Climate Investment Funds

Meeting of the SCF Trust Fund Committee
Washington, D.C.
January 27, 2009

Meeting of the CTF Trust Fund Committee
Washington, D.C.
January 29-30, 2009

Review of practices on NGO/CSO Participation and proposal for the CIF Committees
(Prepared by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature)

REVIEW OF PRACTICES ON NGO/CSO PARTICIPATION AND RECOMMENDED MEASURES FOR NGO REPRESENTATION AT MEETINGS OF THE CIF TRUST FUND COMMITTEES
(CTF TRUST FUND COMMITTEE, SCF TRUST FUND COMMITTEE, AND PPCR SUB-COMMITTEE)

January 2009

Prepared By:

Allison Bleaney
Consultant
IUCN Forest Conservation Programme

&

Carole Saint-Laurent
Senior Forest Policy Advisor
IUCN Forest Conservation Programme

Statement of task

The CIF Committees agreed that the Secretariat would prepare a proposal regarding NGO attendance and civil society participation in the CIF Trust Fund Committees and Sub-Committees. The design documents for the CIF provide, at present, for no NGO/civil society representation on the CTF Trust Fund Committee and for civil society to be invited to identify a representative to observe the SCF Trust Fund Committee and PPCR Sub-Committee meetings.

To support the Secretariat in this effort, IUCN was contracted in December 2008 to conduct a detailed review of current rules, practices and procedures examining how other international entities/ financing mechanisms, global programs and other funds allow for NGO/CSO participation in their Boards and the modalities for arranging this participation. Attention was also given to key services and characteristics of NGO/CSO participation and to specific measures to ensure transparency and efficiency of Board Meetings and balanced stakeholder representation. As an important part of civil society participation, processes for civil society organizations to self select representatives and the lessons learnt were also reviewed.

Selection of case studies

The multilateral bodies and global funding programs that were reviewed include a range of entities, many of which benefit from the direct involvement or advice of the Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs). These bodies and funds were selected to enrich this study with diverse and interesting examples reflecting the current state of play on civil society participation.

1. Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR system)
2. Global Environment Facility (GEF)
3. International Fund for Agriculture (IFAD)
4. Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria
5. European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EDRB)
6. Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)
7. North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC)
8. Roundtable on Sustainable Biofuels (RSB)
9. Global Forum on Development (GFD)
10. United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF)

With specific reference to civil society self selection processes, we will present an overview of the practice developed for the Europe and Northern Asia Ministerial Conference on Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (ENA FLEG), and more recently for the January 2009 meetings of the FIP and the GFP.

Summary of methodology

The work was carried out through a desk study, telephone and e-mail interviews with participants (CSO/NGOs and others) in processes of existing structures and models and in MDB decision-making/consultative processes, review and analysis, development of recommendations, and consultation on and refinement of recommendations. See Annex 3 of this report for a list of telephone and e-mail interviewees and a summary of the main topics discussed.

Summary of the key values of NGO/CSO participation

The efforts and resources that multilateral bodies and global funding programs direct to providing for civil society representation in decision-making processes are not without very good cause. Clear benefits of increased NGO and other CSO participation leading to more effective project implementation and

more sustainable program and project outcomes have been identified by a number of bodies and programs. Among others, these include:

- Technical expertise
- Access to target audiences
- Investment of time and money (by NGOs/CSOs)
- Building synergies
- Independent monitoring
- Strengthening democracy

Summary of lessons learned

One or two individuals will never be able to represent civil society in its entirety and it is a mistake to expect otherwise. However, steps can be taken to increase representativity and ensure high quality contributions. Substantive civil society participation and effective representation requires that representatives have the time and the necessary information prior to the meetings in which they will participate to consult with and get inputs from a range of civil society stakeholders. Civil society representatives can establish channels of communication among and act as conduits of important perspectives and knowledge from a range of key partners and in doing so begin to build relationships that will lead to better policies and programmatic results.

Related to this is the importance of establishing clear selection criteria for the position of civil society representative and ensuring that the rights and responsibilities that flow from this position are well understood from the beginning. These are some of the most challenging aspects of a self-selection process and require adequate time and consideration of the specific forum in which a representative will be contributing, the resources available for the purposes of representation and the kinds of contributions a civil society representative should have the authority to make. Self selection processes also require adequate time to allow as many civil society stakeholders as possible the opportunity to participate and additional efforts in the planning stage to reach out to grassroots organizations and local communities. A final key lesson is that substantive participation and effective representation is very difficult to achieve without, and is enhanced significantly by, the financial and institutional support of a committed Secretariat.

Recommendations

While recognizing that it is for the members of the CIF Committees to decide on the modalities for engaging with civil society, the recommendations contained in this report offer a model that is soundly based on the current practices of other multilateral bodies and the experiences and observations of a range of CSOs and of IUCN.[1]

The recommendations provided in the report pertain to, inter alia, the nature and scope of civil society participation in decision making, arriving at a common understanding of civil society, the roles and responsibilities of civil society representatives, the criteria and procedures for self selection processes, achieving balanced and equitable representation, maximizing the role of the Partnership Forum, and access to information.

---

[1] **Disclaimer:**

This information and recommendations presented in this report represent the views of the author, based on research conducted, IUCN's own experiences and the experiences of others. While informed by interviews with a selection of NGOs, this report does not purport to represent the views of civil society.

INTRODUCTION

The CIF Committees agreed that the Secretariat should prepare a proposal regarding NGO attendance and civil society participation in the CIF Trust Fund Committees and Sub-Committees. The design documents for the CIF provide, at present, for no NGO/civil society representation on the CTF Trust Fund Committee and for civil society to be invited to identify a representative to observe the SCF Trust Fund Committee and PPCR Sub-Committee meetings.

Recognizing that it is general practice amongst global funds and multilateral bodies to provide for representation of civil society at their Board meetings, it has been proposed by some members of the three CIF Committees that civil society representatives should be invited as observers to the open sessions of the Committees. It is expected that the open sessions of the committees will be mainly focused on matters of broad strategy and operational policies, while financing decisions will be considered in executive (closed) sessions. The Secretariat has been requested to identify and analyze practices related to NGO and CSO attendance at Board meetings of other global funding programs, and to present a proposal for further consideration to each of the CIF committees at their meetings in January.

To support the Secretariat in this effort, IUCN was contracted in December 2008 to conduct a detailed review of current rules, practices and procedures examining how other international entities/ financing mechanisms, global programs and other funds allow for NGO/CSO participation in their Boards and the modalities for arranging this participation. Attention was also given to key services and characteristics of NGO/CSO participation and to specific measures to ensure transparency and efficiency of Board Meetings and balanced stakeholder representation. As an important part of civil society participation, processes for civil society organizations to self select representatives and the lessons learnt were also reviewed.

The work was carried out through a desk study, telephone and e-mail interviews with participants (CSO/NGOs and others) in processes of existing structures and models and in MDB decision-making/consultative processes, review and analysis, development of recommendations, and consultation on and refinement of recommendations. See Annex 3 of this report for a list of telephone and e-mail interviewees and a summary of the main topics discussed.

This paper presents the results of this review including recommendations on representation of civil society in the open meetings of the CIF Committees and sub-committees.

DEFINITION OF CIVIL SOCIETY

In order to talk and think seriously about civil society representation, it is important that everyone in the conversation has a clear and shared understanding of what and who make up "civil society." Practices of multilateral bodies and global funding programs indicate a range of views of the kinds of interest groups included in civil society and whether or how representation of these groups is accomplished.

One example is the World Bank Good Practice statement (GP) on involving NGOs in World Bank-supported activities, in which the Bank describes "civil society" as follows:

> "'Civil society' is the space between family, market, and state; it consists of not-for-profit organizations and special interest groups, either formal or informal, working to improve the lives of their constituents. Civil society organizations (CSOs) include local and international

organizations, business and professional associations, chambers of commerce, groups of parlimentarians, media, and policy development and research institutes."[2]

In other words, according to this formulation civil society encompasses a wide range of groups, often with very diverse interests. This makes representation of "civil society" in its entirety difficult and probably impossible to achieve.

It is thus very important to clarify from the onset which constituencies within the larger civil society stakeholder group "civil society representatives" are meant and expected to represent. While there will never be a consultative process at the international level in which every stakeholder group feels that it has been adequately represented, ensuring that the parameters of representation are clear and transparent can serve two important purposes. It enhances the ability of a selected representative to speak on behalf of his or her constituency by informing stakeholders of who their focal point or liaison is to a given decision-making process. It is also an opportunity to demonstrate to participants in a process an awareness that multiple interests exist within one stakeholder group and that the issue of representation has been given serious thought. Clearly identified key constituencies are also important for monitoring how effective a representative or mechanism has been.

Related to this is confusion regarding the characterization of the private sector. While the Good Practice statement (above) includes reference to business and professional associations, the understanding and the practice has differed in multilateral bodies and processes. In some[3] cases there has been some confusion about this and a strong reluctance on the part of non-governmental organizations to consider private sector organizations and/or individual companies as civil society organizations or representatives, particularly where limited spaces for participation are available. The situation with indigenous peoples has also been different in that the expectation of indigenous peoples organizations (IPOs) has often been that they should be treated differently from civil society organizations (CSOs) and be provided with their own opportunities for participation. The practice has varied across bodies and regions.

RULES, PRACTICES & PROCEDURES OF SELECTED MULTILATERAL BODIES AND GLOBAL FUNDING PROGRAMS AND MEASURES TO PROVIDE FOR CIVIL SOCIETY PARTICIPATION

The multilateral bodies and global funding programs that were reviewed include a range of entities, many of which benefit from the direct involvement or advice of the MDBs. These bodies and funding programs were selected to enrich this study with diverse and interesting examples reflecting the current state of play on civil society participation.

1. Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR system)
2. Global Environment Facility (GEF)
3. International Fund for Agriculture (IFAD)
4. Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria
5. European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EDRB)
6. Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)
7. North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC)
8. Roundtable on Sustainable Biofuels (RSB)
9. Global Forum on Development (GFD)

---

[2] See first footnote: World Bank, "GP 14.70 - Involving Nongovernmental Organizations in Bank-Supported Activities," http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/PROJECTS/EXTPOLICIES/EXTOPMANUAL/0,,contentMDK:20064711~menuPK:64701775~pagePK:64709096~piPK:64709108~theSitePK:502184,00.html#f1 (accessed December 30, 2008).
[3] For example, the Ministerial Conferences on Forest Law Enforcement and Governance in Asia, Africa and Europe and Northern Asia. See also the UNFF example provided in this paper which breaks civil society out into nine 'major groups.'

10. United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF)

In particular, the following specific aspects were reviewed:

- Relationship to the World Bank
- Rules governing board meetings
- Procedures for NGO/CSD attendance and participation
- Constituencies invited to be represented
- Key services and characteristics of NGO/CSD participation (information, written inputs, oral statements, voting, etc.)
- Means to ensure transparency and efficiency of proceedings
- Means to achieve balanced developed and developing country representation

The results of this review are summarized in the bullet points below. A table highlighting review findings and further detail on the bodies and programs reviewed are found in Annexes 1 and 2 respectively.

Overview of Key Points from Case Studies of Other International Entities/Funding Programs

1. **Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)**
- All members, including CSOs, participate directly in consensus-based decision-making about CGIAR's research programs and research related activities and funding for CGIAR research centers to carry out approved programs
- Membership is open to nonprofit organizations, based on a minimum $500k contribution
- Decision making authority may also be delegated to the Executive Committee (ExCo)
- There is a place on the ExCo for one CSO/NGO/farmers' association
- Documentation and decisions are made available on the website

2. **Global Environment Facility (GEF)**
- 10 NGO representatives are given access to Council meetings, but only 5 seats for NGOs to attend Council meetings as observers at any one time (i.e. NGOs can take turns sitting in the meeting and watching proceedings on a closed circuit television)
- NGOs determine amongst themselves who will attend Council meetings as the focal points for which agenda items during the Preparatory Meeting for NGOs
- NGOs may make interventions and present written statements at the discretion of the Chair
- Preparatory Meeting for NGOs and a GEF-NGO consultation prior to each Council meeting improve transparency and effectiveness of participation
- Travel grants are provided for all 16 NGO representatives from the GEF-NGO Network to participate in the Preparatory Meeting for NGOs and the GEF-NGO Consultation, but only 10 of these are given access to attend Council meetings

3. **International Fund for Agriculture (IFAD)**
- NGOs attend Governing Council meetings as observers (no definition of 'observer' provided)
- Applications for NGOs to attend Governing Council meetings are submitted to IFAD's NGO Coordination Unit for approval by the Executive Board
- IFAD-NGO Consultations are organized by the IFAD-NGO Steering Committee based on inputs from NGOs (IFAD Regional NGO Focal Points help to collect these inputs), including a preparatory pre-consultation meeting held before each consultation
- The IFAD-NGO Steering Committee provides indirect inputs to the Council regarding policy on NGO collaboration via the NGO Unit in the Secretariat

- Selection of Steering Committee members is based on criteria such as geographical distribution, presence of umbrella networks, etc. (Similar to the criteria recently used for the January 2009 FIP and GFP meetings)

4. The Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria (The Global Fund)
- The Foundation Board includes 5 representatives from civil society (of 20 total voting board members)
- The Foundation Board members participate directly in decision-making, including setting policies and strategies and making funding decisions
- The procedure for selecting the civil society members is determined by the groups they represent
- Consistency of participation is explicitly provided for (i.e. civil society organizations are expected to name alternate delegates to ensure consistent participation)
- A Partnership Forum provides another channel of influence by providing guidance to Foundation Board decisions via the Secretariat
- Information is made available in 5 languages through the website, which is also structured to allow for virtual dialogues

5. European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)
- The Annual Meeting & Business Forum and an NGO Programme held alongside it are the main avenues for NGO input
- NGOs may participate as panelists during specialists sessions of Business Forum
- For consultations, the Bank contacts national and international entities active on relevant issues via its NGO Outreach network which maintains a contact database; 80 NGOs attended the Annual Meeting and Business Forum in 2007
- The NGO programme includes direct dialogue with EBRD management and members of the Board of Directors on Bank policies and major projects
- The Annual Meeting is preceded by preparatory meetings in multiple countries to consult on the agenda for the NGO Programme (2 months prior)
- Improved transparency and additional outreach to civil society are achieved through such means as the e-Alert option, NGO newsletter, translation of policies into multiple languages, mapping of CSOs for information distribution

6. Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)
- CSOs attend annual meetings as observers
- CSOs interested in attending are required to submit requests for invitation to the Office of the Secretary for approval by the appropriate Executive Director.
- NGOs may give presentations and participate in direct discussions with the President and selected member of the Board of Executive Directors
- Additional annual IDB-civil society meetings one to two months prior to the Annual Meeting at which CSOs and IDB staff discuss specific topics selected by the IDB, these typically include an opportunity to participate in direct discussions with the President on the final day
- New IDB-CSO Working Group will prepare for annual meetings

7. North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC)
- The Joint Public Advisory Committee (JPAC) provides advice directly to the Council in the form of written 'Advice to Council' notes on any matter within the scope of the North American Agreement for Environmental Cooperation (NAAEC)
- The JPAC includes 5 representatives from each of the 3 Parties, appointed by each Party or by a Party's National Advisory Committee (multi-stakeholder committees whose members are selected by the Parties and may include NGOs and members of the public among others) if a Party so decides

8. Roundtable on Sustainable Biofuels (RSB)

- The RSB was initiated by a self identified and interested group of stakeholders who then invited under-represented groups to participate
- The Steering Board is composed of Governments, Industry, NGOs/CSOs and IGOs who participate in decision-making about related to the drafting of standards, development of indicators, etc. for sustainable biofuels production
- CSOs participate in Working Groups, and in Regional Outreach Meetings, which provide suggestions to the Steering Board via the Secretariat

9. Global Forum for Development (GFD)

- Designed as an informal structure to facilitate better representation of non-OECD country perspectives in the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC)
- CSOs are invited by OECD DCD/DEV staff to participate in GFD plenaries and workshops based on what they can contribute and on their participation in previous relevant meetings
- Informal Steering Group was created to provide a more formal internal link between the GFD and DAC
- CSOs Provide inputs to DAC members directly during GFD events and indirectly via the Informal Steering Group (OECD Secretariat staff in DCD and DEV)
- Plenary held back-to-back with high level DAC meeting to facilitate increased dialogue between the two fora

10. UN Forum on Forests (UNFF)

- Representatives of 9 "Major Groups" (the 9 identified in Agenda 21 and endorsed by the General Assembly) address the forum at the discretion of the Chair, which in practice usually means that one representative from each major group can intervene during or at the end of each segment of the agenda
- Additional input to decision-makers is provided through contributions in advance to background papers, submission of Major Group Discussion Papers prior to the sessions on specific agenda items, and through ½ or full day Multistakeholder Dialogues held during the official sessions

KEY VALUES OF NGO/CSO PARTICIPATION

The efforts and resources that multilateral bodies and global funding programs direct to providing for civil society representation and/or direct participation in decision making processes are not without very good cause. Clear benefits of increased NGO and other CSO participation leading to more effective project implementation and more sustainable program and project outcomes have been identified by a number of bodies and programs.

i. *Technical expertise*: NGOs and other CSOs are now widely recognized as a resource for expertise on specific subjects related to program development and project implementation. Providing for civil society representation in decision-making processes ensures that the comparative advantage of all partners is brought to bear, leading to better quality outputs/more effective programs. For example, individuals and groups directly affected by programs or projects and the problems they aim to address have a unique perspective to offer that no one else can provide (e.g. those directly affected by HIV/AIDS - Global Fund/CGIAR members who are themselves program implementers/IFAD).

ii. *Access to target audiences*: CSOs often have strong local knowledge and good relationships characterized by mutual trust with communities resulting from a long history of working in a particular area. As such they are "often able to reach segments of rural populations, that governments neglect or do not target as a priority." (IFAD)

iii. *Investment of time and money*: Engaging CSOs can also be good way to create a sense of

national/local ownership of programs and projects, leading to widespread commitment by civil society and a willingness to contribute to and see a program or project through. As the Inter-American Development Bank describes in very pragmatic terms:

> "When stakeholders can perceive the potential benefits of a project or policy and feel a sense of ownership in its outcome they are more willing to put in money and labor of their own. Participation thus can beget additional resources for project and program execution and for an operation's sustainability. Viewed from that angle, participation is a kind of nonfinancial asset at the disposal of every country, since it enables the execution of larger projects than budgets could otherwise accommodate." (IDB)

iv. *Building synergies*: Involving CSOs in program or project design enables a level of understanding and familiarity that encourages them to integrate complementary programs and activities in their own operations, to achieve real synergies and added value from partnership. If involved in developing the strategy of a program from the onset, NGOs and other CSOs have the opportunity to think about and discuss how they can contribute complementary capacity and resources to achieving common objectives. For example, NGOs and other CSOs often engage the poor in capacity-building activities as part of their own programs (IFAD/CGIAR).

v. *Independent monitoring*: NGOs and other CSOs provide oversight, help to ensure accountability of governments and improve government performance by acting as "watchdogs" and motivators (Global Fund)

vi. *Strengthening democracy*: CSO participation in decision-making has strengthened civil society in some countries and catalyzed more participatory approaches to decision-making in other sectors (Global Fund).Furthermore, empowering civil society by providing for representation can contribute indirectly to the effectiveness of Bank projects or programs in States by contributing to the creation of more vibrant democratic systems. (EBRD)

RISKS OF FAILING TO PROVIDE FOR SUBSTANTIVE NGO/CSO PARTICIPATION

i. Substantive participation is that which civil society stakeholders feel is worth the time and effort invested. Failing to provide opportunities for such engagement risks alienating key civil society actors and undermining prospects for benefiting from the values outlined above, thereby reducing prospects for successful program and project development and implementation.

ii. Without the expertise and societal support that CSOs can bring, it will be extremely difficult if not impossible to develop effective and lasting approaches to address climate change.

iii. Until recently, civil society stakeholders engaged in the CIF process have expressed concerns that the civil society participation provided for so far has not been as substantive as it could have been.

According to one participant, as expressed in a letter to coordinators during the CIF Partnership Forum, a number of factors including limited time, often irrelevant questions and the use of inappropriate methods and devices for collecting participant inputs made it extremely difficult for CSO representatives to participate effectively and make substantive contributions. This created an impression in some participants that the Partnership Forum was merely allowing for "token public participation." There is a need for improved arrangements to be put into place to enable civil society to see the Partnership Forum as a real opportunity to communicate with decision-

makers in the CIF. Otherwise civil society representatives will be less interested in bringing their unique and valuable experience to bear on the implementation of the CIF.[4]

Several of those contacted in the preparation of this report indicated that the decision to undertake this research was a clear and positive indication that the prospect of civil society participation in the CIF process and how to achieve it is being taken seriously, though the timing of the study during the holiday season was seen as extremely unfortunate.

SPECIFIC MEASURES TO ENSURE TRANSPARENCY & EFFICIENCY OF BOARD MEETINGS AND BALANCED STAKEHOLDER REPRESENTATION

The case studies reviewed highlighted the following types of measures:

i. *Making meeting documentation available:* Basic measures include making Board meeting agendas, minutes, participant lists, reports, background documents and any other related documentation publicly available in a timely manner. This is particularly important prior to a meeting in order to allow civil society stakeholders an opportunity to review the materials and prepare any inputs or interventions via the appropriate channels, whatever they may be. Allowing a period during which all Board meeting participants, including those attending as observers, have the opportunity to suggest agenda items or provide feedback on a draft would further increase the transparency of the process. Preparation and distribution of documentation to civil society stakeholders in advance is something that has consistently been missing in meetings organized by the World Bank, making it difficult for civil society stakeholders to participate substantively. Providing materials in as many languages as possible is another important way to increase access and thereby transparency.

ii. *Additional preparatory measures:* Beyond making meeting documentation available, additional measures such as providing preparatory meetings allow a broader range of constituents and/or other civil society stakeholders (beyond those participating in decision-making or as observers), having already reviewed the meeting documentation and background information on the issues, to prepare and present a comprehensive contribution which represents the views of a range of stakeholders as clearly and concisely as possible.

The Preparatory Meeting for NGOs that is part of the GEF system for providing for NGO representation at Council Meetings is one example that has enabled NGOs in advance of Council meetings to identify key issues and the appropriate NGO representatives to speak on particular agenda items. In some cases this has led to the development of a written statement to present to the Council on behalf of the NGO network. IFAD's pre-consultations are another, slightly different example where consultation participants are invited to learn about the consultation process and expected outcomes. Allocating adequate staff time and resources to undertake this kind of preparation are essential factors in allowing for substantive NGO participation.

iii. *Web-based information dissemination and platforms:* Most multilateral bodies and global funding programs have a web page within their larger web site dedicated to information intended for and of primary interest to NGOs and/or other civil society groups. These can be quite useful, but oftentimes do not necessarily include straightforward information about the opportunities and related procedures for civil society to participate in decision-making processes. To increase the effectiveness of opportunities available to civil society to become involved in decision-making,

---

[4] E-mail written by Timmons Roberts, Chancellor, Professor of Sociology, Research Fellow, Institute for the Theory and Practice of   International Relations, The College of William and Mary, to the Coordinators of the CIP Partnership Forum, October 11, 2008.

some organizations have taken more proactive steps to ensure that civil society stakeholders are adequately informed about these opportunities.

One example is the "Guide to the GEF for NGOs", written by NGOs, published by the GEF and available for download on the GEF website. This guide goes beyond informing NGOs of the various opportunities to engage with GEF Board members and decision-making. Based on the experiences of other NGOs it provides detailed information about GEF processes and different options for how to get involved.[5]

Another example is the option for e-Alerts informing NGOs about Strategies and Policies, Annual Meeting updates, NGO updates including information about upcoming consultations and how to participate, among other options, offered by the EBRD. Via a simple process, any one with Internet access can sign up to receive regular e-Alerts on the topics or events of their choice.[6]

iv.   *Making information available in local languages:* While what needs to be translated and into which languages needs to be determined on a case-by-case basis, it has been recognized that translations of relevant policies and information about multilateral initiatives into the local languages (or at least national) of the people affected by them (e.g. EBRD/CGIAR) dramatically increases understanding and buy-in. Not only does providing translated documents for a meeting to be conducted in English (but including participants who are not native English speakers) enable individuals presents at a meeting to participate more substantively, it is key to reaching a wider audience via civil society representatives. It also increases the efficiency of representation by reducing the workload of a representative who would otherwise need to find a way to communicate information in local or national language on his/her own, which is a very time-consuming task and can also be costly.

The European Bank for Development and Reconstruction is having its 2008 Environmental and Social Policy translated to the national languages of all of the countries where it has operations request. Similarly, its Public Information Policy has been translated to Russian and the Bank will translate it to the national language of any of the countries in which it has operations upon request.[7] Unfortunately it is the final versions that are being translated after the consultations. Prior to the consultations the documents were available in English and Russian.[8]

In addition to English, The Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria website is available in Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian and Spanish.

v.   *Identifying Alternates:* Nearly every Body or Program reviewed here provides for alternate representatives to act on behalf of Board members as needed. Identifying Alternates for selected NGO and other CSO representatives as part of a selection process is one important method to enhance the efficiency of a system by ensuring that representation is consistently provided for and removing a potential cause of delays.

CIVIL SOCIETY SELF SELECTION PROCESSES: EXPERIENCES & LESSONS

There are two basic approaches to selecting civil society representatives to participate in a meeting. One is for the Secretariat of a body or fund to decide on the basis of applications submitted to it and the

---

[5] GEF, "A Guide to the Global Environment Facility for NGOs," 2007, http://thegef.org/uploadedFiles/NGO_Guide(1).pdf (accessed December 3, 2008).
[6] EBRD, Web site, http://www.ebrd.com/new/alerts/index.htm?q=ngo (accessed January 3, 2009).
[7] EBRD, Web site, http://www.ebrd.com/oppor/ngo/new/index.htm (accessed January 3, 2009).
[8] EBRD, Web site, http://www.ebrd.com/about/policies/enviro/policy/review/index.htm (accessed January 3, 2009).

application of whatever criteria they have deemed appropriate or that is required. Another is to encourage civil society organizations to select from amongst themselves their desired representatives.

This section is based primarily on a review of experiences related to participation in the Europe and Northern Asia Ministerial Conference on Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (ENA FLEG), which represents well the current state of play, as well as some additional lessons learned recently from preparations for the January/February 2009 meetings of the FIP and GFP, and in the past from the World Bank Forest Policy Review process (1999-2000).

In general, the steps in a self selection process are:
1. Compilation of a mailing list of all possible candidate civil society organizations (local, national and international)
2. Development and announcement of the self selection process, including drafting of self selection criteria for endorsement by the implementing body (e.g. World Bank)
3. Distribution of self selection application forms, compilation of replies, structuring and execution of a voting process where applications exceed places, and development of recommendations for final consultation among civil society
4. Submission to the implementing body of the final list of people to be invited and/or sponsored.

ENA-FLEG self selection processes (2004-2005)[9]

i. *Finding a good facilitator:* An effective, transparent self selection process requires an effective, transparent facilitator. Therefore facilitators should be selected carefully. In the Asia FLEG process there were concerns that the organization designated to oversee the self-selection process for one meeting was selecting their "friends." While the impact of this factor alone is not clear, it is one contributing factor to a process that is generally recognized as not having been successful at creating a widespread sense of ownership among civil society stakeholders and others.

ii. *Defining constituencies:* It is important to be clear about which constituencies are included or not (e.g. parliamentarians, think tanks, research institutions, etc.).

This can be complicated in countries where there is not a strong tradition of NGOs. For example, in Vietnam should workers' movements participate as civil society stakeholders even though these are officially sanctioned? In such cases it is important to give consideration to how to draw the line between government and civil society and to make the distinction clear to participants. Thorough mapping of key actors, as broad outreach as possible, and a transparent voting process can do that for you.[10]

It is also important to be clear about whether or not the private sector or indigenous peoples are included in "civil society." The inconsistent inclusion and exclusion of these two particular stakeholder groups in the definitions of civil society used by international entities can complicate participant expectations if not clarified from the onset.

---

[9] IUCN was mandated to identify 15 civil society representatives to participate in the Preparatory Conference, 35 in the Ministerial Conference and 30 in the Antalya workshop. The response to the call for nominations and votes was overwhelming with several hundred people participating in the processes. These lessons are drawn from IUCN's own experience.

[10] For example, the process became controversial in Azerbaijan, where a debate erupted on whether activists or scientific experts should be selected and we were urged to select people ourselves rather than go through the process we had announced. We insisted on following the democratic process, which meant that any interested civil society representative in Azerbaijan could vote on what type of person and which person specifically they wanted to represent them. The participants expressed satisfaction with the result.

iii.   *Reaching out to local stakeholders:* It is worth investing some time and effort in digging deeper to engage grassroots organizations and communities and others who are actually engaged in relevant activities and/or who may be the most affected by illegal activity in the forest sector.

The knowledge that communities directly affected by illegal forest activities can bring to a policy dialogue and the benefit of creating a sense of ownership amongst these groups make them key stakeholders that a robust self selection process should strive to engage.

iv.   *Building capacity:* When planning a self selection process, it is advisable to consider whether there may be a need to build the capacity of some sectors (particularly local NGOs, community organizations, women's groups and farmer's groups, etc.) before they can feel confident and secure about engaging in consultation processes with governments and others.

v.   *Complementary arrangements*: While a self-selection process is important, it alone will not deliver the constructive and well-informed participation by civil society that is needed. IUCN's experience with the FLEG process in Africa and Europe/Northern Asia and participatory processes around the world over the past 50 years suggests that participation needs to be supported by such activities as access to information and technical advice, and face-to-face interaction among civil society groups, among other things.

As a result of these measures, a diverse group of stakeholders participated in an informed and constructive way in the ministerial conference process leading to:
▪ Higher quality products of the Ministerial Conference
▪ Increased public credibility of and societal support for the outcomes of the Ministerial Conference
▪ Improved prospects and momentum for effective follow-up.

Self Selection process for the Forest Investment Programme (FIP) Informal Working Group and Growing Forest Partnerships (GFP) January/February 2009 meetings (2008-2009)[11]

vi.   *Allocating adequate time:* Self selection processes cannot be effectively conducted in one or two weeks. Participants require sufficient time to decide whether or not to self-nominate and in some cases to determine whether their existing role allows them to do so or to get the necessary approval, and also to consider all candidates adequately before making their selections. Additional time is also needed to ensure that civil society stakeholders based in remote areas or countries where e-mail messages are often delayed or are not available as a reliable means of communication have the opportunity to participate in the process and to be represented.

vii.   *Building a solid mailing list:* A good, representative self-selection process conducted electronically requires a good distribution list. This should be arranged for before the process begins and necessitates a person who is available to collect and compile the names and contact details of recipients.

viii.   *Identification of alternates:* In addition to identifying a representative, it is advisable to identify alternates for civil society representatives during the selection process in order to avoid problems in the event that the selected candidate does not respond to communications or is unable to attend an event. Selected candidates and alternates should have one another's contact details and representatives should brief alternates after every meeting. Alternates should also receive all

---

[11] The lessons captured here are based on a summary of the feedback from individuals who participated in the process and IUCN's experience running the process, December 2008.

documentation related to the particular process in order to prepare them to the extent possible in the event that they are required to step in.

Self Selection Process for the World Bank Forest Policy (1999-2000)[12]

ix.   *Scope of the consultation:* It is important that participants have a very clear understanding from the onset of what they are being called to consult on and also what they are not being called to consult on. In other words, what is and is not on the table.

x.   *Scope of the role:* In order to get the most value out of a self selection process, it needs to be clear what the participants' advisory capacity exactly is and where authority rests on different types of issues and matters.

xi.   *Nurturing good relations:* It is a good idea to give prior notice about an upcoming consultative process that will include self-selection to identify representatives so that it is expected, particularly by organizations following a particular process or multilateral body. This provides and opportunity for potential participants to learn more about the process before it is formally launched and also sends the message that civil society stakeholders are seen as key partners.

PROPOSAL TO THE CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUND (CIF) COMMITTEES

If it can be agreed that the desired outcome of providing for civil society representation in the Clean Technology Fund (CTF) Trust Fund Committee, the Strategic Climate Framework (SCF) Trust Fund Committee and the Pilot Program on Climate Resilience (PPCR) Sub-Committee is to develop and implement more effective and sustainable policies and programs that enjoy societal support, we recommend the following:[13]

Participation in Decision-making

1.   *Civil society representatives in open committee meetings should be 'active observers'.*

Discussions on the establishment of the Strategic Climate Fund led to the recommendation that civil society observers be invited "to engage in active dialogue." [14] Building on this and the experiences reviewed in this study, there is an opportunity and a solid foundation for the CIF system to be progressively inclusive and respectful of the added value of civil society by providing for participation that is active rather than passive.
.
2.   *Civil society representatives should be able to:*
    a) *Request the floor to make verbal interventions*
    b) *Request the Co-Chairs to add agenda items to the provisional agenda*

---

[12] Interview with Andrew Deutz (TNC), one of the individuals involved in organizing and running the process, December 18, 2008.

[13] Recommendations are intended to apply for all of the Clean Technology Trust Fund Committee, the Strategic Climate Framework Trust Fund Committee and the Pilot Program on Country Resilience Sub-Committee unless otherwise specified in the text.

[14] " Civil society will also be invited to identify a representative to observe the Trust Fund Committee. Recognizing the special areas of competence on the observers, the Trust Fund Committee will invite observers to engage in active dialogue." World Bank, "Strategic Climate Fund," June 3, 2008, http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTCC/Resources/Strategic_Climate_Fund_final.pdf#Strategic_Climate_Fund (accessed January 6, 2009), 12.

c) *Recommend to the Committee or the Co-Chairs external experts to speak on a specific agenda item*

The power to intervene at the appropriate moment in the discussions without requiring the exercise of the discretion of the Chair on any agenda item is a minimum requirement for any kind of engagement that can be characterized as "active."

Contributing agenda items is an additional important way to enable civil society "observers" to "engage in active dialogue." While inviting civil society representatives to speak on established agenda items does allow for new voices to be heard, it fails to make optimal use of the "special areas of competence"[15] that they bring to the table for the purpose of enhancing the effectiveness of CIF programs and the quality of the activities financed by the CIF. While this particular authority is not extended to 'non-voting' members or 'observers' in any of the models reviewed here, the 'active observer' status being proposed in this report should be understood an effort to take civil society representation one step further to provide for more substantive participation.

The right to invite external experts to speak on specific agenda items is a competence that is currently extended to civil society participants in the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), which is positively received and should be replicated.

3. *If the CIF were to be extended, consideration should be given by the CIF Committees, when discussing possible reforms to the CIF, to expanding the authority of civil society 'active observers' to include decision-making on specified types of matters.[16]*

While recognizing that civil society representatives could make important and useful contributions to decision making, the practice in this area varies widely across different bodies and across different kinds of decisions. It is recommended as a first step that consideration be given to their inclusion in strategic decisions and that after experience in this role is acquired the Committees should consider whether and how the operation of the CIF programs is likely to be enhanced as a result of extending decision-making power to civil society representatives. This approach would allow some time for current Committee members who may be uncomfortable with the idea of extending full participation rights to civil society representatives to develop a comfortable working relationship with the 'active observers', The CGIAR, Global Fund and the RSB are some models in which full decision-making authority is extended to civil society members. While limited civil society membership has made the value of this difficult to assess in the case of the CGIAR, the feedback from the Global Fund is clear that including civil society in decision-making at the country level has resulted in more effective and sustainable programs and projects.

Representativity and Effective Representation

4. *A clear and common understanding of "civil society" or the constituency that a civil society representative is intended and expected to represent should be agreed by the Committees from the onset and communicated to stakeholders in all relevant documentation. Separate arrangements should be made for participation by representatives of indigenous peoples and the private sector.*

In developing this understanding, the following should be taken into consideration:

---

[15] Ibid.

[16] It is recognized that the current design of the CIF provides for a sunset clause, and that the CIF will not continue beyond the provisions of the sunset provision unless the UNFCCC so indicates.

For the purposes of providing for accurate and appropriate stakeholder representation in all three of the CIF Committees, both Indigenous Peoples and the Private Sector (including private companies and business associations) should be recognized as 2 additional, separate stakeholder groups, outside of a working concept of civil society.[17] Most NGOs and other CSOs do not have the governance structures and networks required for adequate consultation with indigenous peoples in accordance with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and are thereby unable to legitimately represent Indigenous Peoples in a consultation. Businesses are very important stakeholders in clean technology and climate change programs, but the role of the private sector, the opportunities open to it and constraints private sector stakeholder face, and often their very reasons for being involved in a process, differ from other groups and therefore need to be represented separately.

For the purposes of representation in the CIF Committees a civil society organization (CSO) should include any independent non-profit organization of individuals working toward a common objective who feel that their cause will be affected by the CIF (with the exception of business associations as mentioned above). This includes large international NGOs as well as national and community-based organizations (CBOs) and anything in between. While the degree of actual independence is bound to vary, it will not be possible to measure this at a global level without risking creating barriers for stakeholders from countries where there is not a strong tradition of NGOs. The voting process should, if structured appropriately, determine whether or not a particular organization is viewed as operating independently enough to be recognized as a CSO.

5. *Civil society representation in the CIF Committees should include individual representation from the following sectors of civil society:*
   a) *NGOs and other CSOs*
   b) *Individuals living in communities directly affected by climate change and/or energy-related development who are participating in specific relevant actions to address these issues*
   Additional spaces for representatives from independent academic or research institutions in the CIF Committees might be considered.

(See suggested composition for individual Committees below)

i.   While the quality of representation is not necessarily improved by increasing the number of representatives present in a meeting there is value in ensuring a degree of variation. At the very least two CSO representatives are required to ensure that the interests and interpretation of one individual are checked. This can further help to reduce concerns about a conflict of interest when there are NGOs active in the process whose own programs are developing proposals for Committee members. Providing for at least two civil society representatives is one way to address these concerns in part. Two representatives is also a minimum to allow for gender balance and representation from both a developing and a developed country, as well from an international and national/local NGO.

In the case of the CIF Committees specifically however, providing for more CSO representation is advisable due to the fact that positions on the CIF and the MDB's involvement in climate-related funding vary significantly and clean energy is a controversial subject. While two representatives are the minimum needed to address the above noted challenges, there is no doubt that representativity and the ability to reach target audiences is strengthened where the number is increased.

---

[17] Representation of both groups should be provided for in all three Committees, however the nature of that representation and related recommendations are beyond the scope of this report.

ii.   While generally recognized as part of "civil society," local communities that are not characterized as indigenous peoples in accordance with UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, are key players in conservation and energy but are often not effectively represented by environmental NGOs.[18] Individuals living in communities directly affected by climate change and energy-related development and actively engaged in measures to address these issues have a crucial perspective and knowledge to bring to the table that others, including many international or even national NGOs, cannot provide. For the Global Fund to fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria, including representatives of people living with HIV/AIDS in decisions about how national program funding should be allocated has resulted in better quality activities and improved the functioning of health programs overall.[19] For these reasons, separate representation by an individual with relevant experience from a community directly affected by climate change is recommended for the SCF Committee and the PPCR Sub-Committee, and energy-related development in the case of the CTF Committee.

iii.   An additional place for scientific/technical expertise from the academic and independent research community could also be provided for within each of the three Committees. This would help ensure that scientific and technical considerations related to the effectiveness of initiatives to address current and future effects of climate change and improve energy efficiency are taken into account. At the country level, inputs from the academic and research communities would also be helpful for the purpose of selecting the locations for CIF-funded projects and would help ensure that CIF dialogues are up to date on technological developments related to climate change adaptation and mitigation and energy efficiency. This would be in addition to invited experts and technical advisory panels and allow for a more active contribution from the scientific community via a right to request agenda items, as opposed to being called on to consider an issue or concern identified by someone else.

Suggested Composition of Civil Society Representatives in Committees:[20]

SCF Trust Fund Committee
Provide for 3 civil society representatives:
- 2 CSO representatives with balanced development status/gender representation and balance between local/national and international CSOs
- 1 CSO representative living in a community dependent on adaptation approaches to secure livelihood/engaged in the implementation of a mitigation scheme
- Possible additional place for 1 scientific/technical expert from an independent academic or research institution

CTF Trust Fund Committee
Provide for 3 civil society representatives:
- 2 CSO representatives with balanced development status/gender representation and balance between local/national and international CSOs
- 1 representative living in a community affected by energy-related development
- Possible additional place for 1 scientific/technical expert from an independent academic or research institution

---

[18] Observation; Interview with Gary Allport, Senior Conservation Policy Adviser, BirdLife Secretariat (seconded to IUCN US), Tuesday January 6, 2009.
[19] The Global Fund, "Lessons Learned in the Field, Health Financing and Governance, A Report on the Country Coordinating Mechanism Model," 2008, http://www.theglobalfund.org/documents/ccm/CCM_GlobalReport_2008_10_en.pdf (accessed December 13, 2008), 11-12.
[20] The numbers suggested should be understood as the minimum amount of representation recommended.

PPCR Sub-Committee
Provide for 3 civil society representatives:
- 2 CSO representatives with balanced development status/gender representation and balance between local/national and international CSOs
- 1 representative from a community dependent on adaptation approaches to secure livelihoods
- Possible additional place for 1 scientific/technical experts from an independent academic or research institution

The Sub-Committee system in place under the broader SCF Committee allows for more focused consideration of individual SCF programs and is closer to the implementation stage. This focus provides for a more specific understanding of the kinds of climate change impacts each program seeks to address. These distinctions should be considered in the selection criteria for the representative from a community affected by climate change and participating in specific relevant measures to address these issues.

6. *The responsibilities of each civil society representative should explicitly include:*
   a) *Consultation with other civil society stakeholders*
   b) *Representation in meetings of the interests of their constituency, not just of their own organization*
   c) *Compliance with agreed consultation guidelines/standards*

More critical than the number of civil society representatives present in a Board or Committee meeting when it comes to effectiveness is the extent to which a representative is able to consult with and accurately present and represent the perspectives of a range of stakeholders in their constituency. With the rights of attending and participating actively in Committee Meetings must come the responsibility of maximizing the opportunities to meaningfully and substantively contribute advice on behalf of a larger group.

Establishing guidelines for consultations is a relatively cost-effective way to ensure that a basic set of standards are being applied and thereby a minimum level of effectiveness is being achieved, while still allowing for flexibility depending on the context and the target audience. The primary purpose of the guidelines would be to allow civil society representatives to work within an agreed framework and set of responsibilities. This would assist them in carrying out the consultations within their constituency. It would also enable representatives to make use of opportunities for additional consultation presented by meetings outside of the CIF program without developing an individual process every time, and while maintaining some consistency in the quality of the consultation.

Consistency in consultation processes can also be a cost-effective way to increase both transparency and enhance the ability of participants to make more substantive contributions by ensuring that the process is predictable (e.g. participants know how far ahead of a meeting documentation will be available and where to access it). Ensuring that the way consultations are conducted remains consistent is also an important part of building trust in the process.[21]

The guidelines would likely need to include a simple reporting method for monitoring & evaluation purposes. The process of developing consultation guidelines should itself involve consultation.

7. *Representation should be for 3 years, with the possibility of a second term.*

---

[21] Electronic responses to interview questions provided by Helen Leake, Policy Advisor, Forest Peoples Programme, January 2009.

Positive working relationships are often a very important factor contributing to successful negotiation processes, but it can take time for parties to get to know and trust one another. Civil society representatives have a very important role to play as a liaison and conduit of perspectives, but should also have a responsibility to seek to use opportunities to engage with decision-makers and other stakeholders strategically. Continuity and consistency in representation are needed for this. (See also the point below on designation of alternates.)

If there are concerns about the ability of one person to effectively represent stakeholders from different regions and sectors, this could potentially be addressed by including requirements for rotating among the different stakeholder groups in the consultation guidelines stipulated in the Terms of Reference for the position of civil society representative.[22] The caveat to this is that it should be complemented by an established process to recall the representative if there is a consensus that he/she is not fulfilling his/her responsibilities.

Recognizing that the current design of the CIF provides for a sunset clause, it is suggested that individuals be selected to fill each of the civil society representative positions for three years, to be reconsidered if the mandate of the CIF is extended.

8. *Convening of the Partnership Forum should be maximized to enhance civil society participation, including facilitating side civil society consultations and opportunities for civil society representatives to meet.*

The annual Partnership Forum is an existing mechanism within the CIF structure that can be further optimized to enhance the effectiveness of the role that civil society representatives play. This can be achieved, in part, by including civil society representatives in the planning and agenda setting for the Partnership Forum.

Additional meeting space at the Forum should be reserved for the civil society representatives to use for side consultations and discussions related to topics in the CIF Committee meeting agendas. Space should also be reserved for the representatives from the Committees to meet with one another to discuss areas of common interest, advocacy approaches, etc. This is a practice of the UNFF Secretariat that is appreciated by the Major Group Focal Points, for example at ad hoc expert meetings held throughout the year. It has led to better results, such as agreement on common statements from time to time, which have tended to be well received by UNFF State members.[23]

The Committees might also consider revising the current mandate of the Partnership Forum to include production of a written report from Partnership Forum discussions highlighting key messages and topics to be shared with Committee members and considered in future meetings.

Self Selection Process

9. *Criteria for each of the representative civil society positions should provide for equitable and balanced representation to the extent possible, should be clear and should include gender balance, balance between developing and developed countries, and balance between local/national and international NGOs.*

---

[22] The Major Groups framework used in the UNFF system could be a potential basis for mapping the different groups to be accounted for in the consultation schedule.
[23] Interview with Dr Jeannette D. Gurung, the Focal Point for the Women Major Group, January 2, 2009.

Three key criteria used to provide for equity and balanced representation in the recent FIP and GFP processes were balanced gender representation, balanced representation from developing and developed countries and balanced representation between international and local or national organizations. The experience with these processes suggests that these criteria can be met relatively easily, though a procedure for applying criteria when it is not met with votes alone should be included in the process from the onset (see below).

It can also be helpful to make clear which stakeholder groups are not included in the definition of civil society that is being used, such as indigenous peoples or private companies and business associations in the case of the recent FIP and GFP processes. This can have implications for how a process is perceived, for example if participants feel that that key members of a constituency are not being reached based on a lack of clarity about who is included in the constituency. On the other hand, leaving a process completely open as in the case of a self-selection process run as part of ENA FLEG in Azerbaijan or the consultations for the World Bank Forest Policy in 1999/2000, can be an effective way of mapping key constituents.

10. A procedure for applying the agreed criteria (e.g. gender balance) where the results of the voting process alone do not fulfill the criteria should be established.

As a first step to facilitate balanced geographic representation between developing and developed countries, the self selected candidates may be separated accordingly into two categories on the voting form. Voters are then asked to identify their first and second choices from each of the two categories (i.e. four choices all together).

Where simple voting alone does not produce a result that fulfills the criteria (e.g. where voting has resulted in all representatives being male or being from international NGOs), one possible approach is to factor in the candidates with the second highest number of first choice votes in each candidate category. If the individual in either one of the categories meets the criteria, he/she is then selected as the representative from the particular category, with the number of votes alone determining the candidate selected in the other category. If the criteria are not satisfied, this same process can be continued until it is. If the second place candidates in both categories have the same number of votes, the candidate with the highest number of second choice votes is the first to be considered.

Having an agreed procedure in place will ensure that the selection process is transparent and can easily be explained with consistency by the individual or organization running the process.

11. A minimum of one month's time should be allowed for each of the CIF Committee civil society representative self-selection processes to be carried out.

In addition to allowing for a more representative process by allowing for more people to participate, allocating an adequate amount of time for the self-selection processes would indicate to civil society stakeholders that the MDBs are willing to address some of the shortcomings of past consultations and are aware of the difficulties involved in organizing effective and credible self-selection processes. It is particularly important to allow adequate time if the selected representatives will be in place for a term of 3 years or anything beyond one meeting.

Too often, as in the case of the recent process for the FIP Informal Working Group Meeting, which had to be carried out over 2 weeks, self selection processes have been initiated too late to allow for sufficient time in the run up to a meeting for adequate preparation by the self selected representatives. Another example of short timing was the ENA FLEG process in which 3 self-selection processes were conducted in 9 months but with extremely little time for carrying out each one. This created to a certain extent the

impression in some people's minds that civil society participation was always some sort of afterthought but luckily in this context this impression was tempered by the fact that the opportunities created during the meetings for CSO input to be provided to decision-makers were ground-breaking in the FLEG context.

12. *An alternate selection should be included for each civil society representative position in the CIF Committees, to be identified through the self-selection processes.*

The alternate would be identified from among the candidates along with the representative as part of the self-selection process for each constituency.[24] To maintain development status and gender balance when there are two NGO/CSO representatives, it is advisable that the same procedure described above is used to identify an alternate who meets the same criteria as the representative to the extent possible.

The selection of an alternate will require that the responsibility to share information and contact the alternate at key times (e.g. to brief him/her after meetings) is included in the ToRs for the representative position to ensure that the alternate is well informed in the event that he/she must step in.

It would also be useful to ask organizations who are putting forward candidates to specify not only which individual would represent the organization and its broader constituency but which alternate individual from within the organization would step in to ensure continuity if the designated individual was not at some point in future available due to an emergency or change in staffing.

13. *A maximum of two individuals from the same organization should be permitted to participate in the self-selection process, provided that the two individuals are based in different regions.*

This will allow for balanced regional representation, since offices of the same international NGO/CSO often have very different perspectives and views, but will minimize the risk of putting organizations with only one office at a significant disadvantage.

Transparency and Access to Information

14. *All meeting documentation should be made available at least two weeks in advance.*

One of the most critical ways to provide for an effective system of civil society participation and representation is to ensure that representatives have access to the meeting agenda and any non-confidential relevant documentation in advance of the meeting and with sufficient notification to prepare. It is recommended that the finalized agenda is made available to stakeholders at least two weeks prior to the meeting to allow for adequate preparation.

The CIF has not been able to achieve this in the past. Therefore a rapid internal assessment of the barriers should be undertaken, and corrective measures and adequate capacity to implement them be put into place.

15. *Background documentation for consultations should be translated into national languages of recipient country members to the extent possible.*

French and Spanish are two languages in very wide use and are a good start. Following that, Russian, Arabic and Chinese would enable the CIF process to reach a considerably wider audience. In Asia, it is relatively difficult to identify one language used fairly consistently across the region. It would thus be

---

[24] The alternate and the representative would there for be based in separate organizations and possibly geographic areas as well.

advisable to provide translation upon request for consultations with a particular national or regional focus to get the best results.

For the CTF Trust Fund Committee it is worthwhile considering having all documentation translated to Japanese so that it can be shared widely with civil society in Japan. Japan is one on the most significant contributors to the CTF, along with the US and the United Kingdom (UK), and there is considerable interest among Japanese civil society in being adequately informed.

In addition to enhancing transparency and efficiency, providing documents in other languages is one way to demonstrate that due consideration and care was given in preparing a consultation or meeting. This can be an important step in building a relationship of mutual trust and respect. At a recent consultation on the FIP program held for indigenous peoples in Barcelona the background information note circulated to participants was available only in English, even though around half of those present were Spanish-speaking with very limited English skills. Translation equipment was finally brought in for the meeting, but it was late, done hastily at the last minute. The participants took note of all of this and as one observer noted, it created tension before the discussion had even begun. Measures to avoid these kinds of situations should be taken in the preparation of future CIF meetings/consultations.

16. Additional measures should be considered to help civil society prepare to contribute to CIF meetings (such as pre-consultation meetings).

In addition to making information available, additional measures to allow civil society stakeholders to prepare their contribution to Committee discussions and share this with the representative(s) are recommended to provide for effective representation. Providing for side meetings at the Partnership Forum is one way to this. The MDBs should also consider the opportunities provided by meetings of other international or regional fora where civil society stakeholders are numerous and provide the appropriate logistical support for representatives to conduct consultations in conjunction with those.

17. Information about the opportunities and procedure for civil society engagement with the CIF process should be available both online and through the MDBs' public outreach channels, such as the World Bank's Public Information Centers.

Most of the entities reviewed do include a web page devoted to information for civil society within their larger website, but the information is not always comprehensive. The CIF should create a web page with information for civil society interested in engaging in the CIF process specifically, with links to other climate and energy-related initiatives. Some minimum requirements for a civil society web page include up to date information about CIF project developments and strategic direction, advance notice of Committee meetings, the Partnership Forum and other consultations along with related documentation, and a description of the self selection process for representatives and how to get involved. The Secretariat could also consider more proactive measures, such as communicating with a regular mailing list of interested civil society stakeholders (could use the lists of self-selection process participants as a start with an online option for anyone to register), online options to sign up for e-Alerts on specific issues, or hosting a civil society CIF blog.

The Secretariat should also ensure that there is dedicated information regarding civil society and the CIF available through the MDBs public outreach channels, such as the World Bank's Public Information Centers. The MDBs should run/provide support to information sessions dealing specifically with the CIF as a platform and/or resource for communities. As one CSO interviewee based in Nigeria commented, in addition to allowing for open access to World Bank-related information, the World Bank PICs are an

important resource for the capacity building work that NGOs/CSOs conduct with local communities.[25] PICs are thus an important medium to reach communities that should be maximized.

Secretariat Support

18. *A World Bank staff person should be designated as the focal point for civil society relations with the CIF.*

Given the challenges and potential benefits for the CIF associated with civil society participation, a full time staff position devoted to relations with civil society would be ideal. This would contribute greatly to enabling effective representation, send a strong message that input is valued and also help to strengthen the linkages and relations between the civil society representatives participating in the three different Committees.

This staff position would support the representatives in carrying out their duties, including seeking out opportunities to make use of other international/regional fora for consultations and would act as a liaison for the civil society representatives in the different Committees. Duties would also include outreach, such as maintaining all web-based communications and fora and ensuring that pertinent information is brought to the attention of civil society representatives to the extent possible. He/she would also be responsible for identifying a credible organization to run the self-selection processes and managing a small budget reserved for the civil society representatives in each Committee.

19. *All travel costs for representatives should be covered and a small budget for information sharing and consultation activities related to the position of representative should be provided.*

The Bank should continue to cover the travel costs of representatives from both developing and developed countries. As one interviewee working in an NGO in the United States pointed out, even NGOs based in a relatively wealthy countries often have limited funds and can be put at a disadvantage if funding is made available solely to civil society organizations based in developing countries.

Information sharing and consultation activities should to the extent possible be supported by the existing capacity of the selected candidates' organizations as part of the role their are fulfilling. Where additional capacity may be required, the selected representatives could propose a budget based on planned activities for consideration by the CIF committees and/or the Secretariat.

---

[25] Interview with Virginia Ifeadiro, Civil Society Consultative Group, Nigeria, December 30, 2008.

Summary of Recommendations

The nineteen recommendations to the CTF and SCF Trust Fund Committees and the PPCR Sub-Committee relate specifically to five key aspects of civil society participation. They are as follows:

Participation in Decision-making
1. *Civil society representatives in open committee meetings should be 'active observers.'*

2. *Civil society representatives should be able to:*
   a) *Request the floor to make verbal interventions*
   b) *Request the Co-Chairs to add agenda items to the provisional agenda*
   c) *Recommend to the Committee or the Co-Chairs external experts to speak on a specific agenda item*

3. *If the CIF were to be extended, consideration should be given by the CIF Committees, when discussing possible reforms to the CIF, to expanding the authority of civil society 'active observers' to include decision-making on specified types of matters.[26]*

Representativity and Effective Representation

4. *A clear and common understanding of "civil society" or the constituency that a civil society representative is intended and expected to represent should be agreed by the Committees from the onset and communicated to stakeholders in all relevant documentation. Separate arrangements should be made for participation by representatives of indigenous peoples and the private sector.*

5. *Civil society representation in the CIF Committees should include individual representation from the following sectors of civil society:*
   a) *NGOs and other CSOs*
   b) *Individuals living in communities directly affected by climate change and/or energy-related development who are participating in specific relevant actions to address these issues*
   Additional spaces for representatives from independent academic or research institutions in the CIF Committees might be considered.

6. *The responsibilities of each civil society representative should explicitly include:*
   a) *Consultation with other civil society stakeholders*
   b) *Representation in meetings of the interests of their constituency, not just of their own organization*
   c) *Compliance with agreed consultation guidelines/standards*

7. *Representation should be for 3 years, with the possibility of a second term.*

8. *Convening of the Partnership Forum should be maximized to enhance civil society participation, including facilitating side civil society consultations and opportunities for civil society representatives to meet.*

Self Selection Process

---

[26] It is recognized that the current design of the CIF provides for a sunset clause, and that the CIF will not continue beyond the provisions of the sunset provision unless the UNFCCC so indicates.

9. *Criteria for each of the representative civil society positions should provide for equitable and balanced representation to the extent possible, should be clear and should include gender balance, balance between developing and developed countries, and balance between local/national and international CSOs.*

10. *A procedure for applying the agreed criteria (e.g. gender balance) where the results of the voting process alone do not fulfill the criteria should be established.*

11. *A minimum of one month's time should be allowed for each of the CIF Committee civil society representative self-selection processes to be carried out.*

12. *An alternate selection should be included for each civil society representative position in the CIF Committees, to be identified through the self-selection processes.*

13. *A maximum of two individuals from the same organization should be permitted to participate in the self-selection process, provided that the two individuals are based in different regions.*

Transparency and Access to Information
14. *All meeting documentation should be made available at least two weeks in advance.*

15. *Background documentation for consultations should be translated into national languages of recipient country members to the extent possible.*

16. *Additional measures should be considered to help civil society prepare to contribute to CIF meetings (such as pre-consultation meetings).*

17. *Information about the opportunities and procedure for civil society engagement with the CIF process should be available both online and through the MDBs' public outreach channels, such as the World Bank's Public Information Centers.*

Secretariat Support
18. *A World Bank staff person should be designated as the focal point for civil society relations with the CIF.*

19. *All travel costs for representatives should be covered and a small budget for information sharing and consultation activities related to the position of representative should be provided.*

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1 - RESULTS OF REVIEW OF SELECTED MULTILATERAL BODIES AND GLOBAL FUNDING PROGRAMS

Body/ Fund and "Board"	Relationship to World Bank	Board Meeting Rules	Procedures for CS Participation	Nature of CS Participation	Means to ensure Transparency & Efficiency	Means to ensure Balanced Representation
CGIAR **CGIAR or the Group**	▪ WB is a cosponsor and member of the CGIAR ▪ WB VP overseeing sectoral work on agriculture is CGIAR Chair	<u>Membership</u> ▪ Based on minimum $500,000 contribution ▪ Governments ▪ IGOs ▪ Nonprofit organizations[27] ▪ Private, for-profit corporations (Currently 64 members: 47 Governments,[28] 4 foundations & 13 IGOs) <u>Selection</u> ▪ Countries, IOs & IGOs are admitted once initial annual contribution is confirmed ▪ For all others membership is decided by the CGIAR[29] ▪ No procedure for selection of representatives <u>Decision-making</u> Consensus	1. CGIAR membership open to CSOs (currently no CSO members, outside of private foundations) 2. Executive Committee (ExCo):[30] ▪ 1 space for a rotating member from any of CSO/NGO/farmers' association (has not been filled since 2006) ▪ Representatives identified by their constituency (no procedural guidelines) 3. Annual stakeholder meeting	1. CSO members participate directly in decision-making 2. Submit recommendations to CGIAR on issues referred to it (by CGIAR) at the Annual Meeting) 3. Report of procedures shared at Business Meeting	• Decisions reached by CGIAR/ExCo are recorded and posted on CGIAR website within 30 days • ExCo meeting documentation is available to all ExCo members and on CGIAR website at least 7 working days prior – CGIAR members invited to comment on Provisional Agenda • Language assistance provided for ExCo members • Alternates for ExCo members	CGIAR ▪ None ExCo ▪ Civil society: None - simply selected by constituency ▪ Government: - 5 OECD/DCD member country reps (Americas – 1, Asia and Pacific – 1, Europe – 3) - 5 developing country reps (Americas – 1, Sub Saharan Africa – 1, Asia & Pacific – 1, Central & West Asia and North Africa – 1, Regional fora – 1) Private Sector / Foundations: None
GEF **Council**	▪ WB is one of the Implementing Agencies of the GEF ▪ GEF Secretariat supported administratively by WB ▪ Currently	<u>Members</u> ▪ Governments <u>Selection</u> ▪ Appointed by constituencies - Recipient Constituencies formed by consultation among the GEF	▪ 5 seats for NGOs to attend Council meetings as 'observers'	▪ NGO reps may make interventions on specific agenda items and present written statements at the invitation of	▪ Alternates for Council Members ▪ Agenda and meeting documents for Annual Meeting available 6-8 weeks prior to the Council	Council ▪ Government - 16 developing countries - 2 Central & Eastern European / Former Soviet Union countries - 14 developed countries

---

[27] Includes CSOs, private foundations, academic institutions, and other publicly and privately funded groups.

[28] 25 developing country governments & 22 'industrialized' country governments.

[29] The decision of the CGIAR is based on a review of the membership request carried out by the ExCo and the resulting recommendations. In conducting the review, the ExCo must take consider the following criteria: (a) compatibility between the objectives and activities of the applicant and the CGIAR; (b) relationship between the applicant and CGIAR Centers; (c) capacity of the applicant to meet its commitments to the CGIAR; and (d) extent to which the applicant can serve as a link between the CGIAR and other potential partners.

				the Chair ▪ Do not have decision-making authority	Meeting ▪ Preparatory Meeting for NGOs prior to Council meeting ▪ GEF-NGO Consultation prior to Council Meeting ▪ Guide to GEF for NGOs	▪ Criteria considered: - balanced representation with due weight given to funding efforts of all donors ▪ Chairperson alternates between recipient and non-recipient countries Voting ▪ Double weighted majority required - 60% of participants - 60% of total contributions ▪ NGOs at Meeting - A total of 10 passes reserved for NGOs to attend Council meetings (NGOs can take turns attending meetings and observing via closed circuit TV) - Criteria for NGO selection includes membership in GEF-NGO Network, balanced geographic representation, balance among international, national and local NGOs and rotation among NGOs
chaired by WB		recipient country Participants[31] in the region in accordance with their own criteria - Non-Recipient Constituencies formed by consultation among interested Participants (expected to be guided primarily by contributions) Decision-making ▪ Consensus ▪ By vote if consensus is not possible				
IFAD **Governing Council**	▪ IFAD Works closely with WB/IMF through co-financing	Members ▪ Governments Selection ▪ Appointed by members	1.NGOs may attend Council meetings as 'observers'	1.Do not have decision-making authority	▪ Pre-consultations held in advance of NGO consultations	Governing Council ▪ Session Chair and 2 Vice-chairs represent each of the

---

[31] The Assembly consists of representatives of all GEF Participants. Any State member of the United Nations or of any of its specialized agencies may become a Participant in the GEF.

	and supervision of IFAD projects & programs and biannual consultations among IFAD's President and the Heads of the WB/IMF on joint programs and operations	Decision-making Taken by vote	2.IFAD-NGO Consultation Steering Committee	2. Indirect inputs (re: policy on NGO collaboration) via Secretariat (NGO Unit)	to enable participants to participate more substantively ▪ NGO Coordination Unit and Regional NGO focal points to help collect inputs for consultation planning process	three country groups[32] Voting ▪ Combination of voting rights based on a)membership and b) contributions IFAD-NGO Consultation Steering Committee ▪ Criteria considered: - Adequate geographical distribution - Presence of umbrella NGO networks - people's organizations and farmers' associations
Global Fund **Foundation Board**	▪ WB is currently the Trustee	Members - 7 reps from developing countries - 8 reps from donors - 5 reps from civil society and the private sector Selection ▪ procedure for selecting Board members determined by the groups they represent Decision-making ▪ Consensus By vote if consensus is not possible	1.Foundation Board Membership 2.Partnership Forum	1.CSO members participate directly in decision-making 2.Indirect guidance for Board decisions via Secretariat	▪ Have CSO/NGO reps identify alternates to ensure consistent participation ▪ Circulate relevant documentation well ahead of a meeting, including summarized reports with items requiring CCM decisions clearly identified ▪ Website available in 5 major languages ▪ Combination of virtual dialogue and	Foundation Board ▪ Civil society: - 1 NGO from a developing country - 1 NGO from a developed country - 1 NGO rep who is a person having direct experience with 1 of the 3 focal illnesses ▪ Private Sector: - 1 private sector rep - 1 private foundation rep ▪ Developing country government: - 1 rep from each of 6 WHO regions, with 1 additional rep

[32] List A (primarily OECD members), List B (primarily OPEC members) and List C (developing countries), with 2 members from each of the three regional sub-divisions within List C (Africa, Europe, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean).

					▪ in-person meetings	from Africa Voting ▪ Majority required in both of 2 groups a) 8 donor reps & 2 private sector reps, and b) 7 developing country reps & 3 NGO reps
EBRD **Board of Governors**	▪ WB & EBRD are collaborating in the joint Business, Environment and Enterprise Performance Survey initiative	Members ▪ Governments Selection ▪ Appointed by members, generally a minister of finance Decision-making ▪ Taken by vote (voting power proportionate to members' number of shares)	1.NGO Programme held alongside Annual Meeting 2.Business Forum (part of Annual Meeting) 3.Consultation workshops 4. Board Consultation Visits (BCVs)	1.Discuss EBRD policies and major projects with Board of Directors 2.Participate in discussions as panelists during specialized sessions 3.Discuss EBRD policies and major projects with senior Bank staff 4. Meet with visiting Directors to discuss issues and concerns relevant to Bank's operations	▪ Circulate NGO Programme agenda for feedback prior to meeting ▪ Preparatory meetings held in multiple countries ▪ E-Alert option designed for NGOs ▪ NGO newsletter available in 2 major languages ▪ Major policies translated into several languages	Consultations/ Preparatory meetings ▪ held in several different countries in the region
IDB **Board of Executive Directors**	▪ WB-IDB MOU	Members ▪ Governments Selection ▪ 1 Executive Director appointed by member with most shares ▪ At least 13 others elected by Governors from the appropriate region Decision-making ▪ Taken by vote (voting power	1.Attend IDB Annual Meeting – meetings with some of the Executive Directors and also the President 2.IDB-Civil Society Meetings	1.Present on and discuss selected topics (must be invited by Executive Director for their region) 2.Discuss selected topics with Bank staff and President	▪ Alternates for Executive Directors ▪ New IDB-CSO working group to prepare for the Annual Meeting ▪ Finalizing a comprehensive "map" of CSO for better information distribution	Board ▪ Government - 3 from nonregional countries - 13 from all other countries

		proportionate to members' number of shares)				
CEC **Council**	▪ None	<u>Members</u> ▪ Governments <u>Selection</u> Appointed by Parties[33] <u>Decision-making</u> By consensus	1.Joint Public Advisory Committee (JPAC) 2. National Advisory Groups (optional multistakeholder advisory bodies for each Party)	1.Advise the Council directly; No decision-making authority 2. Advise Council members from each Party directly; may select JPAC members if tasked to do so by relevant Council member	▪ Guidelines for consultations developed ▪ Alternates for Council members	Council ▪ 1 member from each of the Parties JPAC ▪ 5 reps from each of the 3 Parties
RSB **Steering Board**	▪ None	<u>Members</u> ▪ Governments ▪ Industry ▪ NGOs/CSOs ▪ IGOs <u>Selection</u> ▪ Self identified out of a group of interested stakeholders who came together to initiate the RSB ▪ Selected additional members from under-represented stakeholder groups invited to join (2/3 vote among members in extreme cases) <u>Decision-making</u> By consensus	1.Steering Board Membership 2.Working Group Membership 3.Regional Outreach Meetings	1.CSO Board members have decision making authority 2.Provide suggestions to the Board for consideration via Secretariat 3.Provide suggestions to the Board for consideration via Secretariat	▪ On-line registration for Working Groups and Regional Outreach Meetings ▪ Usually Secretariat sets up a local Planning of local NGO and industry leaders, who also invite their colleagues via email	Steering Board ▪ Criteria includes: - Balanced geographic representation - Balanced representation of social sectors - Balanced representation of actors along the biofuels supply chain Working Groups ▪ Open to anyone Regional Outreach ▪ Open to anyone limited only by space ▪ Secretariat determines which interested participants receive funding to attend (prioritizes individuals with relevant expertise)
GFD	▪ WB is a member observer of	<u>Members</u> ▪ Governments (23 of the	▪ Civil society invited to participate in	▪ Provide inputs to DAC	▪ Plenary held back-to-back with high level	▪ GDF is a joint DCD (operational

---

[33] Signatories to the North American Agreement for Economic Cooperation (NAAEC): Canada, Mexico and the U.S.

Develome nt Assistanc e Committe e (OECD)	the DAC	world's major donors) Selection ▪ Donor countries apply to join; must meet membership criteria (established national aid agency) Decision-making ▪ By consensus	GFD plenaries and workshops (invited by DCD/DEV staff based on what they can contribute, use previous meetings as an indication)	members directly during GFD events and indirectly via the Informal Steering Group (OECD Secretariat staff in DCD and DEV)	DAC meeting ▪ Informal Steering Group established as a more formal internal link with the DAC	arm of DAC)-DEV initiative with the aim of increasing non-OECD member countries participation in decision-making; DEV membership includes non-OECD member countries, thereby the GFD is intended itself as a vehicle for more balanced representation
UNFF **UNFF Session**	▪ WB supports UNFF through its membership in the Collaborativ e Partnership on Forests	Members ▪ Governments Selection ▪ Appointed by members Decision-making ▪ Taken by vote	▪ Major Group representatives may attend UNFF Sessions ▪ Multistakeholde r Dialogue at UNFF Session – one day during UNFF session ▪ Major Groups may submit Discussion Papers on agenda prior to Session	▪ Major Group reps may intervene verbally ▪ No voting rights	▪ Full time staff position devoted to Major Group coordination/r elations ▪ opportunities provided for Major Groups Focal Points to meet on the side of meetings held outside of the UNFF Sessions ▪ UNFF Session topics shared with Major Group Focal Points prior to UNFF Session with time allowed to raise key related issues in Discussion papers	Major Groups ▪ Focal Points for each of the following Major Groups: - Women - Children & Youth - Indigenous People - NGOs - Local Authorities - Workers and Trade Unions - Business & Industry - Scientific & Technological Communities - Farmers and Small Forest Landowners

ANNEX 2 - RULES, PRACTICES & PROCEDURES OF SELECTED MULTILATERAL BODIES AND GLOBAL FUNDING PROGRAMS AND MEASURES TO PROVIDE FOR CIVIL SOCIETY PARTICIPATION

I. *Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)*

The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) is an informal association of 64 public and private sector CGIAR Members, from developed and developing countries, committed to mobilizing agricultural research supporting the sustainable development of agriculture, natural resource management, fisheries and forestry in developing countries. The first formal meeting of the CGIAR was held on 19 May 1971.[34]

Members must make a minimum contribution of US$ 500,000 per annum towards supporting research programs approved by the CGIAR or governance mechanisms of the CGIAR system. Currently the CGIAR membership includes 25 developing and 22 industrialized countries, 4 private foundations, and 13 regional and international organizations.[35] Whether the annual contribution is part of the reason that there are currently no CSO or NGO members is not clear and is worth looking into.

The World Bank has for most of the System's life been the most important donor, thereby guaranteeing the continuity and stability of the System.

The CGIAR (or the Group) is the primary decision-making authority. Membership in the Group is open to:
- Countries that are members of the United Nations (UN) or any of its specialized agencies
- International or regional intergovernmental organizations
- Non-profit organizations such as CSOs, private foundations, academic institutions, and other publicly and privately funded groups with demonstrated interests in activities congruent with the mission of the CGIAR
- Private for-profit corporations with a demonstrated record of engagement in activities congruent with the mission of the CGIAR

All members can participate in consensus-based approval of agricultural research and development programs and endorse funding for CGIAR Centers to carry out approved programs. This approvals process takes place in the Business Meeting segment of the CGIAR AGM.[36]

The ExCo is a subsidiary of the Group, which among other things facilitates the Group's decision-making by reviewing major policy issues and submitting recommendations for consideration by the CGIAR. The Executive Council (ExCo) makes recommendations on matters that have been referred to it at Annual General Meetings (AGMs) or on matters that have arisen between AGMs.[37] It is a committee of shareholders and stakeholders consisting of 7 non-rotating members and 13 rotating members representing geographical and functional constituencies. Rotating members and alternates are identified by the constituency concerned and serve for periods of two consecutive years.

Non-rotating members:

---

[34] Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), "The Charter of the CGIAR System," March 2007, http://www.cgiar.org/pdf/charter%202007_main%20text.pdf (accessed December 3, 2008).
[35] Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, Web site, http://www.cgiar.org/who/members/index.html (accessed December 30, 2008).
[36] The Business Meeting is open to delegations representing CGIAR Members including Cosponsors, Member-Observers, representative of the Alliance of CGIAR Centers, Chair of the Science Council, Genetic Policy Research Committee (GPRC), partner committees or groups and the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR), others may be present as observers.
[37] The CGIAR may also delegate decision-making on a specific issue to the ExCo.

    i.   1 CGIAR Chair (nominated by the World Bank after informal consultation with CGIAR members for endorsement from the Group; from 1947 the CGIAR Chair has been the World Bank Vice President overseeing its sectoral work on agriculture)
    ii.   3 Cosponsors (FAO, World Bank, UNDP and IFAD)
    iii.   1 Science Council chair
    iv.   1 representative of the Alliance of Centres of the CGIAR
    v.   1 representative of the Genetic Resources Policy Committee (GRPC)

Rotating members:
    i.   5 representatives from Organization for Economic Cooperation & Development (OECD)/Development Cooperation Directorate (DCD) countries (1 member from Americas, 1 member from Asia and Pacific, 3 members from Europe)
    ii.   5 representatives from developing countries (1 member from the Americas, 1 member from Sub Saharan Africa, 1 member from Asia and Pacific, 1 member from Central and West Asia and North Africa, 1 member from Regional Fora)
    iii.   1 representative from a foundation
    iv.   1 representative from civil society/NGO/farmers' association
    v.   1 representative from the private sector[38]

Currently there are no CSO/NGO CGIAR members (with the exception of the four private foundations). As of October 2008 the one ExCo rotating member position for a representative from civil society/NGOs/farmers' associations was the only position that remained unfilled, as was the case in 2007, prior to which the position was held by a Farmers' Representative.[39]

Representatives from CSOs may also be invited by the CGIAR Chair or the elected meeting co-chair to attend an ExCo meeting as "observers." Observers may address the Council at the invitation of the Chair but may not participate in decision-making.[40]

In addition to membership in the CGIAR and representation in the ExCo, civil society can contribute inputs to the CGIAR's strategic direction by participating in the annual Stakeholder Meeting. The Stakeholder Meeting is the second segment of the AGM (along with the Business Meeting). It is open to all stakeholders for an exchange of views on major research and development issues but has no decision-making authority. A report on the proceedings of Stakeholder Meeting, incorporating stakeholder views on issues requiring decisions is shared at the Business Meeting and "taken into account when decisions are made."

II. *Global Environment Facility (GEF)*

The Global Environment Facility (GEF or the Facility) is a global partnership among 178 countries, international institutions, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and the private sector to address global environmental issues while supporting national sustainable development initiatives. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Bank are the Implementing Agencies. The GEF is the largest global funder of environmental

---

[38] CGIAR, "The Charter."
[39] CGIAR, "Fifteenth Meeting of the ExCo, October 1-2, 2008, Lisbon, Portugal, Summary Record of Proceedings," http://www.cgiar.org/exco/exco15/exco15_Summary_Proceedings_Oct%2027%202008_.pdf (accessed January 5, 2009), 23; CGIAR, "CGIAR, Twelfth Meeting of the ExCo, May 16-17, 2007, Madrid, Spain, Summary Record of Proceedings, http://www.cgiar.org/exco/exco12/exco12_sop.pdf (accessed January 5, 2009), 24; CGIAR, "CGIAR, "Eleventh Meeting of the ExCo, October 17-18, 2006, Paris, France, Summary Record of Proceedings," http://www.cgiar.org/exco/exco11/exco11_sop.pdf (accessed January 5, 2009), 25.
[40] CGIAR, "The Charter," 41.

projects. It is also the designated funding mechanism for a number of Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and conventions.[41]

The GEF structure includes an Assembly, a Council and a Secretariat. A Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) established by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) acts as an advisory body to the Facility.

The GEF Council is the main governing body of the GEF. All decisions are made by consensus. Among other things, the Council reviews and approves the GEF work program and directs the utilization of GEF funds. The Council is composed of 32 State members, including 16 from developed countries or "non-recipient constituencies" and 18 representing "recipient constituencies" composed of 14 Members from developing countries and 2 Members from the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. [42]

The 18 recipient constituencies are distributed among the geographic regions as follows:
i.   6 representatives from Africa
ii.   6 representatives from Asia and the Pacific
iii.   4 representatives from Latin America and the Caribbean
iv.   2 representatives from Central, Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union

For each geographic region recipient constituencies are formed through a process of consultation among the GEF recipient country Participants[43] in the region in accordance with their own criteria. Amongst other criteria, it is expected that "equitable and balanced representation from within the geographic region" is taken into account in this consultation.[44] The non-recipient constituencies are formed through a process of consultation among interested Participants. It is expected that grouping of non-recipient countries will be primarily guided by total contributions to the GEF Trust Fund.

Five seats at Council meetings are reserved for NGO representatives to attend as observers.[45] As observers, NGO representatives do not have decision-making power. NGOs present in the meeting may make interventions on a specific agenda item when invited to do so by the Chair. The extent to which NGOs are able to intervene can thus vary depending on the Chair. To improve their likelihood of being invited to speak, NGO representatives can arrange to meet with the Chair beforehand to let him/her know that they would like to speak on a particular item. NGOs may also do the same with Council members who can make a request to the Chair to hear from NGOs on an issue.[46] All together ten NGO representatives are given access to attend Council meetings, though only five seats are reserved for NGOs to sit in on a session of the Council meeting at any one time. Over the course of the three-day Council meeting, these ten NGOs may alternate between sitting in the meeting and watching the proceedings on a closed circuit television.

Criteria and rules for NGO attendance to Council meetings, approved by the Council in 1995, and whose application is subject to Council review[47], include the following:

---

[41] Global Environment Facility (GEF), Web site, http://www.gefweb.org/interior.aspx?id=50 (accessed December 3, 2008).
[42] Global Environment Facility (GEF), "Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility," March 2008, http://thegef.org/uploadedFiles/GEF_Instrument_March08.pdf (accessed December 10, 2008).
[43] The Assembly consists of representatives of all GEF Participants. Any State member of the United Nations or of any of its specialized agencies may become a Participant in the GEF.
[44] Ibid., 40.
[45] No definition of the term 'observer' is provided.
[46] Interview with Gary Allport, Senior Conservation Policy Adviser, BirdLife Secretariat (seconded to IUCN US), Tuesday January 6, 2009.
[47] Awotar, Rajen, Liliana Hisas, Djimingue Nanasta and German Rocha, "A Guide to the Global Environment Facility for NGOs," September 2005, http://www.gefweb.org/Partners/partners-

i. For the purpose of representation at GEF Council meetings and participation in related GEF consultations, NGOs are defined as non-profit organizations whose mandate, experience, expertise and capacity are relevant to the work of the GEF. These include: community groups; local, national, regional and international organizations, including NGO networks, dedicated to preserving the environment or promoting sustainable development; indigenous people's organizations; and academic and research institutions.

ii. NGO representatives are responsible for communicating with the wider NGO community, including reporting on the Council meeting and NGO Consultations, and they should be determined (selected) by NGOs.

iii. Additional criteria for selecting NGOs to be invited to attend/observe the Council meetings:
- NGOs should be members of the GEF-NGO Network (recently revised from requiring GEF Secretariat accreditation – below).
- A broad based geographic representation should be ensured.
- The agenda for the Council meeting should be taken into account and organizations with relevant competence should be selected.
- A wide representation of views and expertise should be reflected, a balance among international, national and local representation.
- Past attendance of NGOs at Council meetings should be considered, and rotation among NGOs should be sought.

The GEF-NGO Network was initiated by NGOs themselves, in response to the opportunity opened by the Council in 1995. Formal guidelines were adopted in 2003. The Network is governed by a Coordinating Committee of up to fifteen NGO representatives elected as Regional Focal Points (RFPs), along with three representatives of indigenous people's organizations from three main regions. Each region conducts its own election, run by the outgoing RFP. Only GEF-NGO Network members may nominate candidates and participate in the election within each region. RFPs represent their regions and are considered the formal representatives of the GEF-NGO Network. The RFPs elect amongst themselves a Central Focal Point (CFP) to serve as Chairman. The Committee is responsible for coordinating policy and project-specific inputs to the GEF Council and facilitating information dissemination and dialogue about the GEF with NGOs in the regions.[48]

Until recently, NGOs required accreditation by the GEF Secretariat in order to join the GEF-NGO Network and thereby have the opportunity to attend Council Meetings. In response to a recommendation in an independent review of the Network to create a more effective and efficient accreditation process, the GEF Council approved the replacement of GEF Secretariat accreditation with membership in the network November 2008.[49] Network membership is now managed by the Network in accordance with the "Rules and Principles Governing Membership in the GFP NGO Network."[50]

Nongovernmental_Organ/ngo_guide/documents/The%20A%20to%20Z%20of%20the%20GEF.pdf (accessed December 31, 2008), 113-4.
[48] Ibid., 120-3.
[49] The Independent review, conducted in 2005 at the request of the CFP and financed by the GEF Secretariat, noted the following weaknesses in the accreditation process: " The accreditation process is cumbersome, and the Secretariat frequently lacks the information to effectively review requests for accreditation. In addition it provides no option for periodic review of accreditation status." See Global Environment Facility (GEF), "Enhancing Civil Society Engagement and Partnership with the GEF," GEF/C.34/9, GEF Council, November 11-13, 2008, Agenda Item 14, http://www.gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Documents/Council_Documents__(PDF_DOC)/GEF_C34/C.34.9%20Enhancing%20Engagement%20of%20Civil%20Society%20with%20the%20GEF.pdf (accessed December 3, 2008).
[50] See Annex II of "Enhancing Civil Society Engagement and Partnership with the GEF" referenced above.

For NGO representatives, the Council meeting is the final of a series of three meetings held twice a year over the course of one week. The NGO Preparatory Meeting and the GEF-NGO Consultation, held respectively on the Monday and Tuesday preceding the three-day Council Meeting, are intended to facilitate the preparation of NGOs to participate substantively in the Council Meeting.

The NGO Preparatory Meeting is attended exclusively by NGOs and chaired by the Chairman of the NGO network. The entire day is dedicated to preparing NGOs' views and positions for the GEF-NGO Consultation and the Council meetings. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss concerns on agenda items to be presented at the Consultation and Council meetings. Interventions drafted by each NGO prior to the meeting are presented to NGO colleagues and discussed. It is during the preparatory meeting that the roster detailing which five of the ten NGO representatives will attend the Council meeting in order to intervene on specific agenda items is set. It has generally been agreed that NGO delegates have a social responsibility for communicating NGO views as discussed at the NGO Preparatory Meeting on behalf of the NGO delegation.

This GEF-NGO Consultation is jointly organized and co-chaired by the Chair of the GEF NGO Network and the GEF Secretariat. The Consultation agenda is prepared based on the agenda for the Council Meeting, which is posted on the GEF website six to eight weeks prior to the meeting. NGO Focal Points create an outline for the GEF-NGO Consultation Meeting agenda that is then circulated to the GEF-NGO Network to prepare the final draft. The GEF-NGO Consultation is attended by NGOs, the GEF Secretariat and the implementing and executing agencies. Council Members are also invited to attend. NGOs voice concerns, comment on policies and projects and present positions on substantive issues. Brief reports on regional concerns relevant to the upcoming GEF meeting (prepared by the RFPs) are distributed to consultation meeting participants. The Consultation meeting is the opportunity to raise particular items. Case studies are also presented.[51]

The main purpose of the Consultation meeting is to allow NGOs to communicate their key messages with members of the Council, but not all Council members attend it. In that case, it is necessary to speak to them at some point during the Council meeting before the agenda item comes up, or at the reception the night before the meeting begins.[52] Consultation meetings have furthermore tended to get bogged down with discussion of details of the next day's meeting, rather than being used as an opportunity to pursue strategic priorities. This is happening less as a result of the very focused efforts of key individuals.[53]

Travel grants are provided for sixteen NGO representatives from the GEF-NGO Network to participate in the Preparatory Meeting for NGOs and the GEF-NGO Consultation, but only ten of these are given access to attend Council meetings. The grants are provided for out of the Voluntary NGO Trust Fund and managed by the GEF-NGO Network.[54] For representation at the Council meetings, the network is divided into regions according to the GEF regional structure. GEF-NGO Network members must contact their corresponding RFP to make their case to the GEF-NGO Network in order to be invited to attend the meeting.[55]

NGO attendance at GEF meeting has been successful at giving a voice to those who are interested in sharing their views but who previously did not have the opportunity to do so. How effective it has been in producing advocacy outcomes however, is questionable.

---

[51] Awotar et al., " A Guide to the GEF," 120-121.
[52] Ibid., 123.
[53] Interview with Gary Allport, Senior Conservation Policy Adviser, BirdLife Secretariat (seconded to IUCN US), Tuesday January 6, 2009.
[54] In 2008 the GEF Council approved a recommendation to increase this amount from US$ 50,000 to US$ 70,445 to account for cost increases and inflation. Ibid.
[55] Awotar et al., "A Guide to the GEF for NGOs," 115, 124.

In addition to representation at Council Meetings, NGOs may contribute to GEF activities by participating in policy working groups convened by the GEF Secretariat for the design and development of specific programs or initiatives.

III. *International Fund for Agriculture (IFAD)*

The International Fund for Agriculture (IFAD or the Fund) is a specialized agency of the UN dedicated to eradicating rural poverty in developing countries. Initially intended to be a financial institution, IFAD has gradually assumed the responsibility for the design of most of its projects and is now acknowledged as a leader in project development for the economic advancement of the poor.[56]

IFAD works in close collaboration with the World Bank and the IMF, including through cofinancing and supervision of IFAD projects and programme collaboration, as well as through biannual consultations among IFAD's President and the heads of the World Bank and IMF on programmes and joint operations.

Membership in IFAD is open to any State member of the UN or of any of its specialized agencies, or of the International Atomic Energy Agency, as well as to any grouping of States whose members have delegated to it powers in fields falling within the competence of the Fund. Members' contributions to the Fund are specified in their individual instruments of ratification, acceptance, accession or approval. All contributions are made without restrictions on their use.[57]

IFAD's organizational structure includes a Governing Council, an Executive Board and a President with staff as necessary.

The Governing Council is the Fund's highest decision-making authority. The Council consists of one Governor and an alternate appointed by and to represent each of IFAD's members.[58] Decisions are taken by voting, requiring a simple majority of the total amount votes for approval. Voting rights are allocated on the basis of both membership and contributions to the fund. Membership votes are distributed equally among members. Contribution votes are distributed in proportion to members' cumulative contributions to the Fund. The Council decides the total number of votes to be allocated in each of the two categories.[59] NGOs may apply for Executive Board approval to attend Council meetings as observers via the IFAD NGO Coordination Unit[60] but may not participate in voting.

The main mechanism for NGO representation within IFAD are the IFAD NGO Consultations carried out under the IFAD NGO Extended Cooperation Programme (ECP). The consultations provide a forum for interaction between NGOs and IFAD staff to discuss policy and operational issues, including suggestions for pilot activities. Pre-consultations are held in advance of each consultation to prepare NGO participants with briefings on IFAD, the consultation process and the expected outcome, election procedures for membership in the Steering Committee and the terms of reference of the Committee.

Consultations, including pre-consultations, are organized and facilitated by the IFAD/NGO Consultation Steering Committee. The Committee is made up of seven NGO members and three IFAD staff. NGO Committee members are elected by NGOs participating in the consultations. Adequate geographical distribution and the presence of umbrella NGO networks, people's organizations and farmers'

---

[56] IFAD, Web site, http://www.ifad.org/governance/index.htm (accessed January 1, 2009).
[57] IFAD, Agreement Establishing the International Fund for Agricultural Development, 1976, http://www.ifad.org/pub/basic/agree/e/!01agree.pdf (January 1, 2009).
[58] Alternates may vote only in the absence of the Governor.
[59] IFAD, "Agreement."
[60] IFAD, "IFAD and NGOs: Dynamic Partnerships to Fight Rural Poverty," 2006, http://www.ifad.org/pub/ngo/ngo.pdf (accessed December 13, 2008), 28.

associations are taken into account. The Committee meets twice yearly and is responsible for presenting the IFAD management with recommendations on the choice of the theme as well as the selection of NGOs to be invited to the consultations. The Committee further assesses the effectiveness of the consultation process with a view to proposing improvements and reviews progress made on the recommendations of the Consultation both by IFAD and NGOs. Currently the Committee is the forum where IFAD policies, procedures and operations of relevance to IFAD/NGO collaboration are discussed. This will continue until a more-appropriate policy forum is created.[61]

The NGO Coordination Unit within IFAD is the unit responsible for working with the IFAD/NGO Consultation Steering Committee to organize NGO consultations and coordinating the development of IFAD's strategies and policies on NGO collaboration. NGO Focal Points in each of IFAD's regional divisions assist in the organization of consultations by gathering and consolidating proposals from the regional divisions regarding the themes of consultations, the NGOs to be invited and the documents to be prepared.

In spite of these measures, a central conclusion of the 10th IFAD/NGO Consultation entitled "IFAD/NGOs/Governments: Tripartite Partnerships for Poverty Alleviation and Food Security through Projects and Programmes," held in 2000, was that "the framework within which IFAD, NGOs and governments come together does not fully reflect the strategic importance IFAD is increasingly attributing to NGO collaboration." The Overview Paper of key findings from the consultation highlights a lack of NGO involvement at the conceptual level:

> "There has been little participation of NGOs in the conceptualization and design of poverty-reduction operations. Most projects involve NGOs as service providers on the basis of approaches and parameters set by design teams. NGOs have yet to assume a role as concept initiators…"[62]

Other avenues for NGO engagement within IFAD include grants extended to NGOs to draw upon their expertise in specific areas and special studies commissioned with NGOs to elicit their views on regional poverty assessments prepared by IFAD.[63]

IV. *Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria*

The Global Fund is a public/private partnership dedicated to attracting and disbursing additional resources to prevent and treat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. Since its creation in 2002, the Global Fund has become the main source of finance for programs to fight AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria, funding more than 550 programs in 136 countries and providing a quarter of all international financing for AIDS globally, two-thirds for tuberculosis and three quarters for malaria.[64]

As the Fund's current Trustee, the World Bank is a non-voting member of the Board and also works in partnership with the Global Fund.

The Global Fund's structure includes a Foundation Board, a Technical Review Panel, a Secretariat, Country Coordinating Mechanisms and Principle Recipients.

---

[61] IFAD, "IFAD and NGOs," 13; IFAD, IFAD/NGO Consultation Steering Committee, Web site, http://www.ifad.org/ngo/dialogue/steering.htm (accessed December 13, 2008.)
[62] IFAD, "IFAD/NGOs/Governments: Tripartite Partnerships for Poverty Alleviation and Food Security through Projects and Programmes," Report of10th IFAD/NGO Consultation Pune, India, 29 May - 2 June 2000, http://www.ifad.org/ngo/events/10/10e.pdf (accessed January 2, 2009.)
[63] IFAD, "IFAD and NGOs," 13.
[64] The Global Fund, Web site, http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/about/?lang=en (accessed December 3, 2008).

The Foundation Board is the central decision-making body. Among others the functions of the Board include setting the Global Fund's policies and strategies, making funding decisions, setting criteria for membership, validating eligibility criteria for project and establishing criteria for the rules of procedure for the Partnership Forum.

The Board consists of twenty voting members and four non-voting members. Voting members include:
   i.   Seven representatives from developing countries, one based in each of the six World Health Organization (WHO) regions and one additional representative from Africa
  ii.   Eight representatives from donors
 iii.   Five representatives from civil society and the private sector including:
            a.   One representative of an NGO from a developing country
            b.   One representative of an NGO from a developed country
            c.   One representative of the private sector
            d.   One representative of a private foundation
            e.   One representative of an NGO who is a person living with HIV/AIDS or from a community living with tuberculosis or malaria

Non-voting members include:
   i.   One representative from the WHO
  ii.   One representative from the Joint UN Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS)
 iii.   One representative from the trustee (currently the World Bank)
  iv.   One Swiss citizen with his/her domicile in Switzerland (where the Global Fund is legally registered) authorized to act on behalf of the Foundation to the extent required by Swiss law

The procedure for selecting Board members is determined by the group that each member represents.

Decisions are taken by consensus to the extent possible. If all practical efforts by the Board and its Chair have not led to consensus, any Board member with voting privileges may call for a vote. For the purposes of voting, members are divided into two groups; one comprised of the eight donor seats and the two private sector seats, and a second comprised of the seven developing country seats and the three NGO seats. Motions require a two-thirds majority of those present from both groups.[65]

In addition to membership in the Foundation Board, civil society may contribute to the Board's discussions and decisions by participating in the Partnership Forum. The Partnership Forum takes place every two years and is an important communication channel for stakeholders who are not formally represented elsewhere in the governance structure, providing an opportunity for a wide range of stakeholders, including CSOs, to express their views on the Foundation's policies and strategies. The Partnership Forum is a process, not an event. It consists of online discussions in the e-Forum, consultations on selected themes at a variety of internal and external events throughout the year, and a stakeholder meeting for invited participants.

The objectives of the Partnership Forum include the following:
   ▪   To review and provide feedback on the progress of the Global Fund;
   ▪   To develop recommendations on Global Fund strategy, policy and practice;
   ▪   To mobilize and sustain political commitment to take actions to fight the three diseases and to ensure sustainable long-term financing.

---

[65] The Global Fund, "The Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria: By-Laws, As Amended 12 November 2007," http://www.theglobalfund.org/documents/TGF_Bylaws_en.pdf (accessed December 3, 2008), 4-7.

Following every Forum, a report summarizing e-Forum discussions and another with recommendations from the stakeholder meeting are prepared for and give guidance to the decisions taken by the Foundation Board.[66] The Secretariat organizes the Partnership Forum and is also responsible for communicating the Foundation Board's decisions to stakeholders.[67]

Country Coordinating Mechanisms (CCMs) are an additional mechanism at the country level to ensure that civil society perspectives are incorporated in the design, management and implementation of national programs supported by the Global Fund. CCMs are multistakeholder groups including government, CSOs, those affected by one of the three Global Fund focal illnesses and any other key stakeholders in a country's response to these illnesses. CCMs prepare proposals that reflect a gap analysis of national strategic plans to submit to the Board. Once a proposal is approved, CCMs are responsible for raising resources at the country level and deciding how they will be distributed within national programs.

Key findings in a recent assessment of the CCM model based on case studies in twenty countries include the following:
- The better the quality of civil society participation, the better the functioning of the CCM - the equality of all stakeholders is key.
- CCMs following predictable schedules and with clear governance, structures, tools and processes function most effectively.
- The CCM partnership model has contributed to a re-definition of the relationship between government and civil society in the area of public health by providing a platform for mediating competing interests and empowering civil society in countries where the government has learned to embrace multisectoral collaboration and the added value that it brings.
- CCMs have improved government performance in the three focal disease areas by including civil society as 'watchdogs' and motivators of good performance, enhancing oversight.
- The openness and transparency of the CCM model has helped create an opening for individuals and communities most affected by the Global Fund's three focal diseases to play an active role in shaping resource mobilization and distribution.
- Main obstacles to strengthening civil society participation include:
  o Difficulties interacting with constituencies (often due to logistical difficulties)
  o Limited access to information, poor organization of and information sharing by CCM (despite web-based availability)
  o Limited technical capacity for taking advantage of funding opportunities.
- The role of a strong, functional Secretariat in the performance of the CCM is crucial.[68]

V. European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)

The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development is the single largest investor in Central and Eastern Europe. Originally established to nurture a new private sector in the region in the early nineties, the EBRD uses the tools of investment to help build market economies and democracies in countries from central Europe to central Asia.

The EBRD's members include sixty-one State members, most of which are Central, Eastern and Western European, the European Community and the European Investment Bank. The EBRD and the World Bank

---

[66] The Global Fund, Web site, http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/partnershipforum/?lang=en (accessed December 3, 2008.)
[67] The Global Fund "The Global Fund," 8.
[68] The Global Fund, "Lessons Learned in the Field of Health Financing and Governance: A Report on the Country Coordinating Mechanism Model," 2008, http://www.theglobalfund.org/documents/ccm/CCM_GlobalReport_2008_10_en.pdf (accessed December 13, 2008).

are partners in a series of joint Business, Environment and Enterprise Performance Surveys being conducted in Central and Eastern Europe and Former Soviet Union Bloc.

The EBRD structure consists of a Board of Governors, a Board of Directors and a President overseeing Bank staff.

The powers of the EBRD are vested in the Board of Governors to which each member appoints a governor, generally the minister of finance. The Board of Governors delegates most powers to the Board of Directors, which is responsible for the EBRD's strategic direction. The President is elected by the Board of Governors and is the legal representative of the EBRD. Under the guidance of the Board of Directors, the President manages the work of the Bank.[69]

With respect to engaging in dialogue with civil society, the EBRD explicitly recognizes that there are a number of different groups within the larger civil society stakeholder group, including local communities, NGOs focusing on number areas including the environment, human rights and democracy, social issues and business development, as well ad think tanks, professional associations and academics.[70] While there is no apparent mechanism to ensure that each of these groups is represented in consultations carried out with civil society, the Bank maintains a "flexible" approach to engaging with external stakeholders "given their diverse interests, large number and global spread."[71]

Every year in May, civil society stakeholders have an opportunity for face-to-face discussions about EBRD's polices and major projects with Bank staff, senior management and members of the Board of Directors during the NGO programme, which is organised alongside the Annual Meeting and Business Forum.

As part of the 2007 Annual Meeting (AM) in Kazan, the Bank organised an NGO programme between 19 and 22 May. NGOs were consulted on the agenda for discussion ahead of the AM through emails and preparatory meetings with civil society stakeholders in Moscow, St Petersburg, Tbilisi, Baku and Sofia in February and March 2007. NGOs also met the Bank's President, Board of Directors, Acting Secretary General and other key staff. NGOs participated as panelists in several sessions of the Business Forum. Around 80 NGO representatives from 75 international and local organisations from 21 countries participated in the programme in Kazan.[72] Information about the selection process for NGO participants is not easily accessible. It is likely that the EBRD's NGO Outreach Unit contacts NGOs that are active on relevant issues, as is the case with individual consultations held outside of the meeting throughout the year.[73]

Along with its annual meetings, the Bank holds consultation workshops for civil society to discuss and review policies and revisions, such as the draft 'Rules of Procedure for the proposed Project Complaint Mechanism,' or the Bank's '2008 Environmental & Social Policy'. In the case of the latter, six consultations were held in six different locations (five in Eastern Europe, one in London).[74] NGOs were also invited to send written comments and discussion papers outlining key issues to be considered as part

[69] EBRD, Web site, http://www.ebrd.com/about/structure/index.htm (accessed January 3, 2009).
[70] EBRD, "Public Information Policy: Report on Implementation 2007," http://www.ebrd.com/about/policies/pip/report07.pdf (accessed January 3, 2009), 14.
[71] EBRD, "Public Information Policy, September 2008, http://www.ebrd.com/about/policies/pip/pip.pdf (accessed January 3, 2009), 3.
[72] EBRD, "Public Information Policy," 14-15.
[73]EBRD, "The EBRD and Civil Society, Activities in 2007," fact sheet, http://www.ebrd.com/pubs/factsh/themes/ngo.pdf (accessed January 3, 2009).
[74] EBRD, Web site, http://www.ebrd.com/oppor/ngo/new/index.htm (accessed January 3, 2009).

of the processes for both policies. The Bank also informs civil society stakeholders about the development of major projects and holds meetings to discuss the project and its impact with NGOs and others.[75]

Board Consultation Visits (BCVs) are another opportunity at the country level for NGOs/CSOs to provide inputs to decision-making related to the Bank's operations. Visiting Directors regularly meet with major national and international NGOs/CSOs active in the country concerned. During these meetings NGOs/CSOs may raise specific topics and concerns about the issues relevant to the Bank's operations.[76]

In addition to a dedicated NGO web page, the Bank's NGO Unit uses email notifications and alerts and a regular NGO Newsletter, available both in English and in Russian, to communicate pertinent information with civil society stakeholders. Further, every approved country strategy is translated into the relevant official language. Selected major policy documents such as the 2008 Environment and Social Policy are translated to the national languages of all countries where the EBRD has operations. Others, such as the Bank's Public Information Policy (PIP) are available in English and Russian with translation to all national languages of countries where the EBRD is working available upon request.[77]

VI. *Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)*

The Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) is the main source of multilateral financing and expertise for sustainable economic, social and institutional development in Latin America and the Caribbean. The IDB shares policy and technical advice to achieve sustainable growth, drawing on the expertise of specialists in fields ranging from urban development to macroeconomics. The IDB lends to national, provincial, state and municipal governments as well as autonomous public institutions. Civil society organizations and private sector companies are also eligible for IDB financing.[78]

IDB membership is open to States in North America, Latin America and the Caribbean. 'Nonregional' States which are members of the IMF and Switzerland may also be admitted. The World Bank and the IMF have a long-standing partnership in assisting member governments achieve sustainable growth and development. This partnership recognizes the primary responsibility of the Fund for macroeconomic stabilization and surveillance, and the primary responsibility of the Bank for structural and social issues. Currently the IDB has 26 borrowing members, all of them in Latin America and the Caribbean, and 21 non-borrowing members from Asia, Europe and North America.

The structure of the IDB includes a Board of Governors, a Board of Executive Directors, a President, an Executive Vice President, a Vice President in charge of the Fund, and such other officers and staff as may be considered necessary.

The IDB is headed by the Board of Governors. Governors are appointed by each member county. Voting power is proportional to the Bank's capital subscribed to by the country. The IDB's governors are ultimately responsible for overseeing the Bank's activities and administration, although in practice they delegate many of these responsibilities to the Board of Executive Directors.

Representation to the Board of Executive Directors is distributed as follows:
  i.   One Executive Director shall be appointed by the member country having the largest number of shares in the Bank;
  ii. Not less than three executive directors shall be elected by the governors of the nonregional

---

[75] E.g. the Sakhalin II (Phase 2) oil and gas project; see EBRD, "Public Information Policy: Report on Implementation 2006," http://www.ebrd.com/about/policies/pip/report06.pdf (accessed January 3, 2009), 17.
[76] EBRD, "Public Information Policy," 15.
[77] EBRD, Web site, http://www.ebrd.com/oppor/ngo/faqs.htm (accessed January 3, 2009).
[78] IDB, Web site, http://www.iadb.org/aboutus/index.cfm?lang=en (accessed January 3, 2009).

member countries;

iii.   Not less than ten others shall be elected by the governors of the remaining member countries

The Board of Executive Directors establishes the Bank's policies, approves projects, sets interest rates for Bank loans, authorizes borrowings in the capital markets, and approves the institution's administrative budget.[79] Decisions in the Board of Executive Directors are taken by vote requiring a simple majority for approval. The appointed Director is entitled to cast the number of votes of the country that appointed him/her. Each elected Director is entitled to cast the number of votes that counted toward his/her election.[80]

For the last seven years, civil society groups have been invited to attend the Annual IDB Meeting, during which the annual meeting of the Board of Governors is held. CSOs interested in attending are required to submit requests for invitation to the Office of the Secretary for approval by the appropriate Executive Director.[81]

The programs vary from year to year but generally CSOs have opportunities to meet with some of the members of the Executive Board. These meetings are typically open to representatives of any NGO that has registered to attend the Annual Meeting in full. NGOs may present on and discuss selected topics with Bank staff.[82] At the most recent IDB Annual Meeting, held in Miami, April 4-8, 2008, civil society delegations had the opportunity to meet with the President, as well as representatives from the Executive Director's offices of selected member States.

NGOs present at the 2008 Annual Meeting concluded however that earlier improvements in civil society relations have been eroded under the current presidency. In an issue of *IDB Watch*, a publication produced by NGOs working the reform the IBD, NGO contributors described the situation as follows:

> "The rapid deterioration in the quality of engagement with many civil society organizations has recently bordered on outright exclusion. While the IDB has conceded to direct dialogue between President Moreno and civil society, these encounters have been reduced to brief debates leading to no commitments. Participants have come to view them as offering the illusion of participation rather than substantive conversation."[83]

In addition to the IDB Annual Meetings, the Bank holds annual IDB-Civil Society Meetings one to two months prior to the IDB Annual Meeting, at which CSOs and IDB staff present on and discuss issues surrounding the topic of the meeting, which is selected by the IDB.[84] The IDB President typically attends the final day to address participants and participate directly in discussions.[85] The IDB also jointly hosts annual Caribbean Civil Society Dialogues in partnership with the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB).[86]

---

[79] IDB, Web site, http://www.iadb.org/aboutus/index.cfm?lang=en (accessed January 3, 2009).
[80] IDB, "Agreement Establishing the Inter-American Development Bank," 1996, http://www.iadb.org/leg/Documents/Pdf/Convenio-Eng.Pdf (accessed January 3, 2009).
[81] IDB 2006 Annual Meeting, Web site, http://www.iadb.org/am/2006/civil_society2.cfm (accessed January 3, 2009).
[82] Bank Information Center, Web site, http://www.bicusa.org/en/Article.3678.aspx; IDB 2007 Annual Meeting, Web site, http://www.iadb.org/am/2007/prog_activities.cfm?language=English&pagePos=2&Id=5024&strSite=exram&PAM=AM2007&lang=E&d=&m=&y=&strYear=2007&COL=394D5A&AN=9 (accessed January 3, 2009).
[83] "Civil Society Participation: The New Bottom of the IDB Priority List," *IDB Watch*, Issue 1, Friday April 4, 2008, http://www.bicusa.org/en/Article.3678.aspx#1 (accessed January 3, 2009).
[84] IDB, Web site, http://events.iadb.org/calendar/eventDetail.aspx?lang=English?lang=en&id=30 (accessed January 3, 2009).
[85] IDB VII IDB-Civil Society Meeting, Web site, http://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getdocument.aspx?docnum=877626; IDB VI IDB-Civil Society Meeting, http://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getDocument.aspx?DOCNUM=669187 (accessed January 3, 2009).
[86] IDB, Web site, http://events.iadb.org/calendar/eventDetail.aspx?lang=English?lang=en&id=68 (accessed January 3, 2009).

The Civil Society Advisory Committee (CSAC) is another mechanism used within the IDB system to provide for civil society participation. CSACs are "flexible, pluralistic, advisory, consultation bodies" based in IDB country offices and are intended in part to help to identify the consultation formats most suited to each particular case.[87] CSOCs have so far been established in some IDB country offices. Even in countries where CSACs are operational, the degree to which they are able to influence Bank policies, programs and projects is uncertain and has been questioned by civil society.[88]

As a result of the most recent IDB-Civil Society Annual Meeting in Montevideo, the IDB has committed to implement a series of actions to enhance civil society participation. These actions are laid out in the Montevideo "Road Map" and include the following (among others):
- Form IDB-CSO working group to prepare formal, planned meeting as part of the 2009 IDB Annual Meeting in Medellin
- Jointly finalize a comprehensive "map" of CSOs for better information distribution
- Once Civil Society Advisory Committee (CSAC) guidelines are approved, begin implementation process in stages, prioritizing countries that don't have a CSAC and those whose functioning needs strengthening
- Prepare and conduct a meeting with relevant CS actors to present and discuss the Governance Evaluation and Democratic Institutionalization Methodology before the next IDB –CS Meeting.[89]

VII. North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC)

The North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC) was established under the North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation (NAAEC), adopted by Canada, Mexico and the US in parallel with the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1993. The CEC works to address regional environmental concerns, help prevent potential trade and environmental conflicts, and promote the effective enforcement of environmental law.

The CEC structure includes a Council, a Secretariat and a Joint Public Advisory Committee.

The Council is the central decision-making body and is composed of cabinet-level or equivalent representatives of the Parties to the NAAEC or their designees. Decisions are taken by consensus, unless decided otherwise by the Council. Among other things, the Council oversees the implementation and develops recommendations on the further elaboration of the NAAEC and approves the annual program and budget of the Commission. The Council may further develop recommendations on topics specified in the Agreement related to the objectives CEC, and is explicitly required to:

> "…promote and, as appropriate, develop recommendations regarding… public access to information concerning the environment that is held by public authorities of each Party, including information on hazardous materials and activities in its communities, and opportunity to participate in decision-making processes related to such public access."[90]

---

[87] IDB, "Strategy for Promoting Citizen Participation in Bank Activities," 19 May 2004, http://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getdocument.aspx?docnum=483088 (accessed January 3, 2009).
[88] IDB, "5th Regional Meeting, IDB-Civil Society, Panel on Civil Society Participation," Summary & Recommendations, http://www.iadb.org/exr/csm/2005/documents/soc_civ_part_eng.pdf (accessed January 3, 2009).
[89] IDB, Web site, "IDB commits to civil society roadmap at Uruguay meeting," October 30, 2008, http://www.iadb.org/news/detail.cfm?Language=English&id=4840 (accessed January 3, 2009); IDB, "Road Map Montevideo 2008, http://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getdocument.aspx?docnum=1781131 (accessed January 3, 2009).
[90] CEC, "North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation Between the Government of Canada, The Government of the United Mexican States and the Government of the United States of America," 1993, http://www.cec.org/pubs_info_resources/law_treat_agree/naaec/index.cfm?varlan=english, (accessed December 27, 2008),10-11.

The Joint Public Advisory Committee (JPAC) is the primary mechanism to provide for civil society participation in the Council's deliberations. The JPAC is composed of 15 non-government members appointed in equal number by each of the three Parties. No apparent guidelines exist for distribution of membership amongst different interest groups. The current membership consists of individuals from a range of organizations, including private corporations, academic institutions, environmental NGOs, business organizations and the US Military, as well as two independent consultants. Representation is not distributed equally among the different types of organizations, with the private sector being the most strongly represented.[91]

The JPAC strives "to promote continental cooperation in ecosystem protection and sustainable economic development, and to ensure active public participation and transparency in the actions of the Commission."[92] Its central function is to provide advice to the Council on any matter within the scope of the NAAEC as well as on the annual program and budget for the Commission and any other reports prepared by the Secretariat.[93]

To carry out its function in accordance with its vision, the JPAC is required by the Council to consult with members of the public interested in and affected by the work of the CEC to inform it recommendations. To this end the JPAC has prepared consultation guidelines, outlining the purpose, goals, principles and structure of consultations conducted by the CEC and relevant key financial considerations. For those who opt not to make their views known at the consultation, members of the public are also invited to submit written briefs on the particular topic of consultation to the JPAC by the specified deadline. JPAC members conduct the consultations in partnership with the Secretariat. Following every public consultation, all comments and briefs are analyzed by JPAC, which prepares a report for Council. The report is published and made available to anyone upon request.[94]

National Advisory Committees (NACs) are an additional mechanism for members of the public to share inputs with the Council. In accordance with the NAAEC, Parties have the option of establishing an NAC, "comprising members of its public, including representatives of non-governmental organizations and persons, to advise it on the implementation and further elaboration of this Agreement."[95] NACs vary both in size and in their selection processes for members:

> "The Canadian NAC's six members include representatives of the environmental, nongovernmental and business communities. Canada's NAC members are appointed by a government committee that is composed of environmental ministers from signatory provinces and the federal minister of the environment. The Mexican NAC is headed by the federal minister of the environment, has 38 members and also functions as the National Consultative Committee for Sustainable Development. The 12 members of the US NAC are appointed by the EPA Administrator and advise the US Representative and Alternate Representative to the Council on a wide range of strategic, scientific, technological, regulatory and economic issues regarding the NAAEC."[96]

VIII.   *Roundtable on Sustainable Biofuels (RSB)*

The RSB was formally launched after an informal meeting of NGO, academic, industry, government, and inter-governmental stakeholders from Europe, Brazil, Malaysia, the US and the UN system in November

---

[91] For a list of JPAC members with bios see: CEC, Web site, http://www.cec.org/who_we_are/jpac/member_bio/index.cfm?varlan=english (accessed December 27, 2008).
[92] CEC, Web site, http://www.cec.org/who_we_are/jpac/vision/index.cfm?varlan=english (accessed December 27, 2008).
[93] CEC, "NAAEC," 17.
[94] CEC, Web site, http://www.cec.org/who_we_are/jpac/pub_consult/index.cfm?varlan=english (accessed December 27, 2008).
[95] CEC, "NAAEC," 17.
[96] CEC, Web site, http://www.cec.org/who_we_are/council/nac/index.cfm?varlan=english (accessed January 3, 2009).

2006. This group decided to launch a multi-stakeholder process to develop a standard for sustainable biofuels production as quickly as possible.

Prompted by sense of urgency, the individuals at the meeting determined that the development of the standards and the development of governance processes would have to happen in parallel. Many of the participants at the meeting thus joined the inaugural Steering Board (current) themselves and used their own networks to invite members from regions or sectors that were not yet represented.

One of the lessons from the RSB's experience so far is that an informal structure cannot last for long, as it creates problems over the decision process and weight each board member has in the decision. For this reason, now that a first draft of principles and criteria exists, the governance structure is in the process of being restructured to ensure balanced representation and membership, with formal chambers by stakeholder groups voting the seats on a new Standards Board. It is expected that the new structure will be put into place between February and May of this year.[97]

The RSB Steering Board includes stakeholders from government, civil society and the private sector, with civil society, including academic/research centres, as the dominant group. Selection of Board members is guided by three main criteria including balanced representation of different geographic areas, different sectors of society and different actors along the biofuel production supply chain.[98] Steering Board members serve in an individual capacity and do not represent neither their organizations nor their stakeholder groups.[99]

The Steering Board is responsible for guiding the RSB Secretariat in the process of designing global principles and criteria, to be issued in the form of draft standards for global stakeholder discussion, for sustainable biofuels production and processing.

RSB Working Groups are one of the mechanisms used to provide for wider stakeholder involvement in designing the principles and criteria. Currently there are four Working Groups focused on distinct thematic and technical aspects related to the standard. The central role of Working Groups within the RSB system is to provide suggestions to the Steering Board, which the Board can accept or send back to the Working Group for further consideration. Recognizing that an unelected board lacks formal legitimacy, a special effort was made to invite any interested actor to participate in the Working Groups to draft the standard. During the drafting process the Steering Board generally did not go against the advice or wording agreed upon by the Working Groups. Discussions were kept transparent by using the Bioenergy Wiki and posting all background documents, minutes, and discussions on our website.[100]

Interested participants can sign up to participate via online registration forms. As a result of the fact that the Working Groups have been open to anyone without discrimination, the levels and domains of expertise vary considerably within each Group, from high-level experts to NGO employees eager to learn more about a specific topic. To allow for a more focused discussion between individuals with high levels of expertise in specific areas, the Secretariat creates Expert Panels, with about 10 people on each panel, taken from within or outside of the Working Groups. Based on these discussions, the Expert Panels produce recommendations about corresponding criteria to address the specific issue to take back to the

[97] Electronic interview responses provided by Charlotte Opal, RSB Coordinator, January 2009.
[98] RSB, Web site, http://cgse.epfl.ch/page67476.html (accessed December 26, 2008).
[99] RSB, "Roundtable on Sustainable Biofuels (RSB) Terms of Reference – Steering Board," 2007, http://cgse.epfl.ch/webdav/site/cgse/shared/Biofuels/RSB%20-%20SB%20Terms%20of%20Ref.pdf (accessed December 26, 2008).
[100] Electronic interview responses provided by Charlotte Opal, RSB Coordinator, January 2009.

Working Group before passing them on to the Steering Board for consideration.[101]

In addition to a permanently open discussion platform, Working Group members meet virtually once every two months or more. Working Group decisions are taken by consensus. When consensus if not possible, the point is passed on to the Steering Board for decision.

To complement the virtual dialogues and open the standards drafting process up to a wider range of participants, the RSB has co-hosted a series of Regional Stakeholder Meetings to discuss the draft standards in a number of countries, including Brazil, China, India and South Africa, and is currently planning for more. Any individual interested in attending a Regional Outreach Meeting can register online via the RSB website.[102] The Secretariat also makes an effort to reach out to key stakeholders. Regional Meetings are open to anyone, subject only to space limitations (which has only been a problem once). The RSB Secretariat provide travel grants for some participants to attend. The Secretariat determines whom it will support based on balanced regional and sectoral representations and expertise or experience with relevant issues/regions.[103]

The RSB Secretariat at the Energy Center of the École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL) coordinates global stakeholder feedback on draft principles and criteria to present to the Board.

IX. *Global Forum on Development (GFD)*

The Global Forum on Development (GFD or the Forum) is a joint initiative of the Organization for Economic Cooperation & Development's (OECD) Development Centre (DEV) and Development Cooperation Directorate (DCD), the operational arm of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC). The Forum was launched in 2006 to promote dialogue on priority development issues between OECD members, non-member governments, the private sector and civil society and is structured around a series of events, including informal experts' workshops, policy workshops and higher-level Annual Plenaries, all of which are by invitation only. Civil society participants are selected and invited by DCD and DEV staff based on what experience and knowledge they are able to contribute to the meeting.[104]

The OECD structure includes the Council, Committees and the OECD Secretariat.

Decision-making power in the OECD is vested in the OECD Council. The Council consists of one representative per member country, plus a representative of the European Commission. The Council meets at ministerial level once a year to discuss key issues and set priorities for OECD work.

The Development Assistance Committee is one of many OECD Committees in which representatives of member countries and countries with observer status advance ideas and review progress in specific policy areas. One of the key features distinguishing the DAC from other Committees is its authority to make binding recommendations on matters within its competence to countries on the Committee and to the Council.[105] The DAC is made up of 23 members including the world's major aid donors, along with the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the UNDP as observers. The DCD is the operational arm of the DAC and is part of the OECD 'Development Cluster' along with the DEV and others.

---

[101] Ibid.
[102] RSB, Web site, http://cgse.epfl.ch/page69137.html (accessed December 26, 2008).
[103] Electronic interview responses provided by Charlotte Opal, RSB Coordinator, January 2009.
[104] Interview with Henri-Bernard Solignac Lecomte, OECD Development Centre, Thursday, January 8, 2009.
[105] OECD, "Development Co-operation Report 2007, Volume 9, No 1: "The DAC at Work," 2008, http://puck.sourceoecd.org/pdf/dac/432008011e-05-dacatwork.pdf (accessed January 1, 2009), 107-27.

The Development Centre is a forum for OECD members and non-OECD member countries to share experiences with economic and social policy. The DEV is headed by a Governing Board that is a subsidiary body similar the Committees, but that retains independence from the Council in its decision-making. The DEV Board comprises representatives of the 33 countries, including 23 representatives from OECD member countries and 10 non-member country representatives, and the European Community. The Governing Board interacts with the Council regarding matters within the Centre's field of competence.[106]

OECD Committees are where analysis and consensus building that leads to government policies take place and are the main avenue within the OECD structure through which civil society can have a significant impact. Committees develop their own processes for interacting with civil society. Forums are one of the mechanisms used to engage with non-state experts and stakeholders.[107]

The first and current thematic cycle (2006-2009) of the GFD is focused on identifying options for more effective development finance. By the end of the cycle, the Global Forum process is expected to identify options for the future evolution or managed change of the architecture of international development finance.[108]

The GFD was launched and its structure and thematic framework established in August 2006 at an Informal Experts' Workshop. The Workshop was hosted by the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and the DEV and attended by invited representatives from NGOs, academic institutions, inter-governmental organizations, OECD member and non-member governments and global funding programs, along with selected OECD country representatives and OECD staff.[109]

Participants at the Informal Workshop agreed on the GFD's initially very loose structure.

The Development Finance Network (DEFINE), a global network of think tanks with expertise on development finance, was launched as the intellectual core of the Global Forum process.[110] Representation of OECD and non-OECD member countries is distributed more or less equally within DEFINE. These 'think tanks' are recognized as civil society stakeholders. An informal steering committee made up of DEFINE partners was also created, composed of the Development Centre, the IBON Foundation (Philippines), the Institute of Statistical, Social And Economic Research (ISSER, Ghana), the Overseas Development Institute (ODI, UK) and the North South Institute (NSI, Canada).

Within the framework of the review of Global Forums requested by OECD Council, the Global Forum on Development is implementing new modes of operation and of governance. An informal steering group will be put in place in 2009. It will be comprised of the chairs of the Governing Board of the DEV and of the DAC, the Directors of the DEV and of DCD as well as representatives of two non-OECD members of

---

[106] OECD Development Centre (DEV), Web site, http://www.oecd.org/document/63/0,3343,en_2649_33731_31621631_1_1_1_1,00.html (accessed December 27, 2008); OECD, "Establishment of the Development Centre Governing Board," C(2002)228, Note by the Secretary-General, November 2002, http://www.oecd.org/about/0,3347,en_2649_33731_1_1_1_1_1,00.html (accessed December 27, 2008).
[107] OECD, "Civil Society and the OECD," Policy Brief, 2005, http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/1/3/35744346.pdf (January 1, 2009).
[108] OECD Global Forum on Development, (GFD) Web site, http://www.oecd.org/document/59/0,3343,en_21571361_37824719_37824763_1_1_1_1,00.html (accessed December 27, 2008).
[109] The intention being that participants at the initial meeting would become the core group of participants engaged in the GFD. For detailed list of participants, see: OECD, "Development Finance Architecture: What Flows, Channels and Pools? Informal Experts' Workshop, Paris, 3-4 July 2006, Participants List," http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/0/35/37026730.pdf (accessed January 1, 2009).
[110] OECD, "Development Finance Architecture: What Flows, Channels and Pools? Informal Experts' Workshop, Paris, 3-4 July 2006, Summary of Outcomes: For Discussion," http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/39/37303802.pdf (accessed January 1, 2009).

the Centre and of two members of the DAC. This informal steering group will make proposals to the Governing Board and to the DAC regarding the Forum's future themes and the means by which its activities and the Secretariat that serves it are financed.[111]

Major Global Forum Events are scheduled back-to-back with DAC Senior Level and High Level Meetings to facilitate dialogue to enhance the GFD's ability to influence OECD members and draw their attention to the issues raised in the GFD.

X.   *United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF)*

The United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) is a subsidiary body of the Economic and Social Council of the UN (ECOSOC). The Forum's objective is to promote "… the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests and to strengthen long-term political commitment to this end…" based on the Rio Declaration, the Forest Principles, Chapter 11 of Agenda 21 and the outcome of the IPF/IFF Processes and other key milestones of international forest policy.

The Forum is composed of all member States of the UN and its specialized agencies. Decisions are taken by voting. All members have equal voting rights. UNFF Instruments and Resolutions are non-binding.[112]

The World Bank supports the UNFF and its member countries through its membership in the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF), a partnership of international organizations formed in 2001 following the recommendation of ECOSOC.

The UNFF is guided by a Bureau and serviced by a Secretariat.

The UNFF Bureau consists of one Chairperson and four Vice-Chairpersons in accordance with the principle of equitable geographical distribution. The Bureau members are elected at the end of each UNFF session from among UNFF members. The Bureau has several responsibilities including the follow up of decisions made at UNFF sessions, preparation for the subsequent session as well as the management and organization of sessions.

Among others, a central function of the UNFF is: "To provide for continued policy development and dialogue among Governments, international organizations, including major groups, as identified in Agenda 21 as well as to address forest issues and emerging areas of concern in a holistic, comprehensive and integrated manner."[113]

The UNFF is thus committed to ensuring that the Major Groups formally recognized as "civil society" in Agenda 21 and endorsed by the UN General Assembly in 1992 are represented in dialogue concerning forest-related policy development.[114] These Major Groups (referred to instead or in addition to civil society) are:
1. Women
2. Children and Youth
3. Indigenous People

---

[111] OECD Development Centre, "Programme of Work of the OECD Development Centre 2009-10, http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/54/57/39782186.pdf (accessed December 27, 2008).
[112] Whether or not the decisions that civil society stakeholders are able to influence are biding on State members can be a significant factor with respect to civil society participation. Some organizations feel that participation is not worth their time/effort if the products of a process are not binding.
[113] UNFF, Web site, http://www.un.org/esa/forests/about.html (accessed December 27, 2008.)
[114] ECOSOC, "Agenda 21: Chapter 23, Strengthening the Role of Major Groups, http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/documents/agenda21/english/agenda21toc.htm#sec3 (accessed December 27, 2008).

4. NGOs
5. Local Authorities
6. Workers and Trade Unions
7. Business and Industry
8. Scientific and Technological Communities
9. Farmers and Small Forest Landowners

To meet this commitment, the UNFF has put in place a network of Major Group Focal Points managed by the UNFF Secretariat. Major Group Focal Points are invited by the Secretariat to take on the role of representing the relevant Major Group in the UNFF process. Oftentimes, the selected Focal Points are individuals that have been active in other UN agencies or related fora, but this varies.

The UNFF offers a variety of channels for input from civil society. It is the responsibility of each of the Focal Points to coordinate the inputs of their respective Major Groups in order to take advantage of these channels.

One mechanism for incorporating civil society perspectives in the UNFF process is the Discussion Papers that Major Groups are invited to prepare to be shared with UNFF members prior to every session. Discussion Paper topics must relate to the topics being treated at the particular session. These topics are determined by the UNFF, but are often quite broad. Major Group Focal Points solicit inputs as widely as possible from their networks, including from organizations that are not ECOSOC/CSD accredited. Focal Points are responsible for compiling the inputs into a final document and sharing it with the Secretariat. While Major Groups do make use of this opportunity, papers often seek to highlight the same issues (e.g. more participation, better benefit sharing) packaged a little differently depending on the topic.

Another is participation in UNFF sessions. Representatives of any interested major group are able to participate in UNFF plenary sessions and working groups, and on occasion have been enabled to participate in smaller contact groups. While NGOs are required to be accredited by ECOSOC or the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) in order to attend UNFF sessions, it is common practice for NGO representatives to receive accreditation from an existing ECOSOC/CSD accredited CSO in accordance with that organization's own accreditation procedure and participate on that basis. Major Groups do not have a vote at the UNFF Sessions. Whether or not Major Groups are permitted to intervene during negotiations varies from session to session at the discretion of the Bureau. Interventions from Major Groups were permitted during the negotiation of text at the most recent UNFF Session.

A further important avenue for civil society participation is the Major Groups' role in organizing and participating in multi-stakeholder dialogues (MSDs) during which Major Group Focal Points and others in attendance have the opportunity to discuss issues relevant to the topic of the session with any interested member States. The thematic content and structure of each MSD are negotiated between the Secretariat and the Bureau. The Secretariat represents the Major Group Focal Points in this discussion. While initially MSDs were held one day during the first week of the session, Major Groups are learning more about how best to maximize the one day reserved for the MSD as an opportunity to influence decision-making. For example, the MSD has on occasion been split into 2 half-day meetings with one discussion held during the first week and one held during the second week when the Ministers are present in order to have the opportunity to reach key decision-makers.[115]

Travel grants are provided for representatives from each of the Major Groups to attend. Due in large part to good working relationships between the Focal Points from the different Major Groups,[116] efforts are

---

[115] Ministers generally only attend for the last few days of the second week of UNFF Sessions.
[116] This is with the exception of the Business and Industry Major Group, with which consensus has been more difficult.

made to maximize resources as much as possible to provide for the participation of the maximum number of representatives.

Major Group representatives may also engage with decision-makers by organizing side-events on different thematic areas during UNFF Sessions, which member States may be invited to or even involved in.

The UNFF Secretariat has put considerable effort and resources into nurturing the Major Groups system, including the designation of a full-time Secretariat staff position to manage Major Group relations. This has:

- Enabled regular contact between the Secretariat and the Major Group Focal Points - e.g. bi-monthly telephone discussions with the Major Group coordinator enable the Secretariat to represent Major Groups in discussions with the Bureau about how the MSD consultation at the session will be structured.
- Promoted a good working relationship between MGFPs (e.g. by reserving rooms just for Major Group Focal Points to meet on the side of international meetings)
- Helped enable Major Groups to develop a common position on some issues. This is often well received by governments and thereby can increase effectiveness of civil society engagement[117]

---

[117] The majority of the above regarding civil society participation in UNFF Sessions is based on a discussion with Dr Jeannette D. Gurung, the Focal Point for the Women Major Group, January 2, 2009.

ANNEX 3 - ENTITIES/GLOBAL PROGRAMS THAT HAVE NGOs/CSOs IN THEIR DECISION-MAKING BODIES WITH CONTACT INFORMATION

1.   Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)

Board Members
There are no contact details at present since there are currently no CSO members.

For general information:

CGIAR Secretariat
The World Bank
Washington DC, USA
Tel: +1 202 473 8951
Fax: +1 202 473 8110
E-mail: cgiar@cgiar.org

2.   The Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria

Board Members
Communities (NGOs representative of the Communities Living with the Diseases)
Mr. Shaun Mellors
Senior Technical Advisor
Civil Society Development   International
HIV/AIDS Alliance   Queensberry
House   104-106 Queens Road   Brighton
BN1 3XF   United Kingdom
Phone: +44 127 371 8716   Fax: +44 127 371 8901   Cell: +44 774 805 5868
E-mail: smellors@aidsalliance.org

Developed Country NGO Member
Ms. Jacqueline Wittebrood
International Civil Society Support
Keizersgracht 390   1016 GB
Amsterdam,   The Netherlands
Phone: +31 20 851 1737   Fax: +31 20 421 1767   Cell: +31 6 333 18020
E-mail: jw@icssupport.org

Developing Country NGO Member
Dr. Cheikh Tidiane Tall
Executive Director
African Council of AIDS Service Organizations (AfriCASO)
9513, Sacré Coeur III, P.O. Box 28366
Dakar - Medina   Senegal
Phone: +221 867 3533   Fax: +221 867 3534
E-mail: cttall@africaso.net, africaso@sentoo.sn

3.   Roundtable on Sustainable Biofuels

Board Members
Barbara Bramble
Senior Program Advisor for International Affairs
National Wildlife Federation
E-mail: bramble@nwf.org

Jean-Philippe Denruyter
Global Bioenergy Coordinator
WWF International
European Policy Office
Brussels, Belgium
Tel: +32 2 740 0927
E-mail: JDenruyter@wwfepo.org

Christoph Frei
Senior Director, Head of Energy Industries & PACI,
World Economic Forum /
Titulary Professor,
Energy Center of the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Lausanne (EPFL)
CH-1015 Lausanne
Tel: +41 7 9379 0470
E-mail: christoph.frei@epfl.ch

Heiko Liedeker
Past Director of the Forest Stewardship Council (up to June 2008)

Hisashi Ishitani
Professor, Graduate School of Media and Governance
Keio University, Japan

Melinda Kimble
Senior Vice President, International Bioenergy Initiative
UN Foundation
1800 Massachusetts Avenue NW,
Suite 400, Washington, DC
20036 USA
Phone: (202) 887-9040
E-mail: mkimble@unfoundation.org

Claude Martin
Chairman
International Sustainability Innovation Council of Switzerland

Hans-Björn Püttgen,
Energy Systems Management Chair
Energy Center, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (EPFL)
CH-1015 Lausanne
Tel: +41 21 69 36702 / 32473
E-mail: hans.puttgen@epfl.ch

Ibrahim Rehman
Director, Action Programmes Division
The Energy Resources Institute (TERI), India

Roberto Smeraldi
Director
Amigos de la Terra, Brazilia-Amazonia

Ibrahim Togola
Director
Mali Folkecenter
Faladié SEMA Rue 851, Porte 181
BP E411 Bamako
Republic of Mali
Tel: +223 220 0617/220 6004
Fax: +223 220 0618
E-mail: ibrahim.togola@malifolkecenter.org

N.B. Contact information for RSB Board members is not available on the RSB web site. Some of the members provided their e-mail addresses upon request by the Secretariat and some were found elsewhere online. Requests for contact information can be made to the RSB coordinator:

Charlotte Opal
RSB Coordinator
Energy Center of the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Lausanne (EPFL)
CH-1015 Lausanne
Tel: +41 21 693 24 73
E-mail: charlotte.opal@epfl.ch

ANNEX 4 - SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS WITH NGOS/CSOS AND OTHERS

1. **Andrew Deutz**
   Director, International Institutions and Agreements, The Nature Conservancy
   Tuesday, December 18, 2008 (telephone)

   - Lessons from consultations run for the World Bank Forest Policy 1999/2000
   - Different perspectives within the NGO community related to the CIF

2. **Timmons Roberts**
   Chancellor Professor of Sociology
   College of William and Mary
   (electronic response – letter to the organizers of the first Partnership Forum)

   - Feedback about the first CIF Partnership Forum

3. **Nicholas Senyojo**
   Uganda Environmental Education Foundation (UEEF)
   (electronic response)

   - Suggestions based on experiences with World Bank consultations

4. **Virginia Ifeadiro**
   Civil Society Consultative Group, Nigeria
   December 30, 2008 (telephone)

   - Experience with the World Bank in Nigeria
   - Suggested measures for improving World Bank's relations with civil society and current needs of CSOs in Nigeria
   - Experience with the FIP Self selection process

5. **Jeannette Gurung**
   Director, Women Organizing for Change in Agricultural and Natural Resource Management (WOCAN)
   Friday January 2, 2009 (telephone)

   - Information about UNFF process and options for civil society participation
   - Key aspects of the UNFF system that have enhanced civil society participation

6. **Gary Allport,**
   Senior Conservation Policy Adviser, BirdLife Secretariat (seconded to IUCN US)
   Tuesday January 6, 2009 (telephone)

   - Experiences with the CIF so far
   - Information about GEF structure and procedures
   - Suggestions based on experience with the GEF

7. **Bruce Jenkins**
   Director, Policy Program, Bank Information Center (BIC)

Tuesday, January 6, 2009 (telephone)

- Suggestions and key issues based on past experiences with World Bank meetings/consultations
- Information about FCPC structure and procedures
- Lessons from FCPF experience so far

8. **Charlotte Opal**
   RSB Coordinator
   (electronic response/follow-up telephone)

- Information about RSB structure and procedures
- Lessons from RSB experience so far

9. **Henri-Bernard Solignac-Lecomte**
   OECD Development Centre
   Thursday January 8, 2009 (telephone)

- Information about GFD structure, procedures and experience

10. **Helen Leake**
    Policy Advisor, Forest Peoples Programme (FPP)
    (electronic response)

- Experience with and lessons from facilitating self-selection processes for indigenous peoples' organizations
- Experiences running consultations for other bodies (e.g. ADB, UNDP)
- Suggestions and key issues based on experience with consultations run by the World Bank