

Annexes

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

April 2012

List of Content:

ANNEX A. TERMS OF REFERENCE	2
ANNEX B. LIST OF PERSON.....	7
ANNEX C. INDIVIDUAL NETWORK SUMMARIES	9

ANNEX A. TERMS OF REFERENCE

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Review of the Southern Voices programme 2011-2012

Background – from the programme document:

A Mid-term Review will be carried out in the period November 2011 to February 2012 that will look at the work accomplished in a selection of countries across the various continents. The Review aims to assess and verify the achievements and problems during implementation, to systematize lessons learned and to be forward-looking with recommendations for a possible next phase programme.

The Review will be carried out by a team of external international and regional consultants. The Review's overall terms of reference (ToR) will be approved by the Steering Committee after previous consultation with Southern partners.

1. Introduction

The purpose of the **review** is to make recommendations for adjustments and changes in the next phase of the Southern Voices programme; according to the programme document (see above) it must be forward looking. The plan is to submit a programme application to Danida for a second phase of the programme by March/April next year, so the **review report must be ready in by mid March 2012.**

The Southern Voices Capacity Building Programme aims at providing support for Southern climate policy networks with the aim of "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 benefitting poor and vulnerable people" (immediate objective).

The programme was developed as a three year project to run from Jan 2011 through to Dec 2013 and submitted to the Danish MFA in October 2010 with a view to funding from the Danish Climate Envelope – Denmark's Fast Start Funding. Here the project was granted DKK 8 mio. to cover implementation during the first 18 months until mid 2012, The plan was then

to prepare a follow up application for a second phase to cover the rest of the period planned for the programme, and to submit it for funding for the Danish Climate Envelope for 2012.

Implementation started from January 2011 through the consortium behind the programme, comprised of four NGOs in the Danish 92 Group (DanChurchAid, IBIS, Sustainable Energy and Care) and two international NGOs (CAN-International and IIED), with CARE Danmark as the lead agency.

The programme is a follow up to the project “A stronger voice for developing countries in the international climate negotiations” implemented from Jan 2009 to Dec 2011 with support from the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs - which focused on capacity building and participation of Southern civil society organisations at COP15 and – with an extension towards COP16. The evaluation of this project recommended to strengthen the climate policy networks which grew out of the mobilisation towards COP15, with an emphasis of capacity building (including organizational development) for climate advocacy at the national and regional levels – as well as on a continued engagement in the international climate negotiations.

2. Objectives

Overall objective of the review:

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.

Specific objectives of the review:

1. Review and analyse the progress based on the objectives, outputs and indicators in the Logical Framework Analysis.
2. Assess the results of the applied programme implementation strategy
3. Draw lessons from comparing different network approaches, conditions and contexts for the support.
4. Draw lessons regarding the communication and exchange of experiences between networks – facilitated by consortium members and the Secretariat through the website, newsletter and other means.
4. Present recommendations for adjustments and changes in the phase 2 follow-up project. The review exercise should be forward looking – focusing on improving and adjusting the existing programme.

3. Review outputs

- Draft working paper for discussions and reflections – February 2012
- A Report describing the review’s findings, conclusions and recommendations – April 2012

4. The elements for the methodology:

The review will be based on desk review of relevant documentation, meetings with resource persons in Copenhagen, at COP17 in Durban, and meetings/interviews through field visits to selected countries (among the participating countries in Africa, Latin America and Asia). This will include the following

- Desk study of written material – including capacity analysis, country assessment reports, advocacy plans and progress reporting by networks
- Interviews during COP17 with network participants present
- Assessment of progress of a selected number of national / regional / thematic networks through physical visits and/or interviews skype/phone with active participants and organisations in the selected networks and other stakeholders
- A questionnaire focusing on directions for a next phase programme to be sent by each network and consortium member (to be completed together with the progress report due by 1st February 2011– including preliminary proposals for budgets / activity plans for the next phase project).

The review will assess the work and achievements of the networks according to their plans for advocacy and capacity building, and look at the added value of the support from Southern Voices. The assessment will be informed by interviews with active members in the networks, their member organisations as well as other stakeholders related to their work. With the limited budget for the review, only a few networks will be selected for visits on the ground, others will be covered through interviews at distance (Skype/phone).

5. Proposed time plan:

November – December 2011	Desk Study Field visits to Central America Interviews at COP17 by regional consultant Meeting at COP 17 for networks present and their members Sending out questionnaires – including format for the networks for making preliminary proposals, and action plans for a possible next-phase project. Final decision of selection of other countries for field visits will be done immediately after COP 17.
January – February 2012	Visits to (other) selected countries and analysis of these visits. Self-evaluations analyzed. Discussions and reflections based on draft working paper. Write the Report
March	Review report draft available Adjusted project document proposal for next phase 2012 -2013 Written comments from consortium and Southern network Finalising the project document and the application for next phase

	programme
Early April 2012	Final version of Review rapport Submission of application for next phase programme.

6. Consultant

Consultant selected by Steering Group: Hans Peter Dejgaard – INKA Consult – plus possible Southern Consultants.

The Programme Coordinator will participate in the review as resource person.

Annex 1

Key questions / issues

Assessment of the programmes achievements and challenges so far

- **Benefit:** What has been the benefit for the network and its members of participating in the SV programme?
- **Added value:** What is the added value of the resources from the SVoices programme compared with the other funding sources (to be documented)
- **Advocacy:** What have been the three most important advocacy issues you have raised during 2011? Which role has the support through the SVoices programme played in these initiatives?
- **Members involvement:** To which extent have your member organisations been involved in the activities related to the SV programme: capacity analysis, advocacy plan, contributions to international report?
- **Utility:** What has been or will be the utility of these initiatives for the network and its members?
- **Capacity-building:** In which ways has the network and its members increased their capacity in advocacy issues during 2011? – Technical capacity / organizational capacity / capacity to document and produce evidence?
- To which extent can this be attributed to the SV programme? What has been the role of the network capacity analysis – how have members been involved?
- **Structure of programme:** How have you experienced the relationship between the Southern climate networks, the organisations in the Consortium and the Secretariat? Do you have proposals for improvements? Role of consortium partners: What has been the involvement and support of your partner organisation in the consortium?
- **Information Platform:** What has the value to the network and its members the Southern Voices website, newsletter and the circulation of information? Do you have proposals for improvements? How much have your network contributed?

Proposals for Changes in the next phase of the programme

- Which proposals do you have for changes in the second phase of the programme? Both as regards support for networks – and regarding learning and knowledge sharing across networks – facilitated by the Secretariat?
- **Learning and synergy:** If funding for exchanges and meetings between networks can be raised – which type of initiatives will you prefer and prioritize? please state your 1st, 2nd and 3rd priorities
 - A) an international meeting with sharing of experiences among all SV networks
 - B) regional meetings/workshops for Southern Voices networks
 - C) meetings/workshops on climate change topics like adaptation / REDD forestry / renewable energy
 - D) meetings/workshops on advocacy / networking focused on climate change
 - E) Funds available for joint advocacy initiatives organized by SV networks towards national / regional institutions
 - F) other....
- **End Product:** It has been proposed to publish a “Climate Change Advocacy Toolbox” with contributions from the Southern Voices networks – as the joint product of the phase 2 of the programme. Do you find this would be relevant for your network/organisation? Do you have other proposals.

ANNEX B. LIST OF PERSON

D. Van Nguget	Climate Change Working Group Vietnam
Tran Chung Chau	Climate Change Working Group in Vietnam (CCWG)
Krishna Lamsal	NGO Network on Climate Change (NGONCC) Nepal
Golam Rabbani	Climate Change Development Forum Bangladesh (CCDF)
Godfrey Mharadze	Zimbabwe Climate Change Working Group
Sherpard Zvigadza	Zimbabwe Climate Change Working Group (CLACC)
Euster Kibona	Tanzania Civil Society Forum on Climate Change Umbrella
Khumbo Kamanga	CISONECC – Malawi
William Chadza	ISONECC Malawi
Mahlet Eyassu	Ethiopian Civil Society Network on Climate Change
Pierre Dembele	West African Network on CC and Sustainable Development (WANET-CSD-Inforse)
Garba Tahirou Issa	African Youth Initiative on Climate Change, Niger
Sarjay Vashist	Climate Action Network, South Asia
Mamady Kobele Keita	CAN West Africa
Raju Chhetri	CAN International
Enrique Maurtua Konstantinidis	CAN Latin America
Zareen Myles	INFORSE India
Djinungue Nanasta	INFORSE Senegal
Lawali Malam Karim	National Committee of NGOs and on Desertification (CNCOD) Niger
George Kasali	Zambia Climate Change Network
Rahima Njaidi	Community Forest Conservation Network of Tanzania

Emmanuel Sek	CAN West Africa
Susan Nanduddu	Development Network of Indigenous Voluntary Associations- DANIVA (CLACC fellow)
Gifty Ampomah	CLACC Senegal
Modyouny Tandsa	CLACC Mauritania
Maiga Mouhamadou Farka	CLACC Mali
Anwara Shelly	CLACC Bangladesh (Caritas)
Joan Kariuki	CLACC Kenya
Krystel Dossou	CLACC Benin
Peter With	CARE Denmark
Mattias Söderberg	DanChurchaid
Ana María Méndez	IBIS Guatemala
María Isabel Olazábal	IBIS Central America
Thomas Nielsen	Advisor Danida regional environmental programme in Central America
Lily Mejía	Acicafoc (Central America)
Victor Campos	Centro Humboldt (Nicaragua)
Mónica López	Centro Humboldt
Carmen Torselli	Fundación Solar (Guatemala)
Vivian Lanuza	Fundación Solar

ANNEX C. INDIVIDUAL NETWORK SUMMARIES

Climate Change Working Group, Vietnam

Name of network	Climate Change Working Group Vietnam
Name of Informant	D. Van Nguget
Position in network	Core member
Number of Members	500 fully subscribed
Period of support	2011
Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: The network developed an advocacy plan, which has enabled them know where they want to go.	
Notable achievement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managed to mobilise people to get started and the network has placed itself in such a way that it is divided into thematic groups. The international organisations are now helping the local organisations. Wrote an MOU with the government this has created an enabling environment for collaboration- government thus recognises the network Facilitated the growth of the membership as there is something they are rallying around. 	
Member benefits and participation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The network has created a platform for sharing information and learning The coming together of network members has developed critical relationships that they are going to use for lobby and advocacy 	
Challenges preventing network from reaching goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It has been difficult to get commitment from various members as they are involved in their organisation core business- thus competing assignments There are few NGOs that focus on climate change such that they are not able to cover all the thematic areas of climate change The network received funds late and thus found the time of implementation was too short and thus not able to achieve much 	
Support from other organisations: CARE, OXFAM, WORLD VISION AND SAVE THE CHILDREN	
Added value and communication with SV secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The network has appreciated the sharing and networking that the secretariat has facilitated They have had fruitful communication with the secretariat and they received the newsletter and distribute the same to the membership They have not used the website much 	
Existing capacity base rated on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 is the highest): Lobby and advocacy: "4" The organisation has a history of lobbying and advocating for issues, thus they were able to handle the network issues effectively. Technical capacity: 2.5 The organisation does not have the capacity within, but are able to search for the same whenever need arises Organisation capacity: 2.5 They are average, but do not have funds to facilitate a fulltime person to coordinate issues Research capacity: "4" Have sound research capacity Reporting and Documentation: "3.5" They rated themselves as good, though the consultant is not privy to any samples of their publications	
Recommendations and future initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They would like to narrow the areas of focus for which the network would lobby. They will then built their capacity in the field they chose as a priority and hopefully they will be more effective They would like to search for more funding to enhance their activities, the current SV programme funds have been limited 	

NGO Network on Climate Change- Nepal

Name of network	NGO Network on Climate Change (NGONCC), Nepal:
Name of Informant	Krishna Lamsal
Position in network	
Number of Members	
Period of support	
<p>Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity building program (orientation on climate change) : • A workshop that was designed to enhance the understanding of Media persons on climate change and related issues. “ Linking Media and Climate Change Workshop”: • The network activities were initially supported by CLACC programme, IIED. Later, the activities specifically engaged (and expanded) civil societies of all the development regions in Nepal as strengthening climate network in Nepal with funding support from Development Fund, Norway. 	
<p>Notable achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CLACC Fellow is engaged in capacity building and network strengthening project and contributed in different capacity building activities • Media persons at local level enhanced their understanding on climate change issues. 	
<p>Member benefits and participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity building of the communities and media persons • Shared their capacity and practices on adaptation actions • Provides the opportunity to the network to contribute in climate negotiation process and share the learning 	
<p>Challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a demand for a comprehensive action plan to strengthen the capacity of members and to exercise of adaptation actions at the community level. Long-term need based support becomes the challenge to manage such demand. • The Network also needs to develop a communication strategy for sharing knowledge and practices with other networks. Both nationally and internationally. 	
<p>Support from other organisations:</p> <p>Development Fund, Norway is supporting the implementing of capacity building and climate network project.</p>	
<p>Added value and communication with secretariat:</p>	
<p>Existing capacity base:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy capacity: 3 • Technical Capacity : 3 • Organisational capacity: 3 • Research capacity: 3 • Reporting and documenting capacity: 3 	
<p>Recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members have to have capacity to develop ideas and concepts on adaptation action and design the mechanism for implementation in all affected vulnerable countries. The network needs support to conduct such exercises for capacity building • There is need to develop a clear follow up strategy with more actions involving other regional networks • The network would like a theme based publication from SV country partners, this will allow for issues to be addressed in details 	

Zimbabwe Climate Change Working Group

Name of network	Zimbabwe Climate Change Working Group (CLACC)
Name of Informant	Sherpard Zvigadza and Godfrey Mharadze
Position in network	Chairperson and coordinator respectively
Number of Members	45 organisations
Period of support	
<p>Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: US\$ 5000</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy capacity building for CSOs and partners • Capacity strengthening through training and information dissemination • Production of case studies 	
<p>Notable achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Policy reviews • Setting up of a network website • CSOs advocacy capacity was strengthened • Advocating for a Climate Change Strategy (The process has just started) • Capacity Building for members on advocacy and climate change issues • Engagement with government as a united front and two CSO representatives as the representatives of civil society in the National Climate Steering Committee. • A CSO Climate Change Strategy has been developed with a draft of ideas on how to achieve set targets. Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Management promised to have a look at the document for possible adoption of issues raised. • Membership has increased directly resulting from this SV initiative. We now have new membership from international organisations and other established players in the environment sector 	
<p>Member benefits and participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network has facilitated more coordination and enhanced communication • Members knowledge and capacity built on CC adaptation and they are able to speak on radio on CC • Shared platform for information exchange • The members were responsible for cascading down advocacy issues to their programme constituencies throughout the country • Members have started to mainstream climate change into their programmes e.g Caritas 	
<p>Challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited resources compared to planned activities • Limited continuity from member organisations. We continue to have more new members from the same member organisation, most of whom are new in the subject of Climate Change • Receptiveness among key stakeholders has been weak, and the network activities have been slowed down as they try to mobilise and involve them. The degree of sceptism between the government and civil society groups has been, but slowly the government through the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources management has opened up for any dialogue around Environment issues. • The ever increasing number of organizations willing to join the working group has also stretched available resources to the limit. The working group membership currently stands at over fifty institutions and still more are making enquiries on how to join. • To date, CCWG members have been spread over the five thematic sub-working groups. Namely: a) Policy advocacy and lobbying b) Health c) Ecosystems management and Biodiversity conservation) Water and agriculture e) Energy, Transport, Urban Infrastructure and Housing. Organizations join any of the five thematic groups on voluntary basis. Financial resource constraints have been a major challenge to the activities of the thematic committees as they have had to rely on resources from individual member organisations and a small support from the project. Some of the thematic groups have had their issues overlooked during the main CCWG meetings and workshops since they would not have discussed as a sub grouping level. 	
<p>Support from other organisations:</p> <p>Yes, Financial support UNDP for COP 17 preparations and attendance UNDP support for Pre-COP 17 workshop</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID (facilitating workshop venues) and As part of capacity building and strengthening, the CCWG managed to conduct training workshops for CSOs and journalists (Zimbabwe Environment Journalists Association) prior to the new activities as part of improving climate change reporting. 	

<p>Green-grants</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. We still had another running advocacy project supported by DFID on meeting climate change advocacy needs II. UNDP-provided support for a Pre- COP 17 advocacy workshop III. Financial support for network members to attend COP 17 in Durban
<p>Added value and communication with secretariat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network appreciated the information through newsletters • The current communication strategies are quite good, but there is need to increase the involvement of members in some of the strategies to make sure they own the process. Also the secretariat and consortium members could communicate via skype and web-based open discussion forums.
<p>Gaps that were not catered for.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities that would have been done: Advocating for increased support for CSOs to attend climate change conventions and other local, regional and international conventions • Advocating for continuous CSOs-government in country climate change engagement processes • Also advocated for a Climate Change Policy • Advocated for space for CSOs in national climate Change processes, such as government –sponsored workshops
<p>Existing capacity base:</p> <p>Advocacy capacity: 2.5 Technical Capacity:3 Organisational capacity: 3 Research capacity: 3 Reporting and documenting capacity: 4 This area is one of ZCCWG’s areas of strength.</p>
<p>Plans for the network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We plan to apply for more funding from the same donor supporting this programme and also consider other donors interested in funding such initiatives. • We are also in the process of strategically positioning the network so as to tap into any funding for climate change initiatives. • There is need for more capacity building on advocacy to move to practical to strengthen the first phase.
<p>Recommendation for second phase</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds to enable the capacity building for rural community based organisations or grass root organisations • Carryout documentation of best practices on advocacy • Small funds to allow for implementation on best practices as an opportunity to influence government and other key stakeholders as the government remains the determining factor to the success of all these interventions. • More coordination and communication with consortium members. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What areas do you think the consortium needs to work on to improve the support to its members? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Increase the amount of resources allocated for country programmes II. Increase the programme time frame to facilitate enough time for results dissemination and replication throughout the country III. Create linkages in countries where the programme will be running. It could either be exchange visits or programme familiarisation tours IV. Technical support for proposal writing increase chances for more work aside the consortium V. Capacity building to communication

Climate Change Development Forum, Bangladesh

Name of network	Climate Change Development Forum Bangladesh (CCDF,B)
Name of Informant	Golam Rabbani
Position in network	Coordinator
Number of Members	33
Period of support	
<p>Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advocacy on climate change and mitigation (3 events): one in Bangladesh at National Press Club in presence of Minister of Environment and Forests, Bangladesh; the other two were held in CoP 17, Durban, South Africa ▪ A national seminar on review of Bangladesh position on Climate change for Durban ▪ Internal coordination meeting (3) ▪ Participation in Capacity building programme on climate change and water in Dhaka and Rajshahi 	
<p>Notable achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network strengthened • Climate change and mitigation issue is now priority of the government of Bangladesh for follow up actions (as agreed by the minister in the event) • Contribution in Bangladesh position in current climate negotiation 	
<p>Member benefits and participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity of the CCDF members has been built in climate change issues • The members have been able to raise the voice of the affected communities at both national and global level • Members have participated in the network by sharing their capacity and practices on adaptation actions 	
<p>Challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for a comprehensive action plan to strengthen the capacity of CCDF members and also exercise of potential adaptation actions at the community level. Long-term need based support becomes the challenge to manage such demand • The Network also needs to develop a communication strategy for sharing knowledge and practices with others 	
<p>Support from other organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Norad supported BCAS to participate and raise the voice of Asian LDCs in CoP 17. 	
<p>Added value and communication with secretariat:</p>	
<p>Existing capacity base:</p> <p>Lobby and advocacy: 3.5 Technical Capacity : 3 Organisational capacity: 3 Research capacity: 3 Reporting and documenting capacity: 3</p>	
<p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members have to have capacity to develop ideas and concepts on adaptation action and design the mechanism for implementation in all affected vulnerable countries. The network needs support to conduct such exercises for in-situ capacity building • Follow up with more actions involving other networks • Second phase must include some case study publications from each country/region (may be based on secondary or primary data) 	

Climate Change Working Group in Vietnam (CCWG)

Name of network	Climate Change Working Group in Vietnam (CCWG)
Name of Informant	Tran Chung Chau
Position in network	Coordinator
Number of Members	More than 500 people subscribe to mailing list and a group of 20 organizations as active members
Period of support	Mid 2011, Informant joined network about 3 months ago from the time of the interview
Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support under SV partnership came in while some initiatives were on-going. In one hand, it is possible to say that this is an additional support to current plans. However, initiatives were run separately carry out advocacy work upon network's interest and strength Conducted internal Capacity assessment 	
Notable achievement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The advocacy strategy development helps put things together under one overarching plan. This can be regarded as one achievement of the network with SV support. Under the plan are a number of issues such as advocacy for integration of Climate Change Adaptation into national & local planning. 	
Member and participation benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members have gotten a chance to connect and get to know members of CCWG and members of SV network. As this is important for me because I have to strengthen coordination; Learn knowledge and sharing with members in the area of climate change; Products, so far, are reports on capacity analysis, policy analysis and advocacy strategy. In this regards, network members joined all stages of completing these products. So, they are informants and commentators. It is too early for members to realize benefits of being part of the SV network. Members are only aware of the advocacy plan. 	
Challenges: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dealing with different timings/agendas of each organization/sub-group → this means that the network has to be very flexible in handling and managing timing for meetings, especially to keep on track with the plan; Dealing with various motives to join network of individual organization 	
Support from other organisations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No, the network is trying to mobilize human resource and financials source from network members for certain sub-activity under the overall plan. At the same time they are looking for other source external funding as well. 	
Added value and communication with secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The communication has been good and the network values the opportunity of sharing information from other networks as well as the fact that a platform for sharing via the webpage has been created. Unfortunately they are not using the SV website due to access 	
Existing capacity base: Advocacy capacity: ...3 Technical Capacity :3. Organisational capacity: 3.. Research capacity:2. Reporting and documenting capacity:3....	
Future plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The network hopes to facilitate and support network members to implement the newly developed advocacy plan by making the plan more detailed, mobilizing more organizations to get involved in the implementation, setting up the M&E system for this advocacy assignment, and organizing capacity building sessions for those who are in need. 	
Recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fact that they are at the beginning of the advocacy planning, there are many things to be done in coming time: advocacy capacity building, studies to provide evident for advocacy. They would like to receive more technical support from consortium. For example, advocacy techniques or advocacy related communication and so on. Furthermore, if it is possible, we expect that consortium to help the network in developing proposal in seeking new funding for current advocacy implementation. 	

Tanzania Civil Society Forum on Climate Change

Name of network	Tanzania Civil Society Forum on Climate Change Umbrella
Name of Informant	Euster Kibona
Position in network	Country fellow
Number of Members	
Period of support	
Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network created a platform for civil society organisation to lobby and advocate for climate change issues • The network conducted capacity building sessions on climate change and adaptation. • The platform created enabled them to share relevant information. 	
Notable achievement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed to link with policy makers and have a chair in the national technical climate change committee, this chair has enabled influence into the country climate strategy • Established a stable link/platform for various key stakeholders- government, donors and members 	
Member benefits and participation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member appreciate the engagement with government, something they would not have done on their own • Members appreciate the learning and support they get on climate change issues 	
Challenges preventing network from reaching goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network does not have adequate funds to do what it intends to do • The network does not have all the content on climate change to satisfy members needs/requests • The network does not have a fixed secretariat, so the members are volunteers and thus have competing assignments from their core organisations. 	
Support from other organisations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID has supported Core organisation support • Oxfam and Muvek has supported a multi organisation initiative 	
Communication and support from SV secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The communication with the secretariat would be better if it was direct, currently it is too slow, secondly they receive more emails than they can share with network members • The network has not used the website 	
Areas that they would like to cover, but have not : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network would like to have more intense training for members • They would like to support members to develop fundable proposals 	
Existing capacity base rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest): Lobby and advocacy: "2" This capacity is very low, since it is a new area. The network has been more oriented towards implementation of adaptation Technical capacity:"2.5" They now have basic knowledge on Climate change adaptation, it is an area that they need to continuously build Organisation capacity:" 2" This is also low due to no permanent secretariat, but they have managed o form an effective networking strategy Research capacity: "2" This capacity is limited, the network has not established whether the members are able to conduct proper research to meet international standards Reporting and Documentation: This area could not be rated as it has not tested this capacity since the funding only just received.	
Recommendations and future initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They would like to focus on one or 2 issues of climate change, which will allow them to narrow their planning for the next stage, they hope in this way they will be able to record progress. • They would like to enhance internal learning and advocacy training. This is an area that they are weak, and thus they would like more time to built on it. 	

CISONECC, Malawi

Name of network	CISONECC – Malawi
Name of Informant	Khumbo Kamanga
Position in network	Member
Number of Members	720
Period of support	
Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network conducted a capacity analysis • Imputed into the Disaster Recovery management and climate change policy • Pre cop meeting and round table discussion • Developed a position paper for civil society • Hosted the Caravan of youth who were travelling to Durban • Capacity building for members and youth groups 	
Notable achievement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity assessment report • Enhanced knowledge and skill in climate change and advocacy. • Position paper presented to government and accepted • Have developed a roadmap with members 	
Member benefits and participation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members appreciate the fact that they are having their knowledge capacity built • The fact that they are able to influence government policy is exciting- e.g. DRM policy 	
Challenges preventing network from reaching goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited resources verses what they need to deliver on • The SV reporting was difficult, but they hope the new system will be user friendly 	
Support from other organisations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action Aid supported the Civil society position paper • EU supported position paper • Christian aid supported the DRM and advocacy strategy 	
Added value and communication with SV secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The communication with secretariat is good and has been enhanced with website, however they would like to advertise activities through policy briefs, posters, • Templates on reporting and guiding the capacity assessment were useful • Information received and workshop forums have been useful in building the capacity of the network 	
Areas that are important but not covered by support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the climate change policy • They need organisational support to have a secretariat to run affairs • They need a CC journal • They need support to engage parliamentarians • They would like to mobilise more networks members 	
Existing capacity base rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lobby and advocacy: “4” They only need to reach parliamentarians. • Technical capacity: 2. The organisation does not have the capacity within • Organisation capacity: 2 They do not have funds for overhead costs for the network activities • Research capacity: “2” They have no demonstrated capacity on based on what members have said • Reporting and Documentation: “5” They rated themselves as very good, and have reports to demonstrate 	
Recommendations and future initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They would like to be supported to get more funding • They would like the opportunity to go deeper into issues – focused on activities against outputs and one area instead of every area • Enhanced information sharing across regions • Empower communities among partner networks so that they can interact 	

- Increase the implementation period of programme

CISONECC, Malawi

Name of network	CISONECC Malawi
Name of Informant	William Chadza
Position in network	Member/Secretary
Number of Members	23
Period of support	April 2011
Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: approx. 40 000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network carried out a country assessment • They also carried out a network assessment, which has fed into the strategic plan • They participated in developing the new report developed by SV 	
Notable achievement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network has developed cohesion among development organisations • The members have gained confidence after having peer reviewed each other • They have developed a strategic plan, which has made it very clear to them which direction they would like to move • The membership of the network has grown from 20 to 23 	
Member benefits and participation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main benefit recorded by members is the fact that they now have a joint strategy CC events • Members appreciate that they are able to engage in policy debate and interact with government • Members have participated actively in the organisation of CC events 	
Challenges preventing network from reaching goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members of the network are in other organisation, thus have competing assignments, thus the network activities suffer 	
Support from other organisations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network was able to get other funds, from DF Norway, AAIM, Oxfam and UNDP. Oxfam supported the development of the strategic plan and the other supported the development of the civil society position paper 	
Added value and communication with SV secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication with the network secretariat is smooth, they are advantaged in that they have a local presence of Dan church Aid. • The network appreciate the information and also the networking opportunity and international debate opportunities availed through the network. They have been able to share the same with network members • They have not utilised the website 	
Areas important but not able to accomplish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They would have loved a secretariat, which would have performed bigger assignments • They would like to influence policy, but funds came in late, thus too early to judge impact 	
Existing capacity rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest): Lobby and advocacy: 3 They are good and get recognition from government as the representative of civil society in CC issues Technical capacity: 3 The capacity varies among the members and somehow they are able to draw from the pull for any kind of expertise they need Organisation capacity:3.5 They are well established and have a secretariat that is able to deliver on expectations from members Research capacity: 3 There is evidence among the membership that they have been conducting research. Reporting and Documentation: 2.5 This is a weak area that they need to work on, they feel that they do so much which they have not been able to document.	
Recommendations and future initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SV network needs to improve the technical reviews, this will help built the various networks • They would like the knowledge management enhanced 	

Ethiopian Civil Society Network on Climate Change

Name of network	Ethiopian Civil Society Network on Climate Change- hosted by Forum for Environment
Name of Informant	Mahlet Eyassu
Position in network	CC programme manager
Number of Members	62+
Period of support	January 2011
<p>Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: approx. 40 000</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Printed 2 policy briefs Carried out the network capacity assessment Carried out country assessment Supported 2 people to attend COP 17 Supported the development of promotional material Support team leader 	
<p>Notable achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The network is now self aware after the capacity assessment They have managed to engender the CC policy on existing policy and had a launch that involved all members They have been able to engage government on various policy issues related to CC 	
<p>Member benefits and participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members are happy to know the other players in the sector, they thus have a reference point Members are happy of the fact that they are able to link with government on CC issues The members have been very active and the network has organised itself into 10 working groups that focus on various issues that affect the country. Members generate information/issues within these working groups 	
<p>Challenges preventing network from reaching goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The budge they have is limited compared to what they would like to achieve 	
<p>Support from other organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DFID supported the country assessment The organisation got support from HBF Norway, Netherlands embassy and Christian Aid 	
<p>Added value and communication with SV secretariat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The network is comfortable with the current communication with the secretariat and they attributed this to the long term relationship they have with Dan Church Aid The network appreciated the information received from the secretariat, they noted the newsletter and the engagement. They have been able to see their articles published and thus distributed the same to the membership The network appreciated the information on possibility of new funding The network appreciates the information sharing platform created by the secretariat 	
<p>Areas important but not able to accomplish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They would have liked to have a strategic plan in place 	
<p>Existing capacity rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest):</p> <p>Lobby and advocacy: 3.5 The network is good since the host/lead organisation has been engaging in advocacy for a long time as a core activity</p> <p>Technical capacity: 4.5 The members are good and able to perform various task both at advocacy and implementation</p> <p>Organisation capacity: They have hired one person to run network activities, thus things are moving</p> <p>Research capacity: 3.5 They have sound capacity</p> <p>Reporting and Documentation: 3 They have the capability</p>	
<p>Recommendations and future initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They would like to see the programme thinking more broadly and allowing for innovation best on the unique situation in the various countries They would like to continue contributing to the newsletter They would like more regional and international engagements 	

West African Network on CC and Sustainable Development

Name of network	West African Network on CC and Sustainable Development (WANET-CSD-Inforse)
Name of Informant	Pierre Dembele
Position in network	Secretariat
Number of Members	8 National Networks in Mali, Senegal, Burkina faso, Ghana, Nigeria, Benin, Cote d'ivoire, Togo
Period of support	June 2011
<p>Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: approx. US\$18 800</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They produced both a local and national report on Environment • Produced case studies on renewable energy • Held a regional meeting • Held 3 national meetings • Mapping of NGOs in the sector was conducted in Mali, Benin, Bukina faso, • Supported participation in the Durban conference 	
<p>Notable achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed to develop an ecological draft and handed this to the candidate that is varying for presidential elections • Produced a newsletter on CC • The network is recognised by ECOWAS 	
<p>Member benefits and participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members appreciate the learning that is taking place within the network 	
<p>Challenges preventing network from reaching goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contracting was slow, leaving a short period of implementation • There is limited synergies between SV networks and this causes duplication of efforts • The funds were limited to effectively serve the members in the different countries and thus delays were experienced as they sort funds to supplement those provided by SV • The process of developing activities for the first phase was not inclusive, thus unrealistic expectations for members to achieve and also the issues are not necessarily what members needed. 	
<p>Support from other organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network was supported by Finland, Sida 	
<p>Added value and communication with SV secretariat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network has faced fragmented communication with the secretariat and INFOSE in the southern region, the programme would benefit from consolidation • The network appreciate the information on alternative funding that they have gotten from the secretariat, some members have utilised the website • The emails emanating from the secretariat are more than they can attend to without a secretariat 	
<p>Areas important but not able to accomplish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to have funds to support member activities. Currently the fund cannot and this raises frustration among the membership 	
<p>Existing capacity rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest):</p> <p>Lobby and advocacy: "4" individual networks at country level are well capacitated and there focus now is to ensure they can all influence ECOWAS as a team.</p> <p>Technical capacity: "3" The networks have both advocacy and implementation capacity</p> <p>Organisation capacity: "2" This is a weak area, the network would specifically like to understand how to bring national issues to the regional level so as to have impact at international level</p> <p>Research capacity: "4" The various network members have good experience in conducting research.</p> <p>Reporting and Documentation: "3" The network has the relevant capacity to produce documents and has been able to produce newsletters.</p>	
<p>Recommendations and future initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next phase should focus on evidence based lobbying • There should be more exchange visits starting at local, national culminating at the regional level • The approach should be more consolidated instead of spreading funds thinly • The network would like a deliberate process of building synergies with stronger networks e.g. CAN • The network will utilise the gains from this phase to prepare for Rio+20 and the outcome from the Durban conference will see them host meetings in Benin, Burkina Faso and Mali 	

African Youth Initiative on Climate Change, Niger

Name of network	African Youth Initiative on Climate Change, Niger
Name of Informant	Garba Tahirou Issa
Position in network	National Coordinator
Number of Members	12 organisation of youth
Period of support	
<p>Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: approximately US\$5 000</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A workshop aimed at evaluating the capacity of the network • A study on policies and programmes on climate change in Niger- country assessment • Information exchange meetings • Workshop preparation for COP 17 • Support for participation in COP 17 	
<p>Notable achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition of small organisations not only in the donor community, but also government • Strengthened capacity among members and ownership of SV programme • Network able to advocate for debt against climate • The network was able a access information from the public for elaboration of the country report 	
<p>Member benefits and participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member are happy that government listens to them • Members have participated in the running of the network activities, this has ensured transparency and members comply with the network arrangements. • Member are divided into thematic areas and every 2 weeks there is a report on their various activities 	
<p>Challenges preventing network from reaching goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The initiatives are new to the youth organisations, thus they have to learn a lot on not only the topic, but also how to get their voice heard 	
<p>Support from other organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, Global Network climate debt pilot programme for climate resilience- PPCA • GNDR supported a study on risk reduction and natural disaster in Niger 	
<p>Added value and communication with SV secretariat:</p> <p>SV is the first partner of the organisation, thus it has put the network on the map of Civil society, this has given members confidence to start being an active player</p> <p>The network has good relations with SV and they are on good communication with their consortium member- they have a goggle group, thus they are aware when the network has not received information</p> <p>The network has been able to upload it's information on the website</p>	
<p>Areas important but not able to accomplish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They would have liked support to develop proposals for adaptation • They would also have loved funding to promote clean energy 	
<p>Existing capacity rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest):</p> <p>The network feels that they cannot rate themselves since they are very new in the sector and thus are in the process of learning at every stage.</p> <p>Lobby and advocacy: Technical capacity: Organisation capacity: Research capacity: Reporting and Documentation:</p>	
<p>Recommendations and future initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next phase should support a process that enables them raise funds to carry out some adaptation activities. 	

Climate Action Network, South Asia

Name of network	Climate Action Network, South Asia
Name of Informant	Sarjay Vashist
Position in network	Director
Number of Members	90 member organisations
Period of support	
<p>Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided, they received approximately 35 000:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network carried out a capacity assessment. • Exchange of information • Developed policy briefs • Manage to conduct regional networking 	
<p>Notable achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deepened content knowledge • Brought 25 experts together to debate issues around CC • Hosted CAN south Asia negotiations with policy markers • Developed policy briefs 	
<p>Member benefits and participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members have been able to learn from each other and the silos have been broken • The network has exposed members to international issues • Members have built confidence as they have peer reviewed from each other 	
<p>Challenges preventing network from reaching goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too many formats of doing things 	
<p>Support from other organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oxfam, Henrick ball foundation and Action Aid supported adaptation 	
<p>Added value and communication with SV secretariat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The communication with the secretariat is fine and the network has benefited from the learning from North to South. • The network appreciates the newsletter and shares the same with its members 	
<p>Areas important but not able to accomplish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional cooperation for resource sharing • How trade has been accepted 	
<p>Existing capacity base rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest):</p> <p>Lobby and advocacy: "4" The network is well placed Technical capacity: "4" The network has come of age and members are no longer just tourist in international processes, but come with high expectations to gain from engagement. Organisation capacity: "3" The secretariat is established and is also hosting the regional UNEP node Research capacity: "4" Have sound research capacity Reporting and Documentation: "4" Very good, and they showed the consultant some of th publications they are able to produce.</p>	
<p>Recommendations and future initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network would like to receive funds directly from the secretariat • The network would like to continue building its institutional capacity • The network would like to see more regional engagement and mentoring taking place • The network would like to have more sharing of working practices 	

Climate Action Network, Latin America

Name of network	CANLA Argentina
Name of Informant	Enrique Maurtua Konstantinidis
Position in network	Regional Coordinator
Number of Members	30 member organisations
Period of support	
<p>Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided, they received approximately US\$41000:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network developed a website • The network carried out an internal capacity assessment • They managed to hold 2 workshops 	
<p>Notable achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network has provided a forum for members to express themselves • Network membership has grown • Managed to develop a secretariat to run the SV • The network managed to have 2 members seating in the government delegation • The network had a document ready for COP 17 	
<p>Member benefits and participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint strategy • Joint capacity building initiatives resulting in confidence in the membership • The forums have created a momentum 	
<p>Challenges preventing network from reaching goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency from members is weak • Members have competing assignments • Language challenges, not all members speak English 	
<p>Support from other organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team in Chile got support from Oxfam 	
<p>Added value and communication with SV secretariat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The guide the secretariat provided for the assessment was helpful • Communication with the secretariat is good and a conducive working culture exists • The network has not been invited to contribute to the newsletter • The network has referred to the SV website 	
<p>Areas important but not able to accomplish:</p> <p>The network would like to raise funds to expand activities He network would like to hold capacity building sessions for the media</p>	
<p>Existing capacity base rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest):</p> <p>Lobby and advocacy: 2 One training was held to introduce members, thus more needs to be done Technical capacity: 3 They now have the information, but need to manage the same. Organisation capacity: This is an area they have started to build Research capacity: 3.5 The network members are relatively good, what they need to do is coordinate issues Reporting and Documentation: 4.5 The network is very good and had samples of the same</p>	
<p>Recommendations and future initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They would like more regional meetings • They would appreciate resource persons from the network secretariat • They would like communication tools enhanced- e.g. support to internet 	

INFORSE, India

Name of network	INFORSE, India
Name of Informant	Zareen Myles
Position in network	Member
Number of Members	South Asia Regional Members
Period of support	
Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network carried out 2 meetings one in North and the other in South India with focal points • The network conducted a mapping exercise of members • They held one regional workshop • Held meeting with NEPAL team 	
Notable achievement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing successful case studies and stories 	
Member benefits and participation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with other members and sharing information • Learning from each other experience 	
Challenges preventing network from reaching goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited capacity and understanding of CC • Project period too short compared to expected outputs 	
Support from other organisations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network was not able to get other funds, but have tried to complement with existing funds from their organisation 	
Added value and communication with SV secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network has good communication with the SV secretariat and they appreciate the guidelines for carrying out the capacity assessment. They network has however not utilised the website. 	
Areas important but not able to accomplish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	
Existing capacity rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest): Lobby and advocacy: 1 Not much experience exists in the network Technical capacity: 4. The members are good at implementation of CC activities, however poor at advocacy Organisation capacity: the fact that they do not have a secretariat, they considered themselves weak Research capacity: Capacity not tested Reporting and Documentation: 4 The network is very good and had managed to produce 8 case studies	
Recommendations and future initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds permitting the network would like to hold national and regional capacity building on advocacy • The network would like to have orientation seminars of 2-3 days for decision markers in the various organisations • They would have liked to have training on proposal writing and fundraising • The newsletter should have articles that are divided according to regions 	

INFORSE, Senegal

Name of network	INFORSE , Senegal
Name of Informant	Djinungue Nanasta
Position in network	Regional Coordinator
Number of Members	10
Period of support	
<p>Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: approximately US\$17 000</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation for COP 17 • Attended COP 17 and participated in side events and exhibition • Organised a regional meeting 	
<p>Notable achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in COP 17 successfully 	
<p>Member benefits and participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	
<p>Challenges preventing network from reaching goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The programme implementation period was short compared to what was expected and the funds to support the activities were not adequate 	
<p>Support from other organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes they got support, but most of it was implementation of CC adaptation. 	
<p>Added value and communication with SV secretariat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The communication with the Secretariat is good and the network has received that newsletter which has been shared with members • The network has referred briefly to the SV website 	
<p>Areas important but not able to accomplish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network would have liked to have more planning together to ensure that the CC policy was jointly agreed upon so as to get commitment 	
<p>Existing capacity rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lobby and advocacy: 5 IIED has already built the capacity of the network • Technical capacity: "4" They have the capacity, the challenge is the limited funding • Organisation capacity: 2.5 They are fair • Research capacity: 3 They are good • Reporting and Documentation: 2.5 They are fair and would like to continue building this area 	
<p>Recommendations and future initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They would like more funds allocated for the identified activities • They would appreciate more coordination among the various members so as to hence the synergies and this would bring along objectivity and fairness in the operations • The network should have more direct capacity building sessions for the members • The SV should consult more so that the priorities are in line with the various networks 	

National Committee of NGOs and on Desertification (CNCOD), Niger

Name of network	National Committee of NGOs and on Desertification (CNCOD), Niger – Care international
Name of Informant	Lawali Malam Karim
Position in network	Programme Coordinator
Number of Members	9 community organisation and networks-(200 members downstream)
Period of support	
Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: approximately US\$40 000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network carried out a network member assessment • Carried out the country assessment • Developed an action plan • Advocating for the engendering of CC in policies and strategies in Niger • Attended COP 17 • Platform for national networks 	
Notable achievement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional awareness and training workshop on engendering CC in programmes • National training workshop and information sharing forum • Attending COP 17 and identifying synergies 	
Member benefits and participation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members appreciate the synergies between CNCOD and the Youth network of Niger • Members appreciate attending international fora to share and learn from a wider ordinance • Members have participated in the capacity assessment and country assessment • Members have participated in awareness campaigns • Members appreciate the capacity building sessions 	
Challenges preventing network from reaching goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been weak cross learning among the SV networks • The capacity on advocacy is not sufficient to deliver on expectations • Members have competing assignments 	
Support from other organisations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network got support from the National Council of Environment and sustainable development (CNEDD) Niger and CARE International Niger , the support was for information , adaptation and biodiversity and desertification 	
Added value and communication with SV secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network appreciated the guidelines for the capacity assessment • The communication has to go through CARE international, meaning that there is very little space for independence to manage the process • The network has not received the newsletter and thus has not distributed it • The network did not know of the existence of the SV website 	
Areas important but not able to accomplish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network would have liked to get tips on how to run a network efficiently • They would like to have funds to set up a fulltime secretariat to administer the issues of the network 	
Existing capacity rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lobby and advocacy: 3 They still need to build this capacity further • Technical capacity: "2.5" This capacity is not uniform among the members • Organisation capacity: 2.5 The funding has been limited to support the development of this capacity • Research capacity: 2 They are still weak • Reporting and Documentation: 3 They are fairly good, but they do not have funds to document their stories 	
Recommendations and future initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next phase should give autonomy to networks to prioritise what they feel is important • Funds need to be set aside to support a secretariat for the network • Regional meeting should be enhanced • The network has to address the language issue, not all members are English speakers, there is need to accommodate the other languages • There is need to support networks to have internet connectivity so as to easy communication 	

Development Network of Indigenous Voluntary Associations- DANIVA

Name of network	Development Network of Indigenous Voluntary Associations- DANIVA (IIED)
Name of Informant	Susan Nanduddu
Position in network	CLACC fellow
Number of Members	700, but they are not sure which ones are active
Period of support	6 years
<p>Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: approximately Pounds3 300</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity building on CC issues • National meeting in preparation for COP17 	
<p>Notable achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased outreach to members • Platform for sharing adaptation information with farmers • Recognition from Government • Advocated for the national adaptation programme of action 	
<p>Member benefits and participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members like the opportunity of learning • Members appreciate the collaboration that exists in the network 	
<p>Challenges preventing network from reaching goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The funding was limited compared to what they had to accomplish • IIED reporting was a challenge • The administration of the network activities were a challenge, since there were no funds to get an extra hand to run things 	
<p>Support from other organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oxfam and Novib for adaptation 	
<p>Added value and communication with SV secretariat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They get the mail from the secretariat, the information is sometimes overwhelming and they are not able to share with the members all the information • The network has not been able to utilise the website and have not contributed to the newsletter, they have not gotten the invitation to contribute to the newsletter 	
<p>Areas important but not able to accomplish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative support • Implementation after raising awareness on what needs to be done on CC • More engagement with government 	
<p>Existing capacity rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest):</p> <p>Did not conduct assessment, thus not able to rate the network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lobby and advocacy: • Technical capacity: • Organisation capacity: • Research capacity: • Reporting and Documentation: 	
<p>Recommendations and future initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They would like support to document their case studies • They would to enhance the opportunity to share information at regional level and this can be virtual, thus there is need to enhance internet connectivity • They would like to enhance their capacity to raise funds to support other priority areas • They would like a toolkit on advocacy • There is need to conduct audits on international meetings 	

Zambia Climate Change Network

Name of network	Zambia Climate Change Network
Name of Informant	George Kasali
Position in network	Member
Number of Members	80
Period of support	2010
Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: approximately Pounds 1 500 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information sharing and capacity building 2 workshops 	
Notable achievement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20 NGOs were trained in adaptation 	
Member benefits and participation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members appreciate the knowledge sharing and they have built their knowledge on CC Members appreciate the joint lobby and advocacy that they are able to do 	
Challenges preventing network from reaching goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The funding was limited and thus the network has not been able to carry out most of the activities 	
Support from other organisations: IIED and IDRC have supported research	
Added value and communication with SV secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reporting template was tedious, but it gave the network a starting point, they hope the improved version will be user friendly The communication with the secretariat flows well, they received the newsletter and have distributed to the membership Have not contributed to the newsletter since they are not clear in what to share They have not utilised the SV website 	
Areas important but not able to accomplish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research that would be able to generate information that would influence policy 	
Existing capacity rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lobby and advocacy: 4 They have the capacity and their government is receptive Technical capacity: 3 They need to continue building this capacity Organisation capacity: 2 very weak as they have no funds to support this area Research capacity: 3.5 They have the capacity, but are not utilising it Reporting and Documentation: 2, this is weak and there is need to built it- built the culture of writing among membership 	
Recommendations and future initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They would like to increase the number of people knowledgeable on CC There is need to generate information through research and connection with the university There is need to deepen engagement with government so as to be in tune Regional learning needs to be enhanced and this should be based on technical details and case studies 	

Community Forest Conservation Network of Tanzania

Name of network	Community Forest Conservation Network of Tanzania (CARE Tanzania)
Name of Informant	Rahima Njaidi
Position in network	Executive Director
Number of Members	90
Period of support	2011 April
<p>Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: approximately US\$ 44 000</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal assessment of organisation and selected CBOs this enabled them to understand the capacity gaps in regards to understanding, lobby and advocacy • Trained 40 networks on critical issues on CC • Attended Bond meeting • Attended Durban COP 17 • Held annual forum with 50 community members 	
<p>Notable achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network is now recognised • The network now knows its status in terms of capability • Are leaders/chair in the Africa caucus- the Judge Tony Lavinya is from Tanzania- NGO delegate in the government team • Inclusion of community members into the REDD taskforce 	
<p>Member benefits and participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The members appreciated the assessment • The annual forum was also well appreciated by membership, it was a chance for them to discuss real issues • Members have played a big role in contributing the information that has formed and informed the various processes 	
<p>Challenges preventing network from reaching goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network would like to have satellite offices so as to enhance its outreach for training and mobilisation, however the funds under the SV programme do not allow for this to take place . • Trying to get order at grassroots level has been a challenge, if they remain disorganised then they will not be able to influence policy 	
<p>Support from other organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Norwegian government has supported REDD activities in 2 districts 	
<p>Added value and communication with SV secretariat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network appreciates the communication which has facilitated the information sharing, though the email are too many. • The network appreciates the newsletter and sends this only to the national networks as the local communities will be challenged with the language • The network appreciated the guidelines for report and assessments that the SV secretariat has provided. • The network is comfortable with the relationship with the consortium through they would like more face to face contact 	
<p>Areas important but not able to accomplish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network would like to enhance its outreach at grassroots level, because this is where the impact of CC is most felt 	
<p>Existing capacity rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lobby and advocacy: 4 they are good • Technical capacity: 4 they are good and are able to conduct training for members • Organisation capacity: 3, there is room for improvement, however they feel they are able to coordinate network issues • Research capacity:4 they are good at both the network secretariat and membership • Reporting and Documentation: 5 They are very good and showed the consultant some of their publications 	
<p>Recommendations and future initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is need to provide funds to support coordination at the network organisation • .The network feels that they are behind in the safe guards- International safe mechanisms, thus no yard 	

for accountability.

CAN West Africa

Name of network	CAN West Africa
Name of Informant	Emmanuel Sek
Position in network	SV Programme Coordinator
Number of Members	26
Period of support	2010
Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: approximately Pounds 1 500 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The network carried out the capacity assessment. This was an important exercise to know the weaknesses of members. It helped the network determine the focus as well as how to link with regional and national networks. We also consolidated the node.• A mailing list and database was also put in place.• We used part of the SV to participate in Bonn Intersessional meetings	
Notable achievement: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We strengthened the network• We advocated at national level- AMCEN meeting.• We expanded from 10 to 26	
Member benefits and participation: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Coordination• Better or improved communication	
Challenges preventing network from reaching goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The fact that Assessment of network was online. A regional workshop was supposed to solve this.• It was a challenge to deal with two languages, (French and English but with the majority speaking French, yet communication was supposed to be in English. Translation was supposed to be done. With pressure from SV and CARE one is forced to communicate in English.• There are several networks, like FAMNET, CLACC, One Earth, INFORSE and to come up with several themes. Coordination became a challenge.• Networking is social issue, so the need to understand several cultures becomes a challenge.	
Support from other organisations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• UNEP Hennrik Boel Foundation, German Cooperative, French Agency for development, DFID, CIDA and MONALO. This was to Implement on the ground and Policy analysis.	
Added value and communication with SV secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Website not being used• Newsletter circulation is good• CAN West Africa Article did not appear in newsletter <p>Southern Voices need to be heard more, there is a screen that blocks communication?</p>	
Areas important but not able to accomplish: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It is too early to tell if the programme has had impacts but there has been an effort to advocate at Inter Governmental level, eg ECOWAS.• Engagement of CSOs at the COPs have to be meaningful, hence the need to be strategic to make sure that the negotiators see what we are sending. SV has to make sure that this happens.	
Existing capacity rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lobby and advocacy:• Technical capacity:• Organisation capacity:• Research capacity:• Reporting and Documentation:	

Recommendations and future initiatives:

- More capacity in phase 2 needed
- Creation of southern Caucus
- SV to know that the interest of NGOs is not the same, others may not want advocacy
- Set regional networks
- Need for more Network Assessment
- The need to develop an Action plan
- It is important to see how we can link national issues (thematic) and those of International processes.
- In order to link people in thematic issues, there is need for more money from SV
- Language barrier has to be removed somehow.

CLACC , Senegal

Name of network	CLACC, Senegal
Name of Informant	Gifty Ampomah
Position in network	Regiona Network Coordinator
Number of Members	
Period of support	
Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network received their funds late and hope to carry out a post Cop 17 workshop to give feedback to members 	

CAN West Africa

Name of network	CAN West Africa
Name of Informant	Mamady Kobele Keita
Position in network	Member
Number of Members	
Period of support	
Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network conducted the assessment and analysis • Case studies • Updated member database and mailing list 	

CLACC, Mauritania

Name of network	CLACC Mauritania
Name of Informant	Modyouny Tandsa
Position in network	National Fellow
Number of Members	12 member organisations
Period of support	
<p>Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided, they received approximately US\$1000:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The network organised a meeting with local stakeholders 	
<p>Notable achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created a platform for the locals to meet with policy markers Enhanced understanding of the connection between CC and food security 	
<p>Member benefits and participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The members have been able to engage with their local authorities 	
<p>Challenges preventing network from reaching goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding limitations has meant that the network has not been able to carry out the identified assignments 	
<p>Support from other organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EU and the French agency for Development have supported the network to implement CC projects 	
<p>Added value and communication with SV secretariat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The communication has been weak, it would be enhanced if it was direct since the project is too small for communication to be through the region. The network has not utilised the SV website 	
<p>Areas important but not able to accomplish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The network would have loved funds for follow up on activities They would also like to implement a strategy on lobby and advocacy, but are limited by funds 	
<p>Existing capacity base rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest):</p> <p>Lobby and advocacy: 1 This is a new area for the organisation Technical capacity: 1 The network only has basic knowledge on CC issues Organisation capacity: 1 The organisation is small and does not have the funds to support the logistics of the SV project Research capacity: 1 The network members have not demonstrated this capacity Reporting and Documentation: 2.5 The network has documented some case studies under the EU funding</p>	
<p>Recommendations and future initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They recommend a capacity building component for network members They would like to have the capacity to document some case studies 	

CLACC Network, Mali

Name of network	CLACC Network, Mali
Name of Informant	Maiga Mouhamadou Farka
Position in network	Focal point
Number of Members	30 NGOs and community based organisations
Period of support	June 2011
Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: approx. US\$3 200 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advocating for engendering of CC in various policies Capacity building for members aimed at raising awareness of CC 	
Notable achievement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managed to formalise the network and it is now a thriving platform for relevant organisations on CC. The network continues to hold regular meetings They have been given the mandate by government to oversee civil society organisations activities on CC The network is recognised by government, even though it is not easy and holds meeting with the media and university 	
Member benefits and participation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fact that a formalised system/platform now exist for carrying out learning and advocacy among civil society organisations Members participate in the planning sessions and form part of the leadership Member like the fact that they can now engage in joint advocacy activities at local level 	
Challenges preventing network from reaching goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited funding has hampered the progress of the network The language has been a big hindrance for the network to pass on information to other members Working with state actors is not easy Conflict of interest created by the secretariat of SV between RACC/CLACC Mali and Reso climate 	
Support from other organisations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IIED supported capacity building and Sida supported adaptation 	
Added value and communication with SV secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SV secretariat has been very helpful in providing guidelines for report writing 	
Areas important but not able to accomplish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Besides the capacity building and advocacy which they consider important, but they would have prioritise climate change adaptation for LDC as this is more relevant 	
Existing capacity rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest): They could not rate themselves, since they have not carried out an internal assessment Lobby and advocacy: Technical capacity: Organisation capacity: Research capacity: Reporting and Documentation:	
Recommendations and future initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next phase should strengthen working relationships with academic to better involve them in research and publications Continue to work with media to enhance communication on negative impact of human behaviour Create and Strengthen synergies between CLACC fellows in West Africa Mobilise resources to support members carry out adaptation initiatives Enhance the participation in regional and international fora 	

CLACC , Bangladesh

Name of network	CLACC Bangladesh
Name of Informant	Anwara Shelly (Caritas)
Position in network	CLACC Fellow
Number of Members	19
Period of support	June 2011
Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness campaigns for local Members of parliament, and local government • Advocacy initiatives with government 	
Notable achievement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed to hold training sessions for a wide range of stakeholders including academicians, NGOs, and practitioners • Produced brochures in the local language • Managed to convince government to implement some climate smart initiatives, e.g. building canals • They have been seconded to the government negotiation team • The network managed to advocate for poor people to be supported with inputs and housing 	
Member benefits and participation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The members liked the capacity building sessions and communication with other networks like CANSA, and the climate change forum. • Members have also participated by training others once they are trained- trainers of trainers 	
Challenges preventing network from reaching goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members bring to the network many advocacy issues, but the funds to carry out the same are limited- thus not able to meet member demands • The focus of the network and the community are not always the same e.g. they want houses, canals and forestry. So member satisfaction is low 	
Support from other organisations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network got support from CARITAS Australia who provided funds for excavation of the canal, they also got funds from CARITAS Germany and IIED • They also got support for payment for the coordinator from IIED 	
Added value and communication with SV secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The informant could not comment on this, since she does not have direct communication with the secretariat, however they feel that IIED has to monitor activities and improve on the communication • As a members they have not utilised the SV website 	
Areas important but not able to accomplish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They would have liked to have more opportunity to disseminate information • They would have liked more capacity building sessions on lobbying and advocacy • The capacity building should target the poor and not NGOs, since if the poor are capacitated then they will be able to do their activities 	
Existing capacity rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest): Lobby and advocacy: 3 Technical capacity: 3 Organisation capacity:4 Research capacity: 4 Reporting and Documentation:4	
Recommendations and future initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is need to enhance learning among the various networks under SV support • The consortium members should arrange for meetings with members on a quarterly basis • There is need for more funding so as to not only carry out the activities effectively, but also link with other networks • The period of the programme should be extended from 1 to 3 years 	

CLACC, Kenya

Name of network	CLACC Kenya (IIED)
Name of Informant	Joan Kariuki
Position in network	Member
Number of Members	
Period of support	February 2011
Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: approximately US\$5 000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity building for civil society organisation • Capacity training for youth arm of the civil society organisations • Development climate change working group 	
Notable achievement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced understanding of climate change issues for advocacy among membership • Networking platform for civil society organisations in Western Kenya • Able to showcase the results of poor natural resources decisions and thus get people to adopt sustainable practices • Members are now very confident on CC issues 	
Member benefits and participation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The members appreciate the platform for sharing at national and regional level • Members have participated in network activities by contributing technical issues to the network position papers 	
Challenges preventing network from reaching goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strict budget meant that very few people could benefit from the programmes activities • Balancing the knowledge level among different members is a challenge, as the network does not want to leave anyone behind 	
Support from other organisations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network has gotten support for implementation of projects and not advocacy, these project range from community adaptation and bio fuels for the poor. The donors are Comic relief, DFID, IDRC 	
Added value and communication with SV secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network has a long standing relationship with IIED, thus they is good communication and support, the network appreciates the flexibility of IIED • The network appreciates the newsletter which they have been able to share with members 	
Areas important but not able to accomplish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network would have liked to include more organisations from the grassroots, especially the church organisations which they consider very important as this organisations draw many people 	
Existing capacity rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lobby and advocacy: 4 The network has gone through training and have managed to get some of their membership into the East African community negotiation process • Technical capacity: "4" The few membership are well fast with climate change issues • Organisation capacity: 2.5 They know what needs to be done, but are not able due to competing activities of the organisations • Research capacity: 4 They are very good and have received a lot of support from IDRC in this line • Reporting and Documentation: 3 They are good and are able to produce and document their activities 	
Recommendations and future initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network would like support to raise more funds to enhance its implementation capacity • They would like to see more regional sharing and cross learning • They would like the network to focus more on results and not so much on the administration of the SV programme 	

CLACC Benin

Name of network	CLACC Benin
Name of Informant	Krystel Dossou
Position in network	National Coordinator
Number of Members	11 regular and 15 irregular network members
Period of support	
<p>Activities that have been accomplished utilising the funds provided: approximately US\$3 000</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network conducted advocacy activities • Information sharing • Improved internet connectivity 	
<p>Notable achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Created a platform that brings together government and civil society • Capacity of members has been enhanced in advocacy 	
<p>Member benefits and participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information sharing platform • Organised the participation of civil society in Durban • Members have participated in 3 adaptation projects 	
<p>Challenges preventing network from reaching goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional and international communication has been difficult 	
<p>Support from other organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government of Belgium 	
<p>Added value and communication with SV secretariat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment guides were useful, but the one on reporting was too tedious, they hope the new one will be useful • Regional networking in 2010 was useful • The communication with CLACC has been weak and secondly the language is a big barrier • They have not utilised the website, but will try and look at it now 	
<p>Areas important but not able to accomplish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of adaptation projects on the ground 	
<p>Existing capacity rated on a scale of 1 to 5(5 is the highest):</p> <p>The network is not in a position to rate itself, since they have not conducted an internal network assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lobby and advocacy: • Technical capacity: • Organisation capacity: • Research capacity: • Reporting and Documentation: 	
<p>Recommendations and future initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They still need to learn how to conduct advocacy on climate change • There is need to address the language challenges, material has to be translated if they are to increase the number of people benefiting • Need to support knowledge on mainstreaming of adaptation into the local system • Need support from the local consortium members, e.g. the Demark office • They would like their fundraising capacity enhanced 	