

Executive Summary

Building ecosystems to transform the economy

A case study on strategies
to support the care agenda
in Latin America

Suggested citation: ELA (2026). *Building ecosystems to transform the economy: a case study on strategies to support the care agenda in Latin America*.

This investigation was conducted by the consultants Aileen Allen and Paula Magariños, with the review and contributions of Natalia Gherardi, Julieta Izcurdia, Delfina Schenone Sienra and Laura Pautassi from ELA - Equipo Latinoamericano de Justicia y Género (Latin American Justice and Gender Team). The team would like to express their gratitude for the valuable feedback from Gaby Oré Aguilar (Philanthropic Advisor) and Carolina Robino (IDRC Senior Program Specialist, Economies and Justice) to an earlier version of this report.

This study was developed with the support of the Wellspring Philanthropic Fund and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC). The opinions expressed in this document do not necessarily represent those of Wellspring, IDRC or its Board of Governors and are the sole responsibility of ELA.

English translation: Lía Díaz, 2026.

Foreword

Latin America faces a profound paradox. On the one hand, it is a region that has made significant regulatory and institutional advances in women's rights over the past three decades and drives a transformative care and support agenda. On the other hand, this progress coexists with persistent structural inequalities, a disproportionate overload of domestic and unpaid care work that continues to fall on women and a context of increasing political backlash, weakening community participation spheres, and enforcing budgetary constraints aimed, particularly, at public policies for gender equality.

Collaboration among academia, civil society, feminist activism, and advocacy spaces has driven a participatory process that recognized care as a human right. Today, that process is under threat. These threats become a major political retreat from gender equality since they not only drive cultural changes to the detriment of women's agency, but they also affect society as a whole while questioning the role of the State providing for it and setting forth rules.

We know that building comprehensive care systems is understood as an indispensable social infrastructure for development and life sustainability. However, funding remains a central challenge in moving in that direction. Beyond overcoming budget fragmentation and the lack of structural integration into the national fiscal framework, it requires building a political consensus that can envision a truly transformative alternative and amplify the voices of those leading that change.

As part of the learning process motivated by the discontinuity of funding from the Wellspring Philanthropic Fund, the Economic Justice portfolio of the Women's Rights Program invited ELA to carry out a study proposal aimed at documenting the impact of one of its strategies called "ecosystem approach". This strategy aimed to strengthen and/or build an ecosystem or interconnected network of organizations, groups and institutions that converged collaborating or complementing each other in an effort to transform economies through the care agenda in Latin America. In order to continue the reflection process facilitated by this study and in recognition of the alignment and complementarity of objectives between Wellspring and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) in strengthening organizations working on the care agenda in the region, IDRC collaborated with this study.

The study proposal prepared by ELA was approved by both funders. Initial consultations were held with the persons responsible for the aforementioned institutions, Gaby Oré Aguilar, Senior Program Officer of Wellspring Philanthropic Fund, Carolina Robino, Senior Program Specialist of IDRC, and Laura Pautassi, President of our organization.

ELA considered it was urgent and necessary to promote a reflection on the financing model required to address the challenges of the region and the care agenda. The report published here demonstrates that feminist economic transformation requires radical change not just in public policy, but also in philanthropic and international cooperation practices.

Cooperation and philanthropy have often operated under a traditional fragmented approach: project-bound interventions, metrics for measuring concrete results, predetermined priorities, and a dynamic that favors competition among organizations themselves for scarce resources. This logic limits the ability to impact structural determinants of inequality by forcing civil society entities, academic institutions, and agencies to focus on executing on-time activities rather than designing long-range sustainable strategies.

In response to this limitation, the reflection we share in this report centers on an ecosystem approach to funding, drawing on our conversations with Wellspring counterparts and extending somewhat beyond them. It is precisely because we recognize the collaborative nature of building feminist agendas that the interviews we conducted for this study reflect the work not only of the grantee institutions of the Wellspring Philanthropic Fund's Women's Rights Program, but also of other actors and of the opportunities that emerged from dialogue, collaboration, and trust-building. This paradigm stems from the premise that social and economic problems do not exist in isolation, but within complex and interdependent systems. Funding under an ecosystem logic involves going beyond the support of individual projects to finance complete fields and systems (field building), intertwining the social and political fabric that makes systemic change possible.

Reflecting on the ecosystem approach in the care and tax justice agenda requires embracing core principles that transform philanthropic practice. First, it is important to understand the indivisibility between the care and tax justice agendas since universal systems of care cannot be consolidated without ensuring sustainable public resources. The ecosystem approach has enabled the feminist movement to actively connect with tax justice networks, framing progressive tax reforms and the review of public spending as enabling conditions to guarantee the human right to care. Second, it is also important to highlight the value of flexible, institutional, and long-term funding (core support): structural changes unfold over long-range time horizons. Having institutional funds, not restricted to specific activities, allows organizations to consolidate cross-functional teams, strengthen their operational infrastructure and react in an agile manner to unforeseen windows of political opportunity. Third, a key aspect is giving value to the diversity of actors and complementarity of roles: a healthy ecosystem simultaneously requires the production of academic evidence, community and

grassroots mobilization, legal advocacy in human rights and technical “translation” work before Ministries of Economy and Finance. It is not feasible to expect a single entity to fulfill all functions, and that is why ecosystem funding catalyzes synergies between civil society, academia, unions and intergovernmental bodies which, based on trust-built cooperation, can be able to sustain the specifics of a collective effort. Finally, in this scheme, funders do much more than contribute funds. They become a facilitator who weaves opportunities, an actor who generates spaces for articulation, respects the autonomy of the movements of the Global South, and promotes peer-to-peer collaboration.

The evidence documented in this publication demonstrates the effectiveness of the model. Coordinated work among diverse actors, supported by Wellspring Philanthropic Fund’s Women’s Rights Program and IDRC, among other key funders to the agenda, contributed to mark significant milestones. These include the Buenos Aires Commitment (2022), the Tlatelolco Commitment (2025), the placing of feminist care proposals on the agenda at the Fourth International Conference on Financing for Development (FFD4) in Seville, the Advisory Opinion OC-31/25 of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights and the uptake of feminist narratives on tax justice in multilateral negotiations.

However, the report points to a crucial warning about ecosystem sustainability. Processes such as changes in some foundations’ priorities, dissolution of programs, or contraction of international cooperation evidence the vulnerability of the field when the ecosystem approach rests in informal joint work or in the will of program officials who do not become institutionalized. To protect the achievements achieved against conservative backlash, it is imperative to institutionalize funder partnerships, diversify philanthropic funds, and maintain the political purpose of funding as a sustained commitment over time.

Our own journey as a civil society organization with more than two decades of history in Argentina and the region has shown us that organizations do not act in isolation but are part of a fabric of shared relationships, alliances and capabilities that enable collective advocacy. Investing in that ecosystem involves funding long-term processes and creating conditions for organizations to adapt, innovate, and sustain their work beyond a specific project.

From this perspective, the strengthening of civil society organizations, academic institutions and social movements ceases to be an accessory derivative component of international and philanthropic cooperation to become a democratic defense strategy. It means strengthening the ability of societies to produce knowledge, dispute narratives, defend rights, and build collective responses facing inequality. Ultimately, strengthening the fabric of civil society is not just an investment in organizations, it is an investment in the resilience of democracies and the possibility of sustaining long-term social transformations.

Therefore, reflecting on the funding of care is not a purely technical matter; it is an eminently political debate about the distribution of power, resources and social value of care and support in our societies. The case study presented in this report is a valuable and inspiring guide for funders, social organizations and public decision-makers to go beyond fragmentation and bet decisively on the health of collaborative ecosystems, placing the sustainability of life and tax justice at the heart of Latin American social, economic and political transformation.

I want to express our deep appreciation to Gaby Oré Aguilar and Carolina Robino for their drive and inspiration to conduct this study, as well as to all the people and organizations who generously collaborated by contributing their reflections in the interviews with the ELA team.

We have an opportunity before us: this report shows that backing an ecosystem approach that nurtures processes delivers deep, lasting, and systemic outcomes. We are confident that these reflections will contribute to sustain long-term commitments by philanthropic organizations and the international community, enabling the consolidation of that ecosystem and contributing more strongly to face adverse situations, such as backlash against the gender agenda, economic crises, the growing closure of the civic space and the deployment of authoritative trends in the democracies of the region and at the global level.

Natalia Gherardi

Executive Director
ELA - Latin American Justice and Gender Team

1. Study objectives

The study aims to document an innovative funding case and draw lessons from the experiences of grantees and other funders and partners. It shows how, and to what extent, the ecosystem approach helped bring together diverse perspectives (civil society organizations, academia, intergovernmental bodies, and social movements) to advance a comprehensive care funding agenda in Latin America, in an interconnected way and at multiple levels. Given that Wellspring and IDRC have carried out coordinated care funding efforts in the region, the study analyzes the synergies between the teams of both organizations and draws on the views of other funders and key actors.

The primary objective of the study is to nurture the debate on transformative funding strategies in the context of economic constraints, by providing evidence and recommendations that strengthen the action of civil society organizations and the articulation between diverse actors for the achievement of common goals.

The findings contribute to informing funder decisions to ensure more efficient and effective investment of resources and enhance their impact. This case study has the potential to illustrate how the ecosystem approach can foster shared visions for economic transformation, while safeguarding the specific agendas and priorities of organizations that contribute to the advancement of the care agenda.

2. Main findings

Shared experiences in interviews allow for an approach to the reflections of diverse institutions that, taken together, offer a set of findings that can be grouped into three large areas: those relating to the design and operation of the ecosystem; those relating to the impact on the care funding agenda and those on the tensions generated by the context and how the ecosystem approach can address them.

2.1. About ecosystem design and operation

Finding 1: Funders and grantees conceptualize and experience the ecosystem approach in a differentiated way.

While funders view it as a high-level strategic framework for institutional efficiency and systemic change, grantee organizations experience it primarily

through the practical flexibility and quality of relationships it promotes. Moreover, the vast majority of grantees were not familiar with the term nor necessarily knew that the program under which they received a donation had adopted this approach as a pillar of their theory of change to position gender as a key element of systemic economic transformation. Only three grantees conceive the ecosystem as such. However, it was clear from the interviews that they experienced it. Their experiences with donation broadly matches the desired effect with the adoption of an ecosystem approach. They perceived the strategy not as a theory, but as a series of natural synergies and confluences in which they worked alongside allies who also received funding from the same partners. Responses to the open-ended questions in the survey reinforce the idea that the value of the ecosystem approach was practically experienced. The organizations highlight the possibility of cross-sector coordination, accessing regional and global spaces, connecting civil society, academia, and governments, and strengthening peer lessons. Although several organizations do not identify the approach by name, they do recognize effects associated with collaboration, network opening, and building common agendas.

Finding 2: The ecosystem approach contributed significantly to generating synergies and bringing together visions.

Financing a constellation of actors from an ecosystem approach reduced competition for resources and fostered coordinated action that allowed for the alignment of objectives without imposing a unique agenda. Synergies were expressed in convergence in advocacy networks and the unification of narratives. Coordinated action was mentioned in global tax debates between ecosystem-funded organizations and their contribution to agendas such as the principles of human rights in fiscal policy being adopted by agencies such as the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. In addition, the articulation between ecosystem grantees allowed organizations to reach milestones such as the Fourth International Conference on Financing for Development (FFD4) held in Seville (2025) with an integrated narrative, joining forces rather than making a separate impact. Similarly, the synchronicity of coordinated action between ecosystem actors contributed to hit another milestone in the area of care and tax justice such as the Buenos Aires Commitment (2022). Cross-sector synergies were also enabled by facilitating the care agenda to converge with other fields, such as climate justice and labor rights, granting access to technical spaces with gender narratives.

Finding 3: The flexibility of donations works as a catalyst for agendas.

Flexible funding allowed grantees to cover core costs (such as coordination, salaries, and leadership development), which make it possible to sustain the substantive work stemming from their mandates and “fertilize the soil” for reaching the intended milestones. Because of their flexibility, these funds and the rapid response mechanism allowed organizations to take advantage of unexpected political opportunity windows, such as discussions generated by the COVID-19 pandemic, to drive the care and tax justice agenda. In this sense, for example, Wellspring provided additional resources to the Gender and Trade Network to ensure the participation of social organizations during preparatory events in Bogotá towards the Ministerial Summit of the Regional Platform for Tax Cooperation in Latin America and the Caribbean (PT-LAC) in Cartagena (2023).

Finding 4: Collective action among funders was spontaneous rather than a result of institutional agreements.

The ecosystem approach analyzed relies heavily on people, their connection and trust-building capacity. At the design stage of the Gender and Rights in Economics strategy, there were conversations between funders to learn about different project strategies and portfolios, detect funding gaps and possible complementarities. Throughout their implementation, regional and global forums were used to exchange information and identify opportunities for collaboration. Trust and rapport among the parties were important in moving those dialogues forward, which the funders interviewed described, in some cases, as rather occasional. The alignment between funders and generated synergies is based on the links between the people who lead them and they grow with the connection of vision and good linkage between program officials, which can be transformed into strong institutional frameworks in cooperation. The institutionalization of the approach is key so as not to rely exclusively on individual will, but to integrate it as a way of operating funder institutions.

Finding 5: There is space to promote greater coordination among funders by holding meetings for horizontal sharing and learning.

Given the centrality of cross-sector work among ecosystem actors as a key part of the ecosystem approach, global and regional spaces (such as the Commission on the Status of Women, CSW, and regional women’s conferences) were leveraged to facilitate gatherings among grantees. Their support also made that coordination possible as the grantees prioritized their projects, or through the rapid response

mechanism. For example, different feminist networks and tax justice movements were invited by the ECLAC to participate in parallel events organized during the Regional Conferences on Women. Also, the ECLAC authorities attended the first meeting of the Regional Platform for Tax Cooperation in Latin America and the Caribbean (PT-LAC) held in Cartagena (2023) with the participation of several networks of feminist economists. However, except for its support to the creation of a regional exchange platform by Oxfam (launched in June 2026), specially designed meetings were not scheduled or funded for this topic. At this point, it is important to find a balance between avoiding the overload of the grantees with funder proposals, with the interest of such grantees in having spaces to exchange and learn from other organizations, an aspect that was highlighted by most of the grantees interviewed.

2.2. About the impact on the care funding agenda

Finding 6: Public policy and regulatory advances were made with regard to care and tax justice.

Two key spaces that have allowed for the advancement of the care and tax justice agenda have been the Regional Conference on Women in Latin America and the Caribbean (organized by the ECLAC in coordination with UN Women); and the Fourth International Conference on Financing for Development (FFD4). In particular, the conferences in Buenos Aires (2022) and Tlatelolco (2025) succeeded in having progressive tax reforms to finance care included in the commitments adopted. For example, this led ECLAC's Division for Gender Affairs to provide technical assistance to the Chilean government, at its request, to incorporate a gender perspective into the budget. The IDWF helped secure ratifications of ILO Convention 190 and legal reforms in several countries. The grantees also contributed to the process leading to Advisory Opinion OC-31/25 of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights affirming the status of care as a right. Moreover, FFD4 drove the inclusion of care funding as part of the commitments in Seville, contributing to putting care at the center of the global development funding agenda.

Finding 7: Alternative narratives gained traction in the public debate.

The interviewees recognize that narratives favorable to care have made significant headway in public debate. For example, GI-ESCR brought gender and tax into public debate with strong technical grounding, helping to shape the negotiations for the United Nations Framework Convention on International Tax

Cooperation.¹ The Gender and Trade Network succeeded in putting a feminist proposal for funding care on the agenda of global forums such as FFD4. Another remarkable outcome was GI-ESCR coordination with other organizations to bring the fiscal policy agenda to the IACHR, which helped ensure that several human rights organizations are now working on this issue. Similarly, the Gender and Trade Network helped advance the care agenda in various countries. In Brazil, for example, where the issue was not initially on the radar, this was possible thanks to research and coordination work supported through the ecosystem. For these organizations, results are not merely specific outputs but cumulative progress on this agenda.

Finding 8: Grantees were institutionally strengthened by being able to consolidate their teams and agendas, and to raise the profile of gender-related issues and/or areas of work.

The more institutional and strategic nature of the support provided to organizations aimed at enhancing the work they have been doing for years enabled them to consolidate their teams and work areas. For example, ACIJ expanded and consolidated its team for the area of gender-sensitive budgeting, and ILEX Acción Jurídica could consolidate a multidisciplinary team and hire specialized profiles, such as a quantitative economist, improving the organization's skills in statistical visibility and data analysis. In the case of the IDWF, the support strengthened the federation's financial resilience during the pandemic, allowing it to maintain its global administrative infrastructure and, in turn, to closely monitor implementation so that regulatory advances do not remain a "dead letter". In the case of the ECLAC, the support allowed the hiring of technical specialists who gave the Division for Gender Affairs muscle to influence the areas of economic development. Strengthening the Division's technical teams enabled it to provide more technical assistance. It also opened doors within ECLAC to advance the care and tax justice agenda in other divisions, extending its reach to a wider range of actors, especially those involved in shaping macroeconomic policy in the region.

¹ The United Nations Framework Convention on International Tax Cooperation is an ongoing initiative (2025-2027) for the development of a binding global treaty for tax governance. The Convention's main purpose is to shift international tax rulemaking from the OECD to the UN, with a focus on taxing multinational corporations, tackling tax havens, and taxing digital services.

Finding 9: Alliances and collective action groups were formed or strengthened.

The ecosystem approach promoted the formation and strengthening of alliances and collective action between different actors. ILEX Acción Jurídica, for example, could access the national network of fiscal policy organizations, providing an ethnic and gender perspective that was previously absent, and organizations such as Latindadd and ICRICT of the tax justice movement formed an alliance with the feminist movement. It also allowed GI-ESCR to have political participation in alliances and to be part of advocacy opportunities free from the constraints of a specific program. Networks such as the Gender and Trade Network and the Global Alliance for Care were also strengthened. As noted above, this made it possible to reach milestones such as bringing a unified narrative on care funding to FFD4 in Seville. According to the survey, most grantees agree the main achievement made possible with support was creating new networks or strengthening existing ones to advance a common agenda.

2.3. About the tensions arising from the context

Finding 10: Ecosystem sustainability depends on conditions that still need to be strengthened.

Wellspring dissolution process, even when done ensuring transitional support as an exit strategy, generated uncertainty as to the continuity of the work agenda, as well as in terms of the gap generated from losing a partner with technical knowledge, strategic vision, and great cooperation capacity among diverse actors.

3. Key learnings

3.1. Political and strategic drive

Synergies do not happen by chance, but by deliberate design. To achieve systemic change, the funder must go beyond the role of a funding provider and function as a strategic weaver or broker of knowledge, identifying gaps and connecting actors who, although operating in the same field, do not always collaborate spontaneously. The ecosystem vision should be a pillar of institutional change theory and not merely an administrative accessory.

3.2. Financing logic and flexibility

The most important lesson is the need to fund processes, not just the final output. For “fruits” (laws or policies) to grow, philanthropy must “fertilize the soil” through flexible, multi-year funding (*core support*) that sustains the invisible day-to-day work: staff salaries, operational infrastructure, governance, and leadership development. This type of support enables organizations to innovate and respond nimbly to unforeseen windows of political opportunity, as was the case during the pandemic.

3.3. Role management and language translation

As in nature, a system thrives only when each role is respected and valued. When every actor tries to play the same role, the whole system collapses. A key lesson from this agenda has been the effectiveness of “translation”: relying on actors who convert social and feminist demands into technical macroeconomic proposals that Ministries of Economy and Finance can act on, thereby strengthening the technical legitimacy of the care agenda.

Volatile philanthropic funding and siloed work can undermine both the implementation and the sustainability of an ecosystem approach. Responsible and coordinated exit strategies between funders are paramount to prevent the withdrawal of a key funder—who understands the ecosystem—from affecting the network infrastructure already built, particularly considering that other funders tend to favor isolated projects over collective processes. Similarly, sustainability depends on breaking down silos within foundations (for example, separate climate, economic, and gender agendas) and reducing reliance on the goodwill of individual program officers through institutional frameworks for collaboration.

4. Recommendations

4.1 For funders

→ Provide flexible, multi-year, long-term funding

Modify funding logic is key, moving away from the aid to short-term projects to support long-term processes that contribute to systemic changes. In other words, institutional funding should be unrestricted for at least five years, in order to strengthen fields of work and not just to support organizations in isolation. In addition, flexibility in resource utilization is important because it

allows adjustments to be made in response to changes in context and innovation without the pressure to yield immediate results. Short funding cycles and accountability frameworks geared toward short-term results make teamwork difficult and hinder the capacity-building strategies that an ecosystem approach requires.

→ **Respect the autonomy of social movements**

In relation with the importance of flexible and long-term support, it is equally important in supporting processes to respect the autonomy of movements and avoid the philanthropic tendency to impose agendas that distract them from existing organic work. Reading the room in strategic and political terms regarding context and the field of action is also important.

→ **Fund the entire field: research, political advocacy, movements and infrastructure**

Funders should resist the temptation to specialize or focus on a single type of intervention. An ecosystem requires simultaneous investment in knowledge production, technical advocacy, political pressure, community organization, and coordination infrastructure. Removing any of these components weakens the entire system. In that sense, some actors noted with concern a tendency among funders to withdraw from research funding in particular.

→ **Break down silos within funding organizations**

Funders must be restructured internally to break down their siloed practices. It is contradictory to ask grantees to work collaboratively while funders keep rigid thematic divisions, which makes it hard to have the open conversations that lead to more holistic perspectives. These rigid divisions, for example, between gender justice, economic justice, climate action, and labor rights reproduce the fragmentation that the ecosystem approach aims to overcome.

→ **Act as intermediary, connector and facilitator**

Beyond funding, funders can put their convening power, access to information, big-picture vision, and relationships with governments and multilateral organizations to work by opening doors, connecting actors who would not otherwise meet, and facilitating South-South learning exchanges. In order to achieve this, two things are important: on the one hand, train program officers to act as facilitators and catalysts, who know how to listen to the needs of those who lead these processes (rather than being program managers focused on delivering immediate results); and, on the other hand, finance and generate meeting spaces to promote greater connections, exchanges and learnings between actors, understanding that these operate as enabling factors for the ecosystem.

→ **Transcend individual leadership and institutionalize ecosystem approach**

Formalize the ecosystem approach as an institutional strategy—with documented protocols, agreements between funders, and shared learning systems—so it does not rely on individual program officer vision or networks. This would contribute to the appropriation of the ecosystem approach at the institutional level and facilitate coordination and collaboration between funders, beyond the individual will or personal inclination of those who temporarily hold a position.

→ **Sustain commitment amid backlash and funding contraction**

Counterintuitive as it may seem, sustained philanthropic engagement is most needed precisely when the political climate turns against progress. Funders must resist the temptation to divert resources from difficult contexts or counterhegemonic agendas because it is the predictability of that support that contributes to greater resilience against the risk of agenda setbacks.

→ **Consider co-funding strategies**

It is important to maintain an open dialogue among funders to foster greater cooperation and explore alternative funding models. For example, funders could consider creating a “collaborative funding pool” or consortium in which each funder contributes according to its technical expertise (such as evidence or support to governments) so that civil society organizations do not get caught up in **competition for resources**. These funding pools could also be created to leverage resources in a context of declining funds. In that sense, the Gender Just Economy Collaborative powered by Wellspring, Open Society Foundations, the Ford Foundation, and the Hewlett Foundation globally are a good example in that direction.

→ **Add more funders**

It is important to expand participation to new funders with whom there may be some thematic and focus convergence on their funding strategies. For example, a peer mobilization strategy could be implemented, where philanthropy attracts more funders to this agenda. In that sense, it is important to reconfigure the narrative for new actors to participate in the system, simplifying the complexity of certain themes so that points of agreement can be identified more effectively.

→ **Support organizations in the Global South**

Channel resources and convening power towards knowledge produced in and by organizations in the Global South. It would be important to partner directly with Global South institutions, rather than relying on Global North researchers to lead projects in the Global South, and to foster South-South exchange that connects

the experiences of Latin America with those of Africa and Asia. This scenario would also favor better alignment with the real needs of the organizations that lead the work.

→ **Keep advancing strategic alignment between the care agenda and other policy agendas**

The care agenda provides clear points of contact not only with the tax justice agenda, but also with other agendas, such as climate change and territory defense, disability, union, and feminist urbanism, among others. It is important to consider joining forces with these other actors in an ecosystem approach based on the objectives to be pursued. In particular, linking the care economy agenda with climate finance and just transition debates seems strategic, not only because of the deep intersection between the care and climate crises, but also because most of the philanthropic and public funding currently available is channeled through climate frameworks.

4.2. For ecosystem organizations

→ **Strengthen dialogue capabilities with tax, economic and multi-lateral actors**

This conversation is key to advancing care and tax justice agenda. Access to the spaces and actors that shape economic policy, together with the ability to sustain technical and political debate from a feminist and tax justice perspective, helps lend legitimacy to these agendas among a broader range of decision-makers.

→ **Strengthen alliances**

Sustaining a continuous dialogue that allows us to build trust and convergence of visions and narratives is important to advance in the fabric of alliances that benefit both feminist and tax justice movements. This also makes it possible, in turn, to broaden the range of actors and gradually build alliances with other movements relevant to the care agenda, such as the environmental and disability rights movements.

→ **Strengthen advocacy strategies**

Strengthen the real impact capacity of feminist organizations in the face of civic space contraction and democratic retreats in the region.

→ **Preserve the transformative essence of the feminist agenda**

In the gender mainstreaming process, it is important to have a gender perspective in technical spaces, such as those discussing tax and macroeconomic policies to

shield the transformative, systemic change content proposed by the feminist political agenda. There is always a risk that this transformative dimension will be diluted in debates and negotiations, especially when agreements are reached. Progress towards a care society supported by progressive tax policies is a systemic shift in the economy.

→ **Prioritize public funding of care policies**

Thematically, it would be important to prioritize public funding of care systems by advocating with governments so that they recognize that care is a sound investment and that they have a legal obligation to allocate resources to guarantee the right to care, in accordance with Advisory Opinion OC-31/25 of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. In times of population structure changes, forms of family organization, resource shortages, and economic system crises, among other aspects, it is key for governments to respond to the care crisis from a gender and intersectional approach.

5. Conclusions

The value of the ecosystem approach to economic transformation lies in its ability to move beyond the logic of isolated projects and help build a broad social and political base capable of challenging entrenched ideas about macroeconomics. Through the intentional articulation of diverse actors, a convergence of visions and strategies was promoted to drive the advancement of a comprehensive agenda for the funding of care in the region, in an interconnected manner and at multiple levels. Evidence confirms that this approach has contributed to care and tax justice not only being taken as sectoral issues and being more present in discussions about an economic transformation that gives centrality to the sustainability of life in the region.

Beyond this specific agenda, the value of the ecosystem approach for other issues of the feminist agenda and its adoption by philanthropic organizations committed to women's rights and gender equality is evident, especially in the current context of diminished resources of cooperation and persistence of the backlash.



www.ela.org.ar



Promoviendo derechos
para la igualdad de género