

OPEN SOCIETY FOUNDATIONS
LATIN AMERICA PROGRAM:
**Citizen Security and Justice Field
Portfolio Review**

November 11, 2015

Prepared by Heloisa Griggs (Senior Program Manager) and
Angélica Zamora (Program Officer)

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction and Summary 1**
- II. Citizen Security and Justice Field in Latin America: Background, Role of OSF Network and Other Donors..... 1**
- III. The Latin America Program Citizen Security and Justice Field Portfolio 4**
- IV. Going Forward: Lessons, Adjustments and Outstanding Questions 10**

Appendix I: LAP Citizen Security and Justice Field Portfolio – List of Elements

I. Introduction and Summary

The Latin America Program's major focus in the citizen security and justice field is supporting organizations working nationally and regionally with a demonstrated ability to stimulate debate on improving police and justice sector institutions, constructively engage with law enforcement and justice institutions, and effectively advocate for policy reforms to reduce violence. Our support in the citizen security and justice field has been concentrated in: a) a small group of citizen security organizations committed to improving public safety and reducing violence (currently, Alianza para la Paz y Justicia – Honduras, Brazilian Forum on Public Safety – Brazil, CEsEC – Brazil, Fundación Ideas para la Paz – Colombia, Igarapé Institute – Brazil, Insyde – Mexico, Instituto Sou da Paz – Brazil, and México Evalua – Mexico); and b) human rights organizations focused on improving citizen security, particularly focusing on the relationship between public safety policies and criminal justice systems (CELS, Conectas, Centro Prodh, CMDPDH, DeJusticia, Fundar, IDL, and WOLA).

The Latin America Program has focused on improving citizen security in the region since the program was established in 2002. Heloisa Griggs managed this portfolio from mid-2011 through 2014, and Angélica Zamora has managed it since January 2015. Over the last four years, we have consolidated and narrowed the focus of the portfolio. We concentrated on supporting citizen security grantees committed to building strong organizations and working closely with governments to improve public safety. We maintained existing support for human rights organizations focused on citizen security issues, but reduced the level of support to such organizations as part of the citizen security and justice field to more accurately reflect our assessment of the role such work plays in this field. We also discontinued support for several organizations in the portfolio with serious organizational health challenges or where we had serious questions about the impact of the work. Finally, as part of LAP's decision in 2014 to make reducing homicides one of two main programmatic goals, we substantially increased our focus on the ability of the citizen security and justice field to help reduce homicides.

This portfolio review aims to carry out an in-depth examination of the support to organizations in LAP's citizen security and justice field over the last four years. First, we will provide background on the citizen security and justice field in Latin America, and the role of other donors in this field. Second, we will discuss the grants in the citizen security and justice field, including: a) our shift from primarily project support to significant institutional support grants in this field; b) our support for human rights organizations focused on citizen security and justice issues as part of this field; c) the impact of our decision in 2014 to develop a significant programmatic focus on reducing homicides on our support for this field; and d) our decisions to discontinue support for several grantees in this field. Finally, we will identify possible adjustments to the direction of the citizen security and justice portfolio, as well as outstanding questions about the portfolio.

II. Citizen Security and Justice Field in Latin America: Background, Role of OSF Network and Other Donors

Background on citizen security and justice field in Latin America

High levels of violence and insecurity are a central issue of public concern across Latin America. Academics, civil society actors, and government officials throughout the region have worked to reduce violence and crime over the last couple of decades. Significant civil society expertise on citizen security policies and reforms developed across the region, especially in those countries, like Brazil and Colombia, which have experienced high levels of violence for longer than other parts of the region, like Mexico and Central America, where the increase in violence and crime is more recent. The concept of

citizen security, with its focus on addressing violence and insecurity in ways that respect human rights and on the exercise of citizenship in the region's democracies, became well-known and the field expanded substantially.

Despite these advances in the development of the citizen security field, reductions in violence and crime have been relatively limited and often difficult to sustain over time. The quality of citizens' interactions with security and justice sector institutions across the region remains deeply unsatisfactory. Latin America's violence and crime levels remain among the highest in the world. By and large, the region's law enforcement and justice sector institutions are weak and ineffective. In general, the left leaning governments in power across much of the region over the last ten to fifteen years believed that citizen security would improve once poverty, inequality and the lack of opportunity were addressed, and did not focus on reforming and improving law enforcement and justice sector institutions. While there have been significant gains in reducing poverty and improving social inclusion, violence and crime levels remained unchanged or worsened.

Public debate on public safety in the region often centers on a false dichotomy between short-term, hardline policies and decades-long reform efforts that will not yield results within the time windows political leaders have to effect change. Political and institutional barriers to reform have thwarted the translation of growing technical expertise into concrete change. Those institutions, cities, or states that have reduced violence and/or increased effectiveness and accountability have been led by highly capable and politically astute leaders with a demonstrated capacity to overcome institutional barriers. Oftentimes, as happened recently with the Pacto pela Vida Program in Pernambuco, these gains have stalled or been lost when such leaders leave office.

Compared to some other fields, such as the human rights field, the organizations in the citizen security field are still relatively young. Out of the eight core citizen security grantees in this field, half were established 10-16 years ago (Fundacion Ideas para la Paz – 1999, Instituto Sou da Paz – 1999, CEsEC – 2000, and Insyde – 2003) and the other half were established in the last ten years (Brazilian Forum on Public Safety – 2006, México Evalua – 2009, Igarapé Institute – 2011, Alianza para la Paz y Justicia – 2012). The civil society organizations in this field have largely worked at the local, state and national level (Igarapé, which also has a regional and Global South focus, is the main exception), and have collaborated with each other somewhat, but generally not extensively.

Relationship of LAP citizen security and justice field portfolio to other fields LAP supports

Several core grantees in LAP's citizen security and justice field also receive LAP support for their contributions to the human rights, drug policy or transparency and accountability fields. As discussed in greater detail below, a number of core human rights field grantees receive some level of support for their contribution to the citizen security and justice and drug policy fields as well, though their contribution to the human rights field remains the primary funding relationship, which is reflected in the level of support under each field.

In terms of the eight core citizen security organizations in this portfolio, three organizations (CESeC, Fundación Ideas para la Paz, and Igarapé Institute) also receive LAP support for their role in the drug policy field. The remaining five organizations (Alianza para la Paz y Justicia, Brazilian Forum on Public Safety, Instituto Sou da Paz, Insyde and México Evalua) receive LAP support only for their work in the citizen security and justice field.

Relationship of LAP's citizen security and justice field to the OSF network

For the other main fields LAP supports (Drug Policy, Human Rights, and Right to Information, Transparency and Accountability), there are corresponding OSF network programs focused on the same issues broadly, though often with very different approaches and specific areas of focus (Global Drug Policy Program, Human Rights Initiative and the Fiscal Governance Program). In contrast, there is no such corresponding program for LAP's citizen security field. As a result, there is generally less overlap with other parts of the network in terms of both the issues we focus on in this field and the organizations we support than for other fields LAP supports. For example, we are the only program in the OSF network focusing on reducing homicides. Latin America's extremely high levels of violence and insecurity compared to other regions of the world help explain why this is such an important issue for the Latin America Program, but not a priority for other parts of the network.

However, there are some areas of overlap and collaboration within OSF in connection with the citizen security and justice field. In terms of grant making, the most substantial overlap in terms of shared grantees is with HRI's Justice Area. We coordinate closely with Mary Miller Flowers, Associate Director for Justice, and have increasingly shifted to consolidating our separate grants to shared organizations into co-funded general support grants. We currently co-fund general support grants to two core citizen security organizations (CESeC and Instituto Sou da Paz) and four human rights organizations that receive support for their citizen security work (CELS, Conectas, DeJusticia and IDL). This shift has facilitated a more shared understanding of organizations' strengths and challenges, and is contributing to greater integration between the grantees' criminal justice work supported by HRI and the citizen security work supported by LAP.

There is also a nexus to OSF's emerging Inside Justice initiative, and we have started collaborating with Todd Foglesong on various aspects of our developing work to reduce homicides. We have also collaborated with the Justice Initiative on its work with police on profiling, particularly in connection with some work carried out by Instituto Sou da Paz on stop and search practices that we supported.

Role of other citizen security donors and relationship to LAP's citizen security and justice field portfolio

National or federal governmental institutions, including grants from national research institutions and contracts to provide technical assistance to local governments, are a principal revenue source for most organizations in the citizen security and justice field in Latin America. This poses a number of challenges. Support from governments is often unreliable, while also being subject to complex procurement procedures and long contract cycles. Although such funding helps to generate collaborative working relationships with law enforcement and justice sector institutions, it can also make organizations excessively dependent upon government sources and reduce their autonomy. Organizations that receive a significant portion of their funding from government institutions may be less likely to criticize or challenge government actions.

Another major source of revenue for organizations in the citizen security field in Latin America, particularly in Mexico, Colombia and Central America, is bilateral funding from US and EU government agencies. In Honduras, as well in the rest of Central America, USAID and the U.S. State Department are major donors, funding multimillion-dollar safety initiatives. This funding naturally reflects the interests and vision of the United States regarding public safety, and often duplicates if not outright replaces national governments' efforts. U.S. funding also brings with it several restrictions; for example, organizations working with gangs cannot use U.S. funding for this work, preventing civil

society organizations from undertaking more risky, cutting edge work that has the potential to make an impact on pressing issues, such gang violence. In Mexico, USAID supports crime and violence prevention programs, criminal justice reform, and prevention of human rights abuses. In Colombia, USAID contractors are important funders for post-conflict and peacebuilding initiatives and support initiatives closely aligned with the Colombian government's agenda on these issues. The European Union supports specific initiatives on crime and violence prevention in some Latin American countries.

A third relevant revenue source for citizen security organizations is private foundations, and OSF is the main private donor in the citizen security and justice field in Latin America. Compared to private foundations supporting human rights, there are few private donors supporting citizen security issues in Latin America. The Ford Foundation had a significant focus on this field in Brazil in the past, which it continued at a reduced level until it recently tied off this support (affecting CESeC and the Brazilian Forum on Public Safety). The Tinker Foundation provides a small amount of support in this area, and the Bernard van Leer Foundation focuses on reducing violence affecting children up to eight years old. The Porticus Foundation has just begun providing some funding in this area with a focus on the intersection of public safety and criminal justice issues, and we are sharing information and coordinating with them, as it would be great to have another major private donor in this field. Also, among the still very incipient group of relatively new local foundations focused on rights, justice and democracy there is some fledgling support for citizen security work, such as the Lafer Foundation's support to Instituto Sou da Paz and the Brazilian Forum on Public Safety in Brazil.

A number of multilateral development banks (World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank and CAF) have developed a significant focus on citizen security in Latin America, mainly engaging with governments through loans and other tools. More recently, some of these institutions have developed a focus on involving civil society in efforts to improve citizen security, and started to provide some financial support to citizen security organizations. Multilateral institutions, like the UNDP, have also developed a focus on reducing violence in Latin America, sometimes supporting civil society organizations in connection with specific initiatives.

In some cities/countries, private sector actors have formed and funded civil society organizations focused on improving public safety. These organizations are often focused on property and other crimes affecting higher income segments of the population, rather than violence and insecurity affecting lower income individuals. Many organizations founded by such actors are often supportive of more hardline, punitive measures, though there are important exceptions (like LAP grantees Fundación Ideas para la Paz in Colombia and México Evalua in Mexico).

III. The Latin America Program Citizen Security and Justice Field Portfolio

The Latin America Program's 2014-2017 Strategy (prepared in 2013) was the first strategy in which the program divided its work into fields and concepts, laying out our plans for supporting the citizen security field. We stated that we would support: "a) a small group of key actors able to promote policy debate and engage law enforcement or justice institutions in reform processes; b) actors in specific countries capable of influencing opportunities for reform that emerge as a result of new leadership in key institutions and political transitions; and c) human rights organizations that focus substantially on improving police and justice sector institutions through constructive engagement with such institutions." We noted our interest in supporting organizations engaged in efforts to:

- Increase access to, transparency and accountability of police and justice institutions through civilian oversight;

- Improve information, analysis and management tools that are essential in assessing safety and justice challenges, and developing policies to address them;
- Reduce unequal policies and practices of law enforcement and justice sector institutions, including issues of inadequate resources allocated to marginalized communities, less access to justice for victims of violence, and restrictions on access to a fair legal process for defendants from marginalized sectors; and
- Challenge and reform punitive drug laws and policies to reduce incarceration for low-level drug offenses, as the citizen security and justice field has started to become more interested in the impact of the drug prohibition regime on citizen security.

The first and second focus areas are priorities across the citizen security and justice field in Latin America. The focus on reducing unequal policies and practices of law enforcement and justice sector institutions is a priority for many human rights organizations working on citizen security issues, such as CELS and DeJusticia, but has been less of a priority among the core citizen security grantees, with some important exceptions. Drug policy reform is an area that a growing number of citizen security grantees have started focusing on since we prepared this strategy, with our encouragement and support.

There are currently eight core citizen security organizations committed to improving public safety and reducing violence in this portfolio. Only three of these organizations – Insyde, Brazilian Forum on Public Safety, and Fundación Ideas para la Paz – were already grantees when Heloisa Griggs took over this portfolio four years ago. Insyde, a Mexican organization that both provides technical advice to public safety institutions and advocates for better citizen security policies, has been an OSF-LAP grantee the longest (since 2003) and is also probably the organization in this portfolio we have the most questions and concerns about. LAP has supported the Brazilian Forum on Public Safety, an unusual space for debate and collaboration among police professionals, public safety officials, academics and civil society representatives, since 2006. The organization has several organizational challenges, but has become a valuable partner in this field, especially through its substantial focus on short and long-term reforms to reduce homicides. Fundación Ideas para la Paz (FIP), a Colombian non-profit organization with a strong track record advising law enforcement institutions, has been supported by OSF-LAP since 2008. FIP is a key partner in the field, but also faces some organizational challenges, as it seeks to renew its board of directors and consolidate the organization’s projects into a more coherent institutional agenda.

The Latin America Program has supported Instituto Sou da Paz, CESeC, and Alianza para la Paz y Justicia for two to three years. Instituto Sou da Paz, a nongovernmental organization committed to reducing violence in Brazil with a strong track record providing technical assistance to law enforcement and public safety institutions, is seeking to strengthen its advocacy impact and ability to influence public debate under new leadership. CESeC, which carries out research and advocacy to support the development of public policies that respond effectively to crime while respecting human rights, deftly balances critiquing government policies and practices with working in partnership with government actors to enact reforms. Alianza para la Paz y la Justicia, established in early 2012, is a diverse coalition that promotes peace and justice for citizens in Honduras, one of the most challenging contexts for such work in the region, through both top-down and bottom-up approaches.

México Evalua and the Igarapé Institute are both newer, promising partners in the citizen security field, which we began supporting as part of this portfolio only in 2014 (Igarapé has been funded by OSF for its role as the Secretariat of the Global Commission on Drug Policy since 2011, when the organization was established). The Igarapé Institute is a Brazilian think tank dedicated to promoting evidence-based security and development agendas in Brazil, Latin America and the Global South, and the only organization in this core group with a regional rather than only national focus. México Evalua,

a Mexican think tank established with strong backing and involvement by the Mexican Business Council, is dedicated to designing, monitoring and assessing public policies with a significant focus on public safety and criminal justice policies.

We also support eight human rights organizations focused on improving citizen security as part of this portfolio, particularly focusing on the relationship between public safety policies and criminal justice systems (CELS, Conectas, Centro Prodh, CMDPDH, DeJusticia, Fundar, IDL, and WOLA). There has been much greater continuity in terms of the support for human rights organizations working to improve citizen security in this portfolio, with seven of the eight organizations having received support for this work prior to and during the period covered in this portfolio review (Fundar was added to this group). However, over the last couple of years we have started reducing and recalibrating the level of support for human rights organizations focused on citizen security to more accurately reflect our assessment of their contribution to the field.

Organizational Health and Institutional Support

In comparison to some other fields, such as human rights, the citizen security field in Latin America has less in the way of robust organizations able to promote and sustain change over time. Organizations may be centered around specific citizen security experts in ways that limit the ability of the organization to grow and advance as an institution rather than serving primarily as a platform for a well-known individual. Several organizations have weak or limited governance structures. Many citizen security organizations are overly dependent on public funding, which generates risks and challenges for these organizations. The close working relationships many such organizations maintain with law enforcement and public safety institutions can lead such organizations to be seen primarily as a service provider to the state rather than an autonomous organization with its own objectives and strategy. OSF-LAP is the only donor providing institutional support to organizations in this field across Latin America, and only as of the last couple years, which means the organizations' budgets are often stretched and organized around projects, making it difficult for them to develop and advance institutional strategies.

The organizational health challenges in this field have strongly influenced our decisions on which grantmaking relationships to continue and strengthen in this field. We have developed new relationships and strengthened existing relationships with organizations committed to and taking steps to improve governance and address some of these challenges, such as Instituto Sou da Paz and the Brazilian Forum on Public Safety. We have also discontinued support to organizations that served primarily as a platform for an individual expert and showed no interest in changing, like Ciudad Nuestra. The more difficult situations have involved organizations that have taken some real steps to strengthen governance and financial health, but where significant governance and leadership challenges remain, such as Insyde in Mexico.

The prevalence of organizational challenges in this field initially made us reluctant to shift from project support to institutional support relationships, as we did several years ago in the human rights field. However, a couple of years ago we started awarding institutional support grants to several organizations in this field. We felt comfortable doing so because, after spending a substantial amount of time over the last few years understanding and engaging with grantees in this field on organizational health issues, we had a more solid understanding of the weaknesses, potential for addressing them, and risks involved in such support. We also felt the citizen security and justice field could benefit significantly from the possibility institutional support offers for organizations to be more flexible, respond quickly to opportunities, and innovate.

For most citizen security organizations receiving institutional support from OSF-LAP, this is their only source of institutional support and often their first experience with institutional support. This makes OSF support in this field distinctive and particularly valuable for organizations. In some cases, such as the Brazilian Forum on Public Safety, Fundación Ideas para la Paz and Instituto Sou da Paz, the shift to institutional support accompanied and facilitated parallel processes underway in the organization to develop or consolidate more purposeful strategies, allowing them to move away from primarily structuring the organization's work around existing projects and potential funding opportunities. In doing so, these organizations aim to increase their ability to shape and influence public safety policies rather than primarily responding to demand from state actors for technical assistance. Admittedly, with OSF support usually being the only source of institutional support for such organizations, there are real limits to the extent to which such organizations are actually able to organize and carry out their work according to their own priorities, rather than responding to existing funding opportunities or projects.

However, there also have been challenges in the ways organizations perceive, use and communicate about institutional support. Particularly for organizations that have never previously received institutional support, there has been a tendency to continue to treat such support as if it were a project. We have encouraged organizations to see and use general support as funding that gives them flexibility to experiment with new issues and approaches, and to respond to opportunities and challenges as they emerge, rather than sticking to work plans that may no longer make sense in a changed context. While the shift to institutional support is still very recent, we are starting to see some progress in the approach to and characterization of institutional support in several cases.

In terms of the grant making relationship itself, as we prepared to move from to project to institutional support, we deepened our relationships with these grantees through more regular communication with a broader set of stakeholders (in addition to regular communication with executive directors, occasional meetings with board members and senior and junior staff). Through this process and the nature of the institutional support relationship, we have developed more open, frank working relationships with these organizations, involving regular dialogue on developing citizen security challenges and opportunities and possible approaches. These general support relationships are becoming more dynamic and productive than the previous project support relationships, which tend to feel more transactional.

Human Rights Organizations Focusing on Citizen Security and Justice Issues

Historic mistrust between the human rights field and law enforcement in Latin America means many human rights organizations have not been interested in engaging with relevant state institutions to improve the effectiveness and accessibility of law enforcement and justice sector institutions, focusing instead on opposing and criticizing government security policies. However, a small group of more forward-looking human rights organizations (forming the core of LAP's human rights field) have developed a significant programmatic focus on improving citizen security. These organizations have been more willing than their counterparts to work closely with government actors to bring about policy reforms, and that interest and ability has been useful in their efforts to address the structural law enforcement and justice sectors issues contributing to the institutional violence they have challenged for years.

Over the last four years, we have maintained pre-existing support for human rights organizations to focus on improving citizen security as part of the institutional or project support provided to such organizations (CELS, Centro Prodh, CMDPDH, Conectas, Dejusticia, Fundar, IDL and WOLA). The strong relationship between the region's high levels of violence and insecurity, public support for hardline

security policies, abuses committed by law enforcement, and the mass incarceration of low level offenders continues to make it particularly relevant for human rights organizations to focus on improving citizen security.

Organizations such as CELS, IDL, DeJusticia, Fundar and WOLA have developed important program areas focused on citizen security and the criminal justice system, carving out relevant roles for themselves on these issues in their countries (or for WOLA, in Central America). These organizations have made good use of opportunities to work closely with key state institutions under the leadership of progressive officials, but generally have had less success in influencing public debate on these issues. Over the last two or three years, a few of these organizations, such as CELS and DeJusticia, developed a new, long overdue focus on drug policy reform and the impact of drug policies on citizen security and criminal justice systems.

The relationship between the citizen security organizations and human rights organizations working on citizen security and justice issues in the portfolio varies, but is usually fairly collaborative at the national level. For example, Conectas, Instituto Sou da Paz, CESeC, and the Brazilian Forum on Public Safety know each other well, share information and sometimes work closely on issues, with some variation among the organizations in terms of when and how they work together. Similarly, DeJusticia and Fundación Ideas para la Paz act in many of the same spaces in Colombia (for example, both Maria Victoria Llorente of FIP and Rodrigo Uprimny of DeJusticia serve as members of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Policy), playing distinct, but complementary roles. However, there is generally not much interaction between human rights organizations in a given country and citizen security organizations in another, or vice versa.

We continue to find the role these human rights organizations bring to the citizen security field valuable, particularly their naturally much stronger focus on advocacy, which often contrasts with the default focus of citizen security organizations on providing technical assistance. Unlike many of our citizen security grantees, these organizations do not receive government support and this inevitably impacts how they approach their work in this area.

At the same time, over the last couple of years we have started reducing and recalibrating the level of support for human rights organizations focused on citizen security to more accurately reflect our assessment of their contribution to the field. Our sense is that they had come to represent too large a portion of our support to this field and, especially as the overall budget for the citizen security field was significantly reduced to free up funds for the Prioritizing Homicide Reduction Concept, we have started adjusting our levels of support to these organizations for citizen security work. We are reducing the support under this field to organizations whose work bears a relationship to citizen security policies, but have largely maintained a more traditional human rights approach to the issues, such as CMDPDH and Centro Prodh in Mexico. We are concentrating the remaining support in organizations, like CELS and DeJusticia, which have demonstrated an ability to work closely with government institutions to bring about policy changes.

Relationship between Reducing Homicides Goal and Citizen Security & Justice Field

The Latin America Program's decision in 2014 to make reducing homicides one of our two main programmatic goals has significantly impacted the level and nature of our support for the citizen security and justice field. The decision to focus on reducing homicides was a deliberate effort by the program, following the arrival of Regional Director Pedro Abramovay, to consolidate and focus the program's work, and responded to a suggestion made by OSF's Global Board to focus on homicides.

In the context of our existing support for the citizen security and justice field, focusing our energy and resources on reducing homicides was attractive for several reasons. In a region with grave citizen security challenges, Latin America's homicide rates and numbers stand out as one of the region's most pressing problems. Despite this, the issue is often overlooked and has not become the urgent public policy priority it should be, with much of the attention in the citizen security field focusing on property and other crimes that generate interest and attention from more influential segments of the population. In a context where debate on how to improve public safety often swings between public support for hard-line, repressive security measures and structural public safety reforms proposed by the citizen security field that would take many years to enact and are politically difficult, trying to make progress in the short and medium-term on a specific, hugely important issue in the field was an appealing way forward.

The most immediate impact of the decision to focus on reducing homicides through the Prioritizing Homicide Reduction Concept was a significant reduction in the citizen security and justice field budget (from US\$1.71 million in 2014 to US\$762,000 in 2015). While all areas of the Latin America Program made some adjustments to accommodate the significant new budget for the Prioritizing Homicide Reduction Concept, the bulk of the cuts were made to this field to generate funds for the new concept. That said, the reduction was not as dramatic as the numbers above suggest, as the portions of grants to citizen security and justice field grantees directly related to work to reduce homicides are now supported out of the Prioritizing Homicide Reduction Concept.

A related impact of this decision on the citizen security and justice field has been a reorientation of our support to focus more on the field's contributions to reducing homicides over the long-term (while the Prioritizing Homicide Reduction Concept focuses on short and medium-term efforts to reduce homicides). While several of our citizen security and justice field grantees already focused on reducing homicides previously, we have encouraged others, such as FIP in Colombia, to place greater emphasis on this issue. To date, we have observed that OSF's new focus on reducing homicides is generating significant new attention and interest on the issue in the citizen security and justice field.

While currently reduced, our ongoing support to the citizen security and justice field is very important for achieving the program's goal to reduce homicides in Latin America. In terms of the targeted work under the Prioritizing Homicide Reduction Concept, our prior and ongoing support for the citizen security and justice fields increases the credibility and legitimacy of our work to reduce homicides. Many grantees in this field are also key partners in our more targeted efforts to reduce homicides through the concept, and have been central in helping to shape and carry out initiatives under the concept. Our citizen security partners can help us avoid pitfalls and mistakes from past efforts to reduce homicides in the region, as well as helping us avoid harmful unintended consequences of a narrower focus on homicides. Our ongoing support to the citizen security and justice field, combined with our focus on reducing homicides, will help to sustain efforts to reduce homicides over a longer time frame than anticipated in the Prioritizing Homicide Reduction Concept.

What we stopped funding and did not start funding

Over the last four years, we have made difficult decisions to discontinue support for several organizations in the citizen security and justice field for a variety of reasons. In some cases, we discontinued support for organizations, such as RESDAL (Argentina), whose focus on national security and defense did not really align with the citizen security and justice field. As mentioned above, in other cases, as with Ciudad Nuestra (Peru) and CERJUSC (Peru), we discontinued support to organizations with very serious organizational health challenges and little interest in or capacity to address these challenges. We also discontinued support for organizations, such as CESC (Chile), which had done little

to adapt its work and approach over the years as the citizen security field became more established and the key needs and challenges in the field changed. Finally, we discontinued support to organizations we had funded primarily in connection with a specific opportunity for reform that emerged as a result of new leadership in key institutions or specific time-bound opportunities. For example, we discontinued support for ICCPG (Guatemala), which we had funded for work to support reforms being carried out by then Attorney General Claudia Paz y Paz, once Paz y Paz was removed from this position.

Over the last four years, we have received many requests to fund citizen security work that we have declined. Most often, we declined to support proposed work that focused on training, producing reports or issuing broad recommendations developed from the outside and not connected with a specific opportunity or effort to address actual obstacles to reform from inside law enforcement and justice sector institutions.

IV. Going Forward: Lessons, Adjustments and Outstanding Questions

We have made a few important adjustments to this portfolio over the last couple of years, particularly the decision to make reducing homicides a central goal for the Latin America Program and the significant shift from project to institutional support. These decisions have had a substantial impact on the nature and focus of this portfolio but, as we reflect on these changes, we still have many more questions than answers about these decisions and the impact they will have on the citizen security and justice field.

Our experience supporting and collaborating with our grantees in the citizen security and justice field strongly informed our Reducing Homicides Goal. The difficulty the citizen security field, including OSF-LAP as a donor, has had in reducing violence and insecurity in the region – with debate stuck in a false dichotomy between short-term, hardline policies and decades-long reform efforts that will not yield results within the time windows political leaders have to effect change – helped persuade us of the need to focus on one specific core issue in the field rather than only continue to support it broadly. We and many of our grantees have often felt frustrated by our inability to demonstrate significant traction or progress in improving citizen security, despite supporting projects and organizations in this field for many years.

Through our focus on reducing homicides, we hope to show that it is possible to make progress in the short and medium-term on this specific grave offense in the citizen security field, even as we recognize how interrelated homicides are with other crimes and types of violence. We expect our successes and failures in this effort will generate relevant lessons for the citizen security and justice field on the advisability of focusing efforts on a particular crime and the feasibility of increasing and shaping public interest in an overlooked issue, among other things.

Our Reducing Homicides Goal has helped us further narrow our focus in the citizen security and justice field in productive ways, serving as a useful filter and overarching goal to move towards. In the short term, this has also generated some difficult questions and decisions about the nature of our relationship with longstanding grantees that are not yet focusing on reducing homicides, such as Insyde, and whether to continue support for the citizen security and justice field in countries that are not a priority for our work to reduce homicides, such as Argentina and Peru. We also wonder whether our efforts to influence and shape the citizen security and justice field's focus on reducing homicides may have unintended negative consequences in the longer-term.

We also have outstanding questions about the ongoing role of the human rights organizations working on citizen security and justice issues in this portfolio. We are comfortable with the steps taken over the last couple of years to adjust this part of the portfolio, focusing on those human rights organizations seeking and taking advantage of opportunities to work with state institutions to improve citizen security and reducing support for those organizations relying on more traditional human rights tools. We continue to find the role of human rights organizations in the portfolio valuable, as they complement the approach and tools utilized by citizen security organizations, and are also frequently key actors in preventing the adoption of regressive, hardline security policies. At the same time, especially with the reduction in the budget for this field to generate resources for the Prioritizing Homicide Reduction Concept, we will have to continue reassessing the role of these organizations in this portfolio and appropriate level of support.

Our recent shift to providing institutional support to core citizen security grantees is another change in our support for this field that we expect to learn from. As this move is still recent, it is still too early to say whether it will have the desired impact in terms of increasing the ability of these organizations to be flexible, respond to opportunities and challenges, and further develop their own institutional agendas, rather than primarily responding to demands from state actors. We will be monitoring this transition closely to see what impact it has on a field with organizations facing many governance, management and financial challenges.

One somewhat unintended consequence of our growing focus on organizational health issues and supporting stronger citizen security organizations has been a concentration of our support in the field in countries like Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico, which have a more established, deeper pool of citizen security organizations. This raises a yet unaddressed question of how we should approach our support in this field in countries like El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Venezuela, which have extremely high levels of violence and insecurity, but weaker civil society organizations and institutional capacity more generally. In Venezuela, through our work on homicide reduction, we have started supporting a couple of projects centered around individual experts rather than organizations, recognizing the challenging context and the importance of taking advantage of the very limited opportunities that exist for meaningful work to reduce violence. While we already innately apply somewhat different standards and thresholds based on the national contexts, we may want to more explicitly focus on ways to develop our support in these more challenging contexts.

A related outstanding question for us in this portfolio is whether and to what extent we should be engaging the significant individual expertise in the citizen security and justice field in Latin America. As referenced above, there are comparatively fewer and newer organizations in the citizen security and justice field compared to the human rights field in the region. Much of the existing expertise in this field is individual, particularly academics, often with experience advising or working in relevant government institutions. Since 2011, we have moved away from support for standalone citizen security projects the program had sometimes supported in the past, often led by particular experts, focusing instead on supporting organizations in this field, especially those committed to working closely with relevant institutions to improve public safety. While we believe this was the right choice in terms of narrowing and increasing the consistency of this portfolio, it also means there are a significant set of actors that no longer fit under our criteria for support to this field.

The move away from support centered on individual experts may be an unavoidable cost of narrowing our focus, but it also seems worth asking whether there are spaces or platforms that would allow this individual expertise to contribute more effectively to the citizen security and justice field. The Brazilian Forum on Public Safety is one example of a space that allows academics to engage in broader policy reform debates and projects. The organization frequently serves as a platform for and administers projects led by individual members, particularly academics who would not be able to

carry out such projects through their universities, to work with local and state governments to improve citizen security. The creation of comparable versions of such a platform in other contexts in the region might be useful and there may even be other more effective models for promoting debate and improvements in citizen security, as the Brazilian Forum has some appealing traits, but also serious limitations. It might be interesting to think about encouraging the creation of other such platforms, though we are also very conscious that a donor-driven effort to establish such spaces is unlikely to be effective.

Finally, as referenced briefly earlier, the majority of citizen security organizations work at the local or national level, but not at the regional or international level, and collaboration among the citizen security organizations in this field across Latin America remains fairly limited. Only one organization, Igarapé Institute, has an explicit and significant focus on working regionally and internationally. While the challenges and underlying factors driving violence and insecurity are often shared across the region or parts of the region, differences in the structure of relevant government institutions and other national particularities may partly explain the limited collaboration to date. The relative newness of many organizations in the field may also contribute to this.

Should we as OSF promote further collaboration and integration in the field? Our sense is that a donor-driven effort to facilitate such collaboration broadly across the field without a specific focus is unlikely to have much impact. A number of multilateral actors, such as the OAS and CAF, have been attracted to the idea of establishing something like the Brazilian Forum on Public Safety at the regional level, but this has proven hard to carry out without significant interest and drive from actors who might be well-positioned to lead such an initiative. For now, our main bet in this area is on promoting collaboration and coordination around a specific issue – reducing homicides – and our experience in this more targeted effort to promote collaboration will inform any future efforts to generate regional engagement and collaboration in the citizen security and justice field.