

## **Acknowledgment**

The Director and staff of the Globalization Response Programme wish to acknowledge the following without whose brilliant and thought provoking presentations the public forum and subsequent strategizing sessions would have been impossible. They are Mr. Akoto-Ampaw a distinguished legal practitioner and Coordinator of Jubilee 2000, Miss Zo Randrianamaro Gender coordinator of the Third World Network [Africa secretariat], Mr. Girma Bergashaw IMF Country Representative, Dr. Emmanuel Bakure who stood in for Mr. Peter Harold, World Bank Country Director, and Mr. Dan Lartey leader of the Great Consolidated Popular Party. We are grateful that they made it even though the notice was admittedly short.

We also wish to record our gratitude to Prof. Takyiwaa Manu of the Institute of African Studies and Miss Vicky Okine of Save the Children Fund, who moderated the discussions. We further acknowledge the contributions of the following ISODEC STAFF: Mr. Charles Abugre, Mr. Steve Manteaw, Miss. Victoria Adongo, Miss Christine Coudour and especially Mr. Bishop Akolgo who facilitated the strategizing session and last but not the least Miss Mercy Akwamuwor of the Center for Public Interest Law (CEPIL) who did the rapporteurship.

This acknowledgement will not be complete without the mention of Mr. Clement Nyaaba of the Ministry of Trade and Industry who helped to develop the concept paper. We are also indebted to Chief Haruna Hamidu and the assemblyman for Mamobi West Alhaji Abu Hamidu through whose instrumentality the “wretched of the earth” in Nima, Mamobi, Kotobabi, Alajo, Madina, Chorkor, Zongo, Sukura, etc attended the forum.

### **Introduction:**

As part of its Advocacy programmes the Globalisation Response Programme (GREP) of ISODEC organized a two-day public forum under the topic " **the role of the International Financial Institutions in Ghana's Development Process**". It was organized on the 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> of August 2001 at the Teachers' Hall Complex and the Catholic guests' house (the Good Shepard's Home).

In all about 150 participants attended made up of civil society organizations, diplomatic mission representatives, World Bank and IMF representatives, media people, representatives of political parties, staff of ISODEC and the general public. There were also two cultural troupes in attendance: Abibigroma from the Ghana school of Performing Arts and the Amoah Azangweo cultural troupe.

The first day's programme was an open forum organized at Teachers' Hall. The forum sought to answer questions such as; what has been the role of IMF in Ghana's development process? Between IMF and World Bank who is responsible for what? How will the poor fare under HIPC? Also incorporated in the day's programme was the launching of the book "**The 2001 Annual Budget: A call to honour the Social Contract**" a research analysis by the Center for Budget Advocacy, a Unit of ISODEC.

The forum was organized to deliberate on the following sub-topics:

- HIPC Conditionalities and Ghana's development options
- The social and economic consequences of the current austerity measures
- Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy Programme: Conditionality or a development Strategy?

Each topic had three panel members and a moderator to lead the discussion. There were questions and contributions after each panel presentation.

The second day's programme took place at Good Shepherd Home at Ashiabu, a suburb of Accra on 24<sup>th</sup> August 2001. It was a strategizing session organized to brainstorm on possible solutions to the issues/problems raised during the previous day's open forum and to possibly write a memorandum on them to the President of the Republic. Two workshops were organized during the session.

In all about 22 participants from selected institutions attended the strategizing session. Mr. Bishop Akolgo, the Deputy Executive Director of ISODEC, facilitated the session.

## PRESENTATIONS AT THE PUBLIC FORUM

### **Sub-topic One: "HIPC Conditionalities and Ghana's Development Options"**

On the first panel to consider the above topic were: -

- Mr. Bergashaw, IMF Country Representative, and
- Mr. Akoto-Ampaw, Director of Jubilee South, Ghana

The moderator for this topic was Professor Takyiwaa Manu.

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Speaker – Mr. Bergashaw**

Mr. Bergashaw opened the debate with a brief history of how HIPC came about. He mentioned that in the early 80s what the IMF had in place was the "Traditional Debt Relief". Under this system the financial institutions considered debtor countries that could not pay their debt due to economic constraints. The consideration came in the form of renegotiations with the debtor country concerned to reschedule the payments.

A second type of debts relief system that came to replace the above was "The Toronto Terms". Under these terms 67% of the said debt was rescheduled whilst the rest was written off.

A third type "Nipple Terms" also came in to replace the latter one. In this type of debt relief, 67% of the debts were written off whilst the rest were rescheduled.

Despite the above systems or types of debt relief the creditors (IMF and World Bank) realized that debtor countries could still not pay their debts. They therefore saw the need to put in place a mechanism that would solve the problem of inability to pay once and for all. This need ushered in the HIPC initiative. This initiative is to address the problem of how the debtor country got into the debt situation and secondly to provide a major debt relief, the speaker said.

The speaker then went on to say why Ghana had to join HIPC. He said a look at Ghana's debt figure shows that Ghana is in a very serious debt situation. Comparing this situation with the revenue base of Ghana it shows that Ghana may not be able to pay her debt. He added that currently Ghana uses 45% of its revenue to service debt. This situation he said is not healthy for the economy of Ghana. To him it was a wise decision for Ghana to go HIPC because this will give Ghana a debt relief of U.S \$240 million and this will mean savings and

hence enhance development. He mentioned that the distinguishing feature of the HIPC initiative is development and a good poverty reduction strategy. He indicated that, presently Ghana has reached the decision point to present a poverty reduction strategy. After this point a conclusion point would be reached where a total of 50% of Ghana's debt would be written off.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Speaker: Mr. Akoto -Ampaw**

In his view the HIPC Initiative does not provide any fundamental departure from the old framework of Structural Adjustment. He sees HIPC as a response to the obvious failure of these financial institutions in their dealings with previous attempts at debt servicing. Also it is a response to criticism to those failures.

He then went on to talk about some features of debt relief. He mentioned the following features:

- Total absolutism and arbitrariness, that is, creditor governments and multilateral institutions solely determine the rules governing the loan to be given to the exclusion of debtor governments.
- They (creditor governments and multi-lateral financial institutions) sit as judges to determine what the money should be used for.
- The creditor governments make their own analysis of the debtor government's economy and present it to the IMF or World Bank thus sometimes presenting a picture that does not state the true state of the economy.
- They are the sole arbitrators who decide on how the problem of debt relief should be overcome. They thus act as judges in their own courts.

In effect a fair procedure of negotiation usually between trade partners is totally absent. Those features above-mentioned, he stressed, often work against the debtor country and make the poorer section of its population suffer most.

He explained that besides determining the rules that govern the loan and excluding the recipient country in negotiations, the debt relief always comes along with stringent conditionalities. These conditionalities among which are reduction or total removal of subsidies, reduction in government spending, trade liberalization, cost sharing, etc are inconsistent or contrary to the prevailing economic conditions of recipient countries and thus put pressure on such governments. In this situation the mandate of the elected government to meet its electoral promises is undermined.

He said theoretically HIPC seeks to ensure that debtor countries exit from the debt crisis in a sustainable manner. Studies have however shown that only three (3) countries out of the 23 countries under HIPC will reach exit point with sustainable conditions. In fact there was an admission from IMF that many of these countries would not reach the sustainability point due to external shocks that these countries cannot cope with.

He went on to give a brief outlook of the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS). He sees the paper as purely an attempt by IMF to give a **public service face** to the SAP (Structural Adjustment Programme). To him PRS is a response to public critique that debt relief policies over the past years failed to reduce poverty. The PRS does not cancel the old traditional conditionalities of the WB and the IMF neither does it increase the base of SAP. It is only a renaming of SAP. The analyses that underpin the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper is simple analyses of financial policies but he thinks poverty is created by relations of power, that is, excluding a section of the population in the decision making process and denying them access to certain essential services. To him the picture of HIPC as presented by the IMF and the World Bank is dangerously misleading.

He concluded by saying that he thinks HIPC is not and can never be the solution to our poverty crises. He called on all to question the highly arbitrary manner of this process of debt relief.

### **Questions & Contributions**

The leader of GCPP asked how Ghana could get out of the debt crisis. He thinks the problem lies with the Paris Club, which always makes sure it dictates policies that will make poor countries poorer by making them unable to produce sufficiently for themselves. In his opinion if Ghana is able to put together the two economies, which he named as the government's fiscal economy and the natural economy effectively, she could produce all the basic commodities needed for domestic consumption. By this there will not be any need to go to IFIs (International Financial Institutions) for loans.

Mr. Nibi from the Peoples' National convention (PNC) wanted to know when the servicing of the debt will come to an end and when the real loan will be written off completely and also when the IMF and the WB would stop being prescriptive and become suggestive.

Yet another participant wanted to know why the Letter of Intent (LOI) is not made public and also how Ghana can reclaim the initiative in policy making.

## **Responses**

To the question of how to get out of the debt crisis, the speaker answered that it is a problem of management policy. He said if the recipient country has good management policies in place and only borrows to invest and generate more it wouldn't be difficult getting out of a debt crisis.

Civil society should also be pro-active. It should pressurize the government to negotiate with the creditors (IMF and WB) for immediate debt cancellation and better loan terms in the future.

## **Sub-topics Two & Three:**

“The social and economic consequences of current austerity measures” and “Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper: a conditionality or development Strategy?”

We had the following panel members to lead discussions on the above topics.

- Mr. Bergashaw, World Bank Representative
- Ms Zo Randrianmaro, Third World Network [Africa Secretariat].
- Mr. Dan Lartey, leader of the Ghana consolidated Popular Party (GCPP) and
- Dr. Bakure, World bank country office

The moderator was Ms. Vicky Okine of Save the Children.

### **1<sup>st</sup> speaker - Mr. Bergashaw,**

The speaker basically sought to debunk some misconception he gathered since the opening of the forum. He said the belief that the World Bank/IMF dictates the terms and conditions to donor countries was wrong. He pointed out that debtor countries willingly accept these conditionalities after negotiations. He also said it is not true that all of Ghana's debts are a result of the policies of the International Financial Institutions. To him some are created by economic mismanagement of the fiscal environment of debtor countries. Finally, he said it is not true that the World Bank or IMF says Ghana should not subsidize or provide social services free. To him wanting everything free is simply not realistic and it is the government itself that may not be able to make free services available to all.

Dr. Bakure associated himself with Mr. Bergashaw's remarks and added that Ghana's crises flows from mismanagement, corruption, and lack of public accountability, not IMF/WB interference.

**2<sup>nd</sup> speaker: - Ms. Zo Randrianmaro**

Her presentation was gender oriented because in her view the debate on macro economic issues such as those raised under the Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF) are male dominated. These policies are designed without adequate consideration of women who are the most marginalized and suffer the most from these austerity measures. The speaker elaborated on the socio-economic impacts of austerity measures on women and the marginalized in relation to the fiscal, monetary and trade policies as required by the IMF, the WB and the WTO. She said for instance the planned extension of value added tax [VAT] to small and medium scale enterprises has the likely effect of increasing the prices of products from these sectors thus making them uncompetitive against cheap imported goods. The net effect of this will be a reduction in the incomes of women as they dominate the small business sector.

Also devaluation and other measures taken presumably to stabilize the exchange rate tends to increase production cost and squeeze credit facilities. This leads to a decrease in incomes of men who dominate big businesses and subsequent shift of family responsibilities from men to women who dominate the petit non-formal sector.

Besides, these policies meant to enhance growth through increase in agriculture tend to be export oriented where the men dominate and not the food sub sector where the women dominate.

On the social impacts of IFIs conditionalities, the speaker said they tend to create social inequity between the rich and the poor and between men and women. She noted that the IFIs dictate to debtor governments the space and pace of development and the kind of policies governments should pursue to achieve development. She gave the example of user fees and cost recovery in education and health policies, which has put health services and education beyond the reach of the poor. She emphasized that poor women particularly suffer when it comes to health care as they assume the responsibility of health for their families outside the medical system.

Also conditionalities related to trade liberalization tend to force debtor countries to open up strategic sectors of the economy such as water services to Trans-national co-operations through so-called private sector participation schemes. Once this happens the pockets of shareholders takes precedence over universal access to safe water and the poor, especially women and suffer the most.

She concluded by calling on poor countries to make a critical analysis of the conceptual framework underlying the Poverty Reduction And Growth Facility (PRGF) and the new Poverty Agenda. This she said will enable governments of such countries to understand better the effects of the austerity measures on the poor and the marginalized. She also called upon civil society to open a debate on the current economic orthodoxy, which she said is only interested in women as providers of free or cheap labour.

### **3<sup>rd</sup> speaker - Dan Larley**

The speaker spoke briefly on the economic and political policies of the present government, the expectations of Ghanaians and proposed solution to our debt crisis.

He sees no difference between the economic policies of the present government and that of the previous government. He noted that the people of Ghana voted the new government in power because they wanted a change in governance and not a continuation of policies designed by IMF and WB as in the case of the previous government. He said it is because the previous government pursued the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) that is why we find ourselves in this crippling economic situation today. Unfortunately the present government is also doing the same things under different names “Poverty Reduction Strategy” and “highly Indebted Poor Country Initiative” According to him the IMF and the WB instead of serving humankind are serving corporations and the rich nations.

The speaker does not see why developing countries should allow themselves to be dictated to by these financial institutions when they can develop their own programmes and support them. He was emphatic that Ghana has the money in the form of abundant natural resources and by managing them effectively we can promote domestication, that is, grow what we eat and eat what we grow. He mentioned that Ghana has two types of economies; the fiscal and natural economy and so if the government has destroyed the former we should not sit unconcern and allow the latter to also be destroyed.

The speaker thinks the only way out of this crisis is to forget about the IMF and WB and develop Ghana through economic re-engineering and changing our taste for foreign goods.

### **Summing up - Charles Abugre**

Mr. Abugre indicated that the basis for organizing the forum stems from two motivational factors that also stem from two fears:

1. The fear that the new government is actively engaged in a serious double scheme, which is a reflection of the double scheme of the international Financial Institutions.

2. The fear that the vulnerable situation of the present government is forcing it to take back stage decisions, which he says, if not checked, will undermine our democracy.

He proceeded by stating that HIPC is nothing different from the previous policies but rather a more insidious form of those policies. According to Mr. Abugre there are three theoretical advantages of HIPC and these are:

- a. Participation: there is the general belief that this is a reflection of a new way of thinking and making policies, which would involve the different actors in the economy.
- b. Transparency: Also we are made to believe that everything about HIPC has been laid bare to the public [the facts contradict this in Ghana where the public heard of HIPC after the fact].
- c. The above point would mean that programmes would be owned by the country and would eventually replace programmes promoted through conditionalities.

He said the true situation on the ground or the facts however are that:

- The government is not conducting its business with the IFIs in any participatory or transparent manner. He mentioned for instance that the government reached agreement point with the IMF and WB when the National Development Planning Commission [NDPC] was still consulting on the PRSP. Also the government did not open up a debate on HIPC before declaring Ghana HIPC.
- In reference to the statement by the WB representative that government is not forced into agreements, he asked whether the government had the room to say no to conditionalities during negotiations. It is trite knowledge that these conditionalities are hardly open to negotiations. He also wanted to know who truly owns the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper and what would happen if it were possible to change a good part of this paper.
- Besides, the rule is that the PRSP has to be endorsed by the boards of the WB and IMF before we can begin to access any debt relief and so who owns the document that has to be endorsed? He asked.

- He pointed out that nobody has made any social impact assessment on the macro-economic and structural adjustment policies which has been repackaged under Poverty Reduction Support Credit (PRSC) and Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF)
- He also told participants that it is pressure from civil society that forced the U.S Congress to pass a law that bars their representatives on the boards of the WB and IMF from voting in favour of any loan that requires cost recovery and or cost sharing in health and education.

Mr. Abugre ended his presentation by wanting to know to what extent the IFIs have complied with the above law in its dialogue with the government of Ghana since they were expected to take a cue from the US congress.

### **Questions & Contributions**

The following were some of the questions and contributions that came up after the second and third panel presentations. There were questions as to:

- Whether the donors/creditors and recipient countries jointly take responsibility for the failure of any policy?
- Whether IMF and WB may be sued if they fail to give loans without conditionalities
- The extent to which the IMF has developed a policy on social and environmental policy assessment and if none why?
- The IFIs representatives present should admit that there are certain austere conditions always attached to their loans.

The forum ended with the launching of a book entitled "the 2001 Budget; a call to honour the social contract" a research analysis by the Centre for Budget Advocacy of ISODEC. Mr. Dan – Lartey, leader of the Great Consolidated Popular Party, did the launching.

### **DAY TWO – STRATEGISING SESSION**

The second day's activities took place in the premises of Good Shepard Home at Ashiabu on the 24<sup>th</sup> of August 2001. It was aimed at brainstorming to find solutions to issues raised in the previous day's open forum. It was organized in three modules.

## **Module I**

The first module opened with a review of the previous day's forum. Specifically there was a short review of Ghana – IMF relationship as was discussed in the previous day and participants came up with the following:

- IMF- Ghana relationship is not in a participatory manner
- It is not transparent
- The IMF and World Bank representatives gave us a contradictory picture as against what is given us by the government.
- The role of IMF should be re-examined in totality and not to concentrate on only HIPC.

The next stage of the session was an attempt by participants to define what IMF is. The following were some of the definitions:

- IMF is a multilateral Institution established to ensure trade liberalization and balance of payments for countries with economic difficulties.
- IMF is an institution established to give support to economic programme of poor countries.
- IMF is a dictator institution that seeks its interest but does not consider the impact of its conditions on the poor countries.
- IMF is a beast created for all but controlled by few.
- The Paris Club controls the globalized world through the IMF, WB and the WTO
- An institution where third world countries can get support for their development programmes depending on availability of funds
- IMF diagnosis and prescribes programmes for the World Bank to implement for third world countries.
- IMF is a multinational Institution that provide loan on conditional basis.
- IMF is an intermediary Institution between the rich and the poor.

The above definitions of IMF as presented by participants led us into the third stage of part one. At this stage participants looked at the original objectives of IMF and compared it with its present role to see whether any role has been added or subtracted.

### *Original Objectives of IMF*

- To ensure exchange rate stability
- To support countries with balance of payment problems

- To assist countries affected with world war in development problems.

*Added Roles*

- Give loan on conditional basis
- Determine the growth rate of poor countries
- Interfere in development processes of recipient countries.

The next stage of the review session was for participants to tell what annoyed, shocked and surprised them during the previous day's open forum. The following were some of the revelations.

- The absence of the Finance Minister or his representative at the forum
- The incomplete presentation by the IMF and World Bank representatives
- Shock at the revelation that governments sometimes falsify figures in order to attract IMF/ World Bank loans.
- IMF preaching democracy but acting dictatorially and arbitrarily
- The devastating impact of IMF's policies on the health and educational sectors as portrayed by the sketch
- IMF's refusal to reckon that their policies do not help the poor countries
- The debate at the forum was not fairly balanced because there were no government representatives.
- The statement by the IMF representative that subsidy is not bad but depends on affordability
- The indifference attitude of developing countries suffering under IMF conditionalities and the
- The inability of IMF and World Bank representatives to generally demonstrate the feasibility of HIPC and to give an example of a successful HIPC country

To conclude this session, the facilitator asked participants what they would do if they had the power to act on the above feelings. The following were participants' responses:

- Direct IMF to stick to its original mandate.
- Request loans without conditionalities.
- Request for only grants and explore domestic financing.
- Emphasis the principles of good governance, participation and consensus building and make the IMF/WB more accountable to the people.
- Make the public informed on national issues

- Take a second look before accepting conditions attached to loans.
- Reduce borrowing and count on self reliance
- Negotiate intensively to seek people's interests in negotiations with IFI.
- Put pressure on government to negotiate for better conditions.

## **Module II**

The second module considered what good governance means. The following were participants' definitions of good governance:

- A government that protects the Fundamental Human Rights of its people.
- A government that rules with transparency and protects republican principles knowing it is a steward of what belongs to its peoples.
- Management of development in a consultative and participatory nature.
- A government that tolerates the views of others (opposition).
- Good governance means preaching democratic values e.g. majority rule consensus building and sharing divergent views, transparency and rule of law.

The facilitator then led participants to look at what the IMF and the World Bank mean by good governance. He said before the issue of good governance came up, people realised there was the need for a formula to deal with development effectiveness. This need brought about what was called the "New World Order or Management Era". The thinking then was that to achieve management effectiveness, a country only needed to get a few people from the top hierarchy and train them to manage the country. During this era aid for development used to come from government to government unlike these days that aid sometimes come through NGOs and social organizations. The developed countries helped the less developed countries basically because they wanted their ideologies to be promoted. This meant that whether a government was good or not they would help once it promoted their ideologies. The issue of debt came up only when there was an increase in oil price and many countries could not cope with the effects.

Presently there are two schools of thought on development effectiveness. One school said for there to be development effectiveness there must be good governance. The other school says there must be rights based governance.

To better understand what each school of thought really means by effective development, we must judge them based on their assumptions, the actors involved and the outcomes of

those assumptions. The analysis must be in relation to the role of the state, market, people and Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs).

### **Good Governance.**

Under the good governance framework the state is seen as a hindrance to the market because it does not promote the interest of the investor or private sector. The state must therefore be made an enabler of the market to watch over the interest of the investor. The state is seen as the bad manager of the economy. The market is seen as the best and most efficient generator and allocator of resources guided by the factors of demand and supply. The market rewards high productivity even if it is meant to feed animals at the expense of human beings. It punishes those who do not respond quickly to price changes.

Participants agreed that this assumption was untrue and unfair because.

- A situation of scarcity is sometimes created even before supply could respond to any change in price or demand.
- Human factor is not considered under this framework one cannot therefore cope in such a market system if he/she does not have enough capital or purchasing power.
- The market system can only be considered as a good allocator of resource only if such resources are not constrained. Also it can only be considered impartial and efficient if takes into account the interest and rights of the poor and the vulnerable in society.

Under this framework the people are considered principally as consumers. The NGOs are considered as the collary of the state and the IMF and WBs are considered as debt collectors. The actors are the market, civil societies and the state.

In effect the good governance framework is concerned with only fiscal deficits.

### **Rights Based Governance**

The second school of thought proposes rights based governance. They believe that for there to be an effective development, the rights of the people must determine every action of the government. That is, the people's economic, social, cultural, civil, political and ecological rights must be the source of reference for all government activities. It is assumed under this framework that the state is an enshrinement of values, protector of the marginalised and mediator of interest. In this framework the actors are the market, civil society and the state.

In the Rights based governance the role of the IMF and WB depends on what the people want them to do.

In effect under this framework the economic, social, environmental as well as the fiscal deficits are of utmost importance. The IMF/WB sees Rights under this framework to mean the right to own property and the right to choose but what does the right to choose mean to a poor person who hasn't got the means to acquire in the first place?

Accountability under this framework means accounting to the people but to IMF and WB it means accounting to them for the loans received.

The above analysis means that most governments including ours have failed. Participants proposed that in order to succeed in development effectiveness, a government should adopt the rights based governance.

If a government adopts a right-based governance, its first task would be to reclaim the state for its people and this can be done through gender equity, local self-governance and participatory democracy. There must also be political education, social mobilization and localisation of the economy.

The people at the local level should be allowed first to determine what they could do and what they could not before the next higher level of government comes in. This will make them part of governance - the essence of democracy.

In the rights based governance the people are supreme, what the government does depends on what the people want. In the good governance framework the market is supreme.

The following observations were made after analysing the two schools of thought in relation to the Ghana government.

### **Observations**

- Ghana government does not conduct its business in a participatory manner.
- IMF/World Bank representatives were not willing during the previous day's workshop to admit the failures of its policies. It also shifted blames to the government
- It is important to recognise that there are external factors that influence the government's decision in governance.
- Government needs to sit up and identify itself with the people.
- People must be well directed towards domestication
- Civil society must be educated to know better what IMF and World Bank are.

- We need an independent arbitrator in debt payment between lender countries and borrowing countries.
- We must always link good governance with sustainable development

After a lengthy discussion, participants were grouped into four groups for two separate workshops. The groups that were considered as actors in governance comprised of; the people, IMF/World Bank, government and civil society organizations. During the first workshop each group was to consider the following: its strength, who the stakeholders are and what their interests/concerns/fears are. Each individual group was also to consider its relationship with the other three groups.

## **Workshop One**

### **Group One - PEOPLE**

*Stakeholders (who are the people?)*

- Every citizen
- The power base
- The market
- Resource base
- The nation

*Strength/influence*

- Possess the voting power
- Represent the government both within and outside the country
- Determine the movement of the market
- Form the revenue base of the nation

*Concerns/interests/fears*

- Economic and social welfare
- Peace and stability of the nation
- Unity
- National integrity
- National prosperity

*Relationship*

*Civil Societies (CSO)*

- The people are the macrocosm of the CSO

- Both the people and CSO constitute the pressure group on the government
- People form the support base for advocacy with CSO
- People are a source of information for CSO consumption
- The people form the core of all activities of CSO

*With government*

- The people are a source of power and mandate for the government
- They form the resource base for the government to work with
- Government is a representative of the people
- People are a point of reference for government activities
- The people relate with the outside world through the government

*With IMF/World Bank*

- The people have no direct relationship with the IMF/World Bank
- The people are the direct recipient of the impact of IMF/World policies
- The people relate with them through the government.

**Group Two - IMF/WORLD BANK**

*Who they are*

- International monetary institutions
- They are players in every economy
- They are controlled by the Paris Club
- They co-opt civil society organisations

*Original mandate*

- To give monetary support to governments
- Ensure that interest rates are universal
- To give support for balance of payment problems

*Strength*

- They take over the economic management of countries
- Cajole poor countries to hand over public utilities to Multinational corporations
- Weaken recipient countries with policies of cost recovery
- They control the global market
- Control the macro market by co-opting Civil Societies

**Group three - GOVERNMENT**

Group three defined the three arms of government as:

### *Legislature*

- Define and implement development policies
- Ensure constitutional and human rights
- Ensure mass participation in national issues
- Promote debates on national issues
- Publish annual reports on government transactions

### *Judiciary*

- Ensures efficient legal system
- Ensures that government works within the frame work of the constitution
- Ensure fair and impartial judicial system

### *Executive*

- Speed up passage of freedom of information bill
- Controls government spending
- Establish regular consultation with the members of parliament, civil societies, NGOs etc.

## **Group four – CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS**

### *Stakeholders*

Professional bodies, labour movements, political parties, community-based organisations, religious bodies and NGOs

### *Level of Strength*

The group ranked the levels of strength of the above groups according to whether it is low or high.

- Professional bodies- High
- Labour movements-High
- Political parties-High
- Community based organizations-Low
- Religious bodies and NGOs-High

### *Tools used to influence*

Network, sharing of information, handouts, education, campaigns, seminars, signatures, media etc.

### *Interests/Concerns*

- Professional Bodies- concern about the welfare of their members or the section of society that they work for.
- Religious Bodies- concern about the impact of social and economic policies on the society in general
- Political parties- concern about the economic, social and political developments of the country
- Labour Movements- concern about the social and economic welfare of their members
- Community based organizations- concern about the development of their communities.

## **WORKSHOP TWO**

Participants were grouped again into four groups for a second workshop during which they sought to identify issues that can be worked on to move the government from good governance framework to rights based governance framework. Participants were asked to focus the discussion on the following factors: Issues that needed to be Changed, Actors, and Change strategies.

### **Group One**

#### *Change issues*

- The assumption that the state is a hindrance to the market
- Price should not be a determinant of the market
- CSO and NGO should not be seen as a collary of the state

#### *Actors*

- Ministries of finance, trade and industry, economic planning and regional integration
- The general public
- The Non-Governmental Organizations
- The Civil Society Groups in general

#### *Strategies*

- Negotiate better terms of trade
- Protect the domestic market
- Increase the level of productivity
- Encourage advocacies
- Organize more fora on national issues

## **Group Two**

### *Change issues*

- Organise a solidarity movement to break external dominance
- Ensure genuine participation in all national issues
- Localise the Ghanaian economy

### *Actors*

- The people
- Civil Society Organizations
- Professional bodies
- Academia
- Religious bodies
- The press
- Parliamentarians

### *Strategies*

- Networking
- Access to meaningful information
- Local business promotion
- Awareness creation on national issues

## **Group Three**

### *Issues*

- The role of IMF/WB as debt collectors for multinationals
- Role of government as a watchdog over IMF/WB policies
- Ability to pay external debt

### *Actors*

- Government
- NGOs
- Civil Societies
- IMF/WB

### *Strategies*

- Awareness creation on rights based governance
- Sensitization on the policies of IMF/WB
- Coalition building
- Lobbying

- Establishing an independent body to mediate in the payment of external debts
- Reorientation of governance and its machinery

#### **Group Four**

##### *Issues*

- Budget accountability
- A new definition of development
- IMF/WB should be made passive and active in the development process of recipient countries
- Political education

##### *Actors*

- The general public
- District Assemblies
- Policy makers
- Labour groups

##### *Strategies*

- Lobbying
- Accessibility of information
- Networking
- Media publicity
- Workshops/fora/seminars

#### **CONCLUSION**

The strategizing session ended with a discussion on the issues raised during the second workshop. Participants decided that there was the need to meet again to draft a memorandum to the President of the Republic on the issues.