

A. PARTICIPANT LIST

FACILITATORS:

Ira Lowenthal – MSI
Sharene McKenzie – MSI
Zeric Smith – MSI
Kathie Earle – Rapporteur

PARTICIPANTS:

NAME	AFFILIATION
Janilee Abrikian	Peace and Love in Schools (PALS)
Beth Aub	Transparency International-Jamaica
Martin Aub	The Farquharson Institute for Policy Analysis (FIPA)
Nancy Anderson	Independent Jamaican Council for Human Rights (IJCHR) & The Jamaica Bar Association (JBA)
Lloyd Barnett	IJCHR & Citizens' Action for Free and Fair Election (CAFFE)
Colin Cholmondeley	Mustard Seed Communities & Roots FM (96.1)
Lana Finikin	Sistren Theatre Collective
Karen Gentles	Dispute Resolution Foundation (DRF)
Carrline Giscombe	Caribbean Association for Feminist Research and Action (CAFRA)/Jamaica
Susan Goffe	Jamaicans for Justice (JFJ)
Michelle Golding Morris	CAFRA/Jamaica
Joan Grant-Cummings	Coalition for Community Participation in Governance (CCPG)
Liz Hall	Committee for the Upliftment of the Mentally Ill (CUMI)
Claudette Harrison	Women's Research and Outreach Centre (W.R.O.C.)
Joyce Hewett	Woman Inc. & The Association of Women's Organizations of Jamaica (AWOJA)
Paul Hines	DRF
Rosalie Jackson	Families Against State Terrorism (FAST)
Charmaine Johnson	W.R.O.C.
Dorothy La Croix	AWOJA
Yvonne McCalla Sobers	FAST
Lindsey Miller	Citizens Action for Free and Fair Election (CAFFE)
Sherill Morris	Women's Centre of Jamaica Foundation

Hilary Nicholson
Dawn Paris
Ronnie Salter
Judith Wedderburn

Women's Media Watch (WMW)
JFJ/Montego Bay
Woman Inc. & AWOJA
WMW & Association of Development Agencies (ADA)

B. AGENDA

**MSI/CIV-JAM: Civil Society Partners' Workshop
August 28, 2003**

Strawberry Hill

Goals

- To affirm and update information disseminated in meetings with individual organisations
- To provide CSOs an opportunity to give feedback on MSI's project plans to date
- To bring together the group of CSOs working with MSI/CIV-JAM and begin establishing a working dynamic in the sector
- To allow CSOs to identify and articulate to one another the assets they are prepared to contribute to a collaborative effort to move the sector as a whole forward
- To gather more information about the CSOs' and sector needs

Work Shop Facilitators

Ira Lowenthal—MSI
Sharene McKenzie—MSI
Zeric Smith—MSI

Kathy Earle-Nash—Rapporteur
Janilee Abrikian—Cameo Icebreaker

Agenda

Time	Event	Presenting
9:00	Housekeeping	Zeric
9:05	Welcome	Ira

1. Introductions

9:15	MSI staff: Ira, Zeric, Sharene	MSI Staff
9:20	Participants: Organisation's name, person's name, person's title, organisation's primary mission	Participants
9:50	Purpose of the day: review goals and agenda	Zeric
2. The Project		
10:00	Analytical framework	Zeric & Ira
10:25	Project elements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - guiding principles, challenges and assets - 4 project activity areas - project organisation and management 	Ira & Zeric
10:45	Q & A	MSI Staff
11:15	Coffee break	
3. Sectoral Assets & Resources		
11:30	Review of "homework"	Sharene
11:45	Group Task: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) review 3 strongest assets that each organisation is willing to contribute (each person write the three identified assets of their group on a sticky note) 2) prioritise or rank order all assets for the entire table using an immediacy criteria: "which are the most important for you to do what you need to do NOW?" 3) for each of the three highest priority resources, the group will determine how they would deliver the contribution so that it will benefit the sectors/partners groups. Each group chooses presenter for report-out. 	Zeric and MSI Staff
12:30	Plenary Report-Outs and Discussion (5 min report out for each group)	Zeric

1:00 Lunch

4. The Institutional Development Framework (IDF)

2:00	Review the IDF tool	Zeric
2:15	Plenary discussion and feedback on IDF	Participants
2:30	IDF, Strategic Planning, and MSI/CIV-JAM	Ira

5. MSI/CIV-JAM training approach

2:45	Introduction of draft foundational strategic planning workshop, and anticipated method for determining future trainings	MSI Staff
3:00	Brainstorm on CSO/sector needs	Participants
3:20	Feedback on sectoral priorities	Ira

3:30 National Anthem and end of workshop

C. *STRENGTHENING JAMAICAN CIVIL SOCIETY FOR IMPROVED GOVERNANCE AND CITIZEN PARTICIPATION—PRESENTATION*

[Rose: Pls insert power point presentation here]

D. SALIENT POINTS RAISED BY THE PARTICIPANTS & ASSETS EXERCISE REPORT-OUTS

Following the introductory portions of the agenda, the MSI team presented the proposed programme to participants using a Power Point presentation that appears here as section C, above.

Salient points raised following the presentation were as follows:

1. The analysis of crime and violence in Jamaican society omitted the recent economic decline and the poor state of the education system as causal agents. The etiology of the problem was thus incomplete, and might impair efforts to address or correct the overall dynamic. Globalisation and its potentially negative economic impact on disadvantaged and vulnerable groups (when unaccompanied by social programs expressly designed to mitigate these impacts) was also properly raised as an important current and future consideration when attempting to understand the root causes of social dysfunction and its impact on Jamaica.
2. A vigorous debate was joined by all participants concerning whether or not gender issues should be identified and treated separately as such, or whether they should be “mainstreamed” as part of the programme’s overall attention to human rights and citizen security. While this conundrum was not resolved to anyone’s satisfaction at the time, the emotional tone of the debate clearly indicated that there will be much work to be done in terms of developing a common approach and a mutually intelligible *language* in which gender issues may be addressed by the sector as a whole. Following the debate, the design team’s pragmatic and programmatic rationales for establishing two distinct coordinating secretariats for the two identified sub-sectors within the target group was presented and subsequently accepted by all participants.
3. USG “intentions” in funding the current initiative were questioned by several sceptical participants. The design team offered both analytic and anecdotal evidence that their misgivings were unfounded, and sought to reassure participants of the fidelity with which stated programme objectives could and would be pursued by MSI for both its client and its Jamaican partners/customers.
4. The overall management structure of the programme (which was not explicitly treated in the Power Point presentation) was subsequently explained to the participants. MSI’s approach to programme governance and the involvement of all partners in this aspect of programme development and oversight were also introduced, in much the same terms as they are treated in the Final Activity Design to which this report is annexed.

The Sectoral Assets and Resources exercise is described in detail below:

The aim of this exercise was to determine how the organisations would share their strengths and use them to strengthen the civil society sector. The feedback received here would be crucial as it was to form the basis of the training modules for the project. The goal was to ascertain what resources were available within the present group and to determine the other individuals or organizations that would be needed to facilitate group development or enhancement. It was important that energies were focused on prioritizing organizational needs and determining the strategies which would address them. To facilitate this, the participants would be divided into five groups and asked ***to address the task on page two of the agenda.*** (Note that within the groups it was important to have a mix that cut across the two sub-sectors represented among the partners, to ensure the richness and depth of responses.)

Zeric formed the groups.

Group one: Roots, CAFFÉ, AWOJA, Caribbean Association for Feminist Research and Action.

Group two: IJCHR, Women's Inc., Association of Development Agencies, WROC, DRF

Group three: Coalition for Community Participation in Governance, AWOJA, Sistren, Jamaica for Justice

Group four: Farquharson Institute, Women's Centre of Jamaica Foundation, FAST

Group five: Women's Media Watch, PALS, CUMI, DRF, Jamaica Bar Association

Summaries of the report-outs in plenary

Carrline presented for *group one*.

The priority areas were (1) the capacity to disseminate information using a core of trained persons, (2) mobilization at a national level and (3) lobbying locally and internationally.

The delivery activities were (1) sharing information, (2) sharing databases, (3) networking, (4) sharing skills of trainers and (5) using the mass media.

Karen presented for *group two*.

The three asset areas were (1) advocacy, (2) information and (3) training.

The organizations could share skills and techniques peculiar to them within the area of advocacy.

They could share information within specific sub sectors.

They could share training skills, programmes and techniques both internally and externally.

To the three asset areas requested, networking and lobbying were added because the concerns of the organizations were the same and the organizations operated in a similar fashion and had to share from the same pool of limited resources.

The delivery areas were (1) make skills known and available to each other; (2) make information known and available to each other, for example, interlinking databases, sharing newsletters by sending them through the network; (3) share training programmes within and outside the network.

Beth presented for *group three*.

The priority areas were (1) education of the public to address the democracy deficit, (2) advocacy and (3) lobbying.

The delivery was to take the form of (1) staged drama, (2) film, (3) the use of the web to make comparative studies of different nations, (4) sharing global contacts, (5) increase research and consultation with those who had similar experiences and were successful in their management of them and (6) share common resources, specifically facilities.

Beth pointed out the importance of developing financial security to avoid 'living hand to mouth' within the organizations. Regarding education, she noted that the public trust was not on the side of the NGO's and that this must be addressed within the project. The lack of trust was partly responsible for the limited funding available to NGO's from within the private sector. The NGO's must be demonstrated as being 'worth giving money to'. Information needed to be shared regarding the productivity of their past efforts and their efficiency in the use of funds previously allocated.

Sherill presented for *group four*.

The priority areas were (1) investigative, that is, the observation and analysis of public issues, (2) providing education and information on public issues and (3) lobbying for change in the formal system.

Delivery was to take the form of (1) networking using public forum, community meetings and street corner meetings; (2) media campaigns involving canvassing, the use of the web and outreach of individual organizations and (3) lobbying by participating in the deliberative parliamentary process and making submissions to parliament.

Kathie presented for *group five*.

The priority areas were (1) national reach, (2) advocacy and (3) strategic planning.

National reach was to provide the structure for engagement. Advocacy involved lobbying for policy change, increasing public awareness through open forum, consciousness raising activities and ensuring inclusiveness in activities. It would counter the alienation and withdrawal present within the civil society as it was directed towards government agencies and the general public. Strategic planning referred to the creation of the structure to ensure (1) independence and autonomy through the development of

financial self-reliance and (2) adequate data collection and thereby provide the information for baseline situation analysis and periodic evaluations.

The delivery areas were (1) Advocacy – prepare and circulate pamphlets; make submissions; share advertising space; organize forum and workshops and open them to the public at no cost; writing legal briefs; producing training materials; undertaking media campaigns and sharing articulate and knowledgeable spokespersons.

(2) National reach – use outreach available on behalf of the collaborative project, for example, email lists, addresses and professional contacts; share database; help with programme logistics; mobilize particular target audiences; operationalize sensitization programmes.

(3) Strategic planning - this involved financial self reliance and data collection. Financial self reliance could be developed through the utilization of resource personnel trained and experienced in strategic planning, to structure short, mid and long term goals; to develop practical activities, for example, a trust fund which could be enlarged through grants and donations and administered by the organization. Data collection procedures could be enhanced through the sharing of software and research. Monitoring and evaluation procedures and expertise could also be shared.

[Further analysis is to be done on these results by the MSI/CIV-JAM team, and additional work of this kind will be undertaken in depth during the first training module. The impact of this exercise on the tone and enthusiasm of the participants is discussed elsewhere in the main text of the Final Activity Design (under Core Activity Area 2), and the IDF and training approach portions of the afternoon program are also most comprehensively reflected in that document.]