

RESPONSE BY SOUTH AFRICA TO THE FINAL DRAFT REPORT OF THE WG ON GOVERNANCE AND STRUCTURE OF THE CA OF 30 JULY 2009

In our response to the first draft report we raised three key issues. We need to measure the current report against those comments. These are as follows:

- *That the report be framed as a contribution for the 10 year Celebration/Review of CA.* This item is appropriately covered in the report under item 5 headlined as “General observations and recommendations”.
- *The report has to be consistent with the approved MTS.* The concern we had is that the matters as raised in the first draft of the WG were largely the subject of discussion on the MTS at the CG. The final draft continues to engage on matters that have been the subjects of the approved MTS. Performance to the approved MTS need to be reported on at the next CG as a matter of course by the Secretariat. The current final report of the WG assists in defining priority elements for consideration when reviewing the performance to the MTS but at the same time pre-empts the discussion at the CG and EXCO on the matter. Hence our urging that the matters addressed in the report be framed for consideration and discussion rather than be prescriptive for review by the CG. Recommendation 1 (role and ownership by cities) is already a subject of the MTS. Recommendation 2 (extending participation) is a perspective of some members (mostly Sweden and Norway) and has the potential to undermine the balance of representivity in the CG. The recommendation is debatable and unresolved. Therefore there is no agreement and cannot be constituted as a representation of the WG. While recommendation three (related to the role of NGOs, CBOs etc) offers a multiplicity of views, they are not dissimilar to what was agreed upon at the CG about how to deal with the matter. Thus reconfirming the approach adopted at the CG. Recommendations 4, 5 and 6 (related to decision making and reporting formats) were all subjects of discussion and approvals related to the MTS. (see my notes in the next bullet). Recommendation 7 (permanent staff) was the subject of discussion on the MTS at the CG and the desire of the WG is not inconsistent with the direction adopted at the CG. The proposal (for an M&E post) however has merit and should be a subject of the next CG. Recommendation 8 (Advocacy Strategy) is the contained in the MTS and is a matter for the Advocacy Panel. To suggest otherwise would be to undermine the CG. Recommendation 9 (Cities Alliance presence in Europe) is inconsistent with the purpose of the CA in relation to its primary activities. The application of resources on the north when the organizations focus is in the south would be a contradiction and completely is at odds with the approved MTS. Recommendations 10, 11, 12, and 13 (focus on the poorest countries and secondary and tertiary cities) have all been a primary subject for two members of the work group (Sweden and Norway). The element is not in the ToR for the WG. More importantly we have stated that the issues cannot be addressed because the approved MTS provides for the strategic direction of the CA with regard to its institutional and operational focus.

- *That the WG should not veer into the operational domain of the Secretariat and the other decision making structures.* While we welcome the opportunity to be part of an engagement that allows for the deepening of participation in the work of the CA, we are of the opinion that the WG has veered too much into the operational domain of the Secretariat and the other decision making structures. Only one meeting was necessary (in Nairobi) and the matters had to be submitted as considered opinions of the WG for the wider reflection of all the members at the CG at the 10 Year reflections of CA.