Reporting Agency: UNDP Country: Colombia

# STANDARD PROGRESS REPORT

No. and title: 47628 Technical Secretariat to the G24 and London Cartagena Bogotá Process Reporting period: September 2009- December 2010

## I. PURPOSE

A key role of UNDP in Colombia, a country divided by years of prolonged conflict, is to create and strengthen platforms for dialogue between government and civil society and among civil society groups themselves. UNDP's and the United Nations Resident Coordinator's role in this process was underlined in the 2007 Assessment for Development Results as one of the key activities of the UNDP Colombia office. The 2008-2012 UNDAF (outcome 4.1. output 79 and outcome 4.4 output 90) and Country Program Document (development, peace and reconciliation area) also contain outputs directly associated with this activity. The CPAP foresees outputs in two concrete areas:

- 1. Strengthening at the national level of civil society organizations (CSO) that contribute to peace building, development, human rights and international cooperation agendas
- 2. In coordination with the Government of Colombia provide possibilities for dialogue, consultation and coordination for the design and/or implementation of public policy.

The present project is one of the activities of UNDP Colombia's peace Development and reconciliation Area that aims at producing these outputs. The general objective of the present project is:

**Objective:** The dialogue in the framework of the London Cartagena Bogotá process contributes to the improvement of the relations between the Colombian Government and civil society, strengthening the capacity of civil society organizations to participate in and have a positive impact on the public agenda, including public policy, relating to peace building, reconciliation, inclusive development, the human rights and humanitarian situation, and the coordination of international cooperation around these key issues. The G24 plays an important role as mediator in this process and as the international community's eyes on Colombia.

**Result No 1:** The forum for dialogue created within the framework of the London Cartagena Bogotá Process are maintained and strengthened.

- a) The level playing field between the parties is respected.
- b) The G24 continues to function as a political forum and as a facilitator of the relations between civil society and the government of Colombia.

**Result No 2:** The connexion between the national process and the regions as well as vulnerable populations is strengthened

Result No 3: Knowledge management

The main implementing partners are the following:

• Embassies participating in the Group of 24 G24 (Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, European Union, Japan, Mexico, Norway, Switzerland, United States, and the

European Commission).

- Colombian government, principally Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Acción Social and the Presidential Program for Human Rights
- The Civil Society Consensus Group consisting of the following 7 platforms of civil society organizations: Alianza, Federación Colombiana de Municipios, Fundaciones Empresariales, Consejo Gremial, Confederación Colombiana de ONG, Consejo Nacional de Planeación, Pastoral Social.
- The Colombian Government, represented primarily by Acción Social, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and the Presidential Program for Human Rights. Other Government and State entities participate in the different instances of the process according to the issues at hand.

## **II. RESOURCES**

From 2005 to 2010 the project Technical Secretariat to the G24 and London Cartagena Bogotá Process received resources from different donors as seen in the chart below.

Donor	Total Budget		
HOLAND	\$ 520.781,57		
CANADA	\$ 46.624,39		
SWEDEN	\$ 47.988,79		
Total	\$ 615.394,75		

## III. RESULTS

### General assessment:

The annual work plan of 2009 was implemented satisfactorily, as was affirmed by the process participants in the meeting of the Follow-up Commission (Comisión de Seguimiento) on the 3 February. Highlights from this year was the Process for Guarantees for the Work of Human Rights Defenders, which was constituted during 2009 as a means to overcome the difficulties that caused a rupture in the dialogue on a National Plan for Human Rights in 2008 as well as the seminars on Poverty, Development and MDGs: Analisis from a Global Perspective and Justice in favor of the Victims.

In 2010 the political climate (Presidential elections in May and June) caused some disruption to the implementation of the agreed 2010 agenda and led to the cancelation, at the request of the outgoing Government, of the international conference in Geneva planned for June. Activities that took place during 2010 include a seminar on The Effects of Violence on Ethnic Groups, Meetings of the National Table for Guarantees for Human Rights Defenders and several field trips by the G24.

The uncertainty due to the change of Government also sparked internal discussions within the G24 regarding the future of the Group and its role in the three party dialogue. On the 19 July a final meeting of the Follow Up Commission took place, where all three parties evaluated positively the past seven yrears of three party dialogue. The incoming Vice President was present in the meeting and manifested his interest in continuing dialoguing with civil society and the International community. This interest in multi stakeholder dialogue was finally given concrete shape in the Joint Declaration for the Participative Elaboration of Public Policy on Human Rights signed on the 22 of November by the G24 President, The United Nations, The OAS, The Vice President, several sectors of civil society, including the Cartagena Consensus,

the Ombudsman, The Public Attorney and others (see Declaration Attached).

### Main activities and achievements in the period September 2009 - December 2010

- Seminar on Strengthening of Justice in favor of the Victims, 11-12 November. The preparation of this seminar took place in a three party working group. Negotiations were difficult up until the last moment due to the sensibility of the matter, fundamental differences in the visions of the parties involved and also to some extent due to personal difficulties between certain group members. In spite of the difficulties the group managed to reach agreement on the objectives, agenda, terms of reference and participation in the seminar. The seminar counted with the participation of around 120 delegates, whereof 50% came from the regions. One major result of the seminar was that the three parties to the process signed a joint communication that identified obstacles and needed reforms to allow for better access to justice for the victims. Important was also the overall focus on gender, ethnical and regional differences throughout the seminar
- Seminar on The Effects of Violence on Ethnic Groups 10-11 June 2010 in the "Universidad Externado" in Bogotá. The seminar was preceded by three preparation seminars (in Santa Marta, Cali and Bogotá) aimed at allowing maximum participation and representation of delegates from the local level and financed by contributions from the G24 and UNDP. 175 people participated in the seminar whereof which 40% were representatives of indigenous and afrocolombian communities from all over the country. 40% of the participants were women. The climate of the dialogue at this event was very difficult as a result of the high participation of the communities most affected by the violence and therefore with very little confidence in the State. There was also an obvious distrust from many communities in the international community due to the presence in their territories by multinationals that according to them do not respect their autonomy and sometimes even cause violence and displacement. The difficulties the national platforms have in representing such a diverse universe of population groups, communities and organizations also became clear during the seminar. Several of the delegates from the communities insisted on the need for their own direct dialogue with Government and the international community. Nevertheless the national organizations, in particular Alianza, made an important effort in calming the ambience of the meeting and contributed to a relatively peaceful closing session, in spite of sometimes very heated discussions at some of the working tables and in the introductory plenary sessions. It was not possible to reach agreement on a three party declaration, but an interethnic declaration between indigenous and afrocolombian delegates was concluded and presented to the plenary.
- The process for guaranteeing the conditions for the work of human rights defenders and social leaders was being implemented in the regions throughout 2009 and the first part of 2010. In total 13 regional meetings took place, and as a result five regional working tables on Guarantees were constituted in Sucre, Bogotá, Cauca, Santander y Norte de Santander. The national Working Table on Guarantees met 5 times during this period, the last two meetings (25 June and 5 August 2010) also counted with the assistance by delegates from the 13 regions where regional meetings had been held within the framework of this process. The process has lead to 186 agreed commitments at the national and regional level, which have been registered in a matrix for follow up. In November the new Government reassumed this process and joint preparations commenced for a high level meeting with regional representatives, the three ministers of the national Working Table as well as the newly elected public attorney (Fiscal General). The meeting programmed for 20 December had to be postponed to the 17 January 2011 due to the crisis presented by the Colombian winter. It seems possible that this process will get new impetuous under the leadership of

the new Minister for the Interior and Justice. There is certainly a much more positive ambience thanks to the change of tone of the national government. A key challenge is now to ensure the effective implementation of the commitments agreed in this framework and to achieve concrete improvements in the regions. New challenges in terms of protection and prevention are also presented by the Governments agenda to restitute land to the victims, a series of recent attacks and murders of community leaders that claimed rights to land underline the seriousness of the situation.

- 12 meetings of the G24 took place in the period of this report on issues such as the situation of the Awa people, land mines, elections, MAPP OEA, application of DIH in Colombia, the Victims Law and land restitution and reform. Several embassies of the G24 also assisted in the Review Conference of the Ottawa Convention on Land Mines in Cartagena on the 30 November 4 December. On the 26 may the G24 had a one day retreat to reflect on the future of the Group in the new political climate, the meeting lead to the formulation of a Historic Document that resumes the role and purpose of the G24 in the past as well as a set of regulations for the functioning of the group. Both these documents have been approved by the G24 plenary. Additionally two meetings between the G24 and the outgoing Government (Foreign Minister Bermudez 16 June and Vice President Francisco Santos on 8 July) were arranged in the first trimester of 2010 to allow the parties to exchange opinions regarding the past 7 years of collaboration and ideas for the future. After the positioning of the new governments a series of meetings also took place with the G24 plenary (4 October) and troika (29 October, 2, 3 y 8 November) and the new Vice President to agree on the text of the new Joint Declaration.
- The G24 working groups on land mines, Cooperation and Human Rights worked intensively during 2009 and the first semester of 2010, The Mine group concentrated on the preparation for the Cartagena Review Conference and on the proposal for legislation/regulations that would allow civil organizations to engage in demining activities. The Human rights working group accompanied permanently the regional meetings on Guarantees and also undertook three other field trips on issues related to human rights defenders and LGBT population. The working group on cooperation focused mainly on the humanitarian situation in Colombia.
- The G24 undertook five field trips (Monteria 3 February, Cauca and Nariño 19-21 March, Cali 13 May, Montes de Maria 19-20 May, Sur de Bolívar 6-7 November) in 2010, three of which were organized within the framework of the G24 Working Group on Human Rights presided by the Swedish Ambassador (as a result of the Human Rights Working Group's visit to Montes de María it was finally possible to conform the Working Table on Guarantees for Human Rights Defenders in Sucre).
- Knowledge management: It was foreseen to make an evaluation of the London Cartagena Bogotá Process in 2010, and a series of meetings were organized by the Technical Secretariat for this purpose in the first trimester of the year, but for political reasons it was not considered convenient to proceed with this task neither by the Colombian Government nor the G24. The last meeting of the Follow Up Committee on the 19 of July allowed each party to make their own valoration of the process, which came out as over all positive. The Process Web Site was improved in this period and all results of seminars and other three party activities were posted on the Web. Furthermore as noted above the G24 produced a Historical Memory and a set of internal regulations.
- The presence of the regions and vulnerable populations in the three party process and also in the work of the G24 increased during the reporting period. The Guarantee Process, the

seminars on victims and on violence and ethnic groups as well as the series of field trips undertaken by the G24 in 2010 are important examples of this.

#### Key challenges and lessons learned

- The increased presence of delegates from the regions is an important development for the process. It is in the regions the effects of the ongoing conflict and the grave violations of human rights are most present. However it also brings added challenges in how to manage the tone of the meetings between regional delegates with less dialogue experience and less confidence in the process and the government. It has also visibilized the need for proper preparation at the regional level as well as for the strengthening of the local organizations and their connections to national networks. In particular the Seminar on Ethnic Groups made clear the problematic the national platform organizations face when trying to represent a very diverse multitude of populations groups and local organizations. Their need for time and resources to allow internal deliberation and joint decisions on important issues became more obvious.
- The Guarantee process still has to show significant results in form of a real improvement to the conditions for the work of human rights defenders and social leaders. True political will should manifest itself in the effective implementation of the commitments recorded in the matrix. The presence of the national authorities and the national human rights platforms in the regional meetings has been important, the national government put increased pressure on loacal authorities to take human rights commitments seriously and the human rights platforms have sometimes been able to have a moderating effect on local organizations with little experience and will to engage in dialogue with the authorities. Under the leadership of the new Minister for Interior and Justice and with the active involvement of the Vice president on all matters of Human Rights there seems to be much potential for this process to have important results, however the political situation in the regions during 2011 (local elections) may present some obstacles to local implementation. The government agenda of land restitution underway also presents opportunities and important challenges, as recent attacks and murders of local leaders claiming land rights shows.
- The change in government and uncertainty of what future role the G24 should take lead to internal reflections that also visibilized discontent within the group as regards to lack of transparency in decision making. This led to the elaboration of a set of internal regulations and a Historical Memory document. The incoming government has been ambiguous in its position on the G24, although it now seems clear that the Vice President wants the group to take an active role as party to the Joint Declaration on Human Rights signed in November, the position of the Foreign Ministry is uncertain, This lack of definition of a role for the G24 continues to negatively affect it and makes it difficult to find countries interested in assuming responsibilities, for example as members of the G24 troika. Another uncertainty is whether the United Nations will continue to provide the Technical Secretariat to the group. However, regardless of whether the UN continues to perform this task or not, according to the new regulations the Resident Coordinator continues to form part of the Amplified Troika and participates in the G24 Plenary Sessions as a special invitee.
- The London Cartagena Bogotá Process finalized with the change of government. With the signing of the Joint Declaration on Human Rights in November 2010 a new multi stakeholder process is taking shape. Although the details are still to be defined it seems clear that the focus on the regions will become even more important in this new process. The three pillars (Human Rights, Public Policy and Cooperation) of the former process have been subsumed

in two: Human Rights and Public Policy. And the actors have multiplied which, albeit positive, will present challenges in the future. In the past the Consensus of Cartagena could legitimately represent all civil society organizations involved in the process, now there are many new civil society actors that have not yet agreed on any joint agenda and cannot legitimately represent each other in working groups or other fora. The same applies to the State, which participates with its executive and legislative branch as well as the Public Ministry (Ombudsman and Public Attorney (Procurador)). The International community also has three actors signing the declaration: G24, OAS and the United Nations. It remains to be seen how these actors will organize themselves internally and in their relations with each others

#### **Key Partnerships**

The three party process built on the partnership between the participants. The over arching objective of the process and this project was precisely the foundation of such partnerships, both within each party coalition (i.e. between the embassies of G24, between government agencies and between civil society organizations) and between the three parties. It remains to be seen how these partnerships will remain and develop in the new multi stakeholder process.

The three party process also fomented interagency collaboration coordinated by the Technical Secretariat under the lead of the Resident Coordinator. UNDP played an instrumental role in the support to the technical secretariat as well as to process activities through its REDES program. OACNUDH participated as technical advisor in all the activities of the process that relate to human rights. UNIFEM supported women's organizations in their aim to impact on the process agenda, which resulted in a strong gender focus in all process activities. Other UN agencies participated in the various process activities in accordance with their respective mandates and interests. The RC has signed the new Declaration in the name of the United Nations System in Colombia and will also provide the Technical Secretariat to the new process. It can therefore bee assumed that similar interagency coordination will take place during the new multi stakeholder process.

Donor	Total Budget	Total Delivery 2005-2008	Delivery 2009	Delivery 2010	Balance
HOLAND	520.781,57	356.064,06	156.556,07	-	8.161,44
CANADA	46.624,39	-	17.674,35	\$ 28.950,04	0,00
SWEDEN**	47.988,79	-	16.308,79	\$ 31.680,00	0,00
Total	615.394,75	356.064,06	190.539,21	\$ 60.630,04	8.161,44*

### V. FINANCIAL IMPLEMENTATION

\*refunding to donor

\*\* See annex I for complete information about Sweden's resources in 2010, the USD 16.308.79 expend on 2009 where already reported on February 2010.