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About this report

This report is a tool to record and debate the level of accountability and transparency that occurred around the African Regional Conference on Population and Development (ARCPD). It is meant to document the successes and failures of the variety of stakeholders in the process and reflect on processes and outcomes before and during the ARCPD. This is done only as a means to determine how civil society especially can better impact such proceedings in future, and most especially with regard to such processes affecting Africa and SRHR, such as the Post 2015 process.

In some circumstances content has been deleted or altered as a means to avoid identifying individuals or organisations. No identifiers of individual’s opinions have been included. Although some respondents approved the use of their names, no names have been provided as a means to ensure full confidentiality is ensured, even by process of exclusion. The potential problems of including names has been carefully weighed against the potential gains. These decisions have been taken carefully and with consideration. Finally, transparency, accountability and a desire to improve future processes has been prioritised and a hope that through reflection these ICPD, MDG/SDG and Post 2015 processes will gain from the learning.

Introduction

United Nations General Assembly, through its resolution 65/234, mandated an operational review of the implementation of the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) and its follow up beyond 2014 as well as to respond to new challenges relevant to population and development, the changing development environment and to reinforce the integration of population and development agenda in global processes related to development.

As part of this process, the African Regional Conference on Population and Development was held from 30th September to 4th October, 2013 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. This conference was themed “Harnessing the Demographic Dividend: The Future we want for Africa”. The objective of this conference was to review progress toward the ICPD Programme of Action as set out in the Cairo, 1994. In addition, this conference was intended to bring together representatives from African government, civil society and youth organisations in order to agree a set of priorities, challenges and emerging issues for the African region.

From the 24th-25th September, youths from across Africa came together during the Youth pre-conference to identify their priorities. This was immediately followed by the CSO pre-conference which was held on 26th-27th September (also tasked with identification of priorities). These combined recommendations were presented before the experts prior to the Ministerial meeting from 30th–4th September, 2013.
Methodology

Staff from the following institutions were interviewed for this report:

- The African Union Commission
- United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)
- AfriYAN/Ghana Government Delegation
- World YMCA
- UNAIDS Youth Programme
- Women For A Change Cameroon
- Southern Africa AIDS Trust, Regional Office
- African Population and Health Research Center
- NAYA Kenya

This report does not claim to be complete or to reflect the opinions of all stakeholders but is simply a “Reflection” of those who were so kind as to participate in the study.
Youth Pre-conference

As part of the on-going review of the ICPD Programme of Action for 2014 and beyond, a number of important events were happening within various countries, at the regional and global levels. The Global Youth Forum in Bali in December of 2012 was one of the important milestones which resulted in the Bali ICPD Declaration. Within Africa, one of such events was the African Regional Conference on Population and Development which was held from 30th September to 4th October, 2013 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The conference theme was “Harnessing the Demographic Dividend: The Future we want for Africa”.

Given the need for meaningful participation of young people in the ICPD review including through membership in various government delegations at regional and global level processes, the youth pre-conference was held on the 24th and 25th September, 2013.

“The event was very good and excellent in my view because the preparation and interaction before the event was good. It was very clear from the start what was expected from the event” Anonymous, UNFPA Regional Officer.

The coordination of young people’s participation in the ICPD review in Africa and the organization of the youth pre-conference prior to the ARCPD was a necessary and exciting opportunity. Given the crucial need, AAI in May 2013 among other organizations was invited to sit on the African Regional Youth Steering Committee (YSC) for the ICPD Beyond 2014. No rationale was shared for why particular organisations were selected. This YSC worked closely with the ICPD Beyond 2014 Secretariat, UNFPA Regional Offices in Africa and other stakeholders to ensure the meaningful participation of youth in the regional level processes related to the review. The YSC had a total of 15 members disaggregated by geographical and focus specific organizations including key populations (i.e. young people living with HIV and disabilities). In addition, the YSC included participation of UNFPA, IPPF and AUC.

Youth Steering Committee (YSC) Meeting, Addis Ababa, 13th – 18th July, 2013.
Prior to the first in person meeting the YSC was coordinating preparatory work virtually through online discussion, teleconference since May 2013. The objective of this meeting was:

1. Bring together the YSC members from across Africa to deliberate issues and make recommendations for consideration and incorporation into the ICPD Regional Population Conference for Africa outcomes
2. Identify key priorities and strategies related to youth and promoting their well-being and rights
3. Advocate for the prioritization of youth issues within the reviews of ICPD and the Post 2015 development agenda
4. Create a platform for the development of a coordinated advocacy strategy towards the conference.

The Africa Youth Pre-conference is organized by a steering committee comprised of: African Youth and Adolescents Network (AfriYAN), AIDS Accountability International (AAI), Connect Africa Development, Global Youth Coalition on Aids (GYCA), International Planned Parenthood Federation Africa Region (IPPFAR), Paramount Young Women’s Initiative (PAYOWI), PEPETA, Pan African Youth Union, African
Union Youth Division, Youth Action Movement (YAM), Sonke Gender Justice Network, African Young Positives (AY+) and African Youth and Disability Network (AYWDN).

**Methodology of recommendation building**

One key output from the 1st Youth Steering Committee meeting was the creation of the methodology for coming up with Youth pre-conference. The YSC adopted the methodology of the Youth pre-conference. It was agreed that there would be plenary sessions, with an expert speaker for each theme and discussants from different constituencies speaking to the issue at hand from different perspectives. This was immediately followed by youth delegates breaking out into groups with a facilitator. The breakout sessions provided opportunity for youths to develop specific number of recommendations which were later synthesized by an outcomes group.

The YSC discussed and agreed on the following themes for the youth pre-conference: Health, Education, Employment, Inclusive Participation, Governance and Security.

**Participation at Youth Pre-conference**

The youth pre-conference prior to the ARCPD was attended by 180 youth delegates from across the African continent. Of the 180 youth delegates: 125 were pre-selected and supported by UNFPA country offices, 25 youths were supported by IPPF and 30 were self-sponsored. The process of pre-selection by UNFPA country office of mainly young people that worked with UNFPA country offices compromised their level of contribution on key issues such as health due to possible conflict of interest. In the case of health, youth delegates during the pre-conference were particularly timid to discuss key issues that concern their access to sexual and reproductive health and rights such as access to safe abortions and promotion of human rights as they affect key populations such as LGBT.

**Youth Outcome Document**

After the two-day pre-conference, young people agreed on 36 key priorities and developed the concrete Youth Outcome Statement for governments and partners. Some of the key issues that were covered in the recommendations include: human rights, gender equality, comprehensive sexuality education, youth sexual and reproductive health and rights, and accountability. In addition, the youth also endorsed the Bali Declaration from the Global Youth Forum held in December 2012. This transparent and consultative approach with youth delegates was meaningful in developing of a solid set of recommendations on the key aforementioned thematic areas.

**Youth participation in CSO Meeting**

25 youth delegates that attended the Youth pre-conference proceeded to the CSO pre-conference and provided meaningful contributions to the breakout discussions as evidenced by some recommendations in the Youth Outcome Statement being highlighted in the CSO outcome Statement.

There was no significant transition of recommendations coming from the youth outcome statement into the CSO Outcome Statement despite the presence of youth in the CSO pre-conference breakout sessions.
The lack of a consultative recommendation building during the CSO pre-conference resulted in a weak and non-progressive outcome document. This may also have been as a result of hiring a consultant to develop the zero draft that was too academic in nature without addressing emerging issues.

**Youth participation at Experts Meeting**

25 youth delegates proceed from the CSO pre-conference to attend the Experts meeting. The youth representative was given 10 minutes during the opening ceremony of the Experts meeting to present the Youth Outcome Statement which seemed to have been received well.

**Youth participation at Ministerial Meeting**

The ministerial meeting was attended by 25 youth delegates and CSO representatives. At this point there was little that the youth delegates could do to influence the outcome document of the meeting. However, two members of the youth delegates formed part of national delegations i.e. Ghana and Liberia. Thus these youth delegates were able to influence fellow country government delegates to make meaningful inclusions into the final document on matters related to young people on sexual and reproductive health and employment.

Despite the theme of the conference and initial endeavour to ensure that the voices of CSOs and Youth were prioritized through the hosting of the separate pre-conference, there seemed to be a significant disconnect among the 4 events (youth pre-conference, CSO pre-conference, experts meeting and the ministerial meeting) in coming up with the final Addis Ababa Declaration.
CSO Pre-conference

Process leading to the development of the CSO outcome statement

The CSO Pre-conference was convened by International Planned Parenthood Federation Africa Region IPPFAR and their CSO network Reproductive Health Advocacy Network Africa (RHANA). As part of preparations for the ICPD Conference a steering committee (CSO SC) was formed. It is not clear how the members were chosen to form part of this steering committee.


A meeting was held in Kenya, 12-14 June 2013 to map out the work of the CSO SC at the conference. Two consultants were hired by one of the co-chairs of the CSO SC to develop the CSO zero draft to be reviewed at the CSO pre-conference meeting.

CSO Pre-conference in Addis.

The CSO Preconference lasted for two days and was officially led and coordinated by IPPF Africa Regional Office with input from other members of the CSO steering committee. A team of two consultants was hired to develop the zero draft, yet why this decision was taken and by whom is unsure. Various members of the CSO SC expressed concern about this as the consultant was not approved by the CSO SC and thus an unknown factor in terms of the quality and content of the delivery of the draft CSO Outcome Statement. Prior to the conference the CSO Outcome Statement zero draft was sent out to the members of the CSO SC for comments and input. These were sent back to the leaders of the steering committee.

“It was the first time I was interacting with CSOs at that scale. However, I feel that we lacked a coherent strategy from inception as the leadership was not well coordinated. This can be traced from even the way the issue of involving consultants was handled. Very little time was accorded to steering committee members to review the drafts. As such we did not seem to have a common agenda and in the end we seemed to be attacking each other”. Anonymous, CSO participant at ARCPD

During the CSO pre-conference none of the CSO SC members received the first draft which contained the comments and inputs suggested by SC members and thus an impression was given that this feedback was not utilised. This for obvious reasons is problematic. A unilateral decision was taken by IPPFARO that the zero draft, as developed by the consultants, would be the document to be used for the review during the thematic group sessions thus confirming that feedback already provided would not be used.
The ARCPD CSO Preconference was attended by approximately 150 participants from the region. The participants were divided into four thematic groups according to themes covered in the draft outcome document. These are: 1) Human Security, Environment, Population Mobility, 2) Inclusive Economic Transformation, 3) Health and Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights, 4) Education and Employment. Feedback on the zero draft was then solicited from participants.

The main findings and recommendations from this process (i.e. the reviews of the CSO zero draft document) were to be used to inform the development of the final CSO Outcome Statement, which would then be adopted by CSOs present.

However, the final CSO Outcome Statement was neither distributed to CSO SC nor other CSOs at the conference. It was only on the morning of the Experts Meeting that the Final CSO Outcome Statement was made available to others. CSOs began to register complaints that the CSO Outcome Statement did not reflect the recommendations that had been adopted during the CSO pre-conference. This too is highly problematic. Issues on sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI), abortion and family planning were missing and/or entirely excluded. The final outcome was that CSO representatives at the ARCPD did not want to be associated with the CSO Outcome Statement and stated that they would refuse to sign. AAI too decided not to sign given the content of the document. Problematically the document was dubbed the IPPF Statement by some due to either a perceived or real lack of transparency in the process. The most common criticisms were that there had been no transparency about who was working on the statement or about the decision to exclude recommendations from the CSO outcome statement adopted during the CSO pre-conference. As leader of the process IPPFARO was asked to respond to these criticisms but was unable to do so in such a manner as to convince CSOs to endorse the final CSO Outcome Statement. The result was that to a large extent, the CSO Outcome Statement could not be used for advocacy at the conference. This unfortunate circumstance needs to be understood and discussed openly as a means, not of pointing fingers for the sake of it, but so as to avoid such divided and unhelpful situations occurring again when CSOs are trying to collectively lobby governments and continental bodies.

The CSO SC process lacked transparency and did not have a mapped out strategy on how CSOs would navigate the entire conference. This resulted in a CSO Outcome Statement that was even more conservative than the Ministers Meeting Draft that was adopted with reservations by some countries.

The CSO participation at the ARCPD being an important part of the ARCPD, was expected to yield meaningful recommendations that would have contributed to the Addis Ababa Declaration. However, as earlier highlighted from above, the CSO process of recommendation building had a number of pitfalls that may have led to the weak outcomes statements. Some of the reasons for this weak CSO outcome document include:

- The selection a criterion of CSO’s that attended the ARCPD which were predominately nominated by IPPF and RHANA may have affected the diversity and capacity for CSOs to effectively engage with negotiations at ARCPD. This was demonstrated in the perceived lack of capacity for CSO’s at the ARCPD to contribute to all areas of the ICPD review.
It was further expected that the youth outcome statement would effectively be fed into the CSO outcome statement. However, these two events (youth and CSO pre-conference) and resulting outcome statements seemed to stand in isolation and not consequently draw from each other. This may have weakened the ability for the CSO statement to have greater outcome given how much the youth outcome statement was incorporated into the final Addis Ababa Declaration. This is coupled by the fact that there was little or no prior communication between youth, CSOs and country delegates/ministers before the ARCPD.

“This lack of communication among all stakeholders may have affected the failure for the ARCPD, youth and CSO statements to fully tap inspiration from one another.” Anonymous, CSO participant at ARCPD

“There will always be those civil society individuals who will play the curriculum vitae game. You can’t void that some people position themselves and their organizations and seek the limelight but do not do the work” Anonymous, CSO staffer interviewed

Another factor that may have affected the CSO’s contribution to the Addis Ababa Declaration was that CSOs were not provided with enough time as Youth to completely read out CSO outcome Statement during the experts meeting coupled with the fact that CSO steering committee had consensus that the CSO outcome was presented in weak manner. This therefore might have affected the ability to effectively contribute to the Addis Ababa Declaration. In addition, the CSO statement that was presented to experts was viewed as a statement that was not entirely developed by the CSO pre-conference but as one that was crafted by IPPF. This brought some discomfort among many CSO’s as to reasons for having another CSO decided the final outcome statement for all other CSO’s. This was perceived as lack of transparency on the part of IPPF. This need for transparency among CSOs must highlight the importance of having all CSOs as equal in decision making at platforms such as the ARCPD.

“Youth were also given little or no voice at all at the Ministerial meeting despite their repeated requests for attention.” Youth Steering Committee Representative

“This lack of transparency resulted in organizations such as IPPF having the last say on recommendations. This lack of equity is noticeable among governments but should not to be encouraged among CSOs.” Anonymous CSO Steering Committee member

On another note regarding the development of recommendations, it was noticed that some CSO recommendations were not predominately demanded by African CSOs but influenced by external CSOs. In addition, CSOs were view as being sympathetic for various reasons which may included that they deemed that their work would only be possible through the praising of their governments even when it was import for them to provide adequate checks and balances.

“There are also suggestions that the some of the CSO recommendations were not African driven but influenced by external CSOs. This made it hard
for African externally funded CSOs to challenge the views of their funds.”
Anonymous, CSO Representative in Regional Management

“In addition, this is further compounded by the fact that some CSOs during the ARCPD were viewed to be more sympathetic with their governments rather than providing necessary checks and balances.” Anonymous Academician, participant at ARCPD

“Move away from academically oriented statements to more practical ones capturing real life SRH issues.” Youth Steering Committee member

In view of the fact that CSOs were not given reasonable time during the experts meeting to fully read their outcome statement. For this reason, it would be important for CSOs to quickly adjust to changing processes through better readiness to address such situations. Furthermore, it was clear that there was poor strategic organization by CSO to ensure organized advocacy on key issues such as provision of human rights during the experts and ministerial meeting. This lack of organization was further worsened by the fact that organizations didn’t know their government country representatives.
UNFPA - Africa Regional Report on ICPD

The main findings and recommendations of the UNFPA Africa Regional Report on ICPD, at the opening of the ARCPD, were presented by Dr Hassan- of the UNFPA. He stated that only 27 countries out of the 54 countries in Africa completed the questionnaire. During the discussion in this session, different countries raised concerns with regards to the UNFPA process in terms of this survey, including:

Report results
The results of the report were not representative of all countries on the continent; i.e. the report reflected only a few countries but not the experience of all. In addition to this, the results presented and the presentation itself were overly complimentary to government and its performance; that is to say they favoured government on progress being achieved albeit there are known gaps in terms of the implementation of the ICPD PoA and in some cases where government had actually been a barrier to implementation this was not mentioned. In addition to this undeserved credit given to government, the work done by civil society was not recognized.

Data quality
The quality and quantity of the data was questioned even by the countries that had participated in the completion of the Africa Regional Report process. The questionnaire/ tool used did not offer a wide range of responses with regards to reporting progress made and instead mostly only provided two options (Yes/No). According to the country delegates, this was not sufficient to adequately report the extent of progress made. Importantly the country delegates reiterated that the data should therefore not be used to reflect progress in the continent and should not be recognised as data that reflects the priorities on the continent.

Impact Measurement
Another question asked by countries was whether only programme implementation progress had been analysed or whether the impact of such programme implementation had been measured as well so as to avert any undesirable outcomes for example. The answer to this by Dr Hassan was that this phase of the report did not cover impact measurement; perhaps this could be explored in future. He however said they were able to say Africa has made progress by using different reports, e.g. reporting on MDGs in terms of progress made and on what has been achieved in the continent in terms of ICPD, but that no analysis had been included on whether these had the desired outcomes.
Experts’ meeting

The ARCPD Experts Meeting kicked off by giving the platform to the CSO Steering Committee as well as the Youth Steering Committee to make presentations of the Outcome Statements from each group.

Unfortunately, in addition to having a weaker document that came out of a non-transparent process, the delivery of the CSO outcome statement was ineffective. It is not clear how the selection of the person to read the statement was done but the result is that the presentation was fraught with errors and incomplete by the time the allocated time was called to end. The delivery lacked strategy. For example it had been emphasized by different speakers as well as the conference organisers from the outset that SRHR are at the centre of the ICPD Beyond 2014 process, yet despite this the CSOs missed the opportunity to present their recommendations on SRHR that were in the CSO outcome statement.

Subsequent to the presentations the negotiations by the countries were done parallel to the experts meeting with South Africa as the rapporteur. None of the CSOs were allowed inside the negotiations. CSOs relied mostly on corridor advocacy. The Addis Ababa draft outcome document on ICPD was compiled in this closed meeting and this document was then taken to plenary at the Ministerial Meeting for further inputs and discussions.

Advocacy Strategy
The CSO SC was not able to come up with a clear strategy on how CSOs would advocate influencing the negotiation process. This proved to be a huge gap which also resulted in other dynamics developing and weighing negatively on the process.

IPPF Western Hemisphere Region, represented by Doris Mpoumou, was invited to join the CSO steering committee in order to provide support to CSOs as they had experience from the Latin American process. Their input and strategic thinking in providing guidance added significant value to the CSO SC process prior to the CSO pre-conference meeting as well as during the meeting. This kind of support should be sought at early stages of the process to gain maximum benefit.

Ministerial meeting
The ministerial meeting was held after the two days of negotiations which were done in parallel with the experts meeting. The Addis Ababa draft outcome Declaration document from the experts meeting was presented in the Ministerial meeting.

18 Countries adopted the draft with reservations (see draft outcome report on ICPD- Addis) and Chad was the only country that did not adopt the draft outcome Declaration. Ministers were requested to write country statements and submit them for consideration with regards to the 3 Paragraphs they had reservations on (OP, 17, 18 and 35- see below).

- OP 17- Adopt and protect the human rights of all individuals, without distinction of any kind, and guarantee equality before the law and non-discrimination for all people, in accordance with national policies, laws, religious, ethical values and cultural backgrounds.
• OP 18- Promulgate where absent, and enforce laws to prevent and punish any hate crimes without distinction of any kind, and take active steps to protect all persons from discrimination, stigmatization and violence, in accordance with national laws and policies.
• OP 35- Enact and enforce laws and policies within the national, political and legal framework to respect and protect the sexual and reproductive health and rights of all individuals.

The request was made after it became clear that consensus on the three paragraphs could not be reached.

“The main reason for this lack of consensus was hugely attributed to the fact that countries preferred the deletion of the phrases “non-discrimination for all people” and “without distinction of any kind” as applied to human rights, hate crimes and respect for and protection of sexual and reproductive health and rights implied support for homosexuality.” UNFPA Representative

A speaker who spoke on behalf of the Mali delegation expressed that the UNFPA process was not consultative at country level because the issues that led to an impasse at the conference, i.e. 3 paragraphs, are issues that could have been discussed at country level and perhaps opportunities for awareness and education given so that by the time they come to the negotiations they would be able to engage meaningfully.

This also raised questions with regards to the extent to which the UNFPA includes CSOs, thereby increasing transparency and accountability in such processes. The inclusion of CSOs would also be about addressing the importance of collaboration between government and CSO in the implementation of ICPD.

In the end a draft declaration was adopted however this whole conference presented a number of challenges and lessons to be learnt. As ministers go back to their countries to write up their statement for submission, CSO need to also start thinking very seriously ad strategically about how they are going to engage governments and advocate for the implementation of ICPD. As it stands according to the Global Survey report, 87% of countries in the continent are behind schedule in the implementation of ICPD.

“This problem could have been avoided if there were organized national meetings at country level that would identify key priority areas to be brought for negotiation at regional level. Furthermore, there was mere lack of capacity by attending CSOs to effectively engage with issues around SRHR thus making it difficult to negotiate with country delegates.” Anonymous, CSO Representative in Regional management

There is also the problem of having country delegate representatives not being from the line ministries related to population and development issues including SRHR. This was a clear weakness of the ARCPD when compared to the preparation that was done prior to the 1994 ICPD meeting in Cairo. This may have had an impact of the resulting reservations.
The ministers on the first day of ministerial meeting were not given a prior brief on the draft outcome document from experts meeting. Failure to do might have increased their resistance of key recommendations from the conference (i.e. OP17, OP 18 and OP 35) which border on provision/provision of human rights for all.

Relationships with delegations and partner advocates both in and outside the negotiation room played an important role in ensuring that key recommendation were taken on board.

“Just like in the HIV field where we say know your epidemic, it is also important in this process to know our delegates” Anonymous CSO Representative, Global Management

Some governments viewed things being negotiated for by CSOs to be aimed at promotion of gay rights thus watering down some other equally relevant SRHR issues.

A positive observation is that for the first time at regional level, youth and CSOs had a platform to contribute to the review process on ICPD in Africa

“Another specific positive is that for the first time at a regional level meeting the issue of Comprehensive Sexuality Education was mentioned in relation to its effect on population and development.” Youth Delegate at ARCPD

The ministers were not given a briefing on the draft Experts Meeting Outcome Statement prior to their meeting, and failure to do so likely increased their resistance of key recommendations from the conference (i.e. OP17, OP 18 and OP 35).

Things that affected the conference in particular in related to the AAD. Part of the problem is that people didn’t receive the report in time for them to read the results. So much of the discussion was not base on evidence but rather on information. UNFPA Representative

If there is anything that you need to change in the future is the determination of key findings in the different languages that will help to anticipate different challenges and also for countries to seek clarification. That way things are based on perceived but evidence. And related to that is the whole issue of the translation during the ARCDP which affected the programme. The quality of translation was not good thus. Made problems with the issues on the language. UNFPA Representative

Despite these challenges, relationships with delegations and partner advocates, both in and outside the negotiation room, played an important role in ensuring that key recommendation were taken on board.
Post ARCPD Events and Activities

Introduction
This section provides a description of the events and actions post ARCPD that have been undertaken by AAI, UNFPA and AUC that have created a platform to reflect and discuss matters and/or ultimately change country positions with regard to the Addis Ababa Declaration.

AAI ARCPD ICASA Evening Cocktail
AIDS Accountability International (AAI) in collaboration with Funders’ Network held an AAI ARCPD Evening Cocktail Discussion during the 7th International Conference on AIDS and STIs in Africa (ICASA) on 10th December, 2013. This meeting was aimed at increasing transparency around how processes proceeding up to and during the ARCPD held from 30th September to 4th October, 2013 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia occurred. Invited to speak at this event was Dr. Ademola Olajide, (former head of division, Social Affairs Department. African Union Commission), Ketheth Ehouzou (UNFPA representative), Caroline Kwamboka (Senior Manager External Relations and Advocacy, IPPFARO) as CSO steering committee representative, Jonathan Gunthorp (Executive Director, Southern African AIDS Trust) as CSO representative, and Samuel Kissi (Programme Coordinator, Curious Minds) as youth steering committee representative, Jacques Van Zuydam (Chief Director, National Population Unit) as South African government representative. AAI was represented by Nomvuyo Mabusela, who presented on the role of the CSO ACP and its role prior and during the ARCPD.

Unfortunately, IPPFARO and the South African government were unable to attend this event thus becoming difficult to address some questions highlighted above how IPPF run some processes during the ARCPD.

This event was attended by more than 60 participants that include CSO delegates at ICASA, the donor community and AUC and UNFPA representatives.

UNFPA Interventions after ARCPD
After the ARCPD, the UNFPA’s Executive Directors’ office has taken up the responsibility to follow-up the 17 member states that had reservations on recommendations (17, 18 and 35) including Chad who did not adopt the Addis Ababa declaration ICPD beyond 2014 during the conference. Of the 17 member states, 12 countries have officially withdrawn their reservations and adopted the declaration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Niger</th>
<th>Sierra Leone, Sierra Leone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following member states have not lifted their reservations: Sudan, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Tunisia and Egypt.
Recommendations

This section provides recommendations to all stakeholders including CSOs, National governments and UN agencies such as UNECA and UNFPA on based on key observations from the ARCPD.

- Greater accountability is needed from both government representatives and civil society so that they better represent their constituency and demand outcomes that improve the situation for women and youth with regard to sexual and reproductive health and rights.
- Create dedicated programs to develop civil society delegation members’ capacity to strengthen relationships with government representative country delegations is vital to ensure success both in prior advocacy activities as well as during the final negotiation meetings.
- Develop mentoring and training programs for civil society members on how to work with country delegations is required for improved advocacy at international and regional forums such as the ARCPD.
- There is need for more in-country engagement required between CSOs and governments prior to regional conferences such as the ARCPD which would lead to better negotiated outcomes at regional level.
- There is also the need for adequate government/political mapping prior to regional conferences such as the ARCPD in order to adequately prepare for negotiations both at country and regional level.
- There is need for development of functioning accountability frameworks and capacity building of CSOs in effective program design and implementation.
- There is need for UNFPA and its collaborating partners to develop qualitative as opposed to just quantitative tools or a combination (triangulation) when conducting assessment of progress towards achieving MDGs.
- There is also the need for adequate government/political mapping prior to regional conferences such as the ARCPD in order to adequately prepare for negotiations both at country and regional level.
For further information:
AAI work on the ICPD Review Process

Prior to this event, AAI held a leadership role in Africa on the ICPD Review process:

In April 2012 we sent feedback on the ICPD Programme of Action (PoA) Questionnaire [UNFPA questionnaire] and formed a coalition of Southern African civil society organisations that supported this submission: AIDS Accountability International (AAI), African Men for Sexual Health and Rights (AMSHeR), Network of Africa People Living with HIV and AIDS for Southern Africa Region (NAP+SAR), Partners in Sexual Health (PSH), Southern African HIV & AIDS Information Dissemination Service (SAFAIDS), & The Sexual Health and Rights Initiative South Africa (SHARISA). Read more here.

In late 2012, as a response to the lack of inclusion of all but the largest and surprisingly non-locally grown CSOs in the UNFPA Regional Consultations, AAI led a project with the African Union Commission (AUC), and the African Population Commission (APC) which saw us working together to develop the Civil Society Organisation African Common Position (CSO ACP) on ICPD+ by means of consultative meetings in Johannesburg and Dakar in 2012.

The consultative meetings included presentations from key experts on sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) and ICPD in Africa, as well as discussions and debates on what is required from the ICPD Beyond 2014 process, which, in turn, contributed to the development of the CSO ACP on ICPD+. This position paper highlights the status of the African population, as well as identifies challenges and successes. Recommendations were developed that pave the way for achieving the goals related to the ICPD PoA and ultimately the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) related to SRHR. Read more here.

See the programme here: AAI African Common Position on ICPD+ Invitation.

The CSO ACP on ICPD consultative meetings took place on 23rd-24th October in Johannesburg, South Africa and 30th-31st October, 2012 in Dakar, Senegal.

After going through an E-consultation process with the final input of over 75 experts the CSO ACP was complete. It contains a set of recommendations which are aimed at national governments so as to address population and development issues. Read more here. AAI received 222 signatories representing 342 CSOs from 42 African countries and 16 non-African countries to the CSO ACP. See the list here

AIDS Accountability International submitted the CSO ACP on ICPD to the AUC’s Commissioner for Social Affairs, His Excellency Dr. Mustapha S. Kaloko on Wednesday, 5 June 2013. Read more here.

It was planned that it would form part of the African Regional Conference on Population and Development (ARCPD) in September in Addis Ababa, where Ministers in charge of Population would adopt the
continental report on ICPD @ 20 African Common Position once reviewed by the AUC and the African Ministers in charge of population.

As part of the contribution to the ICPD Beyond 2014 process, as well as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) process, AAI also co-wrote the 2012 State of the African Population Report (SAPR), titled “Harnessing the Demographic Dividend for Africa’s Socio-Economic Development”. This was done in conjunction with the African Union Commission. This report documents the current situation with regards to population issues for the continent and is a key source document for related meetings and conferences. The African Union Commission’s Department of Social Affairs and collaborating partners have been publishing the biennial reports on the State of the African Population since 2004. Over the years, the reports have been structured to reflect issues that intrinsically link Africa’s economic growth pattern to its population trends. The first report focused on population and poverty challenges, while the second (2006) underlined the implications of population dynamics for achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The report is used by a large number of leaders in decision-making both as a source of data, and as a respected opinion on what is to be prioritized in national, regional and continental work and what potential solutions exist. AAI is fortunate that we were, by means if co-writing this report, able to influence the content and thus the rest of the post 2015 agenda. Indeed the report shares a title with the African Regional Conference on Population Development (ARCPD), not coincidentally. Find the Introduction and report here.

In May 2013, AAI began the “Are you in” campaign. This campaign sought to create awareness, build capacity and create buy-in to the CSO ACP content for advocacy at the African Regional Conference on Population Development in Addis in September and October 2013. As part of this campaign we launched the CSO ACP Brief: “To make it easier for you, AAI has distilled the full Civil Society African Common Position on ICPD into a 2 page Key Messages in Brief document” Read more here.

The CSO ACP had already been translated into French, Portuguese and Arabic and disseminated for sign on but for this campaign further dissemination continued for capacity building purposes.

The objective of the African Regional Conference on Population and Development was to review progress toward the ICPD Programme of Action. This conference was intended to bring together representatives from African governments, civil society and youth organisations to agree on a set of priorities, challenges and emerging issues for the African region.
From the 24th-25th September, youth from across Africa came together during the Youth Pre-conference to identify their priorities. This was followed by the CSO Pre-conference held on 26th-27th September (also tasked with identification of priorities). These combined recommendations were intended to be presented to the Experts Meeting, (1st and 2nd October) which in turn would influence the outcome document of the Ministerial meeting on the 3rd and 4th October, 2013.

In addition to the above, as part of the preparation for the ARCPD, AAI did a Snapshot Comparison of 3 ICPD Common Position Papers. This research briefly looked at: How much of what we asked for will we get? How does the African Common Position compare to the Latin American Montevideo Consensus in terms of “asks”? How much of the liberal issues such as LGBT and abortion are included in the Draft UNFPA and UNECA African Common Position? Read here: Comparison of the 3 Common Position papers on ICPD
Who we are

AIDS Accountability International (AAI) was established in 2005 with the mission to follow up on commitments to the AIDS epidemic made by governments, businesses and civil society. Still today, there is a widespread lack of advocacy tools for key actors to hold leaders accountable for the rollout of policy, program implementation and performance impact.

AAI believes that leaders should be informed. This is achieved through our research and advocacy, which holds ineffective leadership accountable whilst applauding those who live up to their promises.

In a ten-year perspective, the overall ambition of AIDS Accountability International is to make a distinct contribution in the effort to realize and sustain the universal access targets. Our unique contribution is to shape the political context that determines the level and quality of leadership that is invested in the response to AIDS. Our strategy for achieving this is to generate research and mobilize stakeholders to ensure that the response is governed through accountable leadership that is motivated by a sustained demand among stakeholders in civil society and the public at large.

AAI creates needs-driven research to empower advocacy efforts by developing tools that enables non-governmental organizations, parliamentarians and media representatives to hold governments and leaders accountable. This helps identify best practice, along with assisting governments with monitoring and evaluation of their programs. Through these means, AAI encourages those who are delivering on their commitments, puts pressure on those who are under-performing and stimulates constructive debate about what can be learned from different approaches.
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