Seminar on Democracy Support by NGOs

February 2008

Organized by Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan
Implemented by Shanti Volunteer Association (SVA)

Foreword

The Division of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs deals with various internal and external issues relating to human rights. Within the United Nations system, human rights is one of the three major pillars, together with development and security. The "mainstreaming of human rights" has been promoted, as witnessed by the establishment of the Human Rights Council. Interest in human rights has been increasing both domestically and internationally. Also, together with human rights, democracy is an important element for the peace, stability and prosperity in the international community.

Since the 1990s, the end of the Cold War, there has been an urgent need in the areas of development for donor recipient countries to increase their absorption ability of assistance in order to promote good governance that includes democracy. Poverty eradication has proven challenging, as some policy issues have posed big problems. While globalization continues to proceed rapidly, various challenges on a global scale, such as an increasing discrepancy between poor and rich, are coming out, and the democracy and development are strengthening their interdependency. Democracy is an important factor for deciding the future of development.

It is the people of each country who sustain democratization process. Whether the people understand the significance of human rights and democracy is extremely important in order to stabilize democracy. While the democratization process is set around assistance from the government, empowerment of civil society for building and functioning democratic system is very important. I think it is indispensable that individual participation should come together with initiatives by NGOs and the government.

On the part of the Japanese government, it has provided assistance for elections, governance, and institutional building while respecting each country's ownership and in a way to be along with the country's development plan. In 1996, "Partnership for Democratic Development" was announced, and we have put emphasis on human rights and democracy in our foreign policy, and undertaken its development assistance in a way to assist the self-help efforts of developing countries. In addition, in order to discuss what the Government should do together with civil society in the new trend of the international community, which includes the mainstreaming of human rights, we organized a symposium yesterday with a theme of "Challenges and Prospect of Japan's Diplomacy on Human Rights and Diplomacy". In the symposium, it was emphasized that providing multi-facet menu of options for democracy support and whereby the government and private sector having collaboration is important in dealing with a very complicated and delicate issue such as democratization.

Last year, as a part of international contributions in the area of multilateral

cooperation, Japan disbursed a total of $10,000,000 to The United Nations Democracy Fund (UNDEF). At present, Japan is a member of the Advisory Board of UNDEF, and participates proactively in the discussion of the management of the Fund. As the number of Asian projects has not been large, we hope to have more Japanese NGOs to participate actively.

Today, I expect various discussions to take place, I sincerely hope that discussion will take place in identifying the role of the government and that of private sector and the competitive advantages of each party. In today's seminar, we are honored to have Mr. Roland Rich, Executive Head of UNDEF, academics and prominent NGO members both from Japan and abroad, and expect various discussions. We believe that this seminar is a great opportunity for us to share and exchange on a wide range of opinions and a vast scope of knowledge regarding human rights and democracy.

Human rights and democracy are indeed both very difficult areas to tackle. It is not easy to reach a clear-cut conclusion. However, in the past, significant efforts have been made – making long-term commitments, emphasizing human resources development, understanding local institutions, appreciating the diversity of various countries, and encouraging the developing countries' efforts. I firmly believe that such approach will give us a good hint when we think about democracy support. I hope, through this seminar, we will be able to find a common platform and reach a consensus on the way for us to move forward.

Lastly, I would like to thank the Shanti Volunteer Association and all the staff members who helped realize this event. My sincere thanks goes also to all the distinguished guests who joined us for this seminar, including Mr. Rich, and all the other panelists who have come a long way. Thank you very much.

Mr. Tetsuya Kimura
Director, Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs Division, Foreign Policy Bureau
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan

Contents

1 Program
Seminar on Democracy Support by NGOs

1-1 **Organizers**

- Organized by Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan
- Implemented by Shanti Volunteer Association (SVA)

1-2 Objectives

- To know what is democracy support and United Nations Democracy Fund (UNDEF), and how to design, implement and monitor the project to support democracy.
- To know how to apply for the Fund and to write convincing project proposal.
- To know how to build effective partnership with local/international NGOs, local governments and UN agencies.

1-3 Program

9: 00- 9:45　　Registration

9:45- 10:00　Opening Remark

　　　　　　Mr. Tetsuya Kimura, Director, Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan

　　　　　　Plenary session: What is democracy support?

10:00-10:40　Keynote speech **: The Value of International Democracy Promotion**

　　　　　　　　　Mr. Roland Rich, Executive Head, UNDEF

10:40-10:55　Break

10:55-12:30　Panel discussion

　　　　　　Moderator: Dr. Tatsuya Hata, Executive Director, Shanti Volunteer Association

　　　　　　Presenters:1. **Democracy support by international NGO**: Dr. Preeti Shroff-Mehta, Director, Civil Society and Governance Program, World Learning

　　　　　　　　2. **Democracy support by local NGO**: Ms. Igballe Rogova, Executive Director, Kosova Women's Network

　　　　　　　　3. **Democracy support by Japanese NGO**: Mr. Michiya Kumaoka, Co-Representative, People's Forum on Cambodia, Japan

　　　　　　Commentator: Mr. Roland Rich, Executive Head, UNDEF

12:30-13:45　Lunch

13:45-15:15　**Thematic Group sessions**

　　　　　　Session 1: Planning and implementing projects for democracy support

Group　A:　Integrating democracy support to social development projects:

Trainer: Ms. Akiko Ikeda, Secretary to the UNDEF Advisory Board

Moderator: Mr. Michiya Kumaoka

Group　B:　Projects for strengthening civil society

Trainer: Dr. Preeti Shroff-Mehta

Moderator: Dr. Tatsuya Hata

Group　C:　Projects for women's empowerment and reconciliation

Trainer: Ms. Igballe Rogova

Moderator: Mr. Kazushito Takase, Director, International Development Program, World Vision Japan

15:15- 15:30　Break

15:30-17:00　**Session 2: Monitoring, partnership building and fund-raising for projects for democracy support**

17:00-17:15　Evaluation and closing

2 Presenters and Trainers

- **Mr. Roland Rich**

  He brings to the job over 30 years of experience as a diplomat, a scholar and a democracy promotion practitioner. Prior to his appointment to UNDEF, he was a member of the directing staff at the Centre for Defense and Strategic Studies of the Australian Defence College, teaching and mentoring colonel-level officers undertaking a master's degree in international relations. In 2005 he was a research Fellow at the National Endowment for Democracy in Washington DC. Between 1998 and 2005, he was the Foundation Director of the Centre for Democratic Institutions at the Australian National University which is Australia's democracy promotion institute undertaking projects in the Asia-Pacific region. He joined the Australian foreign service in 1975 and had postings in Paris, Rangoon, Manila and, from 1994-1997, as Australian Ambassador to Laos. He has also served as Legal Advisor and Assistant Secretary for International Organizations in the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.

- **Ms. Akiko Ikeda**

  She is responsible for strengthening of donor relations and for ensuring Member States' contributions to the Fund. Furthermore, she contributes to the organization of UNDEF's governing mechanisms, namely the Advisory Board and the Programme Consultative Group. In addition, she undertakes outreach activities with civil society and UNDEF's key partners, and develops outreach/communication as well as resource mobilization strategies. With regard to project management, she monitors and evaluates UNDEF's projects. Prior to UNDEF, she worked six years at Mine Action Service of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, where she established landmine survivors programmes by implementing socio-economic programmes in mine-affected countries such as Afghanistan, Burundi, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea and Sudan, with local governments and civil society.

- **Dr. Preeti Shroff-Mehta**

  She is the Director of Civil Society and Governance Programs at World Learning, Washington, DC. She has 20 years' leadership experience as an academician and trainer in the international development field and has managed development projects sponsored by USAID and the US State department, the World Bank, Ford Foundation, USA; Ontario Ministry for Community Economic Development, Canada; OXFAM, England; Social and Health Ministry, Government of Finland; Misereor, Germany; UNICEF, India and Government of India. She has managed global projects in areas of policy advocacy and action, public sector and local governance reform, non-formal education, local livelihoods and life-skills development, human rights, anti-trafficking, religious harmony and community reconciliation, women's leadership, HIV/ AIDS advocacy and grassroots innovations.

She is an adjunct faculty at World Learning's School for International Training (SIT) as well as at the School for Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University.

- **Ms. Igballe Rogova**

She is a Founder and an Executive Director of Kosova Women's Network, in which she advocated actively in Kosova and internationally for the implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1325, especially in relation to peace-making processes in Kosova and South East Europe. She provides technical and moral support to women-led organizations representing various ethnicities, communities, and interests throughout Kosova, building their capacity as organizations. She forges partnerships with numerous local and international organizations in Kosova and abroad, including Rockefeller Brothers Fund and UN agencies. She actively advocated for Kosova and United Nations Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) government representatives to involve women in decision-making; lobbied for women's priorities to be addressed. She received Women of the Year Award by the International Network of Women's Organizations, San Francisco in 1998.

- **Mr. Michiya Kumaoka**

He is Co-Representative of People's Forum on Cambodia, Japan, Former President of Japan International Volunteer Center (JVC), Visiting Professor of the Graduate School of University of Tokyo, and Advisor to UNHCR Tokyo Office. He had been a representative of JVC Cambodia Office during 1985-1988. After establishing People's Forum on Cambodia, Japan in 1993, he has been involved in democracy support and human rights issues in Cambodia. He has also involved in relief and rehabilitation projects in war affected countries in Asia and Africa. He has written books including "The Frontline of Cambodia" (Cambodia Sai Zensen) and "Children's Iraq" (Kodomotachi no Iraq).

3 Plenary Session: What is democracy support?

Keynote address: The Value of International Democracy Promotion

Mr. Roland Rich

Executive Head of UN Democracy Fund (UNDEF)

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. It's a great pleasure for me to be here and share my thoughts with you this morning, and hopefully in the coming sessions, exchange some ideas with you. I'd like to also thank the Shanti Volunteer Association for organizing this session. Maybe you have not seen for yourselves the significance of the organizers in this seminar, but we have seen this morning some examples of cooperation between governments and NGOs. It's Ministry of Foreign Affairs that organized this event, Japan International Cooperation Agency provided the venue and Shanti Volunteer Association is the host for this seminar. Well, I think people in this audience would take this as normal, but I can assure you that in many countries in the world, this would be an unusual event for NGOs and governments to work together in that way. And yet, it seems that we can tell from many examples that by working that way, this result can be achieved.

I'm going to speak to you about this very powerful word "democracy" and some of the actions that we can take to help promote democracy in various places around the world. I've been fortunate in being able to have several careers in my working life. But as a diplomat in the Cold War years, it was my learning period of diplomacy and I can tell you that in that period, we used the word democracy very, very rarely. It was not a subject that was spoken about in the 1970s or 1980s. And the words "human rights" were very rarely discussed as well when you were having discussions with various countries. And there's another word that was never discussed, although we could see evidence of it all around us. And that was the word "corruption". Corruption was also a word that we weren't allowed to discuss in those days. With the end of the Cold War, a lot of these barriers to open discussions fell away, and we were able to try to look at the underlying issues and look at the real problems of underdevelopment and poverty.

It became quite evident that merely looking at the economic issues and even simply looking at the education issues were insufficient. This term "governance" became a part of our vocabulary so much so that the underlying problems that are in a lot of development issues, that are in a lot of the societal development issues, was "bad governance". It is often put as the goal of "good governance", but it was in fact, bad governance. One of the postings I had was in Burma (Myanmar), in Rangoon (Yangon). At that time, a General Ne Win ran the country and he banded by whim, whatever came into his head. In fact, at one stage, one of his astronomers told him that the number nine was a very propitious number for him. So he changed the whole currency of the country and did away with the decimal system. Currency had to be denominations of nine so we had 45 check notes and 90 check notes to spin. Could we have a better example of bad governance? And people wondered why Burma (Myanmar) had

under-development in those days. So, we are now more open to that sort of discussions.

Whereas human rights became very much accepted in the international dialogue, it took the word "democracy" a little bit longer to become a part of the accepted issues that should be discussed, acted on and worked on in the international domain. And I guess the underlying question that goes to the heart of this is: Is democracy, and building democracy in a country simply the responsibility and solely responsibility of that country? Or is there international responsibility to be involved in building democracy in countries all over the world? It's a difficult question and often countries hide behind this shield that they called "sovereignty" as a defense to allow themselves whatever they wish to do within their own countries, and of course there is international law and a lot of international practice that supports the notion that a sovereign country has many rights within their borders. But human rights, I think, led the way in showing that these rights are not the rights to do whatever one wants to do in one's own country and are completely unfitted. There has to be some limits and rules about these sorts of issues. And I think that democracy has also started to be seen as an issue that is part of the international agenda. I think we need to ask why, why should democracy be seen as an international good, and I have to concede here that we don't have all the evidence yet. We do not have all the evidence that democracy will bring the sort of benefits that we think it will bring. But we do believe that democracy brings better quality developments; that democracy brings the most sustainable development; that democracy brings better protection of human rights.

Very importantly, from the point of view of International Relations, various strong theoretical and empirical studies support the notion that democracy brings peace. Democratic Peace Theory, at its very minimum, says that consolidated democracies do not go to war against each other. If that is the case, then it gives us many important reasons why the international community should be assisting other countries to democratize. It is not just for the reason of helping others; it is for the reason of bringing international peace and development to the world as a whole.

It seems to me that the establishment of the United Nations Democracy Fund is a way of world saying that it now accepts that democracy is a valid issue to discuss and act upon on the international stage. It took quite a number of years: democracy promotion began many years ago, but it was only in 2005 that the UN Democracy Fund was established. So, what I think it means is that the international community has said, "Yes, democracy promotion is now a part of the international agenda". You can understand that there were certain oppositions to this idea in some countries still, and we need to find a way that works with different sorts of countries in democratic promotion. I will come to that in a moment.

Each country achieves its own democracy in its own way. Every country is a product of its own history and geography. Therefore, every country is different. One of the questions we need to ask ourselves: if we are treating democracy as one of those issues that should be discussed universally and acted on universally, is it a universal value? Is it a universal good? I think Amartya Sen made a very strong argument that democracy has now become a universal value that everywhere in the world, it is valued in a certain way. But some countries say, "It's a very valuable thing - democracy, but it's not for us. Let us run our countries without this very complicated notion called democracy. We'll do it a different way", and they justify it on the basis of their own history, their own experiences.

84

Without doubt, there is some validity to the argument that every country has an individual approach to these issues. But can we also perhaps say that there is something innate in the human being that wants to be involved in their own governance? that human beings don't just wish to be led; they also need to have some control, have some say, some involvement in the decisions that affect their lives and the lives of their families? And if we go back to ancient history, we see evidence not just in ancient Athens, the country with the language that gave us the word "democracy". We see it also in Buddhist India, five hundred years before the Common Era. We see it in the area of Asia Minor where some groups who worked in casting blocks were in a sense voting on various decisions. And this strikes me as evidence that the wish to be involved in governing oneself is spread right around the world. It didn't just come out from one source. It is something that is innate to humans. When modern democracy came about, it came about through a particular historical process and I think we can trace this to the French and American revolutions, when the notion of the centrality of the human being and the rights that all humans have arose. The British perhaps gave us a lot more about the institutional structure to democracy, but it is true that the design of modern democracy came from these sources. A lot of these ideas were propagated around the world in the colonial period. Probably what we would have to conclude, not very effectively, what we would have to say, is that there wasn't a lot of enthusiasm amongst the originators of the idea of democracy to bring the concept to the colonized world. Clearly it wasn't in their interest. But, at the very end of the decolonization period, a lot of these institutions of democracy were established in the developing world.

What is perhaps more interesting is that in Asia, two countries decided to go down that part without being forced into it by a colonial power. Two countries decided to try and borrow the institutions of democracy in some form – Thailand in 1930 where the People's Party finally put an end to absolute monarchy, and Japan in the period of Taisho where some of these democracy ideas were brought, adapted, and made into a Japanese system. I think this is a very important step for us to realize that there is, in Japan, quite a long history of contact with democracy and valuing democracy. And I think that already gives Japan a stronger position to work in this field of democracy promotion.

Where did the idea of democracy promotion as we see it originate? It is one of those accidents of history that democracy promotion in history was sort of invented: there is a word in English, "serendipity", a beneficial accident. Democracy promotion was serendipitous. It occurred in the mid-17th century in Portugal and Spain. Portugal and Spain were still run by the remnants of the fascist dictatorships that had been in those countries before the Second World War. Franco died and Salazar successor Caetano in Portugal was deposed. In the mid-70s, Portugal and Spain had to find its way to democracy. In Germany, there were political party foundations that had domestic roles. The German government gave these foundations the role of civic education in Germany. They were to teach mainly children about democracy in Germany, so they had structures. Foundations had certain structures, certain budgets, offices and so forth to do that role and they felt responsible, because they had capacity to do so, to use those structures to help political parties in Spain and Portugal. After democracy was established in Spain and Portugal, the leaders said that the Germans played a critical role in "allowing us to establish our democracy and work this complicated system". So, democracy promotion sort of

accidentally occurred, and in Washington, the policy leaders saw this happening, and decided that they had better create a system that took advantage of this sort of democracy promotion.

The former American President Ronald Reagan gave a speech in British parliament and in the following year, the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) was established. You will hear criticism of the National Endowment for Democracy, especially its early years, because some of the things that had been done covertly by the United States in order to help imprison people in places especially in Central and Eastern Europe, had been done overtly by the National Endowment for Democracy. But this strikes me as a very poor criticism, basically to come out in the open and do something, saying "we think it's a good thing to do and we're going to show you what exactly we are doing". So, democracy promotion was invented serendipitously by the Germans and took a more scientific role in America through the establishment of the NED.

Good ideas were imitated by others and what we now see around the world is a lot of democracy promotion bodies that emerged from these original ideas but each with their own special features. Amongst the bodies you see out there: two German foundations; we also have IDEA (Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance) which is an intergovernmental organization based in Stockholm. Japan cooperates with IDEA on certain projects; We have the Westminster Foundation for Democracy which is the British model; The Droit et Démocratie in Montreal, a Canadian body very much focused on advocacy and working with NGOs; The Center for Democratic Institutions (CDI) which I had the great privilege of leading in the late 90s and early 2000s. Here's the center for Australian democracy. Unlike some of the others, it is based in a university, and by basing CDI in a university, it gave CDI a

sort of academic freedom to really deal with these issues at arm's length from the government even though the funds came from the Australian development assistance program; We have the Dutch Institute for Multiparty Democracy, and unlike the German and American foundations the Dutch decided that all the parties that had representatives in the parliament would participate in this multiparty institute. It is a very important model that they are championing, and it may also be something that others may think about later on; There's the King Prajadhipok Institute which is the Thai democracy promotion institute, focusing mainly on civic education and research in Thailand and also working with its neighboring countries on democratic promotion; And I don't have the logo up there of the Korean Democracy Foundation which is pretty much a research body looking at the process of democratization in Korea, and the Taiwan Democracy Foundation which is quite involved in civil society organizations and has been one of the leading forces in the community of democracies; And we also have regional organizations. The African Union has a democracy and human rights charter. It works in the field and the Organization for American States as does the Organization for Security Cooperation in Europe. So there's a plethora; a wide range of models on democracy promotion in the world. You'll know of course that Japan does not have a body specializing in democracy promotion. I made the point at yesterday's seminar that we should not therefore conclude that Japan is not involved in democracy promotion because it certainly is in many different ways, bilaterally and multi-laterally through UNDP, through UNDEF and through other UN agencies, and working with inter-governmental organizations like IDEA and of course through bilateral program. But Japan does not have a body that specializes in democracy promotion and that is an issue that I

think was discussed yesterday and the subject offered in the discussion. The question should be "Are there things that Japan could achieve?" By doing things that way, it cannot achieve its current mode of promoting democracy. And that's the debate that the Japanese public and Japanese civil society organizations need to have with its government.

What exactly is democracy promotion? What outputs are we looking for democracy promotion? I provide here some sort of general headings of what it is that one does in this area (Annex 1-1, Slide 6). An obvious working area is strengthening parliaments, the assembly of the people's representatives so they can be more effective as representatives of the people. This is especially the case where authoritarian governments had parliamentary bodies but basically kept them in a "coma". In Indonesia, during the Suharto years, there was a parliament, the DPR (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat), that met twice a year. Lots of people in and out, but it never proposed any piece of legislation and it never rejected any piece of legislation put forward by the administration. So, it was really just window dressing. Under a democracy promotion program, the idea is to strengthen that institution, giving the institution more substance to allow it to deal with the issues that a parliament should deal with. That is a very common area for work and it will be an area that Japan would be interested in working in. Because corruption has been seen as one of the ills of a society and one of the handicaps for development, there is quite a lot of work going on in trying to strengthen oversight bodies, orders ombudsman institutions and other forms of organizations like parliamentary committees which are an important to this work.

Now, obviously, elections are a key part of promoting democracy. However, we need to be careful not to equate democracy with elections. Democracy is a lot more than periodic consultations that elections accomplish. But elections are nevertheless a necessary component of democracy and they have to be run competently. They have to be run in a way that the public is accepting of the decision. Now we see in Kenya today what happens when an election is run and the public does not have confidence in the way the election was managed, the way the vote was counted. Riots in the street of Nairobi and one of the most successful countries in Africa is now in jeopardy. So, making elections work is a very strong element of democratic promotion discipline.

Helping political parties is another one. This is very typical work and it is usually best accomplished by other political parties that know what the successful elements of political parties are. So, helping political parties are very important. The German example of helping the Iberian Peninsula tells us that an effective way of dealing these issues is to work with fraternal political parties: the Socialist party of Germany helps the Socialist Party of Spain; the Christian Democrats support its counterpart, et cetera. This allows a sort of a collegiality between the political parties. And in Europe, where you have a certain left-right spectrum where you have certain similarities in political positions, this works quite well. When we try to bring the system in Asia or another part of the world, we find that the fit is not very good. The political spectrum in the countries of Asia for example, does not mirror the political spectrum in Europe. They have different history. The political parties are not formed in consequence of the industrial revolution. It wasn't a worker-employer dynamic that had fueled politics in other countries of the world, so the model that the Germans pioneered does not work so well in Asia. And the model that works much better in Asia is one that the national democratic institute, the foundation of the Democratic Party in the United States has pioneered which is to work

with all political parties on the general skills of what political parties have to do: membership, platform, campaigning, finance, the sort of issues that political parties must accomplish and hopefully stick within the law to accomplish it.

The next point talks about the rule of law and human rights. And I know that this is an area that Japan is already very active. Japan has a very proud constitutional history and I don't think any amendment has been made to the Japanese constitution for fifty or sixty years and that is a record of constitutionalism that is quite hard to match. And this sort of concept again gives Japan the capacity to be involved in this field in the international context.

Civic education is another area where democracy promotion can do a lot of good. Maybe its most sustainable work can be in this field because it usually focuses on children: teaching children about their system of government; teaching children about the fact that their vote is meaningful and what their vote leads to; and how the government of the country works. So, civic education is an important element of democracy promotion. Where a military, authoritarian government has been replaced by a democratically elected government, very similar problems arise. What is the relationship between the new civilian government and the same military that remains in uniform and of course monopolizes the custody of weapons in the country? This issue of civil-military relations can be one of those sensitive and difficult issues to deal with during a transition to democracy. There are many lessons borrowed on how this can be done and there are ways that can help both the military and civilian government in finding oversight mechanisms and processes of dialogue between them that would allow each to play a role they have to play in democracy. I've left to last the issue of strengthening civil society not because it is the least important but because I wanted to say

a little bit more about it. I think that it is an area where disobedience is particularly interested. We know from academic literature that democracy does not work where it is simply institutions not grounded in the people; that without people's active and dynamic involvement in their own society, democracy would not work. And it was Robert Putnam who first articulated this in the study he did about Italy. But he was really following a long line of a comment that dates back to Alexis de Tocqueville who made a statement about early America. It had a very vibrant civil society and Putnam makes the same point that where you have a vibrant civil society, government seems to work better. Now since that time they are bringing more studies as to exactly why this relationship should exist. It's not intuitive. One cannot immediately see the linkage but it seems that building social capital, allowing social capital to link with the institutions of the government, and having that sort of linking capital between people and their government, somehow makes government work. It makes it more accountable. It makes it more responsive to the needs of the people. So, civil society has been seen as one of the necessary elements of successful democracy, and one of the areas where democracy promotion works best, I think, is in helping support civil society in other countries. I mentioned that I had been involved with an Australian democracy promotion institute, and for us, Indonesia was one of the important clients. We tried to work with the civil society organizations in Indonesia, and I had a lot of dealings with various groups therein. It was very interesting to see the world through their eyes. Because in the authoritarian period, there were still NGOs in Indonesia often harassed by the government, arrested or followed. Life was difficult for them. But there were still NGOs in Indonesia and they said that what they very much liked about foreign NGOs coming to participate in their activities was

because the police and military were far less likely to attack them if there were foreign NGOs around. One of the points I very much appreciated: she said that it was like borrowing a little piece of western democracy and having that in Indonesia at that time. So, initially the idea was to have the foreign NGOs come in as a sort of a protection for them. Well, Suharto passed and new period came in. It was in 1998, it was a very dynamic period in Indonesian politics for the next few years. Indonesians had a tremendous sense of humor: they did not call it democracy but they called it "demo-crazy" because there were so many things happening at that time, and again, they needed the help of international community. They needed to know what NGOs should do because their idea was that NGOs protest. That was the limit of their understanding of civil society that in civil society, we NGOs go on the street to protest. And it took a couple of years for them to realize that NGOs do a lot more than that: they look at policy issues, they look at social welfare delivery and they look at safety nets for vulnerable parts of the society, and these are all the things that civil society should do. So again, in the period 1998 until 2002, 2003, they were very interested in foreigners coming in and teaching them how to do all these things. I was in Indonesia in 2004 and I realized that something wonderful had happened. We the foreigners had become redundant. They did not need us anymore. They did not need us as shield. They did not need our skills anymore. They knew exactly what they needed to do in Indonesia. What they did want from the international community, of course, was, funding. And that remains the case. So, working with civil society is a very important part of the process and I think I should mention here the particular role of women in this regard. We know from development experience that when women are involved in development process,

those processes work far better. We know that where girls are educated, we can get take-off of the economy in those countries. These are empirical findings that we have seen in many countries around the world. So the role of women in civil societies should also be seen as critical to the functioning of civil society and UNDEF has a special vocation to work with women on issues of gender if we can. As I said, UNDEF is established to do these things: strengthening democratic institutions, promoting human rights, and in particular, work on participation of all groups in civil society. We work with other parts of the UN to do this. We are a trust fund, so we need to rely on voluntary contributions. We take no money from the UN regular budget. In 2000 and 2007, 120 projects were supported in the first round. This time we received 1800 applications from applicants all around the world including some from Japan. Sadly, we could fund only about 75 of them. And to get the list from 1800 to 75 is a job we are currently engaged in now, and it can be difficult.

These are our major contributors. You see that Japan is a very important contributor, as is India, to the UN Democracy Fund. Asian countries are therefore very involved, very much interested in this work. Korea also is a contributor, and Qatar and Australia are also from the Asia-Pacific region, so it is certainly not a European club. It is not a Northern-American creation. It is a truly international effort to do this.

Here is the very small team we have at UNDEF headquarters. We are very pleased that amongst our small team is Ikeda-san, who is a secretary of the UNDEF board. Our decisions are taken firstly through the secretariat working with other parts of the UN for quality-controlling issues through the advisory board, which Japan sits in, to make a recommendation to Ban Ki-Moon, the Secretary

General, who we hope once the recommendation is made, will accept. The members of the program coordinating group of the UN are listed for you and here are the members of the advisory board. You will see of course that Japan is a member and another 12 countries there. The way the structure of the board works is that seven of the largest donors are on the board and seeks other countries to represent other areas of the international community. So, 13 states, but the Secretary General will also have his own personal representatives, amongst which are two university professors, one UN official, and Ms. Aye Aye Thant, a Myanmar national who is the head of the U Thant Institute, and you may recall that U Thant, her father, was the first Asian Secretary-General of the UN. There is also the category of NGO representation and we have the Arab NGO Network for Development that represents 45 NGOs from 12 Arab countries, and the International Commission of Jurists who brings a lot of knowledge about the rule of law. As I said, Japan is a very important member who we would like to see contributing both through the government and through the NGO community. I think in the Q&A session we can deal with this issue in a little bit more detail.

I want to leave you some quotes from Mahatma Gandhi on democracy because we focused on Asian contribution in this little talk (Annex 1-1, Slide 14). Gandhi had some very powerful things to say about the role of individuals in democracy, and how democracy impacts on those individuals, and I think it is a very telling feature of democracy. Let me thank you for your attention, and thank the organizers for inviting me to come here. It is a great pleasure to be able to address you and discuss things with you. Please feel free to visit our website and contact us if you have any issues you would like to raise. Although we have a very small secretariat, we answer all our emails. Thank you very much.

4 Panel discussion
(1) Democracy support by international NGO

Dr. Preeti Shroff-Mehta

Director, Civil Society & Governance Programs, World Learning

First of all, I would like to thank the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs for giving me the opportunity to participate in this very important process. I thank Shanti Volunteer Association, and I absolutely hope that in future we have another opportunity to have NGOs here from around the world, learning and working together. So, thank you to the entire team from Shanti Volunteer Association. I know they have worked very, very hard for this day. And I absolutely want to acknowledge Mr. Roland Rich, who is here. It is very important for civil society organizations and leaders to see the face behind the UNDEF program. And now that I have met Roland, I have complete faith that this is going to be a very important UN initiative, which will promote genuine partnerships with civil society institutions around the world.

What I would like to do today is to focus on the values behind the word "democratization", approaches, and actual tools required to operationalize, democratization ideas because you cannot go into a country and/or a community and say "I believe in democratization", "you should democratize". Democratization is a very concrete, grassroots level activity and effort. And it is worthwhile when we can support individual citizens, groups of citizens, and institutions, by creating and promoting good leadership. So, today we will focus on very concrete aspects, tools for projects and activities of democratization.

One thing I want to highlight first is, that often we exchange words and argue about what is believed to be democracy and what is democratization. I think it is very important to go beyond words when we are trying to connect across cultures, and focus on what are the values that culture and societies believe in, when we try to communicate democratization goals - how is it that particular culture will understand it. So, for every civil society organization and government, it is very important to define what is democratization in indigenous cultures and in terms of country specific philosophy. Mahatma Gandhi in India defined democratization in one word which is "Swaraj." It means self-government. It is the ability of people, institutions and the country to understand the responsibility of self-governance, In other words, we have to take responsibility and work hard to define what governance is and how you want to participate as a citizen.

The second thing I want to mention, which is the topic for today, is why civil society is important to governance. A university student today told me something critical, after I explained what was I doing at this workshop, She said that civil society must go beyond government. This is what I would like to emphasize – governance is much more than just about governments. It is about civil society's

91

understanding of what is good governance. I am using the term "civil society" to indicate that around the world, there are so many different stakeholders in civil society. NGO is just one representation of civil society groups' ability to organize. So, throughout this presentation, I will focus on the term "civil society" to include multiple stakeholders and multiple leaderships and institutions.

Let us focus for a minute on what are the broader contexts that are pushing us to think about democratization in the 21st century after all these years of very serious thinking about what kind of governments and what kind of societies are we trying to create! We have already reflected on what is the issue at hand, and at the moment, there is an emerging belief that there is a deficit of democracy around the world, in industrially advanced countries as well as countries that are emerging as strong economies with the potential for strong governments. There are multiple reasons behind this. One is even if we have a strong government, they might not necessarily be inclusive governments. The feeling among young people around the world is that governments are not representing well to their needs, so their trust is declining. Young people's trust in the government is declining, even though countries like the United States invest a lot in democracy. Why is this happening? There are various aspects of this phenomenon: even if we had a democratic government, interest in democracy is declining. In many countries, governments should be clear about the feelings of its citizens and effectively respond to citizen needs, especially providing services which are

very critical for citizens. So, there are multiple aspects to why poor governance exists and why there are deficits of democracy around the world.

The second very important reality is that as we become more connected, it becomes increasingly hard to understand the complexity of cultures and to recognize the value of diversity. There is a wide presence of multiple voices, multiple cultures and multiple societies that are very different and not homogeneous around the world. This is pushing all of us to become better human beings, become more inclusive people and leaders, and create institutions which recognize the principles of diversity.

Finally, there is the very important global challenge in ODA culture and international development. We are very used to segmented approaches, as we usually say I belong to this sector, I belong to this institution. I think the democratization debate is pushing us to go beyond these sector specific, issue specific aspects of project design, and look at how we can work in partnerships across cultures, sectors and how we can connect government with civil society. This is a global challenge we all need to take on to deliver much better service to all citizens around the world.

Very quickly, I want to focus on three broad categorizations of international NGOs approaches to democratization, that essentially focuses on connecting citizens and civil society on one hand and government and government institutions on the other hand. A first important area is good governance. I want to emphasize, as did Roland Rich in the morning, that governance

is not just about elections. The real governance comes in between two elections. Between these important events which represent beginning points of democracy. What happens in-between elections are the most important aspects of democratization. Policy advocacy, service delivery, monitoring elections and making sure good policies are in place in between elections is one approach to strengthening democratization, an important aspect of many international NGOs' work. They are working with groups around the world to focus on good governance projects.

A second important aspect is to recognize and fight for human rights, which goes much beyond projects. It is important to support social movements. In other words, we must absolutely respect and value that minorities, vulnerable populations are equal citizens like any other citizens who should have proper access to food, services, education, water or all other aspects of good governance. These are basic human rights and they are also addressed in the UN Millennium Development Goals. I think human rights recognition cuts across all Millennium Development Goals.

And finally, international NGOs have a fundamental responsibility to become ideal leaders. We, of course, receive funds from donor agencies. But I think it is our responsibility to not just take those funds and implement our programs in a responsible way, but also bring innovation and learning back to the donors and share what are good practices, what we have been learning at the grassroots level. And the same is applied to local groups and local NGOs. Let's not forget that we are leaders in thinking,

in changing and in innovation. So, here is a model we have adopted at World Learning which can be used as a framework. There is no ideal model, and looking at the model, there are two points or aspects of the importance of governance to look at – the supply-side governance where the governments are very critical, and the demand-side governance where citizens and civil society are absolutely critical. The important role all can play as civil society and institutions is what we have in the center – what are the main issues that we need to prioritize because we cannot solve everything immediately. On the tools for the process of democratization, as Roland pointed out, democratization must be understood as a process that requires clear goals and objectives.

An important strategic component here is to have a context map while trying to design the project. This helps us to understand what needs are, and address issues that bring civil society groups of citizens and connect them with various levels of the government. We look at national government structures and sub-national government policies and programs ,and we look at how district level implementation is taking place, what are the gaps. Ultimately our target is to have multi-stakeholder groups, religious groups, and community level groups to connect with various levels of governance. On the side of demand, I would like to treat NGOs as just one component of an increasingly complex group of civil society stakeholders, which are often in conflict with each other. This internal competition creates tensions that will always be difficult to work with. We have to support NGOs, increasingly coalitions of NGOs, which is not

easy to manage, but very important to have for national level policy impact. We have grassroots level community stakeholders. We have professional leaders who are representing the community. We have schools and teachers. We have religious organizations and religious leaders. We have traditional, indigenous civil society networks that we must pay attention to as emerging leadership groups in civil society. NGOs comprise most of institutions of civil society, but every country has indigenous civil society that has existed for centuries. We have trade unions and we have indigenous groups. And another important element, which I think in Japan's case is a very important player, is the private sector. I was very curious to hear yesterday about the "peace corporation". It would be very interesting to see how the private sector can champion peace.

Now let us come to some concrete approaches. We adopted a methodology to design democratization projects in various countries. The first thing we do is to map the historical relationship between the state and civil society for each country. Just to give you an idea, which you can expand on however you like. There are three models outlined here because I think they are relevant. One model is the historical relationship that represents weak states and weak civil societies. The country examples are Angola and Ethiopia. Angola is a very particular case because the state is not weak in terms of resource such as diamonds and oil, but the commitment of the state and the presence of institutions are not strong. The second model would be strong state and emerging civil societies. Here, we use the term "strong states"

to represent authoritarian states. In the case of a historically strong authoritarian and/or royal states, you can imagine well that in these contexts civil society is still struggling to emerge. Morocco and Russia are two examples. The third model is the strong state and strong civil society scenario. India and Brazil are obvious cases.

I would like to present four country specific democratization program approaches that we had implemented and are implementing in the process of learning. In Angola, we're focusing on post conflict state situation and society. Civil society is very weak. What we have learnt there is that it is very important to focus on developing human resources and institutional capacity of the government and civil society simultaneously. Because of weak human resources and very weak education system, even the government and ministry staff themselves are learning what public budgets are and how you distribute those. We are working together to train government officials, ministries and civil society simultaneously. We were also focusing on national level coalitions which allows better access to the very poor population of Angola. We focused on transparency coalitions to establish the principle of good governance in a post conflict context where corruption can be human issue.

The second program model is from Morocco, where the King is implementing the new family law. This is the refined and newly introduced family law, which has for the first time given equal rights to all the members of the family including women. So, for the first time in Morocco, women have property rights, divorce rights, rights to have custody of children, rights

to learn legal justice, and rights to inheritance in Morocco. It is very interesting to see that the King is more positive and that the parliament is more conservative. On the program design front, we created a nationwide campaign for understanding what this new law means in terms of a woman's ability to address a simple issue in her family. We also trained ministries and officials across the government. So that they understand now that when they implement new laws, they must involve many parties – justice ministries, police, women, family members etc.

In Albania, we focused on citizen participation in the poverty reduction plan of the Government of Albania. They developed their plans in collaboration with the World Bank PRSP programs. We focused on a very simple tool which can bring profound changes. The tools are called citizen report cards. The commune leaders and citizens, men and women, come together to meet local officials to prioritize and assess the quality of government services at the commune level. They then identify implementation needs and needs for services within the community. At the time, officials were very surprised that the needs identified at the ministry level did not necessarily reflect some of the priorities of the community.

Finally, we are about to launch a project in Indonesia for five years. It is a governance and religious pluralism project. It will focus on how we can intervene in Indonesia at the very opportune moment, in a preventive way to talk about pluralism in governance and political processes in Indonesia. As you know, in the past, Indonesia has had a very strong government and a civil society that is emerging,

and it is very important that pluralistic civil society inform governments and support governments in Indonesia that respect the value of pluralism in the future.

I will stop at that, and end with three quick reflections. As somebody told me in Japan, and I'm taking back that message with me, 'civil society work has to go beyond the government'. Civil society has to reflect the aspirations of the people in a country. Yesterday Roland had raised this - while we implement civil society democratization projects that are short-term in nature, democratization is a long-term process. How do we achieve the best results in a short term? What can contribute to long term profound changes? Finally, let us have the value of respecting diversity and cultures. As Gandhi said, "Change begins at home. We have to be the change that we want to see in other people." Thank you.

Dr. Hata, Moderator

Thank you very much Dr. Mehta, who presented from an international NGO's perspective. Thank you for your insightful speech. The word mentioned by Gandhi, "Swaraj.", has an inclusive and diverse value. This should be received and appreciated. Many stakeholders take part in democracy support. Among them are international NGOS, and the role of international NGOs is to decide how they can fill the gap between demand and supply side and who should be accountable for it. The mapping is also important. International NGOs should respect each nations' indigenous differences and try to promote what is needed for local reasons.

(2) Democracy Support by Local NGO

Ms. Igballe Rogova

Executive Director, Kosova Women's Network

Opening Remarks

Arigatou. I would also like to thank the organizers who gave me the opportunity to be here today with you. And I want to say that for me also this is my first time in Japan, and I am very impressed with two things. One is how nice and kind people are here. And second, I am very impressed with your food. And now I understand why Japanese people live longer because you eat very healthy foods.

Let me in the beginning take this opportunity to thank the Japanese government and organizations for all the aid given to Kosova, especially after the war during the time of reconstruction. And later, as Mr. Rich mentioned, Japan was also involved in supporting many countries through UNDEF and through UNDP. And we receive funding from UNDEF and UNDP as well, so thank you for all your support.

Background on KWN

In the beginning I will give you some background about Kosovo Women's Network, which I will call from now on KWN, which was established in 2000, and was originally a very informal network of women's groups and organizations from various regions in Kosova. Since its inception, KWN has developed into a network that advocates on behalf of Kosovar women, at the local, regional, and international level. Representing the interests of 85 women's organizations of all ethnic backgrounds throughout Kosova, KWN is a leading network in Kosova and in the region. Several of KWN's network members have over ten years of experience in community development.

And the mission of KWN is to support, protect, and promote the rights and interests of women and girls throughout Kosova, regardless of their political beliefs, religion, age, level of education, and ability. KWN fulfills its mission through the exchange of experience, information, partnerships and networking, research, advocacy, and service.

KWN has undertaken numerous advocacy efforts related to democratic development both locally and internationally, often related to greater involvement of women in post-conflict decision-making processes. For its efforts, KWN has received support from UNDEF, UNIFEM, UNFPA, UNICEF, and other international donor organizations.

Introduction

Today I want to provide some concrete examples of how KWN and its member organizations in Kosova have worked at the local, national, and regional level to support democratic development. I will show through case studies how democracy is usually a cross-cutting theme for NGOs working in all fields, including health and education. I hope that these examples will give you some ideas regarding how you can best support democratic

development, based on our experience in Kosova.

First, I will describe the important role that NGOs in Kosova played in democracy support and development during the 1990s while under Serbian regime. Second, I will discuss the lessons learned from the United Nations Mission in Kosova, from now on UNMIK, including how the UN administration often failed to support democratic development in Kosova. Third, I will provide examples of the recent and continued efforts of NGOs in Kosova to support democratic development in our country.

I will close with lessons learned from democracy support in Kosova. Considering mission and experience that we have, I will highlight the involvement of women in democratic development as a cross-cutting theme.

NGO's Support of Democracy during the 1990s in Kosova

Before the war in 1999, women and men in Kosova shared leadership responsibilities politically, socially, and economically. In fact, Kosova had a woman president when its autonomy was revoked in 1989. When the Serbian regime led by Slobodon Milosevic took control of Kosova, almost all Kosovar Albanians were dismissed from their jobs in public institutions. This is almost two million people. Under communism, this meant that Albanians working in the health, education, and government institutions were all unemployed for a decade.

In this situation, some of the first "NGOs" were formed in Kosova. For example, the Mother Teresa Association, named after the

ethnic Albanian nun Mother Teresa, opened more than 60 community-based health clinics, which provided healthcare to the Kosovar Albanian population who could not afford and often did not trust the Serb-run health institutions. Kosovar Albanian doctors who had been ousted from their jobs volunteered at these clinics. Only a few healthcare administrators received minimal salaries; the vast majority of this parallel healthcare system was voluntary. The Mother Teresa society also organized humanitarian aid for families in need throughout Kosova.

Similarly, former political leaders organized a parallel governing system, including holding elections for the parallel government. Citizens contributed by secretly spreading information about the "illegal" elections and opening back rooms of their shops as polling stations. The parallel government organized a parallel education system. Again, it was staffed by teachers and professors who had been ousted from their jobs by Serb regime. Most of their efforts were also voluntary. All citizens who could give 3 percent of the money had to support the parallel government and education system as part of a voluntary tax system. While the education system depended heavily on international aid, citizens were involved as a civil society in supporting this system as much as they were able.

To complement these efforts and at the same time to ensure that women received healthcare and education, some of the first women's organizations in Kosova opened. Motrat Qiriazi, founded by my sister, her husband, and I in 1989 we started this

organization, raised awareness about the importance of education of women. Our organization opened branches throughout Kosova where activists in each community raised awareness about the importance of education. During 1990s, when books in the Albanian language were forbidden, we secretly transported books into the country and opened underground libraries. We helped local citizens raise funds abroad to build schools in their communities when the Selb regime was closing Albanian language schools.

Another leading women's organization, called the Centre for Protection of Women and Children, opened in the early 1990s to provide healthcare for woman in hard to reach areas and to document human rights abuses against women. It was among the first organizations to address the issue of violence against women in Kosova.

Another organization, called the Council for Defense of Human Rights and Freedoms, also opened in 1989 to document human rights abuses against Kosovar Albanians, and to spread this information internationally to human rights groups. Women and men activists volunteering full-time for the council risked their lives transporting information through the mountains when roads were blocked, in order to raise international awareness about massacres occurring in rural areas. Many other citizens volunteered for local NGOs, delivering humanitarian aid to areas under siege, reporting to foreign media about human rights issues in Kosova, and organizing peaceful public demonstrations to raise international awareness about the situation.

Citizens' volunteerism characterized civil society in Kosova during the 1990s. I want to emphasize that although Kosovar NGOs received support from international NGOs and development organizations, Kosovar Albanians started and developed these NGOs in Kosova during the 1990s. Civil society was thus born in Kosova, not brought in by internationals seeking to develop democracy. This is an important differentiation to make, as some international organizations seem to believe, wrongly, that they bring civil society and democracy to "developing" and post-conflict countries.

The United Nations Enters Kosova

While more than a decade we had a peaceful resistance and called for international support for self-determination (considering the numerous documented human rights abuses against the Albanian majority in Kosova), it was the war that brought international attention to Kosova. Perhaps you recall hearing about Kosova on the news in 1999, when more than a million Kosovar Albanians, more than half the population, were displaced from their homes. Following a NATO bombing campaign, the Serb authorities eventually surrendered.

On June 10, 1999, the United Nations Security Council adopted Security Council Resolution 1244, which provided the United Nations Mission in Kosova with the mandate to govern Kosova until its final political status could be decided. At first, most Kosovar women activists were excited to have UNMIK in Kosova. We expected that such revered international institutions as the UNMIK and Organization for Security and Cooperation in

Europe (OSCE) would bring with them higher standards for gender equality and women's participation in political decision-making. We were eager to work with the international agencies in developing effective strategies for responding to the pressing needs of Kosovar women and men. Since democratic development was central to its mission, we assumed that the UNMIK would consult with local people, including women, regarding their political preferences and in making decisions for reconstructing Kosova. We were wrong.

UNMIK and international development organizations often failed to involve already-existing local NGOs in their reconstruction efforts. They preferred to start new organizations to deliver aid so that they could claim in their reports that they have contributed to the development of a new civil society in Kosova. This ignored the experience that activists and citizens already had in the 1990s.

Instead of bringing an inclusive model for democratic institution, the UN imposed a patriarchal system in Kosova. Let me give you one of many examples. In September 1999, the OSCE organized a meeting between civil society and OSCE staff under the pretense of increasing communication between the international governing administration (OSCE and UNMIK) and local people. However, not one woman was invited to this meeting. When asked why, OSCE representative said, "Kosova is a patriarchal society." Although women had been included in decision-making in Kosova before the war, it was OSCE representatives that did not bring them into discussions in the new "democracy."

Only one of the UNMIK Special Representatives to the Secretary General, whose name is Søren Jessen-Petersen, was eager to involve women in the process. Others completely marginalized women, failing to involve or consult with them on key decisions. Rather than supporting development, the leadership of these international institutions imposed a patriarchal system, setting a poor example for new Kosovar Leaders. Thus, UNMIK not only failed to support true democracy, as per its mission, but it also failed to implement its own Resolution 1325 on Woman, War, and Security, adopted in October 2000, which "Urges Member States to ensure increased representation of women at all decision-making levels in national, regional and international institutions and mechanisms for the prevention, management, and resolution of conflict."

Instead of dedicating our energy to supporting reconstruction in Kosova, women activists expended much time and effort fighting to be heard by international decision-makers and undertaking efforts to prove to UNMIK that we were experienced experts and we knew what was best for our communities. We had to prove to them time and time again that women in Kosova were not just victims waiting to be helped; we could help ourselves, as we did during the 1990s, and we could be effective actors in building our future together with international community.

Local NGOs Supporting Democracy after 1999

Considering that women have been left

out of decision-making in Kosova, KWN efforts since the war have often focused on developing a democracy that involves women. For example, prior to the 2004 national assembly elections, KWN cooperated with its member organizations in all 30 municipalities to organize meetings with women citizens where they expressed their political priorities. KWN created a booklet with these priorities, which KWN activists took to all Kosova's political parties and electoral candidates. KWN advocated to the parties and politicians to address women's political priorities in their party platforms.

Another example of KWN's involvement in democratic development is the Reforma 2004 campaign. Since the end of the war, Kosova had a closed list electoral system, which meant that citizens elected political parties rather than individual political leaders. The close list system made it difficult for citizens to hold elected officials accountable because they did not elect a person, only a party. Therefore they did not have a person to whom they could address their concerns. That is another example of how we were involved in democracy campaign in Kosova.

Support for democracy has been a cross-cutting theme in the efforts of numerous other NGOs in Kosova. NGOs have brought citizens' needs to the attention of municipal and national decision-makers; ensuring that citizens' priorities are heard and addressed by politicians is important for building democracy. For example, NGOs have advocated often successfully:

- We advocated for the government to subsidize the building of schools in rural areas so more girls and boys can afford to attend higher levels of education;

- We advocated for the municipal government to help finance the paving of new roads that has made accessing healthcare and education easier for citizens in rural areas.

- We advocated for the government to finish building an oncological institute for screening of breast cancer, a serious health issue plaguing women in Kosova.

- We advocated for the Ministry of Labor and Social Welfare to partially fund shelters for women and children who have experienced violence.

I would like to finish by mentioning some international development organizations that have been effective and have often involved local NGOs in planning and implementing projects to develop democracy in Kosova. For example:

- As I mentioned earlier, UNDEF has supported a project designed by KWN that is bringing together women activists from Serbia and Kosova to identify priorities for democratic development locally and regionally. At the same time, the project is supporting inter-ethnic cooperation between activists.

- UNFPA supported a project designed by KWN that brought much-needed resources to shelters for women and children, as well as helped shelters strategize and conduct research necessary for pressuring the

government to better support shelters.

- I want to mention the Swedish International Development Agency and Kvinna till Kvinna and STAR network of World Learning. They provided invaluable assistance to activists, building capacities identified by activists themselves as needed areas of expertise and assisting with securing for activists' work, as well as advocacy efforts.

And I would be very happy to continue on this topic later during the workshop. Thank you very much for your attention. Thank you.

Dr. Hata, Moderator

Thank you, Ms. Rogova. We heard such stories of NGO's support for democracy including an NGO named after the ethnic Albanian Mother Teresa, how endogenous activities occurred, how people who were living there actually stood up to act, emphasizing education, and where voluntary people played really important roles. Also, she offered a sharp criticism to UNMIK, saying that they had notably disregarded women. She also presented the importance of the partnership between local NGOs and international NGOs.

(3) Democracy Support by Japanese NGO

Mr. Michiya Kumaoka

Co-Representative, People's Forum on Cambodia, Japan

I would like to thank the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Shanti Volunteer Association, Mr. Roland Rich, other panelists and the audience here. I thank you all for coming to this meeting despite the fact that this is a Saturday morning.

I will be talking about what we did as Japanese NGOs for Cambodia. We have members of the public and also professionals like lawyers and professors, and NGOs such as Japan Volunteer Center (JVC), SHARE and Shanti Volunteer Association (SVA) which are action-oriented and work on the ground.

Having heard the story from Kosovo or elsewhere, we often talk about democratization in post-conflict situation. But even before and during conflicts, you can talk democratization, though it is very difficult to introduce democracy. In a region where the respect of human rights is lacking, it is very important to respect human rights by providing both mental and physical supports. But in post conflicts, we also have the process of reconciliation. Reconciliation, the process of democratic integration, or social economic development sometimes takes decades or several decades. As Mr. Rich has already mentioned, the aspect of democracy has to cover a lot of grounds such as political, legal, social and economic grounds.

Now, about Cambodia. I cannot go into detail about the history. The people experienced

Vietnam War, and internal conflicts followed the bad atrocities under the Khmer Rouge rule. As the result, we had a large population of refugees. It was since then that many Japanese took part in providing support. Before the establishment of People's Forum in Cambodia in 1993, I would talk primarily about JVC.

What I say now may duplicate with what has already been said, but it's very difficult and almost impossible to talk about democratization without understanding the background of the country. In Cambodia, it was very important for us to understand language, culture, religion, values, history and social order. Particularly it's very important to understand the sense of pride people have.

This is Cambodia. It is an agricultural society. There is landscapes which look very peaceful on the surface. It looks pretty normal, peaceful, and the kind of society and country which has fishing villages. But at the same time, they experienced the atrocities from the Vietnam War, and the Khmer Rouge rule. Only seven people survived in a concentration camp where a count of 20,000 died. About one survivor, he was a painter and an artist. He painted many pictures of the atrocities (Annex2-2, Slide 12).

We met many individuals there. From them, we learnt the importance of democratization and human rights. Mr. Thun Saray, he was a political prisoner at a prison,

under Heng Samlin Administration. He was also in prison during the Khmer Rouge era. Due to the very poor conditions of the prison, he suffered from several diseases. As a result of the Paris Peace Accord in 1991, he was released and survived. He was offered important positions by many political parties, but he refused and established an NGO on human rights. It was called ADHOC (Cambodian Human Rights and Development Association) in Cambodia.

After he was released, he still suffering physically, but he established ADHOC and he had an office in a temple to protect himself and his organization. It's a very Cambodian way of security and thinking. because it is Buddhist temple, and is seldom attacked. He adopted two approaches – one is basing his office in a temple, and other one is working together with an Irish lady. Whenever he and other members walk around in the country, the Irish lady always accompanies them. He has recovered physically since then, and he is very active right now.

We established the People's Forum in Cambodia because we were concerned about the development process in Cambodia and we needed to act as Japanese citizens to provide support about the process. So we worked together with organizations like ADHOC, COMFREL (Committee for Free and Fair Elections in Cambodia), NICFEC (Neutral and Impartial Committee for Free and Fair Elections in Cambodia) and other organizations to observe elections and also to educate public about elections. There were already those coalitions of local NGOs in Cambodia.

In July 1997, there was a coup d' etat situation in Cambodia. There were two factions fighting with each other. They clashed. During that period, assistance was suspended. We could not communicate with NGOs in Cambodia. So we entered Cambodia from Vietnam to provide support to Cambodian NGOs. Sometimes their cooperation with international NGOs put them into very difficult positions. Sometimes our help did not work better for them. But they asked us to act together. Thus, we cooperated with the coalitions like Forum Asia and ANFREL (Asian Network for Free Elections), and met with police officers and politicians, and asked them not to prosecute and arrest people. That was how we spent our first three months there. Also, we began human rights education for government officials, police, et cetera. I think that helped improve the human rights situation for the better in Cambodia. Also, we got involved in the election process. We provided election education for governmental employees and also NGOs, which was instrumental in holding a round table discussion for conflicting parties. These are pictures of elections. People from Cambodia and Japan worked together in regional organizations for elections and monitoring fair and free elections. We interviewed people who were pressurized. In 1998, there were demonstrations before the results of elections and was like Myanmar's situation right now, where monks were demonstrating. But again, NGOs helped to calm the situation.

What is needed is a comprehensive perspective, which pushes away those culture of violence and culture of impunity, in order to deal with that kind of situation in a comprehensive

way. There are many other issues like the land issues. People with political and economic power are robbing people of their land. As a result, we have an increasing number of people giving up their own land, becoming landless and homeless people. We had advocacy activities for landless situation, as well as poverty situations, homeless and trafficking issues.

What we also need is cooperation with international community, in particular lawyers here in Japan. Japanese lawyers are providing assistance in legal affairs and I think you can give a lot of credit to Japanese lawyers who provided legal assistance in devising new penal codes or civic codes for Cambodia. What we also need is institutions. A fair trial is needed, otherwise, if you go to court, you lose your land. We have to help people get fair trials. That has to be discoursed in the transparent manner. There will be a large Khmer Rouge trial in 2008. Cambodian is looking at the situation with complex emotions.

We have been in close alignments with Cambodian NGOs. In terms of common ground of democracy support, the monitoring on the day of polling and vote counting were rather limited activities. It should be of a longer span, with a more holistic monitoring, in terms of educating voters as well as police and public service members

Expanding the scope of my talk, for poverty eradication, social development and rural development, those links are vital. There are some groups we have got together in education empowerment to voters like NICFEC and COMFREL. We also support Cambodian

people as they are a part of civil society. There are many people illiterate in rural parts, so we might use music or theatrical performance (Annex 2-2, Slide 33,34). We emphasized "don't sell your vote," "even if you do sell, you should not sell your spirit" and "try vote for what you believe." NICFEC and COMFREL are in the urban areas providing education training to voters (Annex 2-2, Slide 35).

This year, there will be a general election. Basically, it is going to be conducted by Cambodian people and Cambodian communities. But there are some requests coming from Cambodia for collaboration between Cambodian local NGOs and us. We are providing support for registration of voters, educating people, monitoring on polling date, and opening of vote envelopes. Also we are preparing for any confusion after the vote. ANFREL, UNDP and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs are also helping us in this effort. With COMFREL, we have been working closely together in order to conduct surveys for a local general election to take place. There have been cases of victims from opposition party being threatened. Headquarters is doing some interviews and research.

At the same time, we are likely to catch up quickly and establish democracy earlier, with the separation of three powers. Empowerment is very important. We classify these levels because it is needed to approach top leaders level in order to advocate on the policy. Maybe to civil servants, we should let them understand the situation first, but how are we going to approach leaders? I think the issue of

dealing with top leaders is going to be equal to big issues such as regional development, rural development and democracy from grassroots, focusing on gender.

Exchanging and sharing experience between them and us is important. For NGOs here in Japan, we believe in the philosophy that we need to enhance based on activities we have done for twenty years. But if we have enough funding, we would like to expand our own activities. We must employ inclusive human resources, and as Mr. Rich and yesterday's speakers told us, multiple CSOs and actors should be in alliance with local actors to promote and enhance activities. Thank you very much.

Dr. Hata, Moderator

Thank you very much, Mr. Kumaoka. Representing a Japanese NGOs, he introduced how it has been getting involved with democratic governance, especially as its activities paid special attention to cultures and political background. Namely, in the case of election monitoring, as well as the issue of land rights. Institutions vary by country, for example in Cambodia, all land rights were vanished under the Pol Pot administration. Another example that I know is in Afghanistan where the older land title has the greater power of proof. So, he pointed out the importance of land rights and also in the significance of legal assistance, social development assistance, and rural development assistance. It is test and challenge to NGOs to act with a clear vision.

(4) Comment and Q&A

Moderator	Dr. Tatsuya Hata, Executive Director, Shanti Volunteer Association
Presenters	Dr. Preeti Shroff-Mehta, Director, Civil Society and Governance Program, World Learning
	Ms. Igballe Rogova, Executive Director, Kosova Women's Network
	Mr. Michiya Kumaoka, Co-Rpresentative, People's Forum on Cambodia
Commentator	Mr. Roland Rich, Executive Head, UNDEF

Dr. Tatsuya Hata

Now, moving on, I would like to get comment from Mr. Rich.

Mr. Roland Rich

Thank you very much, Dr. Hata. I think we have heard three excellent case studies from three very admirable civil society organizations. What I would like to talk about for a few minutes is what we, the managers of the funding processes, expect from the NGOs working in this field. Let me quote this in short saying by Henry Brantley: "Enthusiasm is not sufficient." And often NGOs think "because they are volunteering", "because they have such enthusiasm", that should be sufficient. It is not. "Representing your interest group" or "the vulnerable group let you work with" is also insufficient in itself. Even being right on any particular issue that you are working on is insufficient. What we need from NGOs are much more difficult and require complicated skills.

They need to show great competence. They need to be competent in understanding politics, not just local politics, not just national politics, but also the international politics of the situation. They need to understand how change

occurs, how to be change agents, how to support change agents. And I also think they need to understand the scholarship involved in the particular issue. They need to understand the best practices and even some of the theoretical underpinnings of what they are doing. So, the one thing we are looking for is competence.

Second thing we are looking for in NGOs that work in this field is effectiveness. We need to see them produce the apples that they say that they are going to produce. That often requires that they have achievable and measurable goals in what they are going to do and in the apples they are going to put for it. Sometimes when I see an application or an intention by NGOs that says they want to eliminate corruption, my first thought is that it is impossible, that is far too ambitious a goal. Had it said "we will work towards getting corruption to tolerable levels where it does not distort political processes", that is a far more achievable objective. And so you need to be very effective in the way you do things.

You need to be able to defend your actions. There is no point in gains as I said being right if it ends up leading to you breaking local laws or making enemies of local warlords. So, such actions in this kind of work is not going to

106

be sustainable in that regard. And I think Dr. Preeti was saying very important point. Sometimes, to be effective, you need to cooperate with each other. And in my experience that is one of the hardest things for NGOs to do. It is to get together as an umbrella organization because it is as an umbrella organization that politicians will listen to you far more than as individual NGO. So being effective, being competent is two very important things you are looking for.

Then finally, I think it is also important that NGOs remain idealistic. This is where the idealism in society is being generated. This is where the innovation is coming from in a lot of ways, the sort of processes. A lot of the ideas that are coming from this changing society come from civil society. Some come from politicians. Some come from bureaucrats. Some come from academia. But many of the ideas must be generated by civil society.

And if I might just put a final warning in this regard, all these things tend to put a spot light on the civil society organizations. And it seems to me that it is even more damaging when a civil society organization acts unethically than when such actions are undertaken by politician or private enterprise company, because what we are looking for is the highest standards of ethics from civil society organizations and one of the things that I think NGOs can do when they work in the field is to work on a code of conduct. Stick to that code of conduct, and they are able to defend their actions and their ethics when they work in this often very difficult area with many gray areas. What exactly is right and what exactly is wrong may not be completely clear.

So I might have done as it sounds too preachy, but in this regard, I am hoping that this is a sort of helpful advice because where an NGO can show that it is more than just enthusiastic and good representative but is an effective and competent actor with high ethics and ideals, that is the sort of NGO the international community is looking for. Thank you.

Dr. Tatsuya Hata

Thank you, Mr. Rich. I think, for Japanese NGOs, he struck home the truth and weak point. I understood that NGOs must not go around only with the ideal, cautioning myself as well. However, I hear that even in Japan, various networks and further activities on an issue by issue basis are being taken actively. So, I look forward to ongoing progress.

Now, I would like to open the floor for questions and answers.

Question 1

I have two questions to Mr. Rich. One is how we should collaborate in a cross-sectional way. We have a theme for it called "Power to the Edge", which means the actors in "Edge" should have stronger power, we think. Without explaining more in more detail, such actors are generally called "civil society", leading to defocusing. I would like get some comment on this.

The other question is about the theory of ownership and exchange, which I think has not been established enough. In Japan, we have one example of the concept "commons" named in Japanese "Iriai-chi", from long before the

Taisho Democracy movement, which Mr. Rich mentioned. I think it was through this very fact that Japan had traditionally kept its own democracy, which was destroyed after the World War II. So we think we should revive such a concept. We think unless we figure out this issue theoretically, we can not realize the theory of ownership and exchange. I would also like get some comment on this.

Question 2

I have questions to Mr. Rich and Ms. Preeti. I understand you pointed out that civic education occupies a key place in sustaining liberal democracy. I agree with that. Then where do you think civic education assisted by NGOs should stand in relation to public education by the government in a country? What I mean is whether the NGO will get swallowed up by the government or will the government cotinue to keep some distance?

Furthermore, I would also like to ask how, in such civic education by NGOs, we should deal with specific virtues, ethics, or religious beliefs, which has been a controversial topic in the U.S. since John Rawls delivered it.

Question 3

I have a question to Ms. Preeti. I understand you explained about democratization assistance beyond election in terms of those that NGOs are involved with. In the explanation, you said that we have to achieve short-term results with understanding the importance of having a long-term perspective. I would like you to tell us the detailed example of those short-term results.

Question 4

I have a question to Mr. Rich. In your slide titled "Aspects of Democracy Promotion" you explained that there are various menus to democratization assistance. I would like to ask you how you can prioritize them. In this regard, Ms. Preeti showed in her presentation a really interesting scheme, which is a matrix of strength of nation and civil society. I understand that in those combination patterns, for example a combination of "weak state and weak civil society" needs democratization assistance both to nation and to civil society. As for other examples, in the case of the combination of "Strong state and weak civil society" you can consider to set priorities for the assistance to civil society. On the contrary case, you can prioritize the assistance to the nation such as election observation or parliament assistance. I would like you to tell your opinion about what kind of menu in democratization assistance you should prioritize considering limited funds.

Mr. Roland Rich

Thank you Dr. Hata. Let me try to give three facts that perhaps I could go in reversal order. Discussing this issue of priority is a bit of a devil in the aid community, as well as the development and democracy promotion community as well. And I have an unsatisfactory answer to give – it depends on circumstances. In some places, it is obvious that where an authoritarian administration has fallen, sometimes you simply must have this transitional election to take place and then a lot of resources go into that election because it seems essential that take place. Generally,

though, I do not think you can prioritize in any sort of general sense and as a template and applying it to different countries. You have to look at each country in the way it is. And sometimes you have to take advantage of an opportunity that is available. Sometimes it could be a champion, a local champion over particular issue and international community's lowest support to a champion. So this means a lot of theoretical work done, on sequencing, on whether or not challenge is best adopted by the big-bang approach, which worked very well in Poland, but failed completely in Russia. It is very hard to give one answer. I think the best answer is that you need a lot of knowledge about the society you are working with. And I think that was a comment that was made by one of the panelists as well

On the issue of a role of NGO in civic education, it depends very much on again the situation you are dealing with. In some circumstances, the state takes it upon itself to conduct civic education, putting the resources in its elected commission on the education ministry to do that work. Maybe in those situations, the role of NGOs is to ask "are any groups falling through the safety net?", "are any vulnerable groups not receiving that civic education and not able to access the situation, the powers of a state, and access the resources of the state?" So that might be one area where the state is not providing civic education then civil society groups have to work out where they can be most effective. It might be effective in writing text books for primary schools or they might be effective in discussion groups of adult education. Again, I do not think there is one template or

one lesson for all things.

I think the first question is about the lands and the commons. Problems in Japan, of course, I can not comment on the particular situation, but what I can say is that the issue of lands is underneath and a trigger for many disputes and problems in many and virtually all countries in the world. Access to lands, use of lands, fairness in the use of lands especially agricultural lands and especially the commons is one of these very difficult issues to deal with. And I think we can not give a solution to any particular problem except to say one needs to have a process, a democratic process that allows proper deliberation and proper decision-making in public, transparently, about the use of that land. And where you have transparent public deliberative processes on the use of land, I think we get much better outcome on that use. Thank you.

Dr. Preeti Shroff-Mehta

I am trying to respond very quickly. But I will explain more during the afternoon sessions when we will go into this area systematically, because it is very difficult to answer very quickly "how do you prioritize? What are you going to do to achieve the results?" But I am going to show one of the slides I am going to use at the workshop later (Annex 3-2 Slide 3). It is about the need to have clarity. This I cannot over-emphasize. In NGO planning process, we often begin with very ambitious goals, and it becomes very difficult when we come to the project planning stage and implementation stage. What are the three most important things that we want to achieve at the

end? And the clarity that I mentioned has four levels, and there are some questions here that will guide us in the afternoon session to come to that.

Clarity is critical in terms of what is the issue you are trying to address. Democratization is a process. And you want to design a process of democratization to ultimately address what? Is it about poor peoples' ability to have access to HIV/AIDS medication? Is it woman's ability to have birth certificate to enter children in school? Have that clarity because there is something very important that you want to achieve at the end of democratization process. So clarity in terms of what is the issue you are addressing. Clarity in terms of who are the clients, the citizen you are trying to reach - you cannot reach everyone through one project. Have that clarity. Clarity in terms of what are the expectations of the clients. One mistake NGOs often make, and that's how projects fail, we come in with very big philosophy and ideas and raise so many expectations, and if you cannot meet those, then it creates huge problems during the project implementation phase. So, you have to manage those expectations and goals in terms of your program goals, activity and results clarity.

Finally, it is something very important to keep in mind. Focus not just on your strength in terms of designing and delivering a project, please focus on and be clear about your limitation. I might want to design a perfect project but do I have the funding to achieve the goals of that project? In case when funding is a hundred and twenty thousands dollars, I cannot transform the society in one year. Let's be very

clear about that limitation. And it is very useful to be clear about what are the limitations in terms of the country context, culture, and resources that might be available.

And then now I will quickly answer the other specific questions in terms of civic education. It is very important to link formal education institutions with NGOs because, keep in mind, around the world so many children never make it to school, so even if you design civic education within schools, probably 60 to 70 per cent of rural children, many who live and learn in urban slams, the victims of conflict, are never going to make it to school, even if they make it to school, they will drop out. So civic education efforts must link what schools and government can do through formal education and what can be done outside, which is probably the reality of 70 per cent of children around the world.

The other example is "how do you focus on adult learners?" Civic and citizenship education is absolutely about young learners, but it is also about adult learners, farmers, women workers, landless workers, 'slaves', traditional leaders, and religious leaders. They all need to get enrolled in civic education. So civic education is all-inclusive efforts that need to connect the different stakeholders with each other even if civic education is targeting one group.

In terms of some of the examples that I want to give about targeted activities that can achieve long-term goals, and here the ultimate goal, for example, is social change and society. We are not going to see the ultimate change in our one-year project or two-year project, but

what you are going to see is some skills that have been developed, that will ultimately lead to broader change. In the short run, you are going to see human resource development. You are going to be able to see better NGOs and institutions, in terms of financial resources, ability to manage those resources. So it takes time to see better capacity and better skills that lead to long-term transmissions - we might not see all these results quickly in certain countries.

For example in Morocco, we worked with the Justice Ministry and judges for sequential training for about one and half years. And at the end of the project, one judge pointed out that as a result of the training, for the first time, he was going to hire now at least first woman in this Ministry. He was also going to make sure that court system has women because many issues that come to Moroccan courts are about domestic issues that involve women. This is a very tangible change that we should measure at the end of our project that can be achieved through sequential training. What do people who participate in training do when they go back is extremely critical.

Finally I want to emphasize leadership, leadership, and leadership. Please focus on strengthening good leaders who do not only have the vision but also can transform that vision into an effective strategy.

Dr. Tatsuya Hata

I think they pointed out various topics. Respect for diversity, how to prioritize, how to focus on the process, what we have to do with them in an inclusive manner, in the situation where things vary by country or by region. And how should civil society be developed? I understand it is required that we have to have strength at individual level. I would like to take this opportunity to introduce my personal experience that I was also involved in urban development of slum area and community development in rural area, through which I have felt that it is really important to address the issue of preschool education and primary or compulsory education which nation governments should be involved with, regarding children's participation which is an important part of citizen participation. In terms of participation, I think it is necessary to ensure broader participation including that of disabled or minority people.

Finally, I understood that it is really required from now to clarify goals and results, breaking them down from program level and project level to activity level, toward which NGOs have to make concerted effort with their own code of conduct.

5   Thematic Group Sessions

(1) Group A: Integrating democracy support to social development projects: Support for CSO (Civil Society Organization) and the social vulnerable groups

Trainer: Ms. Akiko Ikeda, Secretary to the UNDEF Advisory Board
Moderator: Mr. Michiya Kumaoka

Session 1: Planning and implementing projects for democracy support

[Objectives]
- To understand the empowerment of CSO and the social vulnerable groups emphasized by UNDEF and learn organizational strategies for applying to UNDEF projects as NGOs

[Contents]
1. Lecture on the empowerment of CSO and the social vulnerable groups
    - Understand the top six priorities in the field of democracy promotion and assistance. Pay special attention to "the empowerment of CSO". Gender issue is also prioritized as a cross-cutting issue. The thematic issue of widely approved projects by UNDEF in the previous round was the empowerment of CSO. Applicants include UN agencies, foundations, research organizations and NGOs. UNDEF is much more interested in supporting projects submitted by NGOs and as a result, UNDEF's data indicate that the number of projects submitted by NGOs occupies the largest share than other applicants.
    - Social vulnerable groups are a very important criteria area to be considered by UNDEF. Vulnerable groups include women, elderly people, persons with disabilities, ethnic minorities and indigenous people. Most applications so far only have targeted women and not much on, for example, persons with disabilities in their projects. In the on-line application format of UNDEF, you will see two parts - gender considerations and marginalized groups in which applicants are expected to fill.   The gender consideration poses a great importance to the work of the United Nations. For example, experts from UNIFEM (United Nations Development Fund for Women) participate in the selection process of UNDEF projects as a member of the Programme Consultative Group (PCG).. It is recommended to include and highlight gender considerations in each project with the view to obtaining approval from the PCG, the UNDEF Advisory Board and ultimately by the Secretary-General of the UN.

- Examples of approved projects in the past in the area of the empowerment of democratic dialogue include: capacity building of young parliamentary member in Bahrain, capacity development of young leaders in the Asia Pacific, political innovation dialogue in Colombia, review of the constitution, growing peace talk in Rwanda, and so on.

2. Organizational strategies for applying for UNDEF as NGOs

   - UNDEF would like to provide grants to small local NGO from developing countries rather than to powerful NGOs in developed countries. With regards to UNDEF application process, applicants are expected to write good but simple and clear English.

   - How should you reflect "democracy support" elements in your project proposals? For example, use words such as "democratic participation" instead of "socio-economic participation" in your projects in order to highlight more consideration for democracy in your paper.

   - It is of extreme importance for Japanese NGOs to make relevance to UN agendas, including climate change and the MDGs. The key word is "Opportunity for All" because UN views all agendas in a comprehensive way. For instance, democracy can be linked not only with the political area but also with the human rights issues or peacekeeping or peace building issues.

   - Goals: Try to set a goal that is achievable within two years, even though we understand democratization takes time. For example, it is possible to increase the number of female cabinet ministers from 5 to 14 in two year's time. Try also to make your projects sustainable by investing continuous efforts to raise funds.

   - Targets: Review to see if your projects truly target and include the social vulnerable group. For example, in your education project, include one component of "civic education" that relates to democracy. Describe the target group in details with the view to giving positive impacts in your application to UNDEF. You should also identify concrete beneficiaries possibly by using concrete figures and names (of locations or towns). UNDEF's priority is to use funds efectively, therefore, it does not see much worth in an initiative that only supports 50 people in a project that costs US$500,000.

   - Activities: From the human security point of view, Japanese NGOs could further expand their experience by pursuing capacity development projects. For NGOs who are implementing democracy support projects already, try to reflect whether your projects truly address concerns for the vulnerable groups or not. For

instance, introduce an initiative that targets a wider participation of vulnerable groups in the election process by organizing a sign language workshop on how to vote for those who can not hear. UNDEF respects a mandate of each UN agency. If your project aims at a health project that includes a rights-based approach and that target a large mass of population, the project would likely to be on UNDEF's "eligible" list. However, if UNICEF is implementing same kind of projects, it is difficult for UNDEF to endorse the similar project. Another example is, if a project plans to implement only computer training sessions only for persons with disabilities, the proposal might not be selected because the project can be submitted to other source of funds such as the UN Disability Trust Fund. Be reminded to make relevance to UNDEF's priority issues in your project proposals. In addition, projects that seek to monitor the human rights situation in a certain country will probably be not approved because the this type of project has been supported by the Office of High Commissioner for Human Rights (and their work on special rapporteurs for human rights).

Session 2: Monitoring, Partnership building and fund-raising for projects for democracy support

[Objectives]
- To understand monitoring, partnership power and fund-raising mechanisms
- To learn how to draft effective applications to UNDEF

[Contents]

1. Lecture on monitoring, partnership power and fund-raising mechanisms
- We would like to emphasize a concept of "partnership power". You would not only obtain financial assistance but also gain knowledge, ideas and support if you establish a good partnership with other organizations with foundations and private companies. There are many foundations worldwide that wish to build partnership with your organizations. The public sector is gradually supporting a concept of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in Japan. You can access to a list of Japanese companies supporting CSR from the United Nations Global Compact website and also obtain a CSR report by Keidanren (Federation of Economic Organizations) web site.
- Japanese NGOs should be more creative and flexible to be more appealing as potential partners. Japanese tend to lack of being opened and being flexible You should try to seek good opportunities for partnership cooperation, which might bear fruitful results.
- Maintain up-to-date on project progress, and update information on your website.

Concerning websites, it is important to keep in mind of, for example, to provide useful features such as "accessibility" or "user friendly" in your website because UNDEF checks web sites of applicants who submit proposals. We do this exercise to double-check NGOs' accountability and activities. Thus, incorporating useful and helpful features in your website will give a positive impression to UNDEF when we look at these websites.

● With regard to UNDEF's monitoring mechanism, UNDEF has been conducting it by emails, telephone, in-person meetings and reviewing a midterm report. We also require applicants to submit final reports in the timely manner.

2. Successful project proposals

● No one write perfect applications. Minor mistakes in grammar and spelling are acceptable. However, it is important to keep sentences as short and clear as possible.

● Use concrete figures and names of areas or towns as specific as possible. Also identify target groups in detail to give a stronger impact.

- Example) Outputs/Deliverable Products

15 lawyers will work for 11 months at 15 different private media companies,….(The proposal from the civil society empowerment project by Public Association Khoma in Tajikistan)

- Example）Outputs/Deliverable Products

1,700+ seminars-up to 42,000 participants; 48 Human Rights workshops & 48 Gender Equality and Social Change workshops for 50 women and men(4,800 total participants):4 Counseling Peace building Centers in Sheikhan, Erbil, Dohuk, & Suleimaniyah; 3 human rights art exhibits; 2 music festivals. （The Proposal of human rights and fundamental freedom project by Concordia in Iraq）

- Example）Explain

…. Our leadership trainings target women and minorities from rural regions severely impacted by human rights abuses: Bamiyan, Ghor, Nangarhar, Wardak. … we engage minority groups such as the Hazara, …. （The proposal of human rights and fundamental freedom project by Equal Access Afghanistan）

- Example) Key Activities

Local production of an original radio series (in Dari/Pashto) combining interview and discussions with Afghan religious scholars about human rights within Islam with dramas and narratives featuring women leaders from the Koran and from Afghanistan. (ditto)

- Example）Explain

The needs of ethnic and religious minorities, the politically marginalized (villagers,

urban poor, IDPs, refugees), the elderly, handicapped, and children…. （The proposal by Concordia）

- Try to use negative words when describing "situations" which are usually not favorable but on the other hand, use positive words to express expected achievements and outcomes.

  Negative words）Problem being addressed

  Most people do not know their rights or how to protect them. Ethnic and religious minorities and women face severe discrimination. Sexual violence is rarely discussed and "honor killings" are still a big problem…. (Ditto)

  Positive words）Defending, Educating, Strengthening, Increasing, Developing skills, Establishing etc.

3. Others

- An applicant can only request a maximum amount of $500,000 dollars per project. However, one organization can submit up to five proposals per year with the condition that activities of each proposal takes place in different countries/locations. UNDEF is probably unwilling to select projects with a large allocation of human resource, travel, building cost etc. From the next round, UNDEF will establish a clear guideline on the budgetary matter.

- UNDEF's Advisory Board makes a recommendation of projects and the Secretary-General will approve the recommended projects. We first conduct an assessment of all projects – during the second round there were 1,800 projects- and label projects as "eligible" or "ineligible". After this process, we will further make a short list. The list will be reviewed by the PCG that consists of the UN agencies and departments and then by the Advisory Board. The final approval will be conducted by the Secretary-General. UNDEF will be transparent in our process as much as possible.

- Currently, UNDEF is planning to open one application per year on-line due to lack of human resources. Also UNDEF tends to avoid endorsing projects that aim at building democracy in an extremely unstable country. In 2006, we approved 125 proposals out of 1,300. Out of 125, three projects have not yet received grants because UNDEF discovered some organizational and managerial problems in two projects and the other one with a political instability in the country in which all UN activities were once suspended.

(2) Group B: Projects for strengthening civil society

Trainer: Dr. Preeti Shroff-Mehta
Moderator: Dr. Tatsuya Hata

Session 1: Planning and implementing projects for democracy support

[Objectives]
- To share participants' backgrounds through self-introduction
- To "self-learn" by participants' cooperation

[Activities]
This session consisted of three parts as below:

1. Introduction from the Trainer
   - The participants were asked to discuss or consider democratization assistance projects through "Action Learning" (or "Group Learning") approach.
   - The participants will not be provided with knowledge from the lecture but re-learn from what they themselves already know and share among them cooperatively.
   - Participants challenge the self-learning that itself is generally easy for us but it is not shared cooperatively.

2. Self-introduction as "Action Learning" or "Group Learning"
   All participants, approx. 30 people, gave self-introduction including information as below.
   1) What is democracy assistance for you?
   2) What kind of activity are you planning to offer such donors as UNDEF?
   - The backgrounds of participants:
     undergraduate/graduate students at university (law, sociology, education, general policy planning, international relations, liberal arts, English literature, human security, etc.); government/public sector (international infrastructure construction, self-defense, etc.); aid agencies (public relations in a multi-lateral donor, health sector specialist in a bilateral donor, etc.); research institutes (governance, democratization, etc.); NGOs (civil society, protection of children, democracy, peace-building, human trafficking, food, emergency humanitarian aid, Africa, Cambodia, etc.); private sector (management consultant, etc.)

- The expressed keywords in terms of "democracy assistance":
  freedom of expression and press; right to information; freedom from want and fear; rights of children; human rights and fairness; social justice; voice of citizens; inclusive decision-making; participatory political system; accountability of government; fairness of access to resources and services; variety of options; collaboration between NGOs and government; dialogue and co-existence of religions; share of democracy experience; respect for diversity; understanding and education of democracy itself; humanitarian aid; civil-military cooperation
- The expressed keywords in terms of concrete examples of activities:
  establishment of a research institute on Asian democracy; media development in post-conflict situation; development of a model of NGO-public-private partnership; Japan-Thailand cooperation on sharing and exchanging democracy experience and knowledge; legalization of right to information and empowerment for utilizing it; democracy enhancement on emergency humanitarian aid

The trainer commented in the course of self-introductions:

"In terms of democratization on emergency humanitarian aid, it is necessary to democratize the activity itself to deliver food, water, and medication, that is to democratize the delivery system itself. It is important to ensure that they will also be delivered to vulnerable people."

[Reviews]
- These self-introductions can be regarded as one example of democracy practice. The participants implemented one thing cooperatively without a person in an authoritarian position.
- Participants experienced listening patiently to other peoples' opinions, and through it they had such various and completely different opinions, despite most of the participants Japanese. It means mapping factors of democratization was practiced.
- This approach means the participants do not listen to some expert's opinion (Expert Model) but begin with what each of the participant already knows (Group Learning).
- Under ordinary circumstances, it is better to spend more time. Time is important in group learning.
- Although many of the participants consider themselves not knowing well about democracy, many good ideas about project were shown, which an expert never comes up with. There are even ideas which can be proposed to UNDEF after the participants bring back and elaborate.

Session 2: Monitoring, partnership building and fund-raising for projects for democracy support

[Objectives]
1. To learn essential points in planning democratization projects
2. To experience democratic process of deliberation through group work

[Activities]
This session consisted of three parts as below:
1. Introduction from the Trainer
   - The participants were asked to devise and plan a project about one of the three issues allocated by the trainer. The participants were divided into three groups, each of consisting of around 10 people.
   - In planning, the 6 types of information as below should be made clear:
      ① Objectives
      ② Stakeholder Mapping
      ③ Design/Strategy
      ④ Tools
      ⑤ Resources/Constraints
      ⑥ Monitoring &Evaluation/Feedback

2. Group Work
   - The participants discussed project plan in three groups as below:
     Group A: Establishment of Asian Democracy Institute in Japan
     Group B: Development of Journalists/Independent Media in the Country "U" under post-conflict situation
     Group C: Education for Street Children in the Country "A" under post-conflict situation
   - The participants discussed expressing and sharing opinions of each one, using sticky notes and similar papers.
   - The trainer did not intervene into any group work (only responding to such questions as definition of words), then the styles of group work depended on each group.

3. Presentations by Each Group
   Group A: "Establishment of Asian Democracy Institute in Japan"
   - Points: involvement of multi-stakeholders; understanding of Japanese culture; utilization of information and communication technologies; disclosure of information

and framework for open participation; progressive expansion of activity, etc.

- Suggestion from the Trainer: to specify targeted institutions and companies as stakeholders (it is important to build network of well-wishers).
- Suggestion from another group: in raising funds from private sector it is necessary to identify return for the targeted companies.
- Lessons learned from group work:

  - The fact that this groups consisted of foreigners and Japanese made managing discussions difficult, but they worked around it with merit.

  - A core member could build framework based on his past experience.

  - We found that different members were able to put out new different ideas.

  - It is important for Japanese to input information for activities in Japan.

Group B: "Development of Journalists/Independent Media in the Country "U" under post-conflict situation"

- Points: devices to make the unwilling government accept the proposal; utilization of back-up from neighbor countries; realization of freedom of expression overcoming clan-based rivalry; progressive expansion of activity; involvement of international society (media and NGOs) in terms of human resources and monitoring; involvement of people concerned (citizens of each tribe), etc.
- Comments from the Trainer: This issue is the one we actually implemented. In the real project, we had the journalists from different tribes work together in one media institute. The existing state media consisted of a single tribe and kept broadcasting messages of hatred. So we set the goals of this project to create and broadcast peaceful messages collaboratively. But actually, there was the event that two trained journalist were abducted by an opponent tribe and one of them was killed. It was a hard project.
- Suggestions from other groups: Based on my experience in Africa, the actual condition is that it is not easy for African countries to cooperate with neighbors. Since media industry is so mature, there is usually little space for civil society to join, thus it is necessary to have some strategy in this regard.
- Lessons learned from group work:

  - Some felt some difficulty to put ideas out, and time was short.

  - There was a sense of unease in the group's atmosphere and some could not participate well.

Group C: "Education for Street Children in the Country "A" under post-conflict situation"

- Points: to address entire problems including trafficking and illegal work surrounding the street children; to establish shelters accordingly and to provide education inside them; to provide children with skills for livelihood improvement and knowledge on health and sanitation; to focus on hearing people concerned; to integrate activities with the intention of transferring this operation to the government in the long-term, etc.

- Comments from the Trainer: This issue is also the one we are actually implementing. In the real project, as presented by the group, we established a shelter, teaching life-skills in the morning, for example how to prevent being infected with HIV, vocational training in the afternoon. In collaboration with the government, we had some teachers of public schools come. Our organization provided salary and goods for that.

- Lessons learned from group work:
  - Definitions of topics to discuss, like "tools", were difficult to understand.
  - All members participated, with each opinion fairly and impartially reflected.
  - Some provided leadership to lead and organize discussion, and to realize fair deliberation

(3) Group C: Projects for women's empowerment and reconciliation

Trainer: Ms. Igballe Rogova
Moderator: Mr. Kazushito Takase, Director, International Development Program,
World Vision Japan

[Objectives]
- To practice linking a project idea such as supporting women's empowerment or inter-ethnic cooperation to a specific UNDEF priority
- To use the methods they have learned to plan effective democracy-building projects

[Activities]
1. Introduction:
   Ms. Rogova mentioned a quotation from Chinese philosopher Lao Tzu as a motto for her work

<div align="center">

Go to the People

Learn from the people

Plan with the people

Begin with what they have

Build on what they know

Of the best leaders

When the task is accomplished

The people will remark

We have done it ourselves.

</div>

2. Planning for Projects on the Empowerment and Reconciliation of Women
   In planning such projects, NGOs should include the following steps:
   - Assess community needs: Spend adequate time learning about the community and its needs. Spend a sufficient amount of time in the field to learn enough about the community.
   - Involve local experts, activists and grassroots groups in planning the project.
   - Plan to involve men in the project in a way that will make it a project for "community development" not just a project "for women".
   - Be prepared: know about your target group before meeting them for the first time. Should read through documents or internet.
   - Respect the local culture and community members. Avoid generalizations and negative stereotypes about the target community.

   - Respect people's needs to be ready to reconcile at the pace and by the means that they choose. People cannot be pressured by donor projects to reconcile

- Media newsletters and recorded radio can be useful as means for involving people.

3. **Group Exercise**

During the 30 minutes exercise, participants formed two groups and discussed about the topic they chose from the options provided.

Group 1: Strengthening democratic dialogue and support for constitutional processes
  -Supposed target community: Afghanistan, Thailand and India
  -Raising the importance of education, and the necessity to pay attention to particular cultural situations the target community is in (ex. Whether women have a say as men do) . The possible way of approaches to people are: working cooperatively together in the area, training of basic part of life (democratic custom) by orientation training, base on peace building (peace education), networking of mothers and children, education by community members both men and women, and make an opportunity to create a "Community" (providing snacks etc).

Group 2: Human Rights and fundamental freedoms
  -Supposed target community: Japan
  -Focusing on the problems migrant female are facing and compensations after war. To advocate for better policies and increase awareness, some issues were identified. Those issues are: domestic violence against migrant women, education for migrant women's children, residential status (immigration & visa), and working conditions (work permit for both foreign women and Japanese women).

4. **Implementing Projects for the Empowerment and Reconciliation of Women**

Several important points for the implementation of projects were explained:
- Like planning step, take regular process for any kind of projects.
- Involve men, local activists and community members in implementing the project.
- Be prepared to make adjustments during the project. If you have doubts about the successful implementation of any of your project activities, it is good to have backup plans in place in order to guarantee a successful project.

Important thing for democratization is that not only women's participation but also men's participation.