

CANCUN START UP – MEETING Southern Voices Capacity Building Programme

Friday 3rd December 15:30 – 17:30,

Venue: ENGO Meeting Room LOBO, at Cancun Messe

Minutes from the meeting – adding to the power point presentation

15:30	Welcome , By Poul Erik Lauridsen, Care International -lead organization in the Climate Capacity Consortium behind the programme
15:40	Presentation of the agenda and purpose of the meeting - slide no 2 By Peter With, Programme Coordinator, Southern Voices CBP Peter also welcomed all. A year ago we were busy during COP15 – also with the interviews of Southern participants – for the evaluation of the first Southern Voices Programme which focused on participation in the international climate negotiations, capacity-building and advocacy. The outcomes of the evaluation have led to the programme we are starting up today: The key messages from the evaluation are the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ COP15 was not the end – only the beginning. Although we failed to reach the ambitious climate agreement we had worked for, civil society was mobilised around COP15 to a higher level than before, and this is the energy we are still building on▪ There is a need to move beyond capacity-building as training of individuals – a new programme must focus on strengthening the organizations – therefore it was decided to focus the support on the climate policy networks
15:45	Round of Introduction of participants and networks – slide number 3 Around 24 representatives from networks were present, and 6 from consortium organizations . DanChurchAid and OVE were not represented, Ibis were represented through the Central America Office. Among the networks, Vietnam and Cambodia were not present – since they were not present in Cancun. Also two observers from the CARE Adaptation Learning Programme , ALP, from Ghana and Kenya attended. All in all it was an impressive turn-out and it was also evident that there is a wide diversity between the networks represented - and that categorization into regional, national and thematic networks are not always easy: regional networks as SusWatch have national platforms; thematic networks have regional structures etc.
16:00	Brief introduction to the new programme , By Poul Erik Main part of the presentation self explanatory from slide 4 – 10 . <i>Additional to slide 10: How were the networks in the programme selected:</i> Members of the consortium proposed networks for support, based on sketches of sub-projects prepared by the networks. The networks were then selected by the steering group based on recommendation by the Secretariat - based on the criteria presented in slide 10 . The criterion on “cutting edge” was used to select between networks which were all qualified. The last one that only networks in countries with a GNI per capita under 2.570 USD is a condition by the Danish Government for all development cooperation activities.

<p>16:10</p>	<p>Management structure and requirements of networks – by Peter</p> <p>See also the paper <i>Outline for start-up phase and requirements</i>.</p> <p><i>Slide 11 illustrates the management structure:</i></p> <p>At the top is the Steering Group for the Southern Voices Programme – with one member for each of the organizations in the Climate Capacity Consortium: CANI, IIED, DanChurchAid, Ibis, OVE and CARE Denmark as the lead agency. The 92-group is not involved in implementation – it participates to channel back the experiences and lessons from the programme to its 23 member organizations.</p> <p>Next is CARE Denmark the lead agency – with responsibility for the grant towards the Danish Government. Care is hosting the Secretariat of the SV Programme</p> <p>In the third row – we have the consortium members who are each responsible for partnership with 2 – 4 networks – either directly or through their country offices in developing countries</p> <p>The countries with networks covered are in the fourth row.</p> <p>Contracts: a) between CARE as lead organization b) (subcontracts) between consortium member organizations and the networks.</p> <p><i>Slide 12:</i> The website of the consortium aims at sharing information and knowledge between the networks.</p> <p>Slide 13: Budget for networks: Further information see also the document: <i>“Outline for start-up phase and requirements”</i></p> <p>Each network will develop a budget in consultation with its partner organization in the consortium. The budget covers the period from Jan 2011 to June 2012.</p> <p>The budget can cover many different activities: part time staff; training, research, publications , advocacy ; The activities budgeted should be listed according to the standard budget lines in the budget template. There is a wide possibility for networks to set their own priorities within the budget lines indicated. However funding must be set aside for the network capacity analysis, for country assessment reports and for local audit if required. The budget can also include payment for field offices or consortium organizations for their technical and administrative support, but there is a maximum on these budget lines to allow networks to get funding for activities. The budgets for networks vary between around 6.000 – 45.000 USD for a 18 months period. The difference is due to the prioritization in the consortium organizations. For instance IIED wished to divide their part of the budget between all 15 CLACC fellows rather than to provide a few fellows with a larger budget.</p> <p>Slide 14: The key requirements and deadlines for networks. In return for the budget for own activities, the networks must deliver on the areas outlined in this slide. These are the standard requirements – the exact way is spelled out in the contract with the network.</p> <p>Slide 15: The network capacity analysis – for further info see the paper <i>“Guidelines for network capacity analysis”</i>.</p> <p>We suggest that networks make the capacity analysis in a participatory process involving its members, assisted by a local external consultant to facilitate the process. For a regional or thematic network with members in many countries - it can be difficult to meet, and you will have to find a way of doing this through electronic communication.</p> <p>Slide 16: Programme Outputs – covering the whole programme when the outputs from each network and from the processes facilitated by Secretariat are added together.</p>
--------------	---

<p>16:30</p>	<p>Questions and discussion</p> <p>Emmanuel Seck CAN WA coordinator: What if there are several networks in the same region - as in WA – should we then include them in the network capacity analysis?</p> <p>Peter: The analysis is a planning tool for each network and a baseline for measuring success and achievements from the resources allocated to the network. So the basic rule is that each network will make its own capacity analysis. However if the network has the ambition of interacting with other networks and find that capacity can be improved from synergy – this could be built into the analysis. Let us discuss the options for the West African networks involved in the programme.</p> <p>George Kasali – CLACC fellow from Zambia: How can we make a network assessment on the small budget which each CLACC fellow will receive.</p> <p>Peter: Maybe each CLACC fellow should not make a network analysis, CLACC can be considered as one network – or the CLACC regional networks can be the considered as the unit for analysis. There are many specific issues like this, also regarding the thematic networks which we need to consider. The principle is that the analysis should make sense as a planning tool – and to measure progress, then we must determine the most appropriate unit for the analysis in each case.</p>
<p>16:45</p>	<p>The country assessment reports and the international synthesis report – proposed outline By Hannah Reid, IIED - International Institute on Environment and Development, IIED.</p> <p>Refer to slides 17 – 23</p> <p>Hannah: I will present our initial thoughts in IIED on how the country assessment reports can be prepared: It is a first try, and we would very much welcome your comments and input on this – in order to take this first outline further.</p> <p>We propose that the country report should first include a mapping of different types of policies and programmes on climate change by government and a variety of donors / actors. After the mapping the step next step will be one or more case studies on selected examples, with a view to present recommendations and learning.</p> <p>The initial thinking is that the process will start through a questionnaire sent out to networks – to be followed up by interviews over the telephone or visits. The regional fellows of the CLACC-network can provide support in the process. In Latin America where there is no CLACC fellows, and here Ibis could play a supportive role</p> <p>Several participants asked how the reports should be prepared in different circumstances.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If there are more actors in one country (for instance Mali or Malawi) – it will make sense to prepare the country assessment in a cooperation between these – and select the organization with most resources to take the lead ▪ Regional networks – cannot make assessment reports to cover all their member countries. One option is to select one or two countries within the region and concentrate on them ▪ For thematic networks the solution can also be to select some countries to serve as examples. Rajah Jarrah representing Accra Caucus told that they had issued a report based on case studies earlier this year, and this model can be followed in this case. ▪ In the country assessment it is obvious that a thematic networks should concentrate on its own thematic expertise. It does not make sense to have a REDD specialised network make case studies on adaptation policies.

	<p>Also the level of ambition was discussed: Hannah mentioned that the questions posed could keep a PhD student busy for years. This is not the intention. The point of departure is that the mapping and assessment should help networks to prioritize their advocacy work. The assessment and the case studies / research should be made with a view to be useful in the advocacy work of the network.</p> <p>The question was also raised: Is the list of policies, programmes and actors in the concept paper was to large and comprehensive?. Hannah answered that it is not necessary to cover all elements in the list in every country assessment. The policy network should include those they find the most relevant for their advocacy priorities.</p> <p>Achala Chandani, CLACC fellow from Bangladesh, found that it would be too heavy a task to cover all what is implemented by CBO's, since this was an immense task. Also Peter raised the issue of the NGO /& CSO support: Should we ask a NGO network to make an assessment of NGO projects? Hannah: We can remove the NGO/CBO implemented projects from the list as a separate element to include. In many cases – however, NGOs are implementing partners / subcontractors for government donors or large NGOs in the final delivery – so they will be included anyway.</p>
17:10	<p>Information strategy for promoting exchange of know-how and experiences between actors in the programme – and outside – by Peter – slides 24 - 26</p> <p>Peter underlined that the Southern Voices programme to support networks should not be a new super-network where all information should be shared between everybody. Nor will it be a joint political platform. The challenge in the information strategy is how to share the information between the networks which is relevant, and avoid the irrelevant. It is a question of filtering information.</p> <p>It is the task of the Secretariat to manage the information tools – the website, the electronic newsletter and a listserver / e-mail list, and hence the secretariat needs to have “correspondents” in the networks – contact persons responsible for identifying which of the networks activities are relevant to share with other networks in Southern Voices. Also Peter requested access to some of the e-mail lists of networks, in order to help him identify stuff which could be relevant to share through the website and the newsletter.</p>
17:25	<p>End of meeting</p> <p>Peter thanked the participants for their contributions, and invited all to join the dinner after the meeting. Raymond suggested that the minutes of the meeting be circulated.</p>
17:30	<p>Group photo: Raymond from INFORSE South Asia suggested that we take a group photo of those attending the meeting – and this was improvised with various pocket cameras.</p>
	<p>BUFFET DINNER AT RESTAURANT AT CANCUN MESSE</p>