

IBRA CONSULT



Review of the first phase of the Southern Voices programme 2011 - 2013

Final report

April 2012

List of Content

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms	iii
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. CONTEXT RELATED TO CLIMATE CHANGE	3
2.1. International negotiations within UNFCCC	3
2.2. Context on adaptation, REDD and sustainable energy	3
2.3. Rio+20 opportunities	4
3. BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANNED PROGRAMME GOALS	5
3.1. Introduction to the programmes objectives	5
4. ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PLANNED PROGRAMME OUTPUTS.....	9
4.1. Output 1: Network capacity analysis reports	9
4.2. Output 2: Capacity building and organisational development	11
5. ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY	26
5.1. General strategy	26
5.2. Selected countries and regions	27
5.3. Core-funding to the networks	27
5.4. Learning and know-how	28
5.5. Capacity building of networks	30
5.6. CAN International and the regions	32
5.7. The Gender dimension	33
5.8. Assessment of the programmes assumptions	34
6. PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE	35
6.1. Programme set-up.....	35
6.2. Remarks from Southern partners.....	35
6.3. Monitoring and reporting.....	36
6.4. Financial status	36
7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	40
7.1. Summary of the Review report's conclusions.....	40
7.2. Conclusions about the eight planed Outputs.....	41
7.3. Conclusions regarding the implementation strategy.....	42
7.4. Recommendations for next phase	43

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

ANACC	Alianza Nacional Cambio Climatico / Nicaragua/Suswatch
AWG-LCA	The Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention
CAN	The Climate Action Network
CANSA	Climate Action Network South Asia
CCAD	Comisión Centroamericana de Ambiente y Desarrollo
CCDF	Climate Change Development Forum
CCNN	Climate Change Network Nepal
CCWG	Climate Change Working Group
CISONECC	Civil Society Network on Climate Change
CLACC	Capacity Strengthening in the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) for Adaptation to Climate Change (network organised by IIED)
CNOD	Comité National des ONG sur la Désertification
Cook Islands Climate Action Network	CICAN
COP	Conferences of the Parties (COP) to international convention
CSD	Commission for Sustainable Development (UN)
CSO	Civil society organisation
DMWG	Disaster Management Working Group
ECOWAS	Economic Commission of West African States
ECSNCC	Ethiopian Civil Society Network on Climate Change
ENDA	Employment Non-Discrimination Act (NGO)
EU	European Union
EWNRA	Ethio-Wetlands and Natural Resources Association
FCPF	The Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
FECOFUN	Federation of Community Forest Users, Nepal
FEMNET	The African Women's Development and Communication Network. Partner to Danish KULU - Women in Development
FfE	Forum for Environment
GCF	Global Certification Forum
GEF	The Global Environment Facility
ICCCAD	International Centre for Climate Change and Development in Bangladesh
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
INFORSE	International Network for Sustainable Energy
Jani	Joint Advocacy Network Initiative
KiriCAN	Kiribati Climate Action Network
KULU	Women in Development (Danish NGO)

LIDEMA	Liga de la Defensa del Medio Ambiente (Bolivia)
MDG	Millennium Development Goals - United Nations
MJUMITA	Community Forest Conservation Network of Tanzania
NAMA	nationally appropriate mitigation actions
NCCN	National Climate Change Network
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NGOF	NGO Forum on Cambodia
NYICC	Young network in Niger
PACJA	Pan African Climate Justice Alliance
PANE	Poverty Action Network Ethiopia
PHE-Ethiopia	Population, Health and Environment-Ethiopia
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
REDD+	REDD, with the addition of conservation, sustainable forest management and enhancement of carbon stocks
RJNCC / AYICC	Niger Youth Network on Climate Change
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SDG	Sustainable development goals (UN)
SICA	Central American Integration System
SUSWATCH-LA	Sustainability Watch Latin America
TFCG	Tanzania Forest Conservation Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNREDD	United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries
WANET-CSD	West African Network on Climate Change and Sustainable Development

1. INTRODUCTION

This Review report is the result of an assessment of the implementation of the Southern Voices programme for 2011-2012. The support provided for the Southern climate policy networks has its objective as *“increasing their capacity for carrying out advocacy and monitoring activities and raising public awareness at national, regional and international levels in order to help implement and develop climate change policies which promote environmental integrity and sustainable development benefiting poor and vulnerable people”*.

The Southern Voices (SV) Capacity Building Programme has been supported by DANIDA through a Consortium composed of four NGOs in the Danish 92 Group (DanChurchAid, IBIS, Sustainable Energy and Care) and two international NGOs (CAN-International and IIED). CARE Denmark is the lead agency. The programme supports more than 20 civil society networks in developing countries.

The first phase of the programme was initiated in January 2011 for a period of 18 months with a grant of DKK 8 million. It was a follow up to the first project that was implemented from Jan 2009 to August 2010 and which was linked to the COP 15 summit. A follow up application will be prepared for the second phase, from mid 2012 until the end of 2013, which will take into account the outcomes of the present Review.

CARE Denmark, as lead agency for the Consortium, commissioned a Review team which, according to the Terms of Reference (see Annex A), has the following objective: *“To assess the achievements and challenges in the first year of the programme, to systematize lessons learned and make recommendations to inform the reflection on and discussion of priorities in the next phase of the programme.”*

The Review team has, in the period between November 2011 and February 2012, assessed the achievements, challenges and lessons learnt from the implementation of the programme. First was the preparation through the reading of relevant documentation. Field work was undertaken with the Team leader, Hans Peter Dejgaard, who visited Nicaragua, Guatemala and Honduras in November 2011. Subsequently, the other consultant, Maggie Okore, conducted one-on-one interviews with close to 30 participants attending the UNFCCC 17th Conference of Parties (COP 17) meeting in Durban. The list of interviewees can be found in Annex B.

In terms of the structure, this report starts with the introduction in Chapter 1 followed by a contextual analysis in Chapter 2 and a brief description of the programme in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 follows, providing the achievements which are structured according to the eight planned outputs. Chapter 5 outlines the experiences gained from applying the implementation strategy as defined in the programme document and Chapter 6 analyses the management of the programme. Finally, Chapter 7 contains a summary of the reports main conclusions and recommendations.

Annex C. provides the Review team’s brief descriptions about each individual network related to Southern Voices, which mainly is built on the interviews carried out in Durban during COP 17.

The present document is a final report that has taken into account the incoming comments to the draft report.

The views and findings expressed in this report are those of the Review team, and do not necessarily reflect those of the members of the Consortium.

The Review team would like to express its their sincere gratitude to the interviewed partners from Asia, Africa and Latin America, as well as the members of the Consortium and the programme coordinator, who contributed valuable responses and participated in the rich discussions during this Review.

2. CONTEXT RELATED TO CLIMATE CHANGE

2.1. International negotiations within UNFCCC

The 15th Conference of the Parties (COP 15) in Copenhagen was not able to deliver an ambitious and legally binding agreement, which was the expectation in the Bali Action Plan agreed within the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). However, COP 16 in Cancun - which followed Copenhagen - made some concrete achievements without resolving the big issues.

COP 17 held in December 2011 in Durban, South Africa, drew about 12,500 participants from governments, the media, civil society organizations, the private sector and UN agencies. In order to get countries like the United States, China and India into the agreements reached in Durban, it was made painfully clear that current mitigation commitments are insufficient to address climate change and keep warming below two degrees Celsius. The first commitment period to the Kyoto Protocol ends in 2012, and Japan, Russia and Canada have refused to join the second commitment period, while the United States has never ratified the protocol.

COP 17 took the disappointing decision that a possible binding agreement will first enter into force by the year 2020 (with the negotiation to be finalised in 2015). Until then emissions cuts will only be based on voluntary commitments.

One of the few commitments made in Durban was the operationalization of the Green Climate Fund (GCF), which is intended to serve as the central long-term financing body for climate action in developing countries. However, it has not been determined where the money for the fund will actually come from, in either the immediate or longer term. The relationship between the GCF, other funding sources and financing for other mechanisms is still unclear (such as REDD+ and nationally appropriate mitigation actions NAMAs).

COP 17 established the new Durban Platform for Cooperative Action, committing all parties to a new negotiating track that aims to establish a global mitigation regime beginning in 2020 and covering all major emitters for the first time.

The insufficient progress in the UNFCCC negotiations underlines the importance of the present programme in the continuation of the CSO/NGO work as constructive watchdogs and facilitators of public pressure on governments to reach results. Nevertheless, the disappointing outcome of COP 17 (and COP 15) implies that CSO networks are considering moving staff resources from the international negotiations into climate change policies and monitoring implementation at regional and national levels.

2.2. Context on adaptation, REDD and sustainable energy

The following is a brief on the situation after COP 17 regarding the three selected themes for the consortium programmes:

- a. Durban resulted in encouraging progress on adaptation with the operationalization of the Adaptation Committee (a key Cancun outcome) and progress on national adaptation programs of action (NAPAs) along with national adaptation plans (NAPs).
- b. The REDD+ issue made progress on financing and technical issues in Durban, which included forest reference levels and safeguarding of information systems. REDD+ financing was a controversial issue under the AWG-LCA negotiations, with countries having difficulty in agreeing on the role of the carbon market. Concerns have been expressed about the rights and the implications for communities and indigenous peoples.
- c. It is expected that the renewable energy/efficiency will get a boost at the coming Rio+20 Summit in June 2012 where it is likely that the final declaration will have reference to the initiative called 'Sustainable energy for all'¹, launched in November 2011 by the UN Secretary General. It has three goals of achieving sustainable energy for all by 2030: i) ensuring universal access to modern energy services, ii) doubling the rate of improvement in energy efficiency and iii) doubling the share of renewable energy in the global energy mix.

It can be recalled that more than 75% of the population in Sub-Saharan Africa do not have access to electricity. The figure is more than 90% in the rural areas, where poor people depend on wood, dung and other biomass fuels. In particular, women have to spend considerable time trying to meet household energy needs.

2.3. Rio+20 opportunities

The analysis above raises the question whether other international processes – apart from UNFCCC negotiations – should be approached in the coming years by CSOs. The coming Rio+20 world summit in June 2012 - on new pathways to sustainable development - is the most obvious to look at as policymakers will be meeting two decades after the first summit at Rio in 1992. The Rio summit had its focus on development, whereas now the conversation is more focused on green growth. Many CSOs are pointing out that while growth has helped reduce poverty, it has not necessarily been good for the eco-system.

Several of the focus areas for Rio+20 are related to climate changes: energy, water, food security and sustainable agriculture, improved resilience and disaster preparedness as well as management of the oceans and fisheries. It will, with the financial crisis, be a priority to connect solutions to the creation of green jobs, youth employment and social inclusion.

The Rio+20 Summit might agree on the elaboration of a set of sustainable development goals (SDGs), or at least for beginning a process to define the goals with a view to subsequently endorsing such goals – possibly as part of the General Assembly-mandated work on a post-2015 development agenda. The SDGs could also become the new basis for redefining, and building on the experience with, the MDGs. Others have suggested that the SDGs could be seen as complementary to the MDGs.

¹ A Vision Statement by Ban Ki-moon, Secretary-General of the United Nations

3. BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANNED PROGRAMME

The programme was planned for a three year period (2011-2013), which has been split into two phases, each one and a half years. Based on the assessment and identified lessons, the present Review aims at providing inputs to possible adjustment of the next one and a half year phase.

3.1. Introduction to the programmes objectives

The Programme is working for the adoption of adequate global climate change agreements at COP 16/COP 17 by governments, in addition to providing an increased focus on the implementation of climate change policies (and finance) in the various developing countries.

The development objective of the programme is: *“The needs, perspectives and positions of civil society organisations and people vulnerable to climate change are adequately advocated for and reflected in a fair, ambitious and binding climate agreement for the period after 2012 adopted by the international community, as well as in the development and implementation of climate change policies and programmes at national, regional and international levels.”*

The programmes **immediate objective** for the period 2011-2013 is: *“Civil society organisations and networks in selected developing countries have through south-south and north-south alliances increased capacity for carrying out advocacy and monitoring activities, and for raising public awareness at national, regional and international levels. This will help implementing and developing climate change policies and programmes, promoting environmental integrity and sustainable development benefitting poor and vulnerable people.”*

These objectives have been supported by a number of contracts with CSO partners in Asia, Africa and Latin America that have carried out the detailed planning in their national networks.

The following **indicators** relate to the immediate objectives at the programme level:

- a) The international synthesis report and the country assessment reports have been widely disseminated and gained the attention of international institutions, national governments and the media, amongst others.
- b) The involved Southern CSO networks have implemented concrete advocacy activities at the national, regional and international levels, including the linkages and experiences from working with CAN international and IIED, amongst others.
- c) 75% of the Southern partner’s networks have made efforts towards strengthening the way their networks function and increase their advocacy capabilities on climate change policies.

The **strategy** for the programme’s implementation was designed with three prioritised themes and three key approaches, as outlined in the table below:

Key approaches: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Advocacy, lobbying and public awareness raising 2. Capacity building and capacity utilization 3. Strengthening know-how within the Southern networks. 	Prioritised themes for regional networking: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Adaptation b. REDD and forestry c. Renewable energy and energy efficiency (low carbon development)
---	--

Types of supported networks:

Some six national networks receive support in the order of around 40.000 dollars for the 18 months period. The regional networks are actually in majority among the partners:

- i) Four CAN regional nodes: CANSA (South Asia), CANWA (West Africa), CAN Latin America and smaller amount for CAN Pacific.
- ii) Sustainability Watch in Central America (through IBIS), which include three national networks in Nicaragua, Guatemala and Bolivia.
- iii) The INFORSE regional networks in South Asia, Eastern and Western Africa.
- iv) Two other thematic networks: The Accra Caucus (on forest and climate change) and 15 fellows organised by IIED with focus on adaptation in Least Developed Countries (CLACC).

Table: Climate Networks Supported through the Southern Voices Programme

Name	Country/Region/Theme	Consortium partner
AFRICA		
Ethiopian Civil Society Network on Climate Change (ECSNCC)	Ethiopia (Capacity assessment)	DanChurchAid
Mjumita – Commity Forestry Network of Tanzania	Tanzania (Capacity assessment)	Care DK
INFORSE (International Forum for Sustainable Energy) East and South Africa	Uganda – covering East and Southern Africa – thematic network (Capacity assessment)	SustainableEnergy
Civil Society Network on Climate Change (CISONECC)	Malawi (Capacity assessment)	DanChurchAid
INFORSE West Africa	West Africa (Senegal) (Capacity assessment)	SustainableEnergy
West African Network on Climate Change and Sustainable Development (WANET-CSD Mali Folkecenter)	West Africa (Mali) (Capacity assessment)	SustainableEnergy
FEMNET Mali	Mali and Africa (Capacity assessment delayed)	KULU – Women in Development
Niger Youth Initiative on Climate Change	Niger (Capacity assessment)	Care DK
CNCOD - Comité National des ONG sur la Désertification	Niger (Capacity assessment)	Care DK
CAN West Africa (Climate Action Network)	West Africa (Capacity assessment)	CAN-International
ASIA		
National Climate Change Network & NGO Forum	Cambodia (capacity not made)	DanChurchAid
NGO Climate Change Working Group (CCWG)	Vietnam (Capacity assessment)	Care DK
CANSA – Climate Action Network South Asia	South Asia (India) (Capacity assessment)	CAN-International
INFORSE South Asia	South Asia (India) (capacity delayed)	SustainableEnergy
LATIN AMERICA		
Sustainability Watch	Central America (Nicaragua)	IBIS

	<i>(Capacity assessment)</i>	
ANACC – Alianza Nacional Cambio Climatico / Suswatch	Nicaragua	IBIS
SusWatch Guatemala	Guatemala	IBIS
CAN Latin America	Regional Latin America <i>(Capacity assessment)</i>	IBIS
PACIFIC		
CAN Micronesia	Federated States of Micronesia	CAN-International
CAN Pacific	Pacific Regional - Replacing CAN-Tuvalu <i>(capacity not made)</i>	CAN-International
THEMATIC		
ACCRA Caucus – thematic network on REDD and Forestry	Global Network on REDD and Forestry <i>(Capacity self-assessment)</i>	Care DK
CLACC – Capacity Strengthening of Least Developed Countries for Adaptation to Climate Change (CLACC) Eastern Africa	Thematic Network on Adaptation – in Africa and South Asia	IIED – International Institute on Environment and Development

Annex C. provides brief descriptions about each individual network related to Southern Voices, which mainly is built on the interviews carried out in Durban during COP 17.

4. ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PLANNED PROGRAMME OUTPUTS

This chapter endeavours to present the progress made by the various networks towards the programme goals. Eight outputs that formed the planned programme are analysed and discussed based on interviews, progress reports, capacity assessment and reports and briefing papers prepared by the networks.

4.1. Output 1: Network capacity analysis reports

Output 1 ‘Network capacity analysis reports’ have been prepared by motivated Southern CSO/NGO networks – through self-assessments and process facilitation by qualified local/regional consultant(s). The reports will provide concrete suggestions and recommendations for strengthening the networks.

Status:

This programme phase has actively promoted the assessment (or facilitation of self-assessment) of the various networks capacity, aiming at improving their organisational/network performance. 11 networks have undertaken the network capacity analysis,² (see table in previous chapter 3) some of them as self-assessments and others with the help of a local consultant.

The SV secretariat supported the networks with guides to carry out country and internal assessments and a reporting format. INFORSE South Asia, among other networks, said that the guides have gone a long way in enhancing the capacity of the networks to understand what is expected of them as coordinators. Others such as CISONICC Malawi said that the guidelines gave them a starting point to undertake the exercise and they now understand the role of their network. Thus the guides were an important assessment tool.

Those that carried out the exercise highly rated it; for example, the Climate Change Working Group from Vietnam described the process as a worthwhile eye opener that has enabled the network to develop one overarching plan for policy advocacy. This was the same case for CISONICC Malawi which has used the findings to develop their strategic plan. The Ethiopian Civil Society network said the exercise enabled them to develop a road map for capacity building, since they understood what capacity gaps existed within the network members. All in all, the networks used the opportunity to reflect on their status and were thereafter able to plan for what gaps they needed to fill so as to be effective in their efforts towards the programme’s goals.

- The **Vietnam** report makes an assessment on the advocacy capacity for the Climate Change Working Group and the Disaster Management Working Group of Viet Nam, where 22

² INFORSE South Asia and FEMNET are delayed, and the following are lacking: Cambodia, INFORSE West Africa, WANET (Mali Folkecenter). Zimbabwe did not have funding to carry out this exercise under the Southern Voice programme, but had done its own voluntary process before the onset of the programme.

member organisations completed a questionnaire, supplemented by a series of interviews. A key recommendation was training of members in effective advocacy tools and techniques.

- In **Cambodia**, two networks are supported through DanChurchaid: an NGO Forum network and National Climate Change Network (NCCN), where the latter has applied for registration. Their dialogue with the government and other stakeholders has underlined the fact that the NGOs themselves prefer to have one voice on climate change.
- The **INFORSE** networks from South East Asia and West African networks decided to focus on a mapping exercise to identify and activate database of their membership in place of the network capacity per se. These networks felt that mapping was an important exercise before they could delve into the details of a future capacity assessment. They wanted to find out, who was still active and thus catch up with their activities in relation to climate change.
- **CAN West Africa** is a network under construction that aims to bring together actors in the African civil society working on the issue of climate change. Indeed, West African economies, mainly agricultural, are weighed down. The information sharing and having a common position of the network's member's stance on climate change are seen as CAN's main asset. A weakness is the exclusive use of English within the network as well as insufficient financial resources for the regional work.
- The **Central America** assessment report provided a good description of the regional SusWatch network. Nevertheless, its relevance and use has been limited by the lack of assessment of their national affiliates. For example, the internal crisis in Solar Foundation in Guatemala is not even mentioned (fortunately resolved later).

Key achievements and indicator:

- Self awareness of networks and capacity building plans initiated
- The indicator for Output 1 has been achieved: *reports from 'network analysis' (and/or self-assessment) of at least 75% of the participating Southern networks (related to the Programme) have been carried out.*

Weaknesses and challenges:

- Significant differences can be observed in the **quality of the network assessment** reports. Some of the reports are well elaborated by local consultants, handling well the participatory process. However, several reports are particularly weak on the organisational analysis, in particular on networks management, structures/decision-making processes, agreed mandates for external representation and accountability mechanisms (refer to page 37 of the programme document). When following up on capacity building in the next phase, special attention will be required in cases where the assessment reports did not have the expected quality.

Conclusion: The network capacity assessment reports revealed that the process was relevant and achieved the intended goal for the 11 networks. They are generally finding the assessments

useful, as they give direction to the network and members. Therefore, the few networks that have not conducted this activity should be encouraged to do so.

4.2. Output 2: Capacity building and organisational development

Output 2. *The Southern CSO/NGO networks have increased their performance, efficiency and accountability through **capacity building and organisational development**, informed by recommendations from the network capacity analysis.*

Capacity is inbuilt into the programme, understood as both technical knowledge and as organisational network capacity.

Content-technical knowledge capacity: Responses from the interviewed network members revealed some level of capacity building on climate change content. The Review noted that some networks, like Climate Action Network South Asia, have been able to build their technical capacity to a high level and are able to produce well researched information for their membership. This could not be said for some networks such as the Tanzania Civil Society Forum which felt that members' knowledge is weak – this same sentiment was echoed by the Zambia Climate Change Network which had only managed to call for one meeting of key stakeholders. These networks still have some ground to cover in regards to building the knowledge capacity of their members.

The Review observed that some networks like the National Committee of NGOs and Desertification Niger have already started addressing the capacity gaps within the membership. However, a number of networks cited budgetary constraints to take the process forward, which would be relevant to consider for the coming programme phase.

Thus this output is still very relevant as networks have a basic understanding of climate change related issues that allows them to initiate processes that will see them effectively advocating and lobbying their respective governments. Also, new members, especially from new practitioners, are being recruited and these need to be introduced to climate change.

The Review team observed various caucuses, monitoring and feedback sessions organised by some of the networks during the Durban conference. Such sessions included, amongst others, the SADC NGOs, PACJA as well as CAN West Africa meetings. It was evident that the capacity of the members had improved considering that a number of networks mentioned during the interviews that before they got support from SV programme, they were not exposed to international processes.

Organisational development:

The Review team questioned the interviewees on the level of participation of network members in network activities. The responses confirmed that members participated, albeit at various levels.

- CAN Latin America has significantly increased its capacity during the last two years. Firstly, its reconstruction committee reversed the weak performance of the previous coordination, and its two general assemblies in 2010 and 2011 confirmed the progress made in terms of the structure, with a functioning coordinator and board in place and increased number of

national members. This was verified in the assessment made in August 2011 where 19 of the 23 member organisations were satisfied with the progress made in the last period.

- A more defined participation structure was noted among the Niger Youth Initiative on Climate Change and CLACC Mali – both mentioned that fellow members are involved in the day-to-day operational running of activities, purposely done to ensure transparency. Secondly, the members are divided into thematic areas that provide fortnightly reports to the network on any activities taking place within their respective thematic areas. This arrangement was also recorded in the Ethiopian Civil Society Network on Climate Change that has elaborated a three-year strategy document of the network.
- CISONICC Malawi mentioned that the members were at the centre of the organisation of activities. These networks reported that this has enabled them to manage with limited funding as the activities are spread among network members. The challenge lay in the fact that commitment by some member organisations was still wanting.
- Reflection on the flow of information revealed that there are gaps between the various networks – for example, Climate Change Working Group in Vietnam said their membership do not have access to Internet. Other networks like the Zimbabwe Climate Change Working Group and Climate Change Working Group of Niger requested for deliberate efforts to be made to enhance the communication within network members through the use of Skype and Web based forums. It can be noted that some networks like CLACC Benin were enabled to set up an Internet system with support from the SV programme.
- The assessment of the **Malawian** network, CISONICC, with 21 national and international NGOs, recommended the development of a strategic plan and the implementation of capacity building activities for the network members. In particular, lack of capacity to analyze issues and advocate among some of the network members was identified.
- **The Ethiopian** Civil Society Network on Climate Change (ECSNCC), with more than 60 CSOs, will have to discuss its future relationship with the Forum for Environment (FfE), one of the founding members that is currently heading and hosting the ‘Secretariat’ of the Network. Furthermore, the capacity building efforts for network member CSOs deserve increased attention so that the CSOs can spur their engagement in practical climate-related projects out on the field.
- The Sustainability Watch network has been further strengthened in Central America. In Nicaragua, the network has been expanded to 30 organisations in the ‘Alianza Nicaraguense ante el Cambio Climático (ANACC)’, which, beyond NGOs, also include trade unions, farmer organisations and universities. In Guatemala, the new management of the NGO network focal point, Foundation Solar, has strengthening the NGO network with taking a more facilitation role. They are also working closely together with the indigenous people’s platform (Mesa Indígena de Cambio Climático). And in Honduras, the SusWatch member Acicafoc is active in the ‘Climate Change Technical Inter-institutional Committee’, which is a forum with approximately 60 institutions from the government, NGOs, the private sector and the academia.

The Review team observed that the field offices of the Danish NGOs (CARE, IBIS and DanChurchaid), e.g. CARE Niger with the two partners on building capacity and advocacy strategy; in Vietnam identifying an experienced consultant for the assessment; as well as assessment in Cambodia and Malawi assisted by DanChurch Aid. IBIS has also followed closely with Sustainability Watch networks in Central America. Although without field offices, IIED is working closely with the CLACC fellows, Sustainable Energy with the Inforce partners and CAN-I with their regional nodes.

Key achievements and indicator:

- Considerable efforts for reaching Output 2 are still lacking, and further work will be needed on this in the next programme phase (*the CSO networks have been strengthened through the implementation of suggestions / recommendations in the 'network analysis' reports – e.g. thematic knowhow, strategic planning, organisational/network development with flow of information, structure, planning, decision-making, volunteer policies, gender, etc.*).
- **Confidence:** The interactions that members have had, has enhanced their understanding and built their confidence to engage on climate change issues. For those who have been collaborating with their governments, that fear has been overcome by approaching the governments as a network than as individuals.
- **Human and Financial Mobilisation:** The funds provided enabled networks to start a process of bringing like-minded organisations to discuss and plan around climate change at national level. In the process, some of the networks were able to pool human and financial resources to initiate joint activities.
- **Increased membership:** Several networks have mobilised more member organisations, resulting in increased number of people interested in climate change issues. This is a positive step for climate change, which previously has not been at the centre of many civil society activities in the South. The networks indicated that they now have active mailing lists of members and continue to expand the membership, which in turn increases their advocacy voice.

Weaknesses and challenges:

- The main challenge, according to the progress reports received in the beginning of February 2012, is that very little is reported on the implementation of the undertaken network assessments (**improvement process**). This remains a key challenge for the coming programme phase.
- **Coordination Support:** The issues of not having sufficient funds to support the coordination of the network activities means the time allocated to the climate change networks compete with many other tasks related to the core mandate of the member organisations.

Conclusion:

This capacity building output number 2 remains relevant for the SV programme where many networks have enhanced their capacity. However, there are some networks which are at their infancy in topic and therefore still need more support in both technical and

organisational networking strengthening. Those that are at a higher level could be strategically utilised to hand-hold and mentor the other network members.

Recommendation no. 1: *There is need for continuation in the next phase of strengthening both technical and organisational networking that can implement the recommendations from the undertaken network assessment reports. Furthermore, more effort is required on analyzing and improving networks management, decision-making processes and agreed mandates for external representation.*

Output 3. *The national/regional networks have adequately prepared and agreed on prioritised advocacy plans (1 or 2 years) related to influencing climate change policies and programmes – preferably collaborating with grassroots/social organisations and indigenous peoples’ organisations on concrete advocacy activities.*

Advocacy plans:

The following definition of advocacy has been applied in the international SV report, “*seeking with, and on behalf of, poor people to address the underlying causes of poverty, bring justice and support good development through influencing the policies and practices of the powerful.*”³

The Accra Caucus for Forests and Climate Change has been very good at approaching COP and Bonn conferences for planning and implementing their advocacy work. They held a training course in May 2011 in Bonn, resulting in detailed planning for COP 17 in Durban. The participants have visibly increased their capacity and knowledge on REDD and advocacy, which also brings the challenges of a gap between the veterans and the newcomers in a network, where the active is spread over Asia, Africa and Latin America.

At the end of COP 17, Accra Caucus outlined priorities until COP 18 at the end of 2012. It could be highlighted from their planning that they have included a number of planned alliances with other actors – such as non member NGO groupings, CSOs, social movements, indigenous peoples, etc.

CISONECC Malawi has managed to develop a road map with members on where they would like to be. This was the same position expressed by CAN South Asia network, which demonstrated a clear direction of where the network is moving.

The network in Vietnam has elaborated an advocacy plan for 2012, which has moved them from being reactionary to being more focussed in their activities. The plan comprises five areas: (i) advocacy for integration of climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction in socio-economic plans as well and sector basis; (ii) advocacy for more finance in adaptation and community based disaster risk management; (iii) more accountability and transparency in humanitarian responses; (iv) natural resource management and (v) participation, rights and voices of vulnerable groups in climate related decisions.

³ Shaw, S. (2011) *Why advocate on climate change?* Tearfund, London

The two networks in Niger, CNCOD and NYICC, have recognized their lack of capacity in terms of strategic and advocacy planning. Activities carried out through the SV program would be their first exposure in such direction. Similar weaknesses are outlined in the assessment of the West-African Climate Action Network, which shows that with the exception of a few organizations such as ENDA, CAN West Africa members are poorly equipped in terms of organization and finance. This makes it difficult to drive dynamic actions of advocacy. The same is reported from INFORSE South Asian members.

Some networks did not have formally written plans but they had good ideas about what they needed to do and how they had got inspiration from the exposure and interaction related to the SV network. The priority for the networks is to influence their governments' position on climate change and have, thus, been preoccupied with trying to get a foothold into their governments' system. Several networks have also acknowledged the need for enhancing evidence based advocacy and the need to collect case studies from their network members.

Key achievements and indicator:

- Advocacy plans have been formulated and discussed in the majority of the networks, thus helping them to implement their follow up activities.
- Training activities on advocacy have been conducted in many networks. However, several networks are still unable to fulfil completely Output 3 (*advocacy plans with priorities have been discussed and agreed within the national/regional CSO network*).

Weaknesses and challenges:

- Several networks have recognized their lack of capacity in terms of strategic and advocacy planning, which seems to be one of the most requested needs expressed by their members.
- The loose nature of some of the networks, their flow of information and decision making structures as well as their funding situation, could be a contributory factor to the networks not having in place formal advocacy plans.

Conclusion:

The Review noted that for those who had developed an advocacy plan, they appreciated the order and prioritisation that such a plan has brought to their work. They suggest that other networks also should be encouraged to develop advocacy plans, where network members have internalised why they are performing the task. This could be achieved through developing a format or guidelines of the advocacy formulation steps and process. The plan will also help networks to get to grips with issues and not feel overwhelmed as they can allocate advocacy tasks among the membership.

Recommendation no. 2: The next phase of the programme should maintain a similar output, where networks will have updated their advocacy plans for 2013 and 2014. The programme could provide support and explain in detail the importance of an advocacy plan to be internalised by network members.

Output 4. *Participating Southern NGO/CSO networks have – according to their advocacy plans – undertaken **lobbying, advocacy and awareness-raising activities**, aimed at influencing the UNFCCC negotiations related to COP16/COP17 as well as national, regional and international institutions involved in implementation and financing.*

Lobbying and advocacy activities: Networks have made considerable efforts to lobby and advocate for various policy positions. In the process of approaching COP16/COP17, they have gained recognition from their respective governments. In some instances, like in South East Asia and the Community Forest Conservation Network of Tanzania, the government negotiation team to the climate talks included representatives from the NGO sector. It was also noted that some networks have made inroads into the regional blocks such as the eighth environmental ministers in Central America (CCAD) and the Economic Commission of West African States (ECOWAS). CISONNECC Malawi provided input into the National Disaster Risk Management policy.

Some of the networks have been successful in lobbying their respective governments to mainstream issues of climate change into existing policies.

- Accra Caucus has continued to be active and effective in UNFCCC advocacy, culminating in a second volume of case studies on the impact of REDD readiness, launched at COP 17 with the title: *“REDD Realities: what are we learning from the past and readiness process?”*. Accra Caucus is recognised as a credible voice on the civil society perspective on REDD.
- An Environmental Pact was elaborated by Mali’s Folkecenter Nyetaa in collaboration with the Forum of CSO in Mali and the umbrella NGO in Mali (SECO-ONG). This pact contains 10 demands of Malian CSO to be discussed with the candidate to the presidential election scheduled for April 2012.
- The Central America’s, Sustainability Watch elaborated position papers for both COP 16 and COP17, which were used for lobbying the regional institutions CCAD and SICA as well as the presidential summits. Their national chapters also did lobbying and public information in their respective countries.
- CLACC network members in Benin, Mali, Mauritania, Zimbabwe, Senegal, Malawi, Kenya, Tanzania, Zambia, South Asia, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Nepal, Bangladesh and Bhutan are members of CAN-I through IIED. As such they have gained immense knowledge about the negotiations as insiders, writing articles in ECO as well as to understand the different negotiation blocks.

The Ethiopian Civil Society network and CLACC Mali have managed to initiate a process of engendering CC issues into the various national policies. In Cambodia, the National Strategy Development Plan resulted in prioritizing climate change issues. CISONNECC Malawi presented a position paper to their government. In some countries, the policies are at the discussion level in parliament. This notwithstanding, the networks have forged ahead. An example is CLACC Bangladesh/International Centre for Climate Change and Development (ICCCAD) that has convinced their government to already implement some of the climate smart initiatives as the policy formulation processing is unfolding.

One of the major determining factors of policy advocacy success has been the receptiveness of the respective governments, meaning that the network members need to build their capacity to understand and navigate around their governments' processes. The Review noted various and diverse strategic approaches that networks have used to try and get their issues across to policy makers. For example, the West African network convinced the contesting candidates to commit themselves to Climate Change issues during the electoral campaign. In Nepal, the network identified the media as an important avenue and thus held a workshop dubbed Linking Media and Climate Change Workshop. After the workshop, they would write articles for the public press and then call on the relevant ministers/policy makers to give comments.

Awareness: Although not financed by the Danish grants, the Review noted that several of the networks have trained *community leaders* and undertaken raising awareness at local level. At the local village level, the training sessions focused on supporting communities to understand the concept of Climate Change adaptation in relation to their context. The community are the source of case studies and they form the constituency voice. Sessions conducted at civil society and government levels zeroed in on bringing the arguments from the village into the national and international discourse. These training sessions can be given credit for grounding networks in the subject area of climate change and for building their skills to appreciate and engage with important stakeholders such as governments and affected communities. Among the examples can be mentioned the work of INFORSE members in Africa and South Asia that are involved in socio-economic projects at the grassroots level.

Key achievements and indicator:

- **Policy engagement and recognition:** Networks have been able to influence different national policies and engage in active dialogue with the delegations representing their governments in the international negotiations. Due to their efforts of mobilising membership from other organisations, the networks have been elevated in many of the participating countries. The Output 4 has been reached to a satisfactory level according to its indicator (*The networks efforts to influence the UNFCCC negotiations – and in particular their own government – for an equitable climate change agreement. Concrete activities carried out toward regional and international institutions, selected according to the networks advocacy plans.*)
- **Public campaign:** The SV support has enabled networks to provide information to the wider public. For example, the NGO network on CC Nepal trained media personnel who are able to flight articles in the mainstream media. CAN South Asia, the Ethiopian Civil Society Network on CC and the Nicaraguan network, among others, have developed policy briefs which they have shared with a wider stakeholder base. Bangladesh produced promotional materials in the local language, thus getting to a wide audience.
- **Linkages:** The SV funds enabled the networks to bring policy makers and local communities together to discuss climate change issues affecting them. The Tanzania Civil Society has successfully developed a platform where the government, donors and the civil society converge. The process has narrowed the theoretical, or somewhat

abstract, explanation of climate change effects and responses to the ordinary peoples' experiences.

- **Case studies:** In an effort to influence policy, SV members have developed and documented case studies, thereby enhancing their countries' knowledge and having good and ready reference material that members can use to put forward their case. An impressive list of case studies can be found in SV's international report (page 3 and 4).⁴

Weaknesses and challenges:

- **Lobby and Advocacy:** Network members such as ENDA Senegal raised the fact that advocacy is a social art and that it is not very common, especially in an African professional environment. This being the case, some of the networks have found it difficult to mobilise and catch up with international processes. The Zambia Climate Change Network expressed that SV support did not provide both the time and adequate financial support to allow for the culture of advocacy to grow and be nurtured. Whilst networks like the Ethiopian Civil Society Network on Climate Change have a history of advocacy, those like CLACC Mauritania and INFORSE South Asia are more of implementers.
- Many interviews and network assessments have pointed to the need for better understanding and handling of **advocacy tools**. Thus, there is need to distinguish and determine the complementary roles that various members can play in a network, and support by the very experienced people to those who are very new to advocacy.

Conclusion: Advocacy activities are the core of the SV programme and, as noted in the above findings, the networks are at different levels. Networks like CISONICC Malawi, CAN South Asia and SusWatch Central America are among those that came to the conference with a position paper, showing that networks have matured. The South Asia representative said "*our members are no longer tourists in such conferences.*" There is therefore need for targeted support to enable those networks that are not yet ready with their policy positions to enhance their activities so that they can engage effectively.

Recommendation no. 3: The programme should prioritise the need for more active people in the networks to know and apply a number of relevant advocacy tools so that they can carry out their advocacy plans for 2013 and 2014. Such efforts could be supported through the development, dissemination and training of advocacy toolkits.

Output 5. Country Assessment Reports have been published by participating Southern NGO/CSO networks with analyses of the performance of their governments in climate negotiations and in planning and implementation of climate change policies and programmes

⁴ Southern Voices on Climate Policy Choices: Analysis of and lessons learned from civil society advocacy on climate change. Hannah Reid, Gifty Ampomah, María Isabel Olazábal Prera, Golam Rabbani and Shepard Zvigadza. November 2011

(including NAPAs and NAMAs, REDD programmes etc.), including assessments of the performance of donor agencies in these fields.

Country assessments: This was one of the main activities identified under the current programme phase because it was critical for the networks to understand their context in relation to Climate Change. This is so that they can advocate for relevant policy issues. Reports on climate change issues have been elaborated in Niger, Ethiopian, Malawi, Cambodia, Vietnam, Nicaragua, Guatemala and Bolivia. However, other networks like Tanzania civil society forum, Zambia Climate Change Network and the Zimbabwe Climate Change Working Group cited budgetary constraints as the reason for not having conducted the exercise.

In addition, many case studies have been elaborated, which can be found in a list in the international SV report (also from other financial sources). This also includes regional networks such as Accra Caucus, INFORSE South Asia, West Africa WANET and CAN nodes in South Asia and Latin America as well as a number of CLACC reports.

Key achievements and indicator:

Some networks now have a good baseline on the country's climate change situation from the assessments, for reference and planning. This baseline will be important for networks to effectively lobby their governments and evaluate if progress can be seen within the coming years. Thus, the Output 5 indicators have been partly achieved (*the Country Assessment Reports have led to network position papers, letters to governments, etc.*).

Weaknesses and challenges:

Several networks will, in the next programme phase, have the challenge of strengthening their documentation for evidence lobbying. And many networks still remain with the work of using these assessment reports for public awareness as expressed in the other indicator (*the published Climate Change assessment reports have received attention from, and been discussed with, line ministries, parliamentarians, business organizations and other stakeholders*).

Conclusion: This Review was not privy to the detailed produced reports and therefore is not able to tell whether they met the expected quality. However, the discussions from the interviews revealed that the information generated has given the networks a starting point. It is thus sound to say that countries where this exercise has not taken place should be encouraged and supported to conduct the same.

Output 6. An international synthesis report *has been be prepared for COP 17, based on the Country Assessment Reports from the participating Southern NGO/CSO networks including a comparison of performances, a general assessment, possible examples of best practises and recommendations.*

The international report was the first joint product from the Southern Voices Programme. More than 20 climate networks and their member organizations have contributed with their experiences of raising awareness on climate change issues and from influencing climate change policies and practices in a wide range of countries – including many of the poorest in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Pacific.

The title of the report is: *"Southern Voices on Climate Policy Choices. Analysis and lessons learned from civil society advocacy on climate change"*. As stated in its foreword:

"...the energy, creativity and passion shown by networks in the South to date is clear from this report. Southern civil society networks need our support and commendation for achievements to date." Saleemul Huq, ICCCAD, Bangladesh.

The draft of SV's international report was launched at COP17 at a well-attended CAN-International/Southern Voices side event and received positive feedback. It is now available for download⁵ and hardcopies will be disseminated in March 2012 in different parts of the world. Furthermore, IIED will make efforts for their distribution using various international mailing lists and websites.

The report was edited by Hannah Reid from IIED in close collaboration with a team of Southern NGO Experts involved in Southern Voices. The Steering Committee requested a format/guide for the analysis and input, which the IIED and the Copenhagen Secretariat submitted to the networks. Many national, regional and thematic networks provided or helped source the material on which Southern Voices international report was based (see page 3-4).

Deadline for inputs was in August 2011; however, the input from Central America was delayed due to problems with translation. Due to the time constraints, it was not possible to involve CLACC fellows in providing as much feedback to the networks as originally foreseen. Nevertheless, the co-authors mentioned in the report that liaison was made with the networks, sourcing material and helping with editing of the synthesis report.

In the view of the Review team, the quality of the report is very good. It is very comprehensive in documenting the civil society actions on climate change advocacy within the many affiliated networks. The report is a good basis for continuing to address the experience among the networks and arguing for greater involvement of the civil society in the South in climate policy. The report also provides a good understanding of the motivation, successes and challenges faced during their advocacy initiatives. It is particular strong on illustrative examples from many developing countries.

Key achievements and indicator:

The programme has, with the international report, successfully achieved its Output 6 according to its indicators (*i) the International Synthesis Report has built on inputs from the various reports from the national/ regional/thematic networks, ii) The report edited, layout, printed and disseminated electronically before the COP 17*). It is at this stage unclear if the third indicator will be reached with the media (*iii) the international report has received coverage in the media and the use of the report for concrete lobbying activities in relation to regional and international institutions*).

Network members confirmed that they had participated by contributing to the content of the report and some submitted real life case studies, which they have also used as evidence for advocacy purposes in their countries. It has generally been appreciated that their inputs have been used in an international report, and they are satisfied with the editorial efforts undertaken by IIED.

⁵ <http://climatecapacity.org/resource-centre/international-report> (November 2011).

Weaknesses and challenges:

- The report seems not to be linked to clear advocacy targets, neither at the national level nor in the international negotiations, which might limit its use among the networks. The material has been very uneven – some countries drew up actual country reports – through consultants, others only submitted case studies. The prepared guiding format was not systematically filled in, which has weakened a methodological approach to synthesise the information across the countries. Time and the process has not permitted to make deeper analyzes and qualitative comparisons to identify best practices.

At the same time, it should be said that it would have been difficult to reach a set of common advocacy targets agreed upon between the 20-30 networks. Networks have their own processes for agreeing to advocacy targets, so it would have implied heavy intra-network consultation and negotiation, which often takes considerable time, could be politically very sensitive and would involve complicated internal 'sign off' procedures. For the Review, it seems well justified with this pragmatic approach for making the international report.

- The time schedule for the production of the report was very tight, so it was difficult to approach the momentum at COP 17 for a wider distribution of the report. There still remains an important task of wider distribution of the report on international mailing lists, websites as well as approaching various international events this year, e.g. the Sixth CBA conference in Hanoi in April, the UNFCCC meeting in May in Bonn, the Rio+20 Summit and COP18 in Qatar in December 2012.

Conclusion: The international report has a very good quality and been able to synthesise the inputs from more than 20 climate networks affiliated to Southern Voices. The challenge will be the dissemination and use of the report.

Table: Southern Voices international report received inputs from the following national, regional and thematic networks:

- The Accra Caucus on Forests and Climate Change
- Alianza Nicaraguense ante el Cambio Climatico (ANACC), Nicaragua
- Capacity building in the Least Developed Countries on Adaptation to Climate Change (CLACC)
- Civil Society Network for Climate Change and REDD (RSC-REDD), Central African Republic
- Civil Society Network on Climate Change (CISONECC), Malawi
- Climate Action Network (CAN) International, regional hubs and thematic groups
- Climate Change Development Forum (CCDF), Bangladesh
- Climate Change Network Nepal (CCNN)
- Climate Change Working Group (CCWG), Viet Nam
- Climate Change Working Group (CCWG), Zimbabwe
- Community Forest Conservation Network of Tanzania (MJUMITA)
- Cook Islands Climate Action Network (CICAN)
- Disaster Management Working Group (DMWG), Viet Nam
- Ethiopian Civil Society Network on Climate Change (ECSNCC)
- Ethio-Wetlands and Natural Resources Association (EWNRA), Ethiopia
- Federation of Community Forest Users, Nepal (FECOFUN)
- Forest Watch Ghana
- Forum for Environment (FfE), Ethiopia
- Grupo de Financiamiento en México

- International Network For sustainable Energy (INFORSE) including regional networks in South Asia and Africa
- Joint Advocacy Network Initiative (JANI), Viet Nam
- Kiribati Climate Action Network (KiriCAN)
- Liga de la Defensa del Medio Ambiente (LIDEMA), Bolivia
- National Climate Change Network (NCCN), Cambodia
- National Committee of NGOs on Desertification (CNCOD), Niger
- Niger Youth Network on Climate Change (RJNCC / AYICC)
- NGO Forum on Cambodia (NGOF)
- Papua New Guinea Eco Forestry Forum
- Population, Health and Environment-Ethiopia (PHE-Ethiopia)
- Poverty Action Network Ethiopia (PANE)
- Reso Climat Mali
- Sustainability Watch Latin America (SUSWATCH-LA)
- Tanzania Forest Conservation Group (TFCG)
- West African Network on Climate Change and Sustainable Development (WANET-CSD)
- Zimbabwe Climate Change Youth Network.

Output 7. *The international Consortium has provided the Southern networks **with know-how, advice, training** and facilitated **exchange of experiences** that responds to the needs of the various national and regional NGO/CSO networks involved in the Programme.*

The Programme document (August 2010) stated that *“a particular challenge for the Steering Committee and the programme co-ordinator will be to get the Programme know-how and synergy mechanisms functioning. This will be needed to stimulate connections between the supply side (of know-how) and the demand side (from Southern partner networks).”*

The Review noted that learning has been taking place within the respective networks e.g. within the ACCRA Caucus or within the Zimbabwe Climate Change Working Group, but cross network learning has been limited, prompting CLACC Bangladesh and the National Committee of NGOs and Desertification, Niger to identify this as one of the key issues for the next phase of the programme.

However, the cross-learning turned out to be a bit difficult to implement during the current phase. For getting a better understanding, the Review elaborated a questionnaire to the networks, where the replies are further analysed in the next chapter 5.

The following are some concrete examples of exchange among the SV members:

- The internal Southern Voice meeting in Durban was attended by almost 50 participants, which provided useful discussion and ideas for the next phase of the current programme (minutes were produced). A meeting was also held with SV members in Bonn in June 2011. However, it is not easy to get people together at the UNFCCC conferences where people are very busy in an intensive setting.
- The Zimbabwe partner (ZERO) collaborated with the South African CSO (Indigo) to organise the Southern African Regional Strategic Advocacy Meeting in Johannesburg to strengthen coordination of advocacy of regional networks in the build up to COP17.

- CAN-International organised a Pre-COP workshop in Addis Ababa, in October 2011, where fifteen members from Western and Central Africa were able to benefit from fruitful discussions together with CARE's Adaptation Learning Programme. CAN South Asia also organized a general assembly in Nepal, where over 30 members participated, including INFORSE in the same region.

Reporting formats: The Copenhagen based secretariat provided guidelines on report writing, though this was thought to be too tedious. The reporting guide has since been changed and, hopefully, the organisations will find it useful.

Funding Information and linkages: The networks regarded the SV secretariat highly for its efforts to provide information on other funding possibilities. During the COP 17, the secretariat went a notch higher by organising a meeting with UNDP GEF for network members. During the meeting, members were able to follow up on their respective country proposals and clarify any outstanding issues. The meeting also crafted suggestions for the way forward.

Networking/participation: SV programme has facilitated some networks to participate in international climate change processes. This has exposed members to such processes in addition to continuously building their confidence levels to participate "on the spot". Again, this activity has increased the voice and capacity of the SV members in the climate change agenda.

Key achievements and indicator:

SV networks have been exposed and are actively participating in international climate change negotiations, which indicates that the SV programme has mobilised a good base of networks from different countries to work towards its objectives. The results respond partly to the defined indicators: *i) Southern national and regional NGO/CSO networks (and network members) benefit from sharing of experiences, know-how and good practices on climate change issues, and ii) Southern networks have benefited from experiences from CAN international, IIED, among others.*

Weaknesses and challenges:

This has been recognised by many as probably one of the weakest points during the current phase, including members of the programme's steering committee. Neither has it worked as expected for the technical and professional knowledge sharing on two of the three themes for regional networking: i) adaptation and ii) renewable energy and energy efficiency. This has worked better within the Accra Caucus on REDD, thanks to its internal dynamics.

Fortunately, as reflected in the coming chapter in this report, many discussions and ideas are on the table for improving this part of the programme.

The funds allocated for the so-called "demand-driven capacity building" did not get requests for advisory and consultancies and for this reason, these resources were transferred into 8 mini-grants (USD 5000 each) for advocacy of network initiatives.

Conclusion: Interviewees said to this Review that they had learnt from other partners in Southern Voices and have appreciated the inputs from the SV secretariat. Nevertheless, the programme has during its first year had difficulties to deliver on this output on promoting know-how and exchange of experiences. Many interviewees expressed the opinion that it is

highly relevant to strengthen SV's effort, as there are many needs among the involved national and regional NGO/CSO networks.

The capacity building has taken various approaches, ranging from learning by doing the assessments and case studies to holding formal awareness workshops, interactions among members and sharing of information directly from secretariat. However, it was clear that network members requested for the regional learning to be enhanced and they requested for more physical contact for exchange and learning between countries – beyond the emails. Furthermore, they called for the improvement of possibilities for approaching a web-based learning platform.

As it will be discussed further in Chapter 5, the next programme phase should maintain a similar output, and find ways to reinforce its implementation through different learning platforms and training efforts.

Output 8. *A web-based learning platform (including website, mailing lists and regular newsletters) will be established by the programme to share information, best practices and lessons learnt from the national, regional and thematic NGO/CSO networks.*

Content information: Organisations that received the two SV newsletters so far from the Copenhagen found them informative. The Review team noted that the organisations that have contributed to the newsletter, like Zimbabwe CCWG and CISONICC Malawi, and have had their articles published, seem to appreciate it more than those whose submitted articles that have not yet been published- such as INFORSE South Asia – or those who have not made any contributions. The other information shared directly by the secretariat was appreciated though in some instances, like the case of Tanzania Networks, the networks seemed overwhelmed with the communication from the secretariat.

Regarding the newsletter, the English speaking networks seemed to have utilised this information more and have shared it with their membership compared to the Francophone West African networks which cited the language barrier as the main reason for not sharing the newsletter with their membership.

Information sharing Web platform: The secretariat has developed a website <http://climatecapacity.org> where information is available for members. Unfortunately, the study recorded very low usage of the website. CAN Latin America and CAN South Asia have used the website and plan to link it to their own organisations' websites. WANET-CSD has also visited the site for information. Besides CCWG Vietnam and Benin who cited issues related to access to the internet, the rest did not seem to have any sound reason why they did not utilise the website. On the other hand, CCWG Zimbabwe has developed its own website and thus formed a platform for sharing its information.

Key achievements and indicator:

The programme has met the planned indicators: i) The web page climatecapacity.org is functioning with regular updates, ii) regular use of the various mailing lists and international newsletters. Nevertheless, these electronic information systems have had limited use by people in the Southern networks.

Conclusion: The information sharing website platform that was formed by the SV secretariat has experienced *low* utilisation among network members. Network members have to be encouraged to appreciate that this platform is a cost effective method for inter-regional learning – taking into account that regional meetings are very expensive to organise. It will be important for the secretariat to make the learning more inclusive and interactive; this may encourage networks to use the same, since their articles/information will be uploaded. Networks should also be encouraged to document and submit their articles for uploading and that may encourage them to visit the site.

Recommendation no. 4: It is suggested to delegate most of the work with the *web-based learning platform (website, mailing lists, newsletters etc.)* to 2-3 partner NGOs in Africa and Latin America (to be handled in English and partly translated into French and Spanish).

5. ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

This chapter focuses on the experiences from applying the implementation strategy defined in the programme document. It includes the selection of countries, core-funding of networks, learning and know-how, capacity-building, the gender dimension and the programme's assumptions.

5.1. *General strategy*

The many results summarised in the previous chapter confirms the general strategy, where the programme focuses on channelling financial resources and know-how, aimed at strengthening civil society networks in influencing national, regional and international forums/institutions regarding climate change negotiations and actions. Evidence from the findings confirm that it would be relevant to maintain the three key focus areas: i) advocacy and public awareness, ii) organizational and network capacity building and utilisation of Southern networks, and iii) strengthening know-how within the Southern networks in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Pacific. The present Review suggests some possible improvements to these areas.

The philosophy is to support existing networks – not to create new ones. Further, the intention is not to establish a new super-network, let alone a common political platform, but to support and strengthen the advocacy work of a wide range of climate networks and promote mutual learning of experiences as well as cooperation and interchange, where networks find it relevant.

The programme comprises a number of strategically placed partnerships between Danish/international NGOs and Southern networks. This is crucial in providing 'added value' to the approach of the Danish NGOs' longstanding presence in many of the Southern countries involved. The programme contributes to the strengthening of CSO/NGO networks and their advocacy, their capacity to act as constructive watchdogs and facilitators of public pressure on governments to carry out measures related to climate change at the national, regional and international levels.

During the design of the programme, it was discussed whether to support a smaller number of networks with more resources or a larger number with a modest grant for each network (average around DKK 100.000 per year). Some interviews carried out during COP 17 in Durban indicated the challenge of insufficient resources for some networks while others like Malawi and Ethiopia managed to be well funded. Where more than 30 countries are engaged through regional networks, the number of national networks with more interventions, supported through Danish field offices, is limited to 10 countries. Another explanation for the not meeting the expectations for funding is that some networks members have not fully understood that this SV Programme is for policy lobbying and advocacy – and not providing funds for climate change projects or for local community work.

5.2. Selected countries and regions

The programme document defined seven criteria for selecting and prioritising among Southern networks, those that have turned out to be motivated and committed in participating in the programme. However, one of the criteria, the gross national income (GNI) which should be less than USD 2.570 per capita according to Danida's limitation for development aid, has resulted in some limitations in the programme's work

The limitation was first felt when the Danish 92 Groups, since the beginning of the project before COP 17 back in 2009, wanted to strengthen the bridges (alliances) between civil society groups in the developing countries and CAN International – the latter being a unique and influential international umbrella network where the present programme intends to strengthen “the Southern voices” in the setup with some of the strongest international NGOs involved.

A concrete example is the CAN member networks in the regional nodes in Latin America and the Pacific, in which many are middle-income countries. At the same time, these countries, in general, play an important role in the UNFCCC negotiations. In the case of CAN Latin America, the alliance with Sustainability Watch in Central America and Bolivia has implied that NGO networks are on board from Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Venezuela, Paraguay, Mexico, Peru and Brazil. At the recent general assembly, Brazilian Vitae Civilis was elected to represent CAN Latin America in the Board of CAN international. In the case of the Pacific, resource constraints have not made it possible to bring together the members to strengthen their joint work and enhance their learning and sharing experiences.

The Danish government has separated its so-called annual “climate budget” into two sub-budgets: half of the 500 million DKK is part of Danida's poverty orientated development budget and the other half is part of the global frame budget that is allowed to work in middle-income countries.

Recommendation no. 5: To strengthen the bridges (alliances) between the civil society groups in developing countries and CAN International, it is suggested that the programme applies to the Danish government for additional financial resources that would allow for certain activities to be undertaken in the Pacific, Latin America and other middle income countries from 2013 within the framework of CAN international.

5.3. Core-funding to the networks

The majority of the networks are receiving support from two or more donors. Therefore, it is disappointing to observe how minimal the international NGOs are applying the aid effectiveness agenda with its principles on ownership, alignment and harmonisation, which recently was reconfirmed at the High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in December 2011 in Busan with clear references to civil society assistance.

The integration of the donors' planning and monitoring systems into the partner networks' own systems has been weak as project agreements and progress reports are prepared exclusively for each donor. This increases the workload and takes away valuable time for implementation. The Consortium programme would be flexible to core-funding as part of further harmonisation

with other donors, preferably based on strengthening the networks own planning/monitoring/evaluation systems. This could also provide more focus on the downward accountability to the networks' constituencies.

Recommendation no. 6: The Consortium members should step up harmonisation efforts with other international NGOs/agencies on shared planning, monitoring and reporting. This could work alongside the core-funding to each network, based on their strategic plans, governance structures, annual work plans and reports written for their own annual assemblies. A greater part of the dialogue should move from activity implementation level to the strategic level, where it may be useful if the network convenes an annual meeting/teleconference for all its donors.

5.4. Learning and know-how

Many examples of advocacy work have been undertaken during the implementation of the on-going programme phase as mentioned in the previous chapter. Nevertheless, limited capacity of the network members is a barrier to advocacy work according to many of the networks' assessments and progress reports. As explained in the previous chapter under Output 3, some of the networks have not even made a prioritised advocacy plan. It has also been observed under Output 5 that the networks' assessment reports of climate change have been used less for advocacy, as expected. Neither has the current phase met the expectation on knowledge sharing about the three prioritised themes of Adaptation, REDD/forestry and renewable energy/energy efficiency.

It has been difficult to live up to the intention expressed in the programme document: *"Focus on strengthening know-how within the Southern networks – brokering knowledge and facilitating linkages on selected themes: adaptation, REDD, renewable energy/ energy efficiency and gender. The programme will provide and facilitate the provision of know-how, advisory services, and opportunities to exchange experiences and receive training that responds to the needs of the various national and regional NGO/CSO networks involved."*

In order to get a better understanding of this weakness in the programme, the Review consultant submitted, together with the programme coordinator, a questionnaire to be filled out by Southern partner networks. The responses are a clear indication of the interest for more learning and exchange of experiences in the coming phase and, in fact, within all the mentioned issues (as indicated in the rating of priorities in the table below).

Thematic areas for learning on advocacy	Sum	Tools	Sum
Adaptation	30	Advocacy to decision makers	29
Disaster Risk Reduction	26	Fund Raising	28
Energy / Mitigation	24	Awareness raising mobilisation	27

REDD and REDDiness	21	Monitoring policies and donors	25
		Network and Organisational development	23
		Media, campaigning	19

Another explanation for the limited success with knowledge sharing could be that networks are already affiliated to other networks, providing relevant information. The Cambodia network points to their membership of Adaptation Knowledge Platform (AKP) and Asia Pacific Adaptation Network (APAN). Nevertheless, they still request for more training and exchange of experiences within the framework of good practices and lessons learnt on climate change advocacy, adaptation and REDD+.

CAN West Africa specifically wished to learn from Guatemalan network on how the latter organized civil society participation in the National Roundtable on Climate Change in Guatemala. They also want to learn about low-carbon development in South Asia.

The next phase could probably look at experiences from the CLACC fellows based in 15 different vulnerable countries, which is very good for the COP negotiators and contacts with policy makers, in terms of sharing lessons learnt from in-country NGO networks and grassroots communities . Although the networks are also sharing experiences with advocacy tools, , they nevertheless requested for more sharing on the specific application of tools within specific climate change issues (e.g. from INFORSE partners on sustainable energy).

The December 1st internal meeting of Southern Voices at COP17 in Durban served as a valuable input into this Review, where the main focus was on the question of how to strengthen learning and exchange of experiences between networks in the next phase of the SV programme. The following ideas were presented at the meeting as well as in the many conversation sessions during the Review process:

- The need for providing access to toolkits to guide lobbying and advocacy
- Developing a web-based learning platform with 'online' resource library toolkit of knowledge products, step by step manuals, overheads for training and some examples. The online toolkit should also contain materials in French and Spanish.
- Publishing the lessons learnt in a report at the end of the coming programme phase: A Climate Change Advocacy Toolbox – based on experiences from Southern Voices networks.
- Training on fund raising and access to guidelines on proposal formulation, aimed at achieving better network financing.
- Consider using training programmes on adaptation conducted by ICCCAD (International Centre for Climate Change and Development), which is located in Bangladesh.
- Setting aside a separate budget line for this, allowing inter alia for face-to-face meetings of the different networks in the programme. Furthermore, part-time staff could be paid

for Southern NGOs appointed to lead this effort within five areas: Network capacity building, advocacy tools, adaptation, REDD/forestry and renewable energy/energy efficiency.

The demand for tools and training on climate change and climate change advocacy in the South is growing fast; Southern Voices is well placed to meet some of this demand with its access to extensive knowledge on the prioritised technical themes and on how to development networking at the organisational level.

It is suggested that the programme coordinator takes the lead in further developing and detailing these ideas into a specific strategy/action plan, aimed at increased emphasis on learning, knowledge sharing and training activities that cut across networks in the SV programme.

The high airfares make it very costly to arrange regional workshops. Consequently, in the view of the Review team, it is very important to be consistent in enhancing a learning culture, where web-based tools are integrated into the activities such as training courses, regional workshops, etc. In fact, NGOs that are active on climate issues are getting many more travels paid than those involved with development issues. It is therefore important to promote a culture where people get better at utilization of websites. It can also be mentioned that sending a qualified person to conduct training in the countries is much cheaper than getting 20 participants together for a regional workshop.

Recommendation no. 7: A specific strategy/action plan should be developed, aimed at increased emphasis on learning, knowledge sharing, and training activities that cut across networks in the SV programme. It could include regional training activities with the assumption that it is promoting a learning culture of using web-based tools and obtaining better skills for accessing international knowledge.

5.5. Capacity building of networks

The network assessments were seen as the first step in capacity building. However, the recommendations for follow-up, as expressed in the reports, were found not to be clear. This aspect will therefore require further dialogue with the networks on how to put in place an adequate process action plan for improving the networks, which often could benefit from the attachment of qualified local facilitators with experiences in managing different tools for organisational/network strengthening. The exact method will be determined by motivation and needs.

The programme document for the current phase emphasised that capacity building goes beyond a training approach with 1-2 day courses. Capacity development refers to the approaches, strategies and methodologies to improve performance at the individual,

organizational and network levels to carry out functions and achieve their development objectives over time.⁶

This definition is mentioned as the term 'capacity building' in the progress reports from the partners are used for everything, including when people meet for 2-3 hours. There seems to be a limited understanding of what capacity development is as a professional term.

The network assessments have had, in several cases, limitations in analysing the network organizational functions with management, structures, information flow, decision-making by internal democratic structures and membership, accountability mechanisms and legitimacy. This is a challenge for the programme as the legitimacy and accountability of civil society organisations will probably be increasingly questioned in the years to come.

It is obvious to explore further the partnership with Danish NGOs, which field offices have worked extensively on capacity building, supported by high levels of trust. An advantage is that this programme often counts on complementary interventions within existing programmes of CARE, DanChurchAid and IBIS.

Quoting from the network capacity analysis of INFORSE East Africa: *"Hence as part of the planned capacity building activities and the SVP or future planned interventions, it can act as a starting point for engaging more members in Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania and Burundi by seeking more ideas on membership, structure and governance, relationship to other networks, legitimacy for advocacy, information and communication work, as well as capacity building."*

This observation underlines the linkage between effective advocacy and the need for good network governance structures and the legitimacy for advocacy. The increased profile of CSOs in the media and towards the political system is increasingly leading to questions about the legitimacy of NGOs to speak on behalf of people. In particular towards organisations with limited constituency, where the majority of the network members are urban NGOs which often have limited membership.

A way forward for increased accountability could be for further efforts to be put towards bridging the gap between organisations working in the local communities. It could also be through alliances with social organisations that represent, for instance, farmers, the youth, trade unions, etc.

Another aspect is the way that the networks are represented at the many international conferences. It is positive to observe many networks' providing position papers for COP 16 and COP 17. Nevertheless, it can also be noticed that participants are often travelling to events without having prior agreed mandate among the member organisations – and also failing to circulate a brief report after the event.

⁶ Source Publication: OECD, 2006, DAC Guidelines and Reference Series Applying Strategic Environmental Assessment: Good Practice Guidance for Development Co-operation, OECD, Paris.

The Review team noticed the very high rating of the two days training course on good practices in NGO work that IBIS and SusWatch organized last year for 19 participants from the networks in Central America. Attached to the course was a good training manual.

Finally, the efforts for strengthening the networks should take into account the fact that many members prioritise their own work over network engagement, even though this programme was designed to provide certain compensation (part-time facilitator) for promoting network activities. Resources are constraints and, often, finding adequate human resources to commit time for network development can be challenging. The question is, of course, how to make each network more important for people in the member organisations.

Recommendation no. 8: Each network could consider developing a simple Process Action Plan for Improvements of the network which, beyond the recommendations in the network assessment report, could also include network governance, increased accountability mechanisms and legitimacy and external representation. The networks should be offered the possibility to count on an experienced consultant to follow up, facilitate and support processes that strengthen the networks (the programme could have at least one part-time facilitator in each region).

5.6. CAN International and the regions

A unique feature with this programme is the close collaboration with the influential CAN international structure, which over the years has practically demonstrated to Southern CSOs how a structured civil society voice can obtain much more attention from the official negotiations and the international media.

Most Southern Voices network members are also members of CAN, participating in the CAN meetings during the COP conferences. These meetings act as conduits for sharing intelligence on the state of negotiations as well as for capacity building. A number of SV network members are present in the CAN strategy and daily meetings. What is disappointing, however, is the relatively few Southern Voices members active in the CAN debates. One reason is that Northern participants are not providing adequate “space” for their Southern colleagues. However, there must also be other reasons, which it would be relevant for CAN to explore further.

The picture is much better in working groups like Adaptation, Finance, REDD, etc. The scenario is similar with CAN’s regional networks (called regional nodes) such as CAN Latin America, CANWEST Africa, CAN South Africa and CAN Pacific. The best functioning network can be observed in South Asia, where the regional network was already well established and with experienced people before the start of the Danish programme. In the course of the last 3 years, CAN Latin America has also developed considerably. Its members have contributed significantly to the reconstruction of the regional node with the support from the CAN international secretariat, the Nicaraguan Centro Humboldt and other Danish partners in Bolivia and Central America. Nowadays, many networks in the region see CAN Latin America playing a leading role among civil society groups on climate change issues.

It has been more difficult to make the linkages with CAN regional nodes in Africa, which are much weaker. Challenges that have come from African networks include the assertion that CAN International has not been able to represent Africa adequately. This resulted in the formation of the platform called Pan African Climate Justice Alliance (PACJA), where many SV participating networks are active. In some cases African NGOS have joined both CAN-I and PACJA (such as ECSNCC (Ethiopia), and ENDA (Senegal). This point to a possible strategic alliance between them, which has the necessary room for divergent views on market mechanisms and other issues.

Where the programme probably could focus most in the next phase is West Africa. CAN West Africa has been weak in its articulation in the sub region, in the relationship with its own members as well as with other networks like FEMNET, INFORSE West Africa and Western Africa's WANET-CSD Mali Folkecenter. And not least with the francophone RAC France⁷ regional network, where many CAN West Africa members are participating. Additional funds to West Africa will not solve the problems; hence this should be accompanied by commitment and willingness of the various regional networks to coordinate – and not getting involved in too many networks that only exhausts energy.

In Southern Africa as a sub-region, the Review team observed a lack of knowledge of CAN International's existence and the regional node is not functioning.

Recommendation no. 9: A regional mapping study is proposed in West Africa that can outline existing potentials and suggestions for improving the coordination between the various regional civil society networks on climate change. Increased support could be considered in the next phase for carrying out the study's recommendations.

5.7. The Gender dimension

Among the progress reports received in February 2012, only one has any reference to gender activity. This is the Ethiopian network that, supported by a mini-grant, reviewed the gender sensitiveness of the existing policies, strategies and programmes of the government and development partners in Ethiopia with respect to climate change.

The Review recalls that gender is considered a key issue in climate change, particularly regarding the use of natural resources, water and land. Increased equality between women and men in gaining access to natural resources is essential in order to improve food security and livelihoods. Consequently, it is proposed that the national networks/platforms attempt to develop an approach to integrate a gender dimension in their climate change work.

It is stated in the programme document that the Danish/international NGOs are expected to undertake dialogue with their partners on how to operationalise the gender dimension in their day-to-day work. This includes spreading the knowledge about existing gender analysis

⁷ A network organised by Climate Action Network France (RAC-F), which is a CAN part that includes the French speaking organisations and country.

methods and tools such as the IUCN & GGCA Gender and Climate Change training manual. Furthermore, the participation of the African women network, FEMNET⁸, could be considered.

Recommendation no. 10: The gender perspectives could be more integrated as part of the implementation of the programme, including how the participating networks can get to know methods and experiences of putting the gender dimension into their work.

5.8. Assessment of the programmes assumptions

The programme document defined four assumptions (and no risks) for the achievement of the planned objectives in the Logical Framework. The Review team confirms that all four have been met that according to the programme document are:

- The member organisations (and their staff and members) will assign priority and human resources to work in the national/regional networks/platforms.
- The Programme is rather ambitious in trying to support such a vast number of networks in three continents of the world. Well-functioning partnership between Southern networks and their Danish/international partners (several with field offices) is considered essential to minimising this risk.
- The focal point organisations (handling the networks administratively) have sufficient financial and administrative capacity to ensure adequate management of Project-supported activities (the majority of the focal points are already known by the consortium's Danish/international NGOs).
- The present programme is assumed to be complementary to a wide range of existing partnerships and projects, in which Danish/international NGOs are engaged (including efforts for increasingly mainstreaming climate change into their country programmes).

The Programme has been planned ambitious; nevertheless, it's impressive to see the amount of work invested in the realisation of this programme, beyond what is paid for.

⁸ FEMNET is part of the programme through due to delays with Danish KULU; a contract was first made in December 2011.

6. PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE

6.1. Programme set-up

This chapter focuses on the management of the programme, where an international consortium composed of CARE Denmark, DanChurchAid, IBIS, Sustainable energy, IIED and CAN International is responsible for the Programme. CARE Denmark has been appointed the 'lead agency' for the contract with Danida.

The consortium partners have, through contracts, delegated the day-to-day execution responsibility to their respective Southern partners.⁹ In this respect, the Project has benefited from the existing management and administrative set-ups of the international NGOs, which in the case of CARE Denmark, DanChurchAid and IBIS also include field offices placed close to many of the network partners in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

It seems that the Consortium's Steering Committee is functioning well. It works through Skype meetings with members located in Nepal (CAN), Argentina (IIED) and Guatemala (IBIS), in addition to the staff in the Danish NGOs in Copenhagen. The meetings are well prepared and the committee generally draws on a very good service from the programme coordinator who is based in CARE Denmark.

With so many actors, this programme could not function without a full time coordinator, who is the only person with a solid overview of the many documents, detailed budgets, progress reporting, network assessments, inputs for the international report, etc. Located in Copenhagen, the coordinator draws on CARE Denmark's strong administrative systems.

In terms of overheads, the programme is not attractive for the consortium members. The participating organisations are probably putting considerable work into handling the many contracts with an average small amount of money. This situation is clearly worsened by the fact that the Danish MFA only approved the first phase – one and a half years – and not the full three year programme period. It takes time to prepare and finalise contracts with the many Southern networks.

6.2. Remarks from Southern partners

The SV secretariat supported the networks with guides to carry out the work, including for the network assessment, reporting format, information on other funding possibilities. Many interviewees said that the guides have helped the network facilitators to understand what is expected of them. Thus the communication from the programme coordinator has been appreciated a lot, though in some cases, the networks seemed overwhelmed with the communication from the secretariat. Again, this goes to show the fact that little time is paid to the facilitators/coordinators in the Southern networks. The limitations of the total DKK 8 million

⁹ The only exception is Accra Caucus without any contract, as they are getting their costs reimbursed at CARE offices in Tanzania, Ghana, Niger and Vietnam.

are felt in terms of the rather subdued support to each network (on average DKK 100.000 per year, with considerable differences).

In some networks, the current arrangement of having communication going through the consortium partner was not as smooth and as real time as would be expected. It was noted that in some instances, the information was delayed at the consortium partner level. The Review further observed that the difference in communication was largely dependent on the individual personality at the consortium level. However, some of the networks reported having smooth and real time communication.

Some of the networks¹⁰ told the Review team, that they received their first transfer four months before COP 17 and it therefore was too early for them to effectively take stock of the results of the support.

6.3. Monitoring and reporting

The Consortium has done well in the field of monitoring and reporting, which has the advantage of building on the existing monitoring system among the Danish/international NGOs. The progress reports contain valuable information on the situation and progress made in the specific sub-projects with the various network partners. The reports also include information regarding constraints and challenges.

As illustrated in chapter 4, with the many examples from networks in more than 20 countries, it is obviously difficult to consolidate the results of such programmes. Particularly due to the Danish support which is aligned to the networks own strategies and work plans, which has implied good ownership but with more difficulties in measuring the aggregated results of the entire programme. Furthermore, it would require a lot of resources to measure the effects of the advocacy and capacity building interventions.

6.4. Financial status

This Review is based on financial reports received for 2011, where a preliminary version of the financial status has been prepared by the programme coordinator.

After two of three semesters of the programme, one would expect most budget lines to have spent around two thirds or 66% of the budget. However, on some budget-lines expenses are less than expected. Key observations are the following:

- a) The consumption of networks is 47% of the budget, on average – but with large variations, from the CAN Latin America who have spent 79% of the budget to CAN's support to Southern Nodes where only 40% of the budget has been spent.
- b) The numbers reflect various realities: the CAN support to networks in the Pacific has not yet taken off. DCA has not yet received the financial report from the networks supported in Cambodia, etc.

¹⁰ WANET, INFORSE West Africa and FEMNET.

- c) Some financial reports cover only the expenses by networks, and not the costs of Danish NGO country offices for supporting the networks.
- d) Reasons for slower implementation the first year may include the following:
 - First of all, it takes time to initiate a new phase of the programme (contracts, plans, etc.)
 - Grants received from many other sources (Malawi, Ethiopia, CANSA)
 - Some networks may not have prepared detailed plans / projects for spending the grant – since the secretariat did not ask for it prior to the approval in 2010. In the new phase, the Review team suggests asking networks to prepare detailed activity planning as a basis for a contract (parallel to processing the application in Danish MFA).
 - Some networks had a slow start, for different reasons: FEMNET (supported through KULU), WANET and INFORSE WA (through Sustainable Energy) – and again CAN Pacific nodes.
- e) Also, on some budget lines at the **Secretariat** – such as travels and meetings, the consumption is lower than expected. Perhaps the activities were overestimated or the workload was beyond the one coordinator.

Follow up suggested:

- Care Denmark could ask Danida for a no-cost extension within the approved budget, which would allow all Southern networks finalizing first phase of the programme. Preferable this could run in parallel to the start-up of the coming second phase.
- Suggests the Southern networks to prepare detailed planning in parallel to processing the application in Danish MFA (May – July 2012)
- Prepare the next phase for two years instead of one and a half years, recognizing that it takes time and transaction costs to move to the next phase (including making the new contracts). This would require an additional application in 2013 for the Danish government's climate funds.

Southern Voices Capacity Building Programme
Expenses recorded for 2011 (*status per 8 March 2012*)

Budget component		Budget 18 months	Expenses recorded by CDK2011	Expenses from financial reports	Remaining of budget	
		DKK	transfers to consortium members/partners	expenses by networks		Expenses as a % of the budget
1. Activities						
A. Support for National, Regional, Thematic Networks						
<i>Danchurchaid</i>	A-DCA					
National networks in Cambodia, Ethiopia, Malawi		835.000	345.000	264.817	570.183	32
<i>CARE</i>						
National networks in Vietnam, Niger, Tanzania	A-Care-V/N/TZ	835.000	539.581	394.916	440.084	47
Regional - Accra Caucus on REDD and Forestry	A-Care-Accra	485.000	225.345		259.655	46
<i>IBIS</i>						
Regional SusWatch Network, Honduras, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Bolivia	A-Ibis	700.000	849.988	441.490	258.510	63
Reconstruction and support of CAN – Latin America	A-Ibis	270.000		214.622	55.378	79
<i>OVE</i>						
Four regional INFORSE networks on sustainable energy and WANET-CSD West African regional network	A-VE	670.000	603.664	394.018	275.982	59
<i>IIED</i>	A-IIED		278.244			
Support for 15 LDC networks through CLACC adaptation fellows		585.000		324.761	260.239	56
Regional workshop training networks in assessment of government climate policies, for input to joint report		230.000		230.452	-452	100

<i>CAN International</i>	A-CAN-I		496.162			
Two regional nodes: West Africa and South Asia, and two national nodes in Tuvalu and Micronesia		570.000		230.059	339.941	40
Channelling Southern input into CAN – through SCBP		100.000		54.098	45.902	54
Support for Gender and Climate partners - through KULU	A-KULU	120.000	49.690			0
Subtotal A		5.400.000	3.387.674	2.549.233		47
B. Activities at Consortium Level			Expenses at Secretariat			
Programme Coordinator	BA	900.000	515.060		384.940	57
Website and electronic newsletter	BB	100.000	67.992		32.008	68
International report for consortium - assessing national climate change policies	BC	350.000	140.000	120.403	210.000	40
Fund for demand driven capacity building and support	BD	225.000	137.908		87.092	61
Strategy workshops, consortium meetings	BE	75.000	30.009		44.991	40
Travels Secretariat	BG	75.000	29.649		45.351	40
Review	BH	150.000	75.000		75.000	50
Subtotal B		1.875.000	995.618		879.382	53
Activities total		7.275.000	4.383.292		879.382	
Contingency		50.000				
Total project costs		7.325.000	4.383.292		879.382	
Audit	BI	151.636				
Subtotal		7.476.636				
Administration 7%	BJ	523.364		14.823		
Grand Total (DKK)		8.000.000				

7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter provides the overall conclusions and recommendations from the Review team. However, it is important to note that the Review is taking place when the implementation has been carried out for about one year (from the start in January 2011). The programme is defined to run over a three year period (2011-2013), divided into two phases.

7.1. Summary of the Review report's conclusions

The overall conclusion of the Review is that the Southern Voices Capacity Building Programme - within its first year of operation - has contributed positively to its over three year's planned immediate **objective**, stated below:

Civil society organisations and networks in selected developing countries have through south-south and north-south alliances increased their capacity for carrying out advocacy and monitoring activities and for raising public awareness at national, regional and international levels. This will help implementing and developing climate change policies and programmes, promoting environmental integrity and sustainable development benefiting poor and vulnerable people.

The programme has contributed to improving the preparation of Southern networks, sending their representatives to the UNFCCC intersessional meeting in June 2011 in Bonn and Durban (COP 17) UNFCCC climate change negotiations. This ties in well with the title of the programme, by promoting a **stronger voice** from civil society organisations in developing countries.

Whereas the previous project (2009-Mid 2010) had its focus on the participation of networks in Copenhagen (COP 15), the on-going programme has, since its start in late 2010, emphasised more on the work in the national and regional networks. This includes **capacity assessment** reports of 11 networks and the first steps for facilitation improvements of these networks. Today, an increased number of networks count with their prioritised **advocacy plans**. As explained in detail in chapter 4, the participating networks numbering more than 20 - have been able to influence different national policies and engage in active dialogue with their governments on climate change policies. They have undertaken studies, developed position papers and carried out public information work.

Southern Voices launched an **international report** during COP 17 of very good quality, where network members contributed. The weakest point during the first year of implementation is the difficulties to deliver on this output on promoting **know-how and exchange of** experiences. Many interviewees expressed the opinion that it is highly relevant to strengthen this aspect for the benefit of the involved national and regional networks.

The **composition** of the Consortium members has been crucial. On the one side is the 'added value' that the Danish NGOs are providing from their longstanding presence in, and partnerships with, many of the Southern countries involved and on the other side is the

collaboration with CAN-International and their regional nodes in Asia, Africa and Latin America, which is a major advantage. This is in itself a learning example for Southern civil society organisations on how a structured civil society voice can obtain much more attention at international level from the official negotiators and the media.

The first year of the implementation has confirmed the general **strategy**, where the programme focuses on channelling financial resources and know-how aimed at strengthening civil society networks in influencing national, regional and international forums/institutions regarding climate change. It seems relevant to maintain the three key focus areas: i) advocacy and public awareness, ii) organizational and network capacity building of Southern networks, and iii) strengthening know-how and exchange of experiences among the networks in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Pacific.

It is in many ways **impressive**, what has been done with the total programme budget of only DKK 8 million. The Programme has been planned ambitious; nevertheless, it's impressive to see the amount of work invested in the realisation of this programme, beyond what is paid for. Said that, the programme would benefit from certain increments in the total budget for the next programme phase, where more activities could be carried out with the same transactions cost, as in the current phase.

7.2. Conclusions about the eight planed Outputs

The following is a brief summary of the assessment of the eight planned outputs that were envisaged in the Logical Framework in the approved programme document.

Output 1: The **network capacity assessment reports** revealed that the process was relevant and achieved the intended goal for the 11 networks. They are generally finding the assessments useful, and will give direction for the coming work with strengthening each of the networks. However, significant differences can be observed in the quality of the network assessment reports, in particular on the organisational analysis, networks management, structures/decision-making processes, agreed mandates for external representation and accountability mechanisms.

Output 2: Several networks have enhanced their capacity and interactions among member organisations. They have enhanced their understanding and built their confidence to engage on climate change issues. For those who have been collaborating with their governments, that fear has been overcome by approaching the governments as a network rather than as individuals. However, there are some networks which are at their infancy in climate change topics and therefore still need more support in strengthening both the technical and organisational networking. The progress reports (February 2012) have only revealed little on the implementation of the recommendations from the undertaken network analysis.

Output 3: Advocacy plans have been formulated and discussed in the majority of the networks. The Review noted that for those who had developed an advocacy plan, they appreciated the order and prioritisation that such a plan has brought to their work. This suggest that other networks also should be encouraged to develop advocacy plans, where network members have internalised why they are performing the task.

Output 4: Advocacy activities are the core of the focus of the networks affiliated to the SV programme. Networks have been able to influence different national policies and engage in active dialogue with the delegations representing their governments in the international negotiations as well as on national climate change policies. At the same time, many interviews and network assessments have pointed to the need for better understanding and handling of advocacy tools.

Output 5: The studies undertaken have given some networks a starting point on the country's climate change situation. This baseline will be important for networks to effectively lobby their governments and evaluate if progress can be seen within the coming years. However, several networks will, in the next programme phase, have the challenge of strengthening their documentation for evidence based advocacy, and also to use it more for public awareness.

Output 6: The international report is of very good quality. Network members confirmed that they had participated by contributing to the content of the report and some submitted real life case studies, which they have also used as evidence for advocacy purposes in their countries. It has generally been appreciated that their inputs have been used in an international report, and they are satisfied with the synthesis and editorial efforts undertaken by IIED.

Output 7: Interviewees told this Review that they had learnt from other partners in Southern Voices and have appreciated the inputs from the SV secretariat. Nevertheless, the programme has, during its first year, had difficulties to deliver on this output on promoting know-how and exchange of experiences. Many interviewees expressed the opinion that it is highly relevant to strengthen SV's efforts as there are many needs among the involved national and regional NGO/CSO networks.

Output 8: The programme has made the web page *climatecapacity.org* functional and produced two newsletters. Nevertheless, these electronic information systems have had limited success in terms of usage by people in the Southern networks. Network members have to be encouraged to appreciate that this platform is a cost effective method for inter-regional learning – taking into account that regional meetings are very expensive to organise.

7.3. Conclusions regarding the implementation strategy

- a. The programme intends to strengthen the bridges (alliances) between civil society organisations in low-income developing countries through alliances in the middle-income countries and northern NGOs, within the framework of CAN International. However, this bridging role is limited by the GNI per capita criteria in Danish development cooperation, where it would be necessary to discuss with the Danish government on obtaining a minor share of the total budget from the so-called global frame of the "climate budget".
- b. A number of the Southern networks are receiving support from two or more donors. Therefore it is disappointing to observe how minimal the international NGOs are applying the aid effectiveness agenda with its principles on ownership, alignment and harmonisation recently confirmed at the Busan conference.

- c. During the first year of implementation, it has been difficult to live up to the expectations on strengthening know-how and exchange of experiences among the Southern networks. Neither has the current phase met the expectation on knowledge sharing about the three prioritised themes of Adaptation, REDD/forestry and renewable energy/energy efficiency. The Review team developed a questionnaire to be filled out by the networks, whose responses clearly indicate the interest for more learning and exchange of experiences in the coming phase. The December 1st internal Southern Voices meeting at COP17 in Durban has provided many interesting ideas to be considered in the next phase, including the development and use of an advocacy toolbox.
- d. The network assessments were seen as the first step in the capacity building process. However, it is necessary to emphasise that capacity building goes beyond a training approach. There should be more focus on the linkages between effective advocacy and the need for good network governance structures and the legitimacy for advocacy. In particular, moving towards networks with limited constituencies.
- e. Most Southern Voices network members are also members of CAN and increased strength can be observed within CAN's regional nodes in South Asia and Latin America. It has been more difficult to make the linkages with CAN regional nodes in Africa, which are noted to be weaker. This is reflected in the importance of the Pan African Climate Justice Alliance (PACJA) and it can be seen in CAN West Africa's weakness with membership and other networks in this sub-region. It is also necessary to consider the language barrier for those speaking French and Spanish.
- f. Almost none of the progress reports received in February 2012 had reference to the gender dimension, a key issue in climate change, particularly regarding the use of natural resources, water and land. There seems to be the need for dialogue about how the networks can integrate a gender dimension in their climate change work.

Regarding the **programme management**, the Consortiums Steering Committee is functioning well and this is also the case with the programme coordinator. Such a programme could not function without a full time staff position. The programme administration draws on CARE Denmark's strong administrative systems.

It has provided considerable additional workload for both the Southern partners and the consortium members as the programme was only approved for one and a half years – not for the full three year programme period. It takes time to prepare and finalise contracts with reporting and consolidating the accounts.

7.4. Recommendations for next phase

The Review's key recommendation is that the Programme should continue with the next phase of the already planned programme period. It is suggested to continue with the same programme document, with relevant changes based on the challenges experienced during the first year of implementation and the recommendations from this review.

The Review agrees with the Consortium estimate of DKK 10 million from Danida poverty orientation budget line (in 2012) and would furthermore recommend an additional amount from the 2013 budget of the Danish governments 'global frame'. These means could increase the resources for the networks – possibly including more networks from middle-income countries – and strengthen the joint programme activities on advocacy, capacity building, learning, exchange of experiences, etc.

Furthermore, it would be good, if an additional amount from 2013 could prolong the coming phase to two years (instead of the one and a half years), which could reduce the transactions cost caused by going from one to the next phase as well as providing more time for achieving the planned outputs on network capacity building, cross learning between networks, among others.

The consortium could suggest the Southern networks to prepare detailed planning in parallel to processing the application in Danish MFA (May – July 2012).

Below are some **specific recommendations** (which have been mentioned in the previous chapters):

Recommendation no. 1: *There is need for continuation in the next phase, of strengthening both technical and organisational networking that can facilitate in implementing the recommendations from the network assessment reports. Furthermore, more effort is required in analyzing and improving the networks' management and decision-making processes as well as agreed mandates for external representation.*

Recommendation no. 2: *The next phase of the programme should maintain a similar output, where networks will have their updated advocacy plans for 2013 and 2014. The programme could provide support and explain in detail the importance of an advocacy plan, to be internalised by network members.*

Recommendation no. 3: *The programme should prioritise the need for more active people in the networks to know and apply a number of relevant advocacy tools so that they can carry out their advocacy plans for 2013 and 2014. Such efforts could be supported through the development, dissemination and training in the use of advocacy toolkits.*

Recommendation no. 4: *It is suggested to delegate most of the work to 2-3 partner NGOs in Africa and Latin America (to be handled in English and partly translated into French and Spanish) through the web-based learning platform (website, mailing lists, newsletters etc.).*

Recommendation no. 5: To strengthen the bridges (alliances) between the civil society groups in developing countries and CAN International, it is suggested that the programme applies to the Danish government for additional financial resources that would allow for certain activities to be undertaken in the Pacific, Latin America and other middle income countries from 2013 within the framework of CAN international.

Recommendation no. 6: The Consortium members should step up harmonisation efforts with other international NGOs/agencies on shared planning, monitoring and reporting. This could work alongside the core-funding to each network, based on their strategic plans,

governance structures, annual work plans and reports written for their own annual assemblies. A greater part of the dialogue should move from activity implementation level to the strategic level, where it may be useful if the network convenes an annual meeting/teleconference for all its donors.

Recommendation no. 7: A specific strategy/action plan should be developed, aimed at increased emphasis on learning, knowledge sharing, and training activities that cut across networks in the SV programme. It could include regional training activities with the assumption that it is promoting a learning culture of using web-based tools and obtaining better skills for accessing international knowledge.

Recommendation no. 8: Each network could consider developing a simple Process Action Plan for Improvements of the network which, beyond the recommendations in the network assessment report, could also include network governance, increased accountability mechanisms and legitimacy and external representation. The networks should be offered the possibility to count on an experienced consultant to follow up, facilitate and support processes that strengthen the networks (the programme could have at least one part-time facilitator in each region).

Recommendation no. 9: A regional mapping study is proposed in West Africa that can outline existing potentials and suggestions for improving the coordination between the various regional civil society networks on climate change. Increased support could be considered in the next phase for carrying out the study's recommendations.

Recommendation no. 10: The gender perspectives could be more integrated as part of the implementation of the programme, including how the participating networks can get to know methods and experiences of putting the gender dimension into their work

Finally, the Review team has made brief comments on the current **Logical Framework**, which will only require minor adjustments for application in the next phase.

DESCRIPTION	Comments to changes in current programme document
Development objective: The needs, rights and perspectives of civil society organisations and people vulnerable to climate change are adequately advocated for and reflected in a fair, ambitious and binding climate agreement for the period after 2012 adopted by the international community, as well as in the development and implementation of climate change policies at national, regional and international levels.	To be maintained
Immediate objectives: Civil society organisations and networks in selected developing countries have through south-south and north-south alliances increased capacity for carrying out advocacy and monitoring activities and for raising public awareness at national, regional and international levels. This will help implementing and	To be maintained

developing climate change policies and programmes, promoting environmental integrity and sustainable development benefiting poor and vulnerable people.	
Output 1 'Network capacity analysis reports' have been prepared by motivated Southern CSO/NGO networks - through self-assessments and process facilitation by qualified local/regional consultant(s). The reports will provide concrete suggestions and recommendations for strengthening the networks.	Adjustments to be made in the 'networking governance', which is lacking, and improved in some cases.
Output 2. The Southern CSO/NGO networks have increased their performance, efficiency and accountability through capacity building and organisational development, informed by recommendations from the network capacity analyses.	Priority output to be implemented in the second phase. Some need improved capacity analyses.
Output 3. The national/regional networks have adequately prepared and agreed on prioritised advocacy plans (1 or 2 years) related to influencing climate change policies and programmes – preferably collaborating with grassroots/social organisations and indigenous peoples' organisations on concrete advocacy activities.	Need to be updated to Advocacy Plan 2012-13.
Output 4. Participating Southern NGO/CSO networks have - according to their advocacy plans - undertaken lobbying, advocacy and awareness-raising activities, aimed at influencing the UNFCCC negotiations related to COP16/COP17 as well as national, regional and international institutions involved in implementation and financing.	Continue with this output. The indicators could be made more clear on position papers etc.
Output 5. Country Assessment Reports have been published by participating Southern NGO/CSO networks with analyses of the performance of their governments in climate negotiations and in planning and implementation of climate change policies and programmes, (including NAPAs and NAMAs, REDD programmes etc.) including assessments of the performance donor agencies in these fields.	Some – not all - country networks could make improvements to their reports, for strengthening their evidences & documentation.
Output 6. An international synthesis report has been prepared for COP 17, based on the Country Assessment Reports from the participating Southern NGO/CSO networks including a comparison of performances, a general assessment, possible examples of best practises and recommendations	No international report in the next phase. An output at programme level could instead be the development of 'advocacy toolbox'
Output 7. The international Consortium has provided the Southern networks with know-how, advice, training and facilitated exchange of experiences that responds to the needs of the various national and regional NGO/CSO networks involved in the Programme.	Consider as an output with increased priority in the next phase, where indicators should measure the learning and knowledge sharing. Including physical and electronic learning events and processes.
Output 8. A web-based learning platform (including website, mailing lists and regular newsletters) will be established by the programme to share information, best practices and lessons learnt from the national, regional and thematic NGO/CSO networks.	Tasks to be delegated to Southern NGOs (with some part in French and Spanish).