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1. INTRODUCTION

The following report aims to provide a summary of the results of the First Coordination Meeting of the non-governmental process for the Community of Democracies. This activity was organized by the Executive Secretariat in the framework of the preparatory process towards the Ministerial meeting of the Community of Democracies, to be held in Santiago in early 2005.

The meeting counted with the participation of 37 people, representing civil society organizations from the different regions of the world, along with the Executive Secretariat that is based in Chile. The list of participants, along with their contact information can be found in Annex Nº1.

The meeting took place at Institute for Political Studies of the Catholic University of Portugal, in Lisbon, between January 19th and 21st of 2004.

The general objective of the meeting was:

Discuss the non-governmental strategy toward the ministerial meeting of Santiago 2005 of the Community of Democracies with a group of social and political actors from the different regions of the world, promoting the creation of counterparts to develop regional activities aiming to formulate proposals and recommendations to the governments that will gather in Santiago 2005.

For achieving this main objective, the meeting had specific objectives, as follows:

- To introduce the Community of Democracies process, both the governmental and non-governmental efforts.

- To learn the objectives, scope of action and activities of the participant’s institutions.

- To present the non-governmental strategy for Santiago 2005, assessing funding opportunities and constrains for its implementation.

- To discuss and decide about 2004 activities at the regional level.
- To establish next steps based on the results of the discussion.

To achieve these objectives, the Executive Secretariat developed and agenda, that is enclosed as Annex Nº2.

In the following pages, a summary of the activities and the discussions during the meeting is provided, presented according to the different panels.

2. OPENING

The meeting was inaugurated by Genaro Arriagada, Chairman of the Executive Secretariat, Andrea Sanhueza, Executive Secretary and Joao Espada, Director of the Institute for Political Studies of the Catholic University of Portugal. That was the opportunity to set the main idea for the meeting, presenting the main objectives and the agenda. That was also the space for participants to present themselves and their respective institutions.

3. FIRST PANEL: BACKGROUND OF THE COMMUNITY OF DEMOCRACIES

The first panel on the 20th was devoted to present a background of the Community of Democracies, both the governmental process and the previous non-governmental efforts. The session was moderated by Richard Rowson, President of the Council for a Community of Democracies, who also presented the governmental process, and counted with the participation as panelists of Yuri Dzhibladze President of the Center for the Development of Democracy and Human Rights, and Claudia Caldeirinha, Director for Europe of the Democracy Coalition Project.

The main ideas presented in this session include the importance of the Community of Democracies, that, as a governmental forum, has the capability and scope to intervene in cases of democratic failure, as it has happened in some cases.

It was also addressed that the non-governmental process for Santiago should take into account the criticism made to the Seoul forum, that include, among others, the lack of commitment demonstrated by some governments and the need of a non-governmental forum
with enough time in advance in order to be able to advocate the proposals resulted from the process, prior to the ministerial.

It was also highlighted the need to define a clear governmental counterpart, so advocacy could be more effective, and the need of concrete steps to move forward.

4. SECOND PANEL: MAIN CURRENT DEMOCRATIC DEFICITS

This panel, facilitated by Pedro Mujica from the Executive Secretariat, counted with the participation of David Altman, from the Catholic University of Chile, who presented his paper “Democratic Challenges in the Contemporary World” written for this meeting. António Pinheiro Torres and Maria do Rosário Carneiro, Congressman and Congresswoman of Portugal, respectively, commented the paper, along with Ozias Tungwarara, from IDEA International and Luis Alvarado from the International Socialist.

Altman’s presentation stressed that the conceptualization and promotion of democracy is an extremely difficult and controversial. It also discussed that although Dahl’s concept of polyarchy provides a good starting point to differentiate democratic from non-democratic regimes, it lacks accuracy in discriminating among different degrees of democratic quality. Democratic quality could be measured through effective degrees of participation and competition.

It also showed some data to demonstrate that “formal” democracies are flourishing worldwide. (More than sixty per cent of the regimes worldwide are democracies). Nonetheless, democratic quality seems low and sometimes no more than a mere façade.

It was argued that democracy is clearly associated with some aspects that affect human welfare, such as economic and human development, stressing that each one reinforces the other and in consequence, advancing civil and political rights impact on citizen’s quality of living in terms of their human and economic development.

Altman’s presentation can be found as Annex Nº3

Several ideas were advanced in the comments of panel two. In the next paragraph some of these are underlined:
1. Promoting transparency of electoral processes, strengthening some mechanisms of direct democracy such as popular initiatives.

2. The need of strengthening political parties, and political institutions.

3. There is a serious problem of representation of minority groups, such as indigenous groups. This problem of representation involves also include majority groups such as women.

4. More indexes and measurements are required to assess the democratic progress, specifically, effective measures of participation that goes beyond electoral politics, such as citizens’ education of civic and democratic values.

5. The need of strengthening civil society, especially where it does not exist. Citizen’s apathy fosters terrorism and populism.

6. Citizens must find new ways of controlling governments.

7. It is essential to increase the democratic culture and education in order to reaffirm the universal character of democracy.

8. A major challenge is that democracy must govern the market and not the market governs democracy.

9. It is essential to clarify the relationship between democracy and quality of development.

5. THIRD PANEL: NON-GOVERNMENTAL STRATEGY FOR SANTIAGO 2005

The third panel was conducted by the Executive Secretary, Andrea Sanhueza, with the main objective of presenting the non-governmental strategy and its current status, gathering suggestions and comments in order to improve it.

Several inputs were received, such as:
- It is important to include the inputs from other forums
- This process should take the opportunity to work closer with governments, keeping the independence.
- It is possible to use this process to support democratic activists
- Further discussions are necessary within the region to identify and address the democratic issues.
- It was highlighted that regional organizations can work on funding, sharing the responsibility with the Executive Secretariat.
- It was mentioned that this process should not be too ambitious, to get some concrete results.

A presentation of the non-governmental strategy that includes these and other comments received during the panel is enclosed as Annex N 4.

6. REGIONAL WORKING GROUPS

On the morning of January 22nd, the meeting divided into regional working groups which attempted to answer the following guiding questions:

1. What are the major democratic deficits in your region?
2. In light of these democratic deficits, what can be done in your region during 2004 in preparation for the Community of Democracies meeting in Santiago 2005?

Although there were six initial regions in the strategy (Europe, Russia and the Newly Independent States, the Middle East and Northern Africa, Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, and the Americas), the small number of participants representing Russia and the NIS made it more useful to combine the regional working groups of Europe with Russia and the NIS.

In the following pages, a report of the results of each group is provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EUROPE, RUSSIA, BALKANS AND NIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants:</strong> Ancuta Vamesu, Partners Foundation for Local Development (PFLD); Claudia Caldeirinha, Democracy Coalition Project; Francesca Malaguti, Mediterranean Institute; Ilona Mihaies, Euroregional Center for Democracy; Joao José Fernandes, OIKOS; Marieke van Doorn, the Institute for Multiparty Democracy (NIMD); and Yuri Dzhibladze, the Center for the Development of Democracy and Human Rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rapporteur:</strong> Marieke van Doorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Counterpart:</strong> Ancuta Vamesu; Ilona Mihaies; Marieke van Doorn; Yuri Dzhibladze</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given the vast diversity of Europe and Russia, the Regional Counterpart first divided the territory into three regions and attempted to define the major democratic deficits per region: (deficits are not positioned in order of importance):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central &amp; Eastern Europe</th>
<th>Western Europe</th>
<th>Russia &amp; NIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>Alienation from national political parties, lack of transparency of the political process at EU level</td>
<td>Crises of democracy: authoritarian personal power regimes (backed up by constitutional changes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (enforcement mechanisms of) Rule of Law</td>
<td>Lack of institutional mechanisms of participation</td>
<td>Dismantling of democratic institutions, subordinating parliament + judiciary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a democratic culture</td>
<td>Discrimination/exclusion of different groups (ethnic, gender, migrants, non-citizens)</td>
<td>Weak political parties/party party systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of transparency &amp; accountability</td>
<td>Lack of ethical standards for the media (1. strong influence of special political/economical interests 2. governmental complacency/inaction: Berlusconi-ism)</td>
<td>Strong influence of military &amp; security services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination/exclusion of different groups (ethnic, gender, migrants, non-citizens)</td>
<td>Lack of institutional support for civil society</td>
<td>Manipulated &amp; fraudulent elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of independent media (1. strong influence of special political/economical interests 2. governmental complacency/inaction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak political parties/party party systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No strong civil society</td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil society organisations under attack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Common Democratic Deficits:** (note: The intensity of these problems greatly vary in the region under analysis, especially in Western Europe, where some countries do not have alarming democratic deficits, especially when comparing with other regions.)

1. **Discrimination and Exclusion of people** (gender, race, ethnicity, and non-citizen status);
2. **Corruption** (lack of transparency and accountability);
3. **Lack of Independent Media** (strongly influenced by political and economic special interests, with the complacency and inaction of governments);

4. Weak political parties systems and a lack of representation of public interests;

5. **Democratic Crisis** (the backslide of democracy in Russia and the NIS, the dismantling of democratic political institutions and authoritarian regimes);

6. **Lack of European governments and NGOs in global initiatives like Community of Democracies process**

---

**Work Plan:**

1. The Regional Counterpart will work to have the six common democratic deficits are included in the governmental meeting in Santiago 2005 and work with the Executive Secretariat to look at the regional commonalities and include them in the collective documents for the NGO-meeting in Santiago in December 2004.

2. The Regional Counterpart will also use the following common opportunities to meet, disseminate information about the CD, and identify potential helpful regional allies at regional conferences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>LOCATION AND DATE</th>
<th>ORGANIZER</th>
<th>ISSUES RELATED TO CD PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting on Corruption in the Balkans, Russia, and NIS, and Eastern Europe</td>
<td>Bucharest, March 2004</td>
<td>Partners Foundation for Local Development (PFLD)</td>
<td>Corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting on Media Responsibility</td>
<td>Lisbon, April 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of Independent Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting on European Profile on Democracy Support</td>
<td>The Hague, July 2004</td>
<td>Institute for Multiparty Democracy (NIMD)</td>
<td>Lack of European involvement in CD process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting for Community of Democracies</td>
<td>Brussels, 1st Quarter 2004</td>
<td>Democracy Coalition Project</td>
<td>Further organize and plan regional work strategy for Community of Democracies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euromed Civic Forum</td>
<td>Location Unknown, November 2004</td>
<td>Mediterranean Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Common Democratic Deficits:**

1. **Political Systems** Operate on a principle of exclusion of women, poor people, and illiterate people from participation and decision-making. This exclusion contributes to radicalism and fundamentalism.

2. **Laws and Regulations** Absence of laws that allow for free and fair elections, and that protect and independent media, individual rights, and the right of association. Laws protect the system and that give the Executive unlimited authority. Lack of implementation of laws that protect and include people.

3. **Absence or Weakness of Civil Society.** Regimes prevent the development of civil society. Two competing forces are operating in the Arab world: 1. civil society (either as individuals or in groups) is calling for a change in regimes; 2. governments using the rhetoric of political change make only superficial changes. Government movement is moving at an accelerated pace, while civil society, facing more challenges, is moving more slowly.

4. **External Elements** Example: the occupation of Palestine has been used as an excuse not to implement democratic change. External elements such as disputes between countries have also interfered with democratic changes. Internal changes should come from inside the country rather than from external elements.

**Work plan:**

1. The Regional Counterpart will invite other people and groups in the region to participate in the process, taking into special consideration the inclusion of women. It will work to inform regional activists of the Community of Democracies, creating an awareness of and getting support for the meeting in Santiago 2005. It will also seek to make contacts with the governments in the region, as well as with the Arab League, and attempt to incorporate some of the work for the Community of Democracies into the Arab League agenda.
2. The regional counterpart will use upcoming regional meetings as meeting places for the European Regional Counterpart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING</th>
<th>DATE AND LOCATION</th>
<th>ORGANIZER</th>
<th>ISSUES RELATED TO CD PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting on Democracy and Political Participation in the Arab World</td>
<td>The Hague, January 2004</td>
<td>International Dialogues Foundation – Interchurch Peace Council</td>
<td>Political Systems, absence or weakness of civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Assembly of the World Movement for Democracy- MENA region workshop</td>
<td>Durban, February 2004</td>
<td>World Movement for Democracy</td>
<td>Raise awareness and increase participation in the CD process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference on Democracy and Citizenship in the Arab World</td>
<td>Morocco, June 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Political systems, absence or weakness of civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional preparatory meeting</td>
<td>Autum 2004</td>
<td>Arab Steering Committee (coordination) Arab Institute for Human Rights (implementing party)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-regional Euro-Arab meeting</td>
<td>Autum 2004</td>
<td>Steering Committee (coordination) PANORAMA (implementing Party)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Common Democratic Deficits:

1. Political Parties: strengthen political parties, education, internal democracy and integration with civil society
2. Elections: electoral systems often need revision, lack of credibility of electoral processes
3. Governance: lack of accountability and transparency, corruption
4. Government relationship to opposition and civil society
5. Security: lack of civilian control over the military, conflicts that make it extremely difficult to improve democracy in the region

Work Plan:

1. The regional counterpart identified two central goals:
   a) to promote ongoing international networking between groups and individuals in civil society in order to share information and best practices;
   b) to influence governments, for example: in the ways that they relate to civil society, or the ways that the governments treat the key issues as defined by the regional group.

2. The regional counterpart will attempt to broaden the representation of civil society for Santiago 2005;

3. The group agreed to organize a regional meeting in August-September, with the aim to prioritize issues and establish concrete proposals.

4. The regional counterpart will orchestrate the outreach for the project in different meetings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING</th>
<th>LOCATION AND DATE</th>
<th>ORGANIZER</th>
<th>ISSUES RELATED TO CD PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third Assembly of the World Movement for Democracy</td>
<td>Durban, February 2004</td>
<td>World Movement for Democracy</td>
<td>Raise awareness and increase participation in the CD process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVICUS Global Meeting</td>
<td>Botswana, March 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raise awareness and increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ASIA

**Participants:** Augusto [Gus] Miclat, Initiatives of International Dialogue; Dorathy Benjamin, Transparency International Malaysia; John Joseph Coronel, Council of Asian Liberals and Democrats; Raj Liberhan, CITI Foundation, Roland Rich, Centre for Democratic Institutions

**Rapporteur:** Dorathy Benjamin

**Regional Counterpart:** Raj Liberhan

### Common Democratic Deficits:

1. **Lack of Access to Information and Free Media** (the government should provide citizens with better information about laws, politics, and decision-making processes)
2. **Inability of Civil Society to Function Freely** (government intervention represses civil society)
3. **Security** (the need for security is often being used as a pretext to curtail civil liberties)
4. **Need for Civic Education** (to promote democracy)

### Work Plan:

1. Expand the working group representing Asia to include representatives of Northern and Central Asia.
2. Contact other sub-regional organizations to have a sub-regional meeting in 2004
3. In an e-mail dated 29.01.04, Gus Miclat committed to send plans for the sub-region, identifying possible convergences.
Participants: Antonio José Almeida, Rights and Democracy; Elba Luna, Impact Alliance; Frances Seymour, World Resources Institute; Gabriel Murillo, Red Interamericana para la Democracia (RID), Gustavo Gamallo, Red Interamericana; Luis Alvarado, Socialist Internacional; Marguerite Sullivan, Internacional Republican Institute; Maria Eugenia Diaz, ACCIÓN; Miguel Santibañez, ALOP; Pedro Vallejos, Christian Democrat Organization of America; Ramiro Cavero, Union of Latina American Parties (UPLA); Richard Rowson, Council for a Community of Democracies; Shanon O’Connell, Nacional Democratic Institute; Ted Piccone, Democracy Coalition Project

Rapporteur: Gustavo Gamallo

Regional Counterpart: To be defined.

Common Democratic Deficits:

1. Inconclusive Citizenship (partial rule of law causes a weak citizenship)
2. Democratic Institutions (political parties, parliaments, electoral systems, and decentralization mechanisms must be made more transparent at the intra-national level)
3. Relation between Democracy and Development (inequity in Latin America)
4. International Dimension: (asymmetries in size and power of nations; increasing capacity of trans-national companies to influence on State’s sovereignty)

Work Plan:

1. The Regional Counterpart defined the following objectives:
   a. To strengthen the preventive nature of the Inter-American Democratic Charter
   b. Collaborate with other multilateral institutions such as the U.N Democracy Caucus.
   c. Work to raise funds to strengthen democracy and contribute to the process (global fund)
   d. Improve the invitation process for the ministerial to make it broader.
   e. CD should take into account the quality of the democracy of its members, and civil society organizations should have a role there.

2. The Regional Counterpart identified the following mechanisms for continuing the CD process within the agendas and activities of their respective institutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>LOCATION AND DATE</th>
<th>ORGANIZER</th>
<th>ISSUES RELATED TO CD PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up process to Buenos Aires Summit of 2005</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Red Interamericana para la Democracia (RID)</td>
<td>Raise awareness and increase participation in the CD process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The INFORID service, a communication mechanism that distributes news to journalists in the region.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Inter-American Democracy Network</td>
<td>Inconclusive citizenship, raise awareness and increase participation in the CD process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The promotion of dialogue and trust-building processes with political parties</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>PP- OPSC</td>
<td>Inconclusive citizenship, democratic institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Forum of the Americas</td>
<td>Quito, June 2004</td>
<td>ALOP</td>
<td>Raise awareness and increase participation in the CD process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union-Latin American Forum</td>
<td>Mexico City, March 2004</td>
<td>ALOP</td>
<td>Raise awareness and increase participation in the CD process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking with civil society organizations</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>ALOP</td>
<td>Raise awareness and increase participation in the CD process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote discussion with municipal associations for local governance</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Political Parties</td>
<td>Inconclusive citizenship, democratic institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of programs of education for democracy, and promoting dialogue between Africa and Latin America on political education and political leadership</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Council for a Community of Democracies</td>
<td>Inconclusive citizenship, democratic institution, international dimensions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In **Annex Nº 5** an integrated time line with regional activities for 2004 is presented.

### 7. REPORT TO GOVERNMENTS

With the aim to develop a collaborative work with governments, the main results of the meeting were presented to the host government of the meeting, Portugal, represented by Dr. Jose Moreira da Cunha, from the Ministry of Foreign Relations, and to the Ambassador of the Republic of Chile, Mr. Manuel José Matta, representing the Chilean government, chair country of the next ministerial meeting.
8. EVALUATION OF THE MEETING

Here, in summary, are the tabulated results of the 14 evaluation forms of the meeting that were submitted to the Executive Secretariat. A more detailed version of these results can be found as an Annex Nº 6 of this report.

Half the participants (50%) thought that the panel reviewing the Background of the Community of Democracies was very good (highest rating). 43% of the participants said the panel discussing main democratic deficits was sufficient (the second highest rating) and 36% thought that it was very good. The discussion on the non-governmental strategy for Santiago 2005 was very good for 43% of the participants and sufficient for 50%. 43% of the participants thought that the paper “Democratic Challenges in a Contemporary World” was sufficient, while 36% thought that it was just right (second-to-last rating). The workshop’s work methodology was rated very good by 71% of the participants, and the rest thought it was sufficient. 86% of the participants gave the location and equipment the highest rating and the rest all rated it sufficient. The participants were unanimous in rating the hotel and meals as very good.

Many of the participants thought that the best thing about the meeting was the group itself: especially in the diversity of nationalities and personal experiences. The opportunity to meet each other and network was often cited as the best part of the meeting, as were the regional working groups. Participants commented on the democratic and interactive nature of the meeting’s organization, and wrote about the efficiency and friendliness of the Executive Secretariat. The majority of participants cited the time constraint as being the major problem that they would like to see improved for the next meeting.