



WORKSHOP REPORT

Promoting Sustainable Development In Southern Africa: Post WSSD Sub-regional Civil society Workshop

Devonshire Hotel, Johannesburg, South Africa

2nd – 4th April 2003

Organized by Danish 92 Group Rio +10 Project Partners in Southern Africa,

Hosted by Environmental Monitoring Group



P.O. Box 13378. Mowbray 7705, South Africa
Tel: +27 21 448 2881. Fax: +27 21 448 2922
Email: info@emg.org.za, Website: www.emg.org.za

Funded by Danish 92 Group Rio + 10 Project with Funds from SIDA

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
Acronyms	3
List of Appendices.....	5
List of Tables.....	6
Executive Summary	7
1.0 Background and Introduction:.....	10
2.0 Objectives	11
3.0 Participation	12
4.0 Activities and Approach.....	12
5.0 Proceedings of the Discussions	13
5.1 Background, Introductions and Welcome Remarks.....	13
5.2 Background and Objectives of the Danish 92 group Rio +10 Project.....	14
5.3 SWOT Analysis For Civil Society in Southern Africa	15
5.3.1 Strengths:.....	16
5.3.2 Weaknesses:.....	17
5.3.3 Opportunities.....	18
5.3.4 Threats	19
5.4 WSSD Outcomes Overview and Priority Issues for Civil Society in Southern Africa.....	19
6.0 Way Forward and Plan of Action	20
6.1 Way forward.....	21
6.2 Plan of Action	23
7.0 Linking with Potential Donors	24
8.0 Lobbying and Advocacy Training	26
9.0 Window of Opportunity: 2 nd AU Summit in Mozambique	27
10.0 Conclusion	27

Acronyms

ABIODES	Organic Agriculture, Biodiversity and SD Association, Mozambique
ADP	Agricultural Development Program
ASC	African Steering Committee
ATN	African Trade Network
AUS	African Unit Summit (in Mozambique)
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CCD	Convention to Combat Desertification
CISANET	Civil society Agricultural Network
CONGOMA	Coalition of NGOs in Malawi
DCN	Debt Cancellation Network
DRFN	Desert Research Foundation of Namibia
EJNF	Environmental Justice Network Forum
EMG	Environmental Monitoring Group
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
F&NN	Food & Nutrition Network
FONGZA	Forum of NGOs of Zambezia, Mozambique
GENTA	Gender & Trade Network in Africa
GPF	Global Peoples' Forum (at Nasrec)
IBIS	Danish NGO, member of the Danish 92 Group / Rio+10 Project
LEADSA	Leadership for Environment and Development in Southern Africa
LINK	an NGO Forum in Mozambique
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MEAs	Multilateral Environment Agreements
MS	Danish NGO, member of the Danish 92 Group / Rio+10 Project
NANGOF	Namibia NGO forum
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation

ODA	Overseas Development Assistance
PELUM	Participatory Ecological Land Use Management
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SANGOCO	South African NGOs Coalition
SWOT	Strengths Weakness Opportunities and Threats
SAPN	Southern African Poverty Network
SARPN	Southern African Research Poverty Network
SATSG	South African Trade Strategy Group
SMI	Social Movements Indaba
WN	Water Network
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
WWF	Danish NGO, member of the Danish 92 Group / Rio+10 Project
ZERO	a regional environment organization in Zimbabwe

List of Appendices

- I List of participants
- II Programme
- III Participant's expectations
- IV Mozambique Post WSSD Report
- V Namibia Post WSSD Report
- VI South Africa Post WSSD Report
- VII Zimbabwe Post WSSD Report
- VIII Danish 92 Subregional Coordinators Report
- IX Southern Africa key networks reports and summaries
- X WSSD Outcomes Overview and Discussions
- XI Possibility of Phase II- Guidelines
- XII Documents for visualizing exercise in Lobbying and Advocacy training
- XIII Content and Discussions for Lobbying and Advocacy Training
- XIV AU summit: Mozambique host civil society meeting
- XV Evaluation of expectations

List of Tables

Table 1	Process of concretizing civil society forum for promoting sustainable development in Southern Africa
Table 2	Consolidating Key Priority Areas for The Forum
Table 3	General Activities
Table 4	Possibility of Phase II time frames

Executive Summary

Southern Africa hosted the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) from 26 August –4th September 2002. Over 27000 civil society delegates attended the WSSD but with very little impact on the outcomes. Despite existence of the SADC core group, the SADC civil society was remarkably invisible, their participation was passive, and the activities were uncoordinated. The poor performance is attributed to the absence of shared vision, lack of capacity, resources, and clear strategy for communication and coordination of activities amongst themselves and with other stakeholders including governments. This is compounded with lack of lobbying, advocacy and negotiation skills and more importantly disparities in understanding sustainable development concept.

The WSSD was one of the learning processes; therefore, lessons and experiences need to be captured because they are valuable for future engagements in local and international processes of importance to sustainable development in Southern Africa. It is against this background that Environmental Monitoring Group (EMG) co-organised with Danish 92 Group Rio + 10 Project partners, and hosted a Southern Africa Sub regional Post WSSD civil society workshop under Danish 92 Group Rio + 10 project sponsorship from 2nd –4th April 2003 at Devonshire Hotel in Johannesburg, South Africa. About 30 participants attended the workshop. These came from the Danish 92 group project partners and some Key networks in Southern Africa. Donor organizations participating in the workshop included the Danish 92 Group, HBS, and UNDP. Efforts to get the NEPAD secretariat proved futile despite getting confirmation for their participation. The SADC Secretariat, SADC Core Group, and the Southern Africa Research Poverty Network (SARPN), were invited but not able to attend because of other commitments.

The theme of the workshop was “ **Promoting Sustainable Development in Southern Africa**”. The objectives were to evaluate the impact of the Rio + 10 project partners in facilitating participation of the civil society in the WSSD and develop a strategic plan for pursuing the WSSD outcomes. This was based on the SWOT analysis, lessons and experiences acquired during the WSSD process and the experiences and challenges facing civil society networking in Southern Africa.

One of the tangible results from WSSD is a piece of paper (Plan of Action) that has to be translated into action. However, there were some intangibles results such as networking, information sharing, potential partnerships, and awareness that need to be transformed into tangibles. The WSSD provided an opportunity for civil society to self- reflect on how civil society is constructed, how the issues are articulated and the internal and external politics and also the battle lines within the sustainable development debate. The challenge for civil society is to

develop alternative development plans that would reflect equity, justice, democracy, and sufficiency.

SWOT analysis results from the national and Regional networks were discussed with emphasis on the structural organizations, governance, decision-making systems, information sharing, networking, political and economical dynamics within the countries and the region. The results showed that the Danish 92 Group Rio + 10 Project catalyzed civil society coordination and brought integration of sustainable development issues in the participating countries. It also created space for civil society interaction and provided an insight on negotiations and lobbying at an international level. The weaknesses confirmed the disparities in understanding and the lack of shared vision and common ground in working together towards promoting sustainable development.

Experiences and lessons acquired in participating the WSSD process were shared. It was observed that issue and member based networks are more coordinated and perform better in many respects however; they find it difficult to mobilize support from the non-members when it is needed. An integrated cross-sectoral network is therefore inevitable. It was learnt that civil society tends to agree on content issues rather than on structural or political issues and that networks that emerge out of need are more sustainable than those that emerge out of availability of money or donor influence. Apparently, the civil society has problems with forward planning as a result they are easily influenced by donor interests.

A strategic plan for a way forward in engaging with the WSSD outcomes was developed and possible means of creating linkages to the various activities and processes were identified. The participants resolved to establish a **“Civil society forum for promoting sustainable development in Southern Africa”**. The objective is to facilitate quality cross-sectoral and cross-thematic dialogue and strategic influence on policies and decisions related to sustainable development in the SADC region and beyond. Participation is open to all legitimate networks and organizations that will share a set of principles and values governing the forum such as equity and human rights, promoting sustainable livelihoods, environmental, social and economic justice. The initiative is likely to improve coordination of activities and promote active participation and influence of civil society engagements in national, regional and international activities towards promoting sustainable development and also increase visibility and recognition of civil society in Southern Africa and subsequently promote strong partnerships amongst civil society organizations and with governments, international community, and other stakeholders including donors. An interim facilitating team was identified with EMG as a coordinating organization. A concept paper is to be developed to motivate interested parties to join the forum. Process of concretizing the forum will be finalized at a civil society parallel meeting to African Union Heads of state Summit from 27th June –2nd July 2003 in Mozambique. The

AU summit has been identified as one of the window of opportunities to lobby for support for the proposed forum from other stakeholders.

The Danish 92 Group, HBS and UNDP have shown some interest to continue supporting civil society activities in Southern Africa however, they are calling for more coordination of the activities. There will be continued discussions with potential donor and other stakeholders.

The workshop included a training exercise in lobbying and advocacy that provided useful basics for lobbying and advocacy. The training focused on approaches and procedures in order to have effective campaigning, lobbying and advocacy strategies.

The workshop concluded with expressions of gratitude and satisfaction on how the workshop was organized and facilitated.

1.0 Background and Introduction:

Southern Africa hosted the World Summit on Sustainable Development from 26 August- 4 September in 2002. Many civil society delegates from southern Africa attended the event. It was one of the golden opportunities for the civil society in the region to engage at an international level. Currently, many countries in southern Africa are on the spotlight because of the worst socio-economic and environmental crises the region is experiencing. Incomes have fallen, debts have increased, large populations are food insecure and environment continues to degrade. It was with great hope that the hosting of the WSSD in Southern Africa would bring some solutions to these hardships. Various analyses of the WSSD outcomes show that poor countries like those dominating Southern Africa had very little gain in the whole process. The WSSD outcomes proved to have undermined some fundamental principles of Agenda 21 from the Rio Process, which laid some grounds for attaining sustainable development for the poor. On the other hand, the business community seems to have had a lot to celebrate on through partnerships, potential investments, and the promising prospects of Nepad.

Overall, there were over 27000 members of the civil society that attended the WSSD in various forms. Most of these were registered for the Global People's Forum at Nasrec, which ran parallel to the official UN event in Sandton, Johannesburg. The Danish 92 group Rio +10 project supported some civil society networks from four countries of the SADC region, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe in their preparation for the WSSD (Tanzania was also supported but under the East African Region). However, there was very little support for the actual participation in the WSSD. Most of the civil society delegates from the networks went to the summit under the support from other sources such as the EU and Ford foundation.

The civil society's presence at the WSSD made very little impact on the WSSD outcomes in Sandton. Most of the delegates were confined to Nasrec. Civil society delegates from Southern Africa were remarkably invisible at both places. Despite the existence of a SADC core group that was mandated to steer the SADC civil society process, the SADC civil society participation was very passive and their activities were uncoordinated. The poor performance is attributed to lack of capacity, resources, and clear strategy for communication and coordination of their activities amongst themselves and with their governments. This is compounded with lack of lobbying, advocacy and negotiation skills. More importantly, there is a huge gap in understanding of the issues surrounding sustainable development debates. International debates on the subject are characterized with jargons and politics too difficult to comprehend.

The civil society's participation might have had very little influence on the WSSD outcomes; however, the experiences and lessons learnt through the process

cannot be written off. These are valuable for future engagement in local and international processes of importance to sustainable development in Southern Africa and would also enhance improvements in civil society engagements in national and regional matters of importance to sustainable development.

What is missing and how to fill the gaps are critical questions in search for a solution to have a vibrant, proactive, and vigilant civil society network that would promote sustainable development in Southern Africa effectively. It is against this background that a Southern Africa sub regional civil society post WSSD workshop for the Danish 92 project partners was proposed to capture the lessons, and experiences acquired and also put to record the achievements and failures. The WSSD is believed to have been a learning process and an eye opener to the UN processes. Many of the civil society were participating the UN process for the first time.

The workshop aimed at laying foundation for developing a strategic plan for a way forward in engaging with the WSSD outcomes and find ways and means of creating linkages to the activities and processes of other SADC civil society networks and bodies. The outcomes of the workshop are to inform the possibility of getting support from the Danish 92 Group Rio + 10 project in its proposed Phase II and also motivate other donors to support the activities of the civil society in the region The workshop was also meant to pave way for a more coordinated and influential SADC civil society in promoting sustainable development in the region.

2.0 Objectives

The purpose of the workshop was to evaluate the impact of the Rio + 10 project partners in facilitating participation of civil Society in the WSSD and develop a strategic plan for pursuing the WSSD outcomes. The workshop specifically looked at:

- a) SWOT analysis of the national and regional networks which was based among other things, on their structural organization, governance and decision making system, information sharing, networking, political and economic dynamics within the countries and the region.
- b) Experiences and lessons of the national and subregional networks in participating the WSSD
- c) Key issues for Southern Africa that emerged from the WSSD Outcomes
- d) Establishing strategies and improving skills in networking, lobbying and advocacy, and negotiation
- e) Developing a plan of action for pursuing the WSSD outcomes

3.0 Participation

About 30 participants attended the workshop. The participants came from the Danish 92 group project participating countries (Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe), and some key networks in Southern Africa and these are: PELUM (Zimbabwe), GENTA (South Africa), LEADSA (Zambia), CISANET (Malawi), and WSSD Secretariat (South Africa). Some donor organizations, which included the Danish 92 Group, Ibis, HBS, and UNDP, also participated in the workshop. There were some efforts to get the NEPAD secretariat but proved futile despite getting confirmation for their participation. Apparently, no apology was sent. The workshop also invited the SADC secretariat, the SADC core group and the Southern Africa Research Poverty Network (SARPN), which unfortunately were not able to attend because of other commitments. A list of participants is attached in Appendix I.

4.0 Activities and Approach

The Director of EMG, Stephen Law, inaugurated the workshop with some welcome remarks. Misha Wolsgaard-Iversen of MS Denmark followed with a brief overview of the Danish 92 group project. Each individual participant presented the reasons for attending and expectations from the workshop. Individual national and Subregional networks presented results of SWOT analyses of their respective networks, which were conducted prior to coming to the workshop. The SWOT analyses results were then discussed in plenary. Some of the key networks, particularly GENTA, PELUM, and the WSSD Secretariat did not conduct the SWOT analyses according to the guidelines that were set for the exercise, instead, they made presentation on the issues they are working on, challenges they are facing, and the strategies they are using to continue pursuing their issues. SARPN, which was not represented at the workshop, conducted a workshop of similar kind just a few days after. The purpose of the workshop was to present findings of a SWOT analysis, which was conducted by a designated design team in order to improve the network's performance in the subregion. The subregional coordinator for the Danish 92 Group Rio + 10 project in Southern Africa had a privilege to attend the workshop. Some of the lessons learnt will be shared in this report. SWOT analysis for the civil society's general performance in the subregion was done in small groups and was discussed in plenary.

There was a presentation on the "Key WSSD Outcomes" by Jessica Wilson, which set the tone for the workshop. The presentation was followed by a group exercise where participants were asked to examine the WSSD outcomes and suggest the way forward. Some specific guiding questions were discussed as follows:

- a) is there need for a regional network focusing on sustainable development?*
- b) what should this network do?*

- c) *What processes and networks are already dealing with the issues and how does the new set up engage with them?*
- d) *What gaps exist and how can we address them?*

Responses to the questions provided a framework for creating a way forward in terms of structural organization, attaching an identity to the suggested structure, identifying gaps and issues to be pursued and developing an action plan with time frames.

The workshop included a training exercise on lobbying and advocacy, which was provided by Mr. Fred Kalibwani from PELUM regional office based in Zimbabwe. This was a long-standing need for most of the participants and it came out strongly as one of the weak areas for the civil society in the region. Contrary to the expectations, the training was more theoretical than practical but this was done on purpose as many of the participants lacked the basics for lobbying and advocacy. The training was done in a participatory manner and was quite interactive. Some materials were distributed among the participants as take away notes. Some case studies, most of them from PELUM's experiences as a regional network for small farmers and its active participation in the WSSD were used.

In concluding the workshop, some opportunities were identified where the proposed structure would play an important role in motivating other civil society organizations and networks to be part of it. One of the challenging exercises was to link the outcomes of the workshop with what prospective donors are interested to support and with what is happening at an African level. Unfortunately, at this stage some of the participants and the donors had already left for other commitments. Therefore, leaving the Danish 92 as the only donor organisation. Misha presented on the Danish 92 group plans. It was noted that some of the donor organisations such as the HBS and UNDP have shown interest in some of the proposed activities and are looking for more collaboration. The discussions on links with donors were not conclusive and the task was left to the coordinating team to continue the discussion. (*Programme of events is attached in Appendix II*)

5.0 Proceedings of the Discussions

5.1 Background, Introductions and Welcome Remarks

In welcoming the participants, Stephen Law, Director of Environmental Monitoring Group, which is the Subregional focal point for the Danish 92 Rio +10 project in Southern Africa, reminded the participants that the WSSD was just an event, which came and is gone. However, its legacy needs to be pursued further. The WSSD left a piece of paper (Plan of Action), which if no action is taken will remain a piece of paper. In addition, people made a lot of contacts and gathered lots of information, which can be utilized to enhance the sustainable development agenda in the region. The challenges for the civil society are to integrate their

activities horizontally and vertically, i.e. to link and network nationally, regionally, and globally and also to capture and turn the intangible WSSD outcomes into tangibles.

Based on the expectations from the participants (Appendix III), there was a general feeling that the workshop is going to build stronger relationships among the civil society networks in the region in order to integrate and improve coordination of activities in information sharing, campaign, lobbying, advocacy, and capacity building. The workshop was an opportunity to learn from one another's experience and strategize on how together we can pursue the WSSD outcomes.

5.2 Background and Objectives of the Danish 92 group Rio +10 Project

Danish 92 Group is a lobby organization consisting of 19 very diverse NGOs. It is quite a challenge in such a group to find a common ground for operation however the group has managed to identify key priority areas to work on based on a set of principles. The Group 92 does not have high profile in Denmark but has some political influence. Three members of the Group 92, WWF Denmark, MS and IBIS, implemented the project. There are field offices in Asia, Latin America, and Africa. In Africa the region is subdivided into three, East, Southern, and Western Africa. In Southern Africa the field offices are in Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe.

The project emerged from the Rio +8 conference that took place in 2000 in Copenhagen where over 70 NGOs attended; half of them were from the South. The NGOs from the North pledged support for the Civil Society WSSD process. A project document was created. The basic idea was to increase influence of the Southern NGOs in the WSSD and other international events. The project was therefore aimed at strengthening the Civil Society in the south in preparation for the WSSD. The group managed to raise some funds about (2million US\$ Dollars). The funds were not enough. Despite the financial constraints the impact of the project has been well recognized and has raised some interest among other donors. The GP92 has been criticized of keeping the project a secret however this is just a misconception. There is a limit to which the project would have spread based on the resources available.

The Group 92 encountered many challenges, conflicts and problems for the two year period of operation on the Rio + 10 project. It is well acknowledged that the project created is unique. As a way forward the Group 92 Rio +10 project will concentrate on other processes since the WSSD is now history. The challenges for the network remain on :

- *How to make the work of the network visible internationally*
- *One of the outcomes of the WSSD process has been creation of space for the civil society in regional and international discussions. How to take advantage of the space*
- *How to continue the initiative that has been started by the process*

- *How to improve South-South co-operation: Latin America, Africa, and Asia while we are improving local links*
- *What do we have in common and what priority interventions need to be targeted*
- *What are the Group's expectations from the donor community*

It is perceived that the project partners will drive the project and the Group 92 will seek ways of supporting the various initiatives with continued hope that other donors will come on board.

5.3 SWOT Analysis For Civil Society in Southern Africa

SWOT analysis results from the Danish 92 Group Rio + 10 project partners showed some formidable strengths and opportunities the project has created. The project catalysed civil society coordination and integration of sustainable development issues at national level. It also created space for the project partners to interact with international networks. More importantly, it provided an insight on lobbying, advocacy, campaign and negotiation in an international arena. However, the SWOT analysis revealed some fundamental weaknesses. It was observed that the project partners had very little knowledge of each other. Unfortunately, the project did very little to facilitate this. The main reason is because the project's communication and sharing of information was based on Internet (email and website). There were very little personal contacts and face-to-face discussions or debates on issues, which would have facilitated knowing each other and allowed establishing common ground for developing common positions or joint proposals on various issues. Internet technology remains a new, expensive, and alien technology in many parts of the region.

The project also overlooked the diversity among the project partners in terms of their priorities and level of understanding and knowledge on the concept of sustainable development. The project partners were drawn together based on the WSSD, which was just too broad, and also because they had a common donor, as a result there was lack of focus and clear agenda for working together. Another major weakness was lack of recognition. The network did not create any identity of its own in the region as a result there was lack of legitimacy and mandate. This created some tensions with WSSD secretariat and the SADC core group that were seen as legitimate bodies to facilitate the civil society processes in the SADC region. Apparently, there were high expectations from the Danish 92 group for more coordination and political influence, which did not match with the resources, the time available and the political environment. One area of major concern was the strong push for the participating organisations to engage at international level when they were just beginning to build capacity on how to engage at national and subregional levels. This created a lot of pressure on the coordinating organisations. Details of the SWOT analyses from the National networks and Report from the Subregional coordinator are attached as Appendices IV, V, VI, VII, and VIII).

The five networks from Southern Africa present at the Workshop (LEADSA, PELUM, GENTA, CISANET and WSSD Secretariat) shared their experiences and challenges as regional networks. Apparently CISANET is more of a national network but working on agriculture and food security, which are issues of importance to Southern Africa. The presentations provided useful comparisons and lessons. It was observed that **issue** and/ or **member based networks** are more coordinated and perform better. However, these networks find it more difficult to mobilise support from other networks when it is needed despite sharing the same concerns . For instance, networks on water and energy might be sharing the same concern around privatization and yet it is very difficult to mobilize the water network to support the energy campaigns (***this is given as an example to illustrate the point***). **An integrated cross- sectoral network** is inevitable in these circumstances to bridge up the gap. It was also learnt that **civil society is united on content issues rather than on structural and political issues**. This was the experience of the WSSD civil society secretariat, which robbed civil society of political space in the WSSD process. It spent 90 % of its time on an organisation structure (which never worked) rather than on substantive issues. The civil society remained divided and polarised. It is also noted that networks that emerge because there is money are not sustainable as compared to those that emerge out of need because once the money is finished the networks lack direction. There is always a problem of forward planning as a result civil society activities are easily influenced by donor interests. Summaries and discussions on the presentations are attached as Appendix IX (a-d).

SWOT analysis of civil society in Southern Africa in general, also provided some useful lessons and challenges with regards to the concept of sustainable development and its relation to globalisation. It is well acknowledged that there is a split among the civil society in understanding the concept of sustainable development and globalization. The disparities are reflected in the approaches and interventions to concerns and issues around the two concepts. It is therefore a big challenge to find a common ground or a shared vision for working together or building alliances.

The following gives a summary of the SWOT analysis for civil society networking in Southern Africa:

5.3.1 Strengths:

- *Most of the countries in southern Africa are experiencing similar socio-economic hardships and are threatened by similar environmental problems.* This provides a legitimate reason to find common ground for working together for purposes of building alliances to fight for common causes and develop joint positions and proposals for interventions.
- *There is diversity in knowledge and experiences among the civil society in the region,* which provides great potential for meaningful integration of the issues,

which would deepen and widen understanding of sustainable development issues and also provide complementary rather than competing efforts to promoting sustainable development.

- *There is high spirit of volunteerism*, which provides a strong back up particularly in terms of human resources and also allows networking that is motivated based on good intentions and not just for money.

5.3.2 Weaknesses:

- *Lack of identity, mandate, and legitimacy were some of the outstanding weaknesses identified.* These make it difficult to market the civil society activities for purposes of fundraising and are a matter of concern when there is need to have political influence. Most of the networks are not recognised by influential institutions and individuals, as a result their impact is jeopardised. The lack of legal status raises a lot of questions around representation and mandate. It is observed that most of the networks operating at regional level have no mandate from the civil society in the region and even those operating at national level have no mandates from the wider communities, which include groups like CBOs, farmers, women, trade unions and youth . Some of the networks are operating in just a few countries of the region and have names implying coverage for the whole region. This is currently the case with the Danish 92 project, which is operating in four countries of the region. It is also an issue for the SARPN whose coverage is also not very clear as to whether it is SADC, Southern Africa or just some selected countries in Southern Africa
- *The civil society in the region is disintegrated with their activities uncoordinated* as a result when they have an opportunity to work together; they have not just different but conflicting agendas to pursue. They also find it difficult to define roles and responsibilities. This is attributed to the leadership vacuum that exists. It was learnt that a SADC core group was established during the WSSD to play a leadership role among the civil society in the region. Unfortunately the group got disintegrated and never provided the expected leadership. At national level, it was observed that each of the countries has an umbrella body, for instance, SANGOCO for South Africa, CONGOMA for Malawi and NANGOF for Namibia. However most of these bodies are politically influenced as such they do not serve the interest of the civil society but of the government. They also exclude other groups that form part of the civil society such as CBOs, and farmers.
- *The civil society lacks a shared vision.* This has a lot to do with their origin and the purpose for their existence. There is a lot of mistrusts and unnecessary competition for resources. In this regard, most of the civil society organisations are reluctant to collaborate. For this reason, most of the civil society organisations operate in a closed system, and are quite known for lack of transparency and accountability
- *Most of the civil society organisation lack long term planning and most of the planning is done on adhoc basis* more especially when there are some potential sources of money.

- *There is also lack of capacity in communication, lobbying, advocacy, and negotiation.* The civil society finds it difficult to engage in debates and discussions at international level. This has also a lot more to do with lack of local analysis and interpretation of the issues and also lack of skills and expertise. Many people shun away from discussing issues where they lack competency. The lack of capacity to engage is compounded with inadequate financial and human resources. Most of the organizations are highly dependent on donor funding, which in most cases come with some strings attached. Some civil society organisations have found themselves pursuing donor's agendas at the expense of their own and the needs of the region. Furthermore, their respective governments provide them with very little support and in some cases if they do, the recipient organisations are viewed as sale outs. The situation allows the Northern NGOs to occupy more space and dominate the civil society debates in international arena
- *There is lack of institutional memory.* Some of the interactions are at individual level as opposed to institutional level. This affects continuity in the event when the particular individual ceases to be part of the institution.
- *Most of the civil society organizations* are not up to speed with the technological advances in communication and are not in the tradition of networking.

5.3.3 Opportunities

- Many of the countries in Southern Africa have recently gone through a *democratization process*, which provides some space for the civil society to participate in decision-making and policy formulation processes at different levels. The civil society should take advantage of this legitimate space to promote sustainable development agendas that are pro poor.
- Southern Africa is currently on the *spotlight* because of hosting the WSSD, the peace deals in DRC, the political situation in Zimbabwe, and the starvation and the health problems such as HIV/AIDS. This provides the civil society with an opportunity to make a name through their interventions, which can easily be captured, at international level. The situation also provides an opportunity to mobilise support at international level in promoting sustainable development. It is observed that there is a strong global social movement, which necessitates regional movements to be integrated in it.
- There seem to be a *shift of donors' interest* from supporting individual organisations to supporting trans-boundary networks and issues such as water, land, food security, and trade.
- *Regional economic integration and the introduction of NEPAD* provides immediate opportunities to influence sustainable development agendas for the region. Most of the governments have come to realise the useful role that the civil society can play as reliable sources of information, which can shape up policies and decisions rather than viewing them as anti government bodies. There is therefore great need for civil society voice in government processes.

- The *WSSD legacy raised a lot of awareness and consciousness on sustainable development, issues*. There is therefore a lot of willingness among the civil society to build solidarity in promoting sustainable development issues.
- There is some *advancement in communication technology*, which despite some challenges facilitates communication among network members.

5.3.4 Threats

- There is a rise in *competition* for limited resources. This creates a lot of unnecessary duplication of efforts
- The democratisation process has brought in some *instability* in the political arena because of the frequent changes in political environments particularly when there is change of governments.
- *Unpredictable interests of the donors*, which render some of the efforts unsustainable.

At the end of the SWOT analysis the participants were faced with the following challenges:

- How to make horizontal and vertical networking work?
- How to capitalise on the WSSD echo for instance in getting messages and positions across
- How to engage with regional governance processes
- How to link with global social movements to the benefit of the region
- How to operate with changing political environments
- How to survive internal political tensions
- How to deal with undue donor pressure
- How to match with the influence of the Northern NGOs
- How to develop a common vision and common objectives
- How to better share and use existing capacity and resources

5.4 WSSD Outcomes Overview and Priority Issues for Civil Society in Southern Africa

The presentation highlighted the key areas where the civil society should put their energies on. It set an atmosphere, allowed the civil society to have a self-reflection of their participation in the WSSD and also to raise awareness of the dynamics and tendencies of some characters during international events such as the WSSD. The discussion was in the post Rio context where rapid globalisation has, exacerbates ecological and economic crisis and also the WTO regime that is threatening global democracy and sustainable development (there is a battle between sustainable development and corporate led globalisation), and the increasing growth of international civil society and social justice movements. It was noted that the intentions of the WSSD were to agree on action plan to implement the agenda 21 and the Millennium Declaration Goals (MDGs). This is a continuation of the Road from Stockholm and Rio. The other purpose was to re-commit to sustainable development and demonstrate best practice sustainable

development projects. The outcomes of the WSSD and how they relate to Agenda 21 are summarized Appendix X

Apart from the action plan, which the civil society had very little influence, most of the outcomes of value to the civil society were on:

- Raising awareness and interest, which was reflected in the WSSD echo.
- Self-reflection on how the civil society is constructed, how they issues are articulated, internal and external relations. It also raised the debate on being part of the civil society because you are funded to do so or because you have passion for sustainable development and also the capacity and capability to engage at different levels.
- Identifying the gaps (fault lines and key battles) in implementation of agenda 21. Particularly looking at the social and economic dimensions. For instance tackling of poverty which is embedded in the MDGs and yet the WSSD did not address the production and consumption patterns. The issues of conservation and management of resources for development in relation to the MEAs, which are in conflict with some of the WTO policies.
- The issue of participation and access to information the level of which goes together with access to financial resources, knowledge and expertise. The political space provided to the civil society
- The means of implementation, which was greatly influenced by, trade agendas. There is a shift from ODA to FDIs. There was no acknowledgement of the ecological debt.
- Chapter 8 of the Johannesburg plan of implementation which addresses sustainable development for Africa and is based NEPAD

Challenges For the SADC civil society include:

- Halting and reversing the corporate globalization, which will require challenging the WTO and FTAs. There is need to document and expose the local experiences of abuse and marginalisation and demand corporate accountability
- Strengthening and promoting alternatives to local economic development plans, which would reflect equity, justice, democracy and sufficiency
- Building a vibrant civil society to confront USA and Trans National companies' military power. This can be done through forums or movements such as World Social Forum.
- Debate, challenge and develop alternative to NEPAD. It is noted that NEPAD is a vehicle for Africa to achieve the MDGs. It should be recognised that some of the MDGs sound attractive to support, however some of them, for instance in water, would be achieved through privatisation, which is problematic because the aim is not of helping the poor but to make profits.

6.0 Way Forward and Plan of Action

6.1 Way forward

The participants felt that the WSSD Outcomes necessitate the civil society in Southern Africa to work together and build solidarity on many of the issues raised. Initially there was a general feeling of avoiding formulation of a new structure because it is recognised there are already so many civil society structures in the region, which do not translate into any better performance. The useful thing to do is to strengthen and support those structures. After vigorous deliberations on the issue, a general consensus was reached to formulate a regional forum that would focus on sustainable development issues in Southern Africa. It was noted that most of the available structures are issue based without cross-links and those that are multi-sectoral are malfunction. The new structure was given a working name: **“Civil Society Forum For Promoting Sustainable Development in Southern Africa”** There were conditions for setting up the forum as follows:

- A network that recognizes various issue based networks
- It should be an overarching structure that would resuscitate the SADC NGO council (this was highly contested and there was no consensus)
- It should be a Multi-Sectoral network that would go along with the economic blocs in the context of NEPAD, for instance a SADC network
- It should have clearly defined criteria and principles for participation
- The structure need to be defined with respect to representation and coordination
- There should be terms of reference for the facilitators

“The Objective of the forum is to facilitate quality cross –sectoral and cross-thematic dialogue and strategic influence on policies and decisions related to sustainable development in the SADC region and beyond.”

The discussion on the new structure continued with some group work with particular emphasis on institutional framework, gaps and activities to fill and pursue. The institutional framework was discussed based on:

- a) *creation of identity*
- b) *membership*
- c) *required tools and resources*

There was a common understanding that the structure will be loose and will operate on shared values and principles as follows:

- a) *equity and human rights*
- b) *promoting sustainable livelihoods*
- c) *promoting social, environmental and economic justice*
- d) *Commitment to shared values and solidarity*

Participation is open to networks and organisations that share these values and principles. The Forum will have a central coordinating point with national and

thematic focal points in the region. Environmental Monitoring Group was chosen as the interim coordinating organization up until another meeting is held probably during the AU summit in Mozambique. EMG was given the following terms of reference:

- a) *collecting and disseminating information on important events*
- b) *Build database on organizations working on Sustainable development issues in Southern Africa*
- c) *Mobilize other networks in the region to join the forum*
- d) *Produce calendar of events for specific issues*
- e) *Allocate tasks*
- f) *Support coordinating organizations at national level*

The Forum will be open to all SADC members and will link with the African processes through the African Steering Committee provided it is still functional. An attempt was made to identify some of the existing networks and processes that the forum could link to. The following are some of them. FARNPAN (a SADC related organization), SARP (Working on Research and information dissemination. The network is also involved in facilitating discussions and debates on various issues related to poverty), NAWISA (Working on water), PELUM, (Small Farmers), CORN, ZERO, LEADSA, SADC Trade and Debt network, AFRODAD, SADC NRM, GENTA, SAPSN (dealing with debt relief issues) and NESDA (African coordination). The participants did not have full details of the specific activities and processes for most of these networks. It was therefore suggested that there should be a thorough inventory of these networks and their profiles. It was noted that most of the networks have weak institutional profiles.

After some discussion, gaps and activities which the proposed forum would play an important role were identified and are summarized as follows:

- *Strategic thinking and planning*
- *Gathering information based on facts and research*
- *Better Coordination*
- *Create formal links with SADC civil society initiatives and networks*
- *Audit of what already exists*
- *Capacity building in generating quality technical information, lobbying and advocacy*
- *Lack of critical mass*
- *Supporting and reinforcing existing networks*
- *Weak institutional profiles*
- *Lack of vibrancy*
- *Box mentality*
- *Facilitation Role*

6.2 Plan of Action

At the end of the discussion the following were the points of action

- a) *Developing and marketing the concept of a Civil Society forum for promoting sustainable development in Southern Africa.*
- b) *Consolidating the institutional framework*
- c) *Prioritization of key issues for Southern Africa*
- d) *An inventory what already exists and best practices*

The specific activities to fill in the identified gaps and time frames are outlined in Tables 1-3.

Table 1 Process for concretizing Civil Society Forum for Promoting Sustainable Development in Southern Africa

OUTPUT	ACTIVITY	TIME FR	RESP
Concept Paper , to be used as basis for discussion in all the various organizations	- Write up / develop concept paper	1 month	EMG: Annie, Jessica; Margareth, Norberto, Fred, Fanny
	- Out for comments to broader group	15 Apr	Whole group
	- Final document	30 Apr	
National Process	- National buy-in process	15 May	All FP's
	- Report on buy-in process	30 May	All FP's
Visioning W'shop on taking forward SD in Africa	- Invites	05 May	Norberto (Mozambique)
	- Confirmations	15 May	
	- Registrations	15 May	
	- Agenda	10 May	

Table 2: Consolidating Key Priority Areas for the Forum

OUTPUT	ACTIVITY	TIME FRAME	RESPONSIBILITY
Strategic Thinking & Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify key issues - Prioritize key issues - Design methodology / plan of action - Organize a dialog forum and plan towards particular events (website 	ST: AU Summit July 03 – opportunity for discussing strategy and issues	Moz – NFP* EMG – RFP*

	dialog)		
	-	LT: before end 2003 – 3 yr plan of action agreed upon	
African Commission – Calendar of Events	-		
Technical Info & Research	- Identify these needs from the audit	Ongoing (dep on audit)	Whole Network
Formal links with SADC & CSO initiatives & NWS	- Identify existing structures for formal linkage (e.g. UNEP / Nairobi) - Contacts within SADC Secretariat** - NEPAD Secretariat**	Short Term	
Role of facilitators on linkages with other networks	- From audit identify potential linkages - calendar of events	Check with audit	
Improve institutional profile of existing networks	- From audit identify better ways of linking the networks - Profiling on SD initiatives and activities – look for networks on the Net	Check with audit	Focal points & volunteer organizations

Table 3: General Activities

OUTPUT	ACTIVITY	TIME FRAME	RESPONSIBILITY
Info on Who does What & Where	- Survey (Human Science Research Council)	Immediately	Regional / national focal pnts*
Sharing & Learning Report (Assessment Report)	Assessment of transformation: - dissemination of survey info - meetings (national & regional) - dissemination of Assmt Report	3 months	Regional / national focal points*
Information of Best Practices	Documentation and packaging Best Practices	6 months	Regional Focal Point (NFP's added later)

7.0 Linking with Potential Donors

There were three representatives from the donor community, Danish 92 group (who funded the workshop), HBS, and UNDP. Some efforts were made to invite Ford Foundation but failed. The idea of inviting the donors was to find possibilities of partnerships. Unfortunately, at the time when the discussions were conducted, thus the last day of the workshop, two of the donor representatives (UNDP and HBS) were absent leaving the Danish 92 alone. It might be seen as a mistake to have left such a crucial discussion to the last minute but it was strategically scheduled in order to avoid donor influence on the plan of action. This was based on the principle of “ ***not planning because there is money but plan out of need and look for the money later***”. Not all participants were happy about the set up.

The absence of HBS and UNDP was not because of lack of interest but had other commitments that coincided with the workshop. The two donors have shown interest to engage with the proposed forum. However the forum needs to be specific on the areas to be supported.

The Danish 92 presented a paper entitled “**Possibility of Phase II: Guidelines for the formulation of a second stage**” (Appendix XI). It was noted that through out the discussion of the workshop there was very little mention of money and yet most of the proposed activities will require money. The challenge is on how to get the money. There was a mention of fundraising responsibility for the coordinating organization, which was refuted on legal grounds, i.e. the coordinating organization has no mandate to fundraise for the forum. The issue was left pending for further discussions.

The presentation from Misha on behalf of the Danish 92 group Rio + 10 Project provided an insight of the status of the Danish 92 group project. It was indicated that there are possibilities of taking the Rio + 10 project into phase II. However the mode of operation may change. It is the desire of the Danish 92 to ensure that a second phase should emerge out of need and that it should have support from the Civil Society. It should also be based on the lessons and experience gained from the first phase. The review exercise is underway in some of the subregions.

The management team, IBIS and MS conducted a workshop in order to clarify the basis for a second phase. It was noted that the Danish 92 has been running international campaigns on trade, environment, sustainable development, poverty, water and energy. The dilemma is that such campaigns cannot be limited to on one region but it feels too much to work with so many countries. One of the biggest challenges is on funding. The project has relied so much on DANIDA. A phase II will require support from more than one donor. So far UNDP, HBS and World Bank have shown some interest however there is no guarantee of the funds yet.

A proposed time frame was presented of the activities that have to be undertaken in preparation for the Phase II as shown in Table 4. Phase II is expected to start at the beginning of January 2004.

Table 4: Proposed Time Frame

National draft proposals to be submitted to IBIS, MS, WWF, other focal points & Network Secretariat in Copenhagen	19 May 2003
Regional / sub-regional proposals to be submitted	10 Jun 2003
An Overall Project document drawn up by the Secretariat in Copenhagen to be submitted to all parties	30 Jun 2003
Hearing process, discussion	Jul / Aug 2003
Comments to be sent to Secretariat in Copenhagen	18 Aug 2003
Project Document to be finalized	05 Sep 2003

8.0 Lobbying and Advocacy Training

The workshop was combined with a lobbying and advocacy training in order to respond to the capacity needs in this field. The training was more theoretical than expected but it provided useful basics to those people that have no skills and knowledge in the field. The emphasis for the training was on the different steps and procedures that have to be taken in order to have an effective lobbying and advocacy strategy for the region. The following issues were highlighted:

- a) *developing a clear agenda,*
- b) *getting the right skills, experiences and knowledge*
- c) *identification and utilization of window of opportunities.*

It was mentioned that although Lobbying and advocacy is a crucial role that the civil society play, the exercise is done with poor planning and budgeting and without any monitoring and evaluation.

The training started with a visualizing exercise, which reflected on accepting no limits, having a fighting spirit all the time, and the urgent need for change (Appendix XIII). The exercise was in the context of the WSSD and the experiences the civil society had for instance the lack of access to Sandton. A lot of reference was made to how PELUM managed to get small farmers to the WSSD and got a plat form during the official event to speak to a group of influential people despite all the hurdles they faced.

There was also a discussion on the different approaches to campaigning, lobbying, and advocacy and the relationship of these. Four approaches were identified which are applicable to different situations. These are:

- a) *Public interest approach*
- b) *Citizen Action approach*
- c) *Transformational approach*

d) *A combination of the above*

The participants had no opportunity to have practical exercises during the training based on the issues identified in the workshop. However the participants went through various steps in developing a Campaign, Advocacy and Lobbying Strategy (CAL). This looked at four basic categories as follows:

- a) *Entryist*
- b) *Complementary*
- c) *Non-Compliance*
- d) *Confrontational*

The participants were able to relate to some of these steps based on the work that they are doing or are planning to do.

(Content of the training is attached as Appendix XIVa and b)

9.0 Window of Opportunity: 2nd AU Summit in Mozambique

The 2nd AU summit is scheduled for 2nd-12th July, 2003. The civil society in Mozambique are planning to host an African civil society meeting prior to the AU summit, from 27th June-2nd July, 2003. Details of the plans to host the meeting are attached as (Appendix XV). The Civil society in Mozambique is mobilizing civil society in Africa to support the event. Some of the issues to be discussed will be the role of the civil society in Nepal and AU.

The participants noted this as a window of opportunity to market the concept of forming the civil society forum for promoting sustainable development in Africa. Apparently the agenda for the meeting has not been set.

10.0 Conclusion

The workshop ended at a happy note. Participants were satisfied with the way the workshop was organized and facilitated and also the energies that were put into the various discussions. There was a reflection on the expectations of the participants against the proceeding of the workshop. Most of the exceptions were met except for those that were beyond the workshop's scope. (Appendix XVI shows the extent to which the expectations were met) It was recognized that the workshop was a beginning of the processes to strengthening the political influence of the civil society in the region. The participants expressed gratitude to the Danish 92 for sponsoring the workshop and were hopeful that such support will not end there. The participants were also thankful to EMG and other organizers for the workshop. The participants were asked to fill in an evaluation form. The results confirmed the satisfaction from the participants on the organization of the workshop. However there was dissatisfaction with the food from the hotel that created some stomach problems in some participants. Otherwise people were happy with the venue

The workshop was wrapped with people expressing their impression of the workshop in one word. The following were some of the words: Constructive, Innovative, Integrating, Productive, Taxing, Informative, Awesome, Draining.

*****the end