



Building International and Regional Consensus

Policy Dialogue Report: Perspectives on a Roadmap for Zimbabwe 9 May 2011



I. Introduction

On 9 May 2011, the Southern African Liaison Office (SALO) convened a 'Building International Consensus' policy dialogue session at the Burgers Park Hotel in Pretoria. The focus of the half-day dialogue was on the challenges and progress made towards implementation of the Global Political Agreement (GPA) in Zimbabwe, and specifically on the 'Roadmap' process. **Ambassador Lindiwe Zulu, the International Relations Advisor in the Presidency and a member of the three-person South Africa facilitation team (Facilitation Team) on the Zimbabwe peace process¹**, delivered the Keynote Address. The session also included the following panel of speakers from South African and Zimbabwean civil society and academia, chaired by Richard Smith, SALO Board member:

- Deprose Muchena – Deputy Director, Open Society Initiative of Southern Africa (OSISA)
- Isabella Matambanadzo – Zimbabwean feminist activist and human rights campaigner
- Dewa Mavhinga – Regional Information and Advocacy Coordinator, Crisis in Zimbabwe Coalition
- Professor Chris Landsberg – University of Johannesburg and a member of the SALO Reference Group
- Vasu Gounden – Executive Director, ACCORD

Also in attendance was Patience Chiradza, the National Coordinator of the Joint Monitoring and Implementation Committee (JOMIC) Secretariat in Zimbabwe.

¹ The other two members are Charles Nqakula, former Minister of Defence, and Mac Maharaj, former Minister of Transport.

II. Main Themes

Ambassador Zulu's contribution to and participation in the dialogue was very much welcomed and commended by various members of the panel for the inclusive approach, informative account, clarity and update on the Roadmap process and on the direction and status of the work of the Facilitation Team. There was an overall sense that although serious obstacles remain to democratic reform in Zimbabwe, progress has been and continues to be made, albeit slowly. The main themes echoed through the dialogue were:

- South Africa is committed to seeing a **free, developing and respected African continent; Africans must take the lead in formulating solutions** to problems on the continent, and **South Africa and the SADC** must and do accept a **position of responsibility** with regard to Zimbabwe;
- The importance of **monitoring and implementing the Roadmap** with concrete timeframes;
- Reiterating the necessity of a **people-driven constitution**;
- Stressing the importance of **electoral reform** to lay the foundations for free and fair elections – pre-, during *and* post-elections; and
- Critical and urgent need for genuine **security sector transformation** and **media freedom**.

III. A free, developing and respected Africa

Ambassador Zulu opened the session by contextualising the dialogue within the framework of South Africa's, as well as the region's and Africa's, interests in seeing a continent that is stable and respected, and the imperative for all its citizens to enjoy the benefits of freedom, dignity and human development:

“ ... from a South African perspective we really would like to see an African continent that is free from all the challenges that we currently face ... We would like to see an African continent that is developing ... a continent that is respected in the international community, but the only way that the African continent can also be respected in global politics is also for the African continent and its leaders to do the right thing at the right time ... I also think that the negotiators are also ... always making that point, that it's not about you, you are able to wake up in the morning in a comfortable bed, you are able to open a fridge and have something to eat, you are able to drive a car to work, it's not about you. It's about the rest of the people who ... were forced by the circumstances to be where they are today. We need to reverse that in order for the people of Zimbabwe to feel the comfort of being citizens of Zimbabwe. We say to them, there are so many Zimbabweans who are in South Africa, thousands of them did not come here because they just simply wanted to come, nobody wants to just wake up in the morning and pack your bags and just go to some other country ... It mustn't be because the conditions in your country make it impossible for you to make a living for yourself ... this is what drives us as South Africans to carry on with the process.”



IV. Roadmap

One of the first tasks of the Facilitation Team was to agree on a set of issues for negotiation, which were then signed off in an 'implementation matrix' that, like the Roadmap, is based on the GPA. The issues of major concern as related by Ambassador Zulu included:

- Sanctions

- Media; external radio stations; hate speech
- Rule of law
- State security organs and institutions
- Review of allocation of Ministries
- Land audit; land turner systems
- Electoral vacancies
- Cabinet and Council Ministers' rules and guidelines
- Transport arrangements

These were among the key aspects that have stalled the Roadmap process: “in order for us to talk about a roadmap ... we believe that the implementation of all these issues first and foremost would create an enabling environment in Zimbabwe firstly; secondly we also believe that these issues if they are dealt with, if they are implemented ... are also confidence-building mechanisms.” There was confirmation that the facilitation process is underpinned by an approach that in order for the Roadmap to succeed, it must be a document that has buy-in not only among the three GPA partners but from the wider Zimbabwean society, and ordinary citizens in particular. Ambassador Zulu also referred to JOMIC, a mechanism or committee whose role it is to ensure that implementation of the GPA is monitored and an annual report presented which up to now had not been materialising. JOMIC's first report was eventually presented to the Facilitation Team, and “[s]ome areas we were happy with, but some ... we were completely unhappy with because of the slow pace of implementation.”

Attendees to the dialogue were informed that a draft of the Roadmap was presented to the Facilitation Team by the three signatories to the GPA – and signed. However there are a few very contentious issues, “less than three”, which still need to be referred to the principals, and that will take “a bit of pushing to get them through”:

“We had long discussions, sometimes frustrating, but all I can say is that ... we came out with an enriched document ... accepted by all the three global political agreement partners. So, the next step now is for us to take that document, finalise it as the Facilitation Team, return it to them so that they can present it to their principals ... and we have to also present that document to the facilitator President Zuma and ... to SADC ...”, as SADC is the “guarantor for this whole process.”

One issue that SADC, the African Union and the three political signatories to the GPA collectively and clearly agreed on was the need for the lifting of sanctions. Following the recently held 2011 SADC Troika Summit in Livingstone (Livingstone meeting), the Facilitation Team with SADC visited the U.S., the U.K. and Brussels to discuss the lifting of sanctions:

“...we truly believe that it's time that these sanctions must be lifted. And the reason why the sanctions must be lifted is because firstly, we do not think that the sanctions are having the effects they were meant to have, and secondly, we also believe that we are making progress in Zimbabwe and the fact that we are actually now with a roadmap in hand ... The fact that the three political parties have again come together, drafted and concluded a roadmap and presented that roadmap to their principals and to the facilitation is very good progress.”

As an outcome of a decision made at the Livingstone meeting, the Facilitation Team is also expected to expand to include members from SADC nominated by the Troika.

V. Constitution

Challenges, as well as progress, with the Constitutional Outreach process were acknowledged by Ambassador Zulu. She informed the gathering that the parliamentary committee mandated with collecting data, information, views and ideas from people across Zimbabwe had done so, and that

notwithstanding the challenges they witnessed of violence and disagreement, there was also positive feedback on the process thus far undertaken:

“They have completed that process, but as they were continuing travelling, traversing around the country collecting those ideas, they were confronted with challenges of violence, they were confronted with challenges of clear disunity around what kind of a constitution does Zimbabwe want to see at the end, but from the facilitation team and our meeting with COPEC ... we were happy with the fact that one of the things they said to us is that ‘travelling across the country being a multi-party committee was very helpful’ ... in their opinion it was so helpful because it was more like a healing process itself.”

The point, however, was also made that what must be attended to is the importance of having *solid timeframes* for the constitutional-making process. As **Deprese Muchena (Deputy Director, OSISA)** stated:



“It’s important that in terms of the constitutional making process itself that we don’t continue to say that we are about to finish, we are about to finish, we are about to finish, but what is missing in the matrix that the Ambassador was talking about are solid timeframes. We don’t have for example in any of the columns under timeframes ... security sector reforms by May 2011, we don’t have media reforms by August 2011, we don’t have legislative agenda by October

2011, and in the absence of strict guidelines I think there will be a serial abuse of the agreement and the roadmap and the roadmap will be used to cushion political leaders in Zimbabwe from further criticism by SADC especially after SADC demonstrated the new spirit in Livingstone.”

VI. Elections

Ambassador Zulu’s feedback with respect to elections was unequivocal:

“You need to create a conducive environment for the elections, you need to strengthen the institutions that are supposed to carry the elections ... but at the same time I cannot stand here and say when the elections will be held, because everything will depend on how fast we are able to implement the decisions that we have taken in the form of ensuring that we have the necessary institutions to make sure that ultimately at the end, elections must be free and fair and ... what happens post elections is also taken care of.”

A major undercurrent of the facilitation has been that the conditions and environment for the next elections must be different from those in 2008. The facilitation is also informed by the SADC regulatory framework adopted in Mauritius that stipulates under what circumstances elections should take place. In response to a question by a member of the Embassy of Netherlands, Ambassador Zulu responded:

“As for the guarantees about political parties accepting the [election] results, this is the very reason why I kept on saying in the development of the roadmap, what happened in 2008 keeps ringing in our ears because that’s not what we want to see. That’s why for us, pre-, during and post-elections is very important and we can’t deal with that only during the time of the election or after the elections, we need to deal with it now ... We would like to see that happening across the African continent, so that we as Africans, the people that go to vote must have confidence ... That for us is very, very important.”

In order to achieve this, Mr Muchena, as did other panellists, spoke about the critical need for a reformed electoral system – “reforming the institutional and legal framework of elections ... The Zimbabwe Election Commission must be robust, well staffed by professionals, not members of the Central Intelligence Organisation which is the case up to now.”

VII. Security sector reform

On the issue of the security sector reform, Mr Muchena argued that bodies like Zimbabwe’s Central Intelligence Organisation (CIO) need to be reassessed in that it does not have a legal mandate or governing law underpinning it – the CIO does not have existence in law as there is no piece of legislation in Zimbabwe that establishes it. *Ergo* the CIO is not a national entity that represents Zimbabwean citizens; “it becomes a political institution of a political party.” He spoke about the importance of reviving the security sector with “values of civilian oversight”, of ensuring freedom of association and enabling the full exercise of other freedoms linked to respect for the rule of law.

Vasu Gounden (Director, ACCORD) concurred with this view, warning that:



“... security sector reform is essential; we know that the military is a factor in Zimbabwe, unless we engage in security sector reform in Zimbabwe to build new values, unless we begin to understand the interests of the military, deal with that, build new values and put the military under civilian control and ensure that a professionalised intelligence services and military that existed previously in Zimbabwe is resuscitated now, we will not make any headway ...”

Other panellists including **Dewa Mavhinga (the Crisis in Zimbabwe Coalition)** likewise echoed the concern:

“... our main challenge is not random violence or intra-party violence but state-sanctioned violence that is perpetrated mainly by State agencies including the military ... we are saying that the military must completely separate itself from political issues ... we appeal to SADC as the guarantor of this arrangement to ensure that there are mechanisms on the ground to prevent violence and to create a buffer zone between the people of Zimbabwe who are not armed and a politicised military ...”



VIII. Other themes

The panel speakers also discussed other issues including the following:

- The need to acknowledge the **link between the political situation and economic growth** process in Zimbabwe including the human development indicators and not only in terms of the Gross Domestic Product;
- **Three different types of interests in conflict situations** and the need to understand what each of these are through an ‘analysis of a balance of forces’:
 - Substantive interest – interest in the substance of the negotiations, which has to do with power;

- Psychological interest – relating to leaders who carry “very strong psychological interest that have to do with their egos”; and
- Procedural interest – relating to the level of fairness in how procedures are conducted, such as the election process; though procedural issues alone will not resolve the problems in conflict situations, as all three types of interests have to be analysed, understood and dealt with.
- The need to **ensure that resources are available** – financial resources as well as technical expertise – to properly implement the GPA and Roadmap.

Isabella Matambanadzo (Zimbabwean feminist activist and human rights campaigner) spoke passionately about women’s rights and why this is important in terms of the GPA and the Roadmap, particularly in the context of the **rights of black women in a post-colonial state**. Ms Matambanadzo argued that it is black African women who have borne the brunt of the crisis in Zimbabwe both politically and economically. However, violation of their rights as well as sexual violence against their persons are a subject that is largely ignored or minimised – for example, as evidenced by certain articles in the GPA and various pieces of legislation that are drawn “along patriarchal colonial lines”, and yet normalised and accepted; and the need to account for the manner in which women are not only marginalised but also *instrumentalised* by the State, often through violent or coercive means, for political ends. She also spoke about how the media in Zimbabwe is a source of re-enforcing sexist ideology and propaganda, and that this is one of the key pillars of media transformations that must be discussed and addressed.



There were also concerns expressed about **JOMIC’s capacity** in terms of its current make-up and powers to monitor and call for implementation of the GPA.



Patience Chiradza (JOMIC) responded that JOMIC is a creation of the GPA with a committee comprising of twelve senior politicians from the three signatories to the GPA, including five cabinet ministers. JOMIC’s Secretariat itself is comprised of five people, with three of them seconded by the political parties. One of JOMIC’s initiatives thus far has been launching inter-party dialogues in provinces throughout the country.

IX. Conclusion

Professor Chris Landsberg (University of Johannesburg / SALO Board) spoke about what lessons can be learnt for Zimbabwe from South Africa’s own democratic transition with a focus particularly on the need for international consensus to enable any genuine transition:

“For me, the real breakthrough about the Roadmap is that a huge Global Political Agreement document is now being simplified into 8 key issues that could form the basis for fundamental consensus between the West and Africa in particular, but I would certainly include Russia and China here ...”



As well as international consensus, it is believed that the strong stand taken at the Livingstone meeting against political violence and intimidation in Zimbabwe was an indication of recognition that the situation in Zimbabwe is a regional issue that needs to be addressed with regional cooperation. It also illustrated that South African political role-players have now taken the debate beyond the issue of security of borders to those such as citizenship and cooperation with other

regional states in responding to what is a regional crisis. Judging from the number and variety of responses heard at the session, the need to convene such broader-based meetings around the Roadmap provides for a more robust, informed and participatory process, democratising the space around the GPA and the forthcoming elections.

Going forward with the process, Ambassador Zulu affirmed the importance of dialogue to reach consensus:

“... this dialogue in my opinion must not be the beginning and the end now. I think these dialogues must be continuous because it further enriches ... the questions that I get from here help me as I go again to engage with the facilitators, as we go and engage they keep ringing in my head; what about this, what about that? It’s not that we’ll think of everything, but if we continuously engage like this ... we will get somewhere ... I can assure you that particularly since Livingstone the wheel is moving very fast and we hope that the spirit of Livingstone will live with us until the day that we say there is going to be an election in Zimbabwe. We as the Facilitation Team are driven by the fact that what is happening to the ordinary people of Zimbabwe can’t go on forever, at some point it has to stop.”

The analysis and recommendations included in this Policy Dialogue Report do not necessarily reflect the view of SALO or any of the donors or conference participants, but rather draw upon the major strands of discussion put forward at the event. Participants neither reviewed nor approved this document. The contents of the report are the sole responsibility of SALO, and can under no circumstances be regarded as reflecting the position of the donors who provided financial assistance for this policy dialogue session.

About the Southern African Liaison Office:



The Southern African Liaison Office (SALO) is a non-governmental organisation which promotes informed process and debate about regional conflicts and crises. SALO does this by organising dialogue events and forums for informed discussion amongst key government and civil society actors from South Africa, the SADC region and internationally, as well as through advocacy, documentary media production, and research and analysis.

SALO would like to thank the generous contributors to this project:

The Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Pretoria * Swedish Embassy in Harare * Norwegian Embassy Pretoria
* Irish Aid and the Irish Embassy in Pretoria * Olof Palme International Centre

