

**REPORT OF A MEETING OF AFRICAN NGOs ENGAGED IN PEACE
AND SECURITY RESEARCH
24 – 26 NOVEMBER 2002
HOLIDAY INN BEATRIX STREET, PRETORIA, SOUTH AFRICA**

The meeting was organized by the Institute for Security Studies (ISS) with funding from the International Development Research Centre (IDRC).

Appendix: Participating organizations

Monday, 25th November 2002

Session 1 – Welcome and Objectives:

Chair: Mr Keith Muloongo, South Africa

1. Mr Keith Muloongo, Deputy Director of the ISS, welcomed participants, thanked the IDRC for the funding of the event, and outlined the purpose of the meeting. This was to discuss the nature and modalities of NGO engagement in respect of African 'peer' review on issues relating to human/individual security. The first part of the meeting was therefore devoted to briefings and discussions to establish a common level of knowledge about developments within the African Union, specifically regarding the Conference on Security, Stability, Development and Cooperation (CSSDCA) and the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). The second part of the meeting provided a forum to discuss the potential role of participants in monitoring the implementation of the commitments of African leaders as it affected human security. After this introduction participants introduced themselves and the organizations they represented (see list appended to this report).

2. Dr Jakkie Cilliers, Executive Director of the ISS then introduced the Institute, its structure, programmes and composition, and outlined its history of constructive co-operation and engagement with the OAU/AU as a positive example of how NGOs could support intergovernmental organizations. He concluded the first part of his presentation by an overview of the work on documenting OAU/AU decisions that had been done by the ISS in recent years.

3. Dr Cilliers pointed to the fact that the meeting in Pretoria has sought continental representation from each of Africa's five regions. The meeting constituted a gathering of the more important research institutes engaged in the peace and security sector and was a first step to explore collaboration and networking given developments regarding peer review in Africa. Dr Cilliers pointed out that the meeting was a civil society-driven initiative and therefore did not form part of any mandated process. According to him a desired outcome would be a project that would track and report on the progress by African leaders to commitments to human security under the auspices of a continental steering committee and that could release a first report on the fringes of the Maputo Summit of the AU in July 2003.

4. During the subsequent discussion participants explored the relationship between the AU and civil society organizations (CSOs) recognizing that political support for and

engagement with CSOs within the Interim Commission of the Union was encouraging and strong. Participants recognized that research NGOs such as those gathered at this meeting have a unique opportunity to become more engaged with the Union as part of the process of the transition from the OAU. Others noted that governance and civil society in Africa are both weak and that the relationship between the two often either subsidiary or confrontational. Participants raised the problem of a lack of access to information and documentation from the African Union and related processes such as NEPAD and commended the ISS for its efforts in this regard, calling on it to continue and expand its efforts.

Session 2 – Overview of the African Union (AU):

Chair: Mr Samuel Doe, Ghana

5. Dr Jakkie Cilliers presented a status report on developments regarding the African Union (AU) and its key organs following the Durban Summit in South Africa during July 2002, including the establishment and prospects for the various organs of the Union, including the Economic, Social and Cultural Council (ECOSOCC), the Pan-African Parliament, the transformation of the Commission and the proposed establishment of the Peace and Security Council. Once established ECOSOCC would serve as an institutional mechanism for CSO engagement in an advisory function to the other structures of the Union. A first draft Protocol should be available early in 2003. He also touched upon the relationship with NEPAD and the CSSDCA, concluding with a review of recent developments regarding the NEPAD African Peer Review Mechanism as it affected the AU. Providing an overview of the Protocol on the Peace and Security Council and its functions, composition and structure, Dr Cilliers pointed out that an important opportunity to institutionalize NGO engagement with the AU was reflected in Article 20 of the Protocol. The latter encourages engagement between the Council and non-governmental organizations, community-based and other civil society organizations to participate actively in the efforts aimed at promoting peace, security and stability in Africa. The Protocol states that CSOs may be invited to address the Peace and Security Council when required. He concluded his presentation by pointing to the fact that such opportunities would only be constructive if African NGOs such as those at this meeting were able to organize themselves and to prove their competence and effectiveness.

6. During the subsequent discussion participants commented on the overlapping nature of a number of initiatives, particularly NEPAD and the CSSDCA and the requirement for simplification and harmonization. The issue of civil society engagement within these various structures and initiatives was also discussed, including the role and composition of the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) Panel of Eminent Persons and CSSDCA evaluation panel. Other issues raised were the need to change the personalized nature of NEPAD and CSSDCA and to institutionalize both processes, and the apparent lack of co-ordination between NEPAD, the CSSDCA and the AU. Participants also discussed issues of corruption in Africa as reflecting the condition of structural weakness that the continent occupies in the global system, pointing to the fact that the various peer review processes did not appear to address this. A recurring theme was the potential role of NGOs to hold African leaders to the commitments they themselves have made, while also highlighting Africa's abject position in the global power structure. Participants pointed to the divisions within NGOs and competition for resources, to the detriment of strategic alliances and mutual capacity-building. Other aspects included

whether NEPAD is the “socio-economic programme” of the AU, or whether it includes a political element and the need to consider the role of NGOs specifically in contributing to peace and security-related activities of AU.

7. Mr Samuel Doe concluded by saying there needed to be modalities for monitoring the transition from the OAU to AU. He pointed to the need for the harmonization of the proliferation of initiatives and structures. NGOs need a framework to create space for their engagement with the AU.

Session 3 – Overview of the Conference for Security Stability Development and Cooperation in Africa (CSSDCA):

Chair: Dr Kinfu Abraham, Ethiopia

8. Mr Ayodele Aderinwale, Executive Director of the Africa Leadership Forum presented a brief overview of the CSSDCA process and then provided additional details of the proposed system of peer review and performance indicators agreed to in Durban (as part of the CSSDCA Memorandum of Understanding). According to him the AU, through the CSSDCA process, has a mandate to engage with civil society and had already run two large meetings in Addis Ababa to this effect. A third is planned for mid-2003. Following the last AU/CSO meeting, in June 2002, the AU had constituted a provisional CSO working group composed of 20 representatives from civil society to review the engagement of CSOs with the Union.¹ This group is, amongst others, engaged in advising the Commission on the accreditation process and content for CSOs with the AU. Mr Aderinwale emphasized the fact that the CSSDCA provided an important point of entry for civil society engagement with the Union as a whole. If civil society does not engage and protect their space within the CSSDCA, the process will inevitably be dominated by governments.

9. During the ensuing discussion some time was spent on how the CSSDCA Unit within the AU perceived the Pretoria meeting and the resistance to NGOs taking an initiative on leadership accountability. Other issues discussed included the fact that the CSSDCA benchmarks required early and extensive action by African leaders with many of the activities to be completed by 2003 and 2004. Participants questioned the realism of the CSSDCA monitoring system working effectively within such a short space of time. The issue of the potential convergence between the CSSDCA and NEPAD processes was also discussed. One participant commented on the extent to which the present divisions on the continent were reminiscent of the Casablanca and Monrovia Groups of the OAU in the 1960s. Others questioned the extent to which reports would be compiled by the countries themselves? Surely civil society should do these reports or at least be engaged in the review process? The need for “multi-speed” progress of integration was also discussed, with participants pointing to the extent to which sub-regional initiatives seem to make more progress, as they are demand-driven and specific, rather than based on grand visions at continental level. A final issue discussed is the fact that much of civil society (and most NGOs) are nationally based, not sub-regional or continental, and that few have the means or the ability to engage at a regional level with governments or intergovernmental organizations.

¹ Including Dr Cilliers from the ISS and Mr Aderinwale from the African Leadership Forum.

Session 4 – Overview of the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD):

Chair: Dr Martin Rupiah, Zimbabwe

10. The speaker for this session was Mr Smunda Mokoena, deputy head of the NEPAD secretariat, who described the process and content of NEPAD. He noted that the Abuja Heads of State Implementation Committee meeting on 3rd November 2002 had clarified some of the discrepancies between NEPAD and the AU, in particular by asserting that the NEPAD Secretariat is not a permanent structure, but will be integrated into the AU Commission. Mr Mokoena pointed, amongst others, to the profile that NEPAD had achieved in focusing global attention Africa’s development challenges and the commitments that it had solicited from, amongst others, the G8. He also pointed to the long-term nature of the NEPAD programme and the obligation upon member states to popularize NEPAD within all sectors of society.

11. During the discussion participants raised various issues of resistance and criticism of NEPAD common amongst some quarters of civil society. They raised the need to co-ordinate between NEPAD and the CSSDCA as well as issues around the nature of the ‘partnership’, and perceptions about elitism and scope. Discussants noted that such a partnership should first and foremost be with and to the benefit of Africa itself and only in the second instance with donors or developed countries. Other issues discussed were the complexity of NEPAD and the challenges of translating implementation into regional projects. People have to know and understand the concept of NEPAD, in order to have ownership of it. Participants noted that NEPAD seemed to involve only a few driving personalities and questioned the degree to which the AU’s 53 countries (beyond a select inner core group) actually participates in NEPAD? Others raised the fact that NEPAD appeared to be “shy” of gender issues and the need for the gender component to be revised. Yet other participants noted that NEPAD had become more realistic after a series of ‘reality checks’ including South Africa’s lack of public engagement with events in Zimbabwe and the apparent confusion caused by recent pronouncements around the nature and extent of peer review as part of NEPAD. Participants noted the damage that these perceptions have done given the fact that development partners obviously respond to their electorates.

12. Responding to issues around lack of consultation, Mr Mokoena referred to a paper on dependence on the donor community by African governments and NGOs written by Ethiopian Prime Minister Meles Zenawi, also pointing to the fact that although African people are duly represented by their governments within the NEPAD process, the secretariat has gone out of its way to engage and consult with civil society. Civil society needs to know where they fit into NEPAD, and make their own space. He informed the meeting about the work being done to set up communication structures to improve communication and outreach.

Tuesday, 26th November 2002

Session 5 – Progress in respect of Peace and Security and the NEPAD APRM :

Chair: Prof Mwesiga Baregu, Tanzania

13. Ambassador Jerry Mamabolo, Deputy Director General: Africa Desk, South African Department of Foreign Affairs, gave a progress report on the peace and security initiative and the APRM of NEPAD. He highlighted Articles 4(g), (h) and (j) of the AU Act, pointing to the fact that the premise for intervention has undergone a fundamental shift in Africa. Previously the OAU principle of non-intervention had served to paralyze the Organization when it came to internal abuses of power. The Constitutive Act provides a framework for action in respect of abuse of power and unconstitutional changes in government.

14. Discussing the proposed AU Peace and Security Council, Amb Mamabolo noted that peace and security issues would be dealt with through the AU structures and that NEPAD would only act in support of the AU. Moving on to the proposed establishment of the AU Peace and Security Council he stated that the original intention was to have five permanent members, but that the final version of the Protocol provides for five countries elected for three years and the remaining ten elected for terms of two years each. Consistent with their position regarding the reform of the UN Security Council, African member states did not want a system of veto powers.

15. Amb Mamabolo also discussed the key NEPAD documents that were presented during the recent AU Assembly meeting in Durban, notably "Towards the Implementation of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) - Summary of Progress Report and Initial Action Plan" (also known as the "Progress Report and Initial Action Plan"). This document elaborated the first phase for the implementation of NEPAD. He also referred to the "Declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance" also submitted by Nigerian President Obasanjo and finally to the document outlining the African Peer Review Mechanism. The former document sought to foster a strong statement of reaffirmation by African leaders of their commitment to the principles and core values of democracy and good political, economic and corporate governance. The document outlining the APRM made it clear that this was an instrument to which Member States of the African Union were encouraged to voluntarily accede for the purpose of self-monitoring, and which aims to foster the adoption of policies, standards and practices that will lead to political stability, high economic growth, sustainable development and accelerated regional integration in the continent.

16. Turning to the results of the recent NEPAD Heads of State Implementation Committee meeting in Abuja (3rd November 2003) he noted that the NEPAD Implementation Committee was now developing the benchmarks for peer review. He emphasized that the NEPAD Peer Review Mechanism was confined mostly to socio-economic aspects and also referred to the recent exchange of letters between the Canadian Prime Minister and the South African President. In his response to the Canadian Prime Minister, President Mbeki had indicated that the AU provisions such as the Declaration on Unconstitutional Changes of Government exist and that they were binding on all member states. Amb Mamabolo noted that the lack of trust and confidence in the OAU's capacity and will to uphold its commitments have fostered a desire amongst Africa's development partners and others to locate this responsibility within NEPAD. However, widespread concerns that NEPAD would then duplicate the AU have meant that the responsibility for political governance peer review has shifted back to the AU. The NEPAD Secretariat has also been instructed to plan for integration with the AU and to devise how the political peer review will work. NEPAD must therefore see how far the AU has gone on these issues within the CSSDCA process. Concluding his presentation Amb Mamabolo indicated that NEPAD would continue to be involved in aspects of political peer

review, but not in competition with AU mechanisms, including the CSSDCA, but in support of them.

17. Participants raised a number of issues in the ensuing discussion, including the relationship between the APRM and the Peace and Security Council and the role of NGOs in implementation. Delegates questioned the willingness to intervene or sanction powerful states like Nigeria, South Africa and Kenya if they become repressive, given the example of Zimbabwe, and also raised the challenge of failed and weak African states. The relationship between the African Economic Community of 1991 and NEPAD was also an issue that lacked clarity as was the expense of meetings and mechanisms for implementing NEPAD. This was clearly an area that civil society should monitor. Participants also remarked on the proposed role of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights as being responsible for aspects of political review and the Commission's obvious lack of the capacity or resources. Without a very dramatic change in the behaviour of Member States in meeting their obligations it will not be possible for the Commission to play a meaningful role in human rights and political review. Other issues of concern regarding the Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights were the procedures, reporting system and appointment of Commissioners, all of which undermined the independence, credibility and competence of the Commission as an institution capable of playing a meaningful role in peer review. Participants emphasized the point that a member state had to invite the Commission to conduct a review and that this procedure would not work as an independent human rights inspection.

18. Responding to some of the issues raised, Amb Mamabolo pointed to an experts' meeting that is trying to devise a fundraising plan for the AU. One of the suggestions on the table is a tax on foreign travellers to Africa, but implementation was difficult since the capacity for collection is doubtful. He again noted the need for complementary rather than overlapping responsibilities between NEPAD and the AU and reported that progress that had been made at the continental level in this regard.

Session 6 – Prospects for ECOSOCC:

Chair: Prof Mwesiga Baregu, Tanzania

19. Dr Eddy Maloka, Executive Director, African Institute of South Africa presented the prospects for the AU Economic, Social and Cultural Council (ECOSOCC). He noted that the 1991 Treaty Establishing the African Economic Community (AEC) provided for an Economic and Social Commission, which has now been replaced by the AU Act provision for ECOSOCC. Whereas the AEC Commission was based on the example of the UN Economic and Social Council as a meeting of ministers of planning and economic development, according to Art 22 of the AU Act, ECOSOCC is to be composed of different social and professional groups to represent civil society in the AU. Dr Maloka noted that in reviewing the prospects for ECOSOCC note will have to be taken of comparative models, for example, the Conseil Économique et Sociale in Francophone countries, such as Cameroon and Cote D'Ivoire. In these countries the Conseil consisted of a body of professional and social groups that interact with their governments. In the case of the EU Economic and Social Committee, representation is dominated by employers and labour but also includes "interest groups". According to this example each country would submit a short list of groups to ECOSOCC for approval. According to Dr Maloka, the problem with this model in Africa is the confrontational relationship between state and NGOs. Member

states could exclude those NGOs they don't like them. On the other hand, if CSOs went straight to ECOSOCC for accreditation, this might create a dysfunctional relationship between the Council and AU since the latter is, after all, an intergovernmental organization. Dr Maloka noted the requirement to distinguish between genuine grassroots organizations and those that render crucial services to communities, or lobby for a good cause. In his opinion there needs to be a combination of the two systems. In conclusion he noted that a Protocol for ECOSOCC was to be submitted to the AU Heads of State Summit in Maputo in July 2003 and that work would shortly start in South Africa, as chair of the AU, to guide this process.

20. As part of the ensuing discussion participants noted that ECOSOCC will not provide a sufficient vehicle for research-orientated NGOs to work with the AU. Some delegates noted that a new accreditation system for NGO engagement with AU should not be linked to ECOSOCC. Research and capacity-building support to the AU which research NGOs can provide should therefore have formal modalities to engage with the AU beyond the ECOSOCC structure. Others noted that since ECOSOCC will only have an advisory function, the executive will still dominate and others questioned the utility of the structure in its entirety. A delegate noted that although the prospects for the establishment of ECOSOCC was exciting for CSOs, the Council would probably provide scant opportunity for research support and engagement by NGOs.

Session 7 – Overview of Commitments by African Leaders to Peace and Democracy:

Chair: Dr Jakkie Cilliers, South Africa

21. Kathryn Sturman, ISS Senior Researcher, described the most important documents and commitments made by African Heads of State and Government to peace and democracy.² She distinguished between the documents according to levels of commitment, including treaties, protocols, declarations and decisions, taken at regional and sub-regional summits. Kathryn grouped the commitments into the following categories: civil society participation; democracy and good governance; unconstitutional changes of government; human rights – with specific reference to rights of women and children; inter-state relations and the use of force; peacekeeping; arms control; refugees and IDPs; terrorism; mercenaries and drug trafficking. She made the point that many of the commitments made by CSSDCA and NEPAD have been made before, some time ago, some many times. Heads of State are often comfortable to commit to general principles, but reluctant to apply them to specific cases or single out any member state for criticism. It is civil society's role to monitor their heads of state, and hold them to their word. Raising popular awareness of these commitments would be a first step in fulfilling this role.

22. In the ensuing discussion participants noted that the energy of civil society should be focused on ways of implementing existing instruments and commitments, instead of inventing new benchmarks. It was enlightening for researchers to see the African instruments acceded to, as they tend to look at international instruments without holding

² See ISS Paper 58 on "Commitments by African heads of state to peace, democracy, human rights and associated issues", July 2002 and database on CD-Rom and ISS website: "From Unity to Union – Key Documents of African Regional Organisations, 1963-2001". A second edition of the CD was presently being produced.

African leaders to their own regional commitments. Participants noted the need to translate these commitments into plans of action and implementation.

Session 8 – NGO accreditation to the AU

Chair: Ms Gladwell Otieno, South Africa

23. During this session Dr Cilliers presented some ideas regarding an accreditation process for CSOs with the African Union, pointing to the fact that a discussion document to this effect should be available in January or February 2003 for wider consultation. The interest of this meeting was only to look at the potential impact of such a process on the type of organizations present at this meeting, namely policy research NGOs engaged in the peace and security sector. In his view an accreditation process should be technical in nature to avoid political or other interference. He also noted that the barriers of entry for accreditation should be set high enough to restrict organizations that are credible, resourced, well-managed, regionally engaged and with an established track-record to restrict the accreditation process to manageable levels. The process had to allow for regular renewal. The exact nature of these benchmarks, he noted, was difficult since it was largely a matter of judgement. Finally, he pointed to the requirement for CSOs including NGOs to commit to a comprehensive code of conduct/ethics for the accreditation process as part of a commitment to standards of good governance.

24. In the ensuing discussion participants highlighted the need to clarify the concept of civil society engagement. Politicians tend to ask NGOs “who do you represent? Do you have a mandate?” This was often a way of delegitimising research-based NGOs, and a major concern for groupings such as those at this meeting. Turning to ECOSOCC, participants noted that Article 22 of the AU Act provides for the Council to be an advisory group of social and professional groupings and that this reflected the thinking within the AU. Others noted that NGO representation to ECOSOCC is likely to be on a country basis (e.g. the South African NGO Coalition, SANGOCO) that would provide little opportunity or room for specific competency above representivity. There was a need for NGOs to devise criteria to engage with the AU above and beyond those reflected within ECOSOCC. Other participants noted the need to create cross-cutting, issue-based alliances, e.g. peace and security, HIV/Aids, media, etc.

25. Participants concurred with the desire to keep governments out of the CSO accreditation process but noted that all processes had their own risks, evident in the UN where organizations such as the US National Rifle Association had played a destructive role for several years. Participants also discussed a number of ideas and concepts regarding an accreditation procedure for NGO engagement with the AU, pointing to the problems in establishing a common system given the diverse nature of CSOs and the ambivalent relationship between civil society and a number of African governments. A number of specific suggestions were made regarding the criteria for the legal and active track record of NGOs, legal requirements regarding registration, minimum number of employees and regional nature of NGOs. Participants were of the opinion that there was possibly a need to elaborate what sort of engagement NGOs will have with the AU, before devising accreditation criteria. Others pointed to the potential use of comparative examples from the UN, ASEAN, etc. There was also a need to find a balance between an open-ended process where all are welcome, but not considered legitimate by Heads of State, and one where all are excluded as was the situation with the OAU.

26. Dr Cilliers concluded by thanking the participants for their input and noting that the discussion had helped to clarify some concepts and ideas and that he hoped it would also help improve the content of deliberations in the provisional CSO working group to devise more appropriate standards and processes.

Session 9 – The Way Forward:

Facilitated discussion chaired by Dr Kwesi Aning, Ghana

27. During this final session a number of recommendations that had been made during the conference were presented, revised and elaborated. The following serves as a summary of the key conclusions and recommendations for action:

- a. Delegates highlight the need for mutual capacity-building and strategic alliances between African NGOs with common purpose. Projects and alliances that serve to monitor the compliance of Governments to commitments undertaken at the level of the CSOs were particularly important in this regard. Those NGOs also engaged in other sectors were encouraged to initiate and engage in such projects.
- b. Participants generally felt that the AU/NEPAD peer review is essentially a state-to-state exercise with its own strengths, but also serious weaknesses. Once peer review starts, civil society will be able to review the state process but will have limited input in the process, except on a sub-contractual basis. Rather than try to seek to be part of peer review, participants expressed their preference for sectors such as the peace and security research sector gathered at this meeting to commence with an own process to track the adherence by African Heads of State to the commitments made within the context of the OAU/AU and RECs. While such a project should be independent from either the AU or NEPAD processes, collaboration and engagement should be encouraged where possible. A number of organizations offered their participation in such a project, calling for it to commence as soon as possible and requested the ISS to formulate and circulate to interested partners an appropriate project framework. This should include a series of publications that are co-produced by the partners. This would be a start-up proposal (12 months) and possibly continue to build capacity thereafter.
- c. Participants called for the creation and management of a common mailing list to disseminate information and key documents relating to peace, security and governance issues of the African Union and RECs to those organizations present at the meeting and others who may wish to join. The ISS offered to undertake this task.
- d. Due to the problem of a lack of access to information and documentation from the African Union and related processes such as NEPAD, participants commended the ISS for its efforts in this regard and encouraged it to continue and expand. The Institute was also requested to continue its work compiling a publicly available database of key documents relating to the African Union and RECs, using the mailing list as an additional dissemination method where appropriate.
- e. Participating organizations requested those serving on the provisional working group with the AU to use the mailing list to disseminate the output from the working group to the members of the NGO sector on peace and security for comment and input once such documents were publicly available. Participating organizations were particularly keen to have the opportunity to review and comment on the

proposed system of accreditation of CSOs with the African Union and the draft CSO code of ethics/conduct.

- f. Although it was apparent that ECOSOCC would not be the primary vehicle for NGO engagement with the AU, participating organizations requested that the draft protocol on ECOSOCC also be disseminated to the members of the NGO sector on peace and security for comment and input once available.
- g. Participating organizations also agreed that a new accreditation system for NGO engagement with AU should ideally not be linked to ECOSOCC. Research and capacity-building support to the AU should be accommodated above and beyond the ECOSOCC accreditation process.
- h. Participating organizations agreed to mobilize resources to attend the third AU-Civil Society Meeting in Addis Ababa, tentatively scheduled for May/June 2003 and to use that opportunity to lobby and look after the interests of the peace and security research sector. A further NGO meeting on engagement with the AU to develop a representative platform to negotiate terms of engagement was one option available to the participating organizations and the ISS was requested to explore the possibility for a meeting between the sector and the AU Commission before the third AU-Civil Society Meeting in Addis Ababa in 2003. Note: At present the 3rd AU-CSO meeting is scheduled for 2004. Funds are being sought to host an additional meeting in 2003.
- i. Participating organizations committed themselves to making every effort to protect and expand the provisions for NGO consultations and input within the Rules of Procedure for the Peace and Security Council that will be produced once the PSC is established.
- j. Participating organizations committed themselves, where at all possible, to audit the progress within their own countries in implementing the commitments that heads of state have made in areas of good governance, human rights, peace and security.

28. In conclusion Dr Jakkie Cilliers drew attention to a proposal from the ECCP (European Centre for Conflict Prevention) for African participation in the proposed programme for an international conference on the role of civil society and NGOs in the prevention of armed conflict. It was agreed to circulate the details and documentation among the participants after the conference and that this would be taken further by those NGOs present engaged with conflict prevention issues, particularly WANEP and the Centre for Conflict Resolution (SA).

29. Dr Aning thanked the ISS and the IDRC for taking the initiative to host the meeting and conveyed the collective thanks of all those present to Ms Jemima Njeri for the excellent logistical arrangements.

The meeting concluded at 17:00.

	NAME	DESIGNATION	ORGANIZATION	TEL	FAX	E-MAIL
1	Ayodele Aderinwale	Executive Director	Africa Leadership Forum	234 39 722 730 - 733	234 39 722 751, 234 39 722 742	aderinwale@africaleadership.org
2	Capapelo Matras	Deputy Director	Angola 2000	244 2 440 848	244 2 440 848	angola2m@yahoo.com
3	Eddy Maloka	Chief Executive Office	Africa Institute of South Africa	27 12 328 6970	27 12 321 3164	eddy@ai.org.za
4	Gamal Abdel Gawad Soltan	Deputy Director	Alharam Center for Political and Strategic Studies	202 578 6037	2 0 2 5 7 8 6833/578 6023	masoltan@link.net
5	Garth le Pere	Executive Director	Institute for Global Dialogue	27 11 339 6585	27 12 339 6616	garth@igd.co.za
6	Gavin Cawthra	Director	Centre for Defence Studies	27 11 7173506	27 11 7173695	cawthrag@zeus.mgmt.wits.ac.za
7	Jakkie Cilliers	Executive Director	Institute for Security Studies	27 12 346 9500/2	27 12 460998	jkc@iss.co.za
8	Jemima Njeri	PA to Executive director	ISS	27 12 346 9500/2	27 12 4600998	jemima@iss.co.za
9	Kathryn Sturman	Senior Researcher, Regional organizations	ISS	2712 346 9500/2	28 12 4600998	kathy@iss.co.za
10	Kinfe Abraham	Executive Director	Ethiopian international Institute for Peace and Development	251 153 1955	251 153 3398	eiipd@telecom.net.et
11	Martin Rupiah	Director	Centre for Defence Studies (CDS)	263 4 744441	263 4 7444 51	rupiyam@africaonline.co.zw
12	Mwesiga Baregu	Professor	University of Dar es Salaam	255 (0)741506382	255 0222 650433	mwesiga@hotmail.com
13	Samuel Doe	Executive Director	West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP)	2 3 3 2 1 221318/221388	233 21 2 21735	wanep@wanep.org \sdoe@wanep.org OR sgbaydee@yahoo.co.uk

14	Vasu Gounden	Director	African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes ACCORD	27 31 502 3908	27 31 502 4160	vgounden@accord.org.za
15	Mazide Abdou Ndiaye	President	FAVDO	221 825-75-33	221 825 7536	mazide@refer.sn
16	Arnold Quainoo	Executive Director	Center for Conflict Resolution	233 21 767405	233 21 76 7405	cencor@africaonline.co.gh
17	Bulelwa Makalima.	African Cluster Manager	Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR)	27 21 4222512	27 21 4222622	letitia@ccr.uct.ac.za
18	Deve Thomas	Programme coordinator	Mwengo	263 4 700090	263 4 738 310	thomas@mwengo.org.zw
19	Elizabeth Sidiropoulos	Director of Studies	SAIIA	27 12 339 2021	339 2154	sidiropoulose@saiia.wits.ac.za
20	Fiona Fintan	Centre Manager	The International Famine Centre	353 21 4904 330	353-21-4904-330	flintan@eircom.net (Work)
21	Wachira Maina	Senior Program Specialis	IDRC Nairobi	254 2 271 3160	254 2 271 1063	wmaina@idrc.org
22	Gladwell Otieno	Programme head, African Security Analysis Programme	Institute for Security Studies	27 12 346 9500/2	27 12 460998	gotieno@iss.xo.za
23	Umesh Bawa	coordinator South Africa	AFSTRAG			afstrag@infoweb.abs.net
24	John Katunga	Executive Director	Nairobi Peace Initiative, Kenya	254 441 484	254-2-443 241	npi@africaonline.co.ke / wachira@Africaonline.co.ke
25	Julia Harrington	Executive Director	Institute for Human Rights and Development	220 495 330/1	220 494 178	Jharrington@africaninstitute.org
26	Kwesi Aning	Senior Researcher	African Security Dialogue and Research	233 21 510 515	234 21 510 515	kwesianing@hotmail.com
27	Mafa Sejamanane	Executive Director	SAPES	263-4-252962/3/5	263-4-252964	mafas@sapes.org.zw
28	Korwa Adar	Chief Research specialist	Human Sciences Research Council	27 12302 2999	27 12 302 2902	kdar@hsrc.ac.za
29	Ochieng Adala	Senior programme officer	African Peace Forum International	254 2 574 092/6	254 2 561 357	Kilenem@Africaonline.co.ke

			Resource Group			
30	Clarence Tshitereke	Senior Researcher	ISS	27 21 461 7211	27 21 4617213	clarence@iss.co.za
31	Rose Othieono	Administration Officer	CECORE / Center for Conflict Resolution	256 - 41 - 255033	256 41 255 033	cecore@swiftuganda.com
32	Shadrack Kiunga	Acting coordinator	FECCLAHA	254 2 272 8289	254 2 272 1626	fecclaha@africaonline.co.ke
33	Smith Richard M	Southern Coordinator	Coalition for Peace in Africa	27 11 331 2944	27 11 331 0671	copa@actionsupport.co.za
34	Smuda Mokoena	Chief operating officer	NEPAD	27 11 313 3331	27 11 313 3778	smundaM@nepad.co.za
35	Philliat Matsheza	Executive director	SAHRT	263 4 339819	263 4 339818	matsheza@sahrit.org.za
36	Willa Mutofwe	Legal officer	AFRONET	260 1 251 813/4	260 1 251 776	kumoyogondwe@yahoo.com
37	Augusta Sena Gabianu	Director	GIMPA	233-21 71 72 17	233-21 71 73 98	agabianu@hotmail.com
38	Amb. Jerry Mamabolo	Deputy Director General, Africa Multilateral, DFA, Pretoria	Department of Foreign Affairs	27 12 351 1000	27 123510465	