



Organization of  
American States



**INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION OF WOMEN**

OEA/Ser.L  
CIM/doc.122/13  
4 February 2013  
Original: Spanish

**REPORT ON THE FOLLOW-UP MECHANISM  
TO THE BELÉM DO PARÁ CONVENTION  
PURSUANT TO RESOLUTION AG/RES. 2711 (XLII-O/12)**

## Contents

Executive Summary .....	v
I. Origin, Legal Bases, Structure, and Purposes .....	1
II. Mandates from the OAS General Assembly (2012).....	2
III. Implementation of the MESECVI .....	3
a. Second Multilateral Evaluation Round (2010–present) .....	3
b. Implementation of the MESECVI recommendations:	
i. General results .....	6
ii. Results in legislation.....	6
iii. Results in national action plans .....	7
iv. Results in specialized services .....	8
v. Results in budgets.....	9
IV. Promotion of the MESECVI.....	11
V. Financing for the MESECVI .....	11
VI. Looking to the Future .....	12
VII. Appendixes:	
a. First Multilateral Evaluation Round (2005–2010): Replies to the questionnaire, preliminary reports I and II, final report, CNA comments, and follow-up report on the recommendations made by CEVI.....	15
b. Status of the appointment of experts and Competent National Authorities during the First and the Second Multilateral Evaluation Round .....	17
c. Participation in meetings of the Conference of States Parties during the First and the Second Multilateral Evaluation Round.....	19
d. Participation of experts in meetings of the Committee of Experts (2005–2011).....	21



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Permanent Secretariat of the Inter-American Commission of Women (CIM), in its capacity as Technical Secretariat to the Follow-up Mechanism to the Belém do Pará Convention (MESECVI), submits to the OAS Permanent Council, pursuant to resolution AG/RES. 2711 (XLII-O/12), the present report on the work carried out to implement the MESECVI between March 2012 and February 2013.<sup>1/</sup>

The MESECVI was designed to follow-up on the commitments made by the states parties to the Convention of Belém do Pará, to contribute to achieving the purposes established therein, and to facilitate technical cooperation among the states parties, as well as with other OAS member states and permanent observers. The MESECVI operates on the basis of Multilateral Evaluation Rounds, which address the recommendations of the Committee of Experts in an *evaluation phase* and a *follow-up phase*.

The Second Multilateral Evaluation Round began in April 2010 with the distribution of a questionnaire adopted by the Committee of Experts to the states parties to the Convention:

- Twenty-eight (28) states parties replied to the questionnaire.
- Eight (8) reports were received from civil society organizations accredited to the OAS.
- The Committee of Experts drew up 28 final country reports.
- The Committee of Experts also drew up the *Second Hemispheric Report on the Implementation of the Belém do Pará Convention*.

The Ninth Meeting of the Committee of Experts was held in Mexico City from November 12 to 14, 2012. It began with a forum on “Indigenous Women in the Inter-American Justice System,” with the participation of Valentina Rosendo Cantú, an activist for women’s human rights; Nina Pacari, Minister of the Constitutional Court of Ecuador; Mirna Cunningham Kain, a member of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues; Otilia Lux de Cotí, Director of the International Forum of Indigenous Women; Martha Sánchez Néstor, Coordinator of the Alliance of Indigenous Women of Central America and Mexico; and Alejandro Negrín, Director of Human Rights and Democracy in the Secretariat for Foreign Affairs (SRE).

After the forum, the Meeting of the Committee of Experts continued with two modules, in which a group of specialists in the area of indicators expressed their views to the experts and described methodologies for applying or implementing indicators on violence against women, with a view to improving on the indicators used during the follow-up phase of the First Multilateral Evaluation Round. Once the modules had ended, the experts discussed the new draft indicators to begin the follow-up phase, which, after approval, would be circulated to the states parties to initiate a follow-up phase of recommendations that would end the second round and subsequently launch the Third Multilateral Evaluation Round.

With a view to the future, the process of strengthening the MESECVI has involved planning new projects to make it possible to expand not only on the work done thus far but also on its impact. Accordingly and in view of the numerous possibilities offered by this Follow-up Mechanism, plans have been made to draw up a *MESECVI Strategic Plan 2013-2017*, whose framework consolidates the principal elements of regional concern regarding tools for guaranteeing that women in the region may

---

1. All documents and background information referred to here, including reports submitted in previous years, are available on the MESECVI Web page: <http://www.oas.org/en/mesecvi>.

exercise their rights to live in a world free from violence. This includes the process of developing a results-based plan for the short, medium, and long terms so that it will be possible to follow up on the situation of violence against women in the region as well as to ensure that states parties have access at all times to the necessary technical tools for addressing the numerous challenges faced in designing national policies to guarantee a region free from violence against women.

## I. ORIGIN, LEGAL BASES, STRUCTURE, AND PURPOSES

The Permanent Secretariat of the Inter-American Commission of Women (CIM), in its capacity as Technical Secretariat to the Follow-up Mechanism to the Belém do Pará Convention (MESECVI), submits to the OAS Permanent Council, pursuant to resolution AG/RES. 2711 (XLII-O/12), the present report on the work carried out to implement the MESECVI between March 2012 and February 2013.<sup>2/</sup>

In pursuance of the mandates issued in resolutions CIM/RES. 224/02 (XXXI-O/02), AG/RES. 1942 (XXXIII-O/03), and CIM/REMIM-II/RES. 6/04, the CIM carried out activities to develop a draft mechanism to follow up on implementation of the Inter-Convention on the Prevention, Punishment, and Eradication of Violence against Women, “Convention of Belém do Pará.” The CIM Permanent Secretariat prepared a working document containing a proposed follow-up mechanism and undertook a process of prior consultation with the OAS member states, specialized international organizations, and civil society groups.

A meeting of government experts was held on July 20 and 21, 2004, to review the proposed mechanism and make recommendations to the states parties to the Convention of Belém do Pará. Upon conclusion of the meeting, the experts presented to the Conference of States Parties to the Convention of Belém do Pará the draft Statute of the Mechanism to Follow Up on Implementation of the Convention of Belém do Pará (MESECVI) for adoption.

The Secretary General of the OAS convened the Conference of States Parties for October 26, 2004, at which time the Statute of the MESECVI was adopted.

With its adoption, the states parties expressed their political will to have a consensus-based, independent mechanism for monitoring and evaluating implementation of the Convention, to which they would submit progress reports, in compliance with the Convention, and they agreed to implement its recommendations.

The MESECVI was designed to follow-up on the commitments made by the states parties to the Convention of Belém do Pará, to contribute to achieving the purposes established therein, and to facilitate technical cooperation among the states parties, as well as with other OAS member states and permanent observers. It is based on principles of sovereignty, nonintervention, and legal equality of states contained in the OAS Charter, and is committed to observing the rules of impartiality and objectivity in its operations, in order to guarantee fair application and egalitarian treatment among the states parties.

The Mechanism comprises two bodies: the Conference of States Parties, which is the political body, consisting of representatives of the states parties, and the Committee of Experts, which is the technical body, made up of specialists in the areas covered by the Convention. Although the experts are appointed by governments, they carry out their duties in a personal capacity and independently. The Secretariat of the MESECVI, of both the Conference and the Committee of Experts, is held by the Permanent Secretariat of the CIM, which is also the seat of the MESECVI.

---

2. All documents and background information referred to here, including reports submitted in previous years, are available on the MESECVI Web page: <http://www.oas.org/en/mesecvi>.

The MESECVI operates on the basis of multilateral evaluation rounds, which address the recommendations of the Committee of Experts in an *evaluation phase*<sup>3</sup> and a *follow-up phase*.<sup>4</sup> During the evaluation phase, the Committee of Experts adopts a questionnaire addressing the provisions of the Convention, for circulation to the states parties. On the basis of the states' replies to the questionnaires and of the information gathered, the Committee of Experts issues a final report with recommendations on strengthening implementation of the Convention. National reports and a consolidated Hemispheric Report (2008 and 2012) are published at the end of this evaluation phase. During the follow-up phase, the Committee of Experts establishes a set of indicators to address implementation of the specific recommendations that come out of the evaluation phase. The information the states parties provide on those indicators serves as input for drawing up a Follow-up Report on the Recommendations (2010).

## II. MANDATES FROM THE OAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY (2012)

At its forty-second regular session (June 3-5, 2012, Cochabamba), the OAS General Assembly adopted resolution AG/RES. 2711 (XLII-O/12), which took note of the report presented (CP/doc.4677/12) and endorsed the agreements reached at the Fourth Conference of States Parties to the MESECVI (April 16, 2012), reiterating its commitment to strengthening the MESECVI and to making progress with the Second Multilateral Evaluation Round and requesting that a report on the results achieved and progress made by the MESECVI be submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-third regular session, in 2013 (June 2013, La Antigua). The present report is submitted pursuant to that mandate.

In addition, it called once again on the states parties to the Convention to facilitate the participation of experts in meetings of the Committee of Experts (CEVI), to disseminate at the national level the objectives and results of the MESECVI, and to disseminate the reports and recommendations adopted in the multilateral evaluation rounds.

In response to these mandates, this report intends to provide information in two areas:

- Progress in implementation of the MESECVI—results of the evaluation rounds, participation of experts and Competent National Authorities, information exchange, and financing of the Mechanism; and
- Progress by the states parties in terms of implementation of the Convention of Belém do Pará in its six principal action areas: (i) legislation; (ii) national action plans; (iii) access to justice; (iv) specialized services; (v) budgets; and (vi) information and statistics, with a view to highlighting new experiences and promoting information exchange during periods between the publication of Hemispheric Reports.

---

3. From 2005 to 2012, the Committee of Experts of the MECSEVI held nine meetings: The first (August 22-24, 2005), second (July 24-25, 2006), fourth (August 14-15, 2008), fifth (June 25-26, 2008), and seventh (September 27-29, 2011) in Washington D.C.; the third (July 18-20, 2007) in Buenos Aires; the sixth (August 23-25, 2010) in Santo Domingo de Heredia; the eighth (May 3-4, 2012) in Panama City; and the ninth (November 12-14, 2012) in Mexico City.

4. From 2004 to 2012, the Conference of States Parties held four meetings: The first (July 20-21, 2004) and fourth (April 16, 2012) in Washington, D.C.; the second (July 9-10, 2008) in Caracas; and the third (March 24-25, 2011) in La Antigua.

### III. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MESECVI

#### a. Second Multilateral Evaluation Round (2010–present)

The Second Multilateral Evaluation Round began in April 2010 with the circulation of the questionnaire adopted by the Committee of Experts to the states parties to the Convention. Twenty-eight (28) states parties replied to the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was also sent to civil society organizations accredited to the OAS, with an invitation for them to submit shadow reports. Eight (8) reports were received from those organizations.

Taking into consideration the comments and clarifications received from the states parties, the Committee of Experts drew up 28 final country reports, as well as the Second Hemispheric Report, which summarizes the results of the country reports and takes a comparative look at the First and the Second Multilateral Evaluation Round regarding progress made in the implementation of the Convention and the results of the MESECVI process.

The country reports and the Second Hemispheric Report were submitted to the Fourth Conference of States Parties, held in Washington, D.C., on April 16, 2012. In keeping with Article 10 of the Rules of Procedure of the Conference, a preparatory meeting, open to all permanent missions, was held in Washington on March 28, 2012. Said meeting considered the draft documents to be submitted to the Conference.

The primary aim of the Conference was to present the evaluations contained in the 28 country reports and the Second Hemispheric Report, whose adoption officially concluded the evaluation stage of the Second Multilateral Evaluation Round. The Conference also considered the status of implementation of the mandates of the Third Conference of States Parties, among them, the establishment of a solidarity sub-fund to support states that, owing to special circumstances, were unable to finance the participation of their experts in meetings of the Committee; the formulation of recommendations on the appointment of experts and the procedure for designating them; and the organization of an informal dialogue between the states parties and the Committee of Experts of the MESECVI.

The Coordinator of the Committee of Experts of the MESECVI, Patricia Olamendi, presented the results of the evaluation phase of the Second Multilateral Evaluation Round. Her presentation covered the 28 final country reports (documents MESECVI-IV/doc.67/12 to MESECVI-IV/doc.94/12) and the Second Hemispheric Report (documents MESECVI-IV/doc.95/12 and MESECVI-IV/doc.96/12). The Coordinator said that the Second Hemispheric Report summarized and examined the information compiled from the replies of the states parties to the questionnaire and from the shadow reports presented to the Committee of Experts, and that it concluded with 42 recommendations, whose implementation would be monitored by the Committee during the recommendation follow-up phase, to begin in late 2012.

Likewise, the Committee Coordinator explained that the 14 reference tables included in the Second Hemispheric Report were intended to help governments, experts, and other parties interested in the matter to rapidly locate, by country, relevant information obtained during the evaluation phase. She explained that, to make the progress achieved by the MESECVI since its inception more apparent, the tables included, where available, the data collected during the First Multilateral Evaluation Round. The

remarks made by the Coordinator of the Committee of Experts were published as document MESECVI-IV/doc.102/12.

The delegations commended the Second Hemispheric Report for its precision and comprehensiveness with regard to prevention and punishment of violence against women, and for providing an action framework useful to the states parties, since its attached tables systematized and compared state actions undertaken in the six areas of the questionnaire: legislation, national policy, access to justice, specialized services, budget, and information and statistics.

The delegations adopted the Second Hemispheric Report by acclamation and decided to use the tables as a matrix to be updated periodically by the Secretariat with information provided to it by the states. They also requested the Secretariat to disseminate the report, especially to international and regional organizations specialized in this area, and to publish it on the Web page of the MESECVI (<http://www.oas.org/en/mesecvi>).

The Eighth Meeting of the Committee of Experts was held in Panama City, on May 3 and 4, 2012. At its first plenary session, in the absence of a quorum, it was decided that decisions would be adopted *ad referendum*, and that the minutes of the sessions would be sent by e-mail to the experts who had not participated so that they could indicate their agreement with the decisions taken.

Participating in the meeting were representatives of the United Nations Development Programme (UNPD), who expressed an interest in receiving the country reports and Hemispheric Reports, as well as the list of experts, with contact information, to enable said representatives to communicate more directly with them. Also taking part were civil society organizations and specialized organizations such as the Central American Feminist Network against Violence against Women, and the Inter-American Network of Shelters (RIRE).

Among matters of special concern to the Committee of Experts, views were exchanged on on-site visits, which were not included in the legal instruments of the MESECVI; publication of the states' replies to the questionnaire and of the preliminary reports, since the legal instruments of the MESECVI did not provide for their publication; and, lastly, the limited budgetary allocations made for the prevention and punishment of violence against women, which jeopardized the application and effectiveness of any state action in this area.

On June 25, the Technical Secretariat distributed to all experts the provisional minutes of the Eighth Meeting of Experts for their adoption *ad referendum*, and established a deadline of July 2, 2012, for comments. No comments on the minutes were received and they were deemed approved.

Likewise, on August 15, 2012, in fulfillment of the mandates adopted, the Technical Secretariat prepared and forwarded to the Committee of Experts, for review, draft indicators to be used to follow up on the recommendations of the Second Multilateral Evaluation Round. The Technical Secretariat received a large number of recommendations and observations from the experts and specialists in the area of gender indicators, which were incorporated into a new draft that was presented at the Ninth Meeting of the Committee of Experts of the MESECVI.

The Ninth Meeting of the Committee of Experts was held in the offices of the Secretariat for Foreign Affairs (SRE) of Mexico from November 12 to 14, 2012. Participating in the inaugural session of the meeting were the Executive Secretary of the Inter-American Commission of Women (CIM);

Ambassador Alejandro Negrín, representative of the SRE; Ambassador Antonio José Aranibar, representative of the OAS in Mexico; and Ana Gúezmes, Regional Director of UN Women for Mexico, Central America, Cuba, and the Dominican Republic.

As part of the agreements adopted during the Eighth Meeting of Experts, in order to broaden the perspective of indigenous women in the framework of the Mechanism, the Ninth Meeting began with a forum on “Indigenous Women in the Inter-American Justice System.” Participating in the forum were Valentina Rosendo Cantú, an activist for women’s human rights; Nina Pacari, Minister of the Constitutional Court of Ecuador; Mirna Cunningham Kain, a member of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues; Otilia Lux de Cotí, Director of the International Forum of Indigenous Women; Martha Sánchez Néstor, Coordinator of the Alliance of Indigenous Women of Central America and Mexico; and Alejandro Negrín, Director of Human Rights and Democracy of the SER. All of the female participants spoke about experiences, challenges, and pending tasks regarding access to justice from the viewpoint of indigenous women, whereas the representative of the SER commented on the progress and commitments made by the Government of Mexico in this area.

After the forum, the Meeting of the Committee of Experts continued with two modules, in which a group of specialists in the area of indicators expressed their views to the experts and described methodologies for applying or implementing indicators on violence against women, with a view to improving on the indicators used during the follow-up phase of the First Multilateral Evaluation Round.

The panelists for the first module were Line Barreiro, an expert from Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW); Shelah S. Bloom, Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina; and Godfrey St. Bernard, Sir Arthur Lewis Institute of Social and Economic Studies, University of the West Indies, Trinidad and Tobago. Paz López, UN Women Regional Advisor for Mexico and Central America, took part as a commentator on the remarks made by the panel.

The panelists for the second module were Alessandra Guedes, Regional Advisor on Intra-family Violence, PAHO/WHO; Rose Mary Madden, Special Program on Women’s Human Rights, Inter-American Institute of Human Rights (IHR); Doris Montenegro, Coordinator of the Central American Feminist Network against Violence against Women; and Liz Meléndez López, Coordinator of the Latin American and Caribbean Committee for the Defense of Women’s Rights, in Peru (CLADEM-Peru).

Once these modules had ended, the experts discussed the new draft indicators to initiate the follow-up phase. The Secretariat of the MESECVI took note of all of the experts’ proposals and, on January 28, forwarded to the experts designated to review it a new draft of the indicators which, after its approval, would be circulated to the states parties in order to initiate the recommendation follow-up phase that would end the second round and subsequently launch the Third Multilateral Evaluation Round.

#### **b. Implementation of the MESECVI recommendations**

During the first evaluation and follow-up round and the second evaluation round, the Mechanism reiterated to the states parties the need to adjust legislation and national policies to the mandates and obligations derived from the Convention of Belém do Pará, allocating necessary resources and designing strategies to guarantee reliable data and statistics specifically in each of the states of the region.

As of the date of submission of this report, the MESECVI has not initiated its second follow-up round. However, presented below is the status of implementation of the recommendations based on the data provided by the states parties during the two multilateral evaluation rounds and the first follow-up round.

*i. General results:*

Of the 34 states in the region that are members of the OAS, 32 are parties to the Convention of Belém do Pará. Canada and the United States have not signed the Convention. Of the 32 states parties to the Convention, 28 participated in both the first and the second evaluation round. However, only 17 of the states that participated in the first round participated in the follow-up round. During the first round, 29 experts and 28 Competent National Authorities participated, whereas during the second, there was a slight variation, with 28 experts and 30 Competent National Authorities taking part.<sup>5/</sup> Thanks to the political will of the states to commit themselves to the MESECVI and the process of implementation of the Convention, as well as to the commitment of the members of the Committee of Experts, a larger number of states are participating in the second round. Unlike the first round, all states have appointed experts for the current round. Similarly, the four countries that did not participate in the first round (The Bahamas, Grenada, Saint Kitts and Nevis, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines) are participating in the second.

The information the states have provided on the exercise of the right of women to a life free from violence has improved in terms of both response and substantive information on the measures implemented to follow up on obligations under the Convention. Given this positive development, it is clearly possible to conclude from the replies provided by the states parties that 32 states of the region have taken some type of measure to respond to different forms of violence against women.

However, implementation of these measures is far from homogeneous in the region, and their periodicity and permanence must be examined in the longer term in order to determine whether they are structural in nature, with a distinction made between structural measures and temporary ones or measures dependent on specific resources or international cooperation.

According to the information provided by states in the replies to the follow-up questionnaire of the Second Multilateral Evaluation Round, only thirteen (13) states mentioned that specific measures had been taken concerning observance of women's right to a life free from violence, as defined in the Convention of Belém do Pará, which expands the concept of intra-family violence to other types of violence against women in both the public and private spheres.

These measures range from implementation in legislation, national plans, specialized services, and training and information campaigns. This report distinguishes those states that are more advanced in the legislative area from those that are more advanced or more successful in the design of national plans, specialized services, or educational, training, or dissemination campaigns.

*ii. Results in legislation:*

- Argentina reported on Law 26.485, the Law on Comprehensive Protection for the Prevention, Punishment, and Eradication of Violence against Women in Areas of Interpersonal Relations

---

5. See detailed information on participation in Appendix I.

(PIPSEVCMADRI). The purpose of this law is to guarantee women's right to live a life free from violence.

- Bolivia gave constitutional rank to the right of women to live a life free from violence. In the final report, the country said that, on that basis, the Plurinational Assembly of Bolivia was discussing a comprehensive draft law on the protection of women that would provide a legal guarantee of women's right to live a dignified life, free from violence. However, as of the drafting of this report, the only area protected by law in Bolivia is intra-family violence.
- In Colombia, Law 1257, the Law on a Life Free from Violence, was adopted in December 2008. Its purpose is the adoption of norms to guarantee that all women may live a life free from violence, in both the public and private spheres. Thus, forms of violence against women would be punished in those spheres.
- In Ecuador, the right to live a life free from violence is recognized and guaranteed under the Constitution. It bears mentioning that current legislation does not comprise definitions that include violence against women, but only intra-family violence. To ensure the existence of enforcement mechanisms on the right of women to a life free from violence, various legislative reforms have been undertaken, including those introduced in the Penal Code (2005), which described crimes, increased penalties, and incorporated aggravating circumstances, and those introduced in 2006 that incorporated important reforms on sexual harassment into the Labor Code.
- In El Salvador, the state reported that the Comprehensive Law on a Life Free from Violence against Women<sup>6/</sup> was passed in November 2010 after a long period of study by the Committee on the Family, Women, and Children of the Legislative Assembly and with technical assistance from the Salvadorian Institute for the Development of Women (ISDEMU). According to the state, this law gives institutions a period of one year to create necessary conditions for its effective application. It should be mentioned that the law is a compilation of the proposals made by civil society.<sup>7/</sup>
- In Mexico, all federative entities (31 entities) and the Federal District had laws, as of March 2010, on women's access to a life free from violence, the necessary legal basis for defining policies, plans, programs, and projects to that end.
- The Dominican Republic reported that Law 24-97, a law amending the Penal Code, constituted an important step forward for women in the formal protection of the rights of women to live a life free from violence, in both the private and public spheres. This law incorporates protective measures, both criminal and civil; punishes sexual violence within marriage; and defines violence against women as well as intra-family or domestic violence. Violence against women is understood as violence occurring in both the public and private spheres.
- Venezuela reported on the adoption in November 2006 of the Organic Law on the Right of Women to a Life Free from Violence. It is a law that is applied directly and whose classification as an organic law means that its provisions take precedence over other laws. It expressly recognizes all rights stemming from CEDAW and Belem do Pará (Art. 3), thus contributing to the effective incorporation of these human rights conventions into national law.

### *iii. Results in national action plans:*

As concerns the implementation of specific national plans, ten (10) states said that they had a national action plan to tackle the problem of violence against women. Of these 10 countries, nine (9) address the problem through a specific national plan on violence against women (Antigua and Barbuda,

6. The law in question was unanimously adopted by the Legislative Assembly, with 75 votes in favor, none against, and no abstentions.

7. The draft law was submitted to the Legislative Assembly by the Feminist Network to Counter Violence against Women and the Women's Parliamentary Group.

Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, Paraguay, and Peru) and one (1) country deals with the matter through its national action plan on gender equity (Dominican Republic).

- In 2007, Costa Rica adopted the National Policy on Gender Equality and Equity 2007-2017 and, in 2008, it drew up the policy's Action Plan (2008-2012), designed as an instrument for guiding the work of government institutions. Among the strategic objectives of this plan is the "effective protection of women's rights against all forms of violence." Under this objective, by the year 2017, free, high-quality information and legal consultation services are to be provided throughout the country, thus enabling women to exercise and demand observance of their rights and to ensure respect for a life free from violence.
- In Paraguay, the Secretariat for Women of the Office of the President of the Republic has, since 1995, been coordinating the national plan for the prevention and punishment of violence against women, and it is currently implementing the III National Plan on Equal Opportunity between Women and Men 2008-2017, which covers the area of "A Life Free from Violence."
- In March 2009, Peru, by DS 003-2009-MIMDES, adopted the National Plan on Violence against Women 2009-2015. The plan's vision is to build a society that guarantees that women, without distinction, may exercise the right to a life free from violence, through respectful treatment, the establishment of equal relations between women and men, and the elimination of discriminatory sociocultural patterns, in a framework of security and full enjoyment of human rights. The plan is a policy instrument that entails joint action by the state and society.

*iv. Results in specialized services:*

Of the 32 states parties to the Convention, 24 have set up shelters or safe houses as part of their specialized services for women victims of violence. These services have been implemented as either purely governmental projects or as projects executed jointly by government and civil society. Of the 24 states, Argentina and Colombia reported that the objective of providing this type of service was exercise of the right to a life free from violence.

- Argentina reported on the construction of shelters for women victims of violence. These shelters are intended to support the decision-making process for a life free from violence. The construction is managed in coordination with provincial and local governments.
- Colombia reported on the project "Positive Families: For the Right to a Life Free from Violence and to a Protective City," which involves improving the living conditions of communities and includes the construction of a shelter for women victims of intra-family violence and/or domestic sexual violence, with a view to providing temporary asylum, shelter, and comprehensive care to unaccompanied women or women with children and/or other minors under their care. These shelters have facilities to provide therapeutic services to family groups.

Even though it is an obligation under the Convention of Belém do Pará, only five states of the region reported that they had some type of dissemination campaign or measure to eliminate stereotypes that intensify violence against women. Listed below are the states with some type of campaign, according to region:

- The Bahamas reported on collaboration among the Gender Office, government agencies, and community NGOs to raise awareness of women's rights and their right to live a life free from violence. However, these campaigns are not necessarily related to the Convention of Belém do Pará.

- Mexico reported on a significant step forward in the implementation of campaigns to disseminate women's rights, in particular the right to a life free from violence, as well as to publicize the Convention of Belém do Pará. These campaigns have been conducted by various government entities as well as in almost all the federative entities and the Federal District.
- Argentina reported that the National Council of Women had participated in and launched campaigns on the right to a life free from violence. Noteworthy in 2010 was the organization, together with the country's Sports Secretariat, the Ministry of Social Development, and the United Nations, of the walks "Let's Build a Path toward a Life Free from Violence and Achievement of Our Rights – Law 26485 on the Integral Protection of Women," in commemoration of International Women's Day, throughout the Province of Buenos Aires.
- Bolivia reported that dissemination campaigns on the contents of the Convention were conducted in keeping with the plan set out in the Communication Strategy. However, details were not given on the number of campaigns conducted or on their size or impact. Nor is it known whether any monitoring was done on the impact of these campaigns.
- In November 2010, Brazil launched the campaign "A Life without Violence Is Every Woman's Right," which was conducted through the mass media, including radio, television, and the written press.

v. *Results in budgets:*

Only five (5) states reported that they had established a budget for police stations, prosecutors' offices, and entities charged with receiving complaints (Argentina, Brazil, Dominica, Ecuador, and Guatemala). Eight (8) states reported that they had established a budget for training civil servants (Argentina, The Bahamas, Brazil, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Mexico, and Panama). Sixteen (16) states reported that they had established a budget for specialized services (Argentina, The Bahamas, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Dominica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, and Venezuela). Eight (8) states reported that they had established a budget for prevention campaigns (Argentina, The Bahamas, Brazil, Chile, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, and Panama). Four (4) states reported that they had established a budget for health campaigns (Argentina, Dominica, Ecuador, and Panama). Details on specific budget allocations by country follow:

- Argentina has a specific budget for police stations, prosecutors' offices, and entities charged with receiving complaints, to which US\$45,000 from UNODC and UNIFEM has been allocated. Likewise, it established a specific budget for training civil servants, to which 30,000 euros from AECID has been allotted. It also has specific budgets for specialized services, prevention campaigns, and health services, regarding which information was not accessible due to the federal structure of the country.
- The Bahamas stated that it has a specific budget for training civil servants, but it did not indicate the amount. Likewise it has a specific annual budget for specialized services, which is established as follows: \$75,000 for the Nassau Links Safe House and the Salvation Army and \$28,000 for the Great Commission of Ministries. The Bahamas Crisis Center receives \$30,000 per year to provide free services to victims of violence, such as legal or psychological services, as well as for campaigns on the prevention of violence against women.
- Barbados has a specific budget for specialized services, to which it has allocated BDS\$10,000 (US\$5,000) for specific gender-based violence programs. The government has earmarked BDS\$350,00.00 for shelters for women victims of violence.

- In Brazil, the federal government has a specific budget for police stations, prosecutors' offices, and entities charged with receiving complaints, as well as for training civil services and for specialized services. However, data are available from only some but not all states. In 2009, a specific budget was established for prevention campaigns. The first campaign, "A Life without Violence Is Every Woman's Right," was allocated \$R3,389,454.73, and the second, "Men United to End Violence!," \$R53,000,000.00.
- Chile has established a specific budget for specialized services, to which it has allocated US\$10.634 million for comprehensive care centers, US\$1,841,654 for safe houses, and US\$378,405 for labor insertion programs. Likewise, it has established a budget for prevention campaigns, to which it has allocated US\$758,865 for prevention awareness campaigns.
- Dominica has established a specific budget for police stations, prosecutors' offices, and entities charged with receiving complaints, for training civil servants, and for specialized services, prevention campaigns, and health services. All of these budgets have been covered by the ministries.
- Ecuador has established a specific budget for police stations, prosecutors' offices, and entities charged with receiving complaints, to which it has allocated US\$34,000 from the National Plan to Eradicate Gender Violence-2010. Likewise, it has established a budget for training civil servants, to which it has allocated US\$1,021,000.00 from the National Plan to Eradicate Gender Violence-2010. As concerns specialized services, US\$1,021,000.00 has been allocated for the comprehensive protection system. For prevention campaigns, it has allocated US\$471,929 from the National Plan to Eradicate Gender Violence-2010, US\$400,000 from the transition committee fund, and the rest from AECID. For health services, it has allocated US\$1,021,000.00 from the National Plan to Eradicate Gender Violence-2010.
- El Salvador has established a specific budget for training civil servants, to which it allocated a budget of US\$31,290.00 for 2010; in the area of specialized services, it allocated US\$2,133,460.00 for the Gender Violence Care Program, and it allotted US\$350,000 for prevention campaigns in 2010.
- Guatemala has established a specific budget for police stations, prosecutors' offices, and entities charged with receiving complaints, to which it allocated 5,323,466.66 quetzales for the creation of criminal courts specialized in violent crimes against women-2010. Similarly, it has established a budget for specialized services, allocating 8,000,000.00 quetzales for CAIMUS.
- Jamaica has established a specific budget for specialized services, allocating \$1,500,000 for the operating costs of the Crisis Center in Kingston and Montego Bay.
- Mexico has established a specific budget for training civil servants, to which it allocated \$10,000,000.00 pesos for 2010. Similarly, in the area of specialized services, it allocated \$84,035,415.00 pesos for shelters in 2010.
- Panama has established a specific budget for training civil servants, to which it has allocated 0.12% of the total budget allotted for violence against women. In the area of specialized services, 0.04% of the budget for social programs has been allocated for shelters. Prevention campaigns have been allocated 0.20% of the social programs budget. A budget has been established for health services, but the government has not provided detailed information in that regard.
- The Dominican Republic has established a budget for specialized services, to which 7,900,000.00 Dominican pesos have been allotted for an office for the defense of women's rights and for shelters.
- Saint Lucia has established a budget for specialized services, to which 0.0004% of the national budget was allocated for 2009.
- Trinidad and Tobago has established a budget for specialized services, to which TT\$1.0 million has been allotted for the National Domestic Hotline, TT\$370,000 for advertising this hotline, and TT\$11.53 million for subsidies to civil society (which run shelters and provide advisory services to victims of violence).

- Venezuela has established a budget for specialized services, to which 8,807,781 million bolívares fuertes was allocated for the National Office for the Defense of Women's Rights in 2010.

#### IV. PROMOTION OF THE MESECVI

The XLII OAS Policy Roundtable: "Priorities for Action in Combating Violence against Women" to launch the *Second Hemispheric Report on Implementation of the Convention of Belém do Pará*, was held on July 11, 2012. The event was inaugurated by the OAS Secretary General, José Miguel Insulza and by Elizabeth Quiroa, President of the Conference of States Parties to the Convention of Belém do Pará (Guatemala).

Following the inaugural session, a panel was held with the participation of Patricia Olamendi, Coordinator of the Committee of Experts of the MESECVI; Maryvonne Lyazid, Assistant Ombudsperson of France and Vice-President of the Department for the Fight against Discrimination and the Promotion of Equality; Elizabeth Abi-Mershed, Acting Executive Secretary, Inter-American Commission of Human Rights (IACHR) of the OAS; and María Leticia Guelfi, UN Women, representing the Secretary-General of the United Nations' "Unite to End Violence against Women" Campaign.

The print version of the Second Hemispheric Report was distributed to all participants. The report is also available on the MESECVI Web page: <http://www.oas.org/en/mese cvi/docs/MESECVI-SegundoInformeHemisferico-EN.pdf>.

The new Coordinator of the Technical Secretariat of the MESECVI, Luz Patricia Mejía, participated in the XXX Interdisciplinary Course on Human Rights, held in San José, Costa Rica, where she delivered a paper on the role of the Inter-American Commission of Women, the Convention of Belém do Pará, and the MESECVI in the inter-American human rights system, in which the functioning of the MESECVI was described and an invitation was extended to coordinate training processes with the Inter-American Institute of Human Rights.

#### V. FINANCING FOR THE MESECVI

The fund established for the MESECVI received contributions from Argentina, Mexico, and Suriname in 2012.

All sessions of the OAS and the CIM Assembly have reiterated their appeal to governments to contribute human or financial resources to the MESECVI. In September 2012, the OAS Secretary General sent a formal letter to all ministers of foreign affairs of the states parties to the Convention requesting monetary contributions to the MESECVI fund or in-kind contributions through the organization of meetings of the Mechanism or the provision of human resources to its Technical Secretariat.

**Table 1**  
**Financial situation of the MESECVI as of August 31, 2012**

Country	Year	Amount (in US\$)
Argentina	2012	15,000.00
Mexico	2012	14,333.00
Suriname	2012	2,000.00
<b>TOTAL:</b>		<b>\$31,333.00</b>

It should be noted that the MESECVI and its Technical Secretariat continue to operate without the necessary resources for full implementation of their numerous mandates and its goal of serving as a

hemispheric leader for the prevention, punishment, and elimination of violence against women. In this connection, a large part of the efforts to strengthen the MESECVI have to be focused on fundraising, among the states parties to the Convention as well as other possible donors through the formulation and execution of specific projects.

## VI. LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

The MESECVI, as a specific mechanism for monitoring the situation of violence against women in the region, has proven to be one of the most useful instruments for gauging advances made in policies implemented to prevent, eradicate, and punish violence against women. This monitoring capacity has made it possible to develop an institutional map, which has been reflected in both the First and the Second Hemispheric Report. Likewise, the MESECVI has acquired relevant experience, and its existence as a product of the will of the states parties is one of its greatest achievements.

Moreover, the launching of the Web page and other communication initiatives taken by the Permanent Secretariat of the CIM have led to much broader dissemination of the Second Hemispheric Report on the Implementation of the Convention of Belém do Pará and of the results of the Second Multilateral Evaluation Round of the MESECVI, thus contributing to a significant increase in the visibility and potential impact of the Mechanism in the region.

These auspicious results demonstrate that, as objectives are achieved, new activities arise and there is an ever greater need for contributions, whether in human or financial resources, to be able to carry them out. Even though various countries have contributed to the MESECVI, Mexico has been the only country to contribute every year, and it has seconded a person from its foreign service to support the Mechanism's activities for a two-year period.

It is apparent that the states parties have shown their support for the evaluation round process by sending their reports within established time frames, appointing their experts and Competent National Authorities, and offering to host meetings of the Committee of Experts or the Conference.

This support should also result in a stronger commitment to facilitate the experts' work. It is essential for them to be able to participate in meetings of the Committee of Experts and to perform the tasks agreed on at those meetings. Strengthening the Committee is a basic pillar of the evaluation round process inasmuch as the Committee is the technical body that, through questionnaires, evaluations, and recommendations, works with the states in their unending struggle to counter violence against women.

A sound MESECVI will have to face present challenges in the war on violence against women, including drawing attention to new scenarios for exercising violence against women,<sup>8/</sup> mainstreaming a gender and human rights perspective into development,<sup>9/</sup> and recognizing and guaranteeing sexual and

8. Apart from the traditional scenarios of couple and former-couple relationships, the family, sexual assault, and the sex trade, other scenarios are emerging such as trafficking in persons for all kinds of exploitation, national and international mafias and criminal networks, gangs, misogyny, consideration of women as fit territory for revenge, and so on. In: Carcedo, Ana. *No Olvidamos ni Aceptamos: Femicidio en Centroamérica 2000-2006*. San José: CEFEMINA: 2010, pp. 21 ff.

9. In the opinion of Ellen Dorsey, Mayra Gómez, Bret Thiele, and Paul Nelson, a human-rights-based approach to achievement of the Millennium Development Goals means abiding by the principle of equality and nondiscrimination, prioritization of the most marginalized communities, and their inclusion in the design of their own community development strategies. Dorsey, Ellen *et al. Falling Short of Our Goals: Transforming the Millennium Development Goals into Millennium Development Rights*.

En: <http://list.iwraw-ap.org/lists/arc/cedaw4change/2010-09/msg00007.html>.

reproductive rights,<sup>10/</sup> which today constitute the area where the life, dignity, and freedom of women are being massively trampled upon.

With a view to the future, the process of strengthening the MESECVI has involved planning new projects to make it possible to expand not only on the work done thus far but also on its impact. Accordingly and in view of the numerous possibilities offered by this Follow-up Mechanism, plans have been made to draw up a MESECVI Strategic Plan 2013-2017, whose framework consolidates the principal elements of regional concern regarding tools for guaranteeing that women in the region may exercise their rights to live in a world free from violence. This includes the process of developing a results-based plan for the short, medium, and long terms so that it will be possible to follow up on the situation of violence against women in the region as well as to ensure that states parties have access at all times to the necessary technical tools for addressing the numerous challenges faced in designing national policies to guarantee a region free from violence against women.

Along the same lines, MESECVI has plans to develop, with the participation of all actors involved in implementing these policies, the set of standardized indicators required to measure compliance with the obligations assumed by the states parties and their gradual implementation. Thus, the Mechanism itself serves to consolidate an instrument for enabling all states to evaluate their own national policies and to determine the limitations and challenges inherent in their implementation.

This set of indicators will make it possible to identify as well as to disseminate advances and best practices of states and to provide ongoing and substantive support to the group of states, which, in keeping with the principles of sovereignty and multilateralism, will be able to interact and strengthen their mechanisms for taking action and settling problems. This is intended to provide states with an evaluation and follow-up mechanism that equips them with technical tools and gradually with a reliable system of indicators of compliance with their own obligations.

Looking to the future of the MESECVI entails envisioning a body that, from its presence throughout the region and with support from all the actors involved, can identify the major challenges of the region on the one hand and, on the other, can shore up, on the basis of lessons learned, best practices, and support, the political will of the states in their own efforts to comply with their obligations under the Convention of Belém do Pará and the hemispheric and regional commitment to eradicate violence against women and girls.

The support governments give to strengthening the Mechanism will determine its effectiveness with which it can address new challenges and accomplish its task of assisting the states parties in implementing the Convention of Belém do Pará.

---

10. At the regional level, the Brasilia Consensus, of July 16, 2010, establishes, in its agreement No. 6, an agenda for achieving promotion of comprehensive health care and the sexual and reproductive rights of women.

See: [http://www.eclac.cl/mujer/noticias/paginas/6/40236/ConsensoBrasilia\\_ING.pdf](http://www.eclac.cl/mujer/noticias/paginas/6/40236/ConsensoBrasilia_ING.pdf).

## ANNEX I

## First Multi-lateral Evaluation Round (2005-2010):

Responses to the questionnaire, preliminary reports I and II, final report, comments from the Competent National Authorities and follow-up report on the recommendations of the Committee of Experts

COUNTRY	EVALUATION						FOLLOW-UP
	Response	Prelim. Rep. I	Prelim. Rep. II	Comments ANC	Prelim. Rep. III	Comments ANC	Response indicators
1. Antigua & Barbuda	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
2. Argentina	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
3. Bahamas	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
4. Barbados	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
5. Belize	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
6. Bolivia	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO
7. Brazil	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
8. Chile	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
9. Colombia	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
10. Costa Rica	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
11. Dominica	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES
12. Ecuador	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
13. El Salvador	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
14. Grenada	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
15. Guatemala	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
16. Guyana	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
17. Haiti	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
18. Honduras	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES
19. Jamaica	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
20. Mexico	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
21. Nicaragua	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
22. Panama	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	SÍ	NO
23. Paraguay	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
24. Peru	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
25. Dominican Republic	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
26. St. Kitts & Nevis	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
27. St. Lucía	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO

COUNTRY	EVALUATION						FOLLOW-UP
	Response	Prelim. Rep. I	Prelim. Rep. II	Comments ANC	Prelim. Rep. III	Comments ANC	Response indicators
28. St. Vincent & the Grenadines	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
29. Suriname	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES
30. Trinidad & Tobago	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
31. Uruguay	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
32. Venezuela	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17</b>

**ANNEX II**  
**Designation of the expert and competent nacional authority during the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Multi-lateral Evaluation Rounds**

COUNTRY	EXPERTS		NACIONAL AUTHORITY	
	1 REM	2 REM (2011)	1 REM	2 REM (2011)
1. Antigua & Barbuda	YES	YES	YES	YES
2. Argentina	YES	YES	YES	YES
3. Bahamas	YES	YES	YES	YES
4. Barbados	YES	YES	YES	YES
5. Belize	YES	YES	YES	YES
6. Bolivia	YES	YES	YES	YES
7. Brazil	YES	YES	YES	YES
8. Chile	YES	YES	YES	YES
9. Colombia	YES	YES	YES	YES
10. Costa Rica	YES	YES	YES	YES
11. Dominica	YES	YES	YES	YES
12. Ecuador	YES	YES	YES	YES
13. El Salvador	YES	YES	YES	YES
14. Grenada	NO	YES	NO	YES
15. Guatemala	YES	YES	YES	YES
16. Guyana	YES	NO	YES	YES
17. Haiti	YES	NO	YES	NO
18. Honduras	YES	NO	YES	NO
19. Jamaica	YES	YES	YES	YES
20. Mexico	YES	YES	YES	YES
21. Nicaragua	YES	NO	YES	YES
22. Panama	YES	YES	YES	YES
23. Paraguay	YES	YES	YES	YES
24. Peru	YES	YES	YES	YES
25. Dominican Republic	YES	YES	YES	YES
26. St. Kitts & Nevis	NO	YES	NO	YES
27. St. Lucía	NO	YES	YES	YES
28. St. Vincent & the Grenadines	YES	YES	NO	YES
29. Suriname	YES	YES	NO	YES
30. Trinidad & Tobago	YES	YES	YES	YES
31. Uruguay	YES	YES	YES	YES
32. Venezuela	YES	YES	YES	YES
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>30</b>



ANNEX III  
**Participation in the Conferences of States Party during the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Multi-lateral Evaluation Rounds**

COUNTRY	1 REM		2 REM	
	I CONFERENCE (2004)	II CONFERENCE (2008)	III CONFERENCE (2011)	IV CONFERENCE (2012)
1. Antigua & Barbuda	NO	NO	YES	NO
2. Argentina	YES	YES	YES	YES
3. Bahamas	YES	NO	NO	NO
4. Barbados	YES	YES	NO	YES
5. Belize	YES	NO	NO	YES
6. Bolivia	YES	YES	YES	YES
7. Brazil	YES	YES	YES	YES
8. Chile	YES	NO	NO	NO
9. Colombia	YES	YES	YES	YES
10. Costa Rica	YES	YES	YES	YES
11. Dominica	YES	YES	YES	YES
12. Ecuador	NO	NO	YES	NO
13. El Salvador	YES	YES	YES	YES
14. Grenada	YES	YES	YES	YES
15. Guatemala	NO	NO	YES	NO
16. Guyana	YES	YES	YES	YES
17. Haiti	NO	NO	NO	NO
18. Honduras	NO	YES	NO	YES
19. Jamaica	YES	YES	NO	YES
20. Mexico	NO	YES	NO	NO
21. Nicaragua	YES	YES	YES	YES
22. Panama	YES	YES	NO	YES
23. Paraguay	YES	YES	YES	YES
24. Peru	YES	YES	NO	YES
25. Dominican Republic	YES	YES	YES	YES
26. St. Kitts & Nevis	YES	YES	YES	YES
27. St. Lucía	YES	NO	YES	NO
28. St. Vincent & the Grenadines	YES	NO	YES	YES
29. Suriname	NO	NO	YES	YES

COUNTRY	1 REM		2 REM	
	I CONFERENCE (2004)	II CONFERENCE (2008)	III CONFERENCE (2011)	IV CONFERENCE (2012)
30. <b>Trinidad &amp; Tobago</b>	NO	NO	NO	NO
31. <b>Uruguay</b>	YES	YES	YES	YES
32. <b>Venezuela</b>	YES	NO	YES	NO
33. <b>Antigua &amp; Barbuda</b>	YES	NO	YES	YES
34. <b>Argentina</b>	YES	YES	YES	YES
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>24</b>

ANNEX IV  
Participation of the Experts in the Meetings of the Committee of Experts (2005-2012)

Country	1 <sup>st</sup> meeting (2005)	2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting (2006)	3 <sup>rd</sup> meeting (2007)	4 <sup>th</sup> meeting (2008)	5 <sup>th</sup> meeting (2009)	6 <sup>th</sup> meeting (2010)	7 <sup>th</sup> meeting (2011)	8 <sup>th</sup> meeting (2012)	9 <sup>th</sup> meeting (2012)
Antigua & Barbuda	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
Argentina	YES								
Bahamas	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES
Barbados	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
Belize	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Bolivia	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Brazil	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES
Chile	NO	YES	NO						
Colombia	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES
Costa Rica	YES	NO	YES						
Dominica	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
Ecuador	YES	NO	YES						
El Salvador	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
Grenada	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES
Guatemala	YES								
Guyana	NO								
Haiti	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
Honduras	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Jamaica	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
Mexico	YES								
Nicaragua	YES	YES	NO						
Panama	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
Paraguay	YES								
Peru	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
Dominican Republic	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES
St. Kitts & Nevis	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
St. Lucia	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
St. Vincent &	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES

Country	1 <sup>st</sup> meeting (2005)	2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting (2006)	3 <sup>rd</sup> meeting (2007)	4 <sup>th</sup> meeting (2008)	5 <sup>th</sup> meeting (2009)	6 <sup>th</sup> meeting (2010)	7 <sup>th</sup> meeting (2011)	8 <sup>th</sup> meeting (2012)	9 <sup>th</sup> meeting (2012)
<b>the Grenadines</b>									
<b>Suriname</b>	NO	YES	NO						
<b>Trinidad &amp; Tobago</b>	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
<b>Uruguay</b>	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
<b>Venezuela</b>	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>18</b>