

FROM: Bank Information Center (US), Sustentarse (Chile), GT Infra (Brazil), Asociación Ambiente y Sociedad (Colombia), Conectas Direitos Humanos (Brazil), Fundación CAUCE: Cultura Ambiental-Causa Ecologista (Argentina), Fundeps (Argentina), Latinoamérica Sustentable, LAS (Ecuador), International Rivers (Brazil)

TO: IDB Board and the South Connection Regional Program Team

RE: Comments and Recommendations on South Connection Regional Program for South American Connectivity (2025-2030)

DATE: February 2026

Civil society organizations recognize the strategic importance of regional connectivity and the priority placed on [South Connection Regional Program](#) by the IDB and its member countries. Drawing on more than three decades of engagement with regional infrastructure initiatives, this document seeks to identify design, governance, and implementation risks that could undermine South Connection's development impact, institutional credibility, and long-term sustainability if not addressed at an early stage.

1. South Connection's focus on intra-regional connectivity does not yet fully incorporate territorial and social outcomes or the needs of local communities.

- South Connection, although framed as a regional integration initiative, prioritizes global competitiveness, logistics efficiency, large-scale transport corridors, ports, energy transmission, regulatory harmonization, and private sector participation, largely justified by the need to strengthen regional and global value chains (sections 1.1, 3.6, 3.12, 4.11, 4.13, 4.17). However, South Connection gives limited attention to investments that strengthen local economies, expand access to basic services, and reinforce territorial governance. It also does not clearly explain how deeper integration into global value chains will align with local and regional development priorities, particularly given its strong emphasis on private sector-led growth.
- Expanding physical and nonphysical connectivity is necessary but insufficient to drive structural economic transformation or advance progress toward the Sustainable Development Goals. In the absence of complementary productive strategies, improved corridors may reinforce existing comparative advantages rather than enable higher value-added activities. Transport corridors can reduce costs and improve market access, but without a coherent territorial development strategy, they risk consolidating existing economic patterns instead of transforming them. If corridor planning is not explicitly designed to attract diversified investment along the routes, new infrastructure will primarily support current economic dynamics, particularly commodity exports and extractive industries.

- South Connection identifies infrastructure gaps such as high logistics costs, restricted market access, slow regional integration, and limited adoption of new technologies (3.3), but it does not clearly explain how addressing these challenges will translate into improvements in quality of life, poverty reduction, or reduced socio-economic inequalities.
- Project selection criteria (4.4) further reinforce this imbalance by prioritizing “demand-driven” projects aligned with market needs and trade flows, while social demand and community priorities remain largely absent. Local communities are mentioned only marginally across the document (1.8, 4.14, 4.27), underscoring this disconnect.
- The economic narrative also places strong emphasis on emulating Asia’s growth trajectory, referenced in 11 sections (including 2.3, 2.6, 3.6, 3.30), encouraging rapid GDP growth and foreign investment. This framing reinforces an approach in which rapid economic growth takes precedence over social and environmental protection. Without a territorial or rights-based approach, this model risks deepening dependence on extractivist sectors, accelerating frontier expansion, and exacerbating socio-environmental degradation.

2. Insufficient reflection on lessons from prior regional integration programs and the IDB’s role in shaping them

- South Connection notes that the Joint Expression of Interest for the integration program, signed by Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, and Uruguay, “builds on the Brasilia Consensus, established in May 2023, in which South American countries reaffirmed their common vision of deepening both digital and physical connection” (1.1). This framing is positioning Brazil’s five “Integration Routes” as a key guide for the project pipeline to be approved under South Connection. This aligns with [reports](#) from March 2025 at the launch of South Connection, which indicated that “the new IDB program will expand the Integration Routes alliance” signed by countries in May 2023 and supported by the IDB, FONPLATA, Brazil’s National Bank for Economic and Social Development (BNDES), and CAF.
- Also, IDB is currently funding two technical cooperation projects specifically focused on supporting the five “Integration Routes”: [Efficient Logistics Corridors to Improve Connectivity in South America](#) and [Support to Brazil's New Integration Agenda](#). The *Efficient Logistics Corridors Project* is especially concerning; its abstract¹ states that it aligns with the “Integration Routes” initiative, both the project information document² and Terms of Reference³ document directly reference Conexión Sur. While the *Efficient Logistics Corridors Project* is designed to support “assessments of existing conditions in national and regional integration corridors” and “facilitate structured dialogue among

¹ IDB. “Development Impacts of the Integration Routes of South America (D3602).” IDB. August 2025. <https://www.iadb.org/en/project/RG-T4766>. Accessed January 22, 2026.

² IDB. “TC Document RG-T4766.” IDB. December 2025. <https://www.iadb.org/en/project/RG-T4766>. Accessed January 22, 2026.

³ IDB. “Selection Process # RG-T4766 TERMS OF REFERENCE.” IDB. December 2025. <https://www.iadb.org/en/project/RG-T4766>. Accessed January 22, 2026.

national authorities, regional organizations, and relevant stakeholders,” there is no explicit consideration of the communities that may be affected by new developments along these corridors. Likewise, while the *Support to Brazil’s New Integration Agenda Project* is designed to support “the development of technical studies and the design of action plans to implement integration corridors,” it does not include activities to identify or mitigate risks to affected communities.

- One of South Connection’s most significant weaknesses is its failure to acknowledge the historical and contextual background of preceding initiatives and programs dating back at least 25 years, including the launch of the Initiative for the Integration of Regional Infrastructure in South America (IIRSA), in which the IDB played a central role. At the time, the IDB released an Action Plan for the [Integration of Regional Infrastructure](#).⁴ South Connection briefly cites three recent documents that constitute its basis: (i) the Mandate of the Presidents of South America, from March 2025; (ii) the Brasilia Consensus, from May 2023; and (iii) the Integration Routes. While Section 1.6 states that South Connection “leverages the IDB Group’s experience in enhancing connectivity across South America,” there are no references to the extensive lessons derived from the [IDB’s own evaluation](#) of IIRSA conducted by the Office of Evaluation and Oversight (OVE).⁵⁶ This evaluation concluded that “the efforts undertaken under IIRSA were not sufficient to improve infrastructure quality and availability indicators or to achieve an improvement in the region’s competitiveness.” Also, it mentions that although IIRSA assembled a large portfolio of infrastructure projects, later evaluations found that many projects mainly served national interests rather than regional integration, lacked clear prioritization, and failed to address regulatory and governance barriers needed to make integration work in practice.
- In addition, there are no references to lessons learned from [research](#) conducted by the Alliance for the Integration and Development of Latin America and the Caribbean (ILAT), which was created by the IDB, CAF, and FONPLATA. An ILAT report analyzing the IIRSA and COSIPLAN initiatives identified imbalances between productive and environmental

⁴ The IDB’s proposal included the establishment of a Technical lessons learned from research conducted by the Technical Coordination Committee (TCC), made up of representatives of the Bank itself, the Andean Development Corporation (CAF), now the Development Bank of Latin America and the Caribbean, and the Financial Fund for the Development of the La Plata Basin (FONPLATA). The Committee’s mandate was to actively assist governments in the implementation and the feasibility of certain projects, and limited civil society participation monitoring of the plan’s development, in areas such as the identification and integrated evaluation of projects and the mobilization of the financial resources necessary for their execution. It also stipulated that, before the end of the year 2000, the TCC would submit proposals “detailing the thematic areas and sectors that would form part of the Plan, indicating the actions considered to be priorities for short-term implementation.

⁵ This includes lessons from IDB’s support for paving of BR-364 highway between Porto Velho and Rio Branco, leading to protests from the movement of rubber-tappers (seringueiros) in Acre, led by Chico Mendes, which eventually led to the PMACI (Programa de Meio Ambiente e Comunidades Indígenas) with mixed results.

⁶ OVE analyzed the 351 projects initially identified under the initiative but found that, among other factors, “the lack of appropriate indicators” prevented a systematic evaluation of their impact on regional integration. It also warned that “countries pursued their integration into the global economy individually, entering into bilateral trade agreements and commitments, which led to global markets being prioritized over intraregional ones.”

interests, the questionable feasibility of some projects, and limited civil society participation. The report also recommends that future integration initiatives should give special consideration to climate impacts and incorporate projects aimed at local development.⁷ By failing to incorporate lessons learned from the IDB's prior engagement on regional infrastructure⁸, South Connection risks repeating well-documented problems, including design and engineering failures, cost overruns, conflicts related to environmental and social rights, escalating deforestation linked to road expansion, poor planning, weak cumulative impact analysis, lack of engagement with civil society and local communities, and governance failures and corruption with cases like "Lavajato"/Odebrecht.

3. Limited integration of environmental and social considerations in South Connection

- Despite proposing large-scale transport, logistics, digital, and energy infrastructure across highly sensitive regions, South Connection devotes limited attention to risks and impacts (only referenced in points 6.16 to 6.18). This suggests that environmental and social factors are being approached as downstream safeguards, rather than as enabling conditions that should inform corridor selection, project design, and eligibility from the outset.
- The document does not reference the [IDB's Sustainable Infrastructure Framework](#), which guides the integration of economic, environmental, social, and institutional sustainability throughout the project cycle. The Framework includes 60 operational criteria that are directly relevant to South Connection's pillar on physical and digital connectivity, yet none of this guidance is incorporated or referenced. This omission weakens South Connection's credibility on sustainability and raises concerns about the IDB's institutional standing, as the institution is not using its own tools to guide sustainable infrastructure planning.
- It is positive that South Connection commits to undertaking Strategic Environmental, Social, and Climate Assessments to identify the impacts and risks associated with regional integration and trade facilitation investments (4.26). However, the document does not specify whether these assessments will include cumulative impact analysis, nor does it anticipate a comprehensive regional assessment. Given the scale of the proposed corridors and the interactions among multiple infrastructure projects, land-use change, and existing socio-environmental pressures, the absence of a strategic assessment of the South Connection's regional scope raises concerns about the adequacy of risk identification and management.

⁷ Barbero, Jose. "La integración física de América del Sur." ILAT. 2024. <https://www.iadb.org/en/project/RG-T3567>. Accessed January 22, 2026.

⁸ See, for example, "The Environmental and Social Impacts of Major IDB-Financed Road Improvement Projects: The Interoceanica IIRSA Sur and IIRSA Norte Highways in Peru." IDB VPS/ESG Technical Note No. IDB - TN 450, November 2012 <https://webimages.iadb.org/publications/english/document/ThClimatee-Environmental-and-Social-Impacts-of-Major-IDB-Financed-Road-Improvement-Projects-The-Interoceanica-IIRSA-Sur-and-IIRSA-Norte-Highways-in-Peru.pdf>

- South Connection’s design does not sufficiently address the need for stronger upstream planning and engagement in the transportation sector. Experience across multilateral development banks, including the IDB, shows that upstream, participatory planning strengthens project pipelines and reduces the risk of misaligned or politically driven investments. Also, it does not clearly provide for early analysis of social and environmental risks, including the cumulative and synergistic impacts of multimodal corridors, or for comparative assessments of alternatives, both of which are critical to robust project design and the early screening of unsuitable options.
- It also remains unclear whether, and to what extent, South Connection will support actions to strengthen territorial governance, such as the recognition of Indigenous Peoples’ and other traditional communities’ land rights, before infrastructure investments, despite the importance of these measures as demonstrated by initiatives such as Amazon Forever.
- In addition, South Connection does not outline clear mechanisms for the timely and effective monitoring of socio-environmental impacts commonly associated with transportation corridors, including land grabbing, deforestation, illegal logging, and mining.
- South Connection does not recognize physical infrastructure as a primary driver of deforestation, particularly in the Amazon, Cerrado, and Chaco regions, nor does it meaningfully engage with this well-documented risk. The term “deforestation” appears only once in the document, in reference to customs processes for certified products (4.17). Infrastructure acts not only as a direct cause of forest loss, but also as a powerful [indirect driver](#) by facilitating agribusiness expansion, cattle ranching, and other large-scale extractive activities that accelerate deforestation frontiers and land-use change. These impacts are often intensified in contexts of weak territorial governance, which are largely overlooked in planning. This omission is particularly concerning given well-established scientific evidence that parts of the Amazon are approaching critical ecological tipping points.
- South Connection does not address land grabbing, narcotrafficking, illegal mining, or other criminal economies that shape territorial dynamics along many of the corridors it may support. The absence of these risk factors omits some of the most critical drivers of social conflict, governance weakness, and environmental degradation in frontier regions. In the context of weak governance, these risks may be exacerbated by South Connection’s focus on transportation infrastructure.
- The IDB states that South Connection will prioritize sustainable infrastructure and references “a *specific fund* to integrate biodiversity and ecosystem services into infrastructure planning” (4.26). However, no information is provided about the Fund, its institutional and governance framework, its objectives, or any other relevant background, including the start date of operations, procedures, funding sources, or timeline.
- South Connection’s limited territorial approach is also reflected in its results framework. The current framework relies on a small set of largely output-focused indicators that do not measure development outcomes or long-term impacts. While the Results Matrix proposes four cross-cutting dimensions and references baseline sources from 2025, these sources are not disclosed, and the six identified indicators, such as the number of

countries or projects, do not assess changes in well-being, social conditions, or environmental outcomes.

4. Insufficient clarity on coordination with other development banks and other IDB regional programs.

- While it's stated that South Connection is intended to complement similar initiatives promoted by other multilateral institutions (1.6), subsequent IDB announcements, including a [new Amazon transport alliance](#) launched at COP 30 with overlapping objectives and different pillars, raise concerns about institutional fragmentation and internal coherence. The document does not clarify how coordination and alignment will be managed across IDB programs or with other development banks, including the World Bank and, potentially, the AIIB⁹. The lack of coordination among other Development Banks investing in integration and connectivity across South America raises concerns about coherence, cumulative impacts, duplication of effort, and the effective governance of all regional integration projects and initiatives.
- Although South Connection states that it will coordinate closely with the Amazon Forever Program (1.8), it does not specify how this coordination will function in practice. As a result, important opportunities to align with Amazon Forever's pillars and territorial priorities, particularly support for community-based bioeconomies, are missed, weakening coherence across the IDB's regional initiatives.

5. Lack of transparency and weak stakeholder engagement in South Connection's design

- Although South Connection frequently refers to "stakeholders," in practice, it limits engagement to governments and private sector actors, with minimal transparency and no meaningful participation by civil society, Indigenous Peoples, Afrodescendants, or traditional communities whose territories and rights may be affected. As a result, community perspectives, priorities, and risks are largely absent from South Connection's design.
- South Connection frames communities as passive beneficiaries rather than rights-holders with decision-making roles, defaulting to a government- and corporate-driven model that has historically generated social conflict. Commitments made by IDB management to take civil society input were not fulfilled, prompting formal requests to the [Board](#) to establish a multi-stakeholder Advisory Panel, following the Amazon Forever precedent.
- The publication of a Stakeholder Engagement Plan methodological approach on October 30 (one month after the South Connection Program document's disclosure) is a positive step toward improving collaboration between South Connection and civil society. However, its effectiveness will be measured by how this plan is implemented. Key elements such as stakeholder mapping, clear engagement processes, and feedback

⁹ Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) expressed intentions of supporting regional transportation initiatives, including the South American Integration Routes, as illustrated by an [MOU](#) signed with the Brazilian National Development Bank (BNDES) in March 2024, and a subsequent [addendum](#) signed in November 2024.

mechanisms remain undefined, undermining accountability, legitimacy, and effective implementation.

- The undersigning organizations held four meetings with the IDB team responsible for South Connection. This team promised a level of engagement and dialogue in the development of this document that was ultimately not fulfilled.¹⁰ Instead of a proposal collaboratively designed with a broad range of stakeholders, this current proposal is the result of discussions solely between IDB management and country-level policymakers (primarily ministers and governors) from the signatory countries, along with select private-sector actors. As a result, civil society sent a [letter](#) to the IDB Board of Directors requesting that the IDB Group open a formal process of engagement.
- In August, the IDB approved the Technical Cooperation “[Design of Sustainable Development Corridors in South America](#)” to support the implementation of South Connection. However, the terms of reference restrict engagement to information dissemination and do not provide for the meaningful participation of civil society, Indigenous Peoples, or local communities in shaping corridor design, risk assessment, or decision-making.

6. Strong reliance on Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) and private sector-led development

- South Connection places strong and unexamined emphasis on private sector leadership, particularly through PPPs and concession models, presenting them as inherently efficient without providing evidence or acknowledging their documented governance, fiscal, and social risks. It does not assess well-known challenges associated with PPPs, including weakened public oversight, opaque renegotiations, risk transfers to governments, and social conflict, despite the scale and strategic importance of the proposed infrastructure. The heavy focus on mobilizing private capital and regulatory reforms, coupled with limited attention to public accountability and community interests, raises concerns about power imbalances, long-term risk allocation, and the enforceability of safeguards, particularly under originate-to-share financing models.
- Regarding the economic impact of PPP financing, PPPs shift the cost of infrastructure from general taxation to user fees. In countries with high levels of informality and limited fiscal space, this can make projects more financially viable. However, when infrastructure operates as a natural monopoly or provides essential services directly to consumers, such as toll roads, relying on user fees can create pricing distortions and raise equity concerns.
- South Connection also repeatedly references the need for “regulatory reforms that facilitate private investment and reinforce market competitiveness” (3.26). There are 35

¹⁰ Members of the IDB Working Group meet four times with the team developing the proposal, one in December 2024, then in March 2025 in the Annual Meetings and after that two other times in May and October 2025. In the three first meetings there were commitments on the side of the IDB to share the draft of the South Connection Program proposal with us for comments. Unfortunately, that didn’t happen and we sent the [letter](#) to the IDB Board urging for more transparency and information around South Connection.

references to private capital, compared with only 12 to government and 6 to communities. This imbalance reveals a development vision in which private actors wield disproportionate influence over public institutions and affected populations, raising questions about accountability, public-interest protections, and the long-term distribution of benefits and costs.

7. Limited clarity and transparency on project pipeline and selection criteria

- South Connection adopts a broadly defined, demand-driven, and flexible approach to project selection (4.4; 6.2), but provides little clarity on how projects will be prioritized to genuinely advance regional integration and be environmentally and socially compatible with the IDB's goals. The absence of clear selection criteria and a transparent project pipeline creates a risk that South Connection becomes an open-ended umbrella for infrastructure investments, regardless of their viability, impacts, or added value.
- For example, it remains unclear whether South Connection will support the five corridors identified in the Brazilian Consensus “Routes of Integration”, especially considering that the IDB signed a [cooperation agreement](#) with other regional development financial institutions (including CAF, Fonplata, and BNDES), committing up to \$10 billion to mobilize support for the Routes of Integration initiative.
- South Connection does not anticipate conducting assessments to analyze the technical or financial viability of proposed projects, nor does it require analysis of expected benefits or potential alternatives. Without such studies, there is a significant risk of promoting road corridors with limited or unproven demand that do not justify the investment, while overlooking alternatives with lower financial costs or fewer social and environmental impacts. A preliminary study published by the [Federal University of Minas Gerais](#) warns of the risks associated with several trans-Amazonian routes included in the Routes of Integration.
- South Connection also states that a marker (or flag) was created to identify operations aligned with South Connection and applied to the active portfolio and project pipeline. However, several projects already approved or in the pipeline that fall within the thematic scope of South Connection do not carry this marker.¹¹ This makes it difficult to understand which specific operations are currently part of South Connection and how the alignment process works in practice.

8. Amazon-related concerns

- South Connection's approach to digital connectivity in the Amazon relies primarily on large-scale, land-based infrastructure rather than lower-impact alternatives such as satellite systems. This emphasis on terrestrial and cross-border corridors risks triggering migration, land grabbing, and conflict-driven colonization, and could extend infrastructure

¹¹ For example, [Plan Maestro Regional de Integración y Desarrollo del Corredor Bioceánico de Capricornio \(PM-CBC\)](#), el [Programa de conectividad territorial e integración de la región occidental del Paraguay: Ruta Bioceánica](#), y el [Diseño de Corredores de Desarrollo Sostenible en América del Sur](#)

into ecologically sensitive areas, including major river systems, with potentially severe impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem integrity.

- There are no substantive references to Indigenous Peoples, Afrodescendants, or other traditional communities as drivers of interregional development. The absence of Amazonian bioeconomies is especially notable, as they are a core component of the IDB's Amazon Forever Program. This lack of alignment signals internal inconsistency between the IDB's regional programs.
- It is concerning that South Connection frames the Amazon as a "physical barrier" (3.7), a perspective that contradicts its own references to nature-based solutions, resilience, and ecosystem conservation. If this framing is not corrected, it risks repeating past mistakes where road construction was prioritized as a way to "break through" the supposed barrier, with the resulting socioenvironmental impacts minimized as collateral costs.
- While South Connection references low-carbon energy systems, section A.4.8 places particular emphasis on energy connectivity, which is closely linked to the expansion of transmission lines and large dams in the Amazon, both of which have well-documented negative environmental and social impacts. South Connection should instead prioritize stand-alone generation, which is better suited to rural contexts and more effective in supporting bioeconomy initiatives and economic diversification in the Amazon.

Recommendations

1. Review and update the South Connection Program Document to reflect the observations and concerns raised. Revise the South Connection Program Document to incorporate the analysis and recommendations outlined above, rebalancing its development vision toward local and territorial priorities. The updated document should clearly define how community-based and Indigenous-led bioeconomies, public services, and territorial development pathways will be supported alongside regional integration objectives.

2. Update, integrate, and apply the IDB's Sustainable Infrastructure Framework. South Connection should explicitly adopt the [IDB's Sustainable Infrastructure Framework](#) to guide planning, project selection, and monitoring, applying its economic, social, environmental, and institutional principles throughout the project cycle. The IDB Sustainable Infrastructure Framework should also be updated to align with best international practices.

3. Establish an independent Advisory Panel. Establish an Advisory Panel composed of representatives from Indigenous and Afrodescendant movements, women and campesinos, affected communities, civil society organizations, and the scientific community. This panel should have a formal mandate to support strategic program design and provide oversight of project monitoring and evaluation. The Amazon Forever Program provides a clear precedent and demonstrates the value of a multi-stakeholder advisory body.

4. Define and publicly disclose project selection criteria before approving additional operations. Develop a clear, public set of criteria for project selection, in consultation with stakeholders and the Advisory Panel, to guide which projects and corridors qualify for South Connection. Prioritization should not rely solely on responding to project demand; it should also incorporate explicit territorial and portfolio-level criteria. Infrastructure corridors generate cumulative and synergistic impacts that cannot be adequately assessed at the single-project level. Supporting upstream planning and adopting a landscape or portfolio perspective (ensuring coherence across corridors and evaluating cumulative environmental and social pressures) would reduce the risk of fragmented investments that, individually, appear viable but, collectively, generate significant territorial impacts.

5. Develop and implement a meaningful stakeholder engagement plan. There should be early, timely, open, informed, accessible, and continuous dialogue and consultation with civil society, Indigenous Peoples, Afrodescendant groups, and the traditional communities who are likely to be affected by South Connection. Prioritize joint design and formulation with communities and civil society from the outset. Engagement should cover South Connection's goals, theory of change, components, priorities, and potential projects or corridors.

6. Apply robust requirements and participatory methodologies in the Strategic Environmental and Social Assessments (SESA). Conduct SESA grounded in robust sectoral planning, including comparative analysis of alternatives across social, environmental, and economic dimensions. SESA should guide project identification and prioritization based on a complete project portfolio. Assessments must evaluate cumulative and indirect impacts across infrastructure types; incorporate regional scenario modelling for the Amazon, Andes, and Southern Cone; integrate climate risk, deforestation, and land-use change projections; assess alternative corridor configurations; and analyze interactions with organized crime and land grabbing. SESA processes should be developed through meaningful participation of civil society, academia, and affected communities.

7. Make diversification and smart specialization explicit in program objectives. Link connectivity investments to locally anchored, higher value-added, and less land-intensive economic activities that reduce ecosystem pressure and frontier expansion. To avoid reinforcing structural dependence on extractive and high-impact sectors, South Connection should pair infrastructure investments with a clear strategy for productive diversification, local enterprise development, sustainable value chains, and community-based bioeconomy models that strengthen territorial economies.

8. Incorporate “no-go” areas and ecological thresholds. Integrate clear “no-go” criteria and ecological thresholds into program eligibility and corridor planning requirements. The Advisory Panel could support the development and periodic review of these criteria.

9. Integrate criminal risk prevention and governance safeguards into corridor planning.

Given the demonstrated link between infrastructure and the expansion of illegal mining, narcotrafficking, and land grabbing, corridor and project design must integrate criminal risk mapping, defender protection measures, anti-corruption safeguards, and transparent procurement requirements into corridor design.

10. Adopt a PPP risk framework before expanding PPP use. Before expanding the use of PPPs, South Connection should adopt a risk framework that includes the assessment and evaluation of social and environmental benefits; independent fiscal risk analysis for governments; minimum track record requirements for concessionaires; mandatory disclosure of contract renegotiations; and screening for social conflict risks.

11. Develop a sector-specific approach to PPPs. Prioritize PPPs in commercially viable infrastructure such as freight corridors, ports, and transmission lines, while applying greater caution in services that directly affect households and individual users.

12. Align South Connection with the Amazon Forever Program. Develop and disclose an action plan that clearly outlines how the two programs will coordinate and collaborate, and clarify institutional responsibilities for coordination. The plan should include criteria to prevent contradictions and promote consistent territorial, environmental, and social approaches across the two regional programs, prioritizing community bioeconomy.

13. Provide information about the fund for integrating biodiversity into infrastructure planning. Disclose governance structure, operational manual, allocation criteria, funding sources, timelines, and monitoring mechanisms of the proposed biodiversity integration fund.

14. Integrate a risk approach to gender-based violence (GBV). Address GBV risks throughout South Connection, particularly in large-scale infrastructure projects near marginalized communities. While South Connection commits to increasing women's workforce participation, it does not address the heightened risk of GBV associated with worker influx. The IDB should require borrowers to incorporate specific GBV risk mitigation and SEA/H prevention measures into procurement and contractor requirements for infrastructure projects.

15. Strengthen the results framework and develop outcome-oriented indicators. South Connection should reinforce the monitoring dimension. South Connection would benefit from adopting a multi-level monitoring architecture distinguishing between: (i) project execution; (ii) service access and quality improvements; (iii) socio-environmental externalities such as deforestation, migration, and conflict; and (iv) long-term economic and territorial impacts. This would shift the emphasis from outputs to measurable development outcomes and improve accountability.