

South Africa Climate Change Advocacy Programme

Impact Assessment



Photograph sourced from the South Durban Community Environmental Alliance (SDCEA)

Oxfam GB

Citizen Voice Outcome Indicator

External Evaluation, May 2012

MARGARET JACK AND MARGARET MCKENZIE

ABBREVIATIONS

AIDC	Alternative Information and Development Centre
C17	Committee of 17 – Civil Society Committee for COP 17
COP	Congress of the Parties of the United National Framework Convention on Climate Change
COP17	17 th Congress of the Parties of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
COSATU	Congress of South African Trade Unions
DEA	Department of Environmental Affairs (South Africa)
DIRCO	Department of International Relations and Co-operation (South Africa)
EU	European Union
GCF	Green Climate Fund
LAMOSAS	Land Access Movement of South Africa
MCJC	Million Climate Jobs Campaign
NACTU	National Council of Trade Unions
OA	Oxfam Australia
OI	Oxfam International
OGB	Oxfam Great Britain
PACJA	Pan African Climate Justice Alliance
RSA	Republic of South Africa
RWA	Rural Women's Assembly
SDCEA	South Durban Community Environmental Alliance
SMS	Single management structure
TCOE	Trust for Community Outreach and Education
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

CONTENTS

Executive summary	1
Introduction	8
Evaluation methodology	9
Overview of process tracing	9
Key phases of the evaluation	10
RSA climate change advocacy programme	12
Outcome One	14
Activities	14
Evidence	14
Causal explanation	16
Summary	20
Outcome Two	21
Activities	21
Evidence	21
Causal explanation	23
Summary	25
Outcome Three	26
Activities	26
Evidence	27
Causal explanation	30
Summary	35
Outcome Four	36
Activities	36
Evidence	36
Causal explanation	39
Summary	41

Contribution score	42
Conclusions and recommendations.....	43
References	47
Appendix one: Oxfam’s financial contribution to civil society organisations.....	49

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

From 28th November to 9th December South Africa hosted the 17th Congress of the Parties (COP17) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Oxfam identified this as *“a unique opportunity to push the South African Government to lead by example by becoming a champion for pro-poor adaptation and mitigation at home and ensuring that people’s voices, especially from Africa, will be heard and listened to by decision-makers.”* (Oxfam, 2011a)

In this context, in late 2010 and early 2011, Oxfam Great Britain (OGB) revised its existing climate change advocacy programme in the Republic of South Africa (RSA) that had been running since 2008 to have a specific focus on COP17. By March 2011, Oxfam had defined the following objectives / outcomes for the advocacy programme (Oxfam, 2011a):

1. The South African government steps out as a global leader on national pro-poor adaptation with a powerful adaptation plan as part of a poverty reduction strategy backed with domestic and global resources;
2. South African government runs an inclusive, legitimate Congress of the Parties (COP) that contributes to a fair, ambitious, and legally binding deal, taking particular leadership with progressive voices (particularly with the Africa Group, Mexico and the European Union [EU]) on finance issues;
3. Individuals and civil society in South Africa are mobilised on three levels: to influence the domestic agenda; to influence international decision making; raised public awareness and action through movements focussed on the COP this year and food in coming years;
4. African organisations and people speak for themselves, particularly around women’s leadership, representation and participation in processes up to and at COP17, both inside and outside the negotiations.

This document is an evaluation of the advocacy programme in the lead up to COP17 that took place from late 2010 to December 2011. The advocacy programme was randomly selected for evaluation by OGB and the evaluation will contribute to a larger organisational evaluation and learning process by OGB.

This evaluation used the process tracing approach, which is a qualitative research protocol that was identified as the preferred methodology for the evaluation by OGB. The specific brief of OGB was to use the process tracing approach *“to assess the extent to which: a) the changes around South African climate change policy and mobilisation that the climate change advocacy programme was seeking have taken place; and b) we can evidence that the project contributed to these changes.”*

Summaries of the evaluation of success in achieving each evaluation and Oxfam’s contribution to this are summarised in the tables below:

Outcome 1	The South African government demonstrates leadership on national pro-poor climate change strategies with a strong adaptation plan that is backed with domestic and global resources	
Key activities	Written submissions and verbal submissions on South African Climate Change Policy by Oxfam Support of the participation of partners in South African Climate Change Policy development process	
Evidence	Does the white paper include an adaptation plan?	Yes, the White Paper includes a clear adaptation plan in Section Five.
	Does the adaptation plan include women and small-scale farmers?	Yes, the White Paper as a whole recognises the impact that climate change will have on the poor and specifically references women and small scale producers.
	Is it backed by global and domestic resources?	No, at this stage there is no clear allocation of global and domestic resources to the White Paper.
What was Oxfam's contribution?	Oxfam's Climate Change Advocacy Programme made a notable contribution to the White Paper development process. Oxfam's Climate Change Advocacy Programme was one of many contributors to the White Paper development process.	

Outcome 2	South African government runs an inclusive, legitimate COP that contributes to a fair, ambitious, and legally binding deal, taking particular leadership with progressive voices (particularly with the Africa Group, Mexico and the EU) on finance issues	
Key activities	Formal meetings with SA COP Presidency through 2011 at Bonn, Panama and other occasions. Written submission to and verbal lobbying of SA COP Presidency.	
Evidence	Did the SA government run an inclusive, legitimate COP?	Partially, as there are limitations as a result of the formal accreditation process.
	Did it contribute to a fair, ambitious, and legally binding deal?	Yes, but insufficient progress was made.
	SA Government taking particular leadership on finance issues	Yes, the SA government took leadership on finance issues.
What was Oxfam's contribution?	Oxfam's climate change advocacy programme was able to influence the SA COP Presidency. Oxfam's climate change advocacy programme was one of many influences on the SA COP Presidency.	

Outcome 3	Individuals and civil society in South Africa are mobilised on three levels: to influence the domestic agenda; to influence international decision making; raised public awareness and action through movements focussed on the COP this year and food in coming years	
Key activities	Contributed to development of a civil society strategy that recommended the formation of C17 and funded some C17 activities Co-funded MCJC Co-funded community awareness raising events of the Sustainable Energy and Climate Change Partnership Hosted three media breakfasts and put on an exhibition to raise the human stories of climate change	
Evidence	Were individuals and civil society mobilised?	Yes individuals and civil society were mobilised despite divisions and funding constraints.
	Was public awareness raised?	Yes, public awareness on climate change was raised in South Africa.
	Was the domestic/international agenda influenced?	Yes, to some extent, the agenda was influenced, although there is debate about how much influence is possible in a global meeting such as COP17
What was Oxfam's contribution?	Oxfam's Climate Change Advocacy Programme made a notable contribution to mobilisation of individuals and civil society. Oxfam's climate change advocacy programme was one of several significant contributors to mobilisation of individuals and civil society. Oxfam contributed to public awareness in the lead up and during COP17. Oxfam was one of a large number of contributors to public awareness in the lead up and during COP17. The Oxfam programme had some limited long term impact.	

Outcome 4	African organisations and people speak for themselves, particularly around women's leadership, representation and participation in processes up to and at COP17, both inside and outside the negotiations	
Key activities	Partnered with organisations that were part of the RWA to gather rural women's stories, develop a memorandum submitted to the South African government on rural women's day, and fund 650 to attend the RWA Supported PACJA Got accreditation for some civil society representatives and some Oxfam staff	
Evidence	Did Oxfam support organisations outside COP?	Yes, financially, although technical and intellectual support also useful
	Did Oxfam support organisations inside COP?	This was not really on their agenda, despite it being part of the outcome
What was Oxfam's contribution?	Oxfam was a major supporter of RWA and PACJA. RWA and PACJA would have been active at COP without the support of Oxfam. Oxfam facilitated civil society voices to be heard inside COP. There is little opportunity for civil society voices to be heard inside COP due to its inherent structure.	

Recommendations and conclusions

OUTCOME ONE

Oxfam had an effective climate change advocacy programme that clearly contributed to the policy development process: Oxfam's participation in the climate change response policy development process was recognised as vocal and strong by the individual leading the policy development process for the South Africa government. In addition there is traceable evidence of wording from at least one of Oxfam's submissions being used in the published version of the National Climate Change Response White Paper.

There is no recommendation arising from this conclusion.

There was a mismatch between this outcome and Oxfam's scale of impact on the outcome. The South Africa climate change policy development process was highly participatory and as a result Oxfam's own contribution to the policy development process was by implication diluted by the impact that other stakeholders must have had on the process through their participation. In addition since Oxfam is an international organisation contributing in a national policy development process its contributions may not always have been regarded by decision makers as having the same level of significance as those of South Africa organisations. So while Oxfam clearly contributed to the final outcome, multiple players can be regarded as having contributed to this outcome as well.

It is recommended that outcomes of advocacy programmes are written to take into account the likely scale of impact Oxfam can have in the context of efforts by numerous other parties.

OUTCOME TWO

Oxfam SA climate change advocacy programme established an influential relationship with the SA COP Presidency from a low base: Oxfam's SA team was able to secure formal and informal access to the SA COP Presidency and played significant role in assisting OI policy objectives through its establishment of a relationship with the SA COP Presidency.

There is no recommendation arising from this conclusion.

This outcome was poorly stated and as a result prevents clear evaluation of success. This outcome combines a number of different outcomes in one. In addition the core of the outcome statement was extremely ambitious and reflects a global scale objective, while other components of the outcome have a more national scale. Considering the small size of the Oxfam climate change advocacy programme in relation to COP17 itself it is not possible to establish a clear chain of evidence linking different concepts in this outcome. In addition, while the SA team achieved a great deal considering its small scale (see previous conclusion), the outcomes statement as it stands sets up the team for failure at the outset. All these factors made it extremely difficult to clearly evaluate this outcome.

It is recommended that outcomes for advocacy programmes are written more simply and focus on single concepts. In addition as per a previous recommendation, outcomes should be at the scale of likely impact of the advocacy programme.

OUTCOME THREE

Individuals and civil society were mobilised. Oxfam played a role at the beginning of C17, as part of the process to galvanise civil society resistance to the global event that was COP17, and funded two organisations (Earthlife and SDCEA) to be part of C17. The monies were received by Earthlife in November, and by SDCEA at the beginning of 2011. In addition, Oxfam financed and offered intellectual support for the MCJC and assisted in the amplification of the campaign through its networking abilities. Oxfam has supported both Earthlife and SDCEA for a number of years and it was the fact that they are mature organisations that have developed capacity for administration, financial systems, and databases of supporters that allowed them to play a role in educating and mobilising for the global day of action.

Organisations with years of support tend to be more administratively and financially accountable for their funds. Therefore it is recommended that when Oxfam considers funding organisations for large-scale one-off events, it considers the maturity of organisation and how much support it has given it over the years.

A number of partners said that if they had had more money, they would have been able to mobilise more people. Having the funding earlier would also have given them time to focus on mobilisation and education rather than logistics and payments. This was due to internal processes and policies which could in part have been avoided if planning had begun much earlier. It should also be said that funding was insufficient for a global event with such ambitious outcomes.

It is recommended that Oxfam consider more timely grant payment by improving its internal appraisal processes and lowers expectations of programme staff engaging in fund-raising for their work.

In addition, if Oxfam wants to engage in global events, funding for it should be commensurate.

The scale of COP17 limits influence of small scale programmes. The sheer scale of governments and organisations involved in COP17 means that small programmes of the scale of Oxfam have limited influence. The review of civil society participation in COP17 made the following observation regarding this “It is important to support ideals based on climate science but also to know the limits of the multilateral system to achieving these ideals. In terms of ambition, civil society is far ahead of multilateral systems and this is set to continue into the near future. In this context it must be questioned whether it is more essential to be building movements on the ground and to defocus from the multilateral process that is failing to deliver than to continue in the present mode.” (Hallows, Reddy and Reyes, 2012: 5). Perhaps it would be more useful to focus on getting different results by doing different things. Is Rio going to be any different from Durban? Would the money be better spent on building local movements?

It is recommended that for single country programmes Oxfam consider alternatives to engaging in the multilateral process of COP.

OUTCOME FOUR

Organisations (or rather networks) did speak for themselves. Oxfam played an important financial and technical role in allowing these voices to emerge. The RWAs that emerged with memoranda handed to government and to the COP Presidency indicates an impressive level of organisation that Oxfam contributed to.

There is no recommendation arising from this conclusion.

Perhaps one of the more important outcomes of the October and COP assemblies is that **women shared their own climate change adaptation strategies.** This is an interesting outcome as it could be argued that the narrative around COP is a disempowering one. That narrative suggests that people can only cope with climate change if the government negotiates on their behalf for an adaptation plan. There is no sense that people need and have their own local adaptation strategies which can be shared and implemented.

It is recommended that Oxfam look to fund knowledge sharing events that actively engage people and communities in sharing their local solutions to their climate change challenges. This should NOT be a 'best practice' exercise, but a genuine exchange of information, strategies, reasons, hopes, and results of experimenting. Best practice is not useful here because it offers blanket solutions which are not delicate enough for different contexts.

Inside COP, African voices were not heard. It is not clear what the strategy inside COP was, or whether it is worth engaging in that manner at all.

OVERALL

The initial impression of the programme outcomes is that they are too ambitious for one organisation to affect. This was particularly the case regarding outcomes linked directly to COP17. Many commentators suggest that most people knew that very little was going to be achieved at COP17, despite Africa having three clear demands. Given the structural difficulties of influencing one of the most complex and most expensive global processes, having programme outcomes that refer to COP17 outcomes is not useful.

On further investigation, the limitation on funds and the delay in them being disbursed came down to internal Oxfam processes. Planning began only nine months ahead of the event, and the two new staff members in the programme were asked to devise an action plan. Once completed, they were asked to raise funds for the plan, which they felt was not in their capacities. Therefore, the programme did not get the funding it expected and this tied activities. Internal appraisal processes and the requirement of a monitoring, learning, and evaluation (MEL) framework delayed the acquisition of funds by the programme,

and it was only in August 2011 that the programme had funding it could disburse to partners (Mistry and Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.). These internalities directly hampered the effectiveness of this programme.

It is recommended that longer lead times should be included in Oxfam project planning for large events.

INTRODUCTION

From 28th November to 9th December South Africa hosted the 17th Congress of the Parties (COP17) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Oxfam identified this as *“a unique opportunity to push the South African Government to lead by example by becoming a champion for pro-poor adaptation and mitigation at home and ensuring that people’s voices, especially from Africa, will be heard and listened to by decision-makers.”* (Oxfam, 2011a)

In this context, in late 2010 and early 2011, Oxfam Great Britain (OGB) revised its existing climate change advocacy programme in the Republic of South Africa (RSA) that had been running since 2008 to have a specific focus on COP17. By March 2011, Oxfam had defined the following objectives / outcomes for the advocacy programme (Oxfam, 2011a):

1. The South African government steps out as a global leader on national pro-poor adaptation with a powerful adaptation plan as part of a poverty reduction strategy backed with domestic and global resources;
2. South African government runs an inclusive, legitimate Congress of the Parties (COP) that contributes to a fair, ambitious, and legally binding deal, taking particular leadership with progressive voices (particularly with the Africa Group, Mexico and the European Union [EU]) on finance issues;
3. Individuals and civil society in South Africa are mobilised on three levels: to influence the domestic agenda; to influence international decision making; raised public awareness and action through movements focussed on the COP this year and food in coming years;
4. African organisations and people speak for themselves, particularly around women’s leadership, representation and participation in processes up to and at COP17, both inside and outside the negotiations.

This document is an evaluation of the advocacy programme in the lead up to COP17 that took place from late 2010 to December 2011. The advocacy programme was randomly selected for evaluation by OGB and the evaluation will contribute to a larger organisational evaluation and learning process by OGB. While the evaluation was commissioned by OGB, it should be noted that the advocacy programme was implemented in South Africa by a cross affiliate team and represented one of the first programmes implemented under the newly instituted Single Management Structure (SMS) of Oxfam International (OI). The SMS is a new organising method for OI, aimed at better co-ordinating the work of Oxfam affiliates in a country. It should also be noted that though the advocacy programme has existed since 2008, since the programme underwent a considerable change in the lead up to COP17, the programme prior to the beginning of 2011 is not included in the evaluation.

This evaluation used the process tracing approach, which is a qualitative research protocol that was identified as the preferred methodology for the evaluation by OGB. The specific brief of OGB was to use the process tracing approach *“to assess the extent to which: a) the changes around South African climate change policy and mobilisation that the climate change advocacy programme was seeking have taken place; and b) we can evidence that the project contributed to these changes.”*

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

OVERVIEW OF PROCESS TRACING

The terms of reference for this evaluation contained a document called ***Guidance on evaluating citizen voice using process tracing***, which outlines the steps for the methodology to be used. Process tracing is “particularly relevant for causal inference” between actions and outcomes (Oxfam GB, undated: 1). It can also be used to assign contribution scores for the causality, such that actions carried out under programmes are thought to *contribute* to the overall outcome, rather than be fully *attributed* to the actions. In this instance, the outcomes of the programme relate to the behaviour of the South African government at COP17, and public and civil society participation in and outside COP. Clearly, no one organisation can be responsible for the successful achievement of these outcomes, and this methodology allows the evaluation to estimate Oxfam’s contribution to any outcomes that are successfully achieved.

The process happens in six steps, which are summarised below:

1. Specify the most recent intermediate and final outcomes that the programme was seeking to achieve, including those that may have emerged during the course of implementation of the programme. This information is gathered from project documentation as well as interviews with programme stakeholders. A theory of change is developed at this stage.
2. Document what was done in the programme to achieve the outcomes. In order to sufficiently understand causality, the evaluators need to understand potential causes of the outcomes, hence the need to understand what activities were undertaken. This information comes from insiders, triangulated with other stakeholders.
3. Identify and evidence what outcomes have actually materialised, and notice any unintended outcomes. In this step, evidence of change needs to be marshalled, and the literature specifically mentions changes in duty bearer practices. Much of this data is gathered from outsiders and targets of the programme, triangulated from independent sources.
4. Undertake *process induction* to identify causal explanations for all the outcomes evidenced in step 3. A detailed sequence of processes is developed for each outcome: what specific processes generated each outcome. This is linked to strength of evidence for each causal story and outcome.
5. Undertake *process verification* to check to what extent each explanation of causes is supported by the available evidence. At the end of this process, the aim is to have evidenced explanations for all the outcomes. Specific importance is attached to outcomes that relate to duty-bearer behaviour change.
6. Allocate *contribution scores* for each outcome. This is a qualitative judgement on the extent to which the project contributed to the targeted change. The score is based on a) the extent to which targeted outcomes were achieved, and b) the programme’s contribution to the outcome.

In this evaluation, the steps have been summarised into five broad questions:

1. What did you want to achieve – outcomes;
2. How did you want to achieve it – activities;
3. What was achieved;

4. Explanations or causes of achievements;

5. Extent of contribution.

In an article about contribution analysis's use in evaluation, Kotvojs and Shrimpton write that "Rather than attempt to definitively link a program's contribution to desired results, contribution analysis alternatively seeks to provide plausible evidence that can reduce uncertainty regarding the 'difference' a program is making to observed outcomes" (Kotvojs & Shrimpton, 2007: 27). In this sense, it is not proving the contribution. It also relies on what "a reasonable person" might conclude about the programme contribution, given that they know what was attempted by the programme, and that the intended outcomes actually occurred.

KEY PHASES OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation was conducted over a period of six weeks, including submitted the draft report, receiving feedback, and submitting a final report.

The evaluation was conducted in the following stages:

1. Receiving and reading project documentation;
2. Initial interviews with two key Oxfam staff;
3. Interviews with other staff and stakeholders via telephone, skype, or face-to-face;
4. Writing the draft report, although this ran throughout the process;
5. Workshop with two key Oxfam staff to share preliminary findings and further investigate process induction and verification;
6. Writing the final report, incorporating comments on the draft report and information from the workshop.

The timing of the staff workshop, like the interviews, was affected by an Oxfam South Africa workshop, public holidays and leave taken, and was not ideally situated in the process.

INTERVIEWS

In order to evaluate the programme, key informants to interview were identified in collaboration with Oxfam staff. Four main categories of key informants were identified:

1. Oxfam staff: To secure details on the implementation of the climate change advocacy programme the following Oxfam staff were interviewed:
 - a. Kelly Dent - COP17 Global Lead: Oxfam International;
 - b. Tim Gore - Climate Change Policy Lead: Oxfam International;
 - c. Rashmi Mistry - Climate Change Advocacy Co-ordinator SA: Oxfam Great Britain;
 - d. Canny Geyer – Economic Justice Co-ordinator: Oxfam Great Britain;
 - e. Kevin Roussel - Advocacy and Campaigns Manager: Oxfam Australia South Africa Office;
 - f. Nthateng Mhlambiso – Media lead for COP17: Oxfam Australia South Africa Office;
 - g. Varshi Racoomar – Policy and Advocacy Advisor: Oxfam Australia South Africa Office.
2. South Africa Government: Outcomes one and two particularly aimed to influence the South African government. As a result a number of government stakeholders were identified for interviews.

Unfortunately no representatives of the SA COP Presidency were secured for interviews (see limitations below for further details). The following government stakeholders were interviewed:

- a. Peter Lukey - Chief Policy Advisor: Strategic Environmental Intelligence - Department Environmental Affairs;
 - b. Alf Wills – Chief Negotiator for South Africa: Department of Environmental Affairs.
3. Organisations that received funding and support through the climate change advocacy programme as part of outcomes three and four. The following people were interviewed:
- a. Mercia Andrews – Director of Trust for Community Outreach and Education;
 - b. Brian Ashley – Co-ordinator Million Climate Jobs Campaign;
 - c. Des D’Sa – Co-ordinator South Durban Community Environmental Alliance;
 - d. Dorah Marema – Co-ordinator GenderCC Southern Africa;
 - e. Mithika Mwenda – Co-ordinator Pan African Climate Justice Alliance;
 - f. Tristen Taylor – Project Co-ordinator Earthlife Africa.
4. External Informants: Two external informants were also interviewed to get a further external perspective:
- a. Kulthoum Omari - Sustainable Development Programme Manager: Heinrich Boll Stiftung Southern Africa;
 - b. Bobby Peek – Director Groundwork.

LIMITATIONS

Over the three week period of substantive research with staff and stakeholders, that is, Monday 16th April to Friday 4th May, there was a public holiday in two of the weeks which many people took advantage of to take leave. As a result, many people were unavailable for interview during the process. In addition, some requests to government departments and personnel went unanswered, despite follow-up emails and phone calls. This is to be expected in an evaluation of an advocacy campaign: if every organisation with an interest in evaluating the outcome of an event like COP17 had to request interview time, government personnel would be doing little more than running from interview to interview. However, the timing of public holidays in South Africa did have an effect on the amount of data that could be collected.

The key impact of these problems on the evaluation was that no interviews were secured with representatives of the SA COP Presidency. A key part of outcome two of the climate advocacy programme included interaction with the SA COP Presidency and interviews with the presidency would have assisted in providing external verification regarding this outcome.

RSA CLIMATE CHANGE ADVOCACY PROGRAMME

The outcomes (also expressed as objectives in Oxfam documentation) of the climate change advocacy programme are presented below¹:

1. The South African government demonstrates leadership on national pro-poor climate change strategies with a strong adaptation plan that is backed with domestic and global resources;
2. South African government runs an inclusive, legitimate COP that contributes to a fair, ambitious, and legally binding deal, taking particular leadership with progressive voices (particularly with the Africa Group, Mexico and the EU) on finance issues;
3. Individuals and civil society in South Africa are mobilised on three levels: to influence the domestic agenda; to influence international decision making; raised public awareness and action through movements focussed on the COP this year and food in coming years;
4. African organisations and people speak for themselves, particularly around women's leadership, representation and participation in processes up to and at COP17, both inside and outside the negotiations.

It should be noted that the four outcomes of the programme were designed to support each other and many of the activities of the programme acted to support the achievement of more than one outcome. In the later section of the report each outcome is evaluated separately and the activities most relevant to that outcome are identified.

In total two Oxfam staff from South Africa worked directly on the RSA climate change advocacy programme during 2011:

1. Rashmi Mistry - Climate Change Advocacy Coordinator SA: Oxfam Great Britain;
2. Kevin Roussel - Advocacy and Campaigns Manager: Oxfam Australia South Africa Office.

These staff did get additional support from time to time from other Oxfam staff. It should also be noted that other Oxfam South Africa staff provided considerable support to the Oxfam International team for COP17.

In addition to Oxfam staff time contribution to the programme, a budget of \$370,000 was secured for the programme. A budget breakdown for the programme, extracted from Oxfam Australia (OA) South Africa Office (2012), is outlined in the table on the next page:

¹ A fifth outcome relating to how RSA and OI teams worked together was not included in the evaluation as in discussion with OGB Evaluation Officer it was agreed that this an inward looking outcome and did not deal with the actual impact of the project.

Type	Cost US \$	Supporting affiliates
<i>Research</i> : desktop review of literature and case studies regarding adaptation	0	Oxfam Australia
<i>Lobby and representation</i> : travel budget for staff (Mexico/South Africa Presidency meeting)	11 000	Oxfam Australia and Oxfam Great Britain
<i>Publication</i> : Climate change and food production in Southern Africa and other materials	11 000	Oxfam Great Britain
<i>Media</i> : stories for print/videos of human impact and adaptation, media trainings, material for community media (media trip, website, translations)	55 000	Oxfam Novib and Oxfam Canada
<i>Popular mobilisation</i> : climate tribunal, support to youth engagement, support to day of action, stunts, celebs	77 000	Oxfam Novib and Oxfam Canada
<i>Alliances</i> : strategic funding of partner/coalition activities, support for partners' intercessional participation	150 000	Oxfam Australia
<i>Logistics</i> : office, supplies, meeting rooms for COP 17 team	44 000	Oxfam Novib and Oxfam Canada
<i>MEL</i> : funding for learning with partners and post COP evaluation	22 000	Oxfam Australia
Total	370 000	

OUTCOME ONE

The South African government demonstrates leadership on national pro-poor climate change strategies with a strong adaptation plan that is backed with domestic and global resources

ACTIVITIES

The key Oxfam activities to promote the achievement of this interim outcome in the course of 2011 were:

Written submissions and verbal submissions on South African Climate Change Policy by Oxfam:

1. Written submission to the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) on the National Climate Change Response Green Paper 2010 (Oxfam 2010). 10th February 2010;
2. Written submission to the Department of Environmental Affairs on Draft National Climate Change Response White Paper Version 4-3 (Oxfam 2011b). 25th July 2011;
3. Written submission to the Parliamentary Committee on Water and Environmental Affairs on the National Climate Change Response White Paper (Oxfam 2011c). 20th October 2011;
4. Verbal presentation by Allan Moolman and Kevin Roussel of Oxfam to the National Climate Change Response White Paper hearings hosted by the Parliamentary Committee on Water and Environmental Affairs on 18th November 2011 (Parliamentary Monitoring Group, 2011a).

Facilitated written submissions on South African Climate Change Policy:

1. Facilitated the development of a memorandum on the needs of rural communities and women in particular in terms of climate change policy. It is entitled “Rural women and communities on climate change in South Africa”. This memorandum was used by Oxfam for commenting on and lobbying on the White Paper (Mistry, 2012, pers. comm.);
2. Facilitated submission by Reinet Heunis, a small scale farmer from the Swellendam rural area to the Climate Change Response White Paper hearings hosted by the Parliamentary Committee on Water and Environmental Affairs on 18th November 2011 (Parliamentary Monitoring Group, 2011a).

EVIDENCE

On the 18th October 2011 the South African Government published the National Climate Change Response White Paper. This White Paper was drafted, taking into account public input that was received in response to the publishing of the National Climate Change Response Green Paper in 2010. The White Paper “presents the South African Government’s vision for an effective climate change response and the long-term, just transition to a climate-resilient and lower-carbon economy and society” (Government of the Republic of South Africa, 2011: 4).

DOES THE WHITE PAPER INCLUDE AN ADAPTATION PLAN?

Yes, the white paper includes a clear adaptation plan in Section Five. The adaptation plan includes sections on (Government of the Republic of South Africa, 2011):

- Water
- Agriculture and commercial forestry
- Health
- Biodiversity and ecosystems
- Human settlements – urban settlements
- Human settlements – rural settlements
- Human settlements – coastal settlements
- Disaster risk reduction and management

Each of these sectors identifies priority adaptation actions. Peter Lukey who led the Climate Change Response policy development process in South Africa on behalf of the Department of Environmental Affairs indicated that both the Green Paper and the White Paper reflect a balance between adaptation and mitigation in line with the South Africa government international negotiating position (Lukey 2012, pers. comm.).

DOES THE ADAPTATION PLAN SUPPORT WOMEN AND SMALL SCALE PRODUCERS?

Yes, the White Paper as a whole recognises the impact that climate change will have on the poor and includes wording that specifically references women and small scale producers:

“Climate change and responses thereto, will affect employment, job creation and living standards and, in many instances, this affect may be negative. Vulnerable low-income households and the marginalised unemployed will face the most severe impacts unless urgent steps are taken to reduce South Africa’s vulnerability to climate and economic shocks.”
(Government of the Republic of South Africa, 2011: 34).

This recognition is complemented by including a section in the White Paper on job creation that outlines the objective to achieve net job creation where contraction of jobs in carbon intensive sectors is outpaced by increased opportunities in the green economy (Government of the Republic of South Africa, 2011).

The White Paper also recognises the needs of women and other vulnerable groups. For instance, one of the principles of the White Paper is "Special needs and circumstances – considering the special needs and circumstances of localities and people that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change, including vulnerable groups such as women, and especially poor and/or rural women; children, especially infants and childheaded families; the aged; the sick; and the physically challenged." (Government of the Republic of South Africa, 2011:12). Peter Lukey, from the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism also observed that there was strong criticism of the Green Paper regarding gender and the White Paper had a stronger emphasis on the role of women as compared to the Green Paper (Lukey 2012, pers. comm.).

In the agriculture component of its adaptation section, the White Paper recognises that "under-resourced, small-scale and subsistence farmers are particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change" (Government of the Republic of South Africa, 2011:18). It also identifies several actions to support subsistence producers.

 IS IT BACKED BY GLOBAL AND DOMESTIC RESOURCES?

No, at this stage there is no clear allocation of global and domestic resources to the White Paper. The White Paper includes a section on resource mobilisation which outlines a general strategy for financing the White Paper through a combination of global and local resources. In particular, the White Paper commits the government to “establish an interim climate finance coordination mechanism to secure the necessary resources for mitigation and adaptation priority programmes...” (Government of the Republic of South Africa, 2011: 44). However, the precise source of finance is not clearly outlined in the White Paper.

The parliamentary committee for Water and Environmental Affairs that oversees the climate change policy development process noted in their deliberations after public hearings on the White Paper that “the document did not deal with the kind of funds to deal with adaptation. The Committee wanted to suggest that a climate change budget be drafted, not a new budget but one that collated the relevant departments’ budgets.” (Parliamentary Monitoring Group, 2011b).

In line with the comments of the parliamentary committee, Lukey notes “the important thing is mainstreaming climate change in the work of departments. So the departments need to continue their work, but do it differently. So the resources are used differently” (Lukey 2012, pers. comm.). In response to the concept of a specific adaptation fund, Lukey indicated that he felt the need for specific funds is questionable since the focus is on mainstreaming the issue of climate change. He also emphasised the unpredictability of adaptation requirements and in cases where it is understood what adaptation response is required it should be incorporated into the existing work of the relevant sector using existing budgets (Lukey 2012, pers. comm.).

The comments of Lukey and the outcome statement created by Oxfam suggest that there are two views on the allocation of resources. Lukey’s comments point towards climate change being funded through being mainstreamed within departmental work. In other words, departments address climate change priorities inherently and as a result separate budgets are not required and also not desired as these can create the sense that climate change is not the responsibility of everyone. The Oxfam outcome articulates a vision of ring fenced funding specifically to address climate change adaptation requirements.

CAUSAL EXPLANATION

In this section, we examine whether the available evidence shows that a causal relationship existed between the outcome and Oxfam.

 COMPONENT ONE

Component one is that “Oxfam contributed to the incorporation of a strong adaptation plan in the climate change response White Paper”. The options for the first component of the causal story are:

1. Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **made a notable contribution** to the White Paper development process.
2. Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **made no noticeable contribution** to the White Paper development process.

 CAUSAL STORY ONE

Causal story one is “Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **made a notable contribution** to the White Paper development process.”

Peter Lukey who led the Climate Change Response policy development process in South Africa on behalf of the Department of Environmental Affairs was well aware of Oxfam’s participation in the policy development process. He indicated that Oxfam’s participation was “very strong” and “very vocal in public meetings”. He also noted that Oxfam even participated in smaller caucus meetings towards the end of the process. He indicated that their suggestions were “really good” but there was sometimes too much detail (Lukey 2012, pers. comm.). He did however note that what “works against Oxfam is that it is an international organisation”. He highlighted the general sense of the importance of South African participation in South African policy development processes. He further noted that there is sometimes a perception that international organisations can be arrogant and insensitive to local issues. However, he stated that Oxfam certainly did not fall into this category.

With regards to the impact of Oxfam’s written and verbal comments, this is considered below in three categories:

1. **Comments on National Climate Change Response Green Paper: Oxfam** submitted formal comments on the National Climate Change Response Green Paper (Oxfam, 2010). It was not possible to ascertain whether the direct comments of Oxfam were taken into account as the papers were open for public comment (more details of the number of participants in the public comment process are presented in the next section), however the following notes some of the Oxfam comments that were addressed in the National Climate Change Response White Paper:
 - a. Oxfam requested that a clearer overall adaptation framework be articulated in the legislation that addresses hazards, manages risk and has a stronger emphasis on vulnerable communities (Oxfam, 2010). The National Climate Change Response White Paper does show evidence of the inclusion of a clearer overall adaptation framework dedicating a section to adaptation and including it as part of a broader strategic approach referred to as “climate change resilient development” (The Government of the Republic of South Africa, 2011:13).
 - b. Oxfam requested that there should be a stronger focus on small-scale and subsistence farmers and their contribution to food security (Oxfam, 2010). The National Climate Change Response White Paper highlights that under-resourced, small-scale and subsistence farmers are particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change and advocates for the appropriate use of small-scale labour-intensive agriculture techniques (The Government of the Republic of South Africa, 2011).
 - c. Oxfam requested that the poor and vulnerable are made a priority when planning climate responses (Oxfam, 2010). There has been an increase in the mention of the poor and vulnerable in the National Climate Change Response White Paper. The National Climate Change Response White Paper notes that the government departments are working on sectoral adaptation responses that include the protection and support of vulnerable groups. With regards to water, the Paper takes note of poor communities who are dependent on natural water resources and communities that are at greatest risk because of climate change.

2. **Comments on Draft National Climate Change Response White Paper:** Oxfam was provided the opportunity to make direct comments on the gender aspect of a draft of the National Climate Change Response White Paper (Oxfam, 2011b) before the final version was released to the public. This opportunity provided to a single organisation to comment on a draft that is not available to the general public is unusual. Although most of the comments were not included in the final version, there were a few instances where the additions advised by Oxfam were included. For example, under the Health sub-section of the Adaptation section, a paragraph suggested by Oxfam on the vulnerability of women was included directly in the White Paper: *“Women as primary care-givers are put under additional strain, looking after sick and elderly family members whilst maintaining a household. This leaves them less time to earn a livelihood putting cyclical pressure on them as they neglect their own health to prioritise others.”* (Oxfam, 2011b:15; The Government of the Republic of South Africa, 2011:19). In another instance under the Human Settlements: Rural Settlements sub-section of the Adaptation section, Oxfam’s wording on women as primary producers was included: *“Empowering local communities, particularly women, who are often primary producers, in the process of designing and implementing adaptation strategies.”* (Oxfam, 2011b:19; The Government of the Republic of South Africa, 2011:23).
3. **Comments on the published National Climate Change Response White Paper:** Oxfam also submitted written comments on the published White Paper and made verbal comments to the relevant parliamentary committee. As there is no intention by government to amend the White Paper at this stage, there is not yet any discernible impact as a result of these comments.

CAUSAL STORY TWO

Causal story two is “Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **made no noticeable contribution** to the White Paper development process.”

There is excellent evidence in support of casual story one, which as a result discounts this causal story.

COMPONENT TWO

Component two relates to the extent of Oxfam’s contribution. The options for the second component of the causal story are:

1. Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **was one of many contributors** to the White Paper development process;
2. Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme was **the most significant contributor** to the White Paper development process.

CASUAL STORY ONE

Casual story one is “Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **was one of many contributors** to the White Paper development process”.

In order to assess this causal story it is necessary to present further evidence on the participation process leading up to the publication of the White Paper. A summary of the public participation process is presented below. As evidenced below the participatory process that led to the development of the white paper was both lengthy and solicited considerable participation. This supports casual story one.

LENGTH OF THE SOUTH AFRICA CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Lukey indicates that the policy development process begun in October 2005 with the hosting of the National Climate Change Conference (Lukey, 2012, pers. comm.). This conference was attended by “*over 600 representatives from government, business, the scientific and academic communities, and civil society*” (The Government of the Republic of South Africa, undated: 7). This was followed by the development of the Long Term Mitigation Scenarios that was initiated in 2006 and completed in 2007 (The Government of the Republic of South Africa, undated). In March 2009 a further Climate Change conference was held with over 900 participants “*to initiate a consultative process to develop the South African Climate Change Response Policy*” (The Government of the Republic of South Africa, undated: 18). This was followed by a number of activities that lead to the publication of the National Climate Change Response Green Paper in November 2010 (The Government of the Republic of South Africa, undated).

Considering the length of time of the policy development process, this dilutes the impact of this particular Oxfam programme which was in effect from late 2010 to end 2011.

EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION IN SOUTH AFRICA CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Lukey indicates that the participation in the policy development process was “relatively immense”. He noted that in comparison to other policy processes, participation was intensive. He felt one of the reasons for this is that “climate change affects us all” (Lukey, 2012, pers. comm.).

Once the Green Paper was published the “department conducted many bilateral engagements and made numerous policy presentations at various forums, seminars and conferences. Parliament hosted a public hearing process on the draft policy stretching over three weeks of stakeholder presentations and robust discussions and debates.” (The Government of the Republic of South Africa, undated: 22). Lukey indicated that hundreds of comments were received (Lukey, 2012). Over 4,000 individual issues on the Green Paper were captured in a comment database (The Government of the Republic of South Africa, undated: 22).

Considering the level of participation in the policy development process, the achievement of this outcome can be attributed to the participation and work of many individuals and organisations including Oxfam.

CAUSAL STORY TWO

Causal story two is “Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme was **the most significant contributor** to the White Paper development process”.

Evidence presented in casual story one shows the scale of participation in the White Paper development process, and contradicts the possibility that Oxfam was the most significant contributor to that.

SUMMARY

Outcome 1	The South African government demonstrates leadership on national pro-poor climate change strategies with a strong adaptation plan that is backed with domestic and global resources	
Key activities	Written submissions and verbal submissions on South African Climate Change Policy by Oxfam Support of the participation of partners in South African Climate Change Policy development process	
Evidence	Does the white paper include an adaptation plan?	Yes, the White Paper includes a clear adaptation plan in Section Five.
	Does the adaptation plan include women and small-scale farmers?	Yes, the White Paper as a whole recognises the impact that climate change will have on the poor and specifically references women and small scale producers.
	Is it backed by global and domestic resources?	No, at this stage there is no clear allocation of global and domestic resources to the White Paper.
What was Oxfam's contribution?	Oxfam's Climate Change Advocacy Programme made a notable contribution to the White Paper development process. Oxfam's climate change advocacy programme was one of many contributors to the White Paper development process.	

OUTCOME TWO

The South African government runs an inclusive, legitimate COP that contributes to a fair, ambitious, and legally binding deal, taking particular leadership with progressive voices (particularly with the Africa Group, Mexico, and the EU) on finance issues

ACTIVITIES

The key Oxfam activities to promote the achievement of this outcome in the course of 2011 were:

1. Lobbying to the SA COP Presidency through Department of International Relations and Co-operation (DIRCO), particularly to create space for SA civil society to participate in the official process;
2. Securing meetings with Ambassador Diseko at Bonn and Panama for SA civil society and encouraged participation at a number of other forums such as the informal ministerial meeting in September 2011 in Pretoria (which were attended by at least two South African partners with Oxfam's encouragement);
3. Written submission, including inputs from SA civil society, on Durban COP expectations to SA COP Presidency;
4. Lobbying South Africa, Mexico, Africa Group and other negotiators on finance, as part of the global policy team at UNFCCC events and nationally. In South Africa, this included the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), Department of Transport and DIRCO who were all involved in finance discussions;
5. Building relationships e.g. staff engaged with Ambassador Diseko and the Mexican Ambassador, Mr De Alba;
6. Organised an event in September 2011 on raising finance from bunker fuels to create some awareness of the issue.

EVIDENCE

DID THE SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT RUN AN INCLUSIVE, LEGITIMATE COP?

Partially, as there are limitations as a result of the formal accreditation process.

COP is a massive event including numerous contributors from throughout the world. In total, COP 17 had 6,172 individual participants from 192 parties and two observer states. This was further complemented by 327 participants from 23 United Nations Secretariat units, 278 participants from 20 specialized agencies and related organizations, 486 participants from 52 Intergovernmental organizations and 5,884 participants from 707 non-governmental organizations (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, 2011).

It is clear from the scale of registered participants that a considerable effort is made by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to be as inclusive and legitimate as possible. However the process to get accreditation for COP is lengthy. In addition organisations need to meet minimum requirements to be accredited. Kulthoum Omari from the Heinrich Boll Stiftung Southern Africa feels that

as a result of this COP leaves out important players especially those most vulnerable to climate change (Omari, 2012, pers. comm.).

At COP16 in Cancun, the South African government called on civil society to seek its views (Mistry, 2012, pers. comm.). In South African, the government also conducted a Parliamentary process and awareness raising, but this was not thought to constitute consultation (Mistry, 2012, pers. comm.). Tim Gore, the Oxfam International Climate Change policy lead, noted that SA Government did attempt to improve the inclusivity of COP by arranging a meeting in September 2011 to gain input from other stakeholders. Unfortunately he felt that this meeting failed to deliver as insufficient notice was given for the meeting meaning that key groups did not attend (Gore, 2012, pers. comm.).

DID IT CONTRIBUTE TO A FAIR, AMBITIOUS, AND LEGALLY BINDING DEAL?

Yes, but insufficient progress was made.

There are a wide variety of perspectives on the success (or not) of COP17. Oxfam's own analysis of COP is extracted below (Oxfam, undated):

"The Durban deal had three headline outcomes:

1. *Most significantly, governments agreed to launch negotiations towards a legally binding agreement to apply to all countries to be finalised in 2015, and take effect from 2020. In doing so, they turned away from the model of voluntary pledges of action which threatened to take root after Copenhagen, and cemented the UNFCCC at the heart of a rules-based multilateral approach to tackling climate change.*
2. *The likely continuation of the Kyoto Protocol for some countries.*
3. *The adoption of the governing instrument of the Green Climate Fund.*

But the deal did not deliver on the needs of developing countries, for 3 reasons:

1. *There are very limited prospects for increased mitigation action in the timescale needed to avoid catastrophic climate change. The stronger emissions cuts in the new deal will only take effect in 2020 – too late to avoid warming of more than 2C – and the provisions for action in the interim are minimal.*
2. *No specific new sources of climate finance were agreed on for the Green Climate Fund, which is left for the moment as an empty shell.*
3. *The terms of the new legally binding agreement to be adopted by 2015 and take effect from 2020 threatens to undermine the principle of "equity" in efforts required by developed and developing countries."*

On the basis of the Oxfam analysis it can be concluded that while COP17 made a contribution to a fair, ambitious, and legally binding deal, not enough progress was made.

DID THE SA GOVERNMENT TAKE LEADERSHIP ON FINANCE ISSUES?

Yes, the South African government took leadership on finance issues.

One of the main outcomes of COP17 was the establishment of the Green Climate Fund (GCF). Kulthoum Omari from the Heinrich Boll Stiftung Southern Africa indicates that the South African government did take leadership on finance issues and that the Green Climate Fund was a clear outcome that the South African government wanted to achieve, despite the many shortcomings (Omari, 2012, pers. comm.). Tim Gore, Oxfam International Climate Policy Lead, also agreed that the South African Government took leadership on this issue and that launching of the Green Climate Fund was one of their priorities (Gore, 2012, pers. comm.). This was further supported by Kelly Dent, Oxfam International COP17 lead, who felt that the SA Government played a robust role in attempting to get an agreement on the Green Climate Fund (Dent, 2012, pers. comm.).

With regards to the financing of the Green Climate Fund Alf Wills - the Chief Negotiator for South Africa - highlighted that one of the key parts of the agreement was that South Africa recognised that an effort on finance by a few countries is not enough, so it requires the participation of all. Developing countries are an important part of contribution. Finance can come from multiple sources, but a significant amount should flow through the Green Climate Fund (Wills, 2012, pers. comm.).

CAUSAL EXPLANATION

In this section, we examine whether the available evidence shows that a causal relationship existed between the outcome and Oxfam.

COMPONENT ONE

Component one is that “Oxfam influenced the SA COP Presidency”. The options for the first component of the causal story are:

1. Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **was able to influence** the SA COP Presidency.
2. Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **was unable to influence** the SA COP Presidency.

CASUAL STORY ONE

Casual story one is “Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **was able to influence** the SA COP Presidency”.²

This causal story is supported in the activities sections that show that Oxfam was able to secure meetings with key stakeholders from SA COP Presidency throughout 2011 in the lead up to COP17. If Oxfam was regarded as insignificant and not able to make a contribution, it would not have been able to secure these high level meetings.

Tim Gore, the Oxfam International Policy lead, corroborated this, indicating that the Oxfam SA team was successful during 2011 in establishing a relationship with the SA COP Presidency. He observed that after COP15 in Copenhagen Oxfam’s relationship with SA government loosened but that in 2011 the SA team were able to establish key links with players in both DIRCO and the Department of Environmental Affairs

² Unfortunately, the reviewers have not been able to secure input from representatives of the South African Government regarding Oxfam’s influence on the SA COP Presidency.

(DEA) as both technical levels and senior levels (such as with the COP Ambassador). In particular he stated *“They were able to get intelligence to share with OI and we were able to seed ideas into the team. This was a major contribution from the SA team.”* With regards to the OI international key issue of securing finance from shipping and aviation Gore indicated that the SA team moved key ministry’s in SA government on this significantly. (Gore, 2012, pers. comm.).

The Chief Negotiator for the South African delegation, Alf Wills, said that the national position at COP is consulted with through the National Climate Change Committee, a structure where South African civil society is represented (and on which Oxfam sits), and all those views are taken into consideration (Wills, 2012, pers. comm.).

CAUSAL STORY TWO

Causal story two is “Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **was unable to influence** the SA COP Presidency”.

There is strong evidence in support of casual story one, which as a result discounts the causal story.

COMPONENT TWO

Component two relates to the extent of Oxfam’s contribution. The options for the second component of the causal story are:

1. Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **was one of many influences** on the SA COP Presidency;
2. Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **was the most significant influence** on the SA COP Presidency.

CASUAL STORY ONE

Casual story one is “Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **was one of many influences** on the SA COP Presidency”.

Considering the number of people accredited to attend COP17 discussed in previous sections it is clear that that multiple governments and organisations would have influenced the SA COP Presidency.

CAUSAL STORY TWO

Causal story two is “Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **was the most significant influence** on the SA COP Presidency”.

This causal story is not plausible considering the scale of COP17 and the number of organisations and governments that would be interacting with the SA COP Presidency.

SUMMARY

Outcome 2	South African government runs an inclusive, legitimate COP that contributes to a fair, ambitious, and legally binding deal, taking particular leadership with progressive voices (particularly with the Africa Group, Mexico and the EU) on finance issues	
Key activities	Formal meetings with SA COP Presidency through 2011 at Bonn, Panama and other occasions. Written submission to and verbal lobbying of SA COP Presidency.	
Evidence	Did the SA government run an inclusive, legitimate COP?	Partially, as there are limitations as a result of the formal accreditation process.
	Did it contribute to a fair, ambitious, and legally binding deal?	Yes, but insufficient progress was made.
	SA Government taking particular leadership on finance issues	Yes, the SA government took leadership on finance issues.
What was Oxfam's contribution?	Oxfam's climate change advocacy programme was able to influence the SA COP Presidency. Oxfam's climate change advocacy programme was one of many influences on the SA COP Presidency.	

OUTCOME THREE

Individuals and civil society in South Africa are mobilised on three levels: to influence the domestic agenda; to influence international decision making; raised public awareness and action through movements focus on the COP this year and food in coming years

ACTIVITIES

The key Oxfam activities to promote the achievement of this outcome in the course of 2011 were:

1. Commissioned a scoping study entitled “Fostering Active Citizenship for COP17” which was completed in August 2011. The scoping study was developed through consultations with 60 civil society organisations and 100 people. The study provided a picture of civil society climate change demands and an understanding of how Oxfam in SA can support partners (Oxfam Australia South Africa Office, 2012);
2. Contributed to development of a civil society strategy that recommended the formation of the Committee of 17 – Civil Society Committee for COP 17 (C17), a coalition of civil society organisations. Oxfam participated in a number of strategy meetings and also contributed to the written civil society strategy document. Through this Oxfam provided input into the process of forming the C17 partnership and a strategy for donors (Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.);
3. Co-funded civil society meeting in July 2011 through a contribution of R80,000 out of a total budget of R160,000 (Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.);
4. Funded Earthlife Africa participation in the C17 committee through a contribution of R250,000 (Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.);
5. Contributed to the development of the Million Climate Jobs Campaign (MCJC) by participating in strategy meetings that developed the concept for the campaign (Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.);
6. Co-funded MCJC through a contribution of R250,000 to the Alternative Information and Development Centre (AIDC) earmarked specifically for research. The research budget paid for the development of 38 separate research papers. The papers themselves were written by volunteers, the research budget was used to convene meetings and workshops of key stakeholders to contribute the content of the papers. The budget was also used to print the final booklet of the MCJC (Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.);
7. Oxfam Director spoke at MCJC launch in September 2011 (Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.);
8. Co-funded community awareness raising events of the Sustainable Energy and Climate Change Partnership. The partnership was made up of Earthlife, SDCEA and Groundwork. Oxfam contributed grants to Earthlife and SDCEA to participate in this partnership (Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.);
9. Three media breakfasts hosted to brief media on key COP issues (Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.);
10. Sending press releases to Africa and local media before and during COP17 (Roussel, 2012, pers. comm. & Oxfam Australia South Africa Office, 2012);

11. Participating in radio events during COP17 (Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.) ;
12. Developed content of climate change exhibition. The content of the exhibition was drawn for a joint project in collaboration with Oxfam Canada to gather material to create a narrative on climate change and its impact on rural women. The narrative was developed using women farmers in the Western Cape as a case study. Over 1200 still photos and 20 hours of video footage were produced (Oxfam Australia South Africa Office, 2012);
13. Climate change exhibition created using a total of 21 images from the material collated. The exhibition was hosted in a beachfront location provided free of charge by the eThekweni municipality (Oxfam Australia South Africa Office, 2012);
14. Sponsored women from the case study to attend the exhibition as well as to speak in public regarding their challenges as a result of climate change (Oxfam Australia South Africa Office, 2012);
15. Established a craft shop to compliment the exhibition. This craft shop was established for the benefit of a range of Oxfam partners (Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.).

EVIDENCE

WERE INDIVIDUALS AND CIVIL SOCIETY MOBILISED?

Yes individuals and civil society were mobilised despite divisions and funding constraints.

There were a number of initiatives that worked to mobilise individual and civil society participation in COP17. Those initiatives that had a specific link to Oxfam are discussed below.

C17

A Committee of 17 (C17) was established by civil society for COP 17 following a meeting in November 2010, where a number of civil society organisations met and agreed to develop a common process for COP17 (Hallows, Reddy and Reyes, 2012). The key participants in C17 were environmental organisations, labour, social movements and faith based organisations (Hallows, Reddy and Reyes, 2012).

C17 successfully contributed to the mobilisation of individuals and civil society. Core achievements of C17 were (Hallows, Reddy and Reyes, 2012):

1. A website;
2. The establishment of the People's Space, an alternative to COP17. In total 200 events were hosted in the People's Space at UKZN;
3. Bringing and accommodating 2,000 people to Durban;
4. Arranging the global day of action march during COP17 that was attended by between 10,000 and 15,000 people.

C17 had aimed for a far larger group of people to participate in the march. However the global day of action march was remarked upon by international Oxfam staff members, Kelly Dent and Tim Gore, who have both attended previous COPs (Gore, 2012, and Dent 2012, pers. comm.). Gore commented "This was

the largest march in Africa ever on climate change” and highlighted how a new constituency in Africa is being mobilised to understand how climate change is impacting them.

It should be noted that C17 had a number of challenges. Most significantly, that there was no agreement between organisations on their agenda for COP17. Divisions in civil society emerged quickly, despite organisational development processes. An anonymous respondent suggested that while all organisations believed that it was a good idea for civil society to mobilise, there was disagreement about whether it was their job to take a unified position to government. Creating this unified position seemed to be undoing of C17, whereby they “let the politics go... One sense is a regret – we were caught up with education and mobilisation, but in C17 we didn’t push ‘this is what we want’ in one united voice” (D’Sa, 2012, pers. comm.).

C17 also had resource constraints. It was resourced through a combination of allocation of personal resources from participating organisations and external funding. Very little funding was secured at the outset of the process and in September 2011 the committee decided to approach the South Africa Government for funding (Hallows, Reddy and Reyes, 2012). “Late and limited funding, however, put an under resourced team under enormous pressure and created tension with and within participating groups.” (Hallows, Reddy and Reyes, 2012: 16). Both Earthlife and MCJC suggested that if money had been received earlier in the year, greater mobilisation would have been possible, and if funding was larger, more people would have been afforded the opportunity to come to Durban.

SUSTAINABLE ENERGY AND CLIMATE CHANGE PARTNERSHIP

The Sustainable Energy and Climate Change Partnership was made up of three organisations: Earthlife, SDCEA and Groundwork.

This partnership worked to mobilise groups in the run up to COP17. For instance SDCEA organised, educated, produce booklets, and arrange workshops for marginalised people who do not normally have access to mainstream media and information (D’Sa, 2012, pers. comm.). SDCEA also embarked on a series of workshops in rural areas of the KwaZulu-Natal province, where people spoke about their current realities, such as shortage of water where plantations occur, high temperatures, and illegal dumping of ash, and organisational staff spoke about climate change, giving all attendees the opportunity to put the two things together. They also conducted gender workshops, a book launch, youth and school workshops. All these activities were designed to find out from ordinary working and unemployed people and youth how climate change was affecting them. Through this work SDCEA mobilised non-traditional people to participate in COP, such as shack dwellers, fishers, hostel dwellers, and rural people.

ONE MILLION CLIMATE JOBS CAMPAIGN

The One Million Climate Jobs Campaign (MCJC) is a research and advocacy project developed by a collection of 40 civil society organisations and social movements in South Africa to simultaneously address the challenges of unemployment and climate change as a collective body (One Million Climate Jobs, 2011).

Initiated in March 2011, the MCJC is co-ordinated by the AIDC. During 2011, the MCJC focused on mobilising South Africans to participate effectively in parallel events and negotiations at COP17. Post COP17, the MCJC provides a basis for advocacy and engagement with government on climate change and job creation (One Million Climate Jobs Campaign Website, 2012).

In the run up to COP17, the MCJC developed a booklet on solutions for how South Africa can begin the transition to a low carbon economy. This booklet is based on a collective research project by the MCJC and identifies specific areas of job creation potential. The booklet promotes the creation of climate jobs which are defined as “*decent, people- and publicly driven jobs that reduce the causes and impacts of climate change*” and are based on three principles: ecological sustainability, social justice and state intervention (One Million Climate Jobs, 2011:9).

The campaign took 500 activists from around South Africa to COP on the climate jobs platform and participated in activities in Durban related to the campaign. There was a launch of their booklet based on the research attended by more than 400 people during the civil society process, they had a large presence in the march on the global day of action, participated in extensive media interviews on radio, TV, and print media, and were invited to make inputs into trade union discussions during COP. As a result of this, the core pillars of the campaign have been finalised and endorsed by a range of organisations also at COP, and the campaign has been built with trade unions culminating in a series of workshops planned with Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) and National Council of Trade Unions (NACTU). They also have a platform in the green economy debate at Rio+20.

WAS PUBLIC AWARENESS RAISED?

Yes, public awareness on climate change was raised in South Africa.

During the run up and over the course of COP17, public awareness was raised considerably regarding climate change and related issues. This was a result of events in the lead up to COP and the vast range of formal media establishments and informal activist pop-up shops engaging in reporting about COP, in newspapers, on the radio and TV, over Twitter, Facebook, and on-line publications the world over. Indeed, one of the evaluators had a group of seven Canadian activists/reporters staying next door to her, who were writing and filming for a number of websites.

An Oxfam respondent said that a community radio she listens to now has a weekly spot that talks about climate change, recycling, carbon footprints, being mindful about the environment. This was sparked by media coverage around climate change and COP17 (Rajcoomar, 2012, pers. comm.).

WAS THE DOMESTIC/INTERNATIONAL AGENDA INFLUENCED?

Yes, to some extent, the agenda was influenced, although there is debate about how much influence is possible in a global meeting such as COP17.

In relation to the influence, there is much debate about whether any one movement or organisation can hold its ground inside the COP and have any impact at all. According to one person who was inside, it is so complex with so many processes and side events and press conferences that “inside is a misnomer” (Peek, 2012, pers. comm.).

Alf Wills, the lead negotiator for the South Africa government, indicated that civil society voices played a critical role in the negotiation process. Firstly, they are often a source of new and creative ideas and solutions, which can be brought into inter-governmental processes, and their lobbying of national delegations is an important part of doing that. Secondly, South Africa recognises that the transition to a low carbon future involves sustainable consumption and sustainable production, and to large extent the normal negotiations and solutions deal with the production part and less with consumption. Civil society mobilises the sustainable consumption agenda and increases awareness of that, and contributes to national and

global solutions (Wills, 2012, pers. comm.). The South Africa government mechanism of engaging with civil society is the National Climate Change Committee, on which Oxfam sits. Civil society is represented there, and the Committee’s policy that civil society, business and labour can nominate representatives to be part of the official South African delegation. NGOs have not taken this opportunity since 2007.

In addition a number of respondents commented that the profile of their organisation was raised, or that climate change was now more firmly on a mainstreamed agenda, or that a nascent social movement had been galvanised through the COP processes. In particular the Rural Women’s Caucus was asked to meet with the Office of the COP President to engage with the Office around rural women. During COP, the RWA had interactions with the Department of International Relations and an inter-departmental committee was formed (Marema, 2012, pers. comm.). In addition, the South African Chief Negotiator met with the RWA every other day to feedback what was happening inside COP.

CAUSAL EXPLANATION

COMPONENT ONE

1. Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **made a notable contribution** to mobilisation of individuals and civil society;
2. Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **made no noticeable contribution** to mobilisation of individuals and civil society.

CAUSAL STORY ONE

Causal story one “Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **made a notable contribution** to mobilisation of individuals and civil society”.

Oxfam made a notable contribution to mobilising individuals and civil society by providing considerable support to civil society organisations in four main ways: financial; technical; intellectual; and networking. This support is summarised in the table below:

Financial support (monetary contribution)	<p>Oxfam contributed R1,627,600 in funds to several civil society organisations in support of the activities of C17 or specific activities of the recipient organisations. For further details of the financial contribution see Appendix one.</p> <p>It should also be noted both Earthlife and SDCEA have had at least three year relationships with Oxfam and this has strengthened those organisations such they are able to mobilise people, administer finances accurately, conduct research and gather evidence of the impact of climate change on poor people’s lives, and deliver all these into the C17 programme. Tristen Taylor from Earthlife stated that if Oxfam had not supported Earthlife for the previous three years, there might not have been a global day of action at all during COP17. The lesson for him is that long-term support to build national movements will determine the characters of special events. This seldom comes through in evaluations (Taylor, 2012, pers. comm.).</p>
--	---

<p>Intellectual support (Intellectual support is advice on what to do)</p>	<p>Oxfam’s participated in fledgling movements, and gave input on planning and strategy. A number of respondents from civil society organisations indicated that Oxfam offered valuable insight and expertise to movements that were already in existence.</p> <p>Rashmi Mistry was cited as having great expertise in climate change and in policy processes so she could help navigate through the COP17. The Regional Director of Oxfam was singled out as someone who helped the RWA see strategic moments during COP when they might otherwise have missed opportunities, being occupied with questions of process, and both Kevin Roussel and Rashmi Mistry were mentioned as being very useful and resourceful people during and before the event.</p>
<p>Networking support (links to others)</p>	<p>The MCJC claimed that Oxfam’s contribution to their success was “considerable”. He indicated that the campaign was given a wide audience due to Oxfam’s networks and links. Oxfam used the campaign as a reference point in discussions with others, for example the RWA, Earthlife, and C17, and the campaign was able to link to these processes. Oxfam assisted in reinforcing what the campaign does and took it to others, even across Africa. In essence, Oxfam made space in their processes for campaigning about climate jobs. In the run-up to COP, MCJC was invited to one of the media breakfasts arranged by Oxfam, which afforded the campaign media coverage (Ashely, 2012, pers. comm.).</p>
<p>Technical (expertise and advice on how to do things: media, mobilising, public campaigns)</p>	<p>The Oxfam media team was cited by a number of respondents as extremely useful in that they helped draft case studies and had the ear of the media when organisations wanted their stories published. The fact that so many Oxfam staff members were in Durban meant that civil society had a wealth of expertise to draw on if they wanted it.</p> <p>Oxfam’s technical know-how was said to be “crucial – Oxfam has long been in the debate about climate change and also about rural women and food security – like GROW [Oxfam’s global campaign on food issues]. It has experience and knowledge of the national policy environment and their input is valuable” (Marema, 2012, pers. comm.).</p>

CAUSAL STORY TWO

Causal story two is “Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **made no noticeable contribution** to mobilisation of individuals and civil society”.

This causal story is not plausible considering the evidence presented for causal story one.

COMPONENT TWO

Component two relates to the extent of Oxfam’s contribution to mobilisation. The options for the second component of the causal story are:

1. Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **was one of several significant contributors** to mobilisation of individuals and civil society;

2. Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **was the most significant contributor** to mobilisation of individuals and civil society.

CASUAL STORY ONE

Casual story one is “Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **was one of several significant contributors** to mobilisation of individuals and civil society”.

Oxfam’s contribution to the mobilisation of civil society was through providing support in a variety of forms to several civil society organisations. These organisations which Oxfam supported are clearly important contributors in their own rights through the contribution of their staff capacity, networks and resources from other sources. In addition, several other organisations provided support to civil society. The Global Climate Change Alliance and Heinrich Boll Stiftung Southern Africa provided funding support and also contributed to the development of C17. The South African government was also primary funder of C17 as the total external funding for C17 was R4.4 Million, made up of a contribution of R1.4 Million from donor NGOs and R3.4 Million from the South African government (Hallows, Reddy and Reyes, 2012).

CAUSAL STORY TWO

Causal story two is “Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme was **the most significant contributor** to mobilisation of individuals and civil society”.

This causal story can be dismissed based on the evidence presented for causal story one.

COMPONENT THREE

Component three relates to public awareness. The options for this component are:

1. Oxfam **contributed** to public awareness in the lead up and during COP17;
2. Oxfam **did not contribute** to public awareness in the lead up and during COP17.

CASUAL STORY ONE

Casual story one is “Oxfam **contributed** to public awareness in the lead up and during COP17”.

In terms of raising public awareness, Oxfam supported partner organisations to mobilise around COP17, and it embarked on its own media campaign. The main focus of the Oxfam media strategy was to ensure that media stories about climate change included a human element, that they focused on women and small scale producers as the people who are most affected by climate change. The strategy also aimed to increase media appetite for these kinds of stories such that “that 1,000,000 South Africans are exposed to messages of Oxfam and partners on climate change”. It also wanted to establish Oxfam as the ‘go-to’ organisation on climate change

In order to achieve this, Oxfam held three media breakfasts in the run-up to COP17, where information was given to Durban-based journalists about climate change and partners were invited to attend in order to offer their perspectives on the impacts on climate change on rural women, or food prices, or job creation (MCJC). What emerged was that many journalists did not understand the basics of climate change, for example, what a greenhouse gas is, and therefore aim of foregrounding human stories became more distant.

When looking at the media institutions that were attracted by the media breakfasts, an impressive reach is achieved. South African Broadcasting Corporation TV stations reach 76% of the population; SAFM national radio reaches 708,000 people weekly; radio 702 regional radio reaches 102,000 weekly; *Isoleswe* and *Ilanga* (provincial Zulu language newspapers) also have vast readerships.

In working with partners, Oxfam did facilitate their presence in media briefings, and assisted local partners to write press statements, and offered their database to those partners to contact, particularly the Rural Women's Assembly (RWA) and the Caravan of Hope (Mhlambiso, 2012, pers. comm.).

In addition as part of raising public awareness about the people who are most affected by climate change, Oxfam held a photo exhibition on the impact of climate change on rural women. Oxfam estimated that about 6,000 members of the public and 120 COP17 delegates visited the exhibition (Oxfam Australia South Africa Office, 2012).

CAUSAL STORY TWO

Causal story two is "Oxfam **did not contribute** to public awareness in the lead up and during COP17".

This causal story can be dismissed based on the evidence presented for causal story one.

COMPONENT FOUR

Component four relates to the extent of Oxfam's contribution to public awareness. The options for this component are:

1. Oxfam was one of a large number of **contributors** to public awareness in the lead up and during COP17;
2. Oxfam **was the most significant contributor** to public awareness in the lead up and during COP17.

CASUAL STORY ONE

Casual story one is "Oxfam **was one of a large number of contributors** to public awareness in the lead up and during COP17".

While Oxfam itself suggested that more than a million people could have been reached by the media sources Oxfam invited to its media breakfasts, a clear link between the breakfasts and human stories on climate change cannot be discerned. Since a number of the media establishments targeted for invitation to the breakfasts are large and well resourced, they were likely to have personnel dedicated to environmental and climate change reporting. Examples of these are SABC (the national broadcasting corporation), eTV (a television channel), Business Day (a daily newspaper that details mainly business content), the Mail and Guardian (a weekly newspaper), and SAFM (a news and information radio station, that is part of the SABC). According to one respondent, the media were "lapping up everything they could get" (Peek, 2012, pers. comm.), and a large number of other organisations and corporations also targeted the media for stories.

As a result it can be concluded that while Oxfam contributed to public awareness of climate change, it was one of many contributors.

CAUSAL STORY TWO

Causal story two is “Oxfam **was the most significant contributor** to public awareness in the lead up and during COP17”.

COP itself increases media appetite for stories about climate change. The presence of a massive global event in South Africa, in and of itself led to a significant increase in stories on climate change in the lead up and during COP. This causal story can then be dismissed as a result of this and based on the evidence presented for causal story one.

COMPONENT FIVE

Component five relates to the impact of the programme for the future. The options for this component are:

1. The Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **had considerable long term impact**;
2. The Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **had some limited long term impact**;
3. The Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **had no long term impact**.

CASUAL STORY ONE

Casual story one is “The Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **had considerable long term impact**”.

A major focus of Oxfam’s work in this outcome was support provided to the process of establishing C17 to provide a unified platform for civil society on climate change. While it is perhaps too early to evaluate if C17 will continue into the future, preliminary indications are that internal divisions in C17 will prevent its continued operation. As a result of these divisions, by the end of 2012 only six organisations were left in C17.

As a result of the lack of success in facilitating the formation of C17 as an on-going structure, it cannot be concluded that the programme had considerable long term impact.

In addition while a number of partners favourably mentioned Oxfam’s ability to deal with the media, it seems that the strategy of capacity building was not as broad as it could have been. Media training was planned for partners, but this did not happen due to time and budget constraints (Mhlambiso, 2012, pers. comm.). The plans for media at COP only began in July 2011 and before then there were no teams or strategies. It seems clear that a much earlier start to the media campaign was needed.

CAUSAL STORY TWO

Causal story two is “The Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme **had some limited long term impact**”.

Oxfam’s support of both Earthlife and SDCEA during this programme was in-line with long term support for both organisations. In previous sections evidence has been provided on the significance of this kind of longer term support for building these organisations in the long term. It is important to note that the climate change advocacy programme was able to galvanise success due to Oxfam’s previous long term support for Earthlife and SDCEA.

In addition, the MCJC that was supported by Oxfam is continuing and Oxfam continues to provide non-financial support to the campaign in 2012.

CAUSAL STORY THREE

Causal story three is “The Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme had **no long term impact**”.

There is evidence of some long term impact, so this causal story can be dismissed.

SUMMARY

Outcome 3	Individuals and civil society in South Africa are mobilised on three levels: to influence the domestic agenda; to influence international decision making; raised public awareness and action through movements focussed on the COP this year and food in coming years	
Key activities	Contributed to development of a civil society strategy that recommended the formation of C17 and funded some C17 activities Co-funded MCJC Co-funded community awareness raising events of the Sustainable Energy and Climate Change Partnership Hosted three media breakfasts and put on an exhibition to raise awareness of the human stories of climate change	
Evidence	Were individuals and civil society mobilised?	Yes individuals and civil society were mobilised despite divisions and funding constraints.
	Was public awareness raised?	Yes, public awareness on climate change was raised in South Africa.
	Was the domestic/international agenda influenced?	Yes, to some extent, the agenda was influenced, although there is debate about how much influence is possible in a global meeting such as COP17
What was Oxfam’s contribution?	Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme made a notable contribution to mobilisation of individuals and civil society. Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme was one of several significant contributors to mobilisation of individuals and civil society. Oxfam contributed to public awareness in the lead up and during COP17. Oxfam was one of a large number of contributors to public awareness in the lead up and during COP17. The Oxfam’s climate change advocacy programme had some limited long term impact.	

OUTCOME FOUR

African organisations and people speak for themselves, particularly around women’s leadership, representation and participation in processes up to and at COP17, both inside and outside the negotiations

ACTIVITIES

The key Oxfam activities to promote the achievement of this outcome in the course of 2011 were:

1. Contributing to development of Rural Women’s Caucus by meeting with a range of rural women’s groups, participating in meetings and advising on donor strategy (Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.);
2. Co-funded the Rural Women’s Assembly proposal submitted by the Rural Women’s Caucus. Oxfam contributed R450,000 (Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.). The Assembly was held during COP17 and it brought together 650 rural women. Participants in the assembly also conducted a march on women’s day and participated in the Global Day of Action march. (Oxfam Australia South Africa Office, 2012);
3. Pushing DEA for more engagement with Civil Society on South African policy positions. This led to meetings in Panama and ultimately, in Durban, meetings with negotiators (including the chief negotiator) every other day with civil society to report on events and progress inside COP17;
4. Fundraising support to PACJA for the climate justice caravan (Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.);
5. Funded R160,000 welcome event for climate justice caravan during COP17 in South Africa (Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.);
6. Provided logistical support to climate justice caravan participants during their time in South Africa (Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.);
7. Oxfam facilitated five representatives of partners to be accredited to attend the COP 17 sessions. Oxfam Australia South Africa Office (2012);
8. Oxfam provided support to three partners to attend Bonn intercessional in 2011 (Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.);
9. Oxfam facilitated meeting of 20 South Africa representatives and COP president (Oxfam Australia South Africa Office, 2012);
10. Oxfam facilitated handing over of a memorandum by Rural Women’s caucus to the COP President and Africa Group Chair (Oxfam Australia South Africa Office, 2012);
11. Facilitated a side event on carbon markets on behalf of the Climate Justice Alliance to increase knowledge of carbon trading and the impacts on African agriculture (Oxfam Australia South Africa Office, 2012);
12. Providing a wide variety of support to OI’s global COP17 campaign.

EVIDENCE

In this outcome, Oxfam was able to play a more direct role than in the previous one, although the achievement of the outcome is again contingent on Oxfam’s partners: the RWA and PACJA. Oxfam aimed to support the RWA to define a memorandum of rural women’s needs for the negotiations at COP17, and support PACJA to mobilise NGOs and people in support of Africa’s aspirations at the COP17 negotiations.

DID OXFAM SUPPORT ORGANISATIONS OUTSIDE COP?

Yes, both the Rural Women’s Assembly and the Pan African Climate Justice Network were supported, financially, technically, and intellectually.

RURAL WOMEN’S ASSEMBLY

The Rural Women’s Assembly was a collaborative effort by a range of organisations, and Oxfam funded the Trust for Community Outreach and Education (TCOE) and the Land Access Movement of South Africa (LAMOSA) in the preparatory phase, as well as some places at the RWA held during the COP17 negotiations in Durban. In the preparatory phase, both of these organisations arranged provincial workshops that brought together women in a train-the-trainer format, informing them about COP17, explaining what climate change is and what creates it, and the role of industry and commercial agriculture. TCOE has a history of working with small farmers, fishers, and rural women³, and had been involved in organising the 2009 RWA. The two streams (TCOE and LAMOSA) came together in a RWA of 300 women in Pretoria in October 2011, participated in a workshop, and marched to Parliament. Prior to that, GenderCC Southern Africa ran 15-20 workshops with organisations to explicitly raise the issue of climate change.

The Assembly in October was aimed at rural women farmers and fishers sharing experiences and issues they face, such as access to markets and resources, and challenges related to changes in the weather and water access that are not labelled as climate change. Their stories were collected and a memorandum drawn up based on their specific challenges, which was handed to the president and parliament on Rural Women’s Day, the 15th October. The second aim was to identify key issues to raise at COP17: what are the critical messages they want to tell the world. It was clear from the beginning that a special organisation just for COP should not be set up, but that a consciousness around climate should be integrated into women’s and organisations’ daily practice. It emerged at that Assembly that women are engaging in adaptation behaviours and were sharing their strategies and solutions.

A Rural Women’s Caucus was established, a group of 10-12 people to meet and co-ordinate plans towards the RWA at COP17. Oxfam was part of this group, and fed ideas and materials into this process.

The RWA at COP17 involved approximately 650 women from 10 countries who came together over a period of five days in an event parallel to COP17, in the People’s Space. The Assembly comprised of sharing, learning, intense political discussions, sharing of indigenous seeds, and an alternative to COP. Part of TCOE’s agenda was to inform the women that negotiations were taking place, that they were excluded and had not been consulted on an issue that impacts them directly - and perhaps more severely - than any other sector of society. The women also engaged in direct action: they marched on their own and during the global day of action, they occupied the Speakers’ Square, and found a voice in the chaos of COP.

One respondent an organisation involved in the RWA suggested that the size and visibility of the RWA and the fact that they were invited to a meeting with government inside the COP had a galvanising effect on the RWA. This had an impact on the women themselves, who became aware of the fact that they are able to speak and this increased their confidence and visibility (Marema, 2012, pers. comm.). The process did a lot towards unifying rural women in the region, to have solidarity with each other as small farmers, as those who will be affected, to act together and share how they adapt. They also became aware that their governments were representing them without a mandate (Andrews, 2012, pers. comm.). Another respondent suggested that rural women are now part of the discourse in climate and that climate change

³ Constance Mogale of LAMOSA was not interviewed so LAMOSA’s views are not reflected here.

has been mainstreamed into women's struggles. This is a large claim that cannot be verified at present, but does point to the fact that an advocacy programme needs time to see its effects.

Oxfam gave funding towards the RWA in October in Pretoria, and in the build-up workshops run by TCOE and GenderCC Southern Africa. One respondent suggested that it was "very important when they contributed to the kitty. No-one wants to fund what no-one else is funding, so our profile was increased by being funded by Oxfam and that brings more money" (Marema, 2012, pers. comm.).

PACJA

The Pan African Climate Justice Alliance (PACJA) is a coalition of 300 African civil society organisations that advocate for development that is climate friendly and equity-based. The PACJA aims to ensure that pro-poor and people-centred responses are considered by governments in Africa and provides a unified stance on climate change (Pan African Climate Justice Alliance website, 2011). The PACJA was initiated in 2008 and was born from an initial meeting of African civil society organisations on climate change organised by Oxfam International and NEPAD and a later conference organised by a coalition of international non-governmental organizations (Pan African Climate Justice Alliance website, 2011).

The PACJA African Caravan of Hope was a unique activity on the African continent. 314 people travelled by road from Burundi to South Africa and ended up in Durban. It interacted through the process with about 10,000 people – when they were received in countries, in workshops, rallies, symposiums, walks, tree plantings etc. In each country, a schedule of events had been planned by the allied organisation. The caravan developed the African People's Petition, and collected endorsements and signatures on the way: a total of 1.3 million signatures were on the petition when it was handed over to the South African government at the Union Buildings in Pretoria. Included in those signatures were the vice presidents of Burundi, Uganda, and Tanzania, as well as a number of environmental ministers and other personalities. At the Union Buildings and on arrival in Durban, the caravan was covered by international media including the BBC and CNN.

Oxfam's contribution was significant - financially, and technically, not as a partner but actually as part of process. Oxfam seconded an officer to work with the PACJA secretariat, which was helpful. Within the planning processes, particularly the handover of petition, Oxfam was part of that, and the OI secretariat was useful in coming up with policy documents (Mwenda, 2012, pers. comm.).

DID OXFAM SUPPORT ORGANISATIONS INSIDE COP?

No, although this was not really the intention.

The formal COP17 event took place in the International Convention Centre and Durban Exhibition Centre. This space was physically cordoned off from the public. Only accredited delegates are able to enter the space which was formally handed over to United Nations control by the South Africa government for the duration of COP17.

Oxfam had secured accreditation for more than 20 Oxfam staff, although it is important to note that they were only observers of the process, not participants. Organisations affiliated to the RWA had arranged accreditation for five of their members, and Oxfam ran workshops during COP to offer technical support to those going inside: how COP works, the issues involved, navigating a big conference etc.

The specific role of the programme for COP can be seen as twofold: supporting organisations over the course of 2011 so that civil society was able to influence the agenda; and actively lobbying negotiators during COP17. Inside COP17, OI staff engaged in active lobbying: talking to negotiators in corridors or catching a quick coffee with them, attending any open meetings to talk about their position, analysing text and drawing up positions, and working with allied organisations. Since this role also fell to the global team who came to Durban for COP, it cannot be attributed to this programme only (Mistry, 2012, pers. comm.).

Oxfam support for the RWA did translate into a mention of rural women. The RWA developed a regional memorandum, and the climate change section of it came directly from their October memorandum. This was given to the COP Presidency and UNFCCC as part of the civil society submissions on the global day of action, and the COP President mentioned in plenary that she had met rural women. Outside the official process, one woman was invited to share a stage with the South African President, the mayor of eThekweni, the Minister of Economic Development, and a prominent bishop. She was invited to represent civil society, and her presence was thought to increase awareness in government about who will be affected by climate change (Geyer, 2012, pers. comm.).

PACJA as an organisation had its own accreditation organised, and was not expecting Oxfam support in that. However, Oxfam did offer them technical support through the year (Mistry and Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.).

In commenting on whether the COP was responsive to African voices, Mithika Mwenda said “Though there were a few breakthroughs, especially the establishment of the Green Climate Fund, as well as the agreement on the KP2 [Kyoto Protocol 2], I can't say the Durban outcome is all what Africa desired, nor does it respond to African realities. The Green Climate Fund could be there, but where the money comes is the next war to fight. The KP2 is also problematic as key polluters - Japan, Canada, Russia and US, with possibility of others, having shown it their backs. We have a long way to go”.

CAUSAL EXPLANATION

COMPONENT ONE

Component one is “Oxfam supported organisations outside COP”. The options for the first component of the causal story are:

1. Oxfam was a major supporter of RWA and PACJA;
2. RWA and PACJA would have been active at COP without the support of Oxfam.

CAUSAL STORY ONE

In this causal story, “Oxfam was a major supporter of RWA and PACJA”, the consensus is that while funding was limited, Oxfam’s major contribution technically and as part of planning for COP17 were significant. In the run-up to the October RWA, Oxfam funded workshops to gather women’s stories, and the memorandum from that event was used in lobbying around the last leg of the White Paper. The White Paper process included issues of gender and small scale producers, partly due to the experience and tenacity of Oxfam staff and NGOs (Marema, 2012, pers. comm.).

PACJA had other sponsors but it was Oxfam’s participation as part of the process that was singled out for praise (Mwenda, 2012, pers. comm.). The welcome that the Caravan of Hope received in Durban was significant, not least in the fact that much work was required when the caravan arrived and accommodation for everyone was insufficient.

Oxfam, then, was a major supporter.

CAUSAL STORY TWO

In this story, “RWA and PACJA would have been active at COP without the support of Oxfam”, it is clear that both networks would have been present and active at COP without Oxfam.

An alternative story about the success of the RWA is that TCOE has a lot of experience in movement building and a strong capacity for mobilisation: it organised a mass landless week at the Rio+10 in South Africa. They understand the South African political context very well, and mobilisation is one of their strategies. They co-ordinate the regional alliance with Campesina movement and are able to bring vast experience in people’s dialogue.

COMPONENT TWO

Component two is “Oxfam supported organisations inside COP”. The options for the first component of the causal story are:

1. Oxfam facilitated civil society voices to be heard inside COP;
2. There is little opportunity for civil society voices to be heard inside COP due to its inherent structure.

CAUSAL STORY ONE

In this story, “Oxfam facilitated civil society voices to be heard inside COP”, it is unclear what role OI staff who were accredited for entry to COP17 played, but since they were mainly not from South Africa, it is assumed that they lobbied on behalf of OI’s policies, rather than African civil society. The global team, when talking about climate change, would talk about the 500 rural women or the 200 small scale producers outside, those whose livelihoods will be directly affected by climate change. This was extremely useful, as the OI people were able to talk about climate change in real terms. However, the OI people had not spoken to those rural women and small scale producers themselves, and it therefore seems that Oxfam’s facilitation of civil society voices was for its own purposes, rather than the purposes of civil society itself. In addition, limited capacity was offered to partners to do their own media and communication work, which would have potentially allowed those partners to tell their own livelihoods stories (Mistry and Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.).

CAUSAL STORY TWO

This story, “There is little opportunity for civil society voices to be heard inside COP due to its inherent structure” is commonly thought to be true. Engaging inside COP was extremely difficult for all respondents. “But for the caravanites, the bureaucracy within the UNFCCC and restrictiveness and heavy security reminded them of the process that was intended to sustain the status quo” (Mwenda, 2012, pers. comm.). However, Rashmi Mistry gave feedback to the RWA daily about what was happening inside COP and arranged for the South African Chief Negotiator to report back to them every other day, which is significant.

The processes before COP17 were fraught with decisions about how civil society should respond to the event. The RWA decided that they would not have a strategy and focus for the inside - although they received briefings from Oxfam and Friends of the Earth - because accreditation and the process was too complicated and they were unsure what central message they would give to the negotiation process (Andrews, 2012, pers. comm.).

SUMMARY

Outcome 4	African organisations and people speak for themselves, particularly around women’s leadership, representation and participation in processes up to and at COP17, both inside and outside the negotiations	
Key activities	Partnered with organisations that were part of the RWA to gather rural women’s stories, develop a memorandum submitted to the South African government on rural women’s day, and fund 650 to attend the RWA at the time of COP 17 Supported PACJA Got accreditation for some civil society representatives and some Oxfam staff	
Evidence	Did Oxfam support organisations outside COP?	Yes, financially, although technical and intellectual support also useful
	Did Oxfam support organisations inside COP?	This was not really on their agenda, despite it being part of the outcome
What was Oxfam’s contribution?	Oxfam was a major supporter of RWA and PACJA. RWA and PACJA would have been active at COP without the support of Oxfam. Oxfam facilitated civil society voices to be heard inside COP. There is little opportunity for civil society voices to be heard inside COP due to its inherent structure.	

CONTRIBUTION SCORE

Targeted outcome	Extent observed (high, medium, low, none)	Extent of project/campaign contribution (high, medium, low, none)	Specific contribution score /5	Other evidenced explanations and extent of their contribution (high, medium, low)
The South African government steps out as a global leader on national pro-poor adaptation with a powerful adaptation plan as part of a poverty reduction strategy backed with domestic and global resources.	Medium	Medium	3	Many other stakeholders contributed to this outcome, their contributions ranged from low, medium and high.
South African government runs an inclusive, legitimate Congress of the Parties (COP) that contributes to a fair, ambitious, and legally binding deal, taking particular leadership with progressive voices (particularly with the Africa Group, Mexico and the European Union [EU]) on finance issues.	Low	Low	1	Numerous stakeholder government and civil society organisations contributed to this outcome. Most contributions would be low, except for some of the more significant countries participating in the negotiations.
Individuals and civil society in South Africa are mobilised on three levels: to influence the domestic agenda; to influence international decision making; raised public awareness and action through movements focussed on the COP this year and food in coming years.	Medium	Medium	3	A number of civil society organisations and other funders also made medium contributions.
African organisations and people speak for themselves, particularly around women's leadership, representation and participation in processes up to and at COP17, both inside and outside the negotiations.	Medium	Medium	3	PAJCA and RWA also made high contributions

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

OUTCOME ONE

Oxfam had an effective climate change advocacy programme that clearly contributed to the policy development process: Oxfam's participation in the climate change response policy development process was recognised as vocal and strong by the individual leading the policy development process for the South Africa government. In addition there is traceable evidence of wording from at least one of Oxfam's submissions being used in the published version of the National Climate Change Response White Paper.

There is no recommendation arising from this conclusion.

There was a mismatch between this outcome and Oxfam's scale of impact on the outcome. The South Africa climate change policy development process was highly participatory and as a result Oxfam's own contribution to the policy development process was by implication diluted by the impact that other stakeholders must have had on the process through their participation. In addition since Oxfam is an international organisation contributing in a national policy development process its contributions may not always have been regarded by decision makers as having the same level of significance as those of South Africa organisations. So while Oxfam clearly contributed to the final outcome, multiple players can be regarded as having contributed to this outcome as well.

It is recommended that outcomes of advocacy programmes are written to take into account the likely scale of impact Oxfam can have in the context of efforts by numerous other parties.

OUTCOME TWO

Oxfam SA climate change advocacy programme established an influential relationship with the SA COP Presidency from a low base: Oxfam's SA team was able to secure formal and informal access to the SA COP Presidency and played significant role in assisting OI policy objectives through its establishment of a relationship with the SA COP Presidency.

There is no recommendation arising from this conclusion.

This outcome was poorly stated and as a result prevents clear evaluation of success. This outcome combines a number of different outcomes in one. In addition the core of the outcome statement was extremely ambitious and reflects a global scale objective, while other components of the outcome have a more national scale. Considering the small size of the Oxfam climate change advocacy programme in relation to COP17 itself, it is not possible to establish a clear chain of evidence linking different concepts in this outcome. In addition, while the SA team achieved a great deal considering its small scale (see previous conclusion), the outcomes statement as it stands sets up the team for failure from the outset. All these factors made it extremely difficult to clearly evaluate this outcome.

It is recommended that outcomes for advocacy programmes are written more simply and focus on single concepts. In addition as per a previous recommendation, outcomes should be at the scale of likely impact of the advocacy programme.

OUTCOME THREE

Individuals and civil society were mobilised. Oxfam played a role at the beginning of C17, as part of the process to galvanise civsoc resistance to the global event that was COP17, and funded two organisations (Earthlife and SDCEA) to be part of C17. The monies were received by Earthlife in November, and by SDCEA at the beginning of 2011. In addition, Oxfam financed and offered intellectual support for the MCJC and assisted in the amplification of the campaign through its networking abilities. Oxfam has supported both Earthlife and SDCEA for a number of years and it was the fact that they are mature organisations that have developed capacity for administration, financial systems, and databases of supporters that allowed them to play a role in educating and mobilising for the global day of action.

Organisations with years of support tend to be more administratively and financially accountable for their funds. Therefore it is recommended that when Oxfam considers funding organisations for large-scale one-off events, it considers the maturity of organisation and how much support it has given it over the years.

A number of partners said that if they had had more money, they would have been able to mobilise more people. Having the funding earlier would also have given them time to focus on mobilisation and education rather than logistics and payments. This was due to internal processes and policies which could in part have been avoided if planning had begun much earlier. It should also be said that funding was insufficient for global event with such ambitious outcomes.

It is recommended that Oxfam consider more timely grant payment by improving its internal appraisal processes and lowers expectations of programme staff engaging in fund-raising for their work.

In addition, if Oxfam wants to engage in global events, funding for it should be commensurate.

The scale of COP17 limits influence of small scale programmes. The sheer scale of governments and organisations involved in COP17 means that small programmes of the scale of Oxfam have limited influence. The review of civil society participation in COP17 made the following observation regarding this “It is important to support ideals based on climate science but also to know the limits of the multilateral system to achieving these ideals. In terms of ambition, civil society is far ahead of multilateral systems and this is set to continue into the near future. In this context it must be questioned whether it is more essential to be building movements on the ground and to defocus from the multilateral process that is failing to deliver than to continue in the present mode.” (Hallows, Reddy and Reyes, 2012: 5). Perhaps it would be more useful to focus on getting different results by doing different things. Is Rio going to be any different from Durban? Would the money be better spent on building local movements?

It is recommended that for single country programmes Oxfam consider alternatives to engaging in the multilateral process of COP.

OUTCOME FOUR

Organisations (or rather networks) did speak for themselves. Oxfam played an important financial and technical role in allowing these voices to emerge. The RWAs that emerged with memoranda handed to government and to the COP Presidency indicates an impressive level of organisation that Oxfam contributed to.

There is no recommendation arising from this conclusion.

Perhaps one of the more important outcomes of the October and COP assemblies is that **women shared their own climate change adaptation strategies**. This is an interesting outcome as it could be argued that the narrative around COP is a disempowering one. That narrative suggests that people can only cope with climate change if the government negotiates on their behalf for an adaptation plan. There is no sense that people need and have their own local adaptation strategies which can be shared and implemented.

It is recommended that Oxfam look to fund knowledge sharing events that actively engage people and communities in sharing their local solutions to their climate change challenges. This should NOT be a 'best practice' exercise, but a genuine exchange of information, strategies, reasons, hopes, and results of experimenting. Best practice is not useful here because it offers blanket solutions which are not delicate enough for different contexts.

Inside COP, African voices were not heard. It is not clear what the strategy inside COP was, or whether it is worth engaging in that manner at all.

OVERALL

The initial impression of the programme outcomes is that they are too ambitious for one organisation to affect. This was particularly the case regarding outcomes linked directly to COP17. Many commentators suggest that most people knew that very little was going to be achieved at COP17, despite Africa having three clear demands. Given the structural difficulties of influencing one of the most complex and most expensive global processes, having programme outcomes that refer to COP17 outcomes is not useful.

On further investigation, the limitation on funds and the delay in them being disbursed came down to internal Oxfam processes. Planning began only nine months ahead of the event, and the two new staff members in the programme were asked to devise an action plan. Once completed, they were asked to raise funds for the plan, which they felt was not in their capacities. Therefore, the programme did not get the funding it expected and this tied activities. Internal appraisal processes and the requirement of a monitoring, learning, and evaluation (MEL) framework delayed the acquisition of funds by the programme,

and it was only in August 2011 that the programme had funding it could disburse to partners (Mistry and Roussel, 2012, pers. comm.). These internalities directly hampered the effectiveness of this programme.

It is recommended that longer lead times should be included in Oxfam project planning for large events.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, M (2012). Director of Trust for Community Outreach and Education. Interviewed 26th April 2012.
- Ashley, B (2012). Co-ordinator Million Climate Jobs Campaign. Interviewed 18th April 2012.
- Dent, K (2012). COP17 Global Lead. Oxfam International. Interviewed 26th April 2012.
- D'Sa, D (2012). Co-ordinator South Durban Community Environmental Alliance. Interviewed 23rd April 2012.
- Earthlife Africa (June 2010). South Africa's High Carbon Emission Negotiators, UNFCCC Failing. <http://www.earthlife.org.za/?p=1596>
- Geyer, C (2012). Economic Justice Co-ordinator: Oxfam Great Britain. Interviewed 20th April 2012.
- The Government of the Republic of South Africa (2011). National Climate Change Response White Paper. http://www.environment.gov.za/PolLeg/WhitePapers/national_climatechange_response_whitepaper.pdf
- The Government of the Republic of South Africa (undated). National Climate Change Response Policy – the Policy Development Process. http://www.environment.gov.za/PolLeg/WhitePapers/policydevelopment_process.pdf
- Gore T (2012). Climate Change Policy Lead. Oxfam International. Interview 26th April 2012.
- Hallows D, Reddy T and Reyes O (2012). Copin Copout C17: A review of civil society participation in the UN Conference on Climate Change, Durban 2011. Earthlife Africa, Johannesburg.
- Kotvojs F & Shrimpton B (2007) Contribution analysis: A new approach to evaluation in international development. *Evaluation Journal of Australasia*. Vol 7 (1). pp. 27-35.
- Lukey P (2012). Chief Policy Advisor: Strategic Environmental Intelligence. Department Environmental Affairs. Interview 23rd April 2012.
- Marema, D (2012). Co-ordinator GenderCC Southern Africa. Interviewed 23rd April 2012.
- Mhlambiso, N (2012). Media lead for COP17: Oxfam Australia South Africa Office. Interviewed 20th April 2012.
- Mistry R (2012). Climate Change Advocacy Coordinator SA. Oxfam Great Britain. Interview 4th April 2012, and 8th May 2012.
- Mwenda, M (2012). Co-ordinator Pan African Climate Justice Alliance. Interviewed 3rd May 2012.
- Parliamentary Monitoring Group (2011a). Minutes Public Hearing National Climate Change Response White Paper: 14th November 2011. <http://www.pmg.org.za/report/20111115-public-hearings-national-climate-change-white-paper-2011>
- Parliamentary Monitoring Group (2011b). Climate Change White Paper public hearings: Committee deliberations: 22nd November 2011. <http://www.pmg.org.za/report/20111123-committee-deliberations-climate-change-white-paper-public-hearings>

One Million Climate Jobs (2011) “One Million Climate Jobs- A just transition to a low carbon economy to combat unemployment and climate change”, Campaign Booklet, <http://www.climatejobs.org.za/documents/campaign-booklet.html>

One Million Climate Jobs Campaign Website (2012) <http://www.climatejobs.org.za/>

Omari K Sustainable Development Programme Manager, Heinrich Boll Stiftung Southern Africa. Interview 24th April 2012.

Oxfam (undated). COP17 Evaluation. Draft

Oxfam (2010). Comments on the National Climate Change Response Green Paper 2010 by Oxfam in South Africa. 10th February 2010.

Oxfam (2011a) Draft Strategy for Climate Change Campaigning in South Africa (2011). Revised draft updated post planning workshop. 2-4 March 2011

Oxfam (2011b). Comments on the Draft National Climate Change Response White Paper Version 4-3. 25th July 2011.

Oxfam (2011c). Comments on the National Climate Change Response White Paper. Submitted to the parliamentary committee on Water and Environmental Affairs. 20th October 2011.

http://d2zmx6mlqh7g3a.cloudfront.net/cdn/farfuture/mtime:1321600152/files/docs/111115oxfam_0.pdf

Oxfam (2011d). COP17 Media Strategy. Draft.

Oxfam Australia South Africa Office (2012). Final Report April 2011 – December 2011: Conference of Parties (COP 17) South Africa 2011. February 2012.

Oxfam GB (undated). Guidance on Evaluating Citizen Voice Initiatives Using Process Tracing

Pan African Climate Justice Alliance website (2012).

Peek, B (2012). Director Groundwork. Interviewed 26th April 2012.

Racoomar, V (2012). Policy and Advocacy Advisor: Oxfam Australia South Africa Office. Interviewed 2nd May 2012.

Roussel, K (2012). Advocacy and Campaigns Manager: Oxfam Australia South Africa Office. Interview April 13th 2012, and 8th May 2012.

Taylor, T (2012). Project Co-ordinator Earthlife Africa. Interviewed 19th April 2012.

Wills, A (2012). Chief Negotiator for the South African government. Interviewed 11th May 2012.

APPENDIX ONE: OXFAM'S financial contribution to civil society organisations

Oxfam's financial contribution to a range of organisations is shown in the table below. This money was used for two things: preparation for COP, which involved organising workshops to mobilise and educate partners' constituencies; and coming to COP itself, arranging the global day of action. The following table outlines the amounts given to partners, the approximate date of transfer, and what the funds were earmarked for.

Organisation	Date	Amount	Activities
AIDC (for MCJC)	Later than March	R250,000	Research, booklet
Earthlife	June 2011	R38,000	COP17 mobilisation
	6 December 2012	R100,000	Part of a R250,000 tranche, R150,000 of which went to C17
GCCA	March 2011	R80,000	C17 meeting
LAMOSA	February 2011	R60,000	Women's technical feedback
	August 2011	R81,000	Climate change workshop (Rural Women's Caucus)
	November 2011	R60,000	Workshops on building technical capacity for COP17
PACJA	November 2011	R140,000	Welcome event for the caravan arriving in Durban
RWA		R450,000	Grant to come to Durban
SDCEA	March 2011	GBP15,000	Climate change book and launch event
	June 2011	R93,600	COP17 mobilisation
	October 2011	R125,000	COP17 mobilisation (global day of action work)
TCOE	May 2011`	R70,000	Climate change workshop (Rural Women's Caucus)
	August 2011	R80,000	Climate change workshop (Rural Women's Caucus)