

# DEVELOPING THE CAPACITY OF CIVIL SOCIETY TO TRACK THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AFRICAN PEER REVIEW MECHANISM

## Scoping Workshop Report

12-13 October 2010

Johannesburg, South Africa

This workshop was part of the APRM Monitoring Project (AMP),  
a joint initiative by SAIIA, CPS and AfriMAP



African Insights. Global Perspectives.



Open Society Institute  
Africa Governance Monitoring & Advocacy Project  
AfriMAP

**This project is funded by the Open Society Foundation for South Africa (OSF-SA), the Open Society Initiative in Southern Africa (OSISA) and the African Governance Monitoring and Advocacy Programme (AfriMAP)**

## Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Scoping Workshop Programme .....  | 3  |
| What is the APRM? .....   | 5  |
| Introduction .....  | 6  |
| Day 1: 12 October 2010 .....  | 7  |
| Session 1: Background to the APRM Monitoring Project, APRM Basics, rationale and goals of the<br>Scoping Workshop ..... | 7  |
| Session 2: Keynote address – The APRM and why it should matter to civil society in Southern Africa...                   | 8  |
| Session 3: What exactly are we tracking? .....  | 12 |
| Session 4: What's in it for us? Why should CSOs get involved? .....   | 14 |
| Session 5: Building a network to monitor APRM implementation – lessons from Uganda .....                                | 15 |
| Discussion summary .....  | 16 |
| Day 2: 13 October 2010 .....  | 17 |
| Session 6: The draft APRM Monitoring and Advocacy Tool .....  | 17 |
| Session 7: Group work .....   | 17 |
| Group One: Networking.....  | 17 |
| Group Two: Advocacy .....   | 18 |
| Group Three: AMAT process.....  | 19 |
| Session 8: Conclusion and the way forward .....   | 19 |
| List of AMP Scoping Workshop Participants .....   | 21 |

## Scoping Workshop Programme

Access the AMP Scoping Workshop programme online, with links to all presentations and the Minister's keynote: <http://www.saiia.org.za/component/registrationpro/event/210/-Scoping-Workshop--Developing-the-Capacity-of-Civil-Society-to-Track-the-Implementation-of-the-African-Peer-Review-Mechanism>

| <b>DAY 1: TUESDAY 12 OCTOBER 2010</b> |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| 08:30-09:00                           | <b>Registration</b>  |  |
| 09:00-09:30<br>SESSION 1              | <b>Background to the AMP Monitoring Project (AMP), APRM basics, rationale and goals of the scoping workshop</b> - Steven Gruzd (SAIIA), Robin Richards (CPS), Dugan Fraser   | Outlines the APRM, the AMP and expectations and aims of this scoping workshop  |
| 09:30-10:30<br>SESSION 2              | <b>Keynote address – The APRM and why it should matter to civil society in Southern Africa</b> – Minister of Public Service & Administration, Honourable Richard Baloyi<br>Chairman: Elizabeth Sidiropoulos, SAIIA<br>National Director<br><b>DISCUSSION</b> | Provides a view from the South African government of the roles of civil society in the APRM and its implementation, and update of the process in SA  |
| 10:30-11:00                           | <b>TEA</b>   |  |
| 11:00-11:30                           | <b>What is Monitoring and Evaluation?</b><br>Dugan Fraser and Ogo Nzewi (CPS)  | Provides a brief overview of monitoring and evaluation, explaining how it is done, the role of indicators and overall aims of the process  |
| 11:30-13:00<br>SESSION 3              | <b>What exactly are we tracking?</b> Tsoeu Petlane (SAIIA)<br><br><b>DISCUSSION</b>  | Distills the key issues, recommendations and National Programme of Action (NPoA) items from APRM reports, to select what should be tracked, measured and evaluated, and why this matters to CSOs. Also covers the basics of developing and using indicators. |
| 13:00-14:00                           | <b>LUNCH</b>   |  |
| 14:00-15:30<br>SESSION 4              | <b>What's in it for us – Why Should CSOs Get Involved?</b> Steven Gruzd (SAIIA)<br><br><b>DISCUSSION</b>   | Explores building a coalition of governance monitors, assesses needs and interests of participants   |
| 15:30-15:45                           | <b>TEA</b>   |  |
| 15:45-17:00<br>SESSION 5              | <b>Building a Network to Monitor APRM Implementation: Lessons from Uganda</b> – Lillian Muyomba (NGO Forum Uganda)<br><b>DISCUSSION</b>  | Ugandan civil society groups have successfully banded together to track the APRM's progress in their country. The session will explore both creating the network and compiling an APRM monitoring report   |

## DAY 2: WEDNESDAY 13 OCTOBER 2010

|                          |  |   |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| 09:00-10:30<br>SESSION 6 | <b>The draft APRM Monitoring and Advocacy Template (AMAT)</b> - Yarik Turianskyi (SAIIA), Dugan Fraser and Ogo Nzewi (discussants)<br><br><b>DISCUSSION</b>                        | Present the draft AMET framework, and elicit comment and suggestions from participants, both on proposed methodology and content  |
| 10:30-11:00              | <b>TEA</b>   |   |
| 11:00-13:00<br>SESSION 7 | <b>Group Work</b> – Dugan Fraser<br>Separate groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AMAT Process</li> <li>- Media and Utilisation</li> <li>- Network building</li> </ul> | In smaller groups, participants will discuss areas of common interest, key APRM themes to track and focus on developing indicators to measure whether goals are achieved, including at input, process, output and outcomes stages<br>Each group will have a separate assignment<br>Discuss sources of information<br>Brainstorm on compiling tracking reports<br>Discuss media strategy for publicising results |
| 13:00-14:00              | <b>LUNCH</b>   |   |
| 14:00-15:30<br>SESSION 8 | <b>Synthesis, wrap up and the way forward–</b><br>Dugan Fraser   | Groups report back<br>Highlight the key indicators emerging from each of the thematic areas, explore the way forward for the drafting and completion of the tracking instruments, gauge interest from participants, roles and responsibilities and timelines  |

## What is the APRM?<sup>1</sup>

The African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) is a process that allows governments and their citizens to analyse their problems, assess their progress towards improved governance and make suggestions for effective reform.

To begin active participation in the APRM, a country's government will sign a Memorandum of Understanding with the continental APRM authorities indicating its willingness to undergo review and commitment to the process. The next step involves gathering information and documentation on the performance of the government and other stakeholders in key areas. To help gather this data and manage the process, the country typically forms a National APRM Governing Council (NGC) charged with this responsibility, and it usually appoints research institutes (Technical Research Institutes (TRIs)) to carry out the technical aspects of this review.

All parts of society – civil society groups, religious institutions, labour unions, business groups, as well as the government – should contribute to answering questions on a wide range of issues. The APRM Questionnaire guides the review process by highlighting the country's performance in four broad areas: Democracy and Political Governance; Economic Governance; Corporate Governance; and Socio-Economic Development. Specific issues include human rights, health care provision, the state of the economy, the role of the judiciary and the behaviour of corporations.

Next, the results of this review are incorporated into a Country Self-Assessment Report, which is drafted by the NGC and TRIs. The Country Self-Assessment Report includes a National Programme of Action (NPoA). The NPoA sets out the plans to deal with the problems identified in the review.

Once the Country Self-Assessment Report is completed, the country will be visited by a Country Review Mission. This is a delegation of respected scholars and experts who will conduct an independent study of the country and produce their own report. They will be led by a member of the Panel of Eminent Persons, which is a small body of seven highly respected Africans who are responsible for managing the process across the continent. A draft Country Review Report is submitted to the country by the Panel and its Secretariat for comment, recommendations are put to the participating country, and the country is expected to amend its NPoA accordingly.

The final Country Review Report will be produced by combining the previous ones. It will be presented to the Forum of the Heads of State for discussion and final review. This body consists of the leaders of all the participating countries. It tends to convene on the margins of African Union summits (though not all AU members are participants in the APRM). Once the country has been reviewed by the Forum, it must agree to deal with the various problems that have been identified. Other states undertake to assist the country in its efforts, and to take action if the country does not try to deal with these issues. Finally the country reports annually on progress in implementing the NPoA, and prepares itself for subsequent reviews (every five years).

---

<sup>1</sup> Taken from Corrigan T, *Mastering the APRM: Creating Your Submission*, SAIIA, 2008.

## Introduction

The South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) and the Centre for Policy Studies (CPS) hosted a Scoping Workshop entitled *Developing the Capacity of Civil Society to Track the Implementation of the African Peer Review Mechanism* on 12-13 October 2010 at SAIIA's head office at Jan Smuts House, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

The African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) was established in 2003 as an innovative instrument aimed at improving governance in Africa, created and driven by Africans for Africans. Through a series of voluntary governance "peer reviews", member states aim at collectively improving governance on the continent through sharing best practices and following recommendations made by the APRM Panel of Eminent Persons. The intention of these reviews is to spur reform – at the end of the review each country embarks on implementing a National Programme of Action (NPoA), according to which it is supposed to carry out pre-agreed commitments aimed at improving governance. To date, 29 African states have signed up to the APRM and 13 of these have undergone their first review – including four in Southern Africa (South Africa, Mozambique, Lesotho and Mauritius). For more details on the APRM process see box on page 5.

One of the greatest challenges for the APRM has been the monitoring and reporting on the implementation of the NPoA. There are only loose procedures and guidelines for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and some countries have already missed deadlines for submitting their annual NPoA implementation reports. Furthermore, a number of implementation reports have lacked detail and did not provide concrete evidence and data which shows the extent to which the NPoA is being implemented, or the impact of these interventions. They also tend not to reflect the voices of civil society organisations (CSOs).

SAIIA, CPS and AfriMAP have launched a joint project to empower civil society in Southern African APRM states to track APRM implementation in their countries, known as the APRM Monitoring Project (AMP). Through this project, CSOs will be assisted to develop independent reviews of APRM Implementation through the use of the APRM Monitoring & Advocacy Template (AMAT). As part of the AMP, SAIIA and CPS also plan to conduct fieldwork in South Africa, Lesotho, Mozambique and Mauritius in 2011.

This Scoping Workshop was intended to present AMAT and the ideas behind it to civil society in those countries where the pilot project will be conducted, in order to introduce them to the idea and gather their input. The key objectives of the scoping workshop were as follows.

- To officially launch the APRM Monitoring Project (AMP)
- To gather constructive input to strengthen the draft APRM Monitoring & Advocacy Template (AMAT)
- To ascertain interest from Southern African CSOs in participating in the (AMP), the various roles they could play, and to identify potential partners for Southern African country studies
- To discuss strategies for the implementation of the project, including capacity building, network creation, report compilation, report dissemination and publicity
- To identify and explore benefits for CSOs from participation in the AMP



Right to left: Elizabeth Sidiropoulos (SAIIA's National Director) welcomes Richard Baloyi (South Africa's Minister of DPSA)

## Day 1: 12 October 2010

### Session 1: Background to the APRM Monitoring Project, APRM Basics, rationale and goals of the Scoping Workshop

The first day of the Scoping Workshop started with an introduction by Elizabeth Sidiropoulos, the National Director of SAIIA, and a special welcome to Minister Richard Baloyi, South Africa's Minister of Public Service and Administration. In her speech, Elizabeth Sidiropoulos emphasised the need for a continuous dialogue between the government and civil society and expressed hope that this workshop would promote dialogue between South Africa's civil society and the Department of Public Service and Administration (DPSA), which is responsible for the implementation of the APRM in the country.

This was followed by welcome by Steven Gruz, the head of SAIIA's Governance and APRM Programme, who gave a brief introduction to the APRM and an outline of what the review process entails. His presentation provided a conceptual background of the APRM, as well the intention and objectives of the mechanism. He also outlined the institutions of the APRM that are established internally in participating states – the National Governing Council (NGC), APRM Secretariat and Technical Research Institutions (TRIs) – as well as the external continental structures, which consist of the Heads of State Forum (APRM Forum), the Panel of Eminent Persons (APR Panel), the APRM Secretariat and the Country Review Teams constituted for the various reviews. Finally, he described the five stages of the APRM process: Country Self-Assessment; Country Review Mission; Preparation of the Country Review Draft Report; Presentation of the Country Review to the APR Forum; and public release of the Country Review Report.

Robin Richards, the senior research consultant at CPS provided the background of the AMP, as well as its objectives. He noted that the AMP is a collaborative project between SAIIA and CPS with technical



support from AfriMAP, funded by the Open Society Foundation-South Africa (OSF-SA). The aim of the project is to empower civil society in Southern Africa to track and monitor the implementation of the APRM NPoAs in their respective countries.

The project is currently in its pilot phase which will cover South Africa and Lesotho, and will result in independent civil society reviews of the overall process and the implementation of the APRM in both countries, performed by civil society organisations (CSOs) under the guidance of CPS and SAIIA. Following suggestions made during the workshop, SAIIA and CPS hope to establish a platform to enable any willing CSOs to participate in the project.



Left to right: Steven Gruz (Head of SAIIA's Governance and APRM Programme), Richard Baloyi (South Africa's Minister of Public Service and Administration and APRM Focal Point, Elizabeth Sidiropoulos (SAIIA's National Director), Robin Richards (CPS Senior Research Consultant) and Dugan Fraser (workshop facilitator)

## **Session 2: Keynote address – The APRM and why it should matter to civil society in Southern Africa**

Minister Richard Baloyi, South Africa's APRM Focal Point and chairperson of the NGC delivered the keynote address. He reflected on the overarching purpose of the APRM, which is "to foster the adoption of policies, standards and practices that will lead to political stability, economic growth, sustainable growth and continental economic integration."

Minister Baloyi recalled the key milestones in South Africa's APRM process. He reminded the participants that the country was peer reviewed by the APR Forum in Accra, Ghana in July 2007, and its Country Review Report (CRR) was released in September 2007. South Africa's first APRM NPoA implementation report was tabled to the APR Forum in January 2009 and the second one will be



presented in January 2011. He noted that the DPSA is currently seeking ways in which departments can integrate annual APRM performance targets into their 2011/12 operational plans.

Minister Baloyi said that South Africa's participation in the APRM serves as a process of self-reflection. He noted that participation of civil society in the APRM processes in the country is crucial, as without it, the APRM process would not be legitimate. Civil society participation is stipulated in the APRM and is encouraged by the South African government.



Richard Baloyi (South Africa's Minister of Public Service and Administration and APRM Focal Point)

However, there are challenges preventing effective participation by CSOs in the APRM. Notably, there is the challenge of resources that limits participation and ability to monitor the implementation of the NPoA. Small CSOs in particular are the most vulnerable to the lack of resources and funding. Apart from that, the Minister also pointed to a lack of awareness on the APRM, which prevents participation by various stakeholders.

The Minister mentioned the current process to review the APRM system, including a proposal to increase the size of the APRM Panel of Eminent Persons, and the manner of their appointment. In conclusion, the Minister extended an invitation to civil society to get involved in the current process of writing and reviewing the forthcoming NPoA implementation report in South Africa. He emphasised that a partnership between the government and civil society could ensure continuous improvement of public services and governance practices.

### **Discussion summary**

A concern was raised on the scarcity of references to the APRM in South Africa's policy documents, as well as the fact that the APRM is seldom mentioned in official speeches and the media. South Africa's

government needs to take leadership in integrating the APRM NPoA items into its various national programmes. Minister Baloyi conceded that the visibility of the APRM in the country requires increased effort and that the lack of APRM visibility is part of the broader sidelining of international frameworks in national governance. There is thus a need to balance the broad objective of the APRM with internal (national) programmes. Visibility is important, as prominence of the process could potentially encourage other countries to sign up to the APRM. Minister Baloyi also noted that regional cooperation arrangements could give greater visibility and attention to the APRM and the countries that have been reviewed should share experiences. A view from the floor emphasised that the APRM needs to be given more prominence in government's ongoing work. Apart from involving political parties, it would also be crucial to involve parliamentarians. Furthermore, a point was raised that not enough is being said on the international stage with regard to the APRM's success stories and achievements. One of the donors present at the workshop indicated that visibility can affect funding opportunities for APRM-related projects, as greater visibility can help convince donors that APRM-related projects are worth funding.

The Minister also suggested that for effective civil society participation in the APRM, the NGC should broaden its scope of investigation into the challenges faced by CSOs. There were questions directed at the Minister on the 'doctoring' of CRRs. In response, the Minister noted that multi-stakeholder participation is one of the ways in which manipulation can be reduced. He noted the resources challenge faced by civil society but emphasised the importance of civil society participation. In conclusion, he called for CSOs to engage with the second country report and to make inputs into it.



Dugan Fraser (workshop facilitator) explaining M&E

Dugan Fraser, the workshop facilitator, followed the keynote address with a presentation on Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E). His presentation defined monitoring and evaluation as two distinct but related processes that are often conflated. While monitoring is a continuous function that involves reporting

back on the actual performance relative to what was proposed, evaluation is a time-bound exercise that involves an overall assessment of a programme. Monitoring involves the collection and analysis of data on different levels of process implementation. There is a variety of evaluation techniques that are selected based on the reasons for undertaking this exercise. Fraser concluded by outlining of the specific challenges of both monitoring and evaluation. With regard to monitoring these include: overshadowing evaluation in public management; too indicator-orientated; ignoring complexity; much data gathered, but it is unclear what it gets used for; and, overly technical. Evaluation, on the other hand, suffers from the following: very little rigorous, theory based evaluation; impact evaluation dominating when outcome-level orientation is needed; and, donor driven and not having the regulatory framework that monitoring does.

Dr Ogo Nzewi, a researcher from CPS, concluded the second session of the day with a presentation on good governance and how it fits in with the AMP. Firstly, she discussed various definitions of good governance, particularly those by the World Bank and the UNDP. The former states that good governance is “the manner in which public officials and institutions acquire and exercise the authority to shape public policy and provide public goods and services”, while the latter describes it as “ensuring that political, social and economic priorities are based on broad consensus in society and that the voices of the poorest and the most vulnerable are heard in decision-making over the allocation of resources.” Nzewi also emphasised the difficulty of measuring good governance, as it depends on indicators which are not always easy to quantify. Unlike monitoring tangible quantifiable policy outcomes and/or project deliverables or performance monitoring, monitoring governance is not usually as straightforward, which presents two challenges: Firstly, appropriately clarifying and designating weights/measures and ratings to non-quantifiable constructs such as transparency, justice, responsiveness, citizens’ voices; and, secondly, choosing appropriate methods and design for the monitoring process (requiring a more creative qualitative approach). She noted that the APRM was designed as a tool to measure good governance and in turn, the AMP is intended to measure the success of the APRM process and its ability to improve governance in participating states.

### **Discussion summary**

Baseline studies were suggested as sources of information that could help those working on the AMP to understand countries’ progress or the lack of it with regards to the APRM, specifically in the four thematic areas. The Country Self Assessment Reports (CSAR) were mentioned as potentially being able to serve this purpose. The importance of the role of the media in M&E was also emphasised, given its reach and the access it provides to individuals at grassroots level. It was suggested that the media should not be categorised together with civil society as it might be overshadowed by more traditional sectors of civil society. The project would have to consider how to make better use of the media, including social media. Another consideration for the project would be selecting the appropriate method of M&E, a method that would match the issues. It was emphasised that it is not the intention of the AMP to come up with a model of evaluating the APRM itself. Rather, the aim is to find ways of monitor the APRM’s processes and progress on the NPoA. The AMAT, as a monitoring tool, needs to be linked to broader issue of government. The project team needs to decide if AMAT will monitor Cross Cutting Issues (CCIs), as well as the NPoA or only one of the two. Those carrying out the monitoring process should interrogate the extent to which the NPoA is reflective of the actual targets that should be monitored. It was suggested that an extra column should be inserted into AMAT, where activities related to the NPoA, but not carried out under the APRM’s auspices will be flagged as such. An example of this would be the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), some of which are related to the NPoA items in certain countries. This would also help avoid duplication. The project team was advised to

reflect on the role of citizens in designing and implementing monitoring and evaluation systems. A comment from the floor also highlighted shifts in M&E literature. In particular the work of the United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP) Oslo Governance Centre and Daniel Kaufmann was pointed out.



Centre: Richard Baloyi (South Africa's Minister of Public Service and Administration) responding to a question from the floor

A concern was raised with regards to the collaborative element of the project. It was highlighted that in some countries, with less democratic governments, it would be difficult to proceed with a thorough civil society monitoring process without creating an antagonistic environment.

### **Session 3: What exactly are we tracking?**

Tšoeu Petlane, the deputy head of SAIIA's Governance and APRM Programme, outlined some of the APRM's complexities and the role of AMAT. He also briefly described some of the main features of the AMP and AMAT, with the intention of introducing its main concepts and facilitating discussion around them.

He noted that there are three possible targets that AMAT could focus on: APRM CRR recommendations, CCIs and NPoA items. The AMAT could track implementation, impact or decide on specific indicators. When monitoring implementation, the project would track what has been done, how far the process is, identify weaknesses and assess opportunities for improvement. The monitoring of impact would focus on the implementation period and interrogate the priorities/objectives. Should it be decided that the project will track specific indicators, it is important that meaningful and value adding indicators are carefully selected. Petlane also noted that the AMP seeks to produce independent, collaborative



analysis of APRM implementation, and complement official APRM reporting processes. AMP could feed into the space for civil society in the APRM process, it can also ensure collaboration by strengthening civil society capacity for participation in the APRM process. He concluded by stating some of the project's challenges, including the limited scope of its assessment, civil society capacity, resources, and managing relationships.



Zanele Twala (Action Aid) explaining the challenges faced by CSOs in South Africa's APRM process

### Discussion summary

It was suggested that the project should consider creating a process where civil society monitors itself in terms of its relationship with the government. The project should also seek to understand what the role of the Continental APRM Secretariat is pertaining to the M&E of the APRM. It was indicated that civil society does not have a clear understanding of what the Secretariat is doing to support its involvement in the APRM process. In response, a representative from the Secretariat indicated that the current revisions of the APRM strongly consider civil society participation. In light of the uneven APRM support for civil society in different countries, a manual specifying the role of civil society was proposed. As the project proceeds, the team will need to decide how frequently the M&E processes will take place and how the AMAT report links to the APRM NPoA Implementation Reports.

Concerns with civil society participation in the APRM process were raised, notably by NGC members. Increased civil society participation in the APRM process can encourage broader civil society engagement. The project team was also warned that civil society involvement does not automatically translate to participation. One of the challenges with civil society participation, as noted by Minister Baloyi, is unevenness of resources. There is also a division between larger urban-based CSOs and smaller community based organisations. All of this results in a fragmented civil society. Civil society will need to

be aware of power relations, how these are manifested and how they could be dealt with. Therefore, it is important for the project to consider ways in which it could facilitate engagement and cooperation amongst different types of CSOs. Another key issue was how civil society should proceed with independent tracking of the APRM process in relation to official monitoring performed by government. It was emphasised that the form in which the project and its reports are presented can determine how antagonistic or complementary it is to government efforts on the APRM. It is thus important to position civil society monitoring as a process that would strengthen the formal country review process, through an independent review. Timing is crucial – the AMAT report could be positioned either as a critique of government’s report or ‘feed’ into the formal reporting if released earlier. In conclusion, it was noted that the project team would have to consider various ways through which the AMAT report could be collaborative and complementary to the formal government APRM process while remaining independent.

#### **Session 4: What’s in it for us? Why should CSOs get involved?**

Steven Gruzd discussed civil society participation in the APRM and AMP. Civil society has both the right to be involved in the APRM process, and important roles to play. His presentation identified areas of potential and actual civil society involvement in the APRM process. Civil society participation is emphasised in key APRM documents. He noted that there are various ways in which civil society can react to the APRM, that can broadly be categorised as oppositional or collaborative. The APRM is connected to work that many CSOs are already involved in. It also provides an opportunity for organisations to be part of a process of reflection, dialogue and accountability. Currently, civil society seems to be losing focus and interest in the APRM, and are generally much less involved when it comes to implementing the NPoA and monitoring it, compared to the Self-Assessment phase. Gruzd concluded by providing reasons for civil society’s participation in AMP and emphasising the possible benefits of such participation. Through AMAT, the AMP provides space for CSOs to provide expertise, engage in dialogue with other stakeholders and be part of efforts in the follow-through on the commitments already made by national governments.

#### **Discussion summary**

It was noted that shifts in government also affect the profile and level of engagement with the APRM. Participants noted that the Ministry in which the APRM is housed also affects access to the APRM and can facilitate or affect civil society involvement. Though it seems civil society interest in the APRM has declined, attendance of the workshop is indicative of interest among CSOs in the APRM. There is a strong view that the APRM remains one of the most innovative initiatives to come out of the continent. Caution was expressed with regards to the form that civil society participation assumes. It was advised that those involved in the project should expand the understanding of participation beyond traditional forms of civil society participation.

The APRM is a country-wide process and participation of all stakeholders is crucial at all stages. The involvement of civil society at implementation and reporting stages is vital to ensure continuity, momentum, implementation, and add value. The involvement of civil society would also give the process legitimacy and encourage ownership of the APRM in the country.





Steven Gruzd (SAIIA's Head of Governance and APRM Programme) responding to a question following his presentation

### **Session 5: Building a network to monitor APRM implementation – lessons from Uganda**

Day One concluded with a presentation by Lillian Muyomba, representing Uganda's NGO Forum, who informed participants about how civil society in Uganda monitors the APRM process. She noted that civil society has a history of monitoring the performance of members of parliament (MPs) in Uganda and local government leaders. These monitoring functions are carried out by a network of CSOs called the Uganda Governance Monitoring Platform (UGMP). With regard to the APRM process in the country, UGMP focuses on 32 commitments from Uganda's NPoA that it has the most expertise in.

Muyomba stated that Uganda's APRM model allows for a fair blend of multi-stakeholder participation, which provides space for civil society involvement in the process. The main entry point for civil society is the APRM National Governing Council (NGC) that produces annual APRM reports and organises forums on selected governance themes. In Uganda, the APRM is already established as a guiding document for development, – informing the National Development Plan, adopted in 2009.

Civil society's involvement in the APRM should be understood as a continuation of long-standing participation in the monitoring of governance in Uganda. Uganda has already had a strong network of CSOs that were involved in the APRM since its inception. The network has been consistent on producing annual publications on the APRM since 2005.

However, the targets that have been monitored by civil society are limited and not all of these are outlined in the NPoA, thus the monitoring scope is limited. Political support for the APRM in Uganda is declining and there are various resource constraints. The space for civil society in Uganda is getting

narrower, notably through the recent NGO Act which places restrictions on how civil society can operate. All these limit civil society engagement with the APRM process.

Muyomba emphasised the importance of strengthening an existing network of organisations that will carry out the monitoring process as part of AMAT. UGMP was successful in aligning the APRM work to existing work carried out by CSOs. Different phases of civil society involvement in the APRM required funding. The UGMP has been successful in generating passion for the APRM rather than involvement motivated by financial gain.

While challenges exist, the following lessons are to be learned from UGMP experiences:

- Civil society should diversify its target audience. It should engage and disseminate its findings with various stakeholders, including government and the private sector.
- Formation or strengthening of already existing civil society networks involved in monitoring governance. The Ugandan case demonstrates that connecting the APRM to broader civil society activities can facilitate greater participation and awareness of APRM. Citizens should be able to appreciate the APRM through how it connects to their lives. Greater involvement can also be encouraged if the project builds on existing civil society structures instead of inventing new ones.
- Establishment of APRM monitoring as a space for information sharing between NGOs in different sectors.

### **Discussion summary**

With regard to the funding aspect mentioned in Lillian Muyomba's presentation, one participant suggested that the concern should not be funding, but the conditions attached to the funding. Both passion and funding are needed for effective civil society participation in the APRM. The APRM can also be connected to other international programmes and priorities, such as the MDGs. Connecting the APRM to developmental goals and programmes that are currently receiving greater publicity could bring it back to a central position. It is thus important to constantly measure the extent to which the APRM is becoming part of the national conversation, how it informs national programmes and with what benefits.

There was also a strong view that civil society should think of ways through which tools such as the APRM could strengthen people's access to their rights on a continental level. Civil society should also investigate ways through which information gained through the AMAT process can influence policy and policy development. It should also take advantage of the continental reach of the APRM. It was advised that the project should also look at the different ways through which the publicity of the APRM could be sustained. There was a consensus that the APRM process in South Africa has received less attention following the completion of the CRR. Once the Self-Assessment phase of the APRM is completed, governments seem to revert to traditional unilateral approaches to governance. Thus the project needs to consider ways to sustain ongoing dialogue around the APRM beyond this phase.

## **Day 2: 13 October 2010**

### **Session 6: The draft APRM Monitoring and Advocacy Tool**

The second day of the scoping workshop started with Yarik Turianskyi, a researcher on SAIIA's Governance and APRM programme, presenting a draft version of the AMAT. The presentation was focused on unpacking AMAT and its various stages. The AMAT will function as a guide for civil society in various countries to conduct an independent review of their national APRM processes and the implementation of the NPoA. It is intended to complement and expand upon the government's own M&E process through the official APRM Implementation Report, by providing an additional perspective and detail. Furthermore, it would also develop capacity for CSOs in monitoring and advocacy. Once the monitoring process has been completed, CSOs will identify areas of weakness and develop recommendations to address these in conjunction with the government and donors.

The AMAT will consist of five stages: (1) Desktop Research; (2) Interviews; (3) Assessment; (4) Identification of Priorities; and (5) Creation of an Action Plan. The final report that emerges from the AMAT needs to be accessible for a wide variety of stakeholders: civil society, government, donors, media, academia and ordinary citizens. Thus, it needs to be concise, listing and describing the main issues, while providing enough justification for its conclusions. The AMAT is still in draft form and the Scoping Workshop pointed to some key areas that need to be finalised, such as the rating of individual items on the NPoA as well as the overall evaluation of the APRM process and NPoA implementation in the country, once the review has been completed.

This presentation was followed by a brief presentation on findings from the Afrobarometer's survey pertinent to the APRM, by Francis Kibirige from Afrobarometer. The findings suggest that, overall, prior to a country undertaking the APRM self-assessment process, awareness of the APRM is generally low. During the process, expectations of the Mechanism are raised. These expectations decline later on.

### **Session 7: Group work**

Participants then split into three working groups, in order to discuss three practical issues that needed input from stakeholders: networking, advocacy and the AMAT process. These groups gave participants the opportunity to make suggestions on the design of the AMAT and the way forward for the AMP.

#### **Group One: Networking**

The following suggestions were made by participants of the group concerned with networking:

- A coalition of participating organisations should be convened in each country and the primary purpose should be learning, building and linking up.
- The coalition should strive to become a consistent, sustained and regular group of CSOs.
- The coalition should not be a formal structure and should be seen as a forum, which would have two areas of focus: the coordination of APRM-related activities by its members and implementing a consultative process that ensures the appropriate level of participation.
- The coalition should meet twice every year, and be led by a working committee that meets on a voluntary basis.
- A creative approach should be taken to resource mobilisation and usage, and the forum should avoid being a vehicle for fund-raising by its participants.

- Fund-raising should be coordinated by the working group.
- The roles and responsibilities of the forum should be clearly articulated in a terms of reference.



Participants of the Scoping Workshop during a session

### Group Two: Advocacy

The group dealing with the issue of advocacy suggested the following:

- The objectives behind advocacy need better clarification than has been provided. An advocacy strategy is different to a marketing or media strategy and needs careful consideration and construction.
- Packaging of messages is important and these need to be communicated accessibly, concisely and in a consistent and carefully pitched tone, which should match the message being sent. Any advocacy messaging should be engaging and lively.
- The advocacy strategy should take account of the diverse range of audiences being addressed and note should be taken of how the media platform being used will affect the form of reporting.
- The advocacy strategy should acknowledge the diaspora and its role and seek synergies where possible.
- The advocacy strategy should link, wherever possible, to other communication and awareness-raising events.

- Strategic alliances should be developed with other media initiatives that are dedicated to APRM-related themes and issues.
- Tight quality assurance is needed – sophisticated messages that the APRM needs to emit could land up being over-simplified.
- A training workshop should be held for journalists on how to engage with the APRM and that a similar event should be held for CSOs involved with the APRM on how to engage with the media.
- Initiatives to capacitate stakeholders should also target parliamentarians, whose involvement in other advocacy processes should also be included in the advocacy strategy and systematically facilitated.

### **Group Three: AMAT process**

Group three discussed the AMAT process with reference to the earlier presentation. The group suggested that:

- A balance needs to be found between fieldwork (consultative interactions) and desk research.
- AMAT should provide more guidance on who should be interviewed and how many interviews should be undertaken.
- Business stakeholders should also be interviewed and should specifically be mentioned.
- The AMAT should also provide clear indicators of progress in implementing the NPoA.
- A preparatory phase is needed (referred to as a “Stage 0”) to allow the necessary initial arrangement to be made, including allocating roles and responsibilities amongst members of the forum.
- The AMAT should provide proper guidance on the structuring of a sample for interviews.
- The AMAT should focus on the NPoA but also look into other pertinent issues, especially those raised during Country Self-Assessment processes and not addressed in the NPoA.
- Efforts should be made to link participating organisations’ responsibilities to their ongoing mandates.
- It is likely that for CSOs to participate they will need some kind of training so that they are fully briefed on the AMAT and its intentions and operations.
- Once the AMAT has been piloted, those experiences would be used to feed into the training programme., although there were differing views on how much time would be required.
- The involvement of grassroots structures is very important. Creating relations with existing networks could be a route to achieving this.

### **Session 8: Conclusion and the way forward**

During the Scoping Workshop, a consensus emerged that an independent, civil-society led review of the APRM processes as well as the implementation of the NPoA would be beneficial in Southern African states. It was also agreed that the AMP should become a platform, through which all willing and interested CSOs could interact and participate in the review. Participants also expressed the need for



further consultations with APRM insiders and structural bodies. Many participants also stated that the AMP should not be an elite project, but rather one that will give an opportunity for participation to all civil society – including grassroots organisations. The establishment of a platform will facilitate the access to the AMP by all CSOs. It was also noted that the AMAT still needs some more refining. Thanks to all the suggestions from those who attended, SAIIA and CPS have many new ideas to incorporate into the AMAT. Once the AMAT is updated, the project will proceed to produce reports for South Africa and Lesotho in 2011. The above-mentioned forum will also be established in order to give all interested CSOs an opportunity to participate.



Participants of the Scoping Workshop during a session

*This report was compiled by Yarik Turianskyi and Boitumelo Matlala. Special thanks go to Dugan Fraser, the facilitator of the workshop, whose comprehensive notes formed the basis of this report. SAIIA and CPS would also like to thank the funders of the project – the Open Society Foundation for South Africa (OSF-SA), the Open Society Initiative in Southern Africa (OSISA), and the African Governance Monitoring and Advocacy Programme (AfriMAP).*

If you wish to find out more about the AMP, please contact:

#### **SAIIA**

Steven Gruzd

Head: Governance and APRM Programme

[Steven.Gruzd@wits.ac.za](mailto:Steven.Gruzd@wits.ac.za)

+27 11 339 2021 (ext 160)

#### **CPS**

Robin Richards

Research Programme Manager

[Robin@cps.org.za](mailto:Robin@cps.org.za)

+27 11 403 4001



## List of AMP Scoping Workshop Participants

| NAME & SURNAME               | ORGANISATION                                | EMAIL ADDRESS  |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| Afekheina Jerome             | APRM Secretariat                            | <a href="mailto:Afeikhenaj@Nepad.org">Afeikhenaj@Nepad.org</a>   |
| Anne-Fredericke Roeder       | German Technical Cooperation (GTZ)          | <a href="mailto:anne-friederike.roeder@gtz.de">anne-friederike.roeder@gtz.de</a>   |
| Balfour Lekgwathi            | On the Beat Communications                  | <a href="mailto:balfouronthebeat@yahoo.com">balfouronthebeat@yahoo.com</a>   |
| Boitumelo Matlala            | Centre for Policy Studies                   | <a href="mailto:boitumelo@cps.org.za">boitumelo@cps.org.za</a>   |
| David Penny                  | British High Commission                     | <a href="mailto:David.Penny@fco.gov.uk">David.Penny@fco.gov.uk</a>   |
| Derek Luyt                   | Centre for Social Accountability            | <a href="mailto:csa-admin@ru.ac.za">csa-admin@ru.ac.za</a>   |
| Donald Tlaka                 | UNISA Postgraduate                          | <a href="mailto:donald.tlaka@yahoo.com">donald.tlaka@yahoo.com</a>   |
| Douglas Icativu              | African Institute for Corporate Citizenship | <a href="mailto:douglas@aiccafrica.org">douglas@aiccafrica.org</a>   |
| Dugan Fraser                 | Consultant                                  | <a href="mailto:duganf@iafrica.com">duganf@iafrica.com</a>   |
| Elijah Chiwota               | IPS Africa                                  | <a href="mailto:echiwota@ips.org">echiwota@ips.org</a>   |
| Elisabeth Diethelm-Schneller | Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation    | <a href="mailto:elisabeth.diethelm-schneller@sdg.net">elisabeth.diethelm-schneller@sdg.net</a>                                 |
| Francis Kibirige             | Afrobarometer                               | <a href="mailto:fkibirige@idasa.org.za">fkibirige@idasa.org.za</a>   |
| Glen Mpani                   | OSF-SA                                      | <a href="mailto:glen@ct.osf.org.za">glen@ct.osf.org.za</a>   |
| Helen Hagermann              | Canadian High Commission                    | <a href="mailto:Ellen.Hagerman@international.gc.ca">Ellen.Hagerman@international.gc.ca</a>                                     |
| Herman van Heerden           | Department of Justice                       | <a href="mailto:hvanheerden@justice.gov.za">hvanheerden@justice.gov.za</a>   |
| Jeggan Grey-Johnson          | AfriMAP                                     | <a href="mailto:jeggangj@osisa.org">jeggangj@osisa.org</a>   |
| Jenni O'Grady                | SA Press Association                        | <a href="mailto:news@sapa.org.za">news@sapa.org.za</a>   |
| Joyce Siwani                 | NGC/ECOSOC                                  | <a href="mailto:buli@mtn.blackberry.com">buli@mtn.blackberry.com</a>   |
| Justin Steyn                 | IDASA                                       | <a href="mailto:jsteyn@idasa.org.za">jsteyn@idasa.org.za</a>   |
| Katleho Pefole               | TRC Lesotho                                 | <a href="mailto:pefole@trc.org.ls">pefole@trc.org.ls</a>   |
| Laura Joyce Khanyago         | NGC/ECOSOC                                  | <a href="mailto:takwana@nedlac.org.za">takwana@nedlac.org.za</a>   |
| Libakiso Matlho              | Lesotho                                     | <a href="mailto:wlsales@ilesotho.com">wlsales@ilesotho.com</a> ;<br><a href="mailto:libakiso@yahoo.com">libakiso@yahoo.com</a> |
| Lillian Muyomba              | ACODE, Uganda                               | <a href="mailto:lmuyomba@acode-u.org">lmuyomba@acode-u.org</a>   |
| Lucky Mathebula              | DPSA  | <a href="mailto:mathebula@yebo.co.za">mathebula@yebo.co.za</a>   |
| Mabolae Mohasi               | SADC-NGO                                    | <a href="mailto:mabolaem@yahoo.co.uk">mabolaem@yahoo.co.uk</a>   |
| Mkhululi Mazula              | Open Democracy Advice Centre                | <a href="mailto:Mkhululi@opendemocracy.org.za">Mkhululi@opendemocracy.org.za</a>   |
| Molosiwa Jabob Molapisi      | SANGOCO/NGC                                 | <a href="mailto:mjmolapisi@yahoo.com">mjmolapisi@yahoo.com</a>   |
| Nchafatso Sello              | Lesotho - Consultant                        | <a href="mailto:nchafatsoosello@yahoo.co.uk">nchafatsoosello@yahoo.co.uk</a>   |
| Ogo Nzewi                    | CPS   | <a href="mailto:ebusoma@yahoo.com">ebusoma@yahoo.com</a>   |
| Oupa Makhalemele             | IDASA                                       | <a href="mailto:omakhalemele@idasa.org.za">omakhalemele@idasa.org.za</a>   |
| Patrick Mpedzisi             | IDASA                                       | <a href="mailto:patrick@mpedzisi.com">patrick@mpedzisi.com</a>   |
| Percy Tshabane               | DPSA  | <a href="mailto:percyt@dpsa.gov.za">percyt@dpsa.gov.za</a>   |
| Phillip Machon               | MASC, Mozambique                            | <a href="mailto:P.Machon@masc.org.mz">P.Machon@masc.org.mz</a>   |

|                      |  |  |
|----------------------|--|--|
| Piroshaw Camay       | CORE   | <a href="mailto:corejhb@mail.ngo.za">corejhb@mail.ngo.za</a>   |
| Robin Richards       | Centre for Policy Studies                          | <a href="mailto:robin@cps.org.za">robin@cps.org.za</a>   |
| Russel Ally          | Ford Foundation                                    | <a href="mailto:B.Amunga@fordfoundation.org">B.Amunga@fordfoundation.org</a>   |
| Samantha Waterhouse  | Community Law Centre                               | <a href="mailto:swaterhouse@uwc.ac.za">swaterhouse@uwc.ac.za</a>   |
| Serges Allain Kanmga | Centre for Human Rights,<br>University of Pretoria | <a href="mailto:sergesalain26@yahoo.fr">sergesalain26@yahoo.fr</a>   |
| Sheila Bunwaree      | University of Mauritius                            | <a href="mailto:sheilab@uom.ac.mu">sheilab@uom.ac.mu</a> ;<br><a href="mailto:s.bunwaree@uom.ac.mu">s.bunwaree@uom.ac.mu</a> |
| Steven Gruzd         | SAIIA  | <a href="mailto:steven.gruzd@wits.ac.za">steven.gruzd@wits.ac.za</a>   |
| Thabilise Msezani    | NGC APRM   | <a href="mailto:thabilisem@yahoo.com">thabilisem@yahoo.com</a>   |
| Thabo Rapoo          | CPS  | <a href="mailto:thabo@cps.org.za">thabo@cps.org.za</a>   |
| Theto Mhlakana       | SABC   | <a href="mailto:mahlakoanatt@sabc.co.za">mahlakoanatt@sabc.co.za</a>   |
| Thomas Selemene      | Mozambique   | <a href="mailto:thomselemene9@gmail.com">thomselemene9@gmail.com</a>   |
| Tšoeu Petlane        | SAIIA  | <a href="mailto:tsoeu.petlane@wits.ac.za">tsoeu.petlane@wits.ac.za</a>   |
| Yarik Turianskyi     | SAIIA  | <a href="mailto:yarik.turianskyi@wits.ac.za">yarik.turianskyi@wits.ac.za</a>   |
| Zanele Twala         | ActionAid  | <a href="mailto:Zanele.Twala@actionaid.org">Zanele.Twala@actionaid.org</a>   |
| Zingisile Mapazi     | DPSA   | <a href="mailto:zingisile.mapazi@dpsa.gov.za">zingisile.mapazi@dpsa.gov.za</a>   |