POLITICAL ADVOCACY IN COLOMBIA

Impact Evaluation of the “Building Peace by
securing rights for victims of conflict and violence
in Colombia” Project

Effectiveness Review Series 2018/19

Source: CINEP

MARÍA DELGADO

Leitmotiv Social Consultants for Oxfam GB

www.oxfam.org.uk/effectiveness

OXFAM

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This review would not have been possible without the inestimable help and contribution of all those who generously gave their time and constructive criticism. We would particularly like to say thank you for the ongoing help and support of Luisa Vega (project officer) and Javier Barreto (head of MEL) at Oxfam in Colombia and Andrea Azevedo (MEAL officer at Oxfam GB), without whose constant effort and support it would not have been possible to carry out this work. Thanks also to all the partners who made time in their extremely busy schedules to help us.

Thank you all.

This report has been drawn up by an independent consultant and, as such, the opinions expressed herein represent the points of view and conclusions of its author, which are not necessarily shared by Oxfam or the other actors involved in the review.

Leitmotiv Social Consultants

Leitmotiv was born out of the social commitment and extensive experience of the three founding partners. We work to improve the professional, national and international contexts for social development and international aid. We provide support, advice and technical assistance through project and programme evaluations, training and support for strategic processes. We offer quality, rigorous services specifically designed for every client, and we insist on close, personal and innovative relationships. Always open to learning, Leitmotiv can apply the latest trends and methodologies from the sector, thanks to our wide international networks of collaborators and partners. Our clients include multilateral bodies such as the United Nations, NGOs, government agencies, private companies and foundations.

CONTENTS

Acronyms	3
Executive summary	4
1 Introduction	10
2 Project Description	11
3 Evaluation Design	17
4 Findings	23
5 Lessons & Final Considerations.....	52
Annex I: Brief outline of organisations participating in the project.....	55
Annex II: Evaluation matrix	59
Notes	61

ACRONYMS

AECID	Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation
CAPS	Psychosocial Care Centre Corporation
CC	Constitutional Court
CCAJAR	Corporación Colectivo de Abogados "José Alvear Restrepo"
CCEEU	Colombia Europe United States Coordination
CCJ	Colombian Commission of Jurists
UNHRC	United Nations Human Rights Council
CEV	Commission for Clarification of the Truth
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IACHR	Inter-American Commission on Human Rights
CINEP	Centre for Research and Popular Education
CMSMP	Corporación Mujer sigue mis pasos
IA Court HR	Inter-American Court of Human Rights
ICC	International Criminal Court
HR	Human Rights
DH Colombia	Network of Human Rights Defenders
UPR	Universal Periodic Review
FCECP	Fundación Círculo de Estudios Culturales y Políticos
FFF	Fundación Forjando Futuros
FNEB	Fundación Nydia Erika Bautista por los derechos humanos
MOVICE	Movimiento de Víctimas de Crímenes de Estado
UN	United Nations
OHCHR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
PBI	Peace Brigades International
PT	Process Tracing
ISTJRNR	Integrated System of Truth, Justice, Reparation and Non-Repetition
ToC	Theory of Change
UBPDD	Search Unit for Missing Persons

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the results of the assessment of the advocacy work carried out by Oxfam in Colombia and its network of partners as part of the project¹ *“Building peace by securing rights for victims of conflict and violence in Colombia”*, implemented between March 2015 and May 2019, with funding from the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (AECID).

As part of a wider effort to better capture and communicate the effectiveness of its work, this project has been selected by Oxfam Great Britain (OGB) from a random group of projects that are sufficiently mature to enable a rigorous review of their effectiveness.

The main objective of this assessment is to perform a rigorous, in-depth analysis of the effectiveness of the project in relation to a limited number of outcomes extracted from its Theory of Change (ToC), identified collectively together with the project team. Specifically, expected outcomes 1 and 5 have been selected. Based on this, the assessment tries to extract a number of lessons that facilitate a deeper understanding of the changes brought about as a result.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

With an implementation period of four years (2015-2019) and a total budget of €2,670,948, the project is part of Oxfam in Colombia's programme of rights to integrated justice and a life free from violence for victims, women and children. The project focuses on helping *“victims and Colombian human rights and peace organisations to strengthen their capacities to demand justice for rights violations and to advocate for a more favourable environment to the recognition of victims' rights”*.

It structures the intervention around five outcomes:

01. Strengthening the capacities of organisations for women who are victims of sexual violence, land claimants, relatives of missing persons and local human rights defenders and their skills to demand their rights to truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-repetition.

02. Improving guarantees for victims and their right to have an active participation in legal proceedings through the representation of emblematic cases of serious human rights violations that will help prevent and punish future violations of those.

03. Providing relatives of missing persons, women who are victims of sexual violence and victims of other gross human rights violations with integrated psychosocial health and psycholegal resources.

04. Strengthening physical protection protocols for human rights organisations and defenders, as well as rural communities, driving effective and sustainable mechanisms that enable them to continue doing their work.

05. Increasing the recognition and protection of human rights through advocacy aimed at the Colombian state and the international community, as well as visibility among civil society.

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The assessment was carried out over a period running from December 2018 to March 2019 and included a field visit to Bogotá between 21 January and 1 March 2018.

For this assessment, we have used a theory-based and utilization-focused approach focusing the analysis on those issues that, based on the project's Theory of Change (ToC), the main users of the assessment have identified as key in terms of their learning process. The project's ToC forms the main analytical framework of the assessment exercise. In the analysis and research of these outcomes, we have been guided by a predefined protocol designed by Oxfam GB for the application of Process Tracing (PT), a qualitative research method that is particularly useful for inferring causal relationships. Due to the limitations encountered for the application of this protocol in two of the outcomes analysed and in order to do justice to the achievements obtained in those two areas, we decided to use a 'contribution analysis' approach to outcomes 1 and 2. This explains why in both cases the report deviates from the usual structure suggested by the PT protocol, which *is* followed in the analysis of outcome 3. Therefore, that outcome is the only one rated according to the classification proposed by the protocol.

Based on the ToC reconstructed with the team and in accordance with this, it was decided to centre the assessment on three intermediate outcomes and three key questions:

Intermediate outcome 1: Empowering human rights and victims' organisations and increasing their capacities to demand the re-establishment of victims' rights and to advocate for those rights to be respected and enforced during the peace-building process.	To what extent has this project been able to help its partner human rights and victims' organisations to gain a greater capacity for both individual and collective action in order to demand the re-establishment of victims' rights and promote an environment that is favourable to the protection of such rights?
Intermediate outcome 2: Strengthening the capacity of human rights and victims' organisations to incorporate a gender focus into their work, promoting greater coordination between women's organisations and human rights platforms and organisations.	To what extent has participation in the project helped to strengthen organisations' capacity to incorporate a gender focus into their work and to increase coordination between women's and human rights organisations?
Intermediate outcome 3: Enabling the organisations within the framework of the project to help ensure that victims' rights will be central to regulatory development and the functioning of the transitional justice mechanisms created as part of the Peace Accords.	To what extent have the increased capacity and strengthening of organisations helped those within the framework of the project to be able to carry out effective advocacy work and monitoring actions that help to ensure that victims' rights will be central to regulatory development and the functioning of the transitional justice mechanisms created as part of the Peace Accords?

The data collection process involved the use of methods and tools that promote the inclusion and participation of the many actors with a stake in the project (primarily through semi-structured interviews, documentary review and a questionnaire). Taking into account the nature of the outcomes selected for the assessment, the selection of informants used a purposive, non-probabilistic sample that enabled 40 people (23 women and 17 men) and eight of the 12 organisations involved in the project to participate in the process.

FINDINGS

Outcome 1: Strengthening capacities and skills to claim justice for victims' rights violations

The assessment found evidence of strengthened capacities at different levels. Firstly, we can confirm that the project has made a positive contribution to reinforcing the internal administrative and management processes of some of the partners. Secondly, the data collected indicate that the environment of opportunity created by the project, particularly in terms of the economic support provided, has contributed significantly to strengthening networks and the collective coordination of project partners, both within themselves, in the case of platforms of victims, for example, and in relation to other civil society and key political actors. This coordination is not the result of the project as such, or of the project only, but we have observed that the support provided by the project has helped to keep certain hubs active, such as the working groups of Colombia Europe United States Coordination (CCEEU), and to guarantee quick reactions in the organisations' relations with decision-makers, which otherwise would have been more difficult. This has ensured the active presence of the organisations in a series of key processes for the protection of victims' rights. Lastly, and although it is an aspect that we have not been able to triangulate and analyse in more detail, we can confirm that the project has helped to disseminate the mechanisms and tools offered by the new transitional justice system for victims to claim their rights. By promoting greater ownership and use of them the project is expecting to facilitate victims' action for the enforceability of those rights in the future.

Based on the data collected we can conclude that, in general, the project's contribution to the creation of an environment of opportunity for the development or reinforcement of capacities that the organisations already had in place has been positive.

Outcome 2: Strengthening coordination between women's and human rights organisations and their capacity to incorporate a gender focus into their work with victims

In the case of outcome 2, we must clarify that this is an outcome that is implicit in the ToC and, therefore, does not have a clearly structured framework of action in the project document. It is an outcome that is being analysed at the request of Oxfam, given the latter's interest in understanding the extent to which the organisation's programmatic focus is managing to permeate the dialogue with its partners and, in this case, making it possible to progress towards greater coordination between women's and human rights organisations. Based on the conversations carried out, we can confirm that that conversation has led to certain advances in relation to the acquisition of capacities for greater incorporation of a gender focus in the work of some of the partners. This stronger gender lens is already starting to manifest itself in making the specific features of the violence experienced by women in the context of conflict more visible in their work. On the other hand, we can see a small amount of progress in the mutual recognition between organisations involved in the project, as a first step towards building bridges between women's and human rights organisations. However, these are preliminary and limited advances. In particular, we should mention the Corporación Mujer Sigue Mis Pasos (CMSMP), a relatively new organisation that has found in the project a useful framework in which to consolidate and grow, and above all to raise its visibility and position itself on wider platforms.

Outcome 3: Partner organisations contribute to ensuring that victims' rights are central to legislative development and the set-up of the transitional justice mechanisms created as part of the Peace Accords.

Among these advances, the assessment found evidence at three different levels of the ToC. In each case, however, it is impossible to rule out the contribution of other (f)actors, and the conclusion tends to be that the advances are the result of the confluence of multiple advocacy channels, including the partners' activities.

In a scenario of high political polarisation, the centrality of victims' rights and the reparation of their rights have remained on the public and political agenda in Colombia, though not without difficulty. The data collected confirm that the partners have made a significant contribution to this outcome. Of particular note is the international denunciation and advocacy carried out, which makes it possible to exert indirect pressure on the Colombian government and helps to keep such issues on the agenda. This is evident, for example, in the activities conducted to denounce the systematic murder of social leaders and human rights defenders before bodies such as the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR), International Criminal Court (ICC) and United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC).

Although certainly imperfect and with significant gaps in the opinion of most people, the laws enacted to regulate the Integrated System of Truth, Justice, Reparation and Non-Repetition (ISTJRN) and mechanisms like the Special Jurisdiction for Peace (JEP) include important elements of guarantee for victims that will facilitate their future participation in the various judicial and extra-judicial reparation processes. The information collected indicates a significant presence of the partners, both in key legislative processes (e.g. Legislative Act 01) and in the processes for constitutional review of the legislative framework approved for the implementation of the accords. This presence has, in some cases, ensured the incorporation of legal guarantees for the protection of victims' rights. Moreover, it has also slowed down certain "counter-reforms", which involved or could have involved setbacks to such rights. One example of this is the attempt to disqualify human rights defenders as JEP judges. Another is the creation of special courtrooms for hearings of members of the Army accused of serious crimes before the JEP.

Victims have begun participating in the institutions of the transitional justice system by submitting reports, primarily to the JEP and the Commission for Clarification of the Truth (CEV). Although to date not all organizations have been able to present reports, and given how recently these institutions were established, practically all the organisations consulted report activities involving the documentation of cases with support from the project. This activity will serve as a basis for submission of collective case reports in the near future. Despite the little time that has passed, some organisations have already begun providing inputs and materials to the JEP, and some indications are beginning to appear of the importance of the organisations' contribution to the activity of this institution, whose information has been taken into account in some of the decisions issued to date.

Based on the data collected, and taking into account the difficult context, we can therefore conclude that the advocacy work carried out as part of the project has demonstrated high levels of effectiveness.

Using the scoring system suggested in the protocol, this outcome would be rated as follows²:

Outcome	Classification	Justification
Intermediate outcome 3: Enabling the organisations within the framework of the project to help ensure that victims' rights will be central to regulatory development and the functioning of the transitional justice mechanisms created as part of the Peace Accords.		<p>Outcome achieved in full with evidence that the intervention's contribution has been important.</p> <p>The project is taking place in a political context of particular relevance and opportunity for political advocacy, due to the signing of peace accords between the Colombian government and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia-People's Army (FARC-EP) in November 2016.</p> <p>The assessment has made it possible to observe the presence and contribution of the organisations involved in the project to the numerous reform processes initiated following the signing of the accords, as well as their significant contribution to the positioning of victims' rights on the public agenda and to the incorporation of regulatory advances in favour of such rights. Although the complexity of the processes means we cannot rule out the contribution of other actors to achieving these advances, the data collected show us that the organisations' contribution has been necessary in order to secure these achievements and can therefore be considered significant.</p>

LESSONS AND FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

- The conversations carried out indicate that the flexibility of the project and its focus on reinforcing consolidated lines of work within the organisations (focusing on creating an environment of opportunity) in the long term, as opposed to other possible models of work and intervention, have been key factors in achieving the described outcomes.
- The project design is ambitious and vague in certain aspects, but shows a satisfactory level of horizontal and vertical coherence, with lines of work that are clearly complementary to the end goal.
- It is also accompanied by a high-quality selection of partner organisations, bringing together highly respected organisations with a proven track record, and follows a line of continuity from previous collaborations.
- The data obtained enable us to conclude that, throughout the project's life span and in particular during its formulation, insufficient space has been given to the definition or collective discussion of the outcomes and of what each one means for the different organisations. One recommendation in that regard would be to invest more effort in the inception phase and to promote a collective conversation about the ToC of the project, specifying what each outcome involves. This would facilitate a common reading of the project and make it possible to design a clearer monitoring system with a greater capacity to measure changes.

1 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of the assessment of the advocacy work carried out by Oxfam in Colombia and its network of partners as part of the project³ *“Building peace by securing rights for victims of conflict and violence in Colombia”*, implemented between March 2015 and May 2019, with funding from the AECID⁴.

The implementation of the project is taking place in a period of particular relevance, coinciding with the process of negotiating and signing the Peace Agreement between the Colombian government and the FARC-EP⁵. By strengthening the capacities of human rights and victims’ organisations to demand their rights, the end goal of the project was to contribute to the fight against impunity and to promote the human rights of victims of conflict and violence in Colombia, elements considered basic premises of a lasting peace⁶. This project continues the line of work involving the protection of the human rights of victims that Oxfam and the AECID have supported since 2008⁷.

This assessment has been carried out at the request of OGB as part of a wider effort to better capture and communicate the effectiveness of its work. As part of its Global Performance Framework, each year OGB selects a random group of projects that are sufficiently mature to enable a rigorous review of their effectiveness. This project has been selected in this way from among those executed in the domain of political advocacy.

Moreover, the assessment process is being carried out at a particularly strategic time for the organisation in Colombia, which is currently undergoing a transition process that is expected to be finalised in the coming months and which will see Oxfam’s office in Colombia become a country affiliate. Thus, the assessment has made it possible to carry out a small exercise of reflection on the advocacy work carried out under the justice programme, helping to group together lessons that will hopefully be useful in the organisation’s next phase.

The main objective of this assessment is to perform a rigorous, in-depth review of the effectiveness of the project in relation to a limited number of outcomes extracted from its Theory of Change (ToC), identified collectively together with the project team. Specifically, outcomes 1 and 5 have been selected. Based on this, lessons should be learned from the work carried out, leading to a deeper understanding of the changes brought about as a result. The assessment was carried out over a period running from December 2018 to April 2019 and included a field visit to Bogotá between 21 January and 1 March 2018.

The analysis and research of these outcomes have been guided by the predefined protocol designed by Oxfam GB for the application of Process Tracing (PT), a qualitative research method that is particularly useful for inferring causal relationships.

2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 THE POLITICAL CONTEXT

The implementation of the Peace Accords

Following several years of negotiations⁸ and a plebiscite, on 24 November 2016 the Colombian government and the country's largest guerrilla group, the FARC-EP, reached a definitive agreement to put an end to more than half a century of armed conflict. The agreement was the result of a long process, involving many conversations and milestones. The following simplified timeline⁹ will help to better understand the time frame and context of the project under assessment. The milestones depicted include the various national forums, insofar as they were spaces in which civil society organisations could provide inputs relating to the different items on the negotiation agenda; the text in red refers to the most important milestones in terms of victims' rights.

Figure 1: Timeline of the Peace Accords

The *General Agreement for Ending Conflict and Building a Stable and Long-Lasting Peace* established the conditions for fostering a profound transition and a new stage of coexistence structured around five core pillars: integrated rural reform, political participation, an end to the conflict, resolution of the problem of illegal drugs, and victims of the conflict and implementation and verification mechanisms. An independent commission, the Monitoring, Momentum and Verification Commission for the Implementation of the Accords (CSIVI), would also be established, guaranteeing the participation of civil society and women through a specific gender component.

Of particular interest for this assessment is the last chapter of the general agreement, dedicated to the victims of the conflict. Chapter 5 acknowledges the harm and suffering caused to the civilian population during the years of conflict and places the satisfaction of victims' rights at the heart of the agreed institutional framework. To that end and in response to the *"testimonies, proposals and expectations"* of the victims¹⁰, the agreement establishes the creation of an Integrated System for Truth, Justice, Reparation and Non-repetition, the **ISTJNR**.

The system combines judicial mechanisms for the investigation and punishment of serious human rights violations and breaches of international humanitarian law with complementary extra-judicial mechanisms, which seek to help with clarification of the truth, the search for missing persons and the reparation of the harm caused to individuals, groups and regions.

Figure 2: Integrated System of Truth, Justice, Reparation and Non-Repetition

The agreement offered an historic opportunity to contribute to ending human rights violations and a situation of violence that has resulted in the forced displacement of more than 7.7 million Colombians since 1985, according to the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR)¹¹, as well as making progress towards the satisfaction of victims' rights.

However, in spite of the advances observed, the Second Report on the State of Implementation of the Colombia Peace Agreement¹² drawn up by the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies at the University of Notre Dame, in the US, draws attention to the need to face a series of persistent challenges that are threatening the process and weakening the basic implementation structure of the peace agreement. Of particular relevance to this assessment are the precarious security conditions in which human rights defenders, social leaders and their communities in certain regions are carrying out their work, and the insufficient progress of some of the legal adjustments and reforms required to make some of the institutions that make up the integrated system, such as the Special Jurisdiction for Peace (JEP)¹³, fully operational.

In this difficult context, the victory of Iván Duque in the presidential election of June 2018, amid promises to substantially amend the Havana agreement, opened up significant uncertainties about the focus of the new government and its commitment to peace and to the effective establishment of the institutions designed as part of the peace accords¹⁴.

Colombian civil society and human rights movements in the context of the armed conflict and the peace-building process

Since the creation of Colombia's first human rights NGOs in the 1970s and 1980s, these civil society structures have consolidated themselves as one of the leading agents of social mobilisation in defence of human rights¹⁵.

Later, in 1991, the Constitution opened up a window of opportunity for human rights NGOs, which, making use of the new constitutional framework, underwent a significant process of expansion and specialisation. *"It was at that time that important coordination and cooperation structures began to appear, such as the Colombian Platform for Human Rights, Democracy and Development, the Civil Society Permanent Assembly for Peace, the Alliance and the Colombia Europe United States Coordination (CCEEU), based on proposed alternatives to armed conflict and democratic development in Colombia's regions"*¹⁶.

Since then, Colombia has managed to maintain a large, complex social fabric¹⁷ that has been playing a significant and widely recognised role¹⁸ in the various peace-building processes. It

is important to point out, however, that this support to the different peace processes spearheaded by the government has posed a clear political challenge to such organisations and has forced them to find a difficult balance between that support and their work of opposing and denouncing policies promoted by that same government. As project staff indicate, civil society organisations were clear that the accords were not an end in themselves, but rather represented a tool or medium that could be used to open important spaces for participation at the regional and national levels and to make progress in a wider struggle for the full materialization of citizenship rights. This instrumental aspect is particularly visible for the women's organisations that played a fundamental and widely recognised role in the process of negotiating the peace accords, ensuring that they incorporated important demands in terms of gender equity and women's rights.

However, in recent times and in line with what is happening in many other countries in the region¹⁹, different voices are warning of a certain shrinking of the democratic space accessible to civil society organisations in the country²⁰ and of greater difficulty in establishing constructive lines of dialogue with the new authorities. On top of this, there is the growing threat to the security of social leaders and human rights defenders in the post-conflict context, as already highlighted in the second report by the Kroc Institute and reported from a diverse range of national and international authorities. Even the UN Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, following his recent visit to Colombia, expressed his concern about the increase in violence and stigmatisation aimed at human rights defenders²¹ and called on the new government to take more decisive measures to tackle the problem.

With these brief notes on the political and social context in which these organisations are carrying out their work as part of this project, we hope to help highlight some of the challenges and difficulties they face in their advocacy work, which will be addressed in more detail in the rest of the report.

2.2 THE PROJECT

With an implementation period of four years (2015-2019), the general objective of the project "Building peace by securing rights for victims of conflict and violence in Colombia" is "to contribute to the fight against impunity by providing support for victims of conflict and strengthening the rule of law and respect for human rights, all of which are essential for establishing a stable, long-lasting peace". The project is part of Oxfam in Colombia's programme "the right to justice and to a life free from violence for victims, women and children". In order to contribute to this general objective, the project focuses on helping "victims and Colombian human rights and peace organisations to strengthen their capacities to claim their rights and demand reparation and to create a more favourable environment for the recognition and materialization of those rights".

The intervention is structured around five outcomes:

01. Organisational strengthening: Under this line of work, the project seeks to strengthen the capacities of victims and the organisations that represent them, as well as those of Colombian human rights organisations, and to promote greater collective coordination and networking to demand justice for victims' rights violations and to advocate for greater recognition and protection of said rights.

02. Legal attention: With the aim of helping to overcome the current rates of impunity in the country, this line of work seeks to facilitate access to justice at national and international level for victims, with a special focus on women. To that end, the project has funded legal

support and representation for emblematic cases of serious human rights violations, both at the national and the international levels.

03. Psychosocial support: This line of work provides responses to the psychosocial and mental health needs of victims, especially women, victims of extra-judicial executions and forced disappearances, and victims of sexual violence.

04. Protection: This outcome focuses on strengthening physical protection processes for human rights organisations and defenders, as well as rural communities, driving effective and sustainable mechanisms that enable them to continue doing their work.

05. Visibility and political advocacy: This outcome aims to help increase recognition and protection of victims' human rights and to raise the profile of the situation, concerns and demands for rights of victims within public opinion and in decision-making spaces at the national and international levels. In particular, the activities associated with this outcome have focused on advocating for victims' human rights to be placed at the centre of the establishment and implementation of the ISTJNR established as part of the Peace Agreement.

The project has a total approved budget of €2,670,948, of which €2,500,000 is funded by the AECID, with the remainder coming from Oxfam in Colombia and its 12 partner organisations. The table below lists the organisations involved in the implementation of the project²², together with the funding received by each of them during the period 2015-2019.

Table 1: Partners of the project

Partners	Funding received
Network of Human Rights Defenders (DH Colombia)	€112,596.75
Centre for Research and Popular Education (CINEP) Foundation	€203,996.68
Colombia Europe United States Coordination (CCEEU)	€128,739.21
Circle Foundation for Cultural and Political Studies (FCECP)	€127,438
Psychosocial Care Centre Corporation (CAPS)	€164,597
Colombian Commission of Jurists (CCJ)	€288,206.53
"José Alvear Restrepo" Collective Corporation of Lawyers (CAJAR)	€278,393.65
Woman Follow My Footsteps Corporation (CMSMP)	€30,230
Forging Futures Foundation (FFF)	€298,995.85
Nydia Erika Bautista Foundation for Human Rights (FNEB)	€133,376.56
Peace Brigades International (PBI)	€203,991
Movement for Victims of State Crime (MOVICE)	€200,065.11

Source: Oxfam in Colombia information summarised by the evaluator

Notes on the management of the project

Responsibility for the financial management and monitoring of the project has fallen on Oxfam in Colombia, as the entity tasked with payment processes and monitoring the organisations' activities based on the provisions established in the planning matrix.

Oxfam in Colombia has also led two key collective spaces that were created as part of the project's design: the Management Unit and the Space for Joint Action. Within the framework of the Management Unit, meetings have been regularly held (between four and five per year), which have enabled the organisations to interact and share their reading of the context and key work challenges with others. For its part, the Space for Joint Action has met 22 times over the last four years, with the objective of promoting joint advocacy actions considered to be strategic. The activities carried out or promoted in this space include those related to the "Victims and Rights" campaign, led by Oxfam and other organisations. One example of the activities carried out is the elaboration of a communicative document summarising the key tasks and mandate of the Truth Commission (CEV) and intended to disseminate the content of the agreements and of the tools and mechanisms available to the victims. Other activities include several mobilisation actions in favour of the 'Yes' campaign carried out during the plebiscite of 2016.

Theory of Change

During the first stage of the assessment, the preliminary conversations held with the Oxfam team in Colombia and the review of a series of key documents, including the ToC of the country programme, made it possible to reconstruct the general ToC of the influence work²³ at the programmatic level and to explain some of its underlying assumptions. This reconstruction exercise had a dual objective. Firstly, given that there was no explicit ToC at the project level, it aimed to help the reviewer to better understand the different aspects of the chosen strategy and to ensure an adequate interpretation of the change objectives pursued. Secondly, as will be described in more detail in the methodology section, this exercise enabled us to select a series of intermediate outcomes on which to focus the assessment work, and to identify the main assumptions on which they are based. The following graphic reflects the outcome of the ToC reconstruction work carried out with Oxfam's team in Colombia for this assessment:

Figure 3: Theory of Change

According to this graphic, the influence work that Oxfam and its partners carry out within the context of the peace-building process²⁴ is based on a key underlying assumption that is common to Oxfam's work at the global level: that political and institutional changes, to be sustainable, require promoting the active citizenship and strong voice of those most vulnerable in society. Among other things this means working to strengthen the individual and collective capacities of organised civil society to claim greater recognition and satisfaction of the rights of the victims of the conflict. This, in turn, means enabling the right conditions for them to do that by providing training and facilitating stronger collective coordination and protection of those organizations. In line with this logic, this assessment is focused on analysing how this greater collective capacity to exert active citizenship has contributed to increasing the visibility of the situation of victims and their demands, to legitimise their agenda and claims among society and the public authorities, and to foster greater occupation of the public space and, consequently, increased and better participation by organisations in political decision-making spaces.

3 EVALUATION DESIGN

3.1 OBJECTIVES AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The main objective of this evaluation is to analyse the project's key contributions to the advocacy work carried out by Oxfam and its partners within the framework of project AECID 14-CO1-044 and to extract lessons that can be useful to both the country office and Oxfam GB in future projects. In this sense and given the strategic moment of transition in which Oxfam's office in Colombia finds itself, this exercise is particularly oriented towards learning and collective reflection, but also aims to help increase accountability towards both the donor and the victims' and population groups benefiting from the project.

3.2 SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The main unit of analysis of this assessment is the project funded by the AECID. However, given the broad design of the initiative, the diversity of the lines of intervention covered and the requirements of the chosen methodology (PT protocol), the effectiveness review focuses on analysing the effectiveness of the advocacy work carried out within the framework of the project, which corresponds primarily to outcomes 1 and 5. Even in the context of these outcomes, we do not pretend to cover all possible results that could be somehow associated to them but to focus on a few processes implemented and on the outcomes achieved as a result of them. This effort to focus the assessment and limit the number of issues to be analysed took into consideration two key factors, which were discussed in depth with the project team during the preliminary meetings. Firstly, the resources available and the assessment's capacity to tackle the breadth of the work carried out with a sufficient level of depth. Secondly, the areas of greatest interest, usefulness and potential for learning for the main users of the assessment, especially in light of the process of transition towards the establishment of Oxfam in Colombia as a country affiliate.

Taking these factors into account and on the basis of the ToC previously described, it was agreed to focus the assessment on the following intermediate outcomes²⁵:

Intermediate outcome 1: Human rights and victims' organisations are empowered and increase their capacities to claim and advocate for victims' and human rights within the peace-building process.

Intermediate outcome 2: The capacity of human rights and victims' organisations to incorporate a gender focus into their work is strengthened and greater coordination between women's organisations and human rights platforms and organisations is promoted.

Intermediate outcome 3: The advocacy work of partner organizations effectively contributes to making victims' rights central in the regulation, set-up and functioning of the transitional justice mechanisms created as part of the Peace Accords.

The definition of these outcomes enabled us to explore some of the central hypotheses underlying the ToC and to attempt to answer three key assessment questions²⁶:

1. To what extent has this project been able to help partner human rights and victims' organisations to gain a greater capacity for both individual and collective action in order to demand the restoration of victims' rights and promote an environment that is more favourable to the protection of such rights? (Intermediate outcome 1).

2. To what extent has participation in the project helped to strengthen organisations' capacity to incorporate a gender focus into their work and to increase coordination between women's and human rights organisations? (Intermediate outcome 2).
3. To what extent have the increased capacity and strengthening of partner organisations helped them to carry out effective advocacy work and monitoring actions that contribute to making victims' rights central in the regulation, set-up and functioning of the transitional justice mechanisms created as part of the Peace Accords? (Intermediate outcome 3).

The assessment exercise covers the project implementation period (2015-2019) and, taking into account the resources available and the assessment questions selected, focuses exclusively on the activities carried out in the national context by the partner organisations. It should also be pointed out that, at the time of the assessment, there were advocacy actions that had not yet been carried out, which means that they cannot be reflected in this report. This is the case for a planned conference in Brussels and a closing event, which are intended to trace the roadmap of the organisations' advocacy for the next four years.

In summary, the assessment excludes:

- The regional activities carried out by the partners.
- Political processes prior to the signing of the peace agreement. In an attempt to specify the thematic scope of the assessment in relation to outcome 3 and taking into account the time and effort requirements of the PT protocol, it was decided to limit the analysis to the advocacy work carried out in relation to the implementation of the peace agreement and the implementation of the ISTJNR. This meant omitting from the assessment important contributions to previous processes related to the negotiation of the agreement in order to concentrate on more recent processes with a greater learning potential for the team.
- Other lines of work promoted by the project, mainly psychosocial care work, legal support and representation, and activities aimed at strengthening physical protection processes for human rights defenders and organisations. The large number of participating organisations and the breadth of their work within the framework of a project that covers five different lines of work, though complementary, prevent us from doing justice to the acknowledged effort of each and every one of them and from reflecting the work of all the organisations. A final assessment of the project is expected to be carried out soon, which will have a wider focus that we hope will give fair coverage to these areas.

3.3 METHODOLOGICAL FOCUS

As previously mentioned, the main purpose of the effectiveness reviews led by Oxfam is to better express and communicate the effectiveness of the work done by the organisation, as well as to promote evidence-based learning. The effectiveness reviews use different methodological focuses depending on the thematic area in which the project is situated²⁷.

For this assessment, we have used a theory-based and utilization-focused approach focusing the analysis on those matters which, based on the aforementioned ToC, the main users of the assessment have identified as key in terms of their learning process. The project's ToC thus forms the main analytical framework of the assessment exercise.

For the analysis and research of the selected outcomes, a predominantly qualitative and inductive focus based on the PT methodology was used. In particular, the assessment used a protocol designed by Oxfam GB for the application of said method in its effectiveness review of interventions in the thematic areas of citizen voice and policy influencing.

PT is a qualitative research method that is particularly useful for inferring causal links. The use of this method makes it possible to review the effectiveness of a project and the contribution

of the different strategies adopted to specific social and policy change outcomes. In this way, the methodology seeks to understand: a) whether the social change or changes pursued have taken place (whether the outcome has materialised); and b) to what extent it can be established that the contribution of the project or intervention to these changes has been significant. For its part and along similar lines, the use of methods such as contribution analysis has enabled us to confirm or rule out causal assumptions based on a chain or sequence of reasoning.

Sequence of steps to follow when undertaking PT in advocacy and influencing work

In this section, we will give a brief description of the main steps or stages involved in the application of the research protocol designed by Oxfam²⁸. It is important to point out that these are not intended to be applied in a linear sequence of processes; significant iteration between many of the processes is expected and, indeed, desired.

- Identify a limited number of recent **intermediate and final outcomes** that the project hopes (or seeks) to achieve. This generally involves a series of key actors in a process of (re)construction of the ToC of the campaign or intervention.
- Systematically assess and document the activities carried out in the project/campaign to achieve the selected targeted outcomes.
- Identify and evidence the extent to which the selected outcomes have actually materialised, as well as any relevant unintended outcomes.
- For each outcome selected, carry out a "process induction" with the aim of identifying all possible causal explanations and the (f)actors that may have contributed (one of them being the project or intervention) to the achievement of the evidenced outcomes associated with steps 2 and 3. This means carrying out exploratory and inductive research to identify possible alternative explanations, which are then developed in fuller explanations or hypotheses that may be proven by means of the following step.
- Use "process verification" to assess the extent to which each of the alternative explanations identified in the previous steps is supported by the available evidence. This therefore involves considering, specifying and documenting what type of evidence, if found, would validate or rule out each of these alternative explanations, until the explanation(s) most supported by the evidence remain(s). It is possible that the evidence available will not be sufficient to verify or eliminate all the explanations being researched. In that case, the findings of the assessment may be inconclusive.
- Write a narrative analytical report to document the above research processes and findings.

3.4 DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

The data collection process involved the use of methods and tools that promote the inclusion and participation of the many actors with a stake in the project. This refers to actors with a direct interest in the intervention, such as partners or the advocacy target population (political and institutional actors), but also other actors, such as academic actors or international or multilateral institutions that can provide a qualified external perspective. With this focus, the assessment is intended to help increase the visibility of the diversity of voices intervening in the processes being analysed.

Taking into account the nature of the outcomes selected for the assessment, we used a purposive, non-probabilistic sampling strategy. This choice meant choosing a sample of different individuals who were considered knowledgeable enough to provide relevant information about the aspects to be analysed. One of the disadvantages of this sampling technique is that it has a high level of bias. In order to mitigate this, albeit partially, the data collected were complemented with an extensive documentary review and with the expansion

of the initial sample through the use of the snowball sampling method and the identification of opinion leaders and/or experts from the reference sectors (known as ‘bellwethers’). The inclusion of bellwethers also helped us to verify other alternative causal explanations throughout the research. For the assessment of gender aspects, special care was taken to include actors and institutions with a high level of specialisation and expertise in this topic among the informants.

The conclusions and findings collected in this report are based primarily on qualitative information that was collated following extensive documentary analysis and a number of individual and group interviews conducted with a large number and variety of actors during the field visit. The field work was carried out between 21 January and 1 February in Bogotá. Additionally, in order to complete the information collected, some remote interviews were conducted during the period immediately following that visit. Of all the project partners, the following directly participated in the assessment: CCJ, CCAJAR, CCEEU, DH Colombia, CINEP, CMSMP, FFF and MOVICE. During this time, information was collected from a total of 40 people with the following profiles:

Table 2: Number of actors consulted

Oxfam and partners				External actors					
Oxfam		Partners		Institutions		Academia	International actors		Civil society organisations
2 ♀	1 ♂	15 ♀	8 ♂	2 ♀	5 ♂	2 ♀	2 ♀	1 ♂	2 ♂
40 people consulted (23 ♀ and 17 ♂)									

The main data collection methods and tools used during the assessment were:

Desk review: this focused primarily on reviewing programmatic and project documents, such as country strategies, progress reports, internal meeting minutes and reflection documents²⁹.

Review of secondary sources: the assessment took into consideration the information contained in research, official reports, judicial rulings and resolutions, political declarations, the media, etc.

Semi-structured interviews: the principal tool used to gather data involved in-depth interviews (both in person and remote) conducted with a sample of internal actors (Oxfam and partners) and external ones (decision-makers, staff from different transitional justice and governmental institutions, representatives of international actors, etc.). The interviews were conducted in a semi-structured format, on the basis of a script that made it possible to homogenise the information compiled but offered sufficient margin for flexibility, so that it could be adapted according to the profile of the interviewee and their individual context. In total, 40 people were interviewed, including representatives of eight project partners.

Questionnaires: a short questionnaire was designed and distributed to partners during interviews so that they could quantitatively assess the project’s level of contribution to a series of variables extracted from the ToC. The questionnaire was filled out in person at the end of each meeting, recording the perspectives of the representatives of the eight partner organizations participating in the assessment process. This means that the data provided do not under any circumstances reflect the official or collective position of the entities or represent the perspective of all the organisations involved in the project.

Stakeholders' map: during the preliminary phase, a detailed map of actors was drawn up with the collaboration of Oxfam and the network of partners. This map served two purposes: on the one hand, it gave us an overview of the stakeholders involved in the work assessed, allowing us to understand the network of relationships at regional/national and local level; and on the other, it identified the people to be contacted or interviewed as key informants in the assessment.

Feedback meetings: following the field visit, two feedback meetings were held with the main users of the assessment. The results of the feedback formed part of the analysis that led to the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.

The graph below summarises the main sources of information that contributed to this analysis:

Figure 4: Sources of Information

The information obtained from the different sources described - word-for-word transcriptions of interviews, results of questionnaires and documentary sources - was analysed and duly contrasted and triangulated. This involved the systematic comparison of evidence from multiple sources and methods of data collection. All the interviews were recorded, subject to verbal consent from the participants. The audio files were transcribed (verbatim), processed and codified, together with the reviewer's notes, with the help of a specific software program for qualitative analysis (Dedoose).

3.5 LIMITATIONS

The assessment process benefited from the full cooperation of the people involved in the project, both in the Oxfam country office and in partner organisations, which made available all the resources at their disposal to carry out the field visit. Their support in providing documentation and organising the agenda and arrangement of the interviews and meetings was critical to the successful performance of the information-gathering phase. However, we must highlight a series of limitations and challenges, both logistical and methodological, that may have had an impact on the quantity and quality of the information gathered and, therefore, may affect the validity of the findings.

A most significant logistical limitation relates to the political context in which the assessment and the project itself were carried out. In a highly polarised context due to the recent change of government, with security problems and constant threats to human rights organizations and defenders³⁰ and a frenetic agenda of reforms for the implementation of the peace agreements³¹, securing the cooperation and availability of the people selected as informants during the days of the field visit was not easy. In order to offset this limitation as much as possible, the snowball sampling method was intensified and the coverage of remote interviews increased. That is, additional alternative contacts were identified and the interview period was extended so as to be able to access more people. Despite these difficulties, we managed to collect information from practically all the key external informants except for two institutions and are very grateful to those who gave us some of their precious time. It is also important to point out that, in light of the resources available, it was decided to focus the assessment efforts on the work carried out solely at the national level. This meant that we were unable to incorporate the voice of many key organisations in the territory, which limits the triangulation of certain aspects. Where triangulation was not possible, this is expressly indicated.

Moreover, several limitations were identified in relation to both the application of the methodology and access to key information. Firstly, the paucity of institutional memory, due to a high turnover of staff in the country office, made it difficult to understand some elements related primarily to the design phase. Although this is a fairly common limitation, it forced us to assemble the project puzzle with some key pieces missing.

Secondly, it was not possible to faithfully follow the PT protocol in a totally systematic and rigorous manner. This was due to three main reasons:

- An excessively broad definition of intermediate outcomes, which makes it hard to carry out the entire induction and verification process in a limited time.
- The multiplicity of civil society actors that intervene in the political context of peacebuilding in Colombia and their high degree of collective coordination make it extremely complicated to establish clear lines of causality between identified policy changes and the project, which also makes it hard to identify alternative causal hypotheses.
- The advocacy work of Oxfam and its network of partners in relation to the defence of human rights and victims' rights dates back more than 10 years. With different variants, this project is continuing the work carried out as part of at least two previous projects, which were also supported by the AECID and involved the participation of many of the partners of this project. This means that some of the decisions analysed are the result of prolonged advocacy action over time, making it difficult to isolate or clearly profile each of the processes and their results.

To mitigate some of these methodological limitations, we were careful to triangulate the information obtained by using content analysis and reviewing a large number of secondary sources. It was particularly complicated to apply this protocol to the analysis of outcomes 1 and 2. Capacity-strengthening processes are generally and necessarily long-term processes in which a multiplicity of actors intervene. This makes it difficult to isolate the effects of a single project or a single actor, particularly when the projects in question are continuity projects, as is the case in this assessment. In general, the information gathered during the field visit enabled us to understand in which aspects and capacities the project's support materialised but did not give us a clear idea of how significant or decisive this contribution was. As a result, and in order to attempt to do justice to the goals achieved within the framework of this outcome, we opted to use a contribution analysis approach. This explains why the reporting of this section deviates from the usual structure suggested by the protocol, which is followed in the analysis of outcome 3.

4 FINDINGS

This chapter presents the main findings of the assessment for each of the selected intermediate outcomes.

4.1 OUTCOME 1: CAPACITY-BUILDING

In this section, we will analyse the extent to which the project has actually contributed to strengthening the collective capacities of victims and human rights organisations to claim their rights and to promote an enabling environment for their recognition and restoration.

With the idea of testing the different assumptions and sequential steps implicit in the ToC of the project, in this section we will limit ourselves to analysing the first part of the proposal with which the objective is presented, that is, capacity-building per se, without taking into account the results of this capacity-building in terms of advocacy or enforceability, which will be analysed subsequently in the analysis of outcome 3.

4.1.1 The project's change objectives

The analysis of this outcome involved answering a central question: what do the organisations involved in the project do that they did not do, or did differently, before the project? That is, if we conclude that their capacities have been strengthened, in what aspects is this different or better capacity reflected?

The answer to this question is not easy, for several reasons. Firstly, because the vast majority of partners already had established capacities prior to the project and, moreover, many of them had just participated in previous AECID/Oxfam projects. Secondly, because many other actors intervene in the development of the capacities of each organisation, meaning it is impossible to isolate the individual contributions of each of them. All the partners receive funding from multiple donors and similar projects, meaning that the weighting of the economic contribution of this specific project within their annual budgets varies from one organisation to the next. Among the many donors that support similar capacity-building lines, some of those mentioned during the interviews or identified in the documentary review include: Amnesty International, the Swedish and Norwegian embassies, the EU, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the multidonor fund and German cooperation. But there are more.

And, thirdly, because the wording of the project is, in the reviewer's opinion, too vague in the definition of those capacities or aspects it intended to reinforce. One of the first difficulties encountered was understanding what each organisation understood by "capacity-building", a broad concept that is not always understood in the same way. We must take into account that this project brings together 12 organisations with different mandates, capacities and sizes, six of which participated directly in this outcome. This means that, logically, each one has assessed its capacity needs based on its own reality and reading of the context and, consequently, the interpretation of what this outcome means is, by its nature, diverse. Without considering this a problem in itself, in light of the assessment it did seem important to us to extract a series of variables that would enable us to conduct a somewhat more

systematic analysis of advances or changes applicable to all or most of them and to better understand which capacity changes had been verified with greater clarity.

An initial approximation of what is meant by “capacities” in the context of the project can be extracted from the project's logical framework³² and, specifically, from the indicators associated with its specific objective and with outcome 1, which we will summarise below:

- Strengthening of knowledge, training and legal tools for victims and organisations to effectively claim and enforce their rights.
- Strengthening the capacities of victims to access justice mechanisms, both in land restitution proceedings (Law 1448/2011) and in proceedings relating to sexual violence in the context of the conflict.
- Improving the social and political recognition of victims.
- Increasing female participation in organisations’ decision-making spaces.
- Strengthening internal organisational capacities, including administrative skills.
- Strengthening strategic planning capacities.
- Increasing the level of coordination between organisations and the state.

This list suggests that a combination of aspects and capacities, at several levels and dimensions, were expected to be strengthened. On the one hand, the list suggests that administrative, management and planning capacities of the partner organisations were expected to be strengthened. On the other, the project seemed to expect a certain improvement of capacities related to enhancing partners’ participation in various decision-making spaces and promoting different interactions between the organisations and the state. Thirdly, there is a suggestion of capacity-building processes relating to the strengthening of knowledge and appropriation of the different tools and mechanisms that the peace agreement offers for victims and their organisations to claim their rights.

Lastly, the list includes a couple of specific indicators relating to the participation of women in certain processes, leading us to briefly touch on intermediate outcome 2, which we will analyse separately in section 4.2.

Secondly, we used the ToC to extract additional elements that might help us to identify other implicit variables and to better understand the different changes that the organisations may have experienced in relation to their capacities. By way of example, these include better positioning and visibility for the organisations, both within collective coordination spaces or platforms and in relation to decision-makers and key political actors for advocacy work.

4.1.2 Findings

With some small nuances, outcome 1 practically reproduces the wording of the specific objective and establishes the project's aspiration to help strengthen *“the capacities of organisations that represent women who are victims of sexual violence, land claimants, relatives of missing persons and local human rights defenders and their capacities to claim their rights to truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-repetition”*. Six organisations participate in activities associated with this outcome: CCEEU, MOVICE, CMSMP, CCAJAR, FFF and FCEPS.

By combining the information extracted from the documentary analysis, the matrix and the ToC, we prepared a brief questionnaire, which we shared with Oxfam for its validation and discussed with the eight partners consulted, asking them to rate the project's contribution to the different variables identified on a scale of 1-5. The questionnaire was filled out jointly at the end of the meeting with each of the partners. This allowed us to put into context some of

the issues discussed at the previous meeting. The results of that discussion are summarised in the following figure.

Figure 5: Contribution of the project to capacity building

Organisational strengthening and building the management capacities of the project's partner organisations

Some of the project resources associated with outcome 1 covered the organisation of internal seminars, days or workshops aimed at building administration and institutional management skills, among others. The objective of these activities was to strengthen the organisations' internal capacities and improve their administrative, managerial and/or strategic planning processes.

The documentation reviewed suggests that each organisation opted to reinforce different areas, depending on its particular needs. Below are some examples of processes that have been strengthened or tools acquired that the people consulted have shared with us or that are reflected in the progress reports:

- DH Colombia took the opportunity to strengthen its administrative and financial processes. As an organisation of smaller size and scope, it acknowledges that both the human resources provided by the project and the financial reporting requirements have been key in advancing in these processes and consolidating its management capacities.
- At CINEP, for example, the project resources have served to improve management and monitoring processes, such as the CRECER management platform that is used to facilitate collaborative work and monitoring of projects based on a management-by-results model, which has been strengthened.

- The CCJ, despite not participating in this outcome according to the planning matrix, believes that its participation in the project has helped it to systematise a series of experiences to which the project has contributed, thereby improving management and the transfer of knowledge and expertise for the future.
- MOVICE reports the drawing up of the 2020 Sustainability Plan in February 2018³³, which is enabling it to reinforce its internal organisational dynamic.

In general, and as can be seen in the graphic presented in the introduction, most of the organisations consulted believe that the project's contribution to strengthening their internal capacities has been rather significant.

Strengthening coordination and collective action capacities

From a joint analysis of the planning matrix and the ToC, we can infer an expectation of coordination at various levels:

Internal coordination: organisational strengthening of victims' movements

The support of the project has enabled several of the organisations to hold their national assemblies or local meetings, which, according to the testimonies received, have made a significant contribution to reinforcing their internal coordination. This is particularly the case for those organisations that have a network-based operational model (primarily the CCEEU, MOVICE and CINEP). The project has enabled them to hold meetings, regional and national assemblies, discussion boards, committees or local seminars that have helped them to strengthen as a movement, deepen their reflection and exchange processes, and reach shared positions concerning the implementation of the Peace Accords and of the transitional justice system, among other things. CINEP, for example, reports that it is taking advantage of the space offered by the national assembly of the Human Rights and Political Violence Database Network, which is supported by the project, to promote the exchange of experiences and knowledge between its community base organisations. This, they say, has helped them to promote a greater degree of synergy between those community base organisations and CINEP, which has a greater presence at the national level.

Such opportunities have also been strategic for platforms such as the CCEEU and MOVICE, which bring together a large number of organisations, helping them to define strategies and planning, and to strengthen their internal coordination. In the case of MOVICE, the organisation told us how in recent years, with the support of the project, it has been able to continue promoting activities like the National Meeting of Victims and driving important local reflection processes concerning the significance and potential of the transitional justice system for the various regional chapters into which the movement is structured.

"We've had some reflections, which to me personally have been extremely interesting, about how restorative justice is another way of implementing justice that involves not just a change of attitude, but a new reading of society. We have managed to generate this kind of deeper reflection. From that starting point there is more clarity about why we are going to participate in the special jurisdiction for peace and how. At the outset, that was not so clear; there was some internal resistance. That resistance has been giving way little by little..."

(MVICE)

It is worth pointing out that all the cases reported involve activities that the organisations carry out regularly as part of their mandate, and in which the project's main contribution has been to promote an environment of opportunity and funding that has facilitated these activities. This means that this type of contribution is mostly aimed at guaranteeing the "normal" functioning of the organisations, but also guarantees the continuity of important internal coordination processes that are critical for an effective exertion of collective action and demanding of rights.

Collective coordination and network-based work

Of all the aspects discussed with the organisations consulted, the project's contribution to strengthening the capacity for collective coordination and network-based work stands out. That is the variable that obtains the best assessment of the elements analysed, with 100% of people consulted believing that the project's contribution has been substantial (fairly or very significant). This increased capacity for coordination manifests itself in various different examples.

Both the testimonies received and the internal documentation reviewed (progress reports) confirm that collective action and the concerted, cooperative work of partner organisations, together with others, have been key strategies to advocate for victims' rights to be effectively included and respected in the legal reforms and processes required for the implementation of chapter 5 of the peace agreement. In this sense, the platform facilitated by the CCEEU stands out as a useful tool to bring together civil society organisations, including many of the partners of this project but also other key actors³⁴. The platform has facilitated concerted action along the lines of its different working groups: forced disappearance, extra-judicial executions, implementation of the peace agreements, transitional justice and strategic litigation, for example. These working groups have been hubs of key strategic cooperation in many of the advocacy processes that we will analyse in outcome 3.

It is important to point out that all these coordination spaces predate the project being assessed and that many of the organisations in the project already had a track record of previous consolidated collaboration. However, according to the vast majority of the people consulted, the project's economic support and the possibility of having access to human resources for the coordination and facilitation of these processes have been of great assistance for the optimum functioning of these spaces, during a time of particular intensity and requirements for advocacy work. Once again, this may be a project contribution to the "usual" functioning of the organisations, but which, in a political context of high demand for positioning and materials for organisations, has been crucial in terms of achieving the project's advocacy objectives.

"I think that network-based work is something that the project has been able to strengthen and consolidate. Because it's a practice that we have always done, and that we really like as a way of working, but the funding mechanisms and the projects we are part of do not always favour this kind of work. In this case, we have been able to work jointly on research or advocacy activities at the national level and form coalitions to carry out international work. Even in cases of litigation, we have been able to do joint activities or activities with other organisations and this has mostly been thanks to the project"

[Partner]

One example of a process that may have been difficult to consolidate, according to the partners, without the support of the project, is the work carried out (and led) by the CCEEU and other partners in relation to the recent Universal Periodic Review (UPR)³⁵ process completed in July 2018³⁶. This process managed to involve some 500 civil society organisations in drawing up a common report that was presented to the UNHRC's UPR Working Group for examination during the 30th period of sessions³⁷.

Beyond the coordination of strategies and harmonisation of messages, many agree that, though not training activities in the strictest sense, these spaces provide informal but strategic opportunities for capacity-building and strengthening, since they promote the exchange of information and knowledge and, therefore, boost the capacities of the participating organisations, expanding their presence in wider participation and advocacy spaces. Unfortunately, these aspects fall outside of the scope of this assessment, meaning it was not possible to triangulate this information offered by the partners with other organisations that usually participate in such spaces.

“The organisations that form part of the forced disappearance working group were participating in training spaces and began to increase their participation in broader participation contexts. I think it’s extremely important and indicates that their discourse has been developing and they have been growing stronger as organisations”

(Partner)

Other collective spaces found particularly useful for this exchange of knowledge and analysis by the majority of the organisations consulted are **the Management Unit and the Space for Joint Action** created by the project. Led by the Oxfam team, both spaces sought to facilitate coordinated management of the project and promote joint coordination spaces in which synergies could be generated. The testimonies received indicated that, with different levels of effectiveness, both spaces managed to reasonably achieve these objectives.

Particularly praised by project partners was the Management Unit. This space was unanimously perceived as an important space that has served to capitalise on the diversity of the organisations taking part in the project and to share experiences and analysis, which have enabled them to broaden their perspective on many issues, such as sexual violence. It is interesting to note that, although also found generally useful, the Space for Joint Action, which was expected to serve to promote an enhanced collective capacity among the organisations participating in the project, was relatively less appreciated compared with the management unit. During the implementation of the project, several interesting outputs were generated within the context of this joint action space. This includes the preparation of awareness-raising and dissemination materials about the CEV and the coordination of certain joint activities during the plebiscite campaign, among others. However, the coordination and facilitation of this space was not free of difficulties, and most of the people interviewed agree that, throughout the project, it became increasingly difficult and slow to find points of agreement for joint actions. This can be partly explained by the context created after the signature of the peace agreements, which necessarily increased the number of fronts that the organisations had to deal with. However, it also indicates insufficient capitalisation on this space, which in the new context could perhaps have better served other uses, such as training or exchange of expertise and international experiences.

“I think this space [the Management Unit] was very useful to promote joint reflection, because the context analyses carried out have been very interesting, and in them one can see that we all share similar difficulties, we exchange experiences and perspectives. It’s a very rich process, because each organisation gives its own version of what the main difficulties in the region are, and this means that firstly, we can have a very comprehensive analysis of the context, and secondly, we can see that there are certain difficulties that we perhaps share with other organisations and study how these types of obstacles can be overcome. I think this is a very valuable space for promoting dialogue”

(Partner)

Coordination with state institutions

Although it is not specified how, or established as a clear goal, one of the indicators associated with the specific objective reflects an expectation that the project will help to improve (increase) the level of coordination between victims’ and human rights organisations and the state. In accordance with the baseline used for reporting in the annual reports, this expectation seems to manifest itself in significant participation in (formal) spaces for interaction, though these spaces are not clearly defined. This makes it difficult to use the targets reflected in the baseline to measure progress with enough rigour and prevents us from speaking in quantitative terms about the achievement of those targets.

However, and beyond the participation in a given number of spaces, numerous documentary sources and the testimonies of all the external actors consulted for this assessment describe

the impressive pace of activity and the presence of civil society organisations, including those which are the subject of this assessment, both during the negotiation process between the government and the FARC-EP, and since the signing of the peace agreements. The media, Constitutional Court (CC) decrees, press releases from international bodies and testimonies of external actors interviewed for the assessment, among other things, highlight a significant occupation of existing spaces by Colombian organisations in general, and by some of the partners in particular, in many and varied processes³⁸.

In addition to those public spaces in which the participation of project partners could be verified, project progress reports describe numerous other meetings with different state institutions, including those of the ISTJNR.

Although it is important to highlight that the majority of the organisations mentioned already had a consolidated track record of advocacy and a proven capacity for interaction and coordination with state institutions prior to the project, most of the people consulted also agree that this pace of activity and presence in key spaces would have been difficult to achieve without the support and resources of the project. Perhaps this explains why 71% of the organisations that completed the questionnaire and considered the question pertinent believe that the project has made a significant contribution to improving their relations or coordination with key political actors and decision-makers for political advocacy.

“Without the project, we would not have been able to carry out certain activities or have the reach that we have had. In other words, it’s not that we would have been able to do it only with the project, but it would have been very hard for us to do it without it”

(Partner)

In general, a large number of organisations believe that the work carried out during these years has served to better position them and to gain further recognition from political and state actors. Furthermore, it has also helped them to build more intense and effective working relations with political actors and institutions. Two examples illustrate this type of outcome. MOVICE, for example, believes that its capacity to interact with some of these institutions has ostensibly improved in recent years, which is reflected in a greater number of invitations from institutions such as the JEP and the CC to submit contributions and concept notes during legal proceedings, and more interaction with the Congress. Other organisations, such as the CCAJAR and CCJ, highlight the development of their relations with key actors in Congress and how the capacities acquired and the support from the project have helped them to respond quickly to the requirements of said relations, something that was essential in a period of intense legislative creation. This recent consolidation of working relations between organisations and actors within Congress is also acknowledged by some members of the latter.

“As a general rule, we do not act in Congress without having worked with social and human rights organisations first. Initially this work was less organised, more intermittent, more reactive, but in recent times it has become more formalised and protocolised. Today I can say that we have methods of working that allow this relationship to be much more effective and efficient”

(Member of Congress)

In light of the data collected, we can therefore conclude that the partners have an important presence and participation in different peace-building contexts and processes. However, with the information available, it is impossible to reach a conclusion about the significance of this presence in relation to the situation prior to the project or to measure changes in the quality of said participation (except in some cases). It is clear, though, that the project has made a significant contribution to maintaining the levels of participation and presence of the organisations in key spaces for interaction and advocacy, which, in a scenario in which Colombian social organisations face mounting difficulties, is no small achievement.

Strengthening of knowledge, training and legal tools for victims and organisations for the defence and claiming of rights

Within the framework of the project, each organisation has implemented activities of different kinds with a common goal: to disseminate the tools and mechanisms included in the peace agreement for victims to claim their rights and to promote a stronger ownership of them among victims and their organisations. Described below are some of the activities that serve to illustrate this line of work.

Memory schools: promoted by MOVICE and the CCAJAR, these schools offer a peripatetic space for training, reflection and action in which more than 800 victims of state crime and leaders of social and community organisations from five of the country's departments have participated since 2016. The schools' main objectives are: 1) to make progress in the analysis and understanding of the peace agreements, 2) to strengthen processes of individual, collective and historical memory and 3) the creation of polyphonic, complex and inclusive regional narratives, which acknowledge the processes of violence (armed, social, political and economic) and serve, in turn, to raise awareness of and promote the concerns and demands of victims in the current peace-building scenario.

Collective case documentation days: with a broader reach, the majority of the organisations report activities that combine objectives of support and organisational strengthening with facilitating access to justice to claim their rights. That is the case for the CMSMP, for example, which, with the project's help, implemented a series of local meetings for the collective documentation of cases of sexual violence (see photo). These days, which were also attended by representatives of the Public Ministry and the Public Prosecutor's Office, involved training and educating female victims of sexual violence about their rights and the paths to claim those rights accessible to them. They also served to gather evidence of sexual violence crimes to be collectively brought to the competent authorities in the transitional justice system.

Legal support: Though not a training activity per se, the organisations that offer legal representation believe that their work, in addition to serving to prepare litigation activities, is contributing to the empowerment of victims and the strengthening of their organisational processes. DH Colombia, for example, observes that a significant number of the people that they represent end up becoming more vocal and empowered throughout the process and are more willing to assume leadership positions because of this process. For its part, the CCJ acknowledges that their continued support to the communities that they represent helps to improve knowledge about their cases and to gather credible evidence, but that eventually, this ongoing relationship and support also enables victims and their communities to better coordinate and to expand their understanding, knowledge and use of the mechanisms in place to claim their rights.

Training workshops: In the FFF, for example, project resources have helped them train some 200 people on their rights and to better prepare them to face litigation processes for the restitution of their land. The training days held included specific training about Law 1448/11 and mock hearings that enabled the participants to acquire useful knowledge and experience for their particular cases.

According to the partners consulted, these informal training mechanisms have enabled a great number of community based organisations and individuals to familiarise themselves with and better understand the mechanisms and legal options offered to them by the peace agreement and the transitional justice system (ISTJNR) designed therein. In a context of almost total absence of public policies and scarce resources for the dissemination of the content of the peace agreement, social organisations thus assume an important role in the dissemination of that content and in making the resources on offer to satisfy victims' rights more widely available to the population. The poor capacity of institutions to assume this work is confirmed by external voices, which, even from within the institutions themselves, complain that there has been no decisive effort on the government's part to adequately disseminate the content of the agreements and the mechanisms established to defend victims' rights within the ISTJNR.

"The memory schools have been a very good, consolidated process. This morning we had a meeting of the MOVICE state committee, and it was really nice to hear how victims from the regions have adopted these schools. They are asking us for more, because they couldn't have them in every region and not everyone could attend. And really, what we were hearing is how the process helped, because nobody else is providing training or information about how the system works. Moreover, there are weaknesses in the system that affect even liaison workers at the JEP. Today we heard some victims who reported to be the ones who had to explain how the system works to the liaison workers, how to get in touch, what to do, who to call, because.... they didn't know. Now many regional chapters want to replicate the experience"

(Partner)

"There has been no strong political will, either at the end of the Santos government or under this government, to educate the public at large about the special jurisdiction (JEP) from the perspective of reconciliation and peace-building. The same lack of interest or will applies to the media. At the end of the day, it is hard for these educational processes to reach ordinary people"

(External actor)

Unfortunately, apart from the partner organisations' testimonies, it was not possible to triangulate this information in the regions during the assessment. This means that it is impossible for us to reflect the voice of the victims' organisations in each case and, above all, to understand how these organisations have experienced these processes and have been able to benefit from the knowledge and skills acquired. Therefore, here we are reflecting only one view.

Lastly, many of the conversations held reveal how these continued support processes, in addition to disseminating knowledge, also contribute indirectly to promoting greater empowerment of victims, considered both individually and collectively. From the individual point of view and as already mentioned, DH Colombia, for example, is observing how a large number of the victims it represents have ended up assuming spokesperson positions and becoming social leaders and human rights defenders. Most interestingly, they observe that the percentage of these cases is much higher when the victims are women. Unfortunately, the time and resources available for this evaluation did not allow us to fully triangulate this perception with that of the people who have presumably experienced this empowerment.

On the other hand, from the collective point of view, many partners agree that these capacity-building and support activities help to strengthen and consolidate collective dynamics among victims or specific groups of victims, and to boost the case-documentation capacities of victims' organisations. This strengthening and coordination are crucial to effectively demand their rights within the new framework of the ISTJNR, which establishes a series of mechanisms designed to operate mostly on a collective basis. This means that cases or reports presented to mechanisms such as the JEP and the CEV need to be grouped together in collective dossiers and therefore require coordination and collective work on the part of the distinct groups of victims. In this regard, there is widespread agreement among organisations

that provide legal support and representation, victims' organizations or platforms, such as the MOVICE, and research institutions, such as CINEP.

"For example, in the case of Pueblo Bello, or in the case of El Salado, these are collective cases and it is very difficult to maintain these organisational dynamics over time. The project has enabled us to go and work with these victims' groups on the ground in order to follow up rulings from the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IA Court HR) or the CC, but also to implement specific measures concerning health or medical/psychological care"

(Partner)

"This project enabled us to work on strengthening victims' capacities so that they could better claim their rights. We are in a context of implementation of the peace accords and the transitional justice scenario, so the logic was that the victims would be prepared, that they had the necessary skills. These are victims who we support and represent in judicial proceedings. The majority are old cases, cases that we were already working on before the project, but the idea was that they could be strengthened and organised in the context of collective coordination. Because the victims are not always organised, and this project has allowed us to support them so that they can organise around the victimising facts that unite them. That way, it's easier to implement the legal strategy involving the claiming of their rights"

(Partner)

"The support for organisations such as the CMSMP, which has access to women in the regions who have been victims of violence and did not necessarily have an organisational process, has allowed that corporation to give them the possibility of thinking from a collective perspective, which is what counts"

(External informant)

As was the case when we were discussing individual changes, our capacity to triangulate this perception in the regions during the evaluation was limited, meaning it is impossible to provide concrete data, such as the number of victims' associations or groups formed as a result of these processes or the changes in the way the existing ones act or think.

Other Key Aspects

Strengthening the capacity for advocacy

Other aspects highlighted by the organisations, when asked about the capacities built or strengthened with the help of the project, point more directly to the acquisition of new advocacy skills. It is necessary to clarify that, here, when we talk about advocacy, we do so in the broadest sense, including all those activities that from different logics and entry points attempt to bring influence to bear in favour of victims' rights. We therefore include legal support and representation activities, which, though they appear to be covered in a different outcome (02) of the project, we believe respond to this logic of advocacy in the broad sense.

It is also important to point out that all the aspects that we mention below are primarily the result of the economic resources provided by the project. This means that, as was the case with some of the aspects analysed in the previous section, the project's main contribution in these cases is the creation of an environment of opportunity so that the organisations have been able to use skills and capacities that they already had, but which, due to a lack of resources, they could not actively, or not easily, put into practice prior to the project.

In this sense, the interviews conducted point to a number of manifestations that imply greater capacity. In the first place, partners that provide legal representation and support for victims (CCJ, CCAJAR, DH Colombia and FFF, of those consulted) agree that the project has helped them gain a **greater reach and geographic coverage**. Judicial proceedings usually take years to substantiate. This means that the work of these organizations and their presence in certain regions necessarily takes place over the medium or long term, which therefore requires a

regular flow of resources, not always easily guaranteed. This explains why, for all of the organisations consulted, the 4 years' funding provided by the project has been critical to reach areas where, without those resources, it would have been difficult to get to, and to maintain their presence and support to collective processes that may have been interrupted without that funding. The significance of this support manifests itself in the number of cases directly supported by the project, which account for more than 30% of the cases that the CCJ currently manages, or almost 20% of those represented by DH Colombia³⁹.

"With this project, we were able to travel to the regions to attend local hearings and activities. Our organisation is fundamentally concerned with litigation, and having resources enables us to go to hearings, to inspections, to meetings with victims... to strengthen the processes, because many of the difficulties that organisations have are due to the fact that they cannot travel to the regions, they don't have the resources. This project has given us the freedom to travel and support the communities"

(Partner)

"Having resources and travelling gives us a greater capacity to acquire a better knowledge of the cases, but also means that we can be there, that we can follow up each and every one of them. Or hold commemorations, because the legal process cannot be separated from the processes of memory, we have to continue to support the families throughout that process"

(Partner)

A second manifestation of new or reinforced capacities is suggested by some of the organisations consulted, which acknowledge that the project has enabled them to tackle **new areas of work** that they had not been able to assume until now. That is the case of FFF, which, thanks to the project, has been able to initiate strategic litigation activities, which it hopes will amplify the impact of its legal work. This also applies to the CCEEU, which celebrates the opportunity that the project has provided to strengthen its working relationship with the Colombian Congress and, with that, to reinforce its advocacy work and capacity.

"Organisations that were exclusively dedicated to judicial representation now often intervene in the Congress and participate more actively in the public debate"

(Partner)

"The work in Congress is fairly new on our agenda. The project enabled us to work on the development of a collective advocacy strategy in Congress in collaboration with the LTUs, for example"

(Partner)

In general, all of the organisations consulted acknowledge an enhanced capacity to act in order to fulfil their mandate and carry out their work. The CCJ, for example, describes how the resources received have given it a greater capacity to monitor the proposals and draft laws in Congress and to increase the production of key materials for advocacy, such as the concept notes presented to the CC. This work was something that they already did before the project but which, they say, has multiplied with the project's support, ultimately helping to guarantee the qualified occupation of these spaces of opportunity for advocacy.

"The project makes it possible to have that ability to do what we already know how to do and increase it. In advocacy spaces, if I am alone, then I will only be able to monitor one or two projects in Congress. Being in the project and having this help, however, enables me to monitor 10 of them"

(CCJ)

The flexibility of the project and its marked focus on supporting consolidated lines of work has a great deal to do with this outcome and with the organisations' capacity to maintain a significant pace of activity and presence in political decision-making spaces at times of

particular importance for advocacy action. This improved capacity to act is, however, closely linked to the economic resources provided by the project. This means that, while some capacities, especially those that have to do with the acquisition of experience in new areas of work, can be deemed highly sustainable, the sustainability of other aspects depends to a very high degree on the organisations' capacity to capture financial resources in the future, an area of strengthening to which insufficient efforts seem to have been dedicated within the context of the project.

Strengthening the positioning and visibility of the organisations

Another aspect that was highly valued by many those interviewed has to do with the project's contribution to a better positioning and visibility for the organisations in relation both to existing coordination platforms and to decision-makers and other institutional actors that are key to political advocacy. Of the organisations consulted, 67% assess the project's contribution to their improved positioning in existing coordination platforms and spaces as fairly or very significant. This is particularly visible in the case of organisations of smaller size or scope, such as the CMSMP, which acknowledge that the project helps them to continue positioning the issue of the rights of victims of sexual violence on the agenda and within public debate, and places them in a better position within civil society spaces. This was also the case for other organisations consulted, such as MOVICE, which believes that its participation in the project has significantly contributed to its gaining further **visibility** and to consolidating itself as a reference organisation in the domain of state crime. This stronger visibility and reputation was made evident in the text of the peace agreement, in which MOVICE is one of the organisations assigned a specific role in the implementation process.

"Our organisation is tiny, and becomes much stronger when we feel it is equal to other organisations with a long history and vast technical experience. When we sit down in that dialogue and do a context analysis, our work becomes more valued and we gain recognition. Moreover, the organisation is positioning itself and can act jointly in certain things" (Partner)

Lastly, we must mention a factor that is frequently cited by many of the people interviewed, and which relates to **the political support offered by Oxfam** to all the partners. During recent years, Oxfam in Colombia has been present during the implementation of many of the partners' activities and has supported their work by signing joint press releases and drawing up documents and letters of its own backing their positions. In a political context of deep hostility towards the work of human rights defenders and organisations, this political support seems to provide an extra sense of security that is highly valued by the organisations.

Oxfam's role in managing the project

Lastly, we want to briefly refer to and assess Oxfam's role in managing the project. Although some of the elements of added value identified by the partners have already been mentioned at various times in this section (leadership of the Management Unit and the Space for Joint Action, political support) and are reflections that certainly have more to do with the project's efficiency than its effectiveness, we believe it is appropriate to reflect on some of the issues most frequently mentioned during the conversations held.

In a project that is particularly complex due to the large number of partners and different lines of work, Oxfam's work as coordinator has been very demanding in a period of great internal changes and transition within the organisation. This has led to some difficulties, caused primarily by the high rotation of technical staff and the insufficient institutional historical memory of the project since its design. However, there were also minor difficulties in terms of the relations with the partners, forcing them to adapt to continual changes in ways of interacting and to new management decisions and interpretations. Despite the pace of change and its possible interference in the implementation of the project, in general, the tone of the relations and the team's willingness to help the organisations is highly valued by all the

people interviewed. However, this is still a factor to be taken into account and which should be minimised in the future.

On the other hand, the data reveal that, beyond the coordinator role and the facilitation of the project's collective spaces, Oxfam's support work seems to have been carried out primarily in a reactive manner, according to the time and the needs of each organisation. Although this is inevitable in many cases, it would be interesting to think about a better definition of the role of this organisation, and to clarify the other organisations' expectations in this regard. Oxfam has significant political capital, which it has used effectively to support its partners' work, but it also has vast capacities and expertise in the spheres of advocacy and gender, for example, on which it may not have fully capitalised in the context of this project. The phase during which the ToC is constructed can be strategic in initiating this discussion in future interventions and better identifying the added value that the organisation can bring to initiatives like this one.

4.1.3 Conclusions

Based on the data collected we can conclude that, in general, the project has contributed positively to the creation of an environment of opportunity for the development or reinforcement of capacities that the partner organisations already had in place. We refer to the opportunity generated by the project's economic support, but also by the political support provided by Oxfam to partner organisations and the facilitation of coordination spaces, which, in a political context of great difficulties for social organisations, have made it easier for the partners to carry out their activities and advocacy work. Moreover, although the excessive vagueness of the formulation of the outcome and the weaknesses of its monitoring system make it hard to measure changes in capacity promoted by the project, the review has managed to identify some evidence of new skills and strengthened capacities that can be reasonably identified as project contributions. We can therefore conclude that the outcome, as formulated, has been achieved in a reasonably satisfactory manner.

4.2 OUTCOME 2: COORDINATION AND GENDER MAINSTREAMING

4.2.1 The project's change objectives

As previously mentioned, although it is an implicit outcome of the project, the actual project document indicates a clear aim to place female victims at the centre of the intervention and clearly prioritises them as a target population. This is explained by the central place that women's rights occupy in Oxfam's programmatic work, which is gradually being translated into dialogue with its partners. We should clarify that, although they do not have a specific mandate, all of the project's partners work with female victims and, in many cases, this population group is a principal beneficiary of the organisations' actions, including within the context of the project.

This central aim is not, however, supported by the formulation of specific objectives or outcomes in terms of women's rights, beyond the inclusion of some gender indicators and some implicit and barely articulated elements in the project's ToC. We are talking specifically about three indicators associated with outcomes 1 and 5 that incorporate a gender dimension into different aspects of the intervention. Moreover, the project documents and the ToC suggest an implicit incorporation of the coordination objective already analysed in outcome 1 and propose the improvement of coordination between women's organisations and human rights organisations as an expected, albeit implicit, outcome of the project.

The combination of these implicit elements and the conversations held with the project team in the preliminary phase helped us to identify two implicit intermediate outcomes of the project worth exploring: the strengthening of capacities to incorporate a gender focus into the partners' work, and the reinforcement of coordination between women's and human rights organisations.

Within the logic of the ToC, these outcomes were expected to contribute to making gender issues more visible in the partners' advocacy work, as part of their effort to promote victims' rights. Moreover, by pushing lines of dialogue between both types of organisations, the project was expecting to boost this capacity and gradually promote certain issues of particular relevance to women, thereby guaranteeing greater focus on and space for women's rights on the organisations' agendas, on their advocacy strategies and eventually on the political agenda.

However, the implicit nature of these outcomes has certain implications for the purposes of the review, since 1) they lack a clear measurement framework within the project monitoring system, and 2) because they are not formulated as project outcomes, it is difficult to identify clear activities and specific strategies associated with them.

Moreover, the existing indicators pose some difficulties, due to both the vagueness of their wording and the drawing up of the baseline. For example, one of the indicators associated with outcome 5, among other things, sets out the project's aspiration to promote "*greater social and media recognition of the seriousness of sexual violence in armed conflict*". The wording of the indicator resembles that of an intermediate outcome and does not include concrete targets. This means that important questions are left open with regard to the monitoring and measurement of the changes driven by the project: How is this greater social and/or media recognition expected to manifest itself? How is the baseline used obtained? What does this recognition mean in terms of the achievement of the specific objective and the project's ToC? These are just some examples.

4.2.2 Findings

Strengthening capacities for gender mainstreaming

One of the issues in which Oxfam had great interest was knowing to what extent its programmatic bet in relation to women's rights had managed to permeate the work and collaboration model established with its partners, promoting greater interest and capacity among the partners to incorporate the gender perspective into their own work. The evaluator's interpretation is that the ultimate aim of strengthening these capacities was to promote greater visibility for these aspects in the medium and long term, including sexual violence (Indicator 5.5), in the partners' advocacy work and agenda.

The conversations held with the eight organisations participating in the interview process and the scores given to this topic in the questionnaire reveal various different kinds of results. Although this strengthening cannot be seen in all cases and most people acknowledge that they are only at the start of a road that is not without obstacles, four of the organisations consulted believe that the project's contribution in this regard has been fairly significant and two of them classify it as very significant.

Figure 6: Perceptions about the contribution to the incorporation of a gender perspective

In the cases of MOVICE, the FFF and CINEP, for example, the economic resources provided by the project have enabled them to hire specialised human resources to drive gender mainstreaming in their internal processes and the preparation of action plans. This has already manifested itself in small changes in some of the organizations’ dynamic, such as including budget lines to cover the care of women trainees’ children in new project documents (MOVICE).

On the other hand, and in line with the chain of intermediate outcomes inferred by the reviewer, we could find some evidence of cases where this reinforced capacity is helping to raise the visibility of the specific nature of gender violence perpetrated against women within the organisations’ work. For example, in CINEP’s case, the people interviewed highlight how the work carried out has enabled them to strengthen the research methodology used in their database and to incorporate variables that better reflect the types of victimisation experienced by women in the context of the conflict and make their specific nature more visible. Similarly, MOVICE highlights that most victims of state crime are usually women, something that they have tried to make more visible with outputs such as the report “*State crimes from the perspective of women*”, which was prepared with the support of the project.

“Now we are seeing more clearly the specific harm suffered by women in our reports.”

(Partner)

“In the context of this project, it has been possible to ensure that a group of young women from Cauca have been able to provide training spaces, produce documentation directly with female victims or their families, and present cases with that gender perspective, which is not the case

in all regions. And one of the advances is reflected not only in the number of cases documented, but in conceptual and reflective terms, with regard to how the cases are presented. That experience became visible in the assembly and the other organisations were very interested in finding out how it is done, because they acknowledge that they do not want to stop raising the visibility of these situations, but that sometimes they cannot even draw up a case report in such a way

that it does not revictimise women”.

(Partner)

In other cases, although a lower level of progress is verified, there are positive indications of how Oxfam's dialogue with the partners on this matter is beginning to bear fruit in terms of greater awareness of and sensitivity to the need to promote changes in the organisations’ perspective, incorporating a gender aspect into their work in a more substantial manner. One example of this change of attitude is offered by the CCJ, which, although recognizing that it has difficulties and lacks the capacity to effectively incorporate a gender perspective into its work, believes that the project has helped it to become more aware of the need to work and open strategic debates in this regard.

In conclusion, the evidence gathered suggests that the project, and Oxfam in particular, has made a certain contribution to the strengthening and reinforcement of this gender

perspective in the partners' work. We must point out, however, that, as they themselves tell us, these changes are the result of the contribution of a multiplicity of actors which are pushing in that direction through international development cooperation, which means it would be unfair to attribute it exclusively to this project. Moreover, although the examples described show how these capacities are being reflected in greater visibility for gender issues and the specific nature of the violence experienced by women, it is impossible to identify a specific degree of progress in relation to the indicator associated with outcome 5, which requires more detailed work that unfortunately falls outside of the scope of this review.

Collective coordination between women's organisations and human rights platforms

Although not an objective or outcome explicitly set out in the matrix, the wording of the project documents suggest that the intervention offered an opportunity to further push the dialogue between women's organisations and human rights platforms and to help build bridges that would eventually ensure that a stronger gender perspective in the collective coordination efforts and work supported by the project was incorporated. According to the experts consulted, such bridges are much needed, given the fairly common tendency of organisations that specialise in women's rights and human rights platforms to work in silos, not only in Colombia.

We are therefore talking about initiating a process which is expected to result, in the medium and long term, in women's rights and the specific nature of their experiences of victimisation in the context of the conflict acquiring greater relevance and positioning on social and political agendas. At the time of the review, the question is therefore whether the spaces offered have in any way prompted the initiation of this conversation between the women's organisations and human rights platforms involved in the project and contributed to better coordination between the two.

Although there is a lack of institutional memory about the time of formulation and the selection of partners of the project, the incorporation of two women's organisations into the group of project partners, the FNEB and the CMSMP, seems to respond to this logic of promoting greater coordination between "generalist" human rights organisations and women's organisations. With a somewhat broader mandate, the FNEB groups together families of victims of forced disappearance, mostly women, and works with an integrated and participatory focus to protect the rights of these women and families. For its part, the CMSMP brought the experiences and life lessons of a group of women who had been victims of sexual violence to the project. The CMSMP is a much more recently founded organisation, with a lesser capacity than the other organisations participating in the project. The Management Unit and the Space for Joint Action offered key spaces where all organizations could meet and in which dialogue between the two types of organizations could take place naturally.

The conversations held with several of the partners and the review of the documentation generated by the project suggest that, while the process of mutual recognition has begun, there is still scant evidence of progress in terms of greater coordination and an enhanced capacity for synergies between both types of organisations. The CMSMP is a prime example of this. The corporation has found, in the project, a space where it can grow as an organisation and be recognised as an equal along with the other organisations, which, it says, also helps it to position itself as a valid interlocutor in other spaces and platforms and to push its agenda more effectively.

That is also how the CMSMP is seen by the other organisations, which also recognize that the contacts maintained with the CMSMP within the Management Unit and the Space for Joint Action have helped them to become familiar with the entity's work and learn more about its vision and reading of the context. However, beyond that mutual recognition and the broadening of certain organisations' perspective, which is obviously an important step, the evaluation has found no evidence of greater strategic coordination or generation of synergies

between this organisation and the rest, other than the joint preparation of some training material.

This may be due to the difference in mandates and the specific nature of the work carried out by women's organisations and, probably, to the vast difference in size and capacity between the actors seated around the table, as well as to the lack of a clearer strategy or ToC with which to promote such coordination more openly.

Unfortunately, the impossibility of incorporating FNEB's view into this analysis, due to the attack on the organisation several days before the field visit, means that we cannot compare the CMSMP's experience with that of a much more consolidated organisation with a longer history, and with which most human rights platforms already had contact prior to the project.

Lastly, thinking about the logic and ultimate objective sought through this increased coordination, we should consider whether, and if so to what extent, this greater contact and generation of synergies contributes effectively to advancing the agendas of female victims and raising the visibility of their needs and proposals effectively on social and political agendas. One example that could be used to evaluate this line of contribution is the work carried out by the CMSMP to improve the visibility and positioning of sexual violence as a specific form of victimisation of women in the context of the conflict. As has already been reflected in this report, the corporation has focused its project activity on holding documentation days and meetings that aimed to identify and document collective cases of female victims of sexual violence. These activities were designed to meet the needs of female victims of this kind of violence and to help them claim their rights before the ordinary or the transitional justice systems. This is an issue on which the CMSMP has managed to position itself as a key actor, pushing the issue on the political and media agenda. However, the issue of sexual violence in the context of conflict has been consistently promoted and brought up by different platforms of women's organisations and other civil society actors during the negotiations of the peace agreement, and even before. This means that although in the light of the testimonies and data gathered it is safe to conclude that the project has made a certain contribution to the visibility and positioning of the issue, there are many other important factors and actors that also have to do with this outcome and that make it impossible for us to ascertain or isolate how significant the contribution of the project has been.

In this sense, whilst still acknowledging the project's contribution to the CMSMP's improved positioning and to the mutual recognition between it and the other partners, the evaluation found no clear evidence of the project's contribution to greater social and political consideration for the agenda of the rights of female victims in general, and for victims of sexual violence in particular, beyond the goals achieved by the organisation on its own.

Although we are still at the start of a process and it is normal for these outcomes not to be fully visible yet, this discussion suggests that, in the future, it will be important to make a stronger strategic effort to identify those aspects or coalitions to which the work of Oxfam and its partners brings clear added value, defining concrete advocacy goals with clear ToC that make it possible to measure the contribution of interventions more effectively.

4.2.3 Conclusion

The information analysed does not make it possible to reach clear conclusions about the level of achievement of this outcome. This is due primarily to the fact that the outcome is implicit in the ToC, and that implicit nature has implications in terms of the establishment of clear strategies and the identification of effective measurement parameters. However, the conversations held make it possible to confirm some progress, in terms of both the acquisition of capacities and the establishment of a space for dialogue in which to begin building bridges between women's and human rights organisations. Moreover, particularly in relation to capacities, some of the hypotheses of the ToC are beginning to be confirmed, suggesting that the increase in the capacity to incorporate the gender perspective ends up resulting in greater visibility for gender issues on the organisations' work agendas. This provides good reason to develop this line of work with a greater strategic perspective in future interventions.

4.3 OUTCOME 3: ADVOCACY

In this section, we will focus on the second part of the proposal expressed in the specific objective of the project in order to analyse the extent to which support for organisations' capacities leads to increased action and voice of the victims and their organizations and, with it, increased recognition and protection of victims' human rights. In particular, we will focus on the advocacy work carried out by the partner organisations, both individually and in collaboration, following the signing of the peace agreement and in relation to the implementation of the institutions and mechanisms for transitional justice that make up the ISTJNR (05).

It is important to stress that much of the advocacy work carried out as part of the AECID project falls outside of the scope of this analysis. For example, none of the work carried out in relation to the peace agreement negotiation process, to which many of the project organisations made significant contributions, is covered by the analysis. The importance of this contribution is nevertheless clearly reflected in the final text of the peace agreement, which mentions and allocates concrete tasks to four of the 12 project partners, MOVICE, the CCEEU, the FNEB⁴⁰ and CINEP⁴¹. In the analysis of this outcome, unlike for the previous ones, we will follow the structure suggested by the PT protocol.

4.2.1 Materialisation of the outcome

Despite a certain widespread pessimism about the current political context and the actual will to respect the principle of centrality of the victims in the implementation of the accords, most of the people consulted and the third-party analyses agree that, at least on paper, significant progress has been made in terms of the protection of victims' rights and the implementation of the ISTJNR established in the peace agreement.

Key mechanisms of the ISTJNR for the satisfaction of victims' rights

Special Jurisdiction for Peace (JEP)

Group of justice administration bodies responsible for investigating, judging and punishing crimes committed in the context and because of the armed conflict, particularly those that are most serious and representative. It seeks, above all, to satisfy victims' right to justice, fight against impunity, fulfil the state's duty to investigate, judge and punish, and adopt decisions that grant full legal security to those who participate in the mechanisms of the system.

Search Unit for the Missing (UBPDD)

Special high-level humanitarian and extra-judicial unit responsible for establishing what

happened to people who went missing in the context and because of the armed conflict. It manages, coordinates and contributes to the implementation of humanitarian and extra-judicial actions for the search for and identification of missing persons found alive, and in cases of death, for their location and the dignified return of their remains.

Commission for Clarification of the Truth, Coexistence and Non-Repetition (CEV)

Impartial and independent mechanism of a transitional and extra-judicial nature with a local focus, which seeks to contribute to the satisfaction of the right of victims, and of society as a whole, to the truth. It is not a mechanism for administering justice, but for contributing to the truth and the recognition of victims' rights.

Among these advances, the assessment found evidence of contribution at three different levels of the ToC:

- In a scenario of high political polarisation, victims' issues and the need to restore their rights have remained on the public and political agenda in Colombia, though not without difficulty. One significant example is the major media impact of the debate on the approval and sanctioning of the draft statutory law for the JEP. Another example is the notoriety of the situation and the threat to social leaders and the defence of their rights, an issue that is unfortunately common in the media and in statements from various authorities and political forces.
- Although certainly imperfect and with significant gaps in the opinion of most people, the regulations of the ISTJNR and of mechanisms like the JEP include important elements of guarantee for victims that will facilitate their future participation in the various judicial and extra-judicial reparation processes.
- Victims have begun participating in the institutions of the transitional justice system, primarily by submitting reports. Given the recent establishment of these institutions, this is the main participation mechanism that has been verified at the date of the review. This means that it is too early to discuss the consequences or effects of this participation in light of the effective restitution of victims' rights and the fight against impunity, which are ultimate objectives of the project.

4.2.2 Alternative causal mechanisms

For the achievement of this outcome, we have considered two possible hypotheses or alternative causal mechanisms. The first hypothesis is the project under review. The second hypothesis is the action of other entities and/or key actors that may also have contributed to the advocacy outcomes being analysed.

The AECID project: According to the wording of outcome 5, the project aspired to "increase the recognition and protection of human rights through advocacy activities targeting the Colombian state and the international community, as well as promoting visibility among civil society". This involved supporting actions that would contribute to positioning these issues on the public agenda, raising the visibility of the human rights situation in Colombia and of victims' rights, and using various means to push for the protection and effective satisfaction of these rights by the state.

During the past four years, the project's support has made it possible to carry out various different activities⁴²:

Advocacy with national institutions such as the Congress and the CC: This involves carrying out monitoring actions and participating in legislative and constitutional processes in relation to legislation derived from the peace agreements that could be contrary to the victims' rights to truth, justice and reparation. Examples of these activities include the coordination actions and contribution of the various working groups of the CCEEU to the Legal Technical Units (LTUs) in the Congress and the concept notes and memos presented to the Constitutional Court by several partners (CCJ, CCAJAR, FFF, MOVICE and CCEEU) in relation to the

constitutionality review of various regulations approved for the implementation of the peace agreement.

Visibility, denunciation and advocacy actions with international authorities such as the UN, the Inter-American Human Rights System and the European Union. This includes litigation and denunciation of specific cases promoted by the partners, but also the presentation of reports and the participation in public hearings of bodies such as the IACHR and the UNHRC. One example of this kind of action is the preparation of a joint report in the context of the latest UPR in Colombia.

Lobbying with governmental institutions. Such activities include all those related to the functioning of the mechanisms provided for in the ISTJNR. For example, the presentation of inputs for the preparation and drafting of the regulations governing the UBPDD and the CEV, among others.

Awareness-raising campaigns and communication actions for the visibility of the human rights situation and the public denunciation of violations, such as press releases and statements.

Investigation, documentation and publication of cases of human rights violations and the human rights situation in general. Examples of this type of activity include the publication of the *Noche y Niebla* [Night and Fog] magazine by CINEP and the report on the assassination of social leaders prepared jointly by this organisation, the CCJ and the CCEEU, among others.

The advocacy activity is complemented by actions that, based on other outcomes of the project, can influence decisions related to the functioning of the mechanisms of the transitional justice system or the participation of victims in said mechanisms. We are talking about, for example, legal support and representation (02) and strategic litigation, which, in the judicial and jurisprudential context, support the claiming of rights by specific victims, but also seek to expand the jurisprudential interpretation of some of the legislative advances achieved in favour of victims.

In the application of the different strategies, the parties had to adapt to the different contexts and windows of opportunity identified at each time. It also required an effort to implement a concerted action and apply pressure from different entry points to influence the implementation and functioning of the ISTJNR and contribute to guaranteeing the highest possible degree of faithfulness to the commitments made to victims' rights. The graphic below seeks to explain the different tactics and strategies adopted in order to achieve this outcome.

Figure 7: Strategic Entry Points

Depending on the opportunities open at each time, the presence and participation of the partners in advocacy spaces has been changing in intensity and adapting to the different needs that have arisen throughout the agreement implementation process:

In the first phase, most of the activity of partner organisations focused on influencing the legislative processes required for the implementation of what was agreed in chapter 5 of the peace agreement. This phase began with the so called *fast-track* process, an exceptional mechanism implemented following the signing of the agreements aiming to accelerate the approval of the necessary reforms agreed in Congress. This exceptional legislative process was completed in December 2017. It was at this time that the collective coordination efforts and interaction with key political actors described in outcome 1 were crucial. One aspect that stands out is the organisations' work in the context of the transitional justice working group of the CCEEU and its coordination with the LTUs of the opposition in Congress. During this phase, the interviews conducted, and the Congress documentation reviewed, which we will discuss in more detail later, provide clear evidence of a significant presence of the partners in public hearings or informal sessions of Congress. For example, in relation to the approval of Legislative Act 01 of 2017, the CCAJAR and the CCJ participated in the public hearing in the House of Representatives (Gazette of Congress No. 129 of 2017) and CINEP, the CCAJAR and the CCEEU participated in the public hearing before the First Commission of the Senate (Gazette of Congress No. 109 of 2017).

In parallel to this process, the organisations carried out important monitoring and control work in relation to the Constitutional Court proceedings that led to both claims of unconstitutionality and the presentation of a number of concept notes and memos, pursuant to law or at the Court's invitation, during constitutionality review processes of the different legislative acts issued by Congress. Purely by way of example, the documentary review means

we can confirm the partners' presence in the following constitutional review processes, among others⁴³:

Legislative Act 001	Participation of CCJ and MOVICE in the Public Hearing of the CC Legislative Act 01 of 2017. (https://youtu.be/0-0Km4xrg4s)
Legislative Act 02	The CCJ, CCAJAR and MOVICE intervened in the constitutionality review process of Legislative Act 002 of 2017. CCJ presented a concept note. CCAJAR and MOVICE carried out a joint citizen intervention. CINEP was invited to participate by the CC. (Ruling C-630/17)
Law 1820	Participation of CCJ in Public Hearing before the CC on Law 1820 2016 Decree-Law 277-2017 (https://youtu.be/Ei1xHiGERmk) The CCAJAR, MOVICE and CCEEU presented a joint concept note in the constitutional review process of the law. (Ruling C-007/18)
Legislative Act 03	The CCAJAR and MOVICE intervened in the constitutionality review process of Legislative Act 03 of 2017 (Ruling C-027/18)
Legislative Act 05	The CCAJAR, CCEEU and MOVICE presented a written request to the CC to declare Legislative Act 05 of 2017 fully enforceable (Ruling C-076/18)
Decree 588	The CCAJAR, CCJ, CINEP and CCEEU participated in and presented constitutionality interventions concerning the Decree-Law organising the CEV. (Ruling C-017/18)
Decree 589	Intervention by the CCJAR, CCJ, MOVICE and FNEB in the constitutionality review process of the decree organising the UBPDD.
Statutory Law 008	Intervention by the CCJAR and CCJ in the constitutionality review process of the articles of the Draft Statutory Law on the JEP. (Ruling C-080/18)

In the second phase, the organisations' intervention was focused on advocating for the establishment and implementation of institutions to take into account the interests and rights of victims. It was in this phase that there was significant concerted mobilisation by the partners to nominate candidates to these institutions and ensure that people who were expected to be more sensitive to their positions and aspirations were designated for key positions in the institutions of the ISTJNR. It was also the phase in which contact began with those in charge of the new institutions and relations were forged for dialogue and collaboration for the preparation of different work tools (protocols, for example) and the contribution of materials such as case reports. Although the period for submitting reports to both the JEP and the CEV began only relatively recently, the information reviewed shows that some partners have already started presenting their reports to both bodies⁴⁴.

Finally, and in parallel to the ones above, a third strategic line is the advocacy work carried out with the international community in general and with bodies belonging to the Inter-American System and the UN in particular. In this sense, since the beginning of the project in 2015, the presence of the partners in international forums has become habitual. Proof of this can be found in the register of public hearings of the IACHR, which shows the regular participation of various partners of the project, such as the CCAJAR, CCJ, CCEEU and MOVICE, and the occasional participation of others, such as the FNEB and CINEP. One or more of the partners have participated in nine of the 15 sessions held since October 2015⁴⁵. This presence can also be verified in international monitoring processes such as the 2018 UPR before the UNHRC. Though it falls outside of the scope of this review, we would also include in this line of international advocacy work the actions of denunciation and legal representation before the IACHR and the IA Court HR.

Other alternative causal mechanisms

Given the historical significance of political processes involving advocacy, it was normal to anticipate the existence of more than one causal hypothesis to explain this outcome. The data collected during the field work have made it possible to identify a series of (f)actors that, beyond the project, have been able to contribute to the achievement of this outcome.

Firstly, we must remember that we are talking about a very broad civil society context in which there are a great many victims' organisations and human rights defence platforms, including the partners of the project. This means that it is often difficult to isolate the individual work of each one. This is even more the case when in general, and based on the data collected, the organisations tend to combine strategies and to function in joint advocacy networks. That is what happened, for example, in the UPR process, in which more than 500 organisations came together to produce a joint report that was presented to the UNHRC. However, it is also what is happening with regard to the working groups promoted by the different social organisations (such as the CCEEU) and institutional authorities (such as the AECID and other donors and the Opposition). This high level of coordination can be seen in the testimonies of many of the people consulted, who insist on attributing most of these results to a strong concerted effort.

Secondly, we should point out the active presence and interests of the international community, on the one hand, and of certain key national political actors, on the other. We are referring to actors such as the OHCHR, the International Criminal Court (ICC), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the international community in general, which frequently issue concept notes, press releases and statements on these issues and work together with civil society organisations on many of the processes analysed. There are also actors such as members of Congress and authorities representing the new institutions, whose activity and positions tend in many cases to converge with those of civil society organisations. To give one example of how these varied actors come together, which we will describe in more detail later, this is what happened in relation to the government's intention to include a clause that would prevent human rights defenders from being JEP judges, which was denounced by various organisations, the international community, members of Congress and even the president of the JEP, among others. This convergence of interests and often of positions makes it extremely difficult to isolate clear lines of contribution.

4.2.3 Findings

Given the difficulties expressed in the previous paragraph and the limitations we face in exploring in depth the contributions of the different actors intervening in the advocacy processes under analysis, in this section we will limit ourselves to setting out a series of examples in which the contribution of the partners and the support of the project, based on the evidence gathered, has been found to be sufficiently significant. We will divide the findings into the three aspects in which we have already mentioned that the outcome materialised to some extent.

Keeping the centrality of victims and their rights on the public and political agenda

Despite the fact that "*victim centrality*" is a clear guiding principle established within the peace-building process and present in practically all of the documents and official statements reviewed, in recent times a number of voices, including the ICRC⁴⁶, have been calling for a greater centrality of victims' rights on Colombia's public agenda. This is also reflected in the thoughts of some of the project partners, which complain that, with the implementation of the agreements, the victims, or at least some of them, are no longer a priority. This feeling has surely been accentuated by the recent change of government⁴⁷ and the major setback currently facing the development and implementation of the mechanisms that make up the ISTJRNR, as already pointed out by the Kroc Institute.

In this context, and despite the tireless advocacy work carried out over the last two years, victims' organisations and human rights platforms are finding few routes of interaction

through which to channel their proposals. More importantly, some of the advances achieved are now being called into question or directly threatened. This may explain a certain change in the work of partners that have recently adopted more reactive strategies, such as denunciation and resorting to international pressure, compared with the first phase analysed, especially during the fast-track period, when a more proposal-based approach was observed.

Despite the difficulties encountered, the results of the questionnaire shared with the partners show a more than reasonable level of satisfaction in terms of keeping certain issues on the agenda, thanks partly to the project's support. Seven out of eight of the organisations consulted consider this contribution to be fairly or very significant. This was confirmed in the discussions held with the different partners.

This positioning of issues on the agenda was achieved using different tools and strategic entry points. At the national level, for example, the ongoing work of monitoring debates and legislative processes concerning the victims' situation carried out by the organisations and its impact in the media has managed to "*place victims on the country's agenda*", in the words of one of the external actors interviewed.

At the international level, one of the strategies used to keep the human rights situation and victims' rights alive on the public and political agenda has been the performance of advocacy and research actions⁴⁸ in order to secure positions from bodies such as the IACHR, the IA Court HR and the UNHRC on the human rights situation in Colombia. Although it is difficult to quantify the results of this activity and trace clear lines of causality, some data indicate a certain relationship between the presence and advocacy activity of the organisations and some of the official statements issued by the IACHR, for example. Various examples illustrate the results of this work.

Firstly, the 2017 annual report of the IACHR, which, although it acknowledges the effort made by the state in the first year of implementation of the peace agreement, expressly cites a joint press release promoted by the CCEEU⁴⁹ that brings together several of the concerns of civil society organisations, including the unconstitutionality of the disqualification of human rights defenders as JEP judges, and agrees with that sentiment⁵⁰.

Another of the issues on which the report reproduces the position and information facilitated by the organisations, in both the public hearing of March 2017⁵¹ and reports and data provided by some of the partners⁵², can be found in the chapter dedicated to human rights defenders. Since the signing of the peace agreement, social organisations have been denouncing the increase in attacks and threats against social leaders and human rights defenders. This issue is the subject of a specific chapter of the project within the framework of outcome 4. In addition to the actions provided for in that outcome, several international advocacy actions have been carried out in order to denounce the situation, thereby pushing the Colombian government to acknowledge the existence of systematic patterns in these attacks and offer a clear and forceful response to them. Although it is difficult to confirm a direct line of causality, some changes are observed in this regard. While in July 2018 the High Counsellor for Coexistence and Citizen Security was still denying the existence of any systematic patterns⁵³, recent statements from the Public Prosecutor's Office (albeit in a very nuanced way) have begun to acknowledge a certain systematicity, which reveals a modest reorientation towards the positions defended by social organisations.

Of these actions, the one that stands out is the joint report drawn up by the CCJ, CCEEU and CINEP, together with other organisations, which has served as a basis for the partners' interventions with the Inter-American System and the UN Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, among others. The report denounces the existence of systematic patterns in the attacks on defenders and estimates that only 8.5% of cases in which charges are brought result in a conviction. This figure, which contrasts with the claim made by the Public Prosecutor's Office that 50% of cases are solved, was used by the representative of the CCJ in the public hearing of December 2018 before the IACHR and expressly cited by that body in a press release of January 2019⁵⁴, which suggests a certain temporal correlation between the two acts. The weight of the data and arguments used by the organisations can also be seen in the intervention of other national institutions such as the Office of the Inspector General, which, for example, in its recent report entitled "Systematic violence against defenders of territorial rights in Colombia", as well as in previous reports, refers to the data provided by organisations such as the CCJ and the 'We Are Defenders' programme.

One last example of action with international bodies promoted by the project is the coordination process led by the partners with regard to the UNHRC's UPR for examination during the 30th period of sessions, a process that culminated in the recommendation that Colombia implement the ISTJNR, and in particular the JEP, in accordance with the text of the peace agreement and guarantee sufficient resources for it to function independently. Although it is difficult to attribute this concrete statement to the actions of a specific actor, the joint report presented (and led) by the partners and other organisations is the one that has the most mentions (61) in the summary of communications⁵⁵ from interested parties prepared by the OHCHR, ahead of leading international organisations such as Amnesty International (50) and Human Rights Watch (8). This illustrates the reputation and impact of the document presented and means that we can infer a certain influence on the final position.

Finally, we must mention that, although it falls outside of the scope of this review, the international denunciation and advocacy activity is complemented by important international litigation and support activity by several of the partners (CCAJAR, CCJ, FNEB and DH Colombia), in the context of which some important pronouncements and rulings have been achieved, from both the IACHR and the IA Court HR.

Advocacy in the process of legislative development and implementation of ISTJNR institutions

As we have already touched on, the signing of the peace agreement in late 2016 signalled the beginning of a complex process of reforms for the implementation of the measures agreed in the various chapters of the agreement. Of these processes, we focused on those reforms that were necessarily promoted to fulfil the chapter on victims and, in particular, the implementation of the ISTJNR.

In this context, the activity of project partner organisations focused on ensuring that these reforms respected the spirit of the agreements in relation to victims' rights and incorporated a series of guarantees in that regard. This was pursued through various activities, such as the preparation of several concept notes, *amicus curiae* and proposal documents presented by the partners to the CC and Congress, whether at the latter parties' request or on the partners' own initiative. Without the increased capacity provided by the project, these actions would have been difficult to carry out, according to the majority of the partners consulted. External actors consulted confirm this contribution from the organisations and link it to the organisations' enhanced capacity to carry out their monitoring work and to establish strategic ties with key political actors in these processes, among other things.

"The monitoring and follow-up work on the regulatory framework and execution of court rulings, and preventing jurisprudential setbacks, has been a fundamental role played by civil society. I think that many of these setbacks were finally curbed also because of this action, and they now

no longer happen. They could even promote changes that made it possible to increase victim participation”

(Institutional actor)

“Allowing victims to present appeals to JEP decisions, for example. That was not the case previously. It was something achieved by the organisations. Initially, it was a dialogue between the jurisdiction and the appearing parties, but the reforms managed to incorporate victims’ voices at various times, even giving them the opportunity to object to decisions taken; these changes are gradually being incorporated into the norms and acts that govern the jurisdiction”

(Institutional actor)

“They have begun speaking to members of Congress, for example. But this has happened mostly on the initiative of members of Congress, not on theirs. The opposition bench is a small group within Congress, but they know how to build networks. And they have done some very important work. The organisations realise this. Some very important qualitative progress has been made in this relationship”

(Institutional actor)

“Civil society came together with actors which historically it had not collaborated with, like political actors that were not so sympathetic to its positions, institutional stakeholders with which it would never have sat down and other sectors of civil society with which it would never have interacted. They managed to agree on a few fundamental messages, which I think was a great effort”

(Institutional actor)

The fruits of this activity include some advances⁵⁶:

- **Legislative Act 001** of 4 April 2017: abundant documentary evidence has been found of the participation and contributions of the partners in different phases of the process of approving the Legislative Act. For example, there is evidence of the presence of the CCEEU and CCAJAR at the public hearing held in the First Commission of the House of Representatives (24 January 2017) to discuss the Draft Legislative Act⁵⁷, and of the CCAJAR, CCEEU, CCJ, MOVICE and CINEP at the public hearing for the constitutionality review (6 July 2017) of Legislative Act 001⁵⁸.
- Several testimonies gathered for this review indicate that the obligation established in Article 12 of this legislative act, pursuant to which the procedural rules governing the JEP must guarantee the involvement of victims as participants *“in accordance with national and international standards and the parameters established in the Final Agreement”*, constitutes one of the organisations’ main contributions. These testimonies are confirmed in the sheet of amendments included in Gazette of Congress No. 30 of 2017 (Presentation report for second debate on Draft Organic Law No. 002 of 2016), which expressly acknowledges that in relation to the drawing up of Transitional Article 11 (the current Article 12), *“the suggestions of citizens that were presented at the Public Hearing and backed by representatives Lozano and Navas are being incorporated, as follows: it is clear that the procedural rules, by including victim participation, will have to take into account national and international standards”* (p.24). In the reviewer’s opinion the significance of this contribution, from a legal point of view, is particularly important, since it has the capacity to lay foundations to facilitate subsequent advocacy work and to establish a benchmark for the enforceability of rights.
- **Draft JEP Statutory Law 008 of 2017**: the review has found documentary evidence of the participation of the CCJ and CCAJAR in the legislative procedure (public hearing of the Senate on 11 September 2017) and of the CCJ, CCAJAR, MOVICE and 7,000 citizens (online petition managed by the partners) before the CC claiming the unconstitutionality of Articles 100 and 104 of the Draft Law, which declare human rights defenders to be ineligible to participate in this jurisdiction as judges. Ruling C-080 of 2018 declares the

unconstitutionality of the paragraph denounced by the aforementioned organisations, siding with their positions. Although other important actors also made statements to that effect, both internal and external actors agree that this decision is the result of multiple actors coming together around the same position. This means that the organisations' contribution, though not considered sufficient (and requiring collaboration from other actors), was necessary and, therefore, significant for the achievement of the outcome. At the time of the evaluation, the Draft Law had not yet received presidential sanction.

- **Law 1922 of 18 July 2018**, by means of which certain procedural rules concerning the JEP were adopted. Title 1 of the Law governs victims' rights in the procedure and the guarantees relating to their participation. The CCJ, CCAJAR, MOVICE and CCEEU have presented claims of unconstitutionality against various provisions of this regulation to the CC. Along with several other issues, they denounce the fact that the Law incorporates certain rules that grant special treatment to members of public forces (paragraph 2 of Article 11 and Article 75), which would contravene the Constitution.
- Subsequently to this claim, but making use of the aforementioned regulation, in September 2018 the Democratic Centre⁵⁹ presented Draft Legislative Act 24 of 2018 in Congress, proposing the creation of "special sections" for judging members of the military within the JEP. Although the CC has not yet issued a ruling on the contested regulation, the consensus reached on 31 October 2018 between the Democratic Centre, the Liberals, the Social Party of National Unity, Radical Change and the Green Alliance managed to halt **the creation of a new chamber within the JEP** for the judgement of military actors. Although the solution ultimately reached is aligned with social organisations' demands, in this case it is difficult to trace clear lines of contribution between the action of said organisations and the end result, and to understand the significance of their contribution.
- **Decree 589, pursuant to which the UBPDD, the search unit for missing persons in the context of the armed conflict, was organised.** In addition to what the documentary sources reviewed reveal, the key actors interviewed confirm the importance of social organisations' contribution to these advances.

"Decree 589, now finally approved, places a great deal of emphasis on the participation of victims' family members and organisations that represent victims, as well as human rights organisations. So much so that, if you look at the decree, you will see that the Unit has to draw up a national search plan, and that this plan must be worked on and constructed together with the organisations. The role of these organisations was fundamental in achieving that"

(Institutional actor)

Another point of entry for advocacy in relation to the ISTJNR in recent years has come through the process of establishment and operationalisation of the institutions of the ISTJNR, which has enabled organisations to carry out important lobbying activity in order to influence the appointment of JEP judges, CEV commissioners and leaders of the UBPDD. As a result of this mobilisation, the organisations have managed to secure the appointment of a large number of people from the domain of human rights to such positions.

That is the case of the Head of the UBPDD, a human rights defence lawyer who was a member of the CCJ between 1999 and 2009, for example, and of Commissioners Valencia and Beristáin, the latter having a past professional connection with both the PBI and CCAJAR. Both were selected at the proposal of the project's partner organisations. In the case of the JEP and during the nomination process, the CCEEU's transitional justice working group coordinated some important scrutiny work that made it possible to put forward numerous objections to candidates that, in its opinion, did not meet the minimum standards required to hold the position. In parallel, a number of "like-minded" candidates were proposed for nomination. We should point out the large number of judges with ties to human rights defence who were ultimately selected, many of them connected, according to their CVs, with some of the human rights organisations involved in the project⁶⁰. This strategy, though it might appear to

contribute effectively to guaranteeing a certain sensibility of these institutions towards the organisations' positions⁶¹, brings with it a risk of intellectual decapitalisation and weakening of civil society organisations, of which some of the key actors interviewed are beginning to warn. This is a factor that has significant implications in light of the project's objective to strengthen the capacity of civil society organizations to advocate for citizenship rights and the rights of victims.

Lastly, partner organisations report important contributions and feedback to regulatory processes such as the drafting of the decrees that govern the CEV and the UBPDD, as well as proposals for different working protocols of these institutions. Although this information is difficult to triangulate due to the change in context and government⁶², the representatives of these institutions consulted for this review confirm this collaborative relationship and consider the role of these organisations to be fundamental in the implementation and functioning of the integrated system.

Victims' participation in the ISTJNR

Following the approval of some of the aforementioned reforms and the taking of office of the 38 judges that make up the JEP, the latter began its jurisdictional activity, receiving its first 18 dossiers in March 2018. A few months later, in November of the same year, the establishment of the CEV was completed and it began its activity. Since that date, both institutions have begun to receive reports from victims and the organisations that represent them, one of the mechanisms designed to facilitate the participation of the victims in the transitional justice system. Some of these reports are presented by project partner organisations, which, during the last few years, have been closely supporting communities, victims and organisations⁶³ in the documentation of their cases.

Although at the time of the evaluation not all of them had been able to present reports, practically all of the organisations consulted reported some documentation activity and foresee the submission of reports to the transitional justice institutions in the not-too-distant future⁶⁴. Although it is still early to assess the impact of this activity, given the preliminary stage of proceedings of the five cases open at the JEP and the very recent establishment of the CEV, it is hoped that this memory-building and data-collection work can effectively contribute to the fight against impunity in the context of the conflict.

A recent example of this work is the joint report submitted to the JEP on 7 March 2019 by the CCAJAR, CCJ and MOVICE documenting 23 cases of extra-judicial executions. A simple web search can prove the wide media impact of said report⁶⁵. Despite the little time that has passed, we can already find some indications of the importance of the organisations' contribution to the activity of this institution.

Examples of references to partners' reports taken into account by the Truth Recognition Chamber of the JEP in rulings issued since it began functioning:

- Ruling 005 of 27 July 2018 on case 003: in paragraph 13.d) and e), the Chamber includes the *Noche y Niebla* magazine and the CINEP database, supported by the project, as well as a CCEEU database, among the reports considered in its decision to initiate truth seeking proceedings.
- Ruling 040 of 11 September 2018 on the Urabá case: paragraph 14 acknowledges that the jurisdiction has used information provided by civil society organisations, including CINEP, to build the case.

- Ruling 073 of 26 October 2018 on the request for reconsideration in relation to Ruling 001 of March 2018: paragraph 7 reproduces the declaration submitted by the CCAJAR (representing the victim) and signed by MOVICE and the CCEEU.

The CEV, though established in mid 2018, recently began its activity in November 2018, meaning that organizations have not yet had much time to influence and advocate for victims' rights in this new phase.

4.2.4 Conclusion

Based on the data collected, and taking into account the many difficulties of the context, we can therefore conclude that the advocacy work carried out as part of this project has proved to be highly effective. This is reflected in some of the aforementioned legislative advances, but also in some of the reforms that have been blocked. Although it is difficult to attribute these outcomes solely to the partners' work and to rule out the contribution of other alternative causal mechanisms - and of other actors - the testimonies received and the documented presence of the organisations in many of these processes indicate that their contribution, though probably not a sufficient mechanism, is necessary, which enables us to classify their contribution as significant. One of the institutional informants consulted summarises it as follows:

"I believe that nothing would be what it is without the participation of human rights movements. It's hard for me to define an individual contribution, because all this exists thanks to civil society... It's the result of an enormous amount of work and effort by Colombian civil society"

(Institutional actor)

5 LESSONS & FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Although it is not possible to rule out the contribution of other (f)actors in achieving the outcomes analysed, the data collected allow us to state with reasonable certainty that the project's contribution to reinforcing the partners' capacities to claim and advocate for victims' rights has been significant. In this sense, we can conclude that the effectiveness of the project and its chosen focus has been proven.

In relation to outcome 3, above all, we must take into account the fact that its relatively high position in the ToC means that multiple (f)actors have contributed towards its achievement, over which the project does not necessarily have control. However, though probably far from the organisations' aspirations, the data show that some significant advances have materialised. Moreover, there is interesting evidence demonstrating the role of the organisations and their actual contribution to some of these advances.

Though generally speaking we can draw this conclusion, there is a series of final aspects that we would like to share in terms of lessons learned, as well as proposing some suggestions for the future. It is important to clarify that, although the exercise carried out is focused on effectiveness, many of the factors affecting the achievement of the outcomes have to do with aspects that are normally analysed under other evaluation criteria, such as efficiency or sustainability.

Considerations on the design and the monitoring and review system.

- Firstly, the conversations carried out indicate that the flexibility of the project design and its focus on reinforcing consolidated lines of work within the organisations (focusing on creating an environment of opportunity) in the long term, as opposed to other possible models of work and intervention, have been key factors in achieving the described outcomes.
- In addition to this, the project design is ambitious and vague in certain aspects, but shows a satisfactory level of horizontal and vertical coherence, with lines of work that are clearly complementary to the end goal. It is also accompanied by a high-quality selection of partner organisations, bringing together highly respected organisations with a proven track record, and follows a line of continuity from previous collaborations. However, special care has also been taken to ensure the convergence of interests and political positions among the participating organisations, which has facilitated consensus making and joint action.
- On the other hand, the data obtained enable us to conclude that, throughout the project's life span and in particular during its formulation, insufficient space has been given to the definition and collective discussion of the outcomes and of what each one means for the different organisations. Opting to reinforce organisations and their usual fields of work has meant that the decision about which capacities needed reinforcing and where best to employ the resources was left up to each individual organisation. Although this in itself illustrates the flexibility of the project, it often makes it hard to understand its achievements and hinders deeper learning processes. One recommendation for Oxfam in this sense would be to invest more effort in the inception phase and to discuss the project's ToC collectively, making explicit what each outcome means for each organisation. This exercise makes it possible to initiate a collective dialogue on the mandate of each organization and how they see their contribution to the different outcomes identified. This facilitates a common reading of the project, can counteract possible tendencies towards compartmentalisation of the different actions and helps to identify potential areas of synergy. Moreover, it facilitates the design of a clearer monitoring system with a greater capacity to measure changes. Although in this project spaces such as the Management Unit and the Space for Joint Action have made it

possible to share perspectives and promote synergies, there is still a strong tendency to work on a “business as usual” paradigm, and a common reading of the project’s bigger picture is still missing.

Considerations on the effectiveness of the project in relation to the outcomes analysed

- Based on the data collected, we can conclude that a satisfactory level of effectiveness has been reached in relation to the achievement of the outcomes analysed, and that the project's contribution to the individual and collective strengthening of the capacities of partners and victims has been significant. Although on occasion it has been difficult to measure concrete changes in the organisations’ capacities, it is clear that the advocacy and enforceability work carried out by the organisations has been facilitated by the support of the project, and that some of the results obtained would have been hard to achieve without that support.
- Likewise, the data analysed enable us to conclude with a reasonable degree of certainty that, though it is clear that many of the achievements analysed are largely out of the partners’ control and require the contribution of other (f)actors in order to materialise, the constant advocacy work conducted by partners and their active presence in key decision-making and advocacy scenarios has made a significant contribution to the incorporation of a series of guarantees of protection in the legislative development of the peace agreements, and to keeping the issue of victims’ rights on the public debate agenda throughout the peace-building process.
- Most of the actors agree that one of the keys to success in relation to some of the advocacy gains is the broad scale of the collective coordination effort. In fact, the data collected for this review appear to indicate that the advances achieved are the fruit of the significant concerted action of the partners, both among themselves and with other civil society actors (to which the project has contributed significantly), but also of their capacity to forge strategic ties with other political actors.
- Another key to success, in the reviewer’s opinion, has to do with a project design that brings together different strategies and entry points for advocacy that are highly complementary and that make it possible to apply pressure at different levels and in different spaces. Thus, legislative advocacy work, for example, is reinforced with litigation and judicial advocacy activities (both national and international) that make it possible to expand the jurisdictional interpretation of certain provisions, or with actions at a more operational level in relation to the functioning of institutions.

Considerations on sustainability

- A recurring theme throughout the review has been concern about the sustainability perspectives of the project and its legacy. In this sense, it is true that the results of the review vary, particularly with regard to outcome 1. An analysis of this outcome reveals different degrees of sustainability, and the perspectives vary according to the area of capacity reinforced. Thus, it is reasonable to think that those products generated by or with the contribution of the project in order to reinforce the organisations’ internal capacities (strategic plans, collaborative platforms, gender diagnostics, administrative tools, etc.) leave a reasonably well-established legacy.

However, the option to support the organisations’ mandates and usual lines of work opens up a number of questions about sustainability in terms of the capacity of the organizations to continue carrying out this activity once the project (and, therefore, the funding) has been completed. This is more so in a context of great concern about the declining sources of funding from cooperation⁶⁶. Although in the majority of cases we are talking about organisations with a long and consolidated track record, and therefore with the capacity to survive times of crisis, it would have been interesting to anticipate the completion of the project by reinforcing the organisations’ capacity to have clear exit plans and/or resource

diversification strategies, something which does not seem to have been done, or at least not in a sufficiently robust manner.

ANNEX I: BRIEF OUTLINE OF ORGANISATIONS PARTICIPATING IN THE PROJECT

PARTNER ORGANISATIONS OF OXFAM IN COLOMBIA LINKED TO THE AECID PROJECT

Network of Human Rights Defenders (DH Colombia)

This non-profit organisation based in Bogotá DC works for the promotion, dissemination, protection and defence of human rights, with the aim of achieving peace, understood as improving the political, social, economic, cultural and environmental conditions of Colombian society. It is made up of an interdisciplinary group that handles all aspects of the defence of victims of human rights violations, both individually and collectively, using strategic litigation tools centred on four main focus areas supported by Oxfam: a) judicial, criminal and disciplinary intervention; b) advice and support for victims; c) impact on public opinion; d) strategic intervention before international bodies for victims of human rights violations.

Priority regions for implementation of the project: Valle del Cauca, Cauca, Antioquia, Bogotá DC and Bolívar.

For more information visit: <http://www.dhcolombia.com/>

Centre for Research and Popular Education (CINEP)

The Centre for Research and Popular Education, CINEP (Peace Programme), is an institution based in Bogotá DC which was founded by The Society of Jesus in 1972. In 1988, in partnership with the Intercongregational Commission for Justice and Peace of Conferencia de Religiosos de Colombia, CINEP created the Human Rights and Political Violence Database as a service that increases the visibility of the memory of victims and denounces the serious violations to which they are subjected. In 2006, CINEP, together with the Peace Programme and the Human Rights and Political Violence Database, merged into a single entity to become the Centre for the Promotion of Knowledge and Information Systems, developing five lines of historical and structural research about the Colombian reality.

One of the objectives of CINEP is to constitute a training, capacity-building and support centre that stands up for the most excluded segments of society. As part of this work, CINEP helps organisations and communities promote and assert their rights, supports their capacity-building and their participation in building comprehensive human development and lasting peace. The information compiled in the database is accessible to the public online, via the website www.nocheyniebla.org or open access publications such as the biannual magazine Noche y Niebla and example case.

With the support of Oxfam, CINEP has provided a strategic collaboration by strengthening local capacities to systematically log and shine light on human rights violations in the country.

Priority regions for implementation of the agreement: Cauca, Chocó, Nariño, Valle del Cauca and the Caribbean coast region.

For more information visit: <https://www.cinep.org.co/Home2/>

Colombia Europe United States Coordination (CCEEU)

Colombia Europe United States Coordination – CCEEU is a national and international advocacy platform based in Bogotá DC that works to ensure respect for human rights as an essential element of a full democracy and sustainable and lasting peace. CCEEU is made up of 278 human rights organisations (representing indigenous peoples, peasants, families of victims, Afro-Colombians, trade unions, youth, culture, LGBT and women) and has been working for 23 years with the United Nations Human Rights Council, European, North American and Colombian institutions, and international bodies that protect and guarantee human rights such as the United Nations High Commission for Human Rights, special rapporteurs, working groups and IACHR, among others.

For approximately 15 years, Oxfam has been supporting the work of human rights organisations through CCEEU.

This support has been through two types of action: a) financing a project to develop national and international advocacy strategies, research and internal strengthening to enable the full development of the platform; b) political support, participating in advocacy aimed at the international community, with government institutions where appropriate, and maintaining an advocacy agenda to back up and position the problems of victims and/or human rights defenders.

Priority regions for implementation of the project: Caribbean coast, Antioquia, northeast, southwest and centre.

For more information visit: <https://coeuropa.org.co/>

Colombian Commission of Jurists (CCJ)

A non-governmental organisation based in Bogotá DC which, since 1988, has been defending and promoting full respect for civil, political, economic, social and cultural human rights, as well as humanitarian law, in Colombia.

Comisión Colombiana de Juristas The organisation has various lines of work, including research and documentation of the human rights situation, litigation or legal representation of victims before national and international courts, and promotion of the development of national and international human rights mechanisms in relation to Colombia. Within the framework of this project, they are handling the legal representation of 36 cases of serious human rights violations concerning enforced disappearances, extrajudicial killings, torture, forced displacement and sexual violence, among other crimes committed in the context of the armed conflict. 35 cases are being handled before international bodies (24 before IACHR, 6 before the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, 3 before the UN Human Rights Committee and 2 civil actions in the USA) and the families of victims are being provided with psychological and legal support.

Priority regions for implementation of the project: Nariño, Cauca, Valle del Cauca, Antioquia, Bolívar, the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta region and Bogotá DC.

For more information visit: <http://www.coljuristas.org/index.php>

“José Alvear Restrepo” Collective Corporation of Lawyers (CCAJAR)

A non-profit non-governmental organisation based in Bogotá DC that has 40 years' experience in Colombia in the legal representation of victims of serious human rights violations and crimes against humanity before national and international bodies to assert their rights to truth, justice and comprehensive reparation, and obtain guarantees of non-repetition. Its litigation activities include national and international advocacy actions, as well as training and organisational strengthening processes to empower victims in the defence and assertion of their rights.

Within the framework of the programme and relationship with Oxfam, CCAJAR has fully supported the empowerment of victims of socio-political violence in Colombia so that they demand fulfilment of their rights and make proposals for the establishment of guarantees of non-repetition and reconstruction of their life projects through organisational strengthening, legal support, advocacy and awareness-raising.

Priority regions for implementation of the project: Antioquia, Bogotá DC, Bolívar, Cauca, Nariño, Valle del Cauca and Montes de María.

For more information visit: <https://colectivodeabogados.org/>

Woman Follow My Footsteps Corporation (CMSMP)

Woman Follow My Footsteps Corporation (CMSMP) is an organisation led by women survivors of sexual violence, which is based in Bogotá DC. It works to assert and defend the human rights of this group of women who have been victims of violence within or outside of the armed conflict, seeking different types of mechanisms with the aim of raising awareness of sexual violence and ensuring that women have access to justice and the different programmes offering care for victims of sexual violence and other forms of gender-based

violence that also affect girls and teenagers. In addition, it encourages the participation of women in actions for the prevention of different types of gender-based violence organised by the Corporation.

With the support of Oxfam, over time CMSMP has been developing its work to assist, advise, strengthen, empower, finance, provide political backing and document the various cases of women survivors of sexual violence in the regions of Bolívar (Cartagena) and Choco (Quibdó), as a way of achieving access to justice via the mechanisms established in the peace agreement.

Priority regions for implementation of the project: Antioquia, Bolívar, Nariño, Valle del Cauca and Bogotá DC.

For more information visit: <https://cmujersiguemispasos.wordpress.com/2015/05/04/quienes-somos/>

Forging Futures Foundation (FFF)

The Forging Futures Foundation (FFF) is a non-profit organisation based in Medellín, in the Department of Antioquia, which works to strengthen democracy, peace and the economic, social, cultural and political development of Colombians. Its foundations are Social Justice, Civic Participation, Peaceful Coexistence, Equity and Solidarity. Its main efforts are centred on supporting victims of Colombia's armed conflict with the restitution of their lands. It also carries out other projects related to improving the basic living conditions, health and quality of life of communities nationwide.

In 2012, FFF won the National Peace Prize awarded by Semana magazine, El Tiempo newspaper and Fundación FESCOL for its work defending human rights and helping victims of the armed conflict. That same year, FFF received the Don Juan del Corral Order of Merit from Medellín City Council and official recognition from Antioquia Departmental Assembly. In 2015, it was awarded the National Human Rights Defence award by DIAKONIA Colombia.

The partnership between FFF and Oxfam began in 2011 around the defence of human rights and women's rights. Since then, they have worked together on different projects, moving towards a culture of peace, leading processes of land restitution in the country or documenting and supporting the cases of people claiming back land through the National Unit for Victims.

Priority regions for implementation of the project: Antioquia.

For more information visit: <http://www.forjandofuturos.org/objetivos.php>

Movement for Victims of State Crime (MOVICE)

The National Movement for Victims of State Crime – MOVICE is a coalition based in Bogotá DC that was created 13 years ago. It is made up of more than 200 victims' organisations who work to defend human rights and the rights of victims in Colombia. Its social action is geared towards seeking justice, truth, reparation and guarantees of non-repetition for victims of enforced disappearances, extrajudicial executions, targeted killings and forced displacement committed by the Colombian State and/or paramilitary groups. Its efforts aim to contribute to building peace and democracy in Colombia. It has a presence in 15 of the country's departments.

MOVICE's work with Oxfam has been carried out in the following areas: a) organisational strengthening through internal training process, research projects driven by victims in the territories where their work is being promoted, and support for the Comité de Impulso Ampliado; b) supporting advocacy process that contribute to broadening the strategic agenda, supporting the National Technical Secretariat, engaging in advocacy with representatives of the international community and undertaking mobilisation activities on symbolic dates for the victims' movement.

Priority regions for implementation of the project: Antioquia, Bolívar, Bogotá DC, Nariño and Valle del Cauca.

For more information visit: <https://movimientodevictimas.org/>

Psychosocial Care Centre Corporation (CAPS)

A non-governmental organisation created in 2002, which specialises in care, support and psychosocial capacity-building from a bioenergetic, holistic and integral perspective. CAPS provides individual and collective psychosocial support to individuals, families, communities and social organisations that have suffered from political violence, human rights defenders, female leaders and the trade union sector. In addition, it prepares reports and expert opinions, and provides psychological and legal support to victims to facilitate the exercise of rights against impunity, for the pursuit of truth and justice.

With the backing of Oxfam, CAPS has carried out more than 1,350 individual psychosocial consultations (medical, psychological and therapeutic) with a bioenergetic focus. This has led to improvements in the all-round health of victims, human rights defenders, the Nasa indigenous population in Cauca Department and trade unionists affected by the armed conflict. It has also provided more than 12 significant spaces (commemorations, galleries of memory, exhumations, burials, public hearings) for the construction of memory and emotional redress for victims.

Priority regions for implementation of the project: Cauca and Bogotá DC.

For more information visit: <http://www.caps.org.co/caps/somos>

Circle Foundation for Cultural and Political Studies (FCECP)

Circle Foundation for Cultural and Political Studies (FCECP) is a civil society organisation that for the last 10 years has been defending human rights through the psychosocial support technique in more than 23 regions of Colombia, especially supporting victims of sexual violence in the context of the armed conflict.

Círculo de Estudios

With the support of Oxfam, FCECP has mainly worked on human rights capacity-building with more than 400 women survivors of sexual violence from five organisations in the region of Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta and in Bolívar Department. As a result of this process, qualitative and political resources have been put in place to support the emotional and relational resignification of violent acts. Leaders have replicated these exercises with women in their communities and organisations. Similarly, advocacy work has been supported with the photography exhibition called “The Right to Speak Out”, to raise awareness and encourage reflection on the issue of sexual violence, which has toured 15 cities in the country and five international cities and has been attended by more than 1,000 people. In addition, FCECP has drafted one of three reports on patterns in the use of sexual violence in the context of the armed conflict that will be presented to Colombia’s Truth Commission.

Priority regions for implementation of the project: Bolívar and the Sierra Nevada region.

For more information visit: <http://circulodeestudios.org/la-fundacion/>

Peace Brigades International (PBI)

This is an international organisation whose aim is to contribute to building a society at peace and with social justice in which the right to the truth, justice, full reparation, guarantees of non-repetition and defence of territory are universally respected. Moreover, it works to ensure that defenders of such rights can work without risk to their physical, emotional, and social wellbeing. It has been present in Colombia since 1994. The main focus of its work is international accompaniment, a technique that was pioneered by PBI. It is used to protect human rights defenders who are violently threatened due to the nature of their work. Together with accompaniment as protection, PBI works with local social organisations on peace education programmes to strengthen each society's capacity to resolve conflicts without resorting to violence.

In its work with Oxfam, PBI Colombia has managed to open up and expand workspaces for human rights defenders, communities and organisations by providing comprehensive support based on its four complementary lines of action (physical, political, media and psychosocial), primarily in the region of Urabá and the city of Buenaventura.

Priority regions for implementation of the project: Apartadó, Bogotá DC, Community of San José de Apartadó, Cavida (Cacarica) and Cuencas de Curvaradó and Jiguamiando, Barrancabermeja

For more information visit: <https://www.peacebrigades.org/es/sobre-pbi>

Nydia Erika Bautista Foundation for Human Rights (FNEB)

This is an organisation that was created in exile (Albstadt, Germany) to bring together and represent relatives of victims of enforced disappearance, most of whom are women. Since 2007, the Foundation has been working directly in Colombia where, with a comprehensive and participatory approach, it is dedicated to protecting the rights of women and relatives who have been victims of enforced disappearances and their empowerment as subjects

capable of contributing to the building of a Colombia at peace and without disappearances. Its work is focused in Putumayo, Valle del Cauca, Bolívar, Meta, Cauca, Casanare and Bogotá, and includes Afro Colombians, San Marcelino Indigenous Reserve and two smaller communities. It has a Leadership School for women and relatives of missing persons and an interdisciplinary group of lawyers, sociologists, social workers, documentation specialists and communications specialists. Together with Oxfam, FNEB has worked on a project to support victims in Valle del Cauca, Cauca, Bolívar and Bogotá, mostly women, offering legal support, documentation of cases to present to the Truth Commission and capacity-building for advocacy on public policies in favour of the rights of victims, and women as builders of peace.

Priority regions for implementation of the project: Valle del Cauca, Cauca and Bogotá DC.

For more information visit: <http://www.nydia-erika-bautista.org/index.php>

ANNEX II: EVALUATION MATRIX

Assessment Questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
To what extent has this project helped the organisations involved increase and/or strengthen their capacity for both individual and collective action?	<p>To what extent have the internal capacities of the different organisations been strengthened?</p> <p>To what extent has coordination between organisations been improved?</p> <p>What other (f)actors have contributed to this outcome?</p>	<p>Examples of internal capacities that have been acquired or strengthened</p> <p>Examples of influencing skills/knowledge</p> <p>Coordinated actions promoted by and between the partners</p> <p>Coordinated influencing strategies</p> <p>New or better contacts and interaction with external institutional/political actors</p>	<p>Documentary review</p> <p>Interviews with partners</p> <p>Discussion groups (partners)</p> <p>Direct observation</p>
To what extent has the project helped strengthen the gender component in the work of the organisations involved?	<p>To what extent has the gender component gained weight in the human rights organisations' work with victims?</p> <p>To what extent has the participation and integration of women's organisations been promoted in broader processes of defending victims' rights?</p> <p>What other (f)actors have contributed to this outcome?</p>	<p>Measures taken to strengthen this component in the action of the partners</p> <p>External resources obtained to strengthen capacities in this area</p> <p>Strategy/analysis documents prepared</p> <p>Examples of contact or transfer of know-how from women's organisations</p> <p>Women's organisations incorporated into human rights</p>	<p>Documentary review</p> <p>Interviews (partners, bellwethers, external institutions working to defend women's rights)</p>

		<p>defence processes in which they were not previously involved</p> <p>Perception of the importance of the gender focus in the work of the organisations</p>	
--	--	--	--

Assessment Questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection tools
To what extent has this capacity-building helped the organisations carry out more effective advocacy work for the defence of victims' rights?	<p>To what extent have the contributions of the organisations involved in the project helped guarantee the rights of victims in the development and implementation of the Integrated System of Truth, Justice, Reparation and Non-Repetition (ISTJRN)?</p> <p>To what extent has the project helped strengthen the influencing activities of the partners and raise awareness of their proposals for the defence of victims' rights?</p> <p>What other (f)actors have contributed to this outcome?</p>	<p>Recognition by decision-makers of the approaches and needs (problem) proposed by the partners</p> <p>Examples of contributions (solutions) of organisations accepted in legislative development processes and in the functioning protocols of the mechanisms of the ISTJRN</p> <p>Perception of decision-makers and institutional representatives about the influencing activity and products contributed by the partners</p> <p>Presence and participation of the partners in key influencing spaces</p> <p>Analysis documents and methodologies presented by the partners to the different institutions</p> <p>Contacts and meetings held with decision-makers and institutional representatives.</p>	<p>Documentary review</p> <p>Interviews with partners, decision-makers, institutional representatives, bellwethers.</p>

NOTES

-
- ¹ Throughout this report, we will use the terms 'project' and 'agreement' interchangeably to refer to the evaluated intervention.
- ² This classification applies only to outcome 3 since, as previously mentioned, significant difficulties were encountered when attempting to apply the PT process for the other two outcomes.
- ³ Throughout the report, we will use the term 'project' and 'agreement' interchangeably to refer to the evaluated intervention.
- ⁴ Project Document 14-C01-044
- ⁵ The final Agreement was signed in November 2016, launching the process of reforms necessary for its fulfilment.
- ⁶ General Objective of project 14-C01-044
- ⁷ Projects 08-PR1-391 (2008) and 10-C01-053 (2010)
- ⁸ The first Negotiation Session was held on 18 October 2012 in Oslo, Norway
- ⁹ More details about the timeline of the process can be found at <http://www.ideaspaz.org/especiales/dialogos-habana>. Annex VIII reproduces the timeline drawn up for this assessment.
- ¹⁰ Final Agreement for Ending Conflict and Building a Stable and Long-Lasting Peace, p. 127
- ¹¹ <https://www.acnur.org/noticias/noticia/2018/12/5c243ef94/hay-mas-victimas-de-desplazamiento-forzado-en-colombia-que-numero-de-habitantes.html>
- ¹² "Second Report on the State of Implementation of the Colombia Peace Agreement: December 2016 – May 2018", August 2018
https://kroc.nd.edu/assets/284864/informe_2_instituto_kroc_final_with_logos.pdf
- ¹³ According to the Kroc institute, at the date of this report approximately half of the stipulations related to point 5 of the agreement had not begun to be processed, 37% of the commitments had been minimally implemented and just 10% of commitments were considered to have been implemented in full.
- ¹⁴ Some of the media headlines following Duque's victory reflect these uncertainties: "Beyond the renaming of posts, what concerns me is the focus that the new government is giving to those two institutions. I feel that the new government is claiming that the words 'peace' and 'post-conflict' no longer exist. That they will never appear in any document again. And I worry a great deal about the outlook for those two institutions under a government that wants to eliminate those words. It would appear that, in reality, the government has no outlook when it comes to peace" (<https://www.elpais.com.co/proceso-de-paz/hacia-donde-va-la-politica-de-paz-de-duque.html>); "Iván Duque: the candidate of uncertainty for 8 million victims: In his campaign, Duque referred only to victims of the FARC, proposing a parallel agenda to that agreed in Havana. Will he put an end to the JEP and the CEV?" (<https://pacifista.tv/notas/ivan-duque-el-candidato-de-la-incertidumbre-para-8-millones-de-victimas/>); "To object to the JEP or not: President Duque's dilemma" (<https://www.elespectador.com/noticias/politica/objetar-o-no-la-jep-la-encrucijada-del-presidente-duque-articulo-840511>)
- ¹⁵ López Pacheco, Jairo Antonio. (2012). Human rights NGOs in democracy. Analyses for the study of the politicisation of human rights in Colombia. Political Studies, 41, Institute of Political Studies, University of Antioquia, pp.103–123;
- ¹⁶ López Pacheco, J. & Hincapié Jiménez, S. (2017) Human rights and transnational legal activism. Strategies of NGOs in Mexico and Colombia. Latin-American Profiles, vol. 25, no. 49, Mexico, Jan./Jun. 2017
- ¹⁷ Van C. Evans (2016). The civil society of Colombia. Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, Indiana University. According to this research, Colombia has approximately 61.5 civil society organisations for every 10,000 inhabitants, which gives the country the second-highest rate of registered organisation in the Americas, after the US. In addition to these, there are countless organisations representing victims or other actors that are more informal or that do not have legal status and therefore are not registered.
- ¹⁸ Some authors (Manrique, 2014) even manage to establish a correlation between the participation of Colombian organisations in the Havana talks and the overcoming of certain crises experienced during that process. An example of the reflection of that role in the media:
<https://colombia2020.elespectador.com/politica/sociedad-civil-clave-en-la-busqueda-de-la-paz>

-
- ¹⁹ Aho, E. & Grinde, J (2017) Shrinking space for civil society: challenges in implementing the 2030 agenda. Forum SYD; Report on the state of civil society 2016, CIVICUS
- ²⁰ Andrew Firmin (2017). Contested and under pressure: a snapshot of the enabling environment of civil society in 22 countries. CIVICUS; Emelie Aho & Jonatan Grinde (2017). Shrinking space for civil society: challenges in implementing the 2030 agenda. Forum Syd; <https://www.civicus.org/index.php/media-resources/news/united-nations/geneva/3115-the-deterioration-of-civic-space-in-colombia-guatemala-and-honduras>
- ²¹ <https://www.ohchr.org/SP/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=23968&LangID=S>
- ²² For a brief description of these organisations, see Annex I
- ²³ The ToC reconstructed for this assessment takes into account the work carried out within the framework of the AECID project, but places it in a wider context of programmatic work. It should be clarified, therefore, that this concerns the ToC of the influence work, and not of the project, which means that certain aspects and lines of work included may be excluded from the ToC in question, or may not be fully reflected.
- ²⁴ Although it would be possible to see how this ToC could be applicable to influence work outside of the context of the peace process, in this assessment we will limit our analysis exclusively to what has been carried out within this framework.
- ²⁵ More information on this process can be found in the preliminary report (Annex IV)
- ²⁶ The complete assessment matrix can be consulted in Annex III.
- ²⁷ For more information: <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/how-are-effectiveness-reviews-carried-out-594353>
- ²⁸ For more information on this protocol: <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/blog/2013/02/~-/media/C396B507E01C47AB880D7EEF9ECCD171.ashx>; https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resources/guide/process-tracing_draft_protocol
- ²⁹ The list of documentation reviewed can be consulted in Annex V.
- ³⁰ In January 2019, several days before the start of the field visit, the headquarters of the FNEB in Bogotá was the subject of an attack, which is why we did not believe it was appropriate to insist on its participation in the assessment process during the field visit.
- ³¹ To illustrate the pace of the reform agenda, the Second Report on the State of Implementation of the Colombia Peace Agreement by the Kroc Institute lists 11 legislative initiatives approved, another 10 tabled and 35 decrees with the force of law issued over a period of barely two years.
- ³² The exact wording of these indicators can be checked in Annex II.
- ³³ Half-year progress report PAC 4 (1 January – 30 June 2018)
- ³⁴ Representatives of Legislative Technical Units (LTUs) of the Congress of the Republic of Colombia and of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) usually participate in these working groups.
- ³⁵ The UPR is a mechanism of the UNHRC through which it periodically examines fulfilment of human rights obligations and commitments by the 193 UN Member States. Civil society actors may participate in the consultation process at the national level, which results in the preparation of the national report, or submit pertinent information as interested actors.
- ³⁶ Report of the UPR Working Group for Colombia; A/HRC/39/6
- ³⁷ Although the report is officially signed by 22 organisations and platforms, many more participate in its preparation. The signatory partners include the CCJ, CCAJAR, CCEEU and the Committee for Solidarity with Political Prisoners (CSPP), an entity run by MOVICE.
- ³⁸ It should be pointed out that, although here we are limiting our analysis to the period 2015-2019, the activity of the organisations in relation to victims' rights dates back to long before the implementation of the project being assessed.
- ³⁹ 36 of the approximately 113 cases that the CCJ has open have been financed by the project. In the case of DH Colombia, the project has directly financed eight cases out of a total of 42.
- ⁴⁰ Peace Agreement, p. 143: "we have agreed to start up a special process of contribution and collection of strictly humanitarian information between the National Government, the FARC-EP, the victims' organisations, including the Committee on Enforced Disappearances of the Colombia-Europe-United States Coordination, FEVCOL, PAIS LIBRE, ASFADDES, ECIAP, the Visible Victims Foundation, MOVICE, the Nydia Erika Bautista Foundation..."
- ⁴¹ Peace Agreement, p. 44: "We, the National Government and the FARC-EP, have agreed to request that the National Participation Council, with support from Foro por Colombia, Viva la Ciudadanía and CINEP, organise the national participative space mentioned in section 2.2.1."
- ⁴² The full list of activities covered in the project can be consulted in the planning matrix (Annex II)

-
- ⁴³ The CCJ's website offers a long list of many other regulatory processes related to the regulatory implementation of the Final Agreement between the Colombian government and the FARC: http://www.coljuristas.org/proceso_de_paz.php?p=gobierno_farc
- ⁴⁴ An example of this activity: <https://www.colectivodeabogados.org/?La-Escuela-de-la-Memoria-le-Habla-a-la-Comision-de-la-Verdad>
- ⁴⁵ In five of the hearings reviewed, no issues related to Colombia were dealt with. Another three dealt with issues related to Colombia but not directly related to matters of transitional justice or connected to the mandate of the partners.
- ⁴⁶ <https://www.icrc.org/es/document/las-victimas-deberian-ser-parte-central-de-la-agenda-publica-en-colombia>
- ⁴⁷ In June 2018, Iván Duque, supported by parties that had backed the 'No' campaign in the plebiscite on the agreement reached in Havana, won the presidential election.
- ⁴⁸ Due to limitations of scope, this analysis does not cover communication and mobilisation work, including campaigns, carried out in order to position these issues on the national agenda. Measuring the effects of such work would need to be tackled differently, which is not possible to do at the moment.
- ⁴⁹ The report refers to a joint press release by the organisations promoted by the CCEEU (<https://coeuropa.org.co/el-compromiso-con-los-derechos-humanos-es-una-cualidad-no-una-inhabilidad/>)
- ⁵⁰ "The Commission is of the view that if the Statutory Law is approved with such a limitation, it could prove an obstacle to the defense of human rights and the rights of victims in the framework of the JEP"; 2017 Annual Report, CHAPTER V: FOLLOW-UP TO RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE IACHR IN ITS COUNTRY OR THEMATIC REPORTS, p. 728; IACHR
- ⁵¹ The CCJ, CCAJAR and CCEEU all took part.
- ⁵² Express references to the PBI press release and the 'We Are Defenders' programme, of which the CCJ forms part.
- ⁵³ <https://www.eluniversal.com.co/colombia/asesinatos-de-lideres-sociales-no-son-sistematicos-gobierno-282338-0BEU398622>
- ⁵⁴ <http://www.oas.org/es/cidh/prensa/comunicados/2019/008.asp>
- ⁵⁵ A/HRC/WG.6/30/COL/3
- ⁵⁶ This list claims to show only some examples of the legislative advocacy activity of the partners in the context of the implementation of the agreements and therefore is not exhaustive. Other advocacy actions include the denunciation of Article 75 of Law 1448 by the FFF and the CCJ, which is still under research.
- ⁵⁷ Gazette of Congress No. 30 of 2017, p.
- ⁵⁸ Ruling C-647-2017
- ⁵⁹ Democratic Centre is a Colombian political party founded in 2013 by Álvaro Uribe Vélez. Following the 2018 elections it became the leading political force in Congress, with 52 seats, and the largest party in the Senate.
- ⁶⁰ In its 2017 annual report, the IACHR states that 16% of the judges have experience in human rights.
- ⁶¹ This is an issue that needs to be analysed and confirmed after these institutions have been functioning for a certain length of time.
- ⁶² The review has not had access to people with key responsibilities during the reviewed period (Santos government).
- ⁶³ In some cases, the partners have collaborated on the documentation of other organisations, such as the Regional Corporation for the Defence of Human Rights (CREDHOS) and various human rights organisations based in the Casanare department: <http://hacemosmemoria.org/2018/05/13/credhos-informe-jep-conflicto-armado/> <https://cospacc.org/?p=124>
- ⁶⁴ This excludes those that do not directly carry out this activity as per mandate (although many of their member organisations do): the CCEEU, MOVICE and PBI.
- ⁶⁵ <https://www.jep.gov.co/Sala-de-Prensa/Paginas/La-JEP-recibe-informe-sobre-23-ejecuciones-extrajudiciales--en-Cesar--entre-2007-y-2009.aspx>; <https://youtu.be/3S2WlxIKWlo> (Contagio Radio); <https://videos.telesurtv.net/video/740641/colombia-entregan-a-jep-informe-sobre-ejecuciones-extrajudiciales/>; <https://www.radionacional.co/actualidad/noticias/jep-falsos-positivos-general>; <https://colombia2020.elspectador.com/jep/organizaciones-de-ddhh-piden-la-jep-investigar-al-general-adolfo-hernandez-por-falsos-positivos>; <https://www.diariomilitar.es/colombiaorganizaciones-sociales-denuncian-a-militar-por-ejecuciones-extrajudiciales/>

⁶⁶ According to the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), flows of official development aid to Colombia have decreased by around 40% since 2015. Data available at: oecd.org/dac/stats/idsonline.

Oxfam Effectiveness Reviews

For more information, or to comment on this report, email policyandpractice@oxfam.org.uk

© Oxfam GB October 2021

This publication is copyright but the text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. Email policyandpractice@oxfam.org.uk.

The information in this publication is correct at the time of going to press.

ISBN: 978-1-78748-812-0

DOI: 10.21201/2021.8120

Oxfam GB, Oxfam House, John Smith Drive, Cowley, Oxford, OX4 2JY, UK.

OXFAM

Oxfam is an international confederation of 21 organizations, working with its partners and allies, reaching out to millions of people around the world. Together, we tackle inequalities to end poverty and injustice, now and in the long term – for an equal future. Please write to any of the agencies for further information or visit www.oxfam.org.

Oxfam America (www.oxfamamerica.org)

Oxfam Aotearoa (www.oxfam.org.nz)

Oxfam Australia (www.oxfam.org.au)

Oxfam-in-Belgium (www.oxfamsol.be)

Oxfam Brasil (www.oxfam.org.br)

Oxfam Canada (www.oxfam.ca)

Oxfam France (www.oxfamfrance.org)

Oxfam Germany (www.oxfam.de)

Oxfam GB (www.oxfam.org.uk)

Oxfam Hong Kong (www.oxfam.org.hk)

Oxfam IBIS (Denmark) (<http://oxfamibis.dk>)

Oxfam India (www.oxfamindia.org)

Oxfam Intermón (Spain) (www.oxfamintermon.org)

Oxfam Ireland (www.oxfamireland.org)

Oxfam Italy (www.oxfamitalia.org)

Oxfam Mexico (www.oxfammexico.org)

Oxfam Novib (Netherlands) (www.oxfamnovib.nl)

Oxfam Québec (www.oxfam.qc.ca)

Oxfam South Africa (www.oxfam.org.za)

KEDV (Turkey) (www.kedv.org.tr)

OXFAM

www.oxfam.org.uk/effectiveness