FINAL REPORT

CCIC Forum – From Principles to Practice:
Improving Our Development Effectiveness as CSOs
Ottawa, May 26-27, 2011

1. Introduction

The Forum provided an opportunity for civil society organizations (CSOs) to think about how to begin to situate the Istanbul Principles and the draft International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness within the Canadian civil society context, and to consider some of the challenges to doing so in the current environment. It was attended by approximately 90 CSO representatives and nine representatives from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). The Forum agenda is attached as Appendix A.

Forum participants demonstrated their support for the Istanbul Principles by adopting the following resolution:

> "We, as members of Canadian civil society engaged in international development, meeting under the auspices of the Canadian Council for International Co-operation, resolve to adopt the *Istanbul CSO Development Effectiveness Principles*. We do so with a view to complementing and strengthening existing Canadian accountability mechanisms, including the *CCIC Code of Ethics and Operational Standards*, and to pursuing ongoing, voluntary efforts to implement these Principles within our own context-specific environments."

2. Keynote Address

Emele Duituturaga, Executive Director of the Pacific Islands Association of Non-Governmental Organisations (PIANGO) and Co-Chairperson of the Open Forum on CSO Development Effectiveness, provided the keynote address, on the theme of "the value of one, the unity of many". She stated that she was present to stand with CCIC during this defining moment, and to say "let's work together". Drawing on her own experiences, she said that while being defunded by government is difficult, it can also be seen as a form of liberation.

She described the history of PIANGO's sudden defunding by the New Zealand government, and the coalition's struggle to survive and rebuild. Its members realized that PIANGO is not an office paid by donors to do what donors want: *they* are PIANGO. PIANGO's re-emergence has been described as being like the phoenix emerging from the ashes. The phoenix, a mythical bird that never dies and that flies far ahead, represents our capacity for vision.

Ms. Duituturaga thanked CCIC for its instrumental role in giving birth to, and nurturing, the Open Forum. If PIANGO is the Pacific phoenix, CCIC could be the Canadian phoenix, and the Open Forum the global phoenix. The Open Forum is the global space of civil society to define who we are, what we are about and how we hold ourselves accountable. What is unique about the Open Forum is that for the first time, civil society has a common group of principles that were developed from the bottom up. The Istanbul Principles extend beyond our own organizations, to how together we can create a better world.

Some might think that CCIC has been spending too much time on global policy issues. What is happening is a global phenomenon, so we need the unity of civil society as a global movement to influence changes that affect us on our home ground. Working in isolation will only weaken and divide us. The role of a national platform is to be the national phoenix: to rise above the level, be ahead of the game, scanning the environment without borders, to see what is coming. The Open Forum has helped us connect, learn from and influence each other.

The Open Forum process is specifically aimed at influencing aid architecture. At the Busan High-Level Forum, for the first time CSOs will be present as partners. It is a different world, not business or development as usual. The landscape has changed; new donors like China are major influences. It is important that CSOs learn from each other and take advantage of opportunities. The Open Forum is the only mechanism that we have to collectively hold our governments to account for reneging on their commitment in paragraph 20 of the *Accra Agenda for Action*.

The value of the Open Forum is also that we in civil society can hold each other accountable in our partnerships. It provides the space and opportunity for CSOs in the South to steer aid discussions, not just to be passive recipients. Aid effectiveness is premised on development effectiveness. We must turn our best thoughts to it, harnessing the value of one and strengthening the unity of many.

3. Workshops on Areas for Canadian CSO Implementation of the Istanbul Principles

The aim of the workshops was to identify two or three practical measures that could be taken by CCIC, by the community or by individual members over the next year in order to advance the Istanbul Principles in the workshop area. The recommendations from these workshops are summarized below. They are not intended as specific directions for CCIC, but as a foundation of ideas for a plan of action that will be developed based on priorities as well as available financial and human resources.

3.1 Strengthening Transparency and Accountability with Our Constituencies

There are both internal and external drivers for transparency and accountability. Multiple stakeholders have variable expectations, and there are multiple accountabilities (to public, governments (North and South), partners, etc.). There are issues of costs, risks and limits to different degrees of transparency and accountability, and both collective (sectoral) and individual (organizational) responses to pressures for more accountability and transparency.

There is a need for clearer, shared understandings and norms of transparency and accountability. Ideas for developing these included:

- Map standards, policies and systems among Canadian international development CSOs to identify existing practices, but also develop a resource for all groups.
- Use the above mapping process to identify institutional gaps in terms of standards.
- Identify minimum standards for different levels of accountability and transparency in different areas, necessary to respond to the requirements of communicating with multiple constituencies.
- Use the basis of these minimum standards to supplement to the CCIC Code of Ethics and its guidance documents.
- More specifically, develop standards on the following: how we portray partners in

communications to Canadians; codes of practice for funding arrangements between civil society, governments and the private sector; and a format for reporting on expenditures across Canadian civil society.

- Gather lessons learned re "best practices" into a series of case studies or learning circle exchanges.
- Consider certification as a possible option (this was presented not as a recommendation but as a proposal to be debated).

3.2 Understanding Rights-Based Approaches to Development

The discussion identified that we need to both engage the public and decision-makers on rights-based approaches (RBA) and undertake work internally in our sector to improve our understanding of RBA and ensure consistency with our own practice.

Action ideas for work with the public and the government included the following:

- Build a collective strategy to show the public and MPs how human rights advocacy is central to the achievement of development change, with concrete people-centered examples.
- Reclaim/use the *Official Development Assistance Accountability Act* as a key tool for guiding Canadian assistance.
- Increase understanding among decision-makers of <u>states</u> as duty-bearers; clarify their obligations.
- Grow support for the principle that advocacy should be publicly financed as important and necessary. The AQOCI campaign was cited. (A caveat was noted: advocacy is only one part of a human rights approach and the two should not be equated.)
- Join major campaigns, e.g. the women's peace and security campaign of the Nobel Women's Initiative.

Action ideas for work in our own community included the following:

- Reach consensus on what we <u>mean</u> by RBA. There is a need to better understand RBA.
- Document examples of good practice/positive experiences. Share and learn.
- Use major global events as moments of mobilization, e.g. March of Women.
- Learn about and apply the "Do No Harm" principle for our programming.
- Question and discuss if our programs help our counterparts to claim local democratic space, how explicit is decision-making with partners, by partners.
- Find means to de-mystify and simplify a human rights approach. Showing how "people are at the centre of development" is a simple way to express the idea of engaging with communities and counterparts in the South as citizens and participants, not as "recipients". Highlight the legal foundation of human rights as its legitimacy.
- Learn a way to engage in a rights-based approach that connects to those who don't talk that language. This involves considering the risks/baggage of RBA. Interest-based negotiations may offer a model.

3.3 Equitable Partnerships and Solidarity in Development

There is still a need to define/revisit the concept of partnership. The changing nature of the role of Canadian CSOs (facilitator to build solidarity) must be acknowledged. It is important to define our individual identities as partners and what we expect from each other. There is an

intersection of partnership, solidarity and common cause, with increasing focus on solidarity and common cause.

Ideas for implementation included the following:

- Start with the Partnership Principles in the CCIC Code of Ethics as a reference point for improving partnerships.
- Document case studies to highlight successes and challenges in partnerships and to learn from both positive and negative experiences.
- Share specific partnership agreements with each other, as well as the process of developing them, particularly for those who are initiating written agreements for the first time.
- Address the Canada Revenue Agency requirements for agreements, as the terms from CRA (which emphasize Canadian "direction and control") are in conflict with building solidarity and create a disabling environment.
- Protocols for CSO staff to enhance equitable partnerships would be useful.

3.4 Building a Learning Culture: Creating and sharing knowledge

A number of challenges to creating and sharing knowledge were identified: how to better tell our stories, to better connect with existing research and networks, to invest in learning and embed it in our daily work, to be self-critical and honest. The more competitive external environment is a challenge, and there is a need for safe spaces where failures can be shared among peers and lessons learned. It can sometimes be a challenge to highlight best practices in this context.

Ideas included:

- Make better use of provincial and regional Councils.
- Make better and more frequent use of technological tools to share knowledge by organizing webinars and podcasts, using Web TV, and participating in the Public Engagement Hub.
- Use some of the existing coalitions to share knowledge and learn (such as the Food Security Policy Group, the CCIC geographic working groups, and others).
- Use CCIC's Code of Ethics as a tool to stimulate voluntary reflection rather than simply as guidelines for compliance.
- Link with academia through collaborative research, partnerships with institutions, internships, drawing on academic expertise. Document lessons learned from development practice.
- Create specific learning spaces within individual organizations and plan time and resources to support these spaces.

4. CIDA and Canadian CSOs: Emerging Issues, Opportunities and Challenges

Darren Schemmer, Vice-President of CIDA's Partnerships with Canadians Branch (PWCB), spoke on emerging issues, opportunities and challenges of mutual interest and concern to CIDA and the CSO community. Significant successes have been achieved by development efforts over the last few decades, and rapid changes are taking place in developing countries and at the international level. More than ever, Canada's well-being depends on the well-being of people in developing countries. Fostering inclusive economic growth is key.

The majority of the world's poor are now living in middle-income countries. We need to think about how to help these countries get better results from their own resources. The majority of

the world's poor now live in cities, and we have to think about how we can work more effectively in urban environments. However, the most pervasive and deepest poverty is still in remote rural areas and conflict-affected states. Making progress there requires special skills and better analysis of conflict situations.

There are a rapidly increasing number of development actors, including more donor countries, some of whom have joined the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and follow the aid effectiveness principles, but also many who have not. But the increase in official donors is small compared with the explosion of CSOs around the world. It is now understood that lasting development progress goes well beyond governments and other actors for whom international development is the primary mandate. Increasingly, all need to be better at analyzing our objectives, where they overlap and where we can make common progress while retaining our respective interests and independence.

With technological change, local ownership is increasingly a reality. Through the Internet, mobile phones and social media, people in developing countries can identify what they want and with whom they want to work. Technology allows more direct contact, which means more accountability. Demands for transparency and accountability are greater than ever, and are coming both from funders (including taxpayers) and from beneficiaries.

CIDA is responding to this new context, seeking to achieve greater impact with more investment in a few areas, through geographic and thematic focus. There is more focus on results: what is being accomplished with aid spending. Many development results take a long time, but there is a need to define what concrete results we can expect to achieve, report on and share knowledge about in the shorter term. This is the only way to maintain the confidence of supporters.

CIDA is becoming more open to the wide diversity of international and Canadian partners in the public, for-profit and not-for-profit sectors. Processes and selection criteria are being made public. The PWCB call for proposals process allows the most meritorious proposals to be chosen for funding, through a process that is the same for everyone. CIDA's geographic and humanitarian assistance programs will also soon be publishing common processes and selection criteria. CIDA is increasing transparency of processes through which decisions are made, of agreements signed, and of results achieved. Ever more information will be made available to the public directly through CIDA's website.

The Accra High-Level Forum marked the formal recognition of CSOs as development actors in their own right, and of their contribution to development and to aid effectiveness. CIDA was happy to have contributed to this recognition. CIDA and Canadian CSOs share an interest in aid effectiveness and development effectiveness. CIDA looks forward to the work of the Open Forum on CSO Development Effectiveness and the Istanbul Principles, to address the issues that CSOs themselves have raised: achieving and demonstrating results, coordination among CSOs and other actors, and accountability to all stakeholders.

CIDA would also like to turn attention to how we learn more from each other's experience. There has been an ongoing conversation between PWCB and CCIC members through the CCIC Evaluation Reference Group, and input is appreciated as CIDA moves from compliance evaluations to more learning evaluations. PWCB would also like to look at streamlining reporting to allow for real-time knowledge-sharing of results and lessons learned.

CIDA is aware that the enabling environment for CSOs can be challenging, and has recently become more challenging in certain developing countries. To address this, CIDA supports the department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade in chairing the Community of Democracies Working Group on Enabling and Protecting Civil Society. CIDA expects that CSOs themselves will continue to lead in fostering appropriate enabling environments for both local and foreign CSOs, while recognizing the local government's right to know what foreign organizations are doing in its territory.

The level of commitment that CSOs bring to whatever they do is impressive. CIDA wants to be able to support that commitment and to tap into the diversity of Canadians' skills, ideas and experience. CIDA wants to engage with Canadians in a way that reflects the strength of Canadian society, while achieving results for people living in poverty.

4.1 Discussion

A number of issues were raised in discussion, including: greater transparency for the criteria and weighting used in the proposal assessment system at PWCB (weighting will soon be on CIDA's web site); how to make space in the current call for proposals system for innovation and development breakthroughs, which have associated higher risks; how decisions are made to define the parameters of calls for proposals (see the Minister's original announcement for the five categories for the Partners for Development program); and how CIDA and CSOs can learn from each other in the context of reduced funding for coalitions and umbrella organizations such as CCIC (sharing of knowledge will be expanded in the next few years and in new forms of evaluation). Mr. Schemmer noted that, in order to receive funding, an umbrella organization would have to show the link between its activities and reduction of poverty in a developing country or countries. General funding of umbrella organizations is not something that CIDA is interested in doing at present; the focus is on trying to achieve results in the field. With regard to new funding modalities, it was noted from the plenary that there is no evidence that the competitive funding model is effective in improving development outcomes, and that there may be a role for CCIC in assessing and holding the government to account for improved outcomes.

5. CCIC/CIDA Workshops on Enabling Conditions

Three workshops were held, under Chatham House rules, with participants from CIDA and CSOs. Key points raised in these workshops are summarized below.

5.1 Implications of Funding Modalities for CSO Development Effectiveness

The group considered CIDA's rationale and guiding principles for new funding modalities. This included generating greater transparency, accountability and fairness in terms of having clear guidelines, evaluation criteria and timelines for all CSOs applying for funding. It also included streamlining the administrative process, while creating greater internal and external funding predictability and a greater ability to anticipate end results; and being more strategically focused in terms of the aid effectiveness agenda in working with civil society.

The discussion also drew on the principles that drive CSOs' own development practice in order to understand better how the new funding modalities could effectively contribute to CSO development effectiveness.

- *Improved communication* was seen to be an essential characteristic of partnership, particularly as the relationships with program officers and associated communications and dialogue experienced in the past are no longer possible. Possible ideas included: 1) An

ongoing consultation process between the sector and CIDA on changes being proposed, the challenges CIDA is facing, as well as the lessons learned by CSOs from living the experience of different funding modalities; 2) A *direct feedback mechanism* on the CIDA website regarding issues for the current call for proposals system.

- An *online interactive discussion forum* could develop greater interaction between CIDA and CSOs on development effectiveness and funding modalities.

- *Greater flexibility for proposing project concepts, and on minimum budgets*, beyond current practices, would allow for a greater range of CSOs to be eligible.

- What could be possible *feedback processes* for unsuccessful proposals that would allow for continued learning and improved development practice?

- There can be potential tensions between certain funding modalities, such as the current call for proposals system, and *the importance of development innovation,* with associated risk-taking. An *innovation fund* could be created to increase proposals and experiences arising from innovative ideas.

- Consideration should be given to ways that *evaluations and CIDA's thinking around new approaches to evaluation* fit with different funding modalities, including the new call for proposal system.

5.2 Issues of CSO Coordination: Being more strategic while sustaining responsive programming and partnerships

Workshop participants discussed the benefits of coordination and collaboration. Mechanisms can range from informal to formal, but some level of coordination between Canadian CSOs was seen as positive, particularly at the level of information-sharing and networking in Canada and in the field. At a more in-depth level, several observations were made about coordination.

- *Coordination and cooperation are a means to an end*, not ends in themselves, and it is important to understand the *drivers, rationales and objectives* for more substantive coordination*.* These include the decentralization of decision-making in CIDA and concentration on countries of focus, and corresponding implications for CSO partnerships and areas of intervention. There is also a need for CSOs to coordinate to scale up their voice in interactions with national governments in the context of local planning. In emergency humanitarian contexts, coordination in the field is often driven by necessity.

- Coordination makes the most sense where there is *sectoral concentration.* It is important to consider possibilities for synergy not only with Canadian actors, but with CSOs from other countries active in that sector and other official and non-state donors. There needs to be a strong rationale, particularly as there are *costs* associated with increased coordination (attending meetings, travel etc.), which can be burdensome to small organizations.

- Examples of successful *mechanisms* for coordination and cooperation include PAGER, Canadian Foodgrains Bank, KAIROS, CCIC's geographic working groups, and other geographic tables (Sudan and Burma) where there is a strong rationale to work together. The rationale, drivers and objectives are key.

- In addition to programmatic collaboration and cooperation, there are mechanisms used by CSOs to coordinate around *advocacy* and around *fundraising* for humanitarian agencies.

- To facilitate an exchange of information and exploration of possible means for coordination, CIDA has convened meetings of Canadian CSOs and/or partners in many regions. This has been, and can be, done both in countries of concentration and in other countries of CIDA programming. CSOs should remember to bring to CIDA's attention key programs and partners in non-core countries, so that **CIDA missions can help to facilitate visits and meetings to discuss coordination** where there is a good rationale.

5.3 Monitoring and Evaluation for Accountability and Learning

CIDA is in the process of rethinking its approach to evaluation, and there are various interesting initiatives underway to improve reporting and evaluation processes, to encourage a more strategic, analytical, "big picture" approach and promote more focus on learning.

- There are distinctions and tensions between what is needed for accountability and what is needed for learning. The **purposes** of monitoring and evaluation efforts should be clear. Learning requires space, resources and a culture of learning*.

- There is a need for tools and methodologies for more strategic, learning-oriented approaches to monitoring and evaluation, and for **opportunities for CSOs to share tools, methodologies and experiences.**

- In a **competitive environment**, fostered by new funding modalities, both donors and CSOs face challenges to longer-term learning, building on lessons learned to improve practice, and scaling up programming based on best practices.

- CCIC's **Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)** provided much-needed opportunities for collaboration and sharing among CSOs and a valuable contribution to CIDA's discussion and thinking about evaluation and monitoring. Given current constraints, there is **a need for champions to take the ERG forward**. There may be opportunities to expand the group beyond the CCIC membership and link with other initiatives.

6. Reflections on the Outcomes of the Forum

Robert Fox (Oxfam Canada) and Kevin McCort (CARE Canada) reflected on the key themes that had emerged from the Forum.

Mr. Fox reflected that the discussion on the Istanbul Principles had been situated within a broader questioning of the efficacy of CSOs' development model and the viability of our business model. Externally, many people are questioning the development model and demanding evidence that the work of CSOs, and public support for it, is making a difference. There is a deeper questioning of the role of CSOs, coming from both the North and the South. Some northern CSOs are still working in ways that are quite operational, playing roles, which from a rights-based approach, are understood to be the roles of the state. Some also find themselves playing roles that are better played by their partners. They compete with partners for roles, legitimacy and funding, which is not defensible, legitimate or appropriate.

Forum participants grappled with the value-added of Canadian CSOs. Most have already made the shift in terms of their development model, away from direct operational involvement to supporting their partners, capacity-building, knowledge development and advocacy. But Canadian CSOs feel vulnerable in terms of our "business model", because we have difficulty articulating to constituencies in Canada what is our value-added. As a sector, we underestimate our supporters and do not invest in building their understanding of development. Lacking

confidence that the public will fund work in capacity-building, networking and advocacy, we use the work of our partners to sell our own value-added, which is neither legitimate nor sustainable. The question of how to articulate our value-added – how to have a sophisticated conversation with our supporters – is a key challenge.

CIDA's perspective is clear: there is no longer any sense of partnership as CSOs have historically understood it. It costs money to develop proposals and compete for funding, and none of this is funded by CIDA or other donors. CSOs' costs to obtain funding are increasing at a time when demands to reinvest in learning and raise the quality of our work are also increasing. Working with a higher-cost, higher-risk model, we need to look at how to more effectively communicate our value for money and provide transparency to donors and to those with whom we work. It is a challenge.

All this is taking place in a context in which there is a proliferation of small NGOs being developed by individuals, who do work that is seen by the public as being direct and easily understandable. What is the capacity of the public to distinguish the value-added brought by larger, more experienced organizations? Mr. Fox described some of the initiatives that Oxfam Canada has undertaken to change both its development model and its business model, devolving power to the field, diversifying funding sources, focusing on women's rights and gender-based violence, building knowledge and expertise that contribute to the broader work of Oxfam International, investing in systems to collect, analyze and disseminate knowledge, and working with the Global Reporting Initiative to strengthen reporting for accountability systems.

Mr. Fox noted that the workshops had been structured to ask what CCIC could do, and some participants had held back because of concerns about the Council's financial and staff limitations. He reminded participants that CCIC is not its Secretariat, it is its members. He concluded by noting that we need to release the power and dynamism of our community to confront the challenges we face, to demonstrate the efficacy of the development model and the essential integrity of our organizations and the work we do.

Mr. McCort reflected on what he had heard from the four workshops on the Istanbul Principles. On transparency and accountability, he noted that Canadian NGOs and their leaders are highly trusted, according to surveys, but that leaders of international NGOs are the least trusted among them. There is work to be done. Many fear increased transparency, notably because critics can seize on an organization's expressions of weakness to attack it. The one tried and true strategy to minimize this risk is to work together as a consistent, coherent community. The community worked together around Bill C470 [on charity compensation], not to avoid transparency and accountability, but to have some measure of control over the discussion and not let it be entirely defined by critics of the sector.

CARE Canada has recognized that it needs to be an "open source" organization, able to capture the motivations and aspirations of individuals who have returned from overseas and want to do something. If CSOs don't figure out how to welcome and involve these individuals, there will be many people doing what they consider to be good work, but who are not part of the community of practice, signing on to codes of conduct or learning from professionals. Misapplied enthusiasm can be a major problem: if these individuals and small NGOs are not using participatory approaches and respecting women's rights, they are not helping. We have an obligation as a community to curb bad practice – first, by providing means for individuals to get involved in good practice through our organizations, and secondly through the use of

standards and accreditation. Don't be afraid of transparency and accountability: use them to improve the performance and professionalism of our sector, and work with other groups that are seeking similar goals (e.g. Imagine Canada).

The forum discussions on building a learning culture recognized the importance of people-to-people contact, which can be enabled by technology, but is not technology-dependent. This sector does not rely on cookie-cutter solutions, so that contact between people is vital. But it is an expensive way of learning: getting people together costs time and money, and given the resource constraints of the sector and the pressure to demonstrate quantitative results, it is a significant challenge.

Discussing our failures is useful for learning, but there are fears about exposing weaknesses to criticism. There would be value in doing this collectively, in building our capacity as a community to analyze and learn from failures, in order to reduce the risks to individual organizations of doing so.

The forum discussions of rights-based approaches touched on the difficulties of communicating such approaches to Canadians. There seems to be a sense among Canadians that rights are a "zero-sum game", that working for rights elsewhere will somehow reduce Canadians' rights. It is important to engage supporters and donors in discussion on this. People understand needs-based approaches and can, with time, come to understand rights-based approaches. CARE has been taking this journey with its supporters, but it has not been without challenges.

On the subject of partnerships, Mr. McCort described some of the ways in which CARE Canada is partnering with other Canadian CSOs to achieve better results – through the Humanitarian Coalition, through joint programs overseas, and in joint advocacy work in Canada. It is all about building a quilt of organizations: we are all much stronger when woven together. Particularly in a challenging environment, collaboration is tremendously enabling.

On the subject of new funding modalities, it is important to realize that what is happening at CIDA is being driven by government-wide standardization of procurement processes. The best procurement processes are trumping the best learning processes. CSOs should be addressing their concerns to the source of the changes (i.e. Treasury Board), and building on the work of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Grants and Contributions.

Mr. McCort concluded by noting the importance of diversifying funding sources beyond Canada. Within Canada, there are also opportunities. There is much public discussion about how aid is failing, how state-to-state aid has failed to deal with grassroots poverty, but when critics cite examples of what works, they talk about the community-based work of CSOs. If CSOs can better capture the interest and motivations of Canadians, and incorporate them into our organizations and networks, we will be well set to weather the challenges we face. The network that CCIC creates provides tremendous opportunities to find partners and build constituencies.

Appendix A: Forum from Principles to Practice: Improving our Development Effectiveness as CSOs

The goal of the Forum on *From Principles to Practice* is to think about how we can begin to situate the *Istanbul Principles and the draft International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness* within the Canadian international CSO context.

- What tools do we need to help us fulfill our role as development actors in our own right?
- What barriers exist within Canada that prevent us from realizing our full potential as development actors?
- What are the challenges and opportunities in the current political environment that frame Canadian CSO work on development effectiveness?
- How can we further our work with CCIC's existing Code of Ethics?
- What are appropriate roles for CCIC?

The Istanbul Principles and the Draft Framework on CSO Development Eff ecti veness are available on the Open Forum web site: **www.cso-effectiveness.org**

Thursday, May 26, 2011

9:00 a.m. – 9:10 a.m. *Greenery Room*	**Introduction to the Forum** "As Internati onal Development CSOs, why are we here? Where are we going?", *Gerry Barr, President-CEO, Canadian Council for International Co-operation*
9:10 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. *Greenery Room*	**International Keynote Address** "Fulfilling our role as development actors in our own right in changing and challenging political environments", *Emele Duituturaga (Executive Director, PIANGO and Co-Chairperson of the Open Forum on CSO Development Effectiveness)*
10:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. *Greenery Room*	**Break**
10:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. *Location to be confirmed*	**Facilitated parallel workshops** on different areas for Canadian CSO implementation of the Istanbul Principles (IP) An "Agora" format: Each workshop will last one hour, allowing each individual to participate in two workshops. The workshops hope to identify two or three practical measures CCIC or the community can take to move this agenda forward over the next year? • **Workshop A**: Strengthening transparency and accountability with our constituencies • **Workshop B**: Understanding rights-based approaches to development (with simultaneous interpretation) • **Workshop C**: Equitable partnerships and solidarity in development • **Workshop D**: Building a learning culture: Creating and sharing knowledge

12:30 p.m. – 1:30 p.m. *Salle à manger Village*	**Lunch**
1:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. *Greenery Room*	**Short report-back from morning workshops** Key conclusions and potential tools for CCIC to develop
2:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. *Greenery Room*	**Emerging issues, opportunities and challenges of mutual interest and concern to CIDA and the CSO community,** *Darren Schemmer, Vice President, Partnerships with Canadians Branch, Canadian International development Agency.*
2:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. *Location to be confirmed*	**CCIC/CIDA Workshops** on enabling conditions in light of current government policies and approaches • **Workshop A**: Implications of funding modalities for CSO Development Effectiveness (with simultaneous interpretation) • **Workshop B**: Issues on CSO coordination. Being more strategic while sustaining responsive programming and partnerships • **Workshop C**: Monitoring and evaluation for accountability and learning
4:30 p.m. – 5:30 p.m. *Greenery Room*	**Brief presentations of workshop discussions**