et al. 2014, cited in International Organisation for Migration 2015: 29). From a historical perspective, migratory flows from Europe to Latin America have been more significant in terms of numbers of people. Thus, it is not only the case that of the 22-26 million European emigrants to the Americas between 1815-1914, about one half went to Latin America; additionally, many more were exiled as a result of Fascist regimes in Europe in the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s (Córdova Alcaraz 2015: 22).

During the time frame pertaining to this report (1999-2018), it is important to note that the mobility of people from LAC to the EU has been shaped by at least three major global events. The first of these is the fact that migration from LAC to the United States decreased in the wake of the large-scale deportations in the United States after the international War on Terror of the Bush regime as of September, 2001. Second, the process of regional integration within Latin America and the Caribbean, including MERCOSUR, the Andean Community, the Central American Integration System and the Caribbean Common Market have facilitated the mobility of people within LAC (Durand 2009, cited in Córdova Alcaraz 2015: 30). Moreover, the financial crisis of 2008 must be taken into account, leading to an 8% fall in LAC migration to Spain and a 4% increase to the United States at the same time as migration from LAC to other European countries increased by 3% (Organization of American States 2012, cited in International Organisation for Migration 2015: 30).

In a general sense, the central driving factor behind the flows in people from LAC to the EU is labour-related migration. Already during the decades of the 1970s and 1980s, the southern European economies of Spain and Portugal experienced a period of growth in which there was strong demand for flexible, informal labour. These jobs have been accompanied by very low labour security, long hours and poor pay, many of which have been filled by migrants willing to carry out this work. Thus, out of 3.8 million new jobs created in Spain between 1999 and 2012, only 1.7 million were filled by Spanish citizens. Many others were filled by the more than 1.5 million Latin Americans and Caribbeans between 15 and 49 years of age who were incorporated into the Spanish labour market between 2000 and 2012 (Canales 2013, cited in Córdova Alcaraz 2015: 34). In general, the European labour market has a strong demand for migrant labour. Thus, Fargues/McCormick (2013) estimate that by 2025 the European Union could fill as many as 21.4 million jobs by non-EU residents — albeit

jobs that are precarious, poorly paid and therefore less attractive to EU populations, who may be in a position to demand or gain access to other alternatives (cited in Córdova Alcaraz 2015: 34).

The importance of labour migration frames one of the major stakes in how the issue of migration is dealt with at the bi-regional level. First of all, this pertains to the effect of remittances in Latin America and the Caribbean. In some countries of LAC, remittances are very important, making up more than 15% of Gross Domestic Product such as in El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras and Jamaica (Córdova Alcaraz 2015). The main destination countries for remittances in terms of value stemming from the EU are Brazil, Ecuador, Colombia, Peru, Dominican Republic and Bolivia, in that order. In Brazil in 2012 they made up 1,596 million USD, 22% of remittances to LAC stemming from the EU. Reflecting the role of Spain as a major source of destination for LAC migrants to Europe 62 % of all remittances to LAC stem from Spain (Córdova Alcaraz 2015: 77ff.). The flow of values toward LAC decreased in the wake of the financial crisis. In spite of the economic relevance of the remittances for many of these countries, the permanent emigration of highly skilled people has a strong negative impact on social relations and on these countries' ability to achieve higher levels of social wellbeing and to diversify their economies.

[Comment: this section will be expanded upon in order to expound in greater detail upon: a) the role of remittances in LAC; the role of labour market precarisation in the EU and possible competition from migrants from LAC; and the effect of the permanent emigration of highly-skilled people from LAC to the EU region].

The same is true of illicit drugs which represent a large social problem in many Latin American countries that either produce or play an important role as a route of transportation for illicit drugs, thereby creating a series of social problems in those countries, including serious issues related to the security and wellbeing of the population as well as numerous human rights violations. This, of course, has a direct negative impact on an issue that has been a strong focus as part of the LAC-EU agenda, which is increasing social wellbeing and social cohesion in the LAC region.

[Comment: the analysis in this section must also be expanded and differentiated].

The drug problem in the EU has not been associated with the same level of violence as has been the case in countries in which illicit drugs are produced (e.g., Peru, Colombia, Bolivia), or in countries in which the drugs transition, such as Mexico, Central America or the Caribbean which are or have been important routes towards large markets in the United States and the European Union. In turn, this is reflected in the EU-LAC bi-regional relation, which tends to emphasize drug trafficking in the LAC region over drug consumption in the EU.

c) What are the main achievements, what are the main challenges regarding mobility in the social dimension of bi-regional relations?

Achievements regarding the mobility of people and of illicit drugs relate to programmes that have been successful in contributing to a greater understanding of the phenomenon and towards implementing regulatory policies. They include the development of policy dialogues and concrete programmes over the years of the EU-LAC relationship. These are topics that have been continuously developed in fora beyond EU-CELAC summits. For example, more recently, the issue of illicit drugs

has been linked to security and has become a key issue in the EU renegotiation of the strategic partnership with Mexico, including its revision of the Global Agreement, a trade agreement that has been in force between Mexico and the European Union since 2000 (Gratius 2015: 12).

Another positive achievement through the EU-LAC relationship is that it has created a context in which the issue of illicit drugs has been dealt with without direct military intervention. This stands in strong positive contrast to the LAC relationship with the United States where military and covert intervention has been a central characteristic of dealing with drugs.

However, to address the strong negative effects of labour migration and illegal drugs on social wellbeing and social cohesion in Latin America, it would be also equally important to put new issues on the political agenda which have not been addressed as part of the bi-lateral relationship, such as dealing with illegal drugs from the perspective of drug consumption and addressing socioeconomic inequality in the LAC region.

A further challenge regarding illegal drug trafficking could be for the EU and CELAC to work not only bi-laterally but also trilaterally with the country that also plays a highly important role in this constellation, the United States, in order to define and implement synergies between EU and US-policies towards drugs in Latin America, including the issue of consumption.

2.2 INEQUALITY

We define inequality on two analytic levels. On the one hand, we address inequalities between countries and among regions. On the other, there are inequalities between individuals and social groups that can be defined as a disparity among individuals, social groups and institutions, in time and space, that create a hierarchy of access to socially-relevant and economically important goods (income, wealth, etc.) and power resources (rights, political participation, political power, etc.). Beyond the traditional emphasis on class differences and unequal distribution of income, we also consider inequalities of gender, class, ethnicity and the interrelations among these social categories.

In the analysis of inequality we focus on the following key questions:

- a) How is inequality addressed in the social, scientific and cultural dimensions of bi-regional relations? How has this changed in the time period considered?
- b) How and to what extent does inequality have an impact on the cultural, scientific, and social dimensions of bi-regional relations?
- c) What specific roles do cultural, scientific and social relations between EU and LAC play in fostering social inclusion and reducing social inequalities within and between the two regions?
- d) What are main achievements, what are main challenges regarding inequality in the social, scientific and cultural dimensions of bi-regional relations? What are commonalities and differences concerning strategies to address social inequalities and enhance social inclusion? What could both regions learn from each other?

2.2.1 Inequality and the Scientific Dimension of Bi-regional Relations between EU and LAC

In the scientific dimension of the bi-regional relations between EU and LAC, inequality is framed on several levels related to the opportunities regarding participation in international, bi-regional collaboration. These include disparities among regions, countries, regions within countries, as well as disparities between institutions, and regarding languages. Further asymmetries stem from access to university education, higher academic degrees; funding for research; access to high level publications; access to international mobility; and access to research infrastructure. In more general terms asymmetries also exist between the natural sciences and engineering on the one hand and social sciences and humanities on the other, as well as among disciplines and thematic fields. In many countries hierarchies also exist between basic and applied sciences.

a) How is inequality addressed in the scientific dimension of bi-regional relations? How has this changed in the time period considered?

Inequality in Scientific Relations at the Level of Political Dialogue between EU and LAC

In the scientific dimension, inequality is indirectly and partially addressed through the political dialogue and the broad policies that seek to mobilize funds for bi-regional and bi-lateral research collaboration. These policies implicitly recognize the relative asymmetries in access to economic resources and means for research and university education. This is reflected especially in the EU's greater role in providing funding for research, collaborative projects and academic education that lead to the mobility of students, doctoral students, postdocs, professors, and researchers from Latin America and the Caribbean to the European Union. Yet, this attempt to increase exchange, co-production of knowledge and enhance joint knowledge circulation in order to decrease inequalities among the regions has also led to new inequalities within the regions and especially within LAC, a fact that is at least partly related to the development of scientific funding schemes. Thus, as relations in the scientific field have moved away from a decades-long emphasis on so-called technical assistance and therefore arguably towards a "more equal partnership between the two continents" (Gaillard/Arvanitis 2013: 1), bi-regional policies have tended to favour a model of co-funding. Since the 1990s a few Latin American states such as Mexico and Brazil set up collaborative funds a trend that has increased over time. And while this has led to a more equal partnership between EU and these countries, it is well worth noting that it is not equality between "two continents" as Gaillard and Arvanitis suggest, but it has led to new asymmetries as there are only a handful of countries on both sides of the Atlantic relation that de facto provide (or are able to provide) such funding, leading to a scientific field dominated by the participation of countries that fare better in terms of funding and science infrastructure than others. Moreover, specific bilateral cooperation programmes (BILATs) with priority countries (Brazil, Mexico, Chile, Argentina) also promote the participation of researchers from these countries in EU-funded programmes. This leads to an additional advantage in the cooperation with European research institutions for the 'big four' in LAC.

Inequality in Particular EU-LAC Programmes in the Area of Science, Technology and Innovation

Inequality has sometimes also been addressed as the subject of specific research programmes that have taken up social inequality as their focus. In general, it appears that inequality has been targeted specifically in the context of social-science studies that have been carried out as part policy-guided

schemes that seek to address inequality from various perspectives such as access to formal employment opportunities, or to include the participation of women as part of programmes such as EUROsocial. This is a programme that has existed since 2004 and has just started its third phase (2016-2021). In general, it appears that previous EU Framework Programmes such as FP7 (2007-2014) tended to prioritize addressing socio-economic inequality more directly. By contrast, the following Framework Programme, Horizon 2020 in which inequality appears somewhat more diffusely as a “global challenge”.

[Comment: Here, specific programmes must be reviewed that have dealt with the issue of inequality. Presumably, these programmes would be predominantly in the social science fields and deal with social inequality in terms of differences in access to resources among social groups, typically in terms of gender, ethnicity, etc. It also seems to be the case that addressing inequality thus takes place in this traditional form close to a developmental approach and that it is less explored in the context of other types of research stemming from natural science, technology or innovation, even though there may well be a need to address various forms of inequality and at various spatiotemporal scales in that context as well. Other types of programmes related to scientific collaboration may not address inequality as the object of research but seek to decrease inequalities in the scientific field by facilitating access to research infrastructure and resources. An example might be the Scielo Open Access Project. www.scielo.org]

In addition, there may be important ways in which EU-LAC programmes may not address inequalities. An important question is whether Science, Technology and Innovation programmes developed between EU and CELAC address only a small group of elites or whether they reach a wider public. If the programmes only benefit the top research institutions on both sides of the Atlantic they may have the effect of contributing to greater inequality among regions, countries, institutions, and researchers. In Latin America they can create a greater distance between top research institutions and the rest of the research institutions in those countries. Some evidence for these types of inequalities can be found in the assessments of (bi-regional) programmes such as ENLACE (Enhancing Scientific Cooperation between the European Union and Central America) which finds that only 23% of people interviewed on a sample of researchers and policymakers in Central American countries are even aware of the existence of the EU Seventh Framework Programme (ENLACE s.a.: 3).

b) How and to what extent does inequality have an impact on the scientific dimension of bi-regional relations?

As discussed above, scientific cooperation between EU and CELAC does not take place equally among all countries. This inequality therefore affects who may benefit from international EU-LAC mobility on the basis of what country they live in. The so-called EU-15 countries account for more than 80% of internationally co-authored papers (except in the case of Mexico), with France, Spain, the UK and Germany leading the collaboration with 22,529, 19,756, 19,744 and 17,506 publications between 1984 and 2007, respectively. Collaboration is even more disparate on the LAC side: Between 1994 and 2007 Brazil produced the largest volume of co-authored papers (32,389) with EU-15 countries followed by Mexico (15,520), Argentina (14,951) and Chile (10,632). All other countries produced fewer than 4,000 publications. Indeed, these are also the countries in which funding for

research has increased steadily in recent years (Kreimer/Levin 2013: 82). This is reinforced by the fact, that there has been a trend over time towards collaborations between the EU and LAC being based on a higher proportion of funding coming from LAC countries, with a substantial increase in LAC funding—albeit from the big four: Brazil, Mexico, Chile and Argentina— from FP6 to FP7 (from 5.26% to 12.04%) (Kreimer/Levin 2013: 87; 89).

[Comment: later versions of this text will also consider two effects: the dynamic increase in investment in the area of science, technology and innovation in some parts of Latin America; and the fact that in some countries in Europe funding has decreased in the wake of the financial crisis in 2008].

Inequalities in terms of career opportunities also affect international collaboration in the scientific dimension and mobility. Scientists from Latin America and the Caribbean show a stronger interest for scientific collaborations with Europe than vice versa. This is related to the fact that collaboration is more important to the scientific careers of researchers from Latin America and the Caribbean than it is for their EU colleagues (Gaillard/Arvanitis 2013: 14).

Political priorities in the type and profile of research as part of the bi-regional agenda have led to a strong emphasis on the natural sciences and far less emphasis on the social sciences. As Gaillard/Arvanitis note, “humanities and social sciences remain rather less internationalized than natural sciences” (2013b: 5). A case in point is the Bioeconomy or Energy Working Groups as part of the Joint Initiative on Research and Innovation (JIRI), an umbrella for policies that is currently at the centre of the joint Action Plan between LAC and EU. In these working groups, the natural sciences tend to be emphasized over the social sciences and humanities as well as application-driven technology and innovation rather over basic science. However, thematic priorities in JIRI also include the fields of information and biodiversity and climate change and health, areas that have seen greater participation of the social sciences.

The focus in terms of the type of research that is encouraged has an important impact not only on the types of fields that participate but also on the direction and outcome of research, given the close connection between certain technologies and their economic or industry applications. There are numerous differences between Europe and Latin America, but also within the regions, with regard to the private sector's commitment to science and research. For example, Germany is a country in which the private sector invests enormously in research. In 2014, private sector research investments amounted to EUR 54 billion. That explains why it is easier for public research funding in Germany to emphasize the freedom of science and the need to promote excellence. On the other hand, countries in which the private sector is less investing in research attach much greater importance to research funding with the meaning of application-oriented research. Discussing what type of research should be given priority is an important aspect of bi-regional political dialogue and is reflected in the 2016 bi-regional Assessment of Programmes and Actions commending the strengthening of links between the CELAC-EU Academic Summits and Business Summits (representing various industries or enterprises), as well as in JIRI's contributions towards “strengthening the interface between research and innovation and to technology transfer and adaptation in formats accessible to micro and [small and medium enterprises]” (Assessment of Programmes and Actions, 2016: 15, 7). *[Comment: this aspect will be elaborated further in later versions of the Synthesis Report].*

[Comment: *Other inequalities that affect the scientific dimension of EU-LAC relations like the predominance of certain languages, disparities in access to research infrastructure as well as asymmetries in dominant paradigms or analytic perspectives in some fields or research will be elaborated further in later versions of the Synthesis Report*].

c) What specific role do scientific relations between EU and LAC play in fostering social inclusion and reducing social inequalities within and between the two regions?

[Comment: *Based on the type of sources considered for this first draft of the present Synthesis Report, we cannot yet address this question which will therefore be addressed in a later version of the Synthesis Report when a broader panorama of policies between EU and LAC on social inclusion has been explored in greater detail and on the basis of further documents/sources.*]

d) What are main achievements and challenges regarding inequality in the scientific dimensions of bi-regional relations? What are commonalities and differences concerning strategies to address social inequalities and enhance social inclusion? What could both regions learn from each other?

[Comment: *Later versions of this text will analyse achievements based on our further analysis and a broader document base.*]

Some of the challenges to be addressed include:

- Addressing inequalities regarding the participation of the natural sciences and engineering fields vs. social sciences and humanities in collaborative research
- Addressing the various activities of state and private actors in funding science, with differences between the two regions and among particular countries with regard to the funding of basic science on the one hand and applied science, on the other.
- Addressing disparities in the participation of certain clusters of countries within the bi-regional collaboration.
- Addressing asymmetries in access to scientific collaboration, including publications, circulation, and visibility of science research as a result of language differences. A case in point is the EULAC-Focus project in which English is the only working language despite the fact that for most of the institutions that participate in the project, Spanish is the dominant language.
- Addressing the challenges to collaboration as framed by class, gender and ethnicity.

2.2.2 Inequality and the Social Dimension of Bi-regional Relations between EU and LAC

In the social dimension of bi-regional relations between LAC and EU we analyse inequality based on the social asymmetries that are addressed in the bi-regional political dialogue and the policies and programmes that have resulted from the former. These include economic inequality, gender- and ethnic-based inequality, and the issue of social cohesion. In the programmes, inequalities targeted also include differences in access to justice, primary and secondary education and the (formal) labour market.

a) How is inequality addressed in the social dimension of bi-regional relations? How has this changed in the time period considered?

Inequality in Social Relations at the Level of Political Dialogue between EU and LAC

Social inequality has been a recurring topic at the political level of EU-LAC relations since 1999. Echoing the promises of the Washington Consensus in early Summit Declarations LAC is commended for being on a path towards an increase in social wellbeing and a reduction of inequalities through the path of formal electoral democracies and free trade. As part of the bi-regional relationship, the European Union is presented as a model that would have achieved regional integration and social well-being by following a similar path, among others by emphasizing that the EU has one of the lowest levels of inequality worldwide (European Commission 2015: 6), even as inequality has grown significantly within and among European countries, not least in the wake of the financial crisis. Typical statements of early Summit documents thus include a political determination of Latin America and the Caribbean “to persevere in the advancement of democratic processes, social equality, modernisation efforts, trade liberalisation and broad-based structural reforms” (Madrid Declaration 2002: paragraph 2).

In addition to socioeconomic inequality, from the beginning Summit documents also make reference to a commitment towards targeting gender inequality as well as equal treatment under the law. More recently, gender equality has become more prominent within the political agenda. First, this was reflected in the addition to the Action Plan as updated during the Santiago Summit (2013) to include a seventh chapter on gender. Secondly, it has been reinforced through bi-regional attention given to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), of which several SDG goals and targets emphasize gender equality. As a result, the EU-CELAC 2016 bi-regional Assessment of Programmes and Actions recommends that the title of Action Plan chapter seven should be amended to read “gender equality” and to make a stronger effort to implement this chapter of the Action Plan, pointing to a study commissioned and published by the EULAC Foundation in 2015, titled *The Issue of Gender in Relations between the EU and LAC as a way of identifying priorities for action* (Assessment of Programmes and Actions 2016: 13).

Other topics in the bi-regional political dialogue that directly or indirectly address social inequality include the notion of achieving social cohesion. As defined in the context of the European Union, social cohesion is closely related to inequality given that it aims at reducing disparities linked to labour market integration, equal opportunities for men and women, as well as sustainable economic development. In addition, the notion of territorial cohesion also addresses inequality given that it

aims at reducing gaps between uneven levels of development of its various regions. Underlining how the European Union defines social cohesion and inequality in the social sphere is important given the fact that the social agenda between the EU and Latin America appears to be particularly strongly guided by a European definition of social inclusion. There is an implicit understanding that Latin America is the main addressee for improvement in the context of the dialogue, something that is underlined by the fact that within the bilateral relationship programmes exist for achieving social development in Latin America and the Caribbean but not the other way around.

A qualitative change in the way that inequality has been dealt with as part of bi-regional relations has to do with the transformation in the Latin American economies, primarily as a result of the export of primary commodities as part of the so-called commodity boom and a reduction of the average poverty rate between 2005 and 2012, from 39% to 28% of the total population in Latin America. As a reflection of this, in the Brussels Declaration (2015), Latin America and the Caribbean are commended for “lifting millions of people out of poverty” (Brussels Declaration 2015: paragraph 59). Even as the LAC region remains the most unequal in the world in terms of wealth distribution, according to Gratius “the reduction in poverty, the expansion of the Latin American middle-class and the exclusion of countries like Brazil or Chile from classical development assistance is part of the EU’s success story as a global development actor” (Gratius 2015: 10). The change in policy envisioned by the EU is a trend towards a decrease in official development assistance flows in the increase role of private banks and nongovernmental organizations as part of addressing the challenges of these so-called middle income countries.

A further qualitative change in the bi-regional political relations addressing social inequality is related to a shift in EU policy towards so-called second generation reforms which tend to deemphasize social cohesion but place greater emphasis on the notions of sustainable development, climate change and governance. This Synthesis Report will address this shift in emphasis from social cohesion towards sustainable development under chapter 2.4.2 below.

Inequality in the Social Dimension of Bi-Regional Relations: Policies and Programmes

For most of the institutionalized EU-LAC relationship social inequality was primarily addressed through the issue of social cohesion which has been described by the European commission as a “leitmotif of the use bi-regional relationship with Latin America, endorsed at the highest political level since the Third EU-LAC Summit” in 2004 (European Commission 2015: 6). From 2005 onward, one of the central programmes to emerge directly from this summit was the multiyear programme known as EUROsociAL (2004-2009), later expanded to a second and third phase as EUROsociAL II (2011-2015) and EUROsociAL+ (2016-2021). The Programme’s central goal of increasing social cohesion sought to improve “welfare based on equal opportunities, with a sense of belonging and with solidarity” (EUROsociAL Website).

A central methodology of the three EUROsociAL programmes has been the exchange of experiences between public administrations (peer to peer) in different thematic areas. The latter include social policies such as labour monitoring systems, adapting education curricula and protecting vulnerable groups such as minorities women and handicapped persons, addressing fiscal policies such as tax reforms and tax education, equal access to justice including strengthening public defence office, conflict resolution and violence prevention, good governance policies such as fighting corruption,

and gender equality policies including assistance to victims of gender violence (EUROsociAL s.a.; European Commission 2015). EUROsociAL is expected to create synergies with other programmes such as the multi-indicative regional programme for Latin America (2014-2020 as part of which social cohesion is a priority. It is also expected to create synergies with UN development programmes as well as with programmes that centre on the bilateral level of relations. According to the 2016 bi-regional Assessment of Programmes and Activities, EUROsociAL is a key initiative because of its relevance to various chapters of the Action Plan that touch on the area of social inclusion and social cohesion (Assessment of Programmes and Activities 2016: 10).

By contrast to other social issues addressed in the context of the bi-regional relationship such as migration, drugs or security, the question of social cohesion/inequality is an important one, something that is plastically reflected in the amount of money that has been granted by the EU for these programmes. During the period between 2002 and 2013 the EU spend 4 million EUR on development cooperation with Latin America in total with main donor countries Spain, Germany, France and the United Kingdom. However, even at the bi-regional levels, a comparison of the money spent on the EU-LAC Migration Programme (a total of 3 million EUR) contrasts strongly with the amount spent on the latest EUROsociAL programme known as EUROsociAL+, for which European Union pledged a total of 32 million EUR.

b) To what extent and how does inequality have an impact on the social dimension of bi-regional relations?

Social inequality in Latin America and the Caribbean has had a deep and profound impact on the character of bi-regional EU-LAC relations. Put briefly, as a result of structural inequalities between the two regions, the social dimension has implicitly set the framework for how social inequality has been addressed in the bi-regional dialogue, i.e., as a development issue to be addressed by LAC and in particular within specific regions of LAC. Although it is frequently highlighted that programmes such as EUROsociAL are characterized by a methodology that underlines an exchange of experiences among equal partners, by reviewing the content of the programmes they focus squarely on addressing issues that pertain to Latin America and the Caribbean. Whereas the fulfilment of packs of vocations, the vulnerability of minority groups, precarisation of the labour market, corruption, and gender inequality are not unknown problems at the European level the magnitude of these issues on the other side of the Atlantic lead to a way of dealing with social issues that is strongly asymmetrical.

Furthermore, the way that social inequality is addressed through the programmes of the bi-regional relationship — i.e., mainly through employment, fiscal policy, access to justice or good governance policies — also tends to accentuate this asymmetry. This is related to the fact that social inequality is largely addressed without a view towards socioeconomic inequality. In other words, social cohesion and inequality are not brought together with the basic fact that the strong economic growth experienced by Latin American economies in recent years was largely based on a historical pattern of the export of primary goods. This focus on extractive production has itself been associated with high levels of social inequality, on multiple dimensions —such as those mediated by the environment or by gender relations— in time and in space (Göbel and Ulloa, 2014). But it is also the basis of an unequal economic relationship as a pillar of EU-LAC relations in which the export of

unprocessed primary goods is at the centre of trade relations with the EU, even though trade with processed goods from Latin America is higher to other regions of the world, in particular the United States (Gratius and Nolte 2013: 5).

c) What are main achievements and challenges regarding inequality in the social dimension of bi-regional relations? What are commonalities and differences concerning strategies to address social inequalities and enhance social inclusion? What could both regions learn from each other?

From the perspective of the institutional actors at the bi-regional level of EU-LAC relations, specific policies to reduce inequality and attain social cohesion in Latin America are seen as successful. These might include successful measures such as improving the quality of local government public spending through greater linkage between plans and budgets; integrating evaluation into the public policy cycle and monitoring; or defining a core set of social indicators for measuring health equity (EUROsociAL Website). These are important measures that have supported local and regional initiatives to address inequality in areas such as access to health, employment or education.

At the same time, many of these policies are based on the premise of improving the efficiency of local bureaucracies in providing better access to public services and, while undoubtedly important, they also do not address the more fundamental issue of socioeconomic inequality which remains a fundamental issue, even as the amount of state revenues from the extractivist expansion undergone by various Latin American economies increased. Many analysts and observers agree about the fact that this increase in revenues that has been associated with an increase of the middle class is coming to a halt to the degree that large markets cease or slow down their demand for these primary goods. On the other, such trends pertaining to Latin America as a whole generally tend to obscure the fact that there are deep social inequalities among countries of the region (Brazil, Chile or Argentina versus El Salvador, Honduras and Haiti) and also deep spatial inequalities within these countries themselves.

According to the 2016 bi-regional Assessment of Programmes and Activities, central bi-regional programmes such as EUROsociAL must ensure that the exchanges that are promoted through the programme “are not limited to sharing knowledge but become learning experiences that materialize in actions oriented to improve public policies and strengthen the capacity of institutions responsible for them” (2016: 10-11).

2.3 DIVERSITY

We recognize diversity on two dimensions: On the one hand, cultural diversity, which encompasses diversity in terms of cultural norms, values forms of knowledge, and practices. It also includes differences spanning gender, age, and ethnicity, as well as the interconnections between these social categories. On the other, biological diversity which refers not only to a diversity of living species in ecosystems and to their complexity. Both dimensions are mutually interdependent when it comes to wellbeing and sustainability.

In the analysis of diversity we focus on the following key questions:

- a) How is diversity addressed in the social, scientific and cultural dimensions of bi-regional relations? How has this changed in the time period considered?
- b) To what extent and how does diversity have an impact on the cultural, scientific, and social dimensions of bi-regional relations?
- c) What are main achievements, what are main challenges regarding diversity in the social, scientific and cultural dimensions of bi-regional relations? What could both regions learn from each other?

2.3.1 Diversity and the Scientific Dimension of Bi-regional Relations between EU and LAC

In the scientific dimension of bi-regional relations, diversity refers almost exclusively to biological diversity. Diversity in the sense of other types of knowledge, including traditional knowledge has been politically recognized but has not been addressed through scientific collaboration.

a) How is diversity addressed in the scientific dimension of bi-regional relations? How has this changed in the time period considered?

Diversity in the Political Dialogue framing Scientific Cooperation as part of EU-LAC Relations

At the level of bi-regional relations between the European Union and Latin America and the Caribbean, diversity has been present with regard to the scientific dimension in three areas:

First, it pertains to biological diversity. Biological diversity (often biodiversity) is briefly mentioned in the first bi-regional Summit of 1999 in Rio. It is further addressed in all subsequent summit documents, markedly increasing in importance within recent years. In 2006 during the Vienna Summit, the common goal to preserve biodiversity was concretized as the joint effort to strengthen the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity “with the aim of effectively implementing the three objectives [...], namely the conservation of biodiversity, the sustainable use of its components, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources” (Vienna Summit 2006, paragraph 27), with similar goals mentioned in subsequent declarations in the Lima Summit (2008). On the one hand, the focus on the Convention on Biological Diversity must be seen within the context of so-called mega-biodiverse countries such as Mexico, Brazil or Colombia

for whom the conservation of these resources is closely connected to their possible valuation and therefore a form of economic development. In particular in the context of scientific research that has increasingly enabled the valuation of these resources. On the other side of the Atlantic, a large part of the research facilities and research infrastructures associated with the conservation and use of biological resources is located in the Global North, including Europe (SOM Bioeconomy 2016. Annex III: 32-42).

While the nexus between valuation and use of biological diversity goes back to at least the 1990s, it entailed a qualitative change with the rise to prominence of the notion of the bioeconomy in both politics and in scientific research. Thus, the stronger emphasis on the issue of biodiversity at the bi-regional political level since 2010 should be seen in this context. Although biodiversity does not appear under the Science and Technology chapter of the Action Plan, the connection to the scientific dimension is reflected in its importance as part of the Science, Technology and Innovation SOM Working Groups where it has been the focus of a Working Group since 2011.

Second, the connection between diversity and science relates to the diversification of energy sources. Energy is a recurrent subject in the bi-regional political dialogue. The Guadalajara Summit (2004) explicitly speaks about energy diversification, citing technologies such as hydrogen cells. In the Vienna Summit (2006) and the Lima Summit (2008) the subject of energy is treated as a chapter of each document. The topic of energy diversification is of strategic political importance to the EU but also to some countries in the LAC region. For example, Brazil practically dominates international ethanol trade markets and Argentina is a key player in biodiesel markets. In the SOM Bioeconomy report (2016), CELAC is presented as “the only region in the world that would be able to meet its energy requirements based on ‘bio’ alternatives” (SOM Bioeconomy 2016: 4). Finding alternate energy sources is explicitly brought together with the scientific bi-regional relationship citing that “Further efforts should be made to capitalise on related EU research projects on energy fund[ing] through the EU Research Framework Programmes, and to promote the EU-LAC knowledge area in this field” (Lima Summit 2008, paragraph 45). Since the Madrid Summit of 2010, energy also becomes an important topic in the bi-regional Action Plan, as reflected by the fact that it is later taken up by the Science, Technology and Innovation SOMs since 2011, where upon a LAC request (Mexico) it becomes first a pilot topic and subsequently a Working Group focusing on issues such as bioenergy (biomass, biofuels), solar energy, wind energy and more generally on energy efficiency (Meeting with Leader of Work Package 4, November 2, 2016, Berlin). At the 2016 Ministerial Meeting, energy was again an important topic with new funds allocated specifically towards the Caribbean on this issue.

Thirdly, at the political level of bi-regional relations there has recently been some emphasis on “taking into account the contribution of ancestral and traditional knowledge” (Action Plan 2010: 2) within the field of science, technology and innovation. According to the Joint Action Plan that accompanied the Madrid Summit 2010 declaration, a main objective is to develop the EU-LAC Knowledge Area through “enabl[ing] sustainable research innovation and knowledge sharing taking into account the contribution of ancestral and traditional knowledge”(EU-LAC Action Plan Madrid 2010, Chapter 1: 2). This phrasing also remains in later updated versions of the Action Plan, as revised in the wake of the Santiago Summit (2013) and the Brussels Summit (2015). However, until the present it does not seem to be reflected as a priority in the SOM on Science and Technology, its political priorities or its Working Groups.

Other intersections between cultural diversity and bi-regional scientific cooperation were not found in political EU-CELAC documents (Summit Documents and Action Plans) reviewed for this draft of the Synthesis Report.

Biological Diversity, Diversification of Energy Sources and Traditional Knowledge as Addressed through STI Cooperation

[Comment: Later drafts will consider specific programmes stemming from SOM 2012 and 2013 Working Group on biodiversity and climate change. These foresee interdisciplinary studies on biodiversity loss. As well as joint activities including mobility calls, joint projects and joint clusters of knowledge (e.g., Bioprospecting in the context of Biodiversity. -BiodivERsA Initiative). The 2016 SOM report on the bioeconomy suggests a strong interest in carrying out collaboration to explore the valuation of biodiversity, presenting the CELAC region as a provider of biodiversity “with some of the world’s most important biodiversity hotspots” (WG JIRI Bioeconomy 2016: 2). Also review Biodiversity research in connection with the trans-Atlantic submarine cable in connection ESFRI LIFEWATCH infrastructure (see Roadmap 2016). In terms of energy diversification, future drafts of this Synthesis Report will consider especially the content of the work done in the context of the STI SOM Working Groups on Energy.]

As detailed above, ancestral and traditional knowledge has been acknowledged as politically important, yet this acknowledgement does not seem to be reflected at the level of concrete scientific collaboration. The various SOM Working Groups do not seem to have defined it further in publicly accessible documents. A document from the EULAKS Programme, “Connecting Research on the Knowledge Society in the European Union and Latin America” contains some critical remarks regarding the role of ancestral and traditional knowledge, citing the precedents that have often led to the privatization of these knowledge systems (Zuckerfeld 2009: 73f.). Nevertheless, at least one of the projects showcased under the EU-LAC Knowledge Area makes explicit acknowledgment of the role of traditional knowledge systems. The 2009-2014 bi-regional network VALORAM (Valorising Andean microbial diversity through sustainable intensification of potato based farming systems) seeks to “connec[t] the most advanced genomics and other frontier research with traditional knowledge about farming systems centred on potatoes” (European Commission, 2010: 16).

2.3.2 Diversity and the Social Dimension of Bi-regional Relations between EU and LAC

In the social dimension of EU-LAC bi-regional relations, diversity is defined through the lens of social cohesion and social inclusion, principally via programmes that seek the inclusion of a diversity of the population considered to be vulnerable groups in this sense. These may include migrants, youth, homeless people, women and groups marginalized according to ethnicity. Diversity in the social dimension is therefore closely linked to social inequality.

a) How is diversity addressed in the social dimension of bi-regional relations? How has this changed in the time period considered?

Diversity in the Political Dialogue framing the social dimension of EU-LAC Relations

As related to the social dimension of bi-regional EU-LAC relations, diversity pertains to social inclusion in the sense of explicitly supporting the inclusion of vulnerable populations who are excluded or disadvantaged, among others, along the lines of gender and ethnicity. It is also an issue closely linked to that of equality/inequality and has been mentioned since the first Summit in Rio (1999) where both parties declared their commitment to work together “on the basis of the principles of equality and respect for plurality and diversity, without distinction of race, religion or gender” (Rio Declaration 1999: paragraph 54). In the following Summit declarations it remains a recurring topic, presenting ethnic discrimination, linguistic inclusion, addressing xenophobia and the vulnerability of migrants. Diversity in the social dimension is not an issue that has very high political priority. Nevertheless, it is a subject addressed in the bi-annual EU-LAC action plans. In the Declaration of the Madrid Summit (2010) it is indirectly addressed under Chapter 5, “Education and Employment to Promote Social Inclusion and Cohesion” whose main objectives to promote education, improve access to labour markets and dignified work “tak[e] into account diversity and levels of vulnerability [...]... in particular for women and young people, as well as for other vulnerable groups” (Madrid Action Plan 2010: Chapter 5: 9-11). In the updating of the Action Plan during the 2013 Summit in Santiago de Chile, a new chapter on gender was included that should guarantee the political participation of women, eliminate gender-based violence, and support women’s economic empowerment (Santiago Summit 2013: chapter 7: 10-11).

Diversity as addressed in the Social Dimension of Bilateral Relations in specific Programmes/Policies

The issue of diversity in the sense of guaranteeing the inclusion of socially vulnerable groups is not the main subject of any specific social programme to result out of the EU-LAC bi-regional relationship. Rather, the specific goal of the EU-LAC Action Plans to “implement programmes to reduce discrimination at work of young people, women and persons with disabilities” (Madrid Action Plan, 2010: Chapter 5 section G) is one of the lines of work within the larger EUROsociAL programmes³ that have been in place since 2005. Here, the programme focuses on some “priority groups”. According to the programme, these are groups that “due to their age, gender, ethnic origin and/or physical or mental condition are at risk, preventing them of development and access to better welfare conditions” (EUROsociAL Website, 2016).

The programme works to reduce the social vulnerability of these groups by supporting local policy initiatives that target the specific vulnerable groups in particular countries and regions in those countries. These have included: supplementing monetary aid with job-market assistance; free of cost fiscal advice for inserting small businesses into the formal economy; working with local governments to revise government protocols to improve assistance to homeless persons; assistance in revising programmes that assist children vulnerable to engage in child labour; among others (EUROsociAL Website, 2016). As is characteristic of the EUROsociAL programme, an emphasis is on

³ EUROsociAL (2004-2009), EUROsociAL II (2011-2015), and EUROsociAL+ (2016-2021).

supporting existing government initiatives or on making them more efficient through training and capacity-building.

b) How and to what extent does diversity have an impact on the social dimension of bi-regional relations?

Diversity as an important aspect of the wider political theme of social inclusion does not as such have a direct impact on the social-dimension of bi-regional relations between EU and LAC. Rather, it plays an important role as a centre of attention in programmes such as EUROsociAL that deal explicitly with issues of social inclusion.

Nevertheless, as underlined in other parts of this Updated Version of the Synthesis Report on Cross-Cutting Topics, it is an issue that reflects but also maintains a type of asymmetry in the bi-regional relations given the fact that these issues of diversity and political inclusion are framed within programmes that address only countries and policies in Latin America and the Caribbean, without addressing the same issues on the side of the European Union (see section 2.2.2, Inequality in the Social Dimension of EU-LAC Relations part b, above).

c) What are the main achievements and challenges regarding diversity in the social dimension of bi-regional relations? What could both regions learn from each other?

A main achievement in this area is to have achieved a sustained focus on the issue of diversity in the sense of considering the vulnerability or exclusion of certain groups as a cross-cutting issue in the most important programme that came out of the bi-regional political, dialogue, EUROsociAL, in its three phases.

A challenge for the future could be to address these issues not only at the level of a support to local bureaucracies, or to aim for greater programme efficiency, but rather to explore further areas in which the exclusion of social groups on the basis of gender, age or ethnicity may also be encouraged through other major policy areas, in particular economic policies such as liberalization in the area of agriculture or trade.

2.4 SUSTAINABILITY

At the core of the concept of sustainability are the interconnections between economic growth, environmental health and social wellbeing. Sustainable development has been a mainstay concept and goal of the social and environmental international agenda from the late 1980s until the present. In the social and cultural areas, the concept of sustainability addresses transformations related to development dynamics, highlighting interdependencies between spatial scales (local, national, regional and global scales) and temporal frames (past, present and future). In the scientific dimension sustainability is more directly addressed as the durability and resilience of ecological rather than eco-social systems, and is increasingly brought into close connection with the implementation of particular technologies that are associated with sustainable practices.

In the analysis of sustainability we focus on the following key questions:

- a) How is sustainability addressed in the social, scientific and cultural dimensions of bi-regional relations? How has this changed in the time period considered?
- b) What are main achievements, what are main challenges regarding sustainability in the social, scientific and cultural dimensions of bi-regional relations?
- c) To what extent and how does sustainability have an impact on the cultural, scientific, and social dimensions of bi-regional relations?

2.4.1 Sustainability in the Scientific Dimension of Bi-regional Relations between EU and LAC

In the scientific dimension of bi-regional LAC-EU relations, sustainability is defined by two related concepts that are important research paradigms in both the natural and the social sciences: 'sustainable development' and later 'sustainability'. While both terms are common use in both social and natural science research, the former is not typically addressed by basic research in the natural sciences. In the context of LAC-EU scientific relations there has also been a tendency to associate certain research topics, approaches and technologies with sustainability and in the case of the technological applications, to treat them as synonymous with one another.

a) How is sustainability addressed in the scientific dimension of bi-regional relations? How has this changed in the time period considered?

Sustainability and Scientific Collaboration in the EU-LAC Political Dialogue

EU-LAC summit documents since 1999 show sustained attention to the term 'sustainable development.' Here, sustainable development is a focus that is closely tied to a well-established development agenda in which socioeconomic issues are prominent. In terms of research, sustainable development is addressed by through the lens of various common preoccupations within social science research, including issues of socioeconomic inequality and social exclusion (see below Chapter 2.4.2, Sustainability in the Social Dimension of EU-LAC relations). At the same time, in recent years there has been an emergent tendency to emphasize sustainability in a way that is decoupled from this former emphasis on development. Despite the common semantic root, the parallel emphasis on sustainability tout court appears to reveal a change in policy emphasis outlining a new role for science and technology.

In EU-LAC summit documents 'sustainable development' has not been supplanted by, but has been complemented by the related but different notion of 'sustainability'. Sustainable development remains important as an "overarching priority for collaborative research" (Fresco et al. 2013: 73) for the European Research Council. At the same time, from the Madrid Summit (2010) and the adoption of the Joint Initiative for Research and Innovation (JIRI) onward, 'sustainability' begins to be used in close relation to and even synonymously with certain technologies and with the term 'green economy'. This is a concept that rose to global prominence in 2012 in the wake of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD), among others. This approach to sustainability is

reflected in the publication of the European Union's Bioeconomy Strategy, also published in 2012 under the Title, "Innovating for Sustainable Growth: A Bioeconomy for Europe". Here, topics associated with the older agenda of sustainable development— including climate change, energy and health remain prominent but are now addressed differently within the emerging research agenda. In particular, they emerge as closely linked to scientific-technological innovations and to research focusing on the natural sciences and technology development.

Sustainability and EU-LAC Science Policy Cooperation

Bi-regional policies and programmes associated with sustainable development do not necessarily use the term 'sustainable' but are conceived of as addressing sustainability. This takes place through an emphasis on other topics such as bioeconomy, energy, or in the context of issues such as climate services and sustainable urbanization which have been important areas of thematic cooperation under the STI SOM Working Groups in recent years.

In parallel, the EU has promoted this approach to sustainability through the green economy or bioeconomy in conferences such as, "Transforming life sciences knowledge into new, sustainable, eco-efficient and competitive products" (European Commissioner for Science and Research, 2005, Brussels). At this conference EU Commissioner for Science and Research, Janez Potočnik underlined the EU "is very interested in finding solutions that lie in the life sciences and biotechnology, because these are sustainable solutions that can help us find a balance between the needs of our economies and our environment" (Potočnik 2005: 2).

In the context of the EU-LAC bi-regional relationship and especially in the wake of the Madrid Summit (2010) these technologies and the science and the associated engineering research are closely linked with the "sustainable transformation of biological resources" which is defined under the SOM Working Group on Bioeconomy as "the development of sustainable processes for the transformation of biomass in added-value products "in the sense of a new bioeconomy (SOM WG Bioeconomy 2016: 4 and Annex IV).

b) How and to what extent does sustainability have an impact on the scientific dimension of bi-regional relations?

In light of the above, it is clear that to assess how sustainability has an impact on the scientific dimensions of bi-regional relations, it is important to note that, in comparison to other cross-cutting terms analysed in this report, sustainability has been characterized by a broad spectrum of definitions, including many different indicators pointing towards sustainability and sustainable practices. Moreover, what is considered sustainable, as alluded to in Chapter 2.4.1.a above, has been (re)defined within the context of EU-LAC scientific relations through particular technologies that are themselves per se assumed to be sustainable.

On the one hand, guiding policy documents that frame the bi-regional scientific relation such as the EU-CELAC Senior Officials Meeting on S&T Concept Note (drafted within the framework of the ALCUE NET programme) state that "new technologies and technology transfer underpin[s] sustainable socio-economic development" (ALCUE-NET s.a. (b): 3). The types of new technologies that are

addressed by this statement are especially close to those defined in dominant technologies with strong roots in industrial applications. For example, according to the Santiago Declaration in 2013, the green economy is seen as “one of the important tools available for achieving sustainable development” (paragraph 40: 12). The kinds of sustainable technologies associated with this are spelled out in documents such as the SOM Working Group on Bioeconomy Thematic Report 2016, stating that intensification technologies such as zero-tillage; GMOs, i.e., molecular engineering, biofuels and in general other biotechnologies can be seen as “ecological” (2016: 4).

This definition of certain technologies as per se sustainable crates a set of potential question marks in the sense of promoting and producing valid and useful scientific research. First, technologies cannot be seen as independent of the social relations that frame them at a given point in time. The impact of this perspective is that scientific research is restrained to those opinions which do consider these technologies to be sustainable, at the detriment of other positions within the scientific field that have questioned the sustainability of those same technologies; or that have pointed to possible conflicts of interest between the promotion of these technologies as sustainable due to industry interests that stand to gain from the promotion of the same technologies. This issue is particularly important given the fact that the sustainable technologies associated with bioeconomy are to “be advanced as a working model for S&T cooperation” between the two regions (Senior Officials’ Working Group on Bioeconomy 2016: 5).

c) What are main achievements, what are main challenges regarding sustainability in the scientific dimension of bi-regional relations?

It can be seen as an achievement that the issue of sustainability has managed to become a mainstay of the agenda, not only at the political levels of regional cooperation but also as one of the research priorities as shown by the types of projects prioritized in programme calls, mobility schemes and funding priorities for research in both regions.

At the same time, care must be taken to avoid language that a priori would assume that certain research approaches and in particular certain technologies would themselves be sustainable as such. Here, it is important to emphasize a basic insight of critical studies of technologies in the social sciences, highlighting that technologies cannot be considered as autonomous entities independently of the social context—including the scientific, social and political context—in which they emerge and into which they are inserted. As a result, it would be adequate for the Working Group on Bioeconomy to depart from a look at the many empirical studies that have dealt with the impact of the use of so-called genetic modification, “zero-tillage” agriculture, biofuels, the removal of “residual biomass”—all of which are assessed in the report as “sustainable”— in order to evaluate whether or not these can be said to be used sustainably in the Latin American context (SOM Working Group Bioeconomy 2016: 19; 10).

In this context, it is a welcome development that the SOM Working Group on Bioeconomy proposed the creation of a Bioeconomy Observatory (ALCUE NET s.a., a). However, the observatory does not appear to have a critical role of accompaniment and assessment of biotechnologies and their potential towards sustainability, but rather their outright promotion: For example, In the case of the Bioeconomy Observatory, the stated goal of the Observatory is to “promote [the] bioeconomy in CELAC by facilitating its knowledge to the general public and stakeholders”, to “promote business

development and support investment decisions in the related sectors” or to “provide a promotion tool to increase the levels of social acceptance of the Bioeconomy principles, sectors and products” (ALCUE NET, s.a., a). However, none of the stated goals are addressed at a critical discussion and assessment of whether the technologies being proposed can be considered as sustainable. A key element of this would be an approach that would gather diverse opinions on this issue, not only from business sectors but from other, varied civil society stakeholders from diverse sectors in their role as participating stakeholders rather than only as receivers of knowledge regarding the bioeconomy (SOM Working Group on Bioeconomy, 2016: 6).

2.4.2 Sustainability in the Social Dimension of Bi-regional Relations between EU and LAC

In the social dimension of bi-regional relations between EU and LAC sustainability has been largely framed by the important social policy and development policy paradigm of ‘sustainable development.’ Sustainable development draws to attention the interconnections between the viability and future resilience of ecosystems and social systems.

a) How is sustainability being addressed in the social dimension of bi-regional relations? How has this changed in the time period considered?

Sustainability and the Social Dimension in the EU-LAC Political Dialogue

Sustainability has been a steady mainstay on the political agenda between EU and LAC through the notion of ‘sustainable development’. The concept first gained prominence in the wake of the Brundtland Report (1987) and following the World Summit in Rio de Janeiro (1992), the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg (2002), and most recently through the Sustainable Development Goals of 2015. The importance of the concept is also reflected in the recent EU-LAC Summit documents: While the Vienna Summit (2006) document uses the terms ‘sustainable development’ or ‘sustainability’ only seven times, the terms are used 16 times in the Lima Summit Declaration (2008). In the Santiago Summit Declaration (2013) they are used 28 times. More recently, the importance of sustainability in the social dimension has been highlighted by the political weight given in the bi-regional political dialogue to the 2013 UN Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (Assessment of Programmes and Actions 2016).

Thus, while the notion of sustainability in the scientific field focuses more on the intersection of social systems and ecology systems, in the social dimension of bi-regional relations, sustainability qua sustainable development tends to highlight not only socioecological environments, but especially the way that they intersect with the viability of or durability of social systems over time, often captured through the notion of wellbeing. In the EU-LAC relationship this has been addressed through a number of subjects that have been the focus of summit declarations including climate change, food security and nutrition or sustainable agriculture. But while some topics have been temporary at the political level — for example, the emphasis on food security in the 2008 Lima Summit can partly be assessed as a political statement in the midst of a hunger crisis as global food prices for basic staples soared globally —, others have become been given ongoing centrality in the

bi-regional relationship. This includes topics that have figured more prominently in bi-regional terms, especially since the Lima Summit in 2008 containing a special chapter on Sustainable Development, Environment, Climate Change, Energy (Lima Declaration, 2008) and have had more attention have also been those included in the bi-annual Action Plans since the 2010 Summit in Madrid (updated in Santiago 2013 and Brussels 2015) and in particular Chapter Two of these documents which addresses exactly these topics (Madrid Action Plan 2010: 4-6; Santiago Action Plan 2013: 3-5; Brussels Action Plan 2015: 5-6).

As detailed in the Action Plans, the points of bi-regional convergence centre most prominently on the issue of climate change, the effective implementation of the Kyoto protocol, and developing policies and instruments for adaptation and mitigation to climate change, among others. The outstanding emphasis here on climate change and the amount of space it is granted in bi-regional political documents as well as in recent summit documents can be read as a reflection of EU priorities in the relationship with LAC as defined by the European Commission; and is also reflected in the European Commission's budget allocation of 557 million EUR (out of a total of 925 million EUR) to Latin America on this topic (Gratius 2015: 14). Additionally, a common objective is the full implementation of the three objectives laid out in the UN Convention on Biological Diversity. Another important issue is the subject of energy and energy efficiency and their accessibility. In the context of the 2030 UN Agenda for Sustainable Development, including the 17 Sustainable Development Goals, these topics are to be brought together more closely with social issues such as the modalities for achieving inclusive economic growth while decreasing inequality; access to finance; or the vulnerabilities of Small Island Developing States, or the effects of bi-regional cooperation on middle-income countries that no longer qualify for funding under the Official Development Assistance (ODA) framework. In the framework of the bi-regional political dialogue, this has been considered important, given the importance of ODA "as a lever for effective implementation of the [Sustainable Development Goals]" (Assessment of Programmes and Activities 2016: 5).

Sustainability and the Social Dimension in EU-LAC Policy Cooperation

A prominent example of the type of programmes that anchor the topic of sustainability in the social dimension is the programme known as EURoCLIMA. Following the dialogue at the 2008 EU-LAC Summit in Lima, the regional EU programme was conceived in order to address climate change mitigation and adaptation within the context of Latin American public development policies and plans. Therefore the countries that participate in the programme are supposed to benefit from studies and information material, seminars and workshops, on-site as well as online courses and webinars as well as technical assistance in the framework of the Paris Agreement in 2015 and in countries' efforts to draw up their Nationally Determined Contributions. EURoCLIMA works by creating information and dialogues that are then channelled towards the improvement of local policies regarding subjects such as soil erosion and loss or gaining access to funding mechanisms in the context of UN Programmes such as REDD and REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation). Currently, a follow up programme is being conceived that will continue with these actions after 2017 and will be known as EURoCLIMA+ (CELAC-EU, 2016: 9). In addition, in the context of the EU Multi-Annual Indicative Programme for Latin America, funding has been agreed upon to support climate change and disaster risk management for the region between 2014 and 2020.

While EUroCLIMA (2009-2012) and EUroCLIMA+ (2012-2015) only involves Latin American states, Caribbean countries participate in a separate programme known as the Global Climate Alliance (GCCA), a programme that is not specific to the Caribbean but which is conceived as targeting so-called least-developed countries and has been funded by the EU since 2007 (Global Climate Change Alliance 2012). The programme comprises a two-pronged strategy consisting of a political dialogue aiming to integrate climate issues into national development strategies, plans and budgets as well as building a dialogue to feed into the climate negotiations; and of technical assistance such as mangrove management or disaster risk reduction, sometimes through CARIFORUM as a base for economic dialogue with the EU (GCCA 2012). The programme has been expanded as of November 2015, now known as GCCA+.

It is important to note that while these climate change programmes and activities are also meant to feed back into the political process at the level of the global climate change negotiations, this has not necessarily led to cooperation between EU and LAC in the context of the UNFCCC climate negotiations as such. This is of course related to the heterogeneity of countries and interests in the two regions and the fact that this heterogeneity represents disparate interests and strategies among others in terms of industry interests affected by climate negotiations; the urgency of how climate change is affecting the various countries in the region; or the availability of resources available to prevent or respond to these effects. As a result, climate change programmes have rather led to a bi-regional dialogue on particular topics leading up to the climate negotiations or to assistance in areas such as defining the Nationally Determined Contributions leading up to the 2015 UNFCCC climate negotiations, but have not led to the possibility of representing common positions or common strategies in climate negotiations. This is a situation that furthermore holds true of other international conventions such as the UN Convention on Biological Diversity.

The working groups that have been established in the context of the EU-CELAC Science, Technology and Innovation Senior Officials' Meetings also play a role in moving the policy agenda forward. While some of the initiatives focus on research specific undertakings, others include concrete actions such as the implementation of a pilot public-private partnership on energy in the bioeconomy focusing on biomass conversion or refining and the EU Partnership Instrument is active in Latin America with projects including low carbon emissions, energy efficiency, resources accounting and valuation of ecosystems, and supporting the phasing out of ozone-depleting substances (Assessment of Programmes and Actions 2016: 9).

An important characteristic of bi-regional cooperation on issues related to sustainability in the social dimension has been the emphasis placed on Corporate Social Responsibility. The issue of Investment and Entrepreneurship for Sustainable Development has been a Chapter on the bi-regional Action Plan since the Santiago Summit in 2013 which promotes the idea that social inclusion, environmental quality and sustained economic growth are not at odds with each other but can be fostered through the capacity building of micro-small and medium enterprises as "new social actors of the economy" (EU-LAC Bi-regional Action Plan 2013: Chapter 8, 12-13). These issues are addressed as part of a political dialogue such as through CELAC-EU Ministers of Economy Meetings as well as industrial dialogues, seminars and events with some Latin American countries in order to strengthen and align industry policy issues between the two regions on issues that include raw materials, Global Earth observation (e.g. geoinformation for environmental as well as security purposes) as well as disaster preparedness to prevent earthquakes or tropical storms) (Assessment of Programmes and Activities 2016: 14).

The emphasis on Corporate Social Responsibility, especially since the World Summit for Sustainable Development in Johannesburg (2002) underscores the general trend to address issues of economic growth and environmental sustainability jointly whereby it is assumed that private businesses should be encouraged as important factors in the area of sustainability and that their goals do not stand in opposition to sustainability as pertains both to the environment as well as to social cohesion. As a result, bi-regional cooperation in the area of sustainability has put a strong emphasis on the role of business as shown not only by the inclusion of a particular chapter on investments and entrepreneurship for sustainable development into the bi-regional action plans but also by a number of programmes. The latter include, among others, AL-INVEST, The Latin American Investment Facility, the European and Latin American business services and Innovation Programme (ELAN), COPERNICUS, an EU-based programme for geoinformation related to sustainability and security. Moreover, six Latin American countries (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Paraguay and Peru) host Enterprise Europe Network Business Corporation Centres. The latter provide support to help small and medium enterprises in doing businesses beyond their national borders and opens up the possibility for European and Latin American small and medium enterprises to seize business opportunities in both regions (Assessment of Programmes and Actions 2016: 14).

b) How and to what extent does sustainability have an impact on the social dimension of bi-regional relations?

The way that sustainability has been dealt with in the framework of the EU-LAC relationship and its particular focus on sustainable development has meant that cooperation can be achieved on this issue where, at least at this level, there seems to be sufficient political convergence. Climate change and the EURocLIMA and GCCA programmes are probably the best example of this type of cooperation.

At the same time, at the level of the impact on the social dimension of bi-regional relations this type of programme reflects an implicit developmental approach in which the Latin American and Caribbean partner countries are addressed as the area to benefit from improvement or efficiency in policies to prevent or mitigate the effects of climate change. Thus all 18 participant countries in the EURocLIMA and GCCA programmes are Latin American and Caribbean countries while no European countries are included. It is thus an asymmetrical constellation assuming that the European side already succeeds on this terrain while the LAC region is called on to improve, even as Europe is, on the whole, responsible for a larger footprint in the emissions that cause climate change.

Furthermore, in order to assess the impact of sustainability on the social dimension, it must be taken into account how sustainability has been treated in other areas of the bi-regional relationship. As discussed above, in the scientific dimension there is a tendency to assume that certain policies and technologies are sustainable in and of themselves. This assumption can also be seen critically from the perspective of the social dimension and its emphasis on sustainable development. Thus, goals are at conflicts when, on the one hand, programmes try to preserve the fertility of soils, biodiversity or water in Latin America through the type of sustainable development policies, while, on the other, Latin America is praised as having a strong strategic potential based on land available for agriculture or biodiversity in the context of a bioeconomy promoting that these resources be exploited in the context of new green growth (SOM Working Group on Bioeconomy 2016: 4-5).

Regarding the increasingly important role that is given to the business sector within the context of bi-regional relations, it is important to note that bi-regional relations are also given shape through business actors and therefore business interests. The encouragement of the voice of business actors in the area of sustainability (as well as other areas such as scientific innovation) stands in contrast with those of other actors which are sometimes mentioned in the political dialogue and which are given a political voice (e.g., EU-LAC Civil Society Forum) but do not have the same political weight in terms of implementing the bi-regional relationship through programmes and initiatives.

b) What are main achievements, what are main challenges regarding sustainability in the social dimension of bi-regional relations?

- Sustainability and sustainable development are significant issues of political agreement in the bi-regional political relationship between the EU and LAC. A common vision in the area of climate change mitigation and adaptation and the positive achievement which has led to the implementation of concrete programmes such as EURoCLIMA and the CGGA.
- As detailed above, however, it remains a challenge to dissociate the social dimension of bi-regional relations from a classic North-South development agenda in which EURoCLIMA partner countries are expected to improve one-sidedly even as the European Union is deeply implicated in Climate Change as a major producer of greenhouse gas emissions.
- As mentioned in the bi-regional 2016 EU-CELAC Assessment of Programmes and Actions bilateral cooperation in areas such as climate change should reflect previous Action Plans' attention to areas such as the use of indigenous and traditional knowledge as well as the "use of nature-based solutions" (Assessment of Programmes and Actions 2016: 10). This would be a positive balance to the already much stronger role of various actors in the business sector whose participation has been much more strongly encouraged such as through the notion of Corporate Social Responsibility.

4 PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions presented here are preliminary. They reflect the fact that thus far, we have only analysed the scientific and social dimensions of bi-regional relations. They will become more differentiated as the analysis evolves over time and when the cultural dimension is taken into account. As detailed in the methodology, the report is primarily based on an analysis of documents of the EU-LAC political dialogue and a few programme documents. Thus far, no results from the other working packages were considered, but of course we hope to enrich our analysis through this material in the near future.

Conclusion 1: If we are to analyse bi-regional relations, we must take into account the respective competencies of the two regional partners (EU, CELAC). In none of the three dimensions of bi-regional relations examined within the framework of the project does the EU have exclusive competence. Nonetheless, there are different possibilities for EU action in policy areas that can be attributed to the three dimensions of bi-regional relations between EU and CELAC. On the other hand, CELAC is a purely intergovernmental political dialogue and concertation mechanism between the 33 Latin American and Caribbean countries. It has no supranational competencies vis-à-vis its member countries. The different institutional architectures of intra-regional relations in Europe and Latin America also have an impact on the possibilities of shaping bi-regional relations. It would be useful to pay more attention to this issue in the further course of the project.

Conclusion 2: Cooperation programmes and activities between both regions have often been characterized by the participation of only some countries in each region. For example, this is the case regarding scientific mobility in which four countries in Latin America carry a very high percentage of all participation. It is also the case for a frequent exclusion of the Caribbean, or of separate negotiation processes, such as is the case in the climate programmes, EUROCLIMA Programme between EU and Latin America on the one hand, and the Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA) programme between the EU and the Caribbean on the other. A major challenge is therefore to identify fields of cooperation in which all countries can participate at the bi-regional level. More specifically, bi-regional programmes should be reconceptualised and adapted to reflect the diversity of needs and contexts of such heterogeneous regions as both the EU and LAC in order to truly strengthen the bi-regional relationship. At the same time, this raises questions regarding the adequateness of existing instruments and communication channels. Are current formats adequate or are others needed in order to better address bi-regional concerns? The 2016 Assessment of Programmes and Activities carried out in the context of the Inter-Summit Ministerial Meeting in 2016 which reviewed the current Political Dialogue and Action Plans is a good step in this direction.

Conclusion 3: A major institutional asymmetry in the EU-LAC relationship is related to the fact that beyond the political dialogue, a large part of bi-regional relations is implemented through instruments to fund common programmes and activities which stem almost exclusively from the EU. Various EU funding instruments such as the Development Cooperation Instrument, the European Development Fund, the Partnership Instrument, and the various Framework Programmes in the area of science and technology have provided the necessary funds for bi-regional programmes and activities in the scientific, social and cultural dimensions. However, given the fact that these have been EU funds, there is a tendency to which funding dictates the format, the thematic priorities and outcomes in a way in which the LAC region is unilaterally addressed and is expected to enact some

kind of change while the EU region is not addressed. These asymmetries due to different levels of funding have been partially addressed in the recent CELAC-EU Assessment of Programmes and Actions (2016) which notes that innovative financing is needed in order to continue to provide funding to LAC countries that have been categorized as middle income countries that may no longer qualify for Official Development Assistance (ODA). Even more importantly, the recommendations made in the 2016 Assessment also note that “both CELAC and EU should take responsibility for and participate actively in every stage of drafting, programming, design and implementation processes as relevant, taking into account intra-regional balance and inter-regional representation” (Assessment of Programmes and Actions 2016: 4).

Conclusion 4: Mobility is central to bi-regional relations between EU-LAC in the field of science, technology and innovation. Although specific motives and drivers for mobility are not necessarily the same on each side of the Atlantic and differ with regard to status groups, disciplines and interests, key factors for mobility include access to cutting edge science and complementary know-how, gaining entry to international technology markets, the valuation of skills, information, and insights concentrated in other countries, and access to funds from foreign institutions and foreign funding agencies. A qualitative and strategic change in the EU-LAC relationship with a significant effect on the mobility of information, knowledge and researchers is marked by the initiation of the Joint Initiative on Research and Innovation (JIRI), launched between the European Union and LAC in 2010 at the Madrid Summit. Mobility has had a positive impact on EU-CELAC relations in the sense of increasing knowledge exchange, knowledge circulation and the co-production of knowledge, the growth of international collaborative experiences, knowledge gain and capacity development of academics and researchers at various levels (students, PhD students, post-docs, professors, established researchers), and the expansion of access and use of infrastructure. Nevertheless, structural inequalities between EU – LAC and within the regions in terms of who can participate in mobility (i.e., who can fulfil the adequate formats in terms of formal requirement, qualifications, thematic foci; and which countries and institutions can position themselves as attractive institutions for scientific exchange) should be taken into account when considering the increased mobility of knowledge. One of the major challenges for bi-regional mobility in the scientific dimension is to reduce structural inequalities between EU-CELAC and within the regions, achieve a more balanced relation between brain gain and brain drain, in the sense of a more symmetric knowledge circulation and a less disparate spatial and temporal pattern of mobility.

Conclusion 5: Mobility in the social dimension of bi-regional relations between EU and LAC comprises of several areas of cooperation and political dialogue. These include the legal and illegal Trans-Atlantic mobility of people, in particular: long-term labour migration; the transfer of remittances sent by labour migrants from Europe to Latin America and the Caribbean; legal and illegal bi-regional circulation of money; and the illicit trafficking of goods, with an emphasis on illegal drugs. Poverty is also a key issue in this context as a structural cause of labour migration. Achievements regarding the mobility of people and of illicit drugs relate to programmes that have been successful in contributing to a greater understanding of the above-mentioned phenomena and towards implementing regulatory policies. They include the development of bi-regional policy dialogues and concrete programmes over the years of the EU-LAC relationship. However, to address the strong negative effects of labour migration and illegal drugs on social wellbeing and social cohesion in Latin America, it would be important to put new issues on the political agenda which

have not been dealt with as part of the bi-lateral relationship, such as dealing with illegal drugs from the perspective of drug consumption.

Conclusion 6 In the scientific dimension of bi-regional relations between EU and LAC, inequality is framed on several levels related to the opportunities regarding participation in international, bi-regional collaboration. These include disparities among regions, countries, and regions within countries as well as disparities between institutions and language skills. Further asymmetries stem from access to university education, higher academic degrees, funding for research, access to high level publications, access to international mobility, and access to research infrastructure. Some of the challenges that should be addressed in bi-regional collaboration include: Inequalities regarding the participation of the natural sciences and engineering fields vs. social sciences and humanities; differences between the two regions and among particular countries with regard to the funding of basic science on the one hand and applied science, on the other; disparities in the participation of certain clusters of countries within the bi-regional collaboration; asymmetries in access to scientific collaboration, including publications, circulation, and visibility of science research as a result of language differences; challenges to collaboration as framed by gender, class and ethnicity.

Conclusion 7: In the social dimension of bi-regional relations the inequalities addressed include economic inequality, gender- and ethnic-based inequality, and the challenge of social cohesion. In the programmes, inequalities targeted also include differences in access to justice, primary and secondary education and the (formal) labour market. As they apply to Latin America and the Caribbean as a deeply unequal region, these inequalities have had a profound impact on bi-regional relations between LAC and EU. This impact has been in the sense of an important asymmetry between the two regions in which LAC is the area that is expected to develop and the EU is a model. Although bi-regional programmes in the social area such as EUROsociAL emphasize a methodology based on an exchange among equal partners, issues of social cohesion, corruption, precarisation of the labour market and gender inequality are only directed towards LAC. Nevertheless, these are not unknown problems on the other side of the Atlantic.

Conclusion 8: In the scientific dimension of bi-regional relations, diversity refers almost exclusively to biological diversity. Diversity in the sense of other types of knowledge, including traditional knowledge has been politically recognized but has not been addressed through scientific collaboration.

Conclusion 9: In the social dimension of LAC-EU bi-regional relations, diversity is defined through the lens of social cohesion and social inclusion, principally via programmes that seek the inclusion of diversity of the population considered as vulnerable — e.g., groups excluded on the basis of gender and ethnicity, or language. Diversity in the social dimension is therefore closely linked to social inequality.

Conclusion 10: In the scientific dimension of bi-regional LAC-EU relations, sustainability is defined by two related concepts that have been important paradigms in research in both the natural and the social sciences: ‘sustainable development’ and later ‘sustainability’. While both are common terms framing both, social and natural science research, the former has not been addressed by basic research in the natural sciences.

Conclusion 11: In the context of LAC-EU scientific relations there has been a tendency to associate certain research topics, approaches and technologies with sustainability, and in the case of the technological applications, to treat them as synonymous with sustainability.

Conclusion 12: In the social dimension of bi-regional relations between EU and LAC, sustainability has been largely framed by the important social policy and development policy paradigm of sustainable development. A challenge would be to bring the various dimensions of the bi-lateral relationship into dialogue with one another. The fact that issues such as biodiversity preservation are on the sustainable development agenda while biodiversity is seen as a primary resource to be exploited in the context of scientific applied research on the bioeconomy highlight contradictions that might be addressed at various levels, not only in the political dialogue but in the development of concrete bi-regional programmes in the future.

5 BIBLIOGRAPHY

5.1 PRIMARY SOURCES

- ALCUE NET (2016a): *CELAC Bioeconomy Observatory*.
<<http://alcuenet.eu/assets/Observatory%20document%20for%20SOM.pdf>>. Accessed November 1, 2016.
- ALCUE-NET (2016b): *EU CELAC SOM on S&T Concept Note. Document prepared by the ELCUE NET project as SOM Technical Secretariat in collaboration with related bi-regional projects and initiatives*. <<http://alcuenet.eu/assets/ALCUENET%20Concept%20Note%20for%20SOM.pdf>>. Accessed August 2, 2016.
- COPLOAD (Cooperation Programme on Drug Policies with EU) (2016): Website.
<http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/regions/latin-america/copolad-cooperation-programme-between-latin-america-and-european-union-drugs_en>. Accessed October 28, 2016.
- ENLACE (2016): *Landscape of Research Technology and Development in Latin America. Setting up the bi-regional Dialogue*. <<http://www.enlace-project.eu/downloader.ashx?id=15>>. Accessed August 11, 2016.
- European Commission International Cooperation and Development (2016): *Latin America. EU-CELAC Migration Project*. Project Portal Online. <https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/regions/latin-america/eu-celac_en>. Accessed November 8, 2016.
- European Commission (2016): *EU support to the Community of Latin America and Caribbean States (CELAC)*. Press Release during the EU-CELAC Ministerial Meeting. <http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-16-3542_en.htm>. Accessed November 13, 2016.
- European Commission (2015): *Action Document for EUROsociAL+, Annex 1*. May 26, 2015.
- European Commission (2012): *Innovating for Sustainable Growth. A Bioeconomy for Europe*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission (2010): *Towards the EU-LAC Knowledge Area. Scientific and Technological Cooperation between Latin America, the Caribbean and the European Union for Sustainable Development and Social Inclusion*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission (2008): "Coordinating Latin America Research and Innovation NETWORKS – EULARINET". In: *INCO-NET projects - Supporting International Science and Technology Cooperation with Major Regions of the World*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- European Commissioner for Science and Research (2005): *Conference on Knowledge-based bio-economy*, Brussels.
- EUROsociAL Website (2016): <<http://eurosoci-al.eu/es>>. Accessed December 13, 2016.
- Global Climate Alliance (2012) "Global Climate Change Alliance. Supporting the most vulnerable to respond to climate change". <<http://www.gcca.eu/policy-dialogue-and-experience-sharing/policy-dialogue>>. Accessed December 6, 2012.
- Joint Steering Committee of the Bilateral Agreement on Science and Technology between the European Union and the United States of Mexico (2016): *Joint Communiqué*. May 27. <https://ec.europa.eu/research/iscp/pdf/policy/8-jscm_joint_communique.pdf>. Accessed December 13, 2016.

Nota Informativa (s.a.): *Fortalecimiento del diálogo y de la cooperación entre la Unión Europea (UE) y América Latina y el Caribe (ALC) para el establecimiento de modelos de gestión sobre migración y políticas de desarrollo*. Unión Europea-América Latina y el Caribe. <http://www.migracion-ue-alc.eu/documents/keydocs/ES/Nota%20informativa%20_%20proyecto%20UE-ALC.pdf>.

Accessed November 8, 2016.

Potočník, Janez (2005): Transcript of speech by EU Commissioner for Science and Researcher at the conference, “Transforming life sciences knowledge into new, sustainable, eco-efficient and competitive products.” 15 September, 2005. <file:///C:/Users/iaboyer/Downloads/SPEECH-05-513_EN.pdf>. Accessed November 15, 2016.

Senior Officials Working Group on Bioeconomy (2016): *Thematic Report. Elaborated by MIMCyT (Argentina) and CIRAD (France). V EU-CELAC Senior Officials Meeting*. 14 March 2016. Brussels. <<http://alcuenet.eu/assets/SOM%20Thematic%20Report-%20Bioeconomy%202016.pdf>>.

Accessed August 2, 2016.

Zuckerfeld, Mariano (2009): “La Reciente Expansión de la Propiedad Intelectual: una visión de conjunto”. In: Casalet, Monica (ed.): *El Papel de las Ciencias Sociales en la Construcción de las Sociedades de Conocimiento. Aportaciones de los Participantes al Summer School del Proyecto EULAKS*. <<http://eulaks.archiv.zsi.at/attach/ebook.pdf>>. Accessed November 1, 2016.

5.2 EU-LAC/EU-CELAC DECLARATIONS (IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER)

Declaration of Rio de Janeiro (1999).

<https://eulacfoundation.org/en/system/files/1999_EN_Rio_Decl_0.pdf>.

Political Declaration. The Madrid Commitment (2002). Brussels. May 17, 2002.

<https://eulacfoundation.org/en/system/files/2002_EN_Madrid_Decl.pdf>.

Declaration of Guadalajara (2004).

<https://eulacfoundation.org/en/system/files/2004_EN_Gdj_Decl.pdf>.

Declaration of Vienna (2006).

<https://eulacfoundation.org/en/system/files/2006_EN_Vienna_Decl.pdf>.

Lima Declaration “Addressing our Peoples’ Priorities Together” (2008).

<https://eulacfoundation.org/en/system/files/2004_EN_Gdj_Decl.pdf>.

Madrid Declaration. Towards a new Stage in the Bi-Regional Partnership: Innovation and Technology for Sustainable Development and Social Inclusion (2010).

<http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/er/114535.pdf>.

Madrid Action Plan. Towards a new Stage in the Bi-Regional Partnership: Innovation and Technology for Sustainable Development and Social Inclusion (2010).

Santiago Declaration (2013).

<http://www.eeas.europa.eu/la/summits/docs/2013_santiago_summit_declaration_en.pdf>.

EU-CELAC Action Plan, 2013-2015. Santiago de Chile (2013).

<http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/135043.pdf>.

Brussels Declaration. Shaping our common future: working together for prosperous, cohesive and sustainable societies for our citizens (2015).

<<https://eulacfoundation.org/en/system/files/EU-CELAC%20Brussels%20declaration.pdf>>.

EU-CELAC Action Plan. Brussels (2015).

<https://ec.europa.eu/research/iscp/pdf/policy/eu-celac_action_plan_2015.pdf>.

EU-CELAC Political Declaration. A partnership for the next generation (2015).

Santo Domingo Declaration (2016).

<<http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2016/10/26-celac-santo-domingo-declaration/>>.

Assessment of Programmes and Actions (2016).

<<http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2016/10/26-celac-assessment/>>.

5.3 SECONDARY BIBLIOGRAPHIC MATERIAL

Acosta Arcarazo, Diego (2009): *Latin American Reactions to the Adoption of the Returns Directive*. Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies. <<https://www.ceps.eu/system/files/book/2009/11/latin-american-reactions-adoption-returns-directive.pdf>>. Accessed December 8, 2012.

Docquier, Frédéric/Rapoport, Hillel (2012). "Globalization, Brain Drain, and Development". In: *Journal of Economic Literature* 50.3, 681-730.

Feld, Adriana/Casas, Rosalba/Sonsire López, Maria/Vessuri, Hebe (2013): "Policies to Promote International Scientific Cooperation in Latin America: Evolution and Current Situation". In: Gaillard/Arvanitis 2013a, 23-48.

Fresco, Louise O. et al. (2013): *Commitment and Coherence: Essential Ingredients for Success in Science and Innovation. An Ex-Post-Evaluation of the Seventh EU Framework Programme (2007-2013)*. <<http://www.kowi.de/Portaldata/2/Resources/fp7/fp7-final-evaluation-expert-group-report.pdf>>. Accessed December 15, 2016.

Gaillard, Jacques/Arvanitis, Rigas (eds.) (2013a): *Research Collaboration between Europe and Latin America. Mapping and Understanding Partnership*. Paris: Éditions des Archives Contemporaines.

Gaillard, Jacques/Arvanitis, Rigas (2013b): "Science and technology collaboration between Europe and Latin America: Towards a More Equal Partnership?" In: Gaillard/Arvanitis 2013a, 1-22.

Gaillard, Jacques/Gaillard, Anne-Marie/Arvanitis, Rigas (2013): "Determining Factors of International Collaboration in Science and Technology. Results of a Questionnaire Survey." In: Gaillard/Arvanitis 2013a, 107-156.

Göbel, Barbara/Ulloa, Astrid (2014): "Colombia y el Extractivismo en América Latina". In: Göbel, Barbara/Ulloa, Astrid (2014) (eds.): *Extractivismo Minero en Colombia y América Latina*. Bogotá/Berlin: Universidad Nacional de Colombia/Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut, 15-33.

Gratius, Susanne (2015): *EU-LAC relations against the background of Atlantic trends and scenarios*. Atlantic Future Policy Paper 02. <<http://www.atlanticfuture.eu/contents/view/eu-lac-relations-trends-and-scenarios>>. Accessed December 15, 2016.

Gratius, Susanne/Nolte, Detlef (2013): *Die EU und Lateinamerika: Partnerschaft auf Augenhöhe?* GIGA Focus Lateinamerika 02. <<https://www.giga-hamburg.de/de/publication/die-eu-und-lateinamerika-partnerschaft-auf-augenhoe>> Accessed December 15, 2016.

- Córdova Alcaraz, Rodolfo (2015) (coord.): *Dinámicas Migratorias en América Latina y el Caribe (ALC) y entre ALC y la Unión Europea*. Bruselas: Organización Internacional para las Migraciones (OIM). <https://publications.iom.int/es/system/files/pdf/dinamicas_migratorias_2015.pdf> Accessed December 15, 2016.
- Kreimer, Pablo/Levin, Luciano (2013): “Scientific Cooperation between the European Union and Latin American Countries: Framework Programmes 6 and 7”. In: Gaillard/Arvanitis 2013a, 79-106.
- Lisack, Gaëlle (2014): *European external cultural relations: Paving new ways?* Stuttgart: Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen. <http://moreeurope.org/sites/default/files/european_external_cultural_relations_paving_new_ways_10.12.2014.pdf> Accessed December 15, 2016.
- Morales, Evo (2008): *Open Letter from Evo Morales regarding the Returns Directive*. <<https://machetera.wordpress.com/2008/06/12/evo-morales-on-the-eu-returns-directive/>>. Accessed December 8, 2016.
- Russel, Jane M./Ainsworth, Shirley (2013): “Mapping S& T Collaboration between Latin America and Europe: Bibliometric Analysis of Co-authorships (1984-2007)”. In: Gaillard/Arvanitis 2013a, 49-78.
- Stuhldreher, Amalia (2015): “La Migración: Cambio de Ciclo en las Relaciones entre la Unión Europea y América Latina y el Caribe”. In: *Estudios Internaciones* 181, 95-114.
- Wölkner, Sabina (2015): *Die Außenpolitische Dimension der EU-Migrationspolitik*. Konrad Adenauer Stiftung. <<http://www.kas.de/wf/de/33.42826/>>. Accessed December 8, 2016.

5.4 INTERNAL DOCUMENTS OF THE EULAC-FOCUS CONSORTIUM

- EULAC-Focus Project. Work Package 4 (2016): *Work Implementation Plan*. Internal project document dated August 17, 2016.
- EULAC-Focus Project. Work Package 5 (2016): *The Social Dimension of the EU. Overview on its Development, Main Instruments and Future Challenges*. Internal project document dated August 25, 2016.
- Research Executive Agency of the European Commission (2016): *Grant Agreement, EULAC-Focus Project*. January 27, 2016.