



"Um outro mundo é possível"

Escritório da Secretaria do Fórum Social Mundial /  
World Social Forum Secretariat Office  
R. General Jardim, 660 – 8º andar – sala 81  
Cep: 01223-010 – São Paulo – SP – Brasil  
Tel.: + 55 11 3258-8914 Fax: + 55 11 3258-8469  
Site: [www.forumsocialmundial.org.br](http://www.forumsocialmundial.org.br)

# Report on the World Social Forum International Council meeting

Utrecht, Holland, from March 31<sup>st</sup> to April 2<sup>nd</sup> 2005

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>02</b>
<b>FIRST PART. WSF IC RESOLUTIONS AND NEXT STEPS.....</b>	<b>03</b>
1. Next IC meetings.....	03
2. Presentation of Commissions' documents and decisions made by the plenary.....	04
2.1 Methodology and Content Commissions proposals approved for 2006 WSF process.....	04
2.2 Expansion Commission proposals approved for WSF Expansion process.....	06
2.3 Communication Commission proposals approved for 2006 WSF process.....	06
2.4 Resources Commission proposals approved by the IC about the financial shortage of the WSF 2005 and the WSF 2006 process.....	07
3. Presentation of proposals for places where the WSF 2006 will take place and adopted decisions....	08
4. Discussion about Strategy and decisions on this issue .....	09
5. Approved Expansion Commission's proposals concerning IC Reorganization and Expansion.....	10
6. Debate about International Secretariat composition and next steps regarding this issue.....	11
7. Work plan and calendar.....	12
<b>SECOND PART. MATERIALS FOR THE DEBATE AND OTHER IC MEETING DOCUMENTS.....</b>	<b>13</b>
8. Meeting's participants list.....	13
9. Evaluation of the WSF 2005 and its methodology.....	16
9.1 Summary of the discussion that took place during the Seminars of Methodology, Content and Expansion Commissions.....	16
9.2 Report about the projects from the IC Content and Methodology Commissions WSF 2005 Memory working group.....	18
9.3 Documents containing the preliminary results from the World Social Forum 2005 Survey....	23
9.4 Written evaluation done by the participants at the IC meeting.....	23
10. Report of the WSF IC Communication Commission – Utrecht, 03/30/2005.....	26
11. Proposals for the strengthening, internationalization and expansion of the IS.....	27
12. Information about the Solidarity Fund for the IC meeting.....	29
<b>APPENDIX.....</b>	<b>30</b>
Definition of terms used in the documents.....	30

## **INTRODUCTION**

The WSF International Council met in Utrecht, Netherlands, from March 31<sup>st</sup> to April 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2005. The meeting was preceded of a joint seminar of the Methodology, Content and Expansion Commissions, in Amsterdam on March 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup>. On March 30<sup>th</sup> the Expansion, Communication and Resources Commissions had a separate meeting, while the Content and Methodology Commissions had a joint one. (There was no meeting for the Strategy Commission).

We present here the report of the meeting, which is basically divided in two parts. In the first part, we reproduced the resolutions adopted by the IC. In the second part, we brought materials that were used for supporting the debates, such as reports of the Commissions' meetings and other documents that were considered important for the debate.

IC agenda included:

On the 31st: Presentation of the participants. Evaluation of the WSF 2005 and its methodology.

Presentation of the proposals elaborated by the Commissions in their meetings on March 30<sup>th</sup>.

Presentation of the proposals for the place where the polycentric WSF 2006 (America, Africa and Asia) will take place and information about other events within the WSF process [beginning].

April 1st: [continuity of the previous issue]. Resolutions of the Plenary about the following questions: 2006 Methodology, Communication, WSF Process Expansion, Resources. There were also discussions concerning Strategy.

April 2nd: Resolutions concerning Strategy; Resolutions concerning the financial shortage of the WSF 2005; Resolutions about IC Expansion; Debate about International Secretariat composition; Resolutions concerning the next IC meetings; News about the "solidarity fund" done for the meeting; Acknowledgments to the organizations and to the people who supported the meeting.

Everyday, three people chaired the IC meeting, as follows:

March 31st: Amit (IOC-India), Gustavo (CUT-Brazil), Mae (FOEI-Holland)

April 1st: Giampiero (Onu de los Pueblos-Italy), Nicola (Focus-Thailand), Sally (ALAI-Ecuador),

April 2<sup>nd</sup> : Brid (TNI-Holland), Njoki (50 years-Kenya), Teivo (NIGD-Peru)

This report was elaborated by Gustavo Codas, Marti Olivella, Moema Miranda y Pierre George with the help of the WSF office in São Paulo.

## **FIRST PART. WSF IC RESOLUTIONS AND NEXT STEPS**

### **1. Next IC meetings**

1.1 – The next meeting will be held in Barcelona, from June 20th to 22nd, 2005.

The next IC meeting will be held in Barcelona, after the Mediterranean Social Forum. It will be held from **June 20<sup>th</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup> 2005**. The IC Commissions should schedule their meetings previously (they should coincide with the MedSF, from **June 16<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup>**).

It is included in the meeting's agenda the discussion on WSF 2007 (Africa) and the perspectives for the WSF process in 2008.

1.2 – The following two meetings will be held in Africa and Asia

The next IC meeting (after Barcelona) should take place in Africa (or Asia) and the other in Asia (or Africa).

1.3 - About the languages to be spoken during the meetings

In order to guarantee full participation of the delegates from all the continents, future meetings will be organized considering three basic languages: English, Spanish and French.

1.4 – The plenary decided that Nicolas, from the CMC Memory group, is in charge of developing tools that should help the preparation for the next IC (debates, circulation of information etc.)

## **2. Presentation of Commission's documents and decisions made by the Plenary<sup>1</sup>**

The four Commissions' meetings held on March 30th elaborated proposals that were debated and approved by the Plenary along with the following text.

### **2.1. Methodology and Content Commissions proposals approved for 2006 WSF process**

*Presented by Martí Olivella (Aliança por um Mundo Responsável e Solidário)*

1. In order to organize the WSF 2006 we are going to make a worldwide consultation about the thematic terrains, at the same time registration process is open.
2. This consultation will allow each organization to indicate in which "event" of the WSF 2006 they want to register and which theme(s) they suggest, pointing some of the 11 "themes" from 2005 or adding some others they consider more appropriate.
3. Based on the interpretation of the consultation and on their "local" sources (information from previous forums, analysis, agendas, surveys...), the Organizing Committees and the CMC will adopt their own thematic list, raising the possibility of having some common themes for the "events".
4. The consultation and activities registration (in its various phases) will be supported by a database for each "event". That database will have the same sincronized structure, allowing, at the same time, autonomy of management for each event and their interconnexion which will enable the organizations to both, enter information and have access to it. (*See proposal of the group WSF tools for the end of May*)<sup>2</sup>.
5. The program of WSF 2006 events will be mainly constituted of the activities proposed by the organizations that are registered in each "event".
6. In some cases and aspects (windows to other events, balance between activities and equity policies) in which it is not possible to favour free articulation of activities, each event's Organizing Committee may promote some activities in collaboration with the appropriate organizations.
7. It is relevant for the WSF process methodology:
  - gender and diversity transversal axes;
  - an equality policy [a work group formed by Marcha Mundial de Mujeres, de la Red Mujeres Transformando la Economía y la Articulación Feminista Marcosur will present a proposal for this policy];
  - concrete mechanisms to guarantee the balance on the events' programs [CMC must elaborate this components in a short term]
8. The frame of responsibilities for WSF 2006 organization is formed by:
  - Organizing Committees of each "event"
  - International Secretariat (complete)
  - requested IC commissions

<sup>1</sup> Observation: there were no meeting and no proposals from the Strategy commission

<sup>2</sup> There is an website specific for that work: [www.wsftools.ras.eu.org/wiki](http://www.wsftools.ras.eu.org/wiki)

In February 2006 an appropriate architecture will be planned for the following stage.

9. We need a list of common concepts – translated – to be used in the WSF 2006 process (documents, webs...). We accept as support for discussion during the next weeks the proposals made by Prabir and Pierre [*see the text on the Second Part, page 30*].

10. Common orientations for the next Forums:

- a) having previous consultations in order to determine the thematic areas.
- b) anticipation of the deadline for registering activities.
- c) opening the space of the Forum for different kind of activities.
- d) stimulating a previous effort for different kinds of self-articulation of activities (fusions, enchainements, mutual invitations, coordinations...)
- e) articulation/interlinking of activities not compulsory.
- f) opening within the Forum space and time for articulations/interlinking.
- g) building a Proposal's Billboard/Mural of Action for the Forum
- h) more effective opening and closing ceremonies

11. Proposals' Billboard/Mural and Instant Memory

- a) Allow each organization to edit, improve and update their proposals.
- b) Allow any organization to request another organization to support their proposal
- c) Translate the proposals and inviting people to keep presenting new ones.
- d) Facilitate access to the proposals when registration of activities for the WSF 2006 takes place, in order to allow having a type of activity aiming to “Coordinate and evaluate the proposals made in 2005”.
- e) Create means by which after registration, the organizations are able to present new proposals to be discussed in the Forum and that can be added in the Billboard/Mural.
- f) Establish connexions with memories from other Forums.
- g) Invite organizations to put a link or to copy the database in order to make this common information more visible.

## **2.2. Expansion Commission proposals approved for WSF Expansion process**

*Presented by Neil Coleman (Cosatu)*

1. While there has been significant expansion of the WSF process since its inception, there is a need for its expansion to be pursued proactively to enhance its geographic, thematic and sectoral spread, in order to correct the imbalance created by its uneven spread.
2. In order to do this, as a first step, information about the spread of the process and the gaps in it should be systematically put together in the form of a database and a “sociogram” of the WSF process and be accessible to everybody. The information should be regionally driven, drawing from information provided by local, national and regional processes. This task would require some support in terms of regular secretarial assistance.
3. We would actively encourage all participants of the WSF to spread the vision and experience of the WSF wherever possible, making optimal use of available resources and the opportunity provided while travelling to different parts of the world.
4. There is a need for specific fundraising to pursue the work of expansion of the WSF process, which will need to be concretised in the form of a proposal over the coming months.
5. Wherever there are specific requests for support from a region, such as a request from Africa that we already have, the IC/Expansion Commission will help in organising support for expansion of the process based on specific requirements and requests from the region.

## **2.3. Communication Commission proposals approved for 2006 WSF process**

*Presented by Sally Burch (Alai)*

1. It is recognized the importance of communication for the WSF, in different ways: activities of massive diffusion, participatory communication with groups and sectors that are interested in the WSF process, specially, regarding internal communication.
2. It will be given priority to initiatives that tend to create a communication tissue that is in accordance to the Charter of Principles.
3. The organizing committees of each place where WSF will take place will create a communication working group, integrated by networks and information and communication media, as well as organizations that have activities in the communication field. Those groups will work together to assure the communication among the decentralized Forums in 2006.

## **2.4. Resources Commission proposals approved by the IC about the WSF 2005 financial shortage and the WSF 2006 process**

*Presented by Njoki Njehu (50 Years is Enough) and Mark Rand (FNTG)*

1. The RC reaffirmed the role and scope of the Resources Commission (RC) was to assist the International Secretariat both in financial management and in mobilizing funds and other resources for the World Social Forum process. Both fiscal management and resource development must be understood in broader social and political contexts.
2. The Resources Commission would meet for two days on **June 18-19**, during the Mediterranean Social Forum in Barcelona. This meeting would bring together members of the RC and engaged funders and others with resource development expertise to begin a process of developing the long-term capacity of the WSF to meet the resources needs of the forum. The convening would build on and develop proposals made during RC meetings in Miami in June 2003 and in Italy in April 2004.
3. A draft charter of finance principles providing minimum ethical and operational standards will be drafted and discussed in Barcelona. This will be submitted for discussion and approval at the next IC meeting.
4. In preparation for the RC meeting in Barcelona, an assessment will be made of all of the resources allocated for the first five World Social Forums. These include descriptions and amounts by category of all of the main streams of income, in-kind and voluntary contributions needed to organize and hold a forum, relevant implications of funding from various sources, and resource-allocation impacts on local formal and solidarity economies and social sectors. Novib agreed to support the Secretariat in this project.
5. The RC needs to take up more rigorously its role of helping the IC and the Secretariat to develop the long-term capacity to generate funding and other needed resources.
6. An RC proposal that a letter in the name of the IC would be sent to all organizations that participated in WSF 2005, requesting solidarity support to help eliminate the 2005 deficit was discussed by the IC. This discussion and the issues it raised highlight the linkages between political and financial decisions of the IC. In this instance, the IC assumes co-responsibility for the financial deficit, but respected the decision of the Brazilian Organizing Committee for dealing with the current situation. No letter from the IC will be sent out, and Brazilian organizations will mount solidarity campaigns to raise the funds needed. Members that can and want to help with this effort should do so.
7. The RC used this opportunity to emphasize the issue of collective responsibility. This case demonstrated the necessity of establishing systems and procedures for the future, and will be taken up at the Resources Commission meeting in Barcelona, in our discussions around a proposal for ethical, political and operational guidelines for financial and non-financial resources.
8. In the meantime, it was made clear to the IC that detailed financial reports for the 2005 forum are available from the Secretariat, and a financial report, including a progress report on how the current deficit is being reduced, will be made at the next IC.

### **3. Presentation of proposals for places where the WSF 2006 will take place and adopted decisions**

The IC showed its support for the three processes that are going on – recognizing the existence of different situations for each case. It also expressed interest in looking for ways of incorporating the European Social Forum – which will take place in Greece, in April 2006 – to the common polycentric process.

**Americas/Venezuela.** When returning from Porto Alegre, social organisations from Venezuela confirmed their interest and conditions of holding the polycentric WSF in Caracas, at the same time that the Forum in Davos. A local Organizing Committee was formed. The Hemyspheric Council of the Americas SF, which will hold its next meeting in Havana on April 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup>, will share political responsibilities with the Venezuelan Committee. This specific architecture is in a discussion and construction process.

**Africa/ Morocco.** Moroccan organizations are mobilized to organise the polycentric WSF in their country simultaneously to the Davos Forum in 2006. They are facing difficulties regarding the local government that claims logistical problems to question the event's taking place in the country. The organizations that are members of the IC made a declaration settled individually by each delegate supporting initiatives from the Moroccan social organizations to solve the problem<sup>3</sup>. The organizations of the African Social Forum Council have the support of the IC to look for alternatives in case it is not possible to accomplish the Moroccan initiative.

**Asia/India.** Organizations from India have launched a consultation to other Asian social organizations to hold the polycentric WSF (corresponding to the South of Asia or to the whole Asia) in that country. The first answers supported the idea, but some expect to amplify this dialogue. A decision will be made in May, during a meeting that will be held in Colombo.

Some other initiatives in the WSF 2005/2006 process:

**Europe/ Greece.** The European Social Forum will take place in April 2006. Its organizing process is already happening – including a consultation that will start after the IC meeting and other political and methodological decisions. Some IC members expressed their interest in looking for new ways through which the ESF may incorporate itself to the polycentric common process. The European organizations presented in the IC meeting will propose to evaluate this possibility – considering the resolutions adopted by this IC. (The participation of observers from the European process in the IC meeting in Barcelona may contribute to the conclusion of this assessment).

There was also information about other processes:

- Mediterranean Social Forum, which will take place in Barcelona, in June 2005.
- Caribe Social Forum intended to be held in Martinica, in November 2005
- Asian Social Forum, which is intended to take place in Pakistan, in November 2005

---

<sup>3</sup> We reproduce here the declaration signed by IC members: "The organizations below, who met in Utrecht, Netherlands, members of WSF International Council, manifestate their solidarity to the Morocco Social Forum Council and express its support to the efforts that social movements and civil society organizations are carrying out in order to hold, on the end of January 2006, in Morocco, the polycentric World Social Fórum. We express our will to work together for this event be successfull".

## 4. Discussion about Strategy and decisions on this issue

### Summary of the debate carried out in the plenary, presented by Amit

The following were the main concerns that were expressed:

1. It is necessary, five years after the WSF process was initiated, to make an assessment that the WSF has had in shaping the resistance to globalisation and in changing the course of globalisation.
2. Given that strategies of globalisation and the concrete situation in many regions have changed, it is necessary for the WSF to adapt itself to the changing situation.
3. Mere reporting of the growth in numbers of the WSF process does not provide a good analysis of the growth and influence of the WSF.
4. There was a concern expressed by some that while the IC discusses Methodology at length, it does not engage with political issues that concern globalisation.
5. The WSF should be seen as taking into consideration the aspiration of those who participate to change the world around us. If we do not do this the WSF faces the danger of being isolated from the concerns of the very people who make it.
6. There were divergent views on how the IC would address issues related to the strategy of the WSF -- (a) does it formulate a definite course by identifying key issues and priorities; or (b) is the WSF strategy that of working out a methodology that promotes debate and common action on issues that would be identified and prioritised by movements themselves.
7. There was also the view expressed that what mandate does the IC have to speak on behalf of the large number of groups, organisations and people who are part of the WSF process.
8. There was unanimity in at least one area -- that the IC needs to set aside at least one full day at the time of the next IC meeting to discuss these issues and come to some consensus on what the IC's view could be on the strategic view of the WSF process.

### Decisions on the Strategy issue, presented by Giampiero and adopted by the Plenary

An enriching discussion took place, in which the following points of consensus could be registered:

- 1) There is the need of improving the quality of WSF IC discussion. The political discussion needs to be a constant function within the IC work. It is something that needs to be structured in the regular organization of the IC work.
- 2) This is why it is necessary to have another IC meeting soon (Barcelona, during the next MedSF), dedicated mostly (1 or 1,5 day) to this debate.
- 3) The general themes of this debate should be: international political conjuncture, WSF tasks in building a culture and politics that differ from the ones imposed by neoliberalism, relationship between WSF and the opposition campaigns, a methodology that would allow to operate the results of the discussion. These general themes should be translated before the IC meeting in an agenda that structures the meeting and its conclusions in a useful way.
- 4) So, the IC needs to be prepared by means of a discussion through e-mail to take place between April and May and an open meeting of the Strategy Commission (which, by the way, haven't met for a long time) in Barcelona. The main objective of this meeting would be to prepare the IC agenda.
- 5) Some people wanted the political discussion not to be restricted to the IC. Anyway, the general sense of the discussion shows that these decisions are a first step to strengthen the WSF general process through the political debate.

## **5. Approved Expansion Commission's proposals concerning IC Reorganization and Expansion**

*Presentado por Amit Sengupta (IOC/AIPSN)*

The priority is to reorganise the IC, and make it more effective. But we also need to find a way to deal with new applications which advances the objectives of making the IC more representative. The process of reorganisation needs to proceed according to a plan which will unfold over the short to médium term.

1. A subgroup consisting of Phumi and Roberto Savio shall synthesize the previous agreements in this regard within the Expansion Commission.

2. A sub-group consisting of Roberto Savio, Neil, Moema, Gautam, Mae, Phumi, Taofiq and Amit, Diane shall be formed to undertake the following tasks and be ready with its report before the next IC meeting:

- Prepare a profile/analysis of the present IC members through information available with the Sectt. and with the help of regional/local processes. The preparation of the profile of the IC would be based on a participatory methodology and also through a questionnaire that would be drafted by the sub-group. The Sectt. will also present a record of participation of members of the IC in meetings of the IC, thus assisting the Comisión in identifying inactive members.

- The group shall also prepare a road map for the reorganisation of the IC so as to ultimately address the imbalances manifest in its present composition. Such a "road map" would be designed to achieve this balance in the medium term (within the next 18 months). This model for the end state of the IC should include proposals on the size, composition and character of the IC, and a concrete plan to achieve this.

- The group shall recommend a procedure of examining new applications for IC membership.

- The group shall, starting with the criteria developed at the Miami meeting of the IC, finalise the criteria to be applied while examining applications for IC membership.

3. For the applications already recieved for membership to the IC, a letter would be circulated to them asking that information as required by the Miami criteria are provide. The proposals will be examined in the Expansion Commission before the next IC meeting based on the above and keeping in mind the necessity to address imbalances in the IC that has been referred to earlier.

## **6. Debate about International Secretariat composition and next steps regarding this issue**

A proposal emerged from the IC meeting and it was presented in the Plenary. It was assumed as a base for a collective discussion, which should take place until the meeting in Barcelona. The outline of the proposal is on the second part of this report.

The International Secretariat (Brazil-India) is responsible for coordinating and animating the debate.

## 7. Work plan and calendar

WSF 2005 Process									2006	
April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February
WEBS DataBase		Consultation and Registration			Themes	Articulation of Activities		Venue spaces Program Proposals		
		16-19: MedSF Barce- lona					Asian SF: Pakistan  Caribe SF: Mar- tinica		FSM 2006 Polycentric Caracas: 25-29 January Morroco: ? India: ?	
20:Mo- rroco 25-26: Havana	6-10: Sri Lanka 15: Da- kar ?: WG Africa 2007	16-19: IC Commissi ons 20-22: IC meeting in Barcelona								

## **SECOND PART. MATERIALS FOR THE DEBATE AND OTHER IC MEETING DOCUMENTS**

### **8. Meeting's participants list<sup>4</sup>**

#### **IC organizations who were present at the Utrecht meeting**

1. 50 Years is Enough!
2. ABONG - Associação Brasileira de ONGs
3. ALAI - Agencia Latinoamericana de Informacion
4. Aliança Por Um Mundo Responsável e Solidário
5. ALOP - Assoc. Latino Americana de Organismos de Promoção
6. Alternatives
7. Amigos da Terra / Friends of the Earth
8. Articulación Feminista Marco Sur
9. ASC - Aliança Social Continental
10. Assembléia das Nações Unidas dos Povos
11. APRODEV - Association of World Council of Churches related Development Organizations in Europe
12. ATTAC- Brasil
13. ATTAC France
14. CADTM- Comité pour l'Annulation de la Dette du Tiers Monde
15. Caritas Internationalis
16. CBJP - Comissão Brasileira de Justiça e Paz
17. CEAAL – Cons. Educação de Adultos da Am. Latina
18. CIDSE – Coopération Internationale pour le Développement et la Solidarité
19. CIVES – Associação Brasileira de Empresários pela Cidadania
20. CLACSO – Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales
21. CMT – Confederação Mundial do Trabalho
22. CIOSL - Confederação Internacional de Organizações Sindicais Livres
23. Conselho Mundial de Igrejas
24. COSATU - Congress of South African Trade Unions
25. CRID - Centre de Recherche et d'Information pour le Développement
26. CUT – Central Única dos Trabalhadores
27. Encuentros Hemisféricos contra el ALCA
28. ENDA – Environnement et Développement du Tiers Monde
29. EURALAT - Observatorio Eurolatinoamericano sobre el Desarrollo Democrático y Social
30. Euromarches – Marches Européennes
31. FAMES – Forum des Femmes africaines pour une Economie Solidaire
32. FIDH – Fed. Internacional Direitos Humanos
33. Focus on the Global South
34. GLBT - South-South Dialogue
35. HIC – Habitat International Coalition
36. IBASE – Instituto Brasileiro de Análises Sociais e Econômicas
37. ICAE - Consejo Internacional de Educacion de Adultos
38. IPF - Instituto Paulo Freire
39. IPS – Inter Press Service
40. NIGD - Network Institute for Global Democratization
41. OCLAE - Continental Organization of Latin America and Caribbean Students
42. OXFAM Internacional
43. PIDHDD – Plataforma Interamericana de Derechos Humanos, Democracia y Desarrollo
44. Projeto K
45. Rede CONSEU (Conferencia de Naciones sin Estado de Europa)
46. Redes Economía Solidaria
47. REMTE – Red Latinoamericana Mujeres Transformando la Economía
48. REPEM – Red de Educación Popular Entre Mujeres
49. Social Watch

<sup>4</sup> Note: the original list was lost and we had to make a second one. Then, it is possible that some present organizations are not registered in this list. We ask to inform us in order to make corrections accordingly.

50. Transform!
51. Transnational Institute (TNI)
52. UBUNTU - Foro Mundial de Redes de la Sociedad Civil
53. World Association of Community Radio Broadcasters (AMARC)
54. World March of Women

## **IC organizations who were absent from the Utrecht meeting**

55. ACTU - Australian Council of Trade Unions
56. AFL-CIO - American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations
57. Africa Trade Network
58. AIDC - Alternative Information on Development Center
59. ALAMPYME – Assoc. Latino Americana de Pequenos e Médios Empresários
60. All Arab Peasants & Agricultural Co-operatives Union
61. Alternative Information Center
62. Alternatives Russia
63. APC - Asamblea de los Pueblos del Caribe
64. Arab NGO Network for Development
65. ARENA - Asian Regional Exchange for New Alternatives
66. Asociación para el Progreso de las Comunicaciones, APC
67. Assemblée Européenne dès Citoyens
68. Babels
69. Bankwatch Network
70. Canadian Council
71. CEDAR Internacional
72. CEDETIM- Centre d'Etudes et d' Initiatives de Solidarité Internationale
73. CES – European Trade Union Confederation
74. CETRI – Centre Tricontinental
75. CLC - Canadian Labour Congress
76. COMPA - Convergencia de los Movimientos de los Pueblos de las Américas
77. CONAIE – Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador
78. Congresso Nacional Indígena do México
79. Coordinación del Foro “El Otro Davos”
80. Coordenadora de Centrais Sindicais do Cone Sul
81. Corpwatch
82. CTA – Central de Trabajadores Argentinos
83. Fecoc - Frente Continental de Organizações Comunitárias
84. Federación Mundial de Juventudes Democráticas
85. Fédération démocratique internationale des femmes (F.D.I.F.)
86. FIAN – Food First International Action Network
87. Fórum Dakar
88. Forum Mondial des Alternatives
89. Forum of the Poors
90. Fórum Social Italiano
91. Global Exchange
92. Global Policy Network
93. Greenpeace
94. Grito dos Excluídos
95. GTA – Grupo de Trabalho Amazônico
96. IATP – Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
97. IFAT - International Federation of Alternative Trade
98. IFG – International Forum on Globalization
99. IGTN – International Gender and Trade Network
100. INSP – International Network of Street Papers
101. IPB – International Peace Bureau / Fundació per la Pau
102. IRN – International Rivers Network
103. Jubilee South - Asia
104. Jubileo South - África
105. Jubileu 2000
106. Jubileu Sul América Latina

- 107.KCTU - Korean Confederation of Trade Unions
- 108.KOPA - Korean People's Action against Investment Treaties and the WTO
- 109.Land Research Action Network
- 110.MST – Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra
- 111.Narmada
- 112.North-South Centre
- 113.OATUU – Organization of African Trade Unions Unity
- 114.Oneworld
- 115.ORIT – Org. Regional Interamericana de Trabalhadores
- 116.Peace Boat
- 117.Public Citizen
- 118.Rede APM – Agricultura Camponesa e Modernização
- 119.Rede Dawn de Mulheres
- 120.Rede de Solidariedade Ásia Pacífico
- 121.Rede Latino Americana e Caribenha de Mulheres Negras
- 122.Rede Mundial de Mulheres pelos Direitos Reprodutivos
- 123.Rede Palestina de ONGs (PNGO)
- 124.Rede Social de Justiça e Direitos Humanos
- 125.SIGTUR - Southern Initiative on Globalisation and Trade Union Rights
- 126.Solidar
- 127.TWN – Third World Network
- 128.UIE – Union Internacional de Estudiantes
- 129.Via Campesina
- 130.Znet

### **Observers at the IC Utrecht meeting**

- 1. ATTAC Bélgica
- 2. FNTG – Funders Network on Trade and Globalization
- 3. Fórum de Autoridades Locais
- 4. Fórum Parlamentar Mundial
- 5. Fundação Ford
- 6. Conselho do FS Africano
- 7. Comitê marroquino del FSM 2006 policêntrico
- 8. CO provisório venezolano - FSM 2006 policêntrico / Américas
- 9. Global Progressive Fórum
- 10. IFTH – International Federation Terre des Hommes
- 11. WSF India Organizing Committee
- 12. NIGD - Network Institute for Global Democratization (tercer representante de esta red)
- 13. Scholar Activit Collective – ISA
- 14. WSF Solidarity Network in Japan

## 9. Evaluation of the WSF 2005 and its methodology<sup>5</sup>

There were no conclusions concerning this aspect. We reproduce here only some frequent opinions and information given during this part of the meeting. They are not the opinion of the whole IC nor of its majority.

### 9.1. Summary of the discussion that took place during the Seminars of Methodology, Content and Expansion Commissions

*Presented by Virginia Vargas (Articulaci3n Feminista Marco Sur)*

#### I. Previous considerations

- During the first two days, the Methodology and Content Commissions gathered with the Expansion Commission. This evaluation corresponds to the first part of the meeting.
- This meeting was very well prepared; documents about methodology and expansion were distributed previously. Those documents supported many discussions, but none of them were profoundly discussed.

#### II. General Evaluation of the WSF 2005

**Orientating emphasis:** A key-element to WSF evaluation is to analyze up to what extent the WSF allows the advance of the social movements.

Hitting points:

- The WSF 2005 made a difference and an impact: it opened space, and happened all over the city. PUC was restrictive. To go from PUC to the World Social Territory was very important.
- The whole process meant a great innovation.
- It was very inspiring.
- The World territory was a very good concept; it gives a sense of strength and localization.
- There were two non-explicit challenges in the WSF 2005: complexity and quality, which are still in process. The challenge is how to convert quantity into quality.

Difficulties/comments:

- Two good opportunities for political impact were missed: the opening and closing ceremonies. And the solidarity night was dull.
- There was no political directionality, it didn't leave any inspiration nor new ideas.
- Co-optation (assimilation) process of WSF: critics to the presence of Lula and Chav3z which was not coherent to the Charter of Principles.

#### III. Methodology

General Evaluation

Along the discussion two different views were evident, expressing the different emphasis related to the WSF:

---

<sup>5</sup> The group in charge of preparing this report could not recover the points worked on the summary made at the end of this debate by the chairs and presented by Mae

1. Apparently, there is an opinion that is shared by the majority:
  - The WSF worked well. It's a good bet and innovation. The format made it more democratic.
  - The feeling that the WSF is for everyone was introduced.
  - The methodology was successful. It has generated initiatives and left more connections.

However: it was an advance, but it is a long term process:

- "It worked well, but not concerning the details"
- "There was a distance between what we have dreamed of and what was done"
- It worked well for the ones who were installed on the WSF, and the campaigns, but not for the more fragile groups nor for the non-central themes.
- The methodology was an innovative one, but also the result of many other innovations made on the past Forums, specially the Forum in Mumbai.

2. A second aspect concerning the methodology:

- The forum is a very dynamic space and it pertains to all the organizations. So, it depends less on the methodology. The things that worked out were result of a process.
- The methodology had a mistaken focus. It interfered in articulations that are/were already going on. The interlinking process has already been happening since the first forum, without WSF methodology.

Evaluation of different dimensions of the methodology:

- a) Self-organization

- It was a positive aspect. It made the Forum more democratic.
- It was the biggest mark of the WSF 2005
- It was really done from the the bottom to the top

However:

- It was possible for the groups who had more resources.
- There was an imbalance and unevenness concerning gender and territory; a risk of masculinization of the Forum.

Criticism to the self-organization:

- WSF is not prepared to be a totally self-organized forum
- The self-organization is over-dimensioned and because of that there were problems.
- It is necessary to provide certain structures in order to allow groups to advance in common action programs.
- Self-organization as a free-market: everyone may compete, but there are relationships of power and inequality.

Self-organization and WSF political meaning

- The self-organization left a political vacuum that was filled by the big event Lula-Chavez.
- The event seemed to have been organized by the IC.
- The articulation for action made us forget about taking care of reaching the people who were participating, something that is done through big conferences.
- It is better to have some events that are not self-organized.
- An alternative to not repeat the previous formula is to have activities co-organized.

However, one question still remains: if the political legitimacy and the eventual political vacuums of the WSF should be filled with big events or with a clear articulation between methodology and politics.

b) Articulation and interlinking process: they represented two very important dimensions, as part of the participative and dialogue dynamics of the methodology. However, none of them worked as it was predicted.

- There was no clear direction.
- The word “agglutination” is ugly and we need to change it
- The movements interlink themselves without the methodology

c) Venue spaces / thematic terrains

- The importance of venue spaces as thematic terrains
- The importance of venue spaces in the city
- The thematic terrains were not totally self-organized; there was work and proposal capacity of the IC Comisión.
- For some people, the 11 thematic terrains were 11 forums, for others, the terrains did not reflect the consultation.
- We need to pay attention to the selection of thematic terrains. It is also important to think of and instigate terrains for emerging theme, for the construction of alternatives.
- Distance between thematic terrains didn't help the interaction and interlinking between them.

d) Proposals' Billboard / Mural

- It is an innovative idea.
- But it didn't work well.
- There were over 300 proposals and they weren't well publicized.
- It is important to combine the proposals' billboard/mural with campaigns' proposals.

#### IV. Transversal Axes

- They didn't work. They were senseless. They were confusing. There were no mechanisms to make them effective.

#### V. Means of communication - communication

- There was no communication policy. The foreign press focused on showing the showers in the Youth Camp and the Lula-Chavez debate, instead of talking about the discussions.
- False democracy: 65% coverage of the Brazilian press was dedicated to 3 Brazilian personalities and they were all men.
- The idea of self-organization was not appropriately spread.
- It is assumed that the communication is self-organized.
- The need of an “introduction” methodology, which informs and communicates for the people who are “getting started” on the Forum.

### **9.2 Report about the projects from the IC Content and Methodology Commissions WSF 2005 Memory working group**

*Presented by Martí Olivella (Aliança por um Mundo Responsável e Solidário)*

#### **Description of the agglutination, mural of proposal, and live memory projects**

Following the directives of the IC in Mumbai, in the joint meeting of the Content and Methodology Commissions of the IC in Passignano (Italy) in April of 2004, it was agreed to advance in the methodology of self-managed creation of WSF 2005 themes and program, as well as progress in

methodologies facilitating self-agglutination of activities and construction of a live memory of the Social Forums.

In Porto Alegre and Sao Paulo meetings of May 2004, the CMC defined some steps to advance in the consultation and the process of self-construction and self-agglutination of the WSF2005 program.

In Sao Paulo, in August and in Paris in September, there were meetings on the building of the Memory of the Social Forums.

In October, in Paris an agreement between ESF 2003 financing Association and CCFD (Catholic Committee against Hunger and towards Development) with IBASE ( acting in name of the Brazilian part of Secretariat and the CMC) to fund with 60,000 € the project of the technical team coordinated by Nicolas Haeringer (Exemole) and Martí Olivella (Nova) both of the Memory WG of the CMC of the IC, with the purpose of supporting self-agglutination process and collection and building of a live memory of WSF 2005, as a contribution to the general dynamics of the future Social Forums.

The team - formed by Brazilians and Europeans - began to elaborate conceptual tables and maps with the registered activities data, tables in which possible agglutinations between activities were indicated (coordination, linking, fusion.) based on the proximity between names and summaries of the activities, as well as between indicated key words.

In the meeting of the CMC in November in Porto Alegre, CMC coordinators decided that this work performed in support to agglutination should not be continued and it was agreed to concentrate team resource and energy on the other objectives: support to the building of Proposals billboard and live Memory (that, in addition to the Billboard proposals and activity summaries, had to include Nomad recordings, Communication WG contents and Culture WG Instantaneous Memory contents). Pierre George, also from IC CMC Memory WG , reinforced this new process as a volunteer.

A team of 11 volunteers coordinated by Gustavo Marin with the contribution of Pierre Jonhson, continued the work begun on agglutination and constructed, from the tables with the agglutinables activities, a set of conceptual maps that it published in [www.portoalegre2005.info](http://www.portoalegre2005.info) and which received 2472 visits before the forum (see annex 2)

Although there were only two months left before the Forum, the team had to rework several times the Billboard project ... until mid January we had not obtained agreement of CMC coordinators on the practical details to develop the project of the Proposal Billboard . A Few days before the Forum, Regina Egger was named operative coordinator of the project in POA.

During the Forum days 11 "mini billboards" were set iup in the 11 spaces, more than 100 volunteers were trained with the support of coordinators from Paulo Freire Institute and Solidarity Network. Computers began to be half-operational by the third day of the Forum and for the closing act 352 proposals had been collected, the majority handwritten and having not received personal and methodologic support sufficient to guarantee a minimum level of quality.

The closing act, in which the Mural- Billboard was exposed, was held in a place different from the announced one, and several members of Secretariat with tens of journalists attended, and not many more participants of the Forum. During this last day, nearly 60 more proposals arrived. After making backups copies of the proposals, gathered proposals were entered into a data base during February and

www.memoria-viva.org was built with subwebsite www.memoria-viva.org/fm05, that allows to consult and to present/display proposals (to see annex 2)

Of over 400 proposals received, we have after review:

291 already published in the Website and are being translated.

73 are being reviewed with their authors before being published in the Web.

70 were duplicated, or were made in the name of individuals - not in the name of organizations -, or were incomplete.

61 proposals have been received after the Forum was over, 45 of which are published in the Website. The others were individual proposals.

By scopes: 156 world-wide, 25 continental, 79 regional 10 national, 19 local and 2 undefined.

More than one third (~100) are collective proposals, and out of these, half are with more than 3 organizations.

By spaces of the forum: A = 16 autonomous thinking B = 37 Defending diversities, C = 11 Arts and creation D = 30 Communication E = 28 Communal properties of the Earth and People F = 27 social struggles G = 23 Peace demilitarization H=19 international democratic order I = 35 sovereign economies J= 40 human rights and dignity K=12 ethics cosmovision spiritualities undefined 13

By languages: 56 in english 26 in french 22 in spanish , 188 in portuguese. 8 were collected translated in 4 languages, 9 in 2 languages , 2 in 3 languages

Proposal billboard website receives now( end of march) an average of 110 visitors a day , with 3 pages per visitor. Visitors enter directly or through google , nearly none enters from forum site homepage.

Since end of march there is an internal search engine ( google type) in the Billboard [www.memoria-viva.org/recherche](http://www.memoria-viva.org/recherche) and proposals can be browsed by languages ( see annex 2)

### **Short evaluation of the projects**

As a team we have been able to develop the three sub projects in a minimum way with diverse results and learnings:

- activities agglutination methodology,
- construction of a Proposal Billboard with proposals database in the Web, and
- design of a Website to go building live Memory of the Forums.

We know what it is not to be done if other Forums want to benefit from the experience. Also we can make suggestions on what would be worth considering to make it better (see annex1)

In spite of numerous "small" problems that were to be resolved on the spot (reduced dimension of the Billboard panels, lack of visibility of the project and the panels, difficulties to form an ample team of volunteers which would help to draft the proposals, multitude of difficulties with the computers and printers, etc.) we were able to gather 352 proposals during the Forum. For future cases, it seems

important and necessary to us to articulate much better the process of the Proposal Billboard with the forum general organization dynamics. For this, it is indispensable to have in the team a political and technical representative in the organizing committee, at least 3 months before the forum, that can dedicate to the coordination between the forum preparation process and the technical team and takes care of the relations with the architects, with the people in charge of the volunteers, the people in charge of the logistics and the computers, the communication and the press, etc.

It is necessary to consider that: a) although the Memory project including Proposal Billboard project was formally approved by the Commission of Methodology and Content, it was discussed very briefly in comparison with the innumerable hours inverted in the subject of aglutinación. Memory topic was not included the COB workgroups; b) memory topic was formally included in Program WG workscope but actually was only assumed by the coordinators of the CMC of the Brazilian secretariat.

Thus the "Proposal Billboard " project was deemed between November and January a technical initiative with an insufficient level of internal legitimacy in the process of the CMC of IC, initiative that was not included in the Brazilian preparation process: the idea of having Brazilian organizations of the COB supporting the Proposal Billboard initiative appeared on January 25th- and the Institute Paulo Freire stepped in the project in emergency.

The experience lived of a technical team located in three countries, and that has to coordinate with political people in charge, shows that working at a distance is not simple, especially when, as the forum draws near, everyone has to face a multitude of urgent subjects.

In order to ensure a good coordination, specially in urgency situations, it is indispensable to gear up with suitable tools that facilitate work in remote networking mode , decision making, etc. The team coordination experience has been very positive thanks to the free internet group or to systems to share files in a same working website. This necessity will be even greater next year next with the challenge of organizing and performing simultaneous forums in networking mode.

Also, it is necessary to try to coordinate the WSF dynamics of memory building with other forums dynamics of memory building, for instance ESF . The connections are in progress. The IC and their commissions have an important role in the building of these relationships, supporting and facilitating these processes.

The lived experience makes us raise, in the field of sistematización, the need for a WSF organizational model consistent with the size and the innovation of the WSF. an organization model that anticipates and prioritizes the subject of sistematización, and creates ahead in time spaces of interlocution and collective responsibility on this subject, spaces that can breed operation groups and common vision, that in turn allow to make decisions within complex and international projects, to delegate to teams with defined responsibilities, that maintain the necessary permanent communication with all actors...

What we have learned, the developed methodologies, used or no, webs.. are at Social Forums organisation committees disposal

It is necessary to decide how to potentiate the proposal database in order to facilitate their circulation and free interlinking and how to propose tools adapted to free self building of Social Forums live memory.

The bases are in place. Now we need clear directives and a responsible organizational model that takes advantage of the creativity, enthusiasm and professionalism and consideration of suggestions and criticisms coming from evaluation process (see annex 3).

Martí Olivella, Nicolas Haeringer and Pierre George of the GT Memory of the CMC of the CI

## **Barcelona - Paris 26/03/05**

---

### **Annexed 1: Suggestions to build a Proposal Billboard of a Social Forum**

- 1, Take within the organizing Committee the decision to build a Proposal Billboard with sufficient time ahead, at the same moment when initiating the organization of the Forum.
2. Create a work group related to the organizing Committee centered in the memory and systematization "memory WG". This group would have the responsibility to stimulate and to gather reports of activities and proposals presented/displayed in these activities and to create memory contents coordinating itself with spaces and actors like "WG comunicación" (that would work by means of "forums of alternative media") and "WG translation" (that would include groups like Babels, Nomad, Solidarity Network... within the collective organizational dynamics of the process and not as entities providing service).
3. This WG, with open composition mixing volunteers and wage-earning people contributed by organizations, would have one or more representatives members of the organizing Committee and would be in charge of organizing the Mural/Billboard, during and after the Forum, on the basis of a formalized mission approved in the organizing Committee. In particular the organizations integrating this "WG memory" would have responsibility for finding beforehand volunteers for the operation during the forum, preparing them in advance

This "WG memory" would have all the even legitimacy to be able:

4. Elaborate collectively a workplan and a census of necessary resources with contributions in time from people depending on organizations and from volunteers and voluntary or professional technical contributions. Also it would make the budget about the funds that were necessary and that would come from the general budget of the Forum.
5. Design the strategy for having organizations participant to the forum know the possibility of presenting/displaying their proposals in the Mural/Bill board in the terms and procedures that would be agreed. The visibility and legitimacy of the "WG memory" in the forum preparation would allow to make an anticipated communication on the Proposal Billboard taking advantage of the consultation, previous agglutination and inscription processes.
6. Present to the Organizing Committee directions and concrete plans about when \* proposals would be received. We think that participation is enhanced if it is possible to be present/display a month before the Forum event days and a month later. Also the group must propose which are the procedures to present/display and to consult the proposals in the different phases (before, during and later): proposals database on the Web, construction of murals/billboards in the spaces of the Forum, human teams and computer equipment to facilitate the presentation of proposals during the Forum...; translation of the proposals; edition and exhibition of the proposals during the Forum...

7. Present directions about integration between the proposals and the activities of the Forum: they appear previously to the activities to be deliberated on?; they are extracted from the activities?; they are elaborated in the Forum between several organizations as a tool for articulation?..

8. Suggest and organize "usages" of Proposal Billboard after the Forum: bank of proposals in the Web to "get to know" what appeared in the Forum? articulation space of organizations revolving around common proposals? space of articulation or priorización of similar actions.?

9. Elaborate methodologies adapted to the objectives and decided procedures. The "WG systematization" of a forum can coordinate with the Memoria Viva team in order to benefit from the tools developed in [www.memoria-viva.org/WSF05](http://www.memoria-viva.org/WSF05)

10. Develop, on the basis of a process consensed within Forum organizing Committee and shared by the memory WG integrants, a good information and communication policy throughout the process in order to assure that all the participants who want to participate (organizations o/y registered participants) have sufficient time to elaborate, present/display and articulate their proposals, with sufficient support guaranteeing the best quality in the form and the content of the proposals.

Memoria Viva Team of the Methodology and Contents Commissions of the IC:  
[contact@memoria-viva.org](mailto:contact@memoria-viva.org)

### **9.3. Documents containing the preliminary results from the World Social Forum 2005 Survey**

*Presented by Cândido Gryzbowski (Ibase) – See PDF attachment sent with this doc*

### **9.4. Written evaluation done by the participants at the IC meeting**

Participants at the meeting had the option also of registering their opinions and evaluation about the WSF 2005 by writing the positive and negative aspects. The answers are reproduced below.

Answers originally in castellano

**Positive:** beginning of articulation/interlinking of movements and organizations around mobilizations and campaigns.

**Negative:** translation didn't work, what limited the articulation process of the World Social Forum.

**Positive:** the new methodology, that should allow a bigger articulation and the creation of alternatives between the organizations and social movements.

**Negative:** give priority to the methodology and not to political issues. If political decisions on how the process is going to follow are not taken, someone else may decide first.

**Positive:** methodology used in the articulation of movement regarding the themes WSF should give priority to and the creation of the World Social Territory.

**Negative:** not having a communication policy nor a proposal to be a counterpoint to the Forum in Davos.

**Positive:** meeting experiences from around the world, improving our organization's articulation with other organizations.

**Negative:** the infrastructure wasn't fully prepared and there was frustration. There was a backward movement concerning communication and WSF worldwide visibility.

**Positive:** impact of the new methodology on the thematic organizations and participation.

**Negative:** the activities were too spread/disperse on the territory.

**Positive:** self-organization favored the diversity.

**Negative:** the dispersion of the Thematic Terrains made more difficult to have a global view of the WSF.

**Positive:** it remains a mobilization and articulation space for all the political and social expressions.

**Negative:** there was little space left for reflexive thinking on politics and about the world situation nowadays.

**Positive:** it has confirmed organizations' commitment and will to build alternatives collectively.

Presence and initiatives of those organizations and entities are WSF vital energy.

**Negative:** political gaps, filled by large events and declaration of the 12 and its consequent distortions. General unbalance, among them, women invisibility. Logistical difficulties that affected activities and articulations/interlinking.

**Positive:** thanks to the positive contribution of the new methodology, the forum was excellent in terms of articulation, previously and during the Forum and because of that, the final balance is positive.

**Negative:** too many thematic terrains/venue spaces, and the fact that facilitating groups have not worked.

### Answers in English

**Positive:** a space which could sustain real details on strategies.

**Negative:** weaker capacity to integrate in the event delegation either organisations or geographically "marginal" (Africa, Asia)

**Positive:** the terrains worked very well for dialogues across sections.

**Negative:** resulted in some degree of restriction within themes

**Positive:** open space, attempt of themes, new methodology.

**Negative:** dust-distance without clean easy transport (bikes would be good). Translation and acoustics in the space.

**Positive:** Attempts to create spaces to facilitate concrete proposals and action (even if this process needs to be improved)

**Negative:** "secret" closing ceremony – missed opportunity to create collective experience, sense of accomplishment, feeling of closure to the Forum. Event end, not with an inspiring "bang", but with a confused whimper. Politically missed opportunity to make a statement to the world through the press and through the experiences of participants of what the Forum had accomplished.

**Positive:** experience of self-organizing

**Negative:** lack of synthesis / articulation between terrains.

**Positive:** facilitation of self-organisation and networking. Avoiding struggles among big organizations for representatives in plenaries

**Negative:** missing of enough facilitation in “agglutination”. To develop more and better all the new tools introduced. Too expensive. WSF invisible in dominant X alternative media for those not there!

**Positive:** the realization of the II Forum for Sexual Diversity within the WSF. The conclusions of all organizations from lesbian, gay, bisexual & trans people from all the world, interconnecting globalization issues.

**Negative:** the political vacuum generated by a complete self-organization of events, the masculinization of event(s) and the no respect of methodology for the implementation of cross-cutting themes.

**Positive:** being more present in the city and closer to the youth camp although there was still some distance

**Negative:** the “methodology” that brought the 11 terrains. It took all the focus away from the political process of constructing alternatives. They were more or less the same themes at 2003 and there were too many to give up the possibility to organize strategically.

**Positive:** self-organization, as a principle, has been a step forwards by giving social movements and articulations the central role in defining the program.

**Negative:** by relying only on self-organization and abdicating a role of the organizing commission (or IC) the Forum lost balance (gender, diversity) and the opportunity to organize a few mass events with high visibility on the central issues = was / peace and neoliberal globalization / alternatives.

**Positive:** in terms of release of progressive energy and connections between many different organizations and networks

**Negative:** Most problems which have been identified flow from lack of political management and coordination. We have to make another world possible = issue of political power.

2 possible evolutions:

- New methodology giving all the initiatives to the bottom...
- The attempt to experiment and accept alternative practices (environment, free software, voluntary work, etc.)

1 problem: Those evolutions need to be better (facilitation groups etc)

**Positive:** World Social Territory. Meeting with Lula.

**Negative:** (needs improvement) translation, lack of opening and closing events.

**Positive:** Methodology, from agglutination to proposal

**Negative:** Wall of proposals, good initiative but no visibility during WSF. Not taken further.

Decentralised WSF 2006: Proposals should be the linking, unifying visible elements between the Fora!

## **10. Report on WSF-IC Communication Commission meeting - Utrecht, March 30<sup>th</sup> 2005**

*Prepared by Sally Burch (ALAI) y Roberto Sávio (IPS)*

There was an agreement concerning the need of defining communication mechanisms for the WSF, emphasizing three levels.

- information and diffusion about the process
- mechanisms for internal communication
- for the polycentric 2006 WSF, it is important to assure communication among the different places of the Forum.

Three proposals were presented to the commission, concerning many aspects of the levels above. And we also received some recommendations from the Expansion commission. The commission has many ideas and it is working on a consensus proposal. Particularly, they include the strengthening of collective coverage initiatives, among independent, community and alternative media that are linked in some way to the Forum process. It would be a matter of giving them a more permanent characteristic, related to the Forum process. It has already been considered the organization of an evaluation and exchange seminar among those media, previous to the World Forums.

Some other proposals concern to:

- Multimedia coverage initiatives, in order to interconnect the many places where the polycentric Forum will take place in 2006.
- Promotion of a pool of journalists who identify themselves with WSF purposes and principles
- Creating tools that can facilitate the intercommunication and mutual knowledge within the Forum process (database, dynamic virtual library etc.)

In the next few weeks, we propose to amplify the commission to include, particularly, some other networks and communication media, and specially to achieve a bigger diversity in the commission's composition, which now is mainly constituted of Spanish speakers. We propose that the commission have a meeting in May to start preparing the process of make concrete those proposals.

The Communication Commission presented the following proposals to the International Council:

- recognizing the importance of communication for the WSF, in its different meanings: activity of massive diffusion, participatory communication with the sectors and groups that are interested in the WSF process and, specially, regarding internal communication.
- to give priority to the initiatives that tend to create a communication tissue, always considering the Charter of Principles.
- organizing committees of each place where the forum will take place should create a communication working group, integrated by networks and information and communication media, as well as for the social organizations that have activities in the communication field. These groups will work together to assure the intercommunication among the decentralized Forums in 2006.

Following people were present to the meeting: Mae Ocampo, FOEI; Sally Burch, ALAI; María Pía Matta, AMARC; Salette Valesan Camba, IPF; Azril Bacal, IPF; Antonio Martins, Attac-Brasil; José Oliveira, ICFTU/CIOSL; Peter Waterman, NIGD; Roberto Sávio, IPS; Pierre George, Caritas.

## **11. Proposals for the strengthening, internationalization and expansion of the IS**

A proposal was built during the IC meeting and presented in the Plenary. It was used as support for a discussion that should take place until the next meeting in Barcelona. The International secretariat (Brazil-India) is responsible for coordinating and animating this debate.

The basic points of the proposal – according to what Gustavo presented to the Plenary – were:

### The architecture as a whole.

We need to be very careful when defining the diverse instances, since we need to preserve the appropriate functioning and articulation among them.

Strengthen the International Secretariat cannot mean to weaken the International Council. Since in 2006 there will not be a centralized WSF – a moment in which we always held massive IC meetings – we need to make great efforts to guarantee that the IC will meet with a good number of representatives at least twice per year.

### The spheres we should develop.

The International Council is our worldwide collective space to build synthesis of creation processes and regional debates. It's also the main body to adopt political-methodological definitions concerning the WSF process.

The work (of some) IC Commissions has demonstrated great potentialities that we should take better advantage of. The Commissions are important spaces because of their inclusive character of new sectors or organizations interested in actively join the build of a worldwide process. Moreover, they have been demonstrating they are able to discuss in depth issues that couldn't be done in regular IC meetings. However, we must pay attention so that their dynamics do not mismatch from the IC general work.

At Polycentric WSF 2006, the necessary interlinking (of other WSF bodies) with organising committees from the different Chapters/venues will have a key role. For each Chapter, political and organizational functions should be set and interlinked with other bodies engaged in the regional process. For example, in Caracas, there is an agreement for a constant and heavy presence of Americas SF's Hemispheric Council together with (the future) Venezuelan Organising Committee.

Finally, at the WSF 2006 perspective, the International Secretariat should have as functions:

- Logistical support to WSF process.
- Assure communication, dialogue and information socialisation between all WSF bodies and between the different Chapters of the Polycentric WSF 2006.
- Coordinate and operate Communication Commission's proposals approved by the IC.
- Fundraising, make viable Resources Commission's proposals approved by the IC.
- Preparation and facilitation of the following meetings:
  - a) IC Commissions
  - b) interlinking between Polycentric WSF's Organising Committees (if it is decided to hold it)
  - c) WSF International Council

The International Secretariat Office will still remain in São Paulo (Brazil), but some tasks and functions may be done in *other spaces* or even in *virtual spaces* (when designated to a specific regional chapter, working group etc.), like what has already been occurring.

Proposals for new International Secretariat composition, seeking its internationalization, strengthening and expansion.

The IS will be formed by the integration of three dynamics:

- a) Polycentric WSF 2006 “Organising Committees”, as it has been defined in each region. It means to have 01 delegate + 01 alternate/deputy from Americas/Caracas; 01 + 01 from Africa/Morocco; 01 + 01 from Asia/India. So, it would be 03 + 03. If ESF joins the polycentric process we must add: 01 + 01.
- b) Commissions that have been working. Nowadays, we concretely have: (i) Methodology and Content and Thematic Commissions, working together; (ii) Resources; (iii) Communication; (iv) Expansion. Considering 01 delegate and 01 alternate/deputy for each, it should have: 04 + 04. As the two Commissions of (i) have been working together, it is proposed to consider them as one single commission. The Strategy Commission hasn't been working (it didn't meet in Netherlands), so it was proposed that *at this moment* it should not integrate this scheme.
- c) The present International Secretariat Brazil - India. Originally composed by 08 Brazilian organisations and many others from India. It was considered the possibility / need to reduce (or not) this number when constituting the new Secretariat. We still need to observe that India organisations are also proposing a WSF 2006 Asian edition – such process fits in the first criteria.

In all the cases, indications should be of “organisations” and not of “people”, even if it is obvious that is indispensable that such organisations designate regular people to follow and to do the tasks.

To have a better idea of the whole, we show below how should be the hypothesis above explained:

	Delegate(s)	Alternate(s)
FSM polyc. Americas/ Caracas	01	01
FSM polyc. Asia / Índia	01	01
FSM polyc. Africa / Maroc	01	01
[FSM polyc. Europe / Greece]	[01]	[01]
Methodology and Cont./Them Commissions	01	01
Communication Commission	01	01
Expansion Commission	01	01
Resources Commission	01	01
Sub-totals for these two dimensions	07 [08]	07 [08]

To these numbers should be added those resulting from discussions concerning the present International Secretariat Brazil – India. On the other hand, as India proposes to hold one of Polycentric WSF 2006, we need to evaluate how this corresponds to the proposed scheme.

Last and strategical observation: because of the composition format proposed here, it should have a mechanism that explicitly assures the gender balance of the new International Secretariat.

## **12. Information on IC meeting's Solidarity Fund**

For this IC meeting, North organizations were asked to make a voluntary contribution to the Solidarity Fund used to reimburse (partially) the airplane tickets from South participants.

Total amount received and reimbursed: 8.350 euros + 400 dollars

### Donors:

a) IC member organizations: Alianza 21; Aprovech; ATTAC France; CADTM; Caritas France; CCFD (CRID); CIDSE; CIOSL; CMT; Consequ; CRID; Euromarches; FIDH; IPS; Oxfam / Novib; Project K; Redes Economia Solidaria; Transform! Italy; Ubuntu; World Council of Churches.

b) Observers: FNTG; Ford Foundation; Local Authorities Forum; Greens – Parliamentarian World Forum; GUE - Parliamentarian World Forum; Terre des Hommes.

Note: a contribution received for the “WSF 2005 Translation Fund” was also used to the “Solidarity Fund” (50 euro).

### Organizations that received resources from the Solidarity Fund:

a) Africa: Organising Committee – Morocco; Enda – Senegal; FAMES – Senegal; two African Social Forum Council members – Mali; two COSATU members – South Africa.

b) Latin America: ALAI – Quito; Dialogo LGTB – Quito; CEAAL – Panama; CLACSO – Argentina; OCLAE – Cuba.

To hold this IC meeting in Utrecht we had the logistical support from ICCO. Novib contributed assuring simultaneous translation into Spanish-English. It was also essential for the activities organized in Amsterdam and Utrecht the support given by TNI (Transnational Institute) and Friends of the Earth International (FOEI).

## APPENDIX

### **Definition of terms used in the documents**<sup>6</sup>

Dispersed WSF: WSF events held in conjunction with each other and declared to be part of WSF 2006

Forum Actors – all participants to forum event and process whether organizing events, organizing activities, or participating to those – they are generally members of some organization or entities

Groups: groups of forum actors organizing activities in the forum, or performing , agglutination/articulation tasks or facilitation tasks

Activity: A Conference/ seminar/workshop/ cultural show/ demonstration/ strategy session held in the WSF Event/Events

Event: WSF2006 Events as the entire corpus of activities held in the dispersed WSF above

Areas: Areas are a set of topics that are loosely or closely related to each other in the perception of some forum actors. As the agglutination process proceeds, they may map into terrains or across terrains

Themes: Themes are either overarching concerns in the WSF such as Imperialist Globalisation, Peace, Patriarchy, Race or diagonals such youth, students, workers, peasantry/farmers

Terrains: Means the physical location of a demarcated cluster of activities and the result of forum organisers and CMC locating these activities in a common space based on some underlying commonalities implied by the terrain name

Proposals: these are proposal of actions of any type that groups of actors make in their names on the Forum mural of proposal after holding activities

Agglutination: The interlinking of activities whose organizers come together on a voluntary basis

Initiative Groups: Initiative groups are self-organised by forum actors in the process of activity articulation and agglutination

Articulation: The process of groups of actors making proposals of any type and taking them to the mural of Proposal of the forum

Facilitation Groups: Facilitation Groups are created by the CMC for specific areas that the CMC may feel require such a group. They may grow in numbers as the process unfolds.

Links between activities: relationships between activities mutually accepted by the actors, reflecting the type and intensity of agglutination

---

<sup>6</sup> Extracted from the text "Challenges and Suggestions for WSF2006 and Further", written by Prabir / India and Pierre George / France – quoted in the resolution on Methodology (page 5). Complete version is available on the set of documents for the debate, sent to the IC mailing list before the IC meeting in Utrecht.