

THE
CARTER CENTER



Andean-United States Dialogue Forum

Fourth Plenary Meeting

Meeting Report

Lima, Peru
August 2-3, 2011

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-----|--|----------------------|
| 1 | Introduction | 3 |
| 2 | Reports on Internal Politics of Each Country | 4 |
| 3 | Efforts toward a Common Agenda: the Dissemination Process..... | 7 |
| 4 | Forum Working Groups..... | 9 |
| 4.1 | Media Working Group | 9 |
| 4.2 | Development Working Group..... | 10 |
| 4.3 | Different Perceptions of Democracy as Impediment to Better Relationships | 11 |
| 4.4 | Drug Policy and Organized Crime | 12 |
| 5 | Participatory Evaluation of the Andean – U.S. Dialogue Forum | 14 |
| 6 | Recommendations for the Future: Last Reflections | 1415 |
| | Annex 1. Agenda of Meeting..... | 16 |
| | Annex 2. List of Participants | 18 |

1 Introduction

The meeting that took place on August 2-3, 2011 in Lima, Peru was the fourth and last of a series of meetings from 2010-2011 between prominent citizens from Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, the United States (U.S.), and Venezuela that were part of The Carter Center and International IDEA's Andean-United States Dialogue Forum project.

The meeting benefited from the participation of Susana Villarán, mayor of Lima, Alberto Adrianzén, member of the Andean Parliament, María Cecilia Rozas from the Foreign Ministry of Peru and Eleonora Silva from the Andean Development Corporation (CAF). Furthermore, newly appointed Foreign Minister of Peru, Mr. Rafael Roncagliolo, greeted the Forum and spoke about the incoming government's wish for further integration and transparent relations between the countries. Special guest former Colombian president César Gaviria spoke about the recent Global Commission on Drug Policy report and debated alternatives for the Andes with participants.

As the last meeting of the initiative, this plenary focused on jointly presenting and analyzing the products and accomplishments of the project and its working groups, evaluating the efforts undertaken, and proposing possible ways to continue to foment stronger relationships and mutual understanding between the Andean countries and the United States. The members reviewed the efforts to disseminate the



Group photo of Forum members from Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, United States and Venezuela together with invited guests.

report towards a Common Agenda between the six countries as well as the actions of the various working groups under the Forum umbrella. In particular, the Forum members engaged in an analysis of the alternatives to the current drug policy in the Andean sub-region and participated in a discussion on the differing models and perceptions of democracy in the Andean sub-region and the United States, how these differences create tensions between countries and how these obstacles could be overcome.

2 Reports on Internal Politics of Each Country

The fourth plenary meeting of the Forum aimed to cement the achievements to date, in strengthening personal relationships between participants and promoting mutual understanding. To achieve this, one Forum member from each country presented the current internal political situation of his or her respective country, followed by a brief period for questions and discussion with the other members. *It is worth mentioning that these reports reflect the viewpoint of individual members and are not necessarily shared by all Forum members.*

Bolivia

The Forum member from Bolivia focused on the upcoming October elections as well as the decline in President Evo Morales' approval rating. The Bolivian leader's approval rating has dropped from December 2009, when he won 64% of the popular vote in the election, to 32-38% only a few months later in April 2010, when Morales' party, *Movimiento al Socialismo* (MAS), incurred substantial losses in the regional elections. The presenter pointed to Morales' unpopular proposal in 2010 to remove government subsidies on oil, raising gasoline prices by 82%. Ultimately, the government folded under popular discontent and withdrew the proposal, but the crisis had already initiated inflationary tendencies in Bolivian markets. After this crisis, in 2011, the Morales government was hit by several scandals. Most notably, the Sanabria scandal, in which René Sanabria, former Chief of Police and member of the *Fuerza Especial de Lucha Contra el Narcotráfico* from 2007-2009, was detained in Panama for his involvement in drug trafficking. Later, Morales complicated diplomatic relations with Chile over the issue of recovering access to the Pacific Ocean, which Bolivia had lost in a war 132 years ago.

It is within this political context that the October elections to elect the top judicial powers in the country will take place. Though it is the first democratic election to choose judicial officials that will take place in the country, opponents of Morales assert that it is yet another way for the President to expand his control. Although the process is democratic, the majority governing party in the legislature nominates the candidates the public will vote on, which runs the risk, according to critics, of limiting the candidates to supporters of Morales and the current government. This conflict has sparked fierce debate throughout the country and has raised the option of the null vote, which would demonstrate disagreement and discontent with the electoral process for these elections.

Colombia

President Juan Manuel Santos, in his first year as President Uribe's successor, has enacted significant changes to domestic and foreign policies. He has passed numerous laws and four constitutional reforms, most notably the Victims Law for the reparation and restitution of victims of the ongoing armed conflict. In terms of foreign policy, Santos has restored relations with Venezuela and Ecuador. During his presidency, the economy has grown by 5% (the second largest increase in the region), primary resource production has increased and foreign investment has increased by 60%. These factors have strengthened Santos' political position.

Yet the president still faces criticisms. Recent political scandals, mainly related to the Uribe administration, have tainted the reputation of the new government. One of the most notable cases includes the suspension of the mayor of Bogotá under corruption charges and the accusations

against Uribe administration officials of wiretapping of human right activities and opposition. These scandals have increased the perception of corruption in the country. Additionally, former President Uribe continually criticizes his successor. Though out of power, he continues to hold a significant sway in public opinion, and while this conflict has not yet affected Santos' ability to govern, analysts predict that the struggle may have implications in the near future. Despite these obstacles, the political, social and economic outlook remains optimistic.

Ecuador

The Ecuadorian members explained to the forum that Ecuador has been troubled by a series of political controversies. Almost a year after the police protests on September 30, 2010, an atmosphere of political instability still prevails. Several months later, on April 4, 2011, Wikileaks revealed a document in which the U.S. Ambassador to Ecuador denounced the Ecuadorian Chief of Police, Jaime Alquilino Hurtado, and requested his U.S. visa be revoked due to graft. In order to salvage popular opinion, Correa quickly declared Ambassador Heather Hodges persona non-grata, and expelled her from her post. While the Ecuadorian President did not wish to incite U.S. retaliation, the United States, in turn, expelled the Ecuadorian Ambassador from Washington, D.C. Another worrying indication is the increase of common delinquency in the country.

Still, Correa has achieved political victories. He has made drastic changes to the judicial system, improved economic growth and instituted the new Law of Higher Education, which allocated more government money to scholarships. Also, the current administration has passed the Law of Competition (anti-monopoly legislation) and enacted "green" taxes to promote biodiversity. He is successfully accomplishing many of the reforms he promised to enact once in office.

Peru

Peru's recent presidential elections had generated a sense of strong polarization in the country. After distancing himself from Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez and presenting himself as a center-left candidate, Ollanta Humala was elected the president of Peru. He has promised to focus on poverty and has already taken steps to improve relations abroad with countries such as Ecuador and work to maintain already positive relations with the United States. Furthermore, analysts consider Humala to have stable economic



Ecuadorian member Susana Cabeza de Vaca and U.S. member Rex Lee Jim

foundations from which to enact his policies, thanks to a sound macroeconomic policy carried out by his predecessor. Overall, large segments of the population are still worried about the administration, but so far the President's actions have shown the people that he is moving in a positive direction. Furthermore, Humala is seen as being at the precipice of a great opportunity to

reform political infrastructure, allocate funds to new social programs and continue to nurture Peru's growing economy, which is considered imperative in the context of social dissatisfaction, social conflicts and the fragile political system.

United States

The U.S. member focused on the current dysfunction in the United States Congress and the underlying question on the role and function of government in the country. Through the recent congressional debates over the debt ceiling, Congress has become a battleground in which issues big and small turn into protracted ideological arguments between Democrats and Republicans. Democrats see government as an instrument to address social problems, a role which requires big government. The Tea Party and Republicans, on the other hand, ideologically oppose big government, and use large ticket items such as the recession and social welfare programs to debate the government's fundamental role. The current political atmosphere is one in which facts are distorted and manipulated by both parties in Congress.

In terms of U.S. foreign policy with Latin America, Roberta Jacobson, former deputy to Peru from 2000-2002, has temporarily replaced Arturo Valenzuela as the Acting Assisting Secretary of the Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, though she may hold the position for some time given the backlog of positions the Senate has to approve in the U.S. government. In reference to the importance of Latin America in United States foreign policy, the presentation emphasized that though there is a large amount of commerce between the U.S. and the region, including one third of their oil exports, the region is diminishing in attention while the Middle East receives most of the U.S. focus. In the absence, Brazil is seen as filling the U.S. role in the region. Still, the presenter emphasized that, depending on future events, the Andean region will come back into focus, considering that international relations are fluid and dynamic.

Venezuela

Two Forum members presented on the internal political situation in Venezuela. They described the economic and political situation before Chavez announced his illness, and then explained how the President's announcement has affected the country. Economically, the country is coming out of a recession, boosted by the oil industry. Yet the growing economy has been hurt by the electricity crisis in Venezuela, where growth has increased the demand for electricity beyond the industry's capacity to provide. Additionally, the problem of inflation still plagues the nation, with an inflation rate that oscillates between 20-25%, despite government efforts to reduce it.

Politically, Chavez is up for reelection in the 2012 presidential elections. During the past two years, his popularity rate has wavered between 40-52%, so his biggest challenge in campaigning is regaining popularity and widening his electoral support. The electricity crisis, prison riots and a widening sense of insecurity among the population are obstacles that have caused people to question his administration's capacity to control and mitigate the nation's problems. Also, the Chavez government has succeeded in helping over 200,000 homeless people through new social programs and has reduced the poverty rate, though many of these programs have come under criticism by the public. Yet despite these weaknesses, the opposition suffers from a lack of leadership and internal fragmentation.

When Chavez announced that he was ill, the political climate changed. His illness generated a sense of uncertainty surrounding the President's future abilities to lead the country, especially since treatment has taken him out of the country for extended periods of time. His popularity has risen by 10% since the announcement, but his cancer has also cast a shadow of doubt over the upcoming elections and led to tensions among Chavistas and the opposition.

3 Efforts toward a Common Agenda: the Dissemination Process

As an initial product of the Forum, members developed a report toward a common agenda among the six countries. Based on public opinion polls, research and interviews of elites in all six countries, the report identifies convergences and divergences in priorities among the Andean countries and the United States. It is designed to improve understanding of the internal dynamics in each country and reduce the stereotypes that impede working together to resolve mutual challenges. Finally, the report presents priorities for a common agenda for cooperation.

After successfully developing the *Report towards a Common Agenda*, Forum members in the six countries implemented activities to disseminate the report, with the objective being that the dissemination will lead to policy impact, the building of relationships and impact on the public opinion, as well as contributing to mutual understanding between the six countries. The dissemination strategy was tailored to the political context of each country. During the meeting, the participants presented, shared and gave feedback on the efforts and challenges of the dissemination process.

Bolivia

The Bolivian participants explained that due to the delicate relations between Bolivia and the United States, the Bolivian group first shared the report with the Minister of Foreign Affairs, David Choquehuanca, prior to pursuing any course of action. The report was well received by the Foreign Minister who emphasized that dialogue initiatives are needed to improve relationships between Bolivia and the United States. Additionally, the report was shared with approximately 100 influential citizens, such as entrepreneurs, political organizations, academic centers, former presidents, former foreign ministers and government officials from La Paz, Cochabamba, Santa Cruz and Tarija. Analyzing the strategy undertaken, one participant expressed that the high level of prudence taken by the group might have limited the dissemination process. One Bolivian member expressed that the efforts undertaken by the Forum with the *Report towards a Common Agenda* was seen as a new message of hope for more and new forms integration, and mentioned, as an example, movements for integration between Bolivian indigenous groups and Native American groups.

Colombia

The Colombian participants reported that the findings of the report were generally well received. The Report was presented and discussed with the Colombian government, including the Foreign Minister, María Angela Holguín, and the Vice-President, Angelino Garzón. The Colombian members of the Forum presented the Common Agenda Report publicly to a wide audience that

included members of the Andean Parliament, academics and representatives of civil society. Furthermore, the report was distributed to a list of influential citizens and organizations.

Ecuador

The Ecuadorian group decided to strategically use the dissemination of the report as a bridge between the Ecuadorian group and the government, since the government had certain reservations against multilateral dialogue and the Forum as an initiative. Based on this, the Ecuadorian group disseminated the Common Agenda Report at three different levels: (1) in high level governmental meetings, including the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Foreign Trade; (2) in national media, such as the newspapers *El Comercio*, *El Universo*, *Vistazo*, *Quantum Informe* and the *Revista Vanguardia*; and (3) with civil society organizations, the private sector and academics. These activities were interrupted following the diplomatic impasse between Ecuador and United States and it was largely overshadowed in the media by news stories on the May 2011 constitutional referendum. Regardless, the Ecuadorian forum members held a forum on Ecuador – U.S. relations in July as part of the efforts to promote mutual understanding and disseminate the report.

Peru

Due to the two-round presidential elections, the Peruvian members expressed that the dissemination process was limited due to the difficulties they faced in drawing attention to the initiative under such circumstances. However, a meeting was held with the Minister of Foreign Affairs, José Antonio García Belaunde. In addition, a breakfast was hosted for the recently elected deputies for the Andean Parliament. The agenda was distributed to President Alan García; parliament members of Fuerza 2011, Gana Perú, Perú Posible and Alianza para el Gran Cambio parties; and academic experts.

United States

Forum members in the United States held diverse events to present and discuss the Common Agenda. It was disseminated at a public panel at the Council of the Americas, co-hosted by The Carter Center and the Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA). A staff meeting was held at the office of Senator Menendez and the agenda was presented to staff members of the House Foreign Relations Committee. The last meeting was held at the Department of State with officials from the Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs (WHA).

Venezuela

The Venezuelan members explained that the prominent polarization in the country limited the ability of disseminating the report. Despite the constraints that this polarization presents, Forum members instead employed a person-to-person approach to share the report. Additionally, a public forum was organized by the newspaper *Últimas Noticias* on May 26, 2011, to disseminate the report and to analyze the relations between the United States and Venezuela among academic experts and businessmen. The meeting received significant media attention, including web broadcasting and ample newspaper coverage.

4 Forum Working Groups

During the course of the Forum, members have formed inter-country working groups to explore various priority issues, such as drug policy, organized crime, the role of the media in inter-country relationships, democracy, inclusive trade and development. As a result, members from the various countries have been working together on a variety of issues, ranging from bilateral dialogues between Colombian and Venezuelan journalists, editors and newspaper directors to analyze and promote a wider understanding of the role of the media and journalists in generating or reducing tensions between countries, to advocacy efforts to extend the Andean Trade Promotion and Drug Eradication Act (ATPDEA) and national consultations to assess the impact and results of current drug policy and propose innovative changes. During the fourth and closing plenary meeting, the Forum members reported and analyzed the advances, achievements and challenges that the working groups have confronted.

4.1 Media Working Group

The Media Working Group organized a series of meetings between Colombian, Venezuelan and, later, U.S. media professionals in order to promote a deeper understanding of the role of the media in inter-country relations and to promote more balanced reporting on issues that cause tensions between these countries. They hoped that the space provided would allow journalists, editors, and directors to look deeply into the quality of reporting on bilateral (and later trilateral) affairs, to pinpoint its weaknesses and to identify solutions that would improve coverage. They also hoped that the sessions would foster new relationships between the members and give them a new perspective in their daily work.

With these objectives, four meetings were held: one in Caracas in November, 2010; one in Bogotá in February, 2011; one in Cúcuta in May, 2011; and another in Atlanta in June, 2011. The first three meetings were between Colombian and Venezuelan media members and focused on uncovering the common missteps in media reporting that might contribute to increasing tensions between the two countries, as well as identifying solutions to improve such problems and to produce higher quality reporting. The last meeting in Atlanta involved U.S. media professionals and focused on the trilateral relationship between Colombia, Venezuela and the United States, the media's role in perpetuating stereotypes and how to combat misconceptions and misinformation through responsible reporting.

At the first meeting in Caracas, the dynamic focused on describing the current state of the media reportage in both countries and what that coverage ideally could look like. Both Venezuelan and Colombian participants described the bilateral relationship as “fragile” and attributed this in part to the role that the charisma and personalities of Chavez and Uribe had come to occupy in diplomatic relations between Venezuela and Colombia. They also discussed the political intricacies that complicate media coverage, such as Venezuela's polarized community.

Following the first meeting, a content analysis undertaken by The Carter Center and Georgia State University revealed that media reports in both countries often emphasize negative events, under-report positive events. Furthermore, coverage is intimately affected by the policies and

personalities of the respective presidents. The second meeting in Bogotá centered on analyzing the content analysis and the topic of balanced coverage.

The third meeting took place in the border town of Cúcuta, Colombia, and centered on border issues between the two countries. During the meeting, the participants discussed the problems they face when reporting on bilateral issues, such as the pervasive influence of the governments' political standpoint in the media's reporting on bilateral events.

Given the triangulation that has often affected the U.S.-Venezuela-Colombia relationship (e.g. the 2009 U.S.-Colombia military base cooperation agreement) and the related media coverage, the group proposed to hold its fourth session with U.S. editors and journalists. This meeting resembled the first in that participants characterized media coverage between the three, identified areas of bias and misinformation, and brainstormed methods of reporting that could improve media coverage.

Overall, participants from both the media dialogue and the U.S.-Andean Forum emphasized the need to continue with dialogue initiatives of this kind. They noted that bringing of journalists together has an enormous potential, given the significant lack of knowledge about the other country; the deep-rooted stereotypes and a dependency on the domestic media on their respective government's view and information. Another lesson learned was the need to also generate hard data on the characteristics of the media coverage to feed into the dialogue on perceptions and to systematize the experience.

4.2 Development Working Group

The Development Working Group was formed to contribute to improving economic relations between the Andean countries and the United States, given the importance of trade to the relationships between the forum countries. The group sought to create proposals and small initiatives towards a more equal and inclusive economic environment and to break the connection between U.S.-Andean commercial preferences and antinarcotics efforts.

Highlights include the organization of a bilateral dialogue on trade between the Ecuadorian and Colombian members. Given the recently improved but still fragile bilateral relations, the trade imbalance between the two countries continues to cause tensions and members wanted to seek ways to improve the situation. As a result, the group supported a process that involved meetings between Colombian and Ecuadorian officials in which they could work towards an economic agreement that, through strategic alliances, investment and transparency would restore the trade balance and abolish restrictive trade policies. The members also actively promoted the project through media coverage with the hopes that public support would help advance the negotiation process. The two foreign ministers met in Bogotá in February and in Quito on June 2, 2010, and as a result, the two countries agreed to a series of agreements, known as the Memorandum of Understanding between the Ecuadorian and Colombian Governments on Commerce, Tourism, and Investment. This model is now being used in dialogues with Mexico and Brazil.

The working group supported the renewal of the Andean Trade Promotion and Drug Eradication Act (ATPDEA), which is a preferential trade system that aims to foster economic growth and

development in the Andean region. In order to promote the passage of the ATPDEA, a bi-partisan letter was developed, signed by former President Jimmy Carter and former Congressman Jim Kolbe (R-Arizona) that was sent to key actors in the U.S. government.

4.3 Different Perceptions of Democracy as Impediment to Better Relationships

Forum members discussed the UNDP/OAS report ‘*Our Democracy*’, together with one of the collaborators of the report, Mr. Juan Pablo Corlazzoli who participated via videoconference. Mr. Corlazzoli outlined the main points of the report while including some anecdotal support drawn from his experiences in the political realm and in civil society. He discussed the need to create a civic democracy where the citizens have full civic, political, economic, social and cultural rights.

The participants had the opportunity to ask questions and debate the findings of the report with Mr. Corlazzoli. While participants generally endorsed the importance of the report, they also raised some questions: one participant pointed out that the report missed topics such as social discrimination and personal security issues (such as common delinquency) when examining democracy; another was concerned about the empowerment of the executive branch since it opens the opportunity of creating autocrats; another wondered whether it would be better to create parliamentary systems rather than presidential in Latin America; another participant asked about components such as corruption, distrust of the authorities and the significant informal sector that corrode democracy. Finally, one participant commented that the practice of term limits on the presidency had been changing since 2000, generating instability in some cases. Mr. Corlazzoli agreed and added that it creates polarization; thus, the efforts of The Carter Center and IDEA need to be multiplied.

The debate was then directed towards a second document, *Visions of Democracy*, drafted by two participants of the Forum. The note written by the two members outlined the changing political atmosphere that the Andean sub-region is going through at this time. They explained that while in the U.S., the concept of democracy is a liberal one, emphasizing the protection of individual rights of liberty and property from abuses by the State and/or other citizens, in the Andean region the concept of democracy has social and cultural roots with more emphasis on collective well-being. New political and social actors are proposing models and practices that could surpass preceding democratic models and making them stronger and more inclusive than the traditional western democratic model.

The Forum then turned to debate over the necessity of term limits or alternation in democratic government. With members noting several examples of challenges to this idea, such as indefinite reelection in Venezuela and the lack of term limits for members of the U.S. Congress, the lack of a universal definition of democracy became a focus of the conversation with two prominent conflicting viewpoints. One member stated that democracy without alternation of leadership is not democracy. Another invoked the Venezuelan case, noting that the collective decision of a population about which form of democracy to observe must be respected as long as that process is free and fair. While acknowledging the validity of both viewpoints, a third member observed that the longer an individual remains in power, the more power he or she naturally accumulates and the competitiveness necessary to democratic governance is diminished. To reconcile these

conflicting views, another member noted that civil society must reach a compromise by identifying and pursuing those elements of democracy that are essential in the long term but are independent of the short term social dynamics and structural differences in practicing democracies that often hinder cooperation in the region.

Several members of the Forum noted the institutional fragility that plagues the Andean region and further complicates the exercise of democracy. As one member stated, this fragility has resulted in many countries lacking organized and effective political parties in which large sectors of the population can become directly involved. This lack of political participation has led to the inability of populations to express the pluralistic characteristics of their societies, further eroding democratic conditions. In such cases, the systems tend to lack an effective balance of power both institutionally and politically that further deteriorates the exercise of democracy. If an effective balance of power existed in such contexts, one member suggested, the potential risks of not having term limitations would not arise. Many members agreed on the need for expanded civic democracy as a way to combat institutional weakness and build stronger balances of power as primary ways to strengthen democracy in the region. Adding to this topic, one participant emphasized the need for the media to play a prominent role in shaping public debate without threats or intimidation from any level of society, especially the government, calling for honest journalism and a minimum of guarantees from governments to achieve such a status.

4.4 Drug Policy and Organized Crime

Presentation of efforts of the Global Commission on Drug Policy and the Latin American Commission on Drugs and Democracy

The Forum benefitted greatly from the presence of a Global Commission on Drug Policy member, the former President of Colombia César Gaviria. Gaviria presented his views and recommendations on current drug policies. Gaviria stressed that drug policy can only change in the western hemisphere when politicians enter the debate. Therefore, the media and influential members of society have an important role to play to encourage and open these debates.

The debate on drug policy in the Western hemisphere has gained great momentum and legitimacy, but the process of changing such policies has remained stagnant. As Gaviria pointed out, an open debate over prohibition or legalization currently exists. However, the U.S. has to a large extent dictated drug policy in the Andes, no change to drug policy is on the horizon despite the fact that 70% of the U.S. population recognizes that the “War on Drugs” has failed. For these reasons, Gaviria emphasized that the topic of drugs is complicated and demands a more nuanced political approach. He suggests first and foremost redefining the problem of drug consumption to be considered as a health concern. Instead of imprisoning consumers and small dealers, they should be sent to treatment facilities. While Gaviria notes that it is true that most crimes are committed by someone in search of money to buy drugs or by intoxicated people, he believes that sending them to jail does not target the roots of the problem. Instead, it allows the underlying cause of addiction to fester. If public policy changes its focus from eliminating drug production to reducing consumption and treating addiction, there are many new directions for public policy to take to tackle this problem. Seeing as efforts to cut off supply have largely failed, Gaviria advocates targeting the demand for drugs.

In support of this approach, Gaviria took note of several alternative drug policies that exist in Europe. He lauded the Swiss drug policy, noting that it maintains a program for citizens found guilty of consumption that allows them to seek treatment while continuing to go to work and stay with their families. Gaviria also noted the importance of continually evaluating the effectiveness and success of these programs. Statistics show that treatment programs greatly reduce addiction relapse and drug-related violence.

Gaviria also noted problems in current Latin American drug policy. The largest obstacle to effective drug policy in the region is the misconception that domestic drug consumption is low and static. Only Brazil has recognized that drug consumption is a large problem and has taken steps to curtail it. Gaviria stressed that drug consumption is a factor that leads to insecurity in Latin American countries, citing statistics that show a positive correlation between drug consumption and crime rates. Additionally, he qualified the successes of Plan Colombia, noting its beneficial effect on national security, but disagreeing with its claimed success in reducing drug production. While the area of illegal farming is reduced, Gaviria claims that production has moved into the mountains, into Peru and onto smaller plots of land that are harder to identify and impossible to fumigate. Additionally, Gaviria supported amendments to the judicial system, noting reforms enacted in Colombia that would allow witnesses to testify in secret and maintain their own safety in cases that relate to big-time drug operations. These changes in public policy could have much greater effects on drug consumption and production than the policies the region has followed since the 1980s.

Presentation and analysis of report “Drug policy in the Andes: in search of more humane and effective alternatives”

Based on consultations carried out in the Andean countries during 2011, two Forum members drafted a report that summarizes the state of the debate on alternative policies in the Andean region. The report was presented by the members and discussed among the participants. The concern was raised that the report was too focused on criticizing the U.S. and the vocabulary



of the recommendations needed to be more specific. However, generally all the participants agreed that the report was informative and constructive. The two authors welcomed the recommendations that had been given and would incorporate them when finalizing the report.

Mayor of Lima, Susana Villarán, Peru Forum member Felipe Ortiz de Zevallos and U.S. Forum member Hattie Babbitt discuss the importance of working with cities and municipalities when looking for alternatives to the current drug policy in the Andean countries.

Additionally, most of the participants emphasized the need to coordinate and cooperate among the Andean countries in order to have a positive effect. One participant stated that if countries did not work together in drug eradication efforts then there was the risk of the ‘balloon effect,’

which suggests that when the problem is dealt with bilaterally instead of by the region as a whole, the risk exists that while there could be a success in one country (like for example in Colombia), the cultivation could pass to another country (such as Peru).

5 Participatory Evaluation of the Andean – U.S. Dialogue Forum

With the aim of assessing the initiative, the members dedicated a portion of the meeting to discussing the relevance of the activities, the efficiency and effectiveness of the project, the impact of the project, and the sustainability of the results.

The participants analyzed lessons learned and the challenges faced by the Forum. The participants expressed that the project gave them the opportunity to better understand each other and to counter stereotypes about each country that have different ideologies and policies, as well as allowing the exercise of tolerance among each other. Members highlighted the importance of the country visits to each forum country since it not only kept people engaged, but also provided the opportunity to understand the political processes that each country is undergoing.

They highlighted that the Forum not only created the opportunity to build trust within a group where mistrust had existed, but it also helped to understand what differentiates each country and most importantly what unites them as an Andean sub-region. In addition, various participants observed the shift that the Andean sub-region is experiencing in its relationship with the United States. Within the framework of the Forum, according to some participants, it was visible that the Andean countries are looking more and more to their neighbors rather than looking to the north.

The participants also discussed the challenges that the initiative faced. One challenge consisted of finding a common vision concerning objectives and goals of the Forum, reaching a consensus among participants within each working group and dedicating the necessary time to the Forum versus personal or work time. For example, a participant explained that the position of some participants had changed and, due to their new functions, their role within the Forum had to change as well.

With all the information compiled from the Fourth Plenary Meeting, as well as all the information gathered from the participants and other activities, the Carter Center and International IDEA will produce a comprehensive final report on the results and lessons learned from the Forum.

6 Recommendations for the Future: Last Reflections

The members of the Forum explored possible future actions that the group could undertake without the involvement of the IDEA and The Carter Center Secretariat. Some of the recommendations given by the participants were:

- To continue to promulgate the values and approach of the Dialogue Forum by using the lessons learned from the Colombia-Venezuela-U.S. media dialogues to expand to others, for instance between Peru and its neighbors.
- To take action on the efforts undertaken by the working group on drug policy and organized crime, for instance by promoting and opening the debate on alternatives to the current approach to drug policy in each Andean country.
- To measure the long-term impact of the Forum in the next 2-3 years in order to show the effect that the Forum has had in the region through individual members.

Annex 1. Agenda of Meeting

Tuesday, August 2, 2011

- 9:00 – 9:30am Opening, review of agenda of the meeting and introduction of members that have previously not participated in plenary meetings. Short presentation of evaluation ideas.
[Kristen Sample, Jennifer McCoy, Graciela Tapia]
- 9:30 – 9:45am Review of the dissemination of the Report towards a Common Agenda for the Andean Countries and the United States in the six Forum countries. Overall overview and strategies employed in each country.
[Presenter: Santiago Mariani]
- 9:45 – 10:15am Open discussion between members on the Report towards a Common Agenda: focus on lessons learned regarding limitations, potential impact, and openings for promoting this type of exercise
[Moderator: Santiago Mariani]
- 10:15 – 10:30am Report and discussion on the activities and the impact of the development working group
[Presenter: Eduardo Egas]
- 10:30 – 11:00am Coffee Break
- 11:00 – 12:00pm Report and discussion on the activities and the impact of the media working group
[Presenters: Ricardo Avila, Maryclen Stelling]
[Moderator: Hector Vanolli]
- 12:15 – 2:15pm Lunch. Reports on internal politics of each country and discussion.
[Presenters: Susana Cabeza de Vaca (Ecuador) Ricardo Avila (Colombia), Ana Maria San Juan (Venezuela), Ricardo Calla (Bolivia), Hattie Babbitt (United States), Ricardo Vega Llona - (Peru)]
[Moderators: Kristen Sample and Jennifer McCoy]
- 2:30 – 3:00pm Presentation of UNDP/OAS report ‘Our Democracy’.
[Presenter: Juan Pablo Corlazzoli via videoconference]
[Moderators: Ana María San Juan and Jennifer McCoy]
- 3:00 – 3:15pm Questions and Answers with Juan Pablo Corlazzoli
[Moderators: Ana María San Juan and Jennifer McCoy]
- 3:15 – 4:00pm Discussion of UNDP/OAS recommendations
[Moderators: Ana María San Juan and Jennifer McCoy]
- 4:00 – 4:15pm Coffee Break

- 4:15 – 5:45pm Discussion: Differing perceptions of democracy as an impediment to better relationships
[Moderators: Ana María San Juan and Jennifer McCoy]
- 5:45 – 6:00pm Conclusions of first day
[Karin Andersson]
- 6:30 – 7:00pm Transportation to Foreign Ministry
- 7:30 – 8:30pm Reception with Peru’s Foreign Minister, Mr. Rafael Roncagliolo
- 8:30 – 10:00pm Dinner. Transportation to Hotel.

Wednesday, August 3, 2011

- 9:00 – 9:30am Opening, re-cap of first day, review of agenda of second day
[Kristen Sample]
- 9:30 – 10:00am Presentation of efforts of the Global Commission on Drug Policy and the Latin American Commission on Drugs and Democracy.
[César Gaviria, former President of Colombia]
[Moderators: Socorro Ramírez and Coletta Youngers]
- 10:00 – 10:30am Working group on drug policy, presentation of report “*Drug policy in the Andes: in search of more humane and effective alternatives*”
[Moderators: Socorro Ramírez and Coletta Youngers]
- 10:30 – 11:15am Debate on implications and openings for drug policy reform in Latin America.
[César Gaviria, former President of Colombia]
[Moderators: Socorro Ramírez and Coletta Youngers]
- 11:15 – 11:30am Coffee Break and Group Photo
- 11:30 - 12:30pm Discussion of report “*Drug policy in the Andes: in search of more humane and effective alternatives*”
[Moderators: Socorro Ramírez and Coletta Youngers]
- 12:30 – 2:00pm Lunch
- 2:00 – 4:00pm Participatory evaluation of Forum led by external evaluator
[Facilitator: Graciela Tapia, Evaluator of the Andean – U.S. Dialogue Forum]
- 4:00 – 4:15pm Coffee Break
- 4:15 – 5:30pm Action-oriented recommendations on future actions and sustainability without the involvement of the Secretariat
[Facilitator: Graciela Tapia, Evaluator of the Andean – U.S. Dialogue Forum]
- 5:30 – 6:00pm Closing
[Kristen Sample and Jennifer McCoy]

Annex 2. List of Participants

Bolivia

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Ricardo Calla Ortega | Academic; Researcher; International Consultant; Former Minister of Indigenous Affairs |
| Germán Choque Condori | Founder of the Universidad de Tawantinsuyo; Former Member of Congress from La Paz |
| José Luis Exeni | Coordinator in the area of Communication and Information, Unión Jurídica Especializada del Desarrollo Constitucional (UJEDC); Former President of the National Electoral Court |

Colombia

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Ricardo Ávila Pinto | Director, <i>Portafolio</i> |
| Rodrigo Pardo García-Peña | Director, <i>Cambio</i> magazine; Former Foreign Minister; Former Ambassador to Venezuela |
| Socorro Ramírez Vargas | Academic; Retired Professor, Universidad Nacional de Colombia Expert in International Relations |

Ecuador

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Susana Cabeza de Vaca | Executive Director, Fulbright Commission of Ecuador; Former Minister of Coordination for Production |
| Eduardo Egas Peña | Executive Vice-President, Corporation for the Promotion of Exports and Imports (CORPEI) |
| Patricia Estupiñán de Burbano | General Editor of the magazine <i>Vistazo</i> |

Peru

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Cecilia Blondet Montero | Executive Director, National Council for Public Ethics (PROÉTICA) |
| Jorge Ortiz-Sotelo | Executive Director, Peruvian Institute of Economics and Politics |
| Felipe Ortiz de Zevallos | Former Peruvian Ambassador to the U.S.; Founder and President, Grupo APOYO; Professor, Pacific University |
| Ricardo Vega Llona | Entrepreneur; Former President, National Confederation of Private Business Institutions (CONFIEP) |
| Antonio Zapata Velasco | Professor of History, Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos; Columnist for <i>La Republica</i> ; Former Advisor to the Peruvian Congress |

United States

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Hattie Babbitt | Attorney; Former Deputy Administrator, United States Agency for International Development (USAID); Former U.S. Ambassador, the Organization of American States (OAS) during the Clinton Administration |
| Rex Lee Jim | Vice President, Navajo Nation Council; Member of United Nations expert group on the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples; Member of OAS Working Group to consider the draft American Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples |

Coletta Youngers Senior Fellow, Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA); Associate, International Drug Policy Consortium (IDPC)

Venezuela

Eleazar Díaz Rangel Director of *Ultimas Noticias*
Orlando Maniglia Ferreira Former Minister of Defense; Retired Admiral
Ana María San Juan Coordinator on Security, State and Democracy, Corporación Andina de Fomento (CAF); Professor, Universidad Central de Venezuela
Maryclen Stelling de Macareño Coordinator, Venezuelan Chapter of Media Watch Global

Special Invitees

Alberto Adrianzén Member of Andean Parliament, Peru; Columnist, *La Republica*
César Gaviria Former Colombian President; Commissioner, Global Commission on Drug Policy
Santiago Mariani Political Consultant
Rafael Roncagliolo Orbegoso Foreign Minister of Peru
Eleonora Silva CAF Representative, Peru
Graciela Tapia Evaluator for the Andean – U.S. Dialogue Forum
Susana Villarán de la Puente Mayor of Lima, Peru

The Carter Center

Karin Andersson Program Associate, Americas Program
Camila Lanusse Coordinator, Ecuador, The Carter Center and International IDEA
Jennifer McCoy Director, Americas Program
Hector Vanolli Representative, Venezuela, The Carter Center

IDEA International

Alfonso Ferrufino Political Advisor, Bolivia, International IDEA
Kristen Sample Head of Mission, Andean Countries, International IDEA