



The potential for using the multistakeholder network model to develop and deliver partnerships for implementation ('Type Two Outcomes') for the World Summit on Sustainable Development

Discussion paper – DRAFT FOR COMMENT

Fanny Calder, Associate Fellow, Sustainable Development Programme, Royal Institute of International Affairs, UK

Executive Summary

Partnerships for implementation have been identified as one of the key outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD). This discussion paper is an output of a project on the potential for using the multistakeholder network model to develop and deliver partnerships for implementation at WSSD. The project is being carried out by the Sustainable Development Programme of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA), and is being funded by the UK Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA).

Despite an emerging consensus that partnerships for implementation should be a central part of the Johannesburg outcomes, there is currently a lack of clarity about the process for developing such partnerships in the run up to the Summit. However, processes based on cooperation between stakeholders from governments, businesses and civil society have been developed within the UN system and elsewhere, for issues such as AIDS drugs, vaccination, dams and freshwater. This report explores how the lessons that have been learnt from these processes can be used to develop effective partnerships for implementation at WSSD.

The report opens with an overview of the way in which partnership outcomes have been addressed in the WSSD preparatory process, and suggests that there is an emerging consensus that partnership outcomes should deliver the following:

- commitment from a wide range of stakeholders to delivering on ambitious, implementation-focused partnership objectives linked to existing international commitments on sustainable development;
- where appropriate, a strong focus on working in partnership with developing countries to meet their needs;
- an international (e.g. global, regional or inter-regional) reach;
- detailed action plans, with clear timetables, and arrangements for monitoring and reporting progress;
- firm commitments on funding/resourcing;
- new action on implementation, agreed specifically in the context of WSSD (e.g. existing partnerships should not be eligible to be registered as Type II outcomes unless they can demonstrate that they will be moving to a new, implementation focused, phase of work).

The report goes on to examine how the multistakeholder network model can be used to help develop such partnerships for WSSD.

It outlines the **strengths of the network model**, which include:

- its **transparency and inclusivity**,
- the ability to develop a more comprehensive analysis of the issues than any one stakeholder group can achieve;

- the ability to foster **innovation**;
- the ability to help governments and civil society stakeholders to **work with markets and business to deliver public goods**;
- the ability to **join-up governance** of a wide range of governmental and intergovernmental organisations;
- the ability to **leverage additional financial resources** by bringing together public and private sources of finance and
- the ability to bring **coalitions of progressive actors** together to support one another's progress.

The report also explores some potential weaknesses of the network/partnership approach. These include the fact that the model can only work where there is enough trust between different stakeholder groups to enable them to work together and where there are clear benefits to be gained from such cooperation; the fact that questions have been raised about the legitimacy of multistakeholder networks, with some stakeholders questioning whether NGOs and/or businesses should be involved in the development of government policy; the risk that network processes will fail to achieve a proper balance between the interests of different stakeholder groups, and the risk that developing country stakeholders in particular may lack the capacity to participate fully in their work. However, the report suggests that many of these issues can be addressed through careful process design.

Based on this analysis, the report argues that **multistakeholder partnerships have a key role to play in delivering credible outcomes at WSSD** for the following reasons:

- the implementation of sustainable development is a complex process and needs the involvement of a wide range of actors;
- effective implementation requires the creation of strong linkages between different actors and organisations;
- new financial and non-financial resources need to be brought to the table;
- an implementation focused summit needs to identify strategies for delivering action 'on the ground';
- a deal on implementation needs to have a clear, credible delivery mechanism.

The report goes on to identify a series of **issues for consideration by stakeholders involved in developing partnerships for implementation at WSSD**. These include:

- the need to ensure that developing country stakeholders play a leading role in the development of WSSD partnerships from an early stage in the process;
- the need to create strong linkages between WSSD partnerships and existing national-level sustainable development processes such as National Strategies for Sustainable Development (NSSDs) and Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRs);
- the potential for building on existing international sustainable development processes, many of which are currently focused on sharing and developing best practice, but which could be given a new remit to deliver implementation as a result of WSSD;
- the importance of involving intergovernmental organisations in WSSD partnerships, and the informal role that partnership processes could play in helping such organisations to coordinate their activities;
- the need for funding, initially for process (i.e. secretariat functions, supporting the involvement of developing country participants) and latterly for delivering the implementation strategies that will be developed by the partnerships.
- the need to engage high level stakeholders, such as Heads of Government, CEOs and directors of civil society organisations, in order to ensure the full commitment of governments and other organisations to delivering the implementation strategies that will be developed by the new partnerships.

The paper suggests that if stakeholders focus their efforts between now and the Summit, it should be possible for new partnerships to be ready to make some substantial and credible commitments. Issues that it should be possible to agree in time for WSSD include:

- who is going to participate in the partnerships;
- what the partnerships' initial objectives should be;
- how the partnership process is going to be taken forward;
- how the partnership process will be funded;
- which implementation activities the partnership will focus on;
- how long it will take to develop and agree a detailed action plan for implementation.

It argues that if this level of agreement can be achieved in time for WSSD Heads of Governments, CEOs and heads of civil society groups will be able to come together in Johannesburg to make credible and exciting commitments to ambitious new partnerships for implementation.

Despite being optimistic about the potential to deliver strong partnerships in time for WSSD, the paper does point out that there is an urgent need to deliver **outreach** to, and **join-up** between potential participants in partnership outcomes for the Summit. DESA have already taken some steps to address this. However, the paper suggests that all stakeholders should consider how they could best contribute to engaging with, and networking between stakeholders, particularly stakeholders from developing countries, with a view to developing robust, inclusive Type Two outcomes.

The paper concludes by suggesting that, if partnerships for implementation are to be accepted as a credible outcome from Johannesburg, **the Summit will need to identify and agree a follow-up process**, in which the progress made by the WSSD partnerships can be reviewed in an inclusive and transparent manner. The paper suggests that reviewing progress made by WSSD partnerships could be a new task for the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD). It also points out that, in order to meet existing commitments on sustainable development, **the international community is going to continue to need to develop and deliver strong partnerships for implementation**, and it therefore suggests that the CSD could be given an ongoing role of fostering and supporting the development of new partnerships into the future.

1.1 Introduction

Partnerships for implementation have been identified by the Secretary General of the UN and the Chairman of the WSSD Preparatory Committee as one of the key outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD). This discussion paper is an output of a project on the potential for using the multistakeholder network to develop and deliver partnerships for implementation at WSSD that is being carried out by the Sustainable Development Programme of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA), and which is being funded by the UK Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA).

Despite an emerging consensus that partnerships for implementation should be a central part of the Johannesburg outcomes, there is currently a lack of clarity about the process for developing such partnerships in the run up to the Summit. However, processes based on cooperation between stakeholders from governments, businesses and civil society have been developed within the UN system and elsewhere, for issues such as AIDS drugs, vaccination, dams and freshwater. This aim of this project is to explore how the models of cooperation that have been developed by these existing 'multistakeholder network' processes could be used to both to help design the processes of negotiating partnerships for implementation in the run up to WSSD, and for implementation of the objectives of such partnerships after the Summit.

The paper is based on a series of informal discussions with key stakeholders from governments, UN organisations, civil society groups and businesses, and on interviews with stakeholders who have been actively involved in existing multistakeholder networks. The first section of the paper reviews the way in which partnership outcomes are being highlighted in the WSSD preparatory process. The second section provides a general analysis of the network model, looking at its strengths and weaknesses and at process design issues. Following this general exploration of the network model, the third section of the paper explores the arguments for using the model to develop WSSD partnerships. The fourth section then goes on to identify key issues that need to be taken into consideration if the network model is to be used to develop WSSD partnerships. These include issues of subject selection, process design, stakeholder identification, funding, communications and the relationship of new partnerships to existing institutions and processes at a national and international level. It should be possible for them to have agreed on their objectives, and on a time-bound process of developing detailed, fully funded action plans for implementation.

Case studies of three existing multistakeholder networks (the Global Alliance on Vaccines for Immunisation (GAVI); the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) and the Global Water Partnership) are contained in Annex I.

1.2 The need for outreach and matchmaking

One of the key issues highlighted by this paper is the need to set in train a process that will enable stakeholders who are interested in developing partnerships for WSSD on the same issue to identify one another. At present, while the Secretariat has initiated a process of registering partnerships that have already been agreed, there is currently no clear process for enabling stakeholders interested in working on the same issues to come together to form new partnerships. Further action on this may be required depending on the output of Precom III.

1.3 Next steps for this project

This paper is being circulated widely to governmental and non governmental stakeholders in the run up to PrepCom III. Following its circulation, the project team will be contacting stakeholders in order to gather feedback on the issues and ideas raised, and to get guidance on possible next steps. A final report will be presented at a side event at PrepCom III.

Section 2: Partnerships and the WSSD Preparatory Process

“The purpose of the Summit is not to renegotiate the road map for sustainability provided by Agenda 21 but to strengthen implementation and take account of emerging trends.... It must also articulate the importance of partnerships between countries and between Governments and civil society... The challenge is to translate Agenda 21 into practical steps focusing on key areas in which faster implementation is required and in which it will have the greatest impact on sustainable development.”

“Implementing Agenda 21”, Report of the Secretary General to PrepCom II

There is widespread recognition that the World Summit on Sustainable Development needs to deliver outcomes that will lead to a substantial increase in the implementation of the international community’s commitments on sustainable development. It is also recognised that governments cannot deliver implementation by themselves, and that Johannesburg should therefore play a role in catalysing strong partnerships for implementation between governments and other actors, such as civil society groups, businesses, and intergovernmental organisations.

Based on this analysis, the PrepCom Secretariat has determined that there should be two types of outcomes from the Johannesburg Summit:

Type I outcomes These will be documents negotiated formally by all States in the global Preparatory Committee. Type I outcomes are expected to include:

- an assessment of progress achieved since Rio
- some form of re-statement of governments’ overall commitment to sustainable development
- commitments to specific, time bound targets, initiatives and/or policies for the promotion of sustainable development (possibly presented as a ‘Johannesburg Plan of Action’).

Type II outcomes These will be commitments to specific targets or objectives for the implementation of sustainable development that will be made by individual governmental or non-governmental actors, or by partnerships of governmental and/or non-governmental actors. Type II outcomes will not be negotiated in the formal WSSD preparatory process, and will not require consensus agreement between all Member States.

There is an emerging consensus that the main focus of the Type Two Outcomes should be on partnerships for implementation. This was reflected in the secretariat’s compilation of “Proposals for Partnerships/Initiatives to strengthen the implementation of Agenda 21” that was published at the end of PrepCom II, which proposes that “[the] Second type of outcomes of the Johannesburg Summit would include a whole range of partnerships focused on concrete and specific initiatives to strengthen the implementation of Agenda 21” and suggests that “interested parties [should] identify partners and.. specify clear targets, timetables, monitoring arrangements, coordination and implementation mechanisms, arrangements for systematic and predictable funding, and for technology transfer”.

An explanatory note published by the Chairman of the WSSD Preparatory Committee in February 2002 gives some more detail about what Type II partnerships should look like, saying:

“..only those partnerships/initiatives that are international in scope and reach (i.e. global, regional and/or sub-regional) and those that are aimed at supporting practical implementation of Agenda 21 and sustainable development activities in developing countries, in particular LDCs and small island developing States as well as in countries with economies in transition) would be announced during the official partnership events due to take place at the Summit. Only those partnerships and initiatives that are new and are developed specifically in the context of the WSSD and its goals will feature at the official partnership events...”

Linkages between Type I and Type II Outcomes

The South African non-paper on a “Global Deal for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21” published at the end of PrepCom II also proposes that “Global partnerships” between governmental and non-governmental actors should be a key part of WSSD outcomes and

further suggests that there should be strong linkages between the commitments made by the non-governmental stakeholders involved in such partnerships, and the commitments made in the formal intergovernmental process at Johannesburg (i.e. the Type I WSSD outcomes).

2.1 Criteria for Type II outcomes

Based on the paperwork emerging from the WSSD Bureau, it is possible to identify a list of criteria that Type II partnerships will need to meet. It appears that Type II outcomes will need to deliver the following:

- commitment from a wide range of stakeholders to delivering on ambitious, implementation-focused partnership objectives linked to existing international commitments on sustainable development;
- where appropriate, a strong focus on working in partnership with developing countries to meet their needs;
- an international (e.g. global, regional or inter-regional) reach;
- detailed action plans, with clear timetables, and arrangements for monitoring and reporting progress;
- firm commitments on funding/resourcing;
- new action on implementation, agreed specifically in the context of WSSD (e.g. existing partnerships should not be eligible to be registered as Type II outcomes unless they can demonstrate that they will be moving to a new, implementation focused, phase of work).

2.2 Preparatory process for Type II outcomes

At present the preparatory process for Type II outcomes consists of the general guidance from the WSSD Bureau on the expected nature of the partnerships as outlined above, a process of registering partnerships (once formed) with the Secretariat and a suggestion that progress made in developing partnerships should be reported at PrepComs III and IV.

However, because of the informal nature of the Type II outcomes, there has been limited discussion so far of how best to actually take forward the process of developing new, ambitious partnerships in the short time available before WSSD. The aim of this paper is to make practical suggestions, based on an analysis of existing multistakeholder networks, both about process-management issues that stakeholders who are engaged in developing, or who are planning to start developing specific partnerships for Johannesburg may want to take into consideration.

Section 3: The Multistakeholder Network Model

The term “multistakeholder network” is a very broad term which describes groupings of governmental, intergovernmental, civil society and private sector stakeholders who come together to create change. Networks have been used to tackle a wide range of issues, including AIDS drugs, sustainable agriculture, dams and vaccination. Networks can and have been started by NGOs and other civil society groups, governments, the UN, business organisations and individual businesses. They can be global, regional, national or local, or can operate at different geographical levels at the same time (for example the Mining Minerals and Sustainable Development Initiative includes groupings at global, regional and national levels). Case studies on three global multistakeholder networks, the Global Alliance on Vaccines for Immunisation, the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research and the Global Water Partnership are included in Annex I to this paper.

Existing multistakeholder networks perform a range of different roles. These include:

- sharing information on problems and solutions;
- developing guidelines for best practice (for policy making, commercial activities, reporting etc.);
- developing and delivering action plans for implementation.

Several major projects have examined the multistakeholder network model in detail, and have provided a useful analysis of how they can best be designed and run. These include

the UN Vision Project on Global Public Policy Networks¹, the United Nations Development Programme's work on Global Public Goods² and UNED Forum's work on Multistakeholder Processes³.

3.2 Benefits of the multistakeholder network approach

The multistakeholder network approach has proved to be effective for the following reasons:

Transparency and inclusivity The multistakeholder nature of the network approach means that a wide range of interested parties can be fully involved in decision making processes.

Analysis The involvement of a wide range of stakeholder groups, each of which can bring its own particular experience and expertise to the table, enables the development of a more comprehensive analysis of the issues than any one stakeholder group can achieve.

Holistic planning Strategies for the delivery of sustainable development objectives are most effective when they involve action by more than one stakeholder group (for example, government changes policy, business changes its practice/develops new products or services, NGOs provide analysis of the issues and can help with delivery). Networks enable the development of holistic plans for delivering change through actions by all parties.

Sharing skills and fostering innovation Bringing stakeholders with different perspectives together encourages all stakeholders to see problems in new ways, and enables the development of new and innovative strategies for change. In order to deliver these strategies one stakeholder group will often need to learn from the experience and expertise of another (for example, in the UK Ethical Trading Initiative⁴, businesses carrying out social audits of their suppliers' factories in developing countries have drawn heavily on development NGO's skills in interviewing local communities to assess their needs). Networks provide excellent opportunities for these learnings to take place.

Working with - and balancing - the market Since Rio it has become clear that harnessing private sector resources will be essential if the international community's commitments on sustainable development are going to be achieved. However, changing business practice to achieve sustainable development presents a complex challenge, and may create competitive disadvantages for first movers. The business community may therefore need to move together to create change, and often will also need support from government policy or the action of civil society stakeholders. Networks enable businesses to develop shared plans of action with one another, give governments the opportunity to design effective policy in close consultation with the companies that it is intended to affect, and allow businesses and NGOs to identify opportunities for working together to deliver change. The transparent, inclusive nature of networks and the involvement of civil society groups can also act as a strong balancing mechanism for commercial interests, ensuring that networks deliver genuinely sustainable outcomes.

Joining-up governance Networks also provide an opportunity for different governmental and/or intergovernmental bodies to identify conflicts, gaps or overlaps between their respective policies and programmes, and to better coordinate their work going forward. They can also help civil society groups to act together in a more effective way, and to avoid duplication of effort.

Leveraging financial resources There is no doubt that meeting sustainable development commitments is going to require a massive increase of financial resources from both public

¹ See *Critical Choices – the United Nations, Networks and the future of Global Governance* Wolfgang H. Reinicke and Francis Deng, International Development Research Centre, Canada, 2000 or go to www.globalpublicpolicy.net

² *Global Public Goods – international cooperation in the 21st Century* Edited by Inge Kaul, Isabelle Grunberg and Marc A. Stern, UNDP, 1999

³ *Multistakeholder processes for governance and sustainability*, Minu Hemmati, UNED Forum, Published by Earthwatch 2002 (see www.unedforum.org)

⁴ For more information on the Ethical Trading Initiative see www.eti.org.uk

and private sources. Developing a shared understanding of what resources are needed to achieve their objectives enables networks to act as strong advocates for additional funding (either from organisations that are members of the network themselves, or other sources), and the detailed strategies and supportive policies that networks can deliver reduce risk and give public and private investors increased confidence that markets will develop and/or that public money will be spent effectively. Networks are also ideal fora for developing public-private partnerships for implementing sustainable development projects, and can help identify how best public money can be used to leverage private investment. In addition, networks can help ensure that existing funding for sustainable development is being used as efficiently as possible.

Supporting leaders and encouraging laggards It is clear that while some businesses, governments and civil society groups are strongly committed to achieving sustainable development, others are far less committed at this point in time. In normal intergovernmental processes, in business fora and in the marketplace itself this leads to a lowest common denominator problem, with the lack of commitment of some preventing others from moving forward as fast as they would like to. Networks can overcome this problem by bringing together progressive actors in “coalitions of the concerned” which work together to support one another’s progress. In addition, by creating the conditions in which progressive businesses and governments can implement sustainable development policies and practices without suffering financially, networks can also send positive encouraging signals to the sustainable development laggards.

Developing trust Working together to deliver shared objectives increases trust and understanding between stakeholder groups who may previously have been suspicious or hostile towards one another. This increased trust helps with the delivery of the network’s objectives, and may also lead to further partnerships outside the network.

Ownership and commitment to take action Through participating actively in the development of strategies for change, all stakeholders gain a better understanding of the need for change, and feel ownership of their network’s objectives and of any plan of action it develops. At the same time the different actors exert pressure on one another to change their behaviour in order to meet the shared objectives of the group (e.g. NGOs and businesses can pressure government to change policy; NGOs and government can pressure business to change practice). These factors increase the likelihood that networks will deliver their objectives.

The network model also has some shortcomings. These include:

Applicability The network model will only work where there is enough trust between different stakeholder groups to enable them to work together; where there is some level of agreement between stakeholder groups on the need for action on an issue, and on how to address it; and where there is clear benefit to be gained by all stakeholders from working together. These conditions are not in place on all sustainable development issues, and even where they are met on an issue at an international level, it may not be possible for stakeholders to work together on a national or regional basis. It is important that these issues are assessed in the early stages of network processes.

Legitimacy Questions about the legitimacy of multistakeholder networks have been raised in the past, with some stakeholders questioning whether NGOs and/or businesses etc. should be involved in the development of government policy. Particular networks have also been criticised for failing to achieve a proper balance between the interests of different stakeholder groups. Such questions can usually be answered by careful process design, through ensuring transparency, and by clearly articulating the objectives of the process, and the way in which the different stakeholder groups can contribute to achieving these objectives.

Lack of capacity to participate While one of the benefits of multistakeholder processes is that they enable a wide range of stakeholders to play an active part in designing and implementing strategies for change, it is important to recognise that participating in such

processes can be extremely time-consuming and expensive. Given the lack of financial capacity and human resources in many developing country governments and civil society organisations, developing country stakeholders can find it hard to participate fully in multistakeholder networks. Strategies for addressing this problem need to be identified if networks are to be used to address issues of importance to developing countries.

Monitoring/reporting/compliance The flexible, multistakeholder nature of networks makes it difficult to establish how progress should be measured, and/or what formal body progress should be reported to. It is also difficult to establish any formal/legal responsibilities for failures to deliver on objectives. However, these difficulties are counterbalanced to an extent by the internal dynamics of the processes, as stakeholders will frequently encourage (and sometimes challenge) one another to deliver on their objectives. “Compliance” is also more likely to be achieved where networks have a high public profile, and particularly where private sector organisations are involved in making public commitments. This can be taken into account in the planning of a network.

Interactions with policy and governance Without strong, supportive policy frameworks and basic good governance, the effectiveness of multistakeholder networks will inevitably be limited. Networks do have the potential to contribute to the development of policy frameworks, and to play some part in developing better systems of governance. However, it is unlikely, for example, that business members of networks will support the development of strong regulatory systems, or policies that have strong negative impacts on them financially, and many issues of governance are likely to be beyond the remit of the network. Inter alia, this suggests the need for strong “Type I” commitments at WSSD.

3.3 Some key issues for managing effective multistakeholder networks

Facilitation and secretariat In order to be successful, networks generally need to be managed and facilitated by secretariats based in organisations that are trusted by all parties, and that are perceived to be relatively neutral in their position on the issues that are being addressed. The individuals that facilitate the networks (who have a role to play both in facilitating meetings and overseeing the overall development of the network’s programme of work) should have some expertise on the issues, and be trained (and have strong aptitude) for facilitation.

Membership and size of networks In order to be effective, it is important that the stakeholders involved in networks are genuinely committed to delivering real progress on the issues being addressed. However, to enable full transparency it is also important that the membership of networks should be as open as possible. One way of tackling both of these issues is for the facilitating body to invite members to self-select, making it clear that the aim of the network is to deliver real change, and that all participants will be expected to contribute to this process. Other strategies for balancing the need for inclusiveness with the need for effectiveness include enabling less committed stakeholders to participate loosely in the network, for instance through circulating progress reports via email, and creating sub-networks (or working groups) to develop detailed recommendations which can then be submitted to the wider network (see **Process**, below). In order to ensure inclusiveness, it may also be necessary for the network secretariat to offer funding for travel, subsistence and even a day-rate to participants from developing countries or from smaller non-governmental organisations (including SMEs).

Objectives In order to be effective, public policy networks need to have clear objectives, shared by all participating stakeholders. In order to ensure that they are genuinely shared, objectives should not be imposed on networks (by governments or the secretariat organisation), but their development should be seen as the first part of a network’s work. It may be useful to establish general objectives at the beginning of a network’s life, and then to go on to identify more specific objectives (e.g. implementation targets) at a later date.

High level commitment If networks are to deliver real change (in policy, business practice, investment patterns etc.) it is important that participating organisations are committed to their work at the highest level. The mandate for organisations’ participation in networks needs to

come from government ministers, CEOs etc., and, while day-to-day participation in the network will usually come from officials and operational staff, these high level stakeholders need to be kept fully briefed on progress, and should be involved in network meetings at key stages in their development.

Process One of the benefits of the flexibility of the network model is that networks can design their own process to best suit the tasks that they need to carry out in order to achieve their objectives. Options for network process design include the following:

- **Steering groups** These generally include representatives of all the stakeholder groups involved in the network process. They are used to oversee the general progress of the network. In some cases it may be beneficial to identify high-level stakeholders (e.g. Ministers, CEOs, Heads of other major group organisations etc.) as members of the steering group of a network process, to ensure their continuing commitment to and engagement in the work that is being done.
- **Working groups** Once a network has agreed its general objectives, it usually becomes necessary to create smaller groups of stakeholders to do detailed work on specific issues. Such groups are generally tasked with producing reports on the issues that they are addressing, which are then circulated to all participating stakeholders for their comments and agreement.
- **Regional, national or local groups** International networks typically need to develop strategies for engaging at a regional, national or local level (see **Working at the national level** below). This can be done by creating sub-groups of the network at these levels.
- **Consultative groups** Not all stakeholders involved with or affected by the issues being addressed by networks will want to (or be able to) participate fully in the process. Setting up consultative groups can help ensure that these stakeholders' views are taken into account by the network. Communications strategies can also help keep non-participating stakeholders engaged (see **Communications**, below).
- **Research and policy design projects** Multistakeholder networks are not generally well suited to producing detailed research work, or to producing highly detailed proposals for policy or other initiatives. When such work is needed by the network, it may be useful to commission experts to carry out specific projects. If experts are being used in this way, it is important that the remit for their work is agreed by all participating stakeholders.
- **Implementation projects** In some cases networks with a remit to deliver implementation "on the ground" may be able to do so directly through actions taken by network participants. However, in other cases, network participants may lack the resources or skills to work in this way, and where this is the case, the job of the network can be to design implementation projects which can then be funded and/or implemented by other stakeholders.

Working at the national level While many existing multistakeholder networks are global or regional in scope, in general implementing sustainable development will require action at a national or local level. Such action should clearly be geared towards meeting the needs of governments and/or other stakeholders, as defined by the stakeholders themselves. In order to be effective, networks therefore need to interact effectively with national or local stakeholders. A useful strategy for ensuring close links at national and local levels is for networks to seek to work in support of, or in partnership with existing country or community-led processes.

Commitment to implementing decisions Building commitment to action is a key part of the network process. The strategies that are developed by networks need to be 'real-world' – network members need to be encouraged to ensure that they can actually deliver the strategies that are developed by the network. Ensuring high-level commitment is key here.

Communications Electronic communications are vitally important enablers for multistakeholder network processes. E-mail groups enable stakeholders to work together in

developing network ideas, and can be used to keep less-engaged stakeholders up-to-date with progress. Web-sites enable processes to be transparent, and enable outreach to potential participants or consultees. Video-conferencing has also been used very successfully in some processes. However, it should be noted that given the importance of building strong, trust-based relationships between stakeholders, network processes do benefit strongly from having some opportunities for 'face-to-face' interaction.

Funding Networks are not expensive to run, but some level of funding is needed for the secretariat/facilitation function, and to fund participation from smaller organisations/developing countries etc. Relatively small-scale funding may also be needed to fund research and/or pilot projects to inform the networks' work. However, much greater levels of funding may be needed to implement the implementation strategies developed by networks, and identifying both public and private sources of implementation funding is a crucial part of the network's work.

3.4 Stages of development While as has already been suggested, the network model is extremely flexible and can be used in many different ways, networks typically evolve along the following lines:

A **network champion** is identified, or identifies itself. This is an individual or organisation who believes that there would be value in different stakeholder groups working together on a particular issue.

The network champion **identifies potential network participants**, and discusses the idea of establishing a network process with them. The champion also asks the other stakeholders to help with the process of identifying further potential participants.

If a sufficient number of potential participants are positive about the idea of working together, a **facilitator** is identified to take the process forward. If the network champion is perceived as being sufficiently neutral, they may become the facilitator, otherwise another individual or organisation will need to take on this role. Sources of **funding for the process** may also need to be identified at this point.

The facilitator begins to convene meetings of the network participants. Early meetings focus on **agreeing the network objectives, designing the process and building a joint analysis of the problems** that the network is trying to tackle. At this point participants may make a **public commitment to meeting the network objectives**.

Once shared objectives have been agreed, the process moves on to identifying **options for joint action** to tackle the problems. These may be developed into an **action plan with targets and timetables**. If funding is needed to implement the networks plans, participants will need to work to identify sources of **funding for implementation** at this point.

Once the options for joint action have been agreed on, participants usually make a further **public commitment to implementation**. They may also make commitments to report publicly on the progress that they make.

Implementation then starts. At this point the network may be disbanded, or participants may want to keep it going if it is seen as a useful forum for coordinating implementation activities, or for sharing best practice. In some cases, participants may feel that it is necessary to create a **permanent institutional home for the network**, or even to create a new institution to help deliver the network outcomes.

3.5 Specific issues relating to implementation-focused networks

Many existing multistakeholder networks do not engage directly in implementation – their focus is rather on setting norms and identifying and sharing best practice. However, if multistakeholder networks are to be used to negotiate and deliver on commitments made at WSSD, it is clear they will need to have a strong focus on implementation. The following issues need to be taken into account in the design of implementation-focused network processes:

Strategies for implementing sustainable development 'on the ground' need to be tailored to meet the specific needs of individual countries or localities. Implementation networks

therefore need to be designed in such a way as to enable them to **interact closely with national-level stakeholders and processes**.

Carrying out the actions identified by implementation-focused networks will require stakeholder groups to change their behavior to a significant extent. This means that **high-level commitment** to the objectives and strategies developed by the networks will be crucial to their success.

While running implementation-focused networks should not be significantly more expensive than running any other type of network, the implementation work that is initiated by the network is likely to **need significant resourcing** (both financial and otherwise).

In order to deliver on their objectives, implementation networks will generally need **extensive support from governments**, who may need to change policy or provide financial and other resources to ensure that the networks are successful in achieving their aims. Governmental commitment to implementation-focused networks is therefore crucially important. Where networks are being used to address developing country issues, it will clearly be important to **actively involve developing country governments** in particular.

Section 4: Using the multistakeholder network model to develop partnerships for implementation (“Type Two Outcomes”) for the World Summit on Sustainable Development

4.1 Arguments for using the multistakeholder network at WSSD

Implementation is a complex process The implementation of sustainable development will require that a huge range of specific actions are taken by many different organisations and individuals. The actions needed will vary widely between different countries, localities and parts of global and national economies. Using the network approach would provide a mechanism for identifying the specific actions that are needed at a global, regional and national level.

Implementation will need to involve a very wide range of actors Networks provide an excellent mechanism for engaging the wide range of actors that will be needed to deliver sustainable development, and for helping to influence their actions and obtain their commitment to change.

Implementation needs more resources Through developing a robust analysis of the actions that are needed to deliver sustainable development, networks have the potential to play a key role in making the case for additional donor funding for sustainable development. They can also help leverage new private sector investment into sustainable development, through creating strong partnerships between public and private actors and can encourage actors to channel additional non-financial resources into sustainable development. In addition they can ensure that existing resources are used efficiently.

A “Global Deal” on implementation needs to be a different sort of deal A deal on implementation needs to be different in nature to a deal on targets, norms or legal frameworks. Governments alone do not have sufficient resources or powers to achieve sustainable development on their own. Networks have the potential to go beyond an aspiration to the identification of the concrete actions that all relevant stakeholders will need to take to fulfil commitments. The network approach also has the potential to bring non-governmental stakeholders to the table at the Summit to make their own commitments to action.

A “Global Deal” on implementation needs to have a clear, credible delivery mechanism It seems clear that actually delivering the sort of Type I outcomes that have been suggested in the preparatory process so far (e.g. “a global plan of action with clear, time-bound commitments, resources and monitoring mechanisms to realise the Millennium Declaration target of reducing by half the number of people who are unable to reach or to afford safe drinking water”) will require strong partnerships between governmental and non-governmental stakeholders. It is also unlikely to be possible to agree highly detailed implementation plans in formal negotiations. The announcement of ambitious network-based Type II partnership outcomes would make Type I intergovernmental commitments made at the Summit look far more robust.

The politics need to change The international politics of sustainable development are currently hampered by the stalemate between North and South over the failure to implement Agenda 21 and other commitments. Introducing a new, cooperative network-based approach and bringing new stakeholders to the table could help move the politics on to a new era of cooperation and innovation.

4.2 Issues to be taken into account if the network model is to be used to help develop partnerships for implementation at WSSD

In addition to taking into consideration the general process design issues raised above, there are a range of issues of specific relevance to stakeholders who are currently developing (or planning to develop) partnerships for WSSD. These are as follows:

Selecting subjects

Given that there is an almost limitless number of subject areas that WSSD partnerships for implementation could address, it may be helpful to consider the following questions when deciding whether to initiate a partnership on a particular subject:

- Has the issue been highlighted in the WSSD Preparatory Process? Is it likely to be reflected in the Type I WSSD outcomes?
- Are a wide range of governmental and non governmental stakeholders interested in working on the issue?
- Are any developing country governments interested in working on the issue (see **engaging developing countries** below)?
- Are there any existing multistakeholder or governmental processes on this issue that could be built-on in developing a new partnership for WSSD (see **building on existing processes** below)?
- Is there enough agreement between stakeholders about what needs to be done on this issue to enable them to form partnerships for implementation?
- Is it clear that bringing stakeholders together to work in partnerships could really add value to process of implementation on this issue?
- How broad should the scope of the partnership be? Should it have a general remit to deliver progress on an issue, or should it be focused on implementing a specific type of activity?

Proposals for specific subjects

During the preparation of this report, stakeholders made several suggestions about issues on which it might be useful to develop partnerships for WSSD. Proposals for work on sectoral issues included Energy, Freshwater, Oceans and the Marine Environment, Sustainable Agriculture, Commodities such as Coffee, and Mining and Minerals. Cross-cutting issues suggested included supporting the development of New Partnership for Africa's Development, supporting individual developing countries in delivering their Poverty Reduction Strategies and/or National Strategies for Sustainable Development, and Capacity Building for Science and Technology. A further list of potential subjects has been published by the Bureau of the Preparatory Committee⁵.

Setting objectives and making commitments

It is clear that the general objective for all Type II partnerships should be to contribute to the implementation of sustainable development. In addition, it would seem to be desirable for objectives to be linked, where relevant, to:

- Specific elements of Agenda 21;
- The Millennium Development Goals;
- Ideas emerging in the formal WSSD preparatory process, and eventually to specific Type I outcomes;
- The delivery of country-led strategies for sustainable development, for example Poverty Reduction Strategies and/or National Strategies for Sustainable Development
- The implementation of ideas developed by existing multistakeholder processes (see **building on existing processes** below)

Given the limited time available before Johannesburg, it is unlikely partners will be able to agree more than a framework for action. If this is the case, initial network objectives should also include commitments to producing **detailed action plans**, and to identify sources of funding for implementing those action plans, within a limited time frame after the Summit (e.g. a year).

It is important that all partners should be fully involved in debating and agreeing partnership objectives.

⁵ *Proposals for Partnerships/Initiatives to Strengthen the Implementation of Agenda 21*
http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/documents/prep2final_papers/chair_paper_0225098e_1202.doc

Targets

Partnerships may want to consider including specific targets in their objectives and commitments. However, it may be hard to arrive at agreement on specific targets in time for Johannesburg. If this is the case the partnerships may prefer to postpone the setting of targets until a later stage in their process (for example, targets could be included in the detailed action plans). Another option would be for partnerships to make commitments to *contributing to* the achievement of international targets, for example the Millennium Development Goals, or any new targets that may be agreed at WSSD.

Engaging developing countries and enabling their participation

Given that it is proposed that one of the key objectives for partnerships for implementation that should be to meet the needs of developing countries (see 2.1 above), it is clear that it will be extremely important to ensure that developing country governments and other stakeholders are fully engaged in the creation of such partnerships, and that they play a leading role in defining their strategies and objectives. Some issues that need to be considered in engaging developing countries in the development of WSSD partnerships include:

- The need to identify developing countries for whom action on the issue being addressed by the proposed partnership is a priority. Ideally these countries should have existing, country-led processes with linkages to the issue being addressed by the proposed partnership, as this will facilitate the identification of relevant stakeholders, and will enable the developing country stakeholders to develop their own analysis of and input on what actions need to be taken to achieve progress on the issue concerned.
- The need to identify governmental and non-governmental stakeholders from developing countries who are actively engaged in implementation-related activities relevant to the partnership subject area. Due to lack of capacity, the relevant stakeholders may not currently be engaged in the WSSD preparatory processes.
- The need to engage developing country stakeholders very early in the development of any new partnership, so that they have the opportunity to influence its objectives and agenda.
- The need to provide financial support (e.g. for travel and accommodation) to enable developing country governments and other stakeholders to participate fully in partnership processes.

Interactions between global and national processes

The implementation of sustainable development strategies generally needs to take place at a national and/or local level. Such strategies therefore need to take into account the specific needs and conditions of the countries and/or localities in which they are being carried out and will be most successful where there is strong ownership and participation from stakeholders at these levels.

This suggests that there is a need to create strong linkages between the international partnerships that are being developed for WSSD and existing national and local sustainable development processes. Stakeholders who are developing such partnerships should therefore consider how best to link with national level processes such as PRSPs, NSSDs, and should ensure that the strategies developed by the WSSD partnerships are strongly informed by the priorities that have been set in these processes.

Building on existing processes

Multistakeholder/partnership processes already exist on many of the issues that are likely to be considered as subjects for Type II partnerships. In many cases, these partnerships are geared towards establishing norms or sharing best practice (e.g. the Global Water Partnership, the Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development Partnership, the Mining Minerals and Sustainable Development Initiative etc.) but have not so far been directly involved in implementation.

While the PrepCom Bureau has suggested that only “new” partnerships will be eligible to count as Type II outcomes at WSSD, it would clearly make sense to build on the work of

existing processes. One way of doing so at the same time as ensuring that something genuinely new is being brought to the table would be to use WSSD as a catalyst for turning existing 'norm-setting' processes into implementation processes.

Alternatively, rather than changing the remit of existing processes (which is likely to be time consuming and controversial) WSSD partnerships could draw on the resources of these processes, both by using the analysis that they have produced as a starting point for designing implementation strategies, and by inviting some or all of their participants to join the new partnerships.

Stakeholders involved in developing partnerships for WSSD may also want to consider bringing together existing processes that are working on similar issues, in order to exploit synergies and achieve economies of scale.

Identifying facilitators and secretariats

Trusted and skilled facilitators can play a key role in enabling stakeholders to work together constructively in the early stages of a network/partnership process, and in helping with process design issues. Stakeholders developing partnerships for WSSD should therefore consider identifying an individual or organisation to take the role of network facilitator as early as possible in the development of their partnership process.

Partnership/network facilitators could potentially be provided by any of the organisations involved in planning a partnership, or alternatively, professional facilitators could be brought into the process. The most important criteria for selecting individual facilitators is the extent to which they are trusted by all partners (to ensure that this is the case, partners should be consulted where possible about the choice of facilitator), and their facilitation skills, which need to be excellent.

The WSSD partnerships will also need some level of secretariat support (for the organisation of meetings, provision of note taking services etc.). Ideally this should be provided by the same organisation as the facilitator. In their early stages of development, partnership processes should be relatively simple and therefore facilitation and secretariat resources should not be too extensive. However, as the processes mature and become more complex (and, for example, issue and/or national working groups are set up), far more secretariat support will be needed.

The role of intergovernmental organisations

The UN and Bretton Woods organisations have played a key role in the success of many of the existing global multistakeholder networks, and have the potential to make very significant contributions to WSSD partnerships for implementation, through contributing financial resources, expertise, and through the provision of secretariat and facilitation resources.

In turn, WSSD partnerships could play a significant role in helping intergovernmental organisations to coordinate their activities on specific issues, both with one another, and with other stakeholders (donors, recipients, the private sector etc.).

It is likely that intergovernmental organisations themselves will become actively involved in establishing some of the WSSD partnerships. Where other stakeholders are planning partnerships, they should identify and engage relevant intergovernmental organisations at an early stage in the partnership process.

Engaging high-level stakeholders

Obtaining and maintaining high level commitment to WSSD partnerships will be crucial to their success. WSSD offers an excellent opportunity to engage Heads of State, Ministers, company CEOs and heads of civil society organisations. Once the subject matter and draft objectives of partnerships have been negotiated in the run up to the Summit, the leaders of partnership organisations can be brought together in Johannesburg to launch the partnerships. Given the need to maintain the engagement of high level stakeholders, partnerships should also include further high-level meetings in their process design.

Funding for process and implementation

In order for any partnership commitments that are made at Johannesburg to be credible, it will be important for new partnerships to identify sources of process funding (i.e. funding for the secretariat, facilitation, and developing country participation) prior to WSSD. The levels of funding required to support partnership processes is relatively small (the relatively elaborate Global Water Partnership discussed in Annex I costs \$15 million per annum to run).

Implementation is likely to be far more expensive, and achieving agreement on sources and levels of funding for implementation in time for WSSD will be difficult. In any event, the process of identifying sources of financial and other resources should be a key part of the ongoing process of partnership implementation, and should involve negotiations over match funding and the development of public-private partnerships. This will be most effectively and efficiently done once partners have started to develop detailed action plans. That said, in order to ensure the credibility of Type II outcomes as a whole, it would be useful for donors to make general commitments at WSSD to supporting the delivery of action plans developed by WSSD partnerships, either within the Type I outcomes or as a Type II outcome.

Monitoring and reporting

Provisions for monitoring and reporting progress will be necessary in order to ensure the credibility of WSSD partnerships for implementation. Each partnership will need to develop its own proposals on monitoring and reporting. It seems unlikely that detailed proposals for this will be able to be agreed by partners in time for WSSD, though partners could commit to producing detailed proposals for monitoring and reporting at the same time as they deliver their action plans.

In addition to the specific monitoring and reporting arrangements that will be needed for individual partnerships, if partnerships for implementation are going to be one of the central outcomes of WSSD, it will be important to identify some form of shared follow-up process for reporting on progress. It seems likely that the best forum for doing this would be the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD). This issue could be addressed in more detail in the formal discussions on Sustainable Development Governance.

4.3 An overall comment on process: the need for outreach and matchmaking

It seems clear that in order to deliver robust, inclusive, well coordinated partnerships for implementation at WSSD, it will be important to ensure that a wide range of stakeholders from governments, businesses and other major groups are aware of the potential to participate in such partnerships, and that stakeholders interested in developing partnerships on the same issues are able to identify one another.

The recent explanatory note on Partnerships that has been circulated by the Bureau and the process of registering partnerships that has been initiated by the WSSD Secretariat are clearly a useful contribution towards raising stakeholders' awareness of the potential to participate in WSSD partnerships for implementation. However, the registration process will mainly focus on collating information about partnerships that have already been initiated, and will therefore not help address the need to enable stakeholders who are at the early stages of considering participating in Type II initiatives on the same issue to identify one another. There is also a need to engage stakeholders who are not actively involved in the WSSD preparatory process, but who could potentially play a key role in developing and delivering successful partnerships for implementation.

This suggests that there is still a need for a formal or informal process of **outreach** aimed at raising the awareness of stakeholders about the potential to become involved in developing WSSD partnerships for implementation, and of **matchmaking** between stakeholders who are involved in developing, or who are considering developing, partnerships on the same or similar issues. The **lack of capacity** of some countries and stakeholders groups to engage even in the early stages of partnership developments also needs to be addressed.

Potential strategies for meeting these needs could include:

- **Awareness raising initiatives**, with the aim of clearly explaining the criteria for WSSD partnerships for implementation. There is a need for such initiatives to be taken within and between governments, and within major group organisations and networks.
- **Matchmaking processes**, to enable stakeholders who are interested in developing partnerships on the same issues to identify one another. These could be web-based, and could either be run formally by the WSSD Secretariat, or informally by other stakeholders.
- **Funding for developing country participation** in the early stages of partnership development. Donors could consider providing funding for this purpose, at the same time as ensuring that stakeholders were aware of its availability (this information could be provided as a part of the awareness raising work).

The Royal Institute of International Affairs hopes that this paper, which will be circulated widely to developing and developed country stakeholders, will make a useful if limited contribution to the awareness raising process.

4.4 The need for an ongoing process for following-up WSSD partnerships, and for initiating new partnerships in the future

If partnerships for implementation are to be accepted as a credible outcome from Johannesburg, the Summit will need to identify and agree a follow-up process, in which the progress made by the WSSD partnerships can be reviewed in an inclusive and transparent manner. Reviewing progress made by WSSD partnerships could be a new task for the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD).

In order to meet existing commitments on sustainable development, the international community is also going to continue to need to develop and deliver strong partnerships for implementation. The international community should therefore also consider launching a process of continuing to foster and support the development of new partnerships at the Summit. Again, there is clearly the potential for the CSD to play a role here, possibly by providing a forum in which new partnerships can be registered.

Section 5: Conclusions

This paper argues that partnerships for implementation have the potential to be one of the most significant outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), because of their potential to engage a wide range of actors in the development and delivery of innovative, synergistic strategies for the implementation of sustainable development objectives.

However, while the PrepCom Bureau has given some guidance on what criteria “Type II” partnership outcomes at WSSD should meet, and the WSSD Secretariat has started compiling a list of planned partnerships, at present the informal nature of Type II outcomes means that the process of actually developing WSSD partnerships is entirely being left to the initiative of national governments and other stakeholders. The aim of this paper has been to provide useful input to this process by showing how the approaches developed by existing processes (“multistakeholder networks”) can be used to help develop new partnerships for implementation in the run up to, and leading on from, Johannesburg. It is hoped that the issues raised will be useful food for thought for all stakeholders who are currently involved in developing, or who are considering developing, partnership outcomes for WSSD.

Some of the **key issues** raised in the paper are as follows:

- The need to ensure that developing countries play a leading role in setting the objectives and designing the strategies of any new partnerships that are launched at WSSD;
- The need to identify trusted and skilled facilitators to help build trust between stakeholders, agree objectives and design robust partnership processes;
- The potential to build on existing processes, possibly using WSSD as a catalyst to move processes that have so far focused on norm setting and/or information sharing towards a more active engagement in delivering implementation “on the ground”;

- The need to ensure that international partnerships have strong links to national and local sustainable development processes (e.g. PRSPs, NSSDs etc), and to ensure that they are strongly guided by such processes;
- The need to engage high level stakeholders, such as Heads of Government, CEOs and directors of civil society organisations, in order to ensure the full commitment of governments and other organisations to delivering the action plans developed by the new partnerships;
- The need for credible arrangements for monitoring and reporting progress;
- The need in the first instance for funding for partnership processes, and, as processes develop, for much higher levels of funding to enable action plans to be delivered.

How far can partnership outcomes be expected to develop between now and WSSD?

The paper argues that developing ambitious, well supported partnerships for implementation within the time available before the World Summit on Sustainable Development is going to present a considerable challenge. While the criteria suggested by the PrepCom Bureau are clearly important, producing detailed, fully-funded plans of action for implementation with strong support from a wide range of actors can be developed by August 2002 will be a considerable challenge.

However, the paper does suggest that, if stakeholders from developed and developing country governments, businesses, civil society groups and intergovernmental organisations put real energy into bringing potential partners together to in well designed, well facilitated processes in the run up to Johannesburg, it should be possible for new partnerships to be ready to make some substantial and credible commitments at the Summit. Issues that it should be possible to agree in time for WSSD include:

- Who is going to participate in the partnerships
- What the partnerships' initial objectives should be
- How the partnership process is going to be taken forward
- How the partnership process will be funded
- Which implementation activities the partnership will focus on
- How long it will take to develop and agree a detailed action plan for implementation

If this level of agreement can be achieved in time for Johannesburg, Heads of Governments, CEOs and heads of civil society groups could come together at the Summit to launch the partnerships by making joint commitments to the initial objectives, and at the same time committing to delivering detailed, funded action plans within a set timeframe after the Summit.

The paper concludes by suggesting that, if partnerships for implementation are to be accepted as a credible outcome from Johannesburg, the Summit will need to identify and agree a follow-up process, in which the progress made by the WSSD partnerships can be reviewed in an inclusive and transparent manner. The paper suggests that reviewing progress made by WSSD partnerships could be a new task for the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD). It also points out that, in order to meet existing commitments on sustainable development, the international community is going to continue to need to develop and deliver strong partnerships for implementation, and it therefore suggests that the CSD could be given an ongoing role of fostering and supporting the development of new partnerships into the future.

Annex II – Case studies of existing multistakeholder networks/partnerships

Case Study A: The Global Alliance on Vaccines for Immunization (GAVI)

Objectives

The overarching aim of the Alliance is to save people's lives and protect people's health through the widespread use of vaccines with a particular emphasis on developing countries.

In the pursuit of this aim, the Alliance has set five strategic objectives: improving access to sustainable immunization services, expanding the use of all existing safe and cost-effective vaccines, accelerating the development and introduction of new vaccines, accelerating research and development efforts on vaccines and related products specifically needed by developing countries, especially those against HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis and making immunization coverage an integral part of the design and assessment of international development efforts, including deep debt relief.

The Alliance was officially launched in Davos, Switzerland in January 2000.

Structure

GAVI has worked hard to develop a network approach to their work in order to ensure that they create a forum where each of their members can work to reinforce each other rather than compete. For the first time in the field GAVI has been designed with vaccine manufacturers at the centre of the process. They are full partners with representatives on the GAVI Board and implementing groups.

The GAVI Board sets the policies of the alliance. Comprised of the highest-level representation from the partners, there are four renewable members: WHO, UNICEF, The World Bank, and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Eleven additional, rotating members are responsible for representing the collective expertise and perspective of their constituencies.

The GAVI Working Group is responsible for the implementation of the decisions of the GAVI Board. The Working Group is comprised of middle-level managers in the GAVI partner institutions. These staff are able to translate GAVI priorities into their respective workplans. The Working Group currently includes nine members, representing WHO; UNICEF; the World Bank; the GAVI Secretariat; the Global Fund for Children's Vaccines; the Gates Children's Vaccine Program at PATH, the University of Maryland School of Medicine, USAID; and Wyeth-Ayerst Labs.

The GAVI Secretariat is made up of five professional staff and two secretaries housed in the European regional office of UNICEF in Geneva. The Secretariat facilitates coordination between the partners and manages the review of country proposals to the Global Fund. The Executive Secretary reports to the GAVI Board. The Secretariat's budget is financed by membership fees paid by the GAVI Board members.

Four GAVI Task Forces have been established to address specific issues of concern to the Board. The Advocacy Task Force is chaired by UNICEF; the Task Force for Country Coordination is co-chaired by WHO and the government of Norway; the Financing Task Force is chaired by the World Bank and USAID; and the Research and Development Task Force is co-chaired by WHO, NIH and Chiron Vaccines. In addition, regional groups have been formed to help coordinate technical support and information sharing between the national and international levels.

Membership

GAVI members include the multinational agencies, bilateral agencies, international development banks, foundations, pharmaceutical industry, NGOs, and most crucially, the national government health programs.

Stakeholders

A range of stakeholders from all stakeholder groups are engaged in the work of the Alliance through working groups which meet five or six times a year. Representatives of all donor groups and key working groups are present on the GAVI Board. Each of the key stakeholders has a primary aim within the GAVI framework, designed to complement each other in the pursuit of wider GAVI objectives.

UN Organisations

As the lead organization in global public health, the World Health Organisation (WHO) works within the Alliance to develop global policies and strategies for immunization and vaccine development. The Vaccines and Biologicals Department is the operational arm of WHO in the Alliance. UNICEF is also actively involved in the work of the Alliance, mobilising leaders from global to community levels to place immunization of children a key priority for development.

Bretton Woods Organisations

Within the GAVI framework, the World Bank supports national governments' efforts toward sustainable financing mechanisms for immunization services including vaccine purchase and infrastructure support.

National governments

Governments who are involved with the Alliance work at the national level with their international partners to further the work of GAVI through an Inter-agency Coordinating Committee or equivalent collaborative mechanism.

Donor governments also work to ensure that health gets an adequate proportion of external aid channelled through the sector coordination mechanisms.

Civil society and business

Members from the vaccine industry work, and are actively encouraged, to ensure a high level of quality in the vaccines they supply, and to develop and supply new vaccines.

Developing countries

Developing country governments work to ensure that their health sectors develop effective measures to provide health services and specifically vaccines, to those most in need.

Implementation and funding

While the GAVI partners remit is to work with national ministries of health in the poorest countries to develop strategies to strengthen childhood immunization, and provide technical support to help countries achieve their plans it does not have an implementation remit. It does however, have a related Global Fund for Children's Vaccines, which provides some of the financial resources necessary to realize those plans.

The Global Fund for Children's Vaccines is a financially independent mechanism designed to raise new resources for immunization and swiftly channel them to developing country health systems. The Global Fund makes its funding decisions based on the recommendations of the GAVI Board. Since the partners of the Alliance provide direction and support, administrative costs are kept low: approximately 98% of Global Fund resources go directly to countries.

The Global Fund was created with an initial grant of \$750 million from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Since that time, the governments of Norway, the UK, the United States and the Netherlands have all supported the Global Fund, pushing its total resources to above \$1 billion for 2001-2005. Further contributions from national governments, corporations and foundations are also actively pursued

Global Fund support to countries takes two forms: (1) provision of new and under-used vaccines with safe immunization equipment, and (2) Funding to help

Case Study B: The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)

Objectives

Simply put, the founding objective of the CGIAR was to "increase the pile of rice" in tropical countries that faced serious food scarcity, through research. More recently, the mission statement was broadened to the following: "To contribute, through its research, to promoting sustainable agriculture for food security in the developing countries".

Structure

The CGIAR network consists of the Consultative Group (a Chairman, Co-sponsors, and other members), CGIAR committees, international agricultural research centres and centre committees, and a virtual System Office with the CGIAR Secretariat serving as its hub. There are 16 international research centres around the world, focusing on specific regional or sectoral issues. Each centre is run as an independent Trust under the laws of the host country, with a board of 8-16 members who represent a cross-section of the stakeholder groups involved in the work of that Trust. Each group has a related advisory committee, who, in addition to the Affiliated Committee on Agricultural Research, the Science Committee and two Partnership committees (NGO and Business), are brought together annually at an Annual General Meeting (AGM). The AGM and the work of the independent centres and committees are coordinated by two central secretariats: one deals with the processes of the group and the other with the scientific research work relating to the Science Council. Further facilitation of the AGM is carried out by a new Executive Council who also meet annually, between AGMs to set agendas and issues for deliberation by the whole.

The CGIAR has no constitution, no statutes, no regulations, and no membership laws. It reaches decisions by consensus, not by voting. Membership in the Group is open to any government or agency that supports the CGIAR mission, is willing to participate in shaping a research agenda based on that mission and provides financial support for the centres to implement the research agenda.

Each part of the CGIAR system performs a distinct set of mutually supportive and complementary functions. These include strategic and medium-term planning, financing and resource allocation, and monitoring and evaluation.

While the structure as it stands was not formally 'designed', it evolved rapidly out of the ideals and objectives of the original research foundations within the World Bank from which the group grew. There is however currently a debate within the CGIAR around the extent of secretariat services, the nature of the relationship between donors and checks on the power of the centre to control agendas and budgets. This debate includes all stakeholders and is likely to result in restructuring in the near future.

Membership

Both membership and contributions to CGIAR are voluntary, while four co-sponsors support the core work programme: the World Bank, UNDP, FAO and IFAD. UNEP were also co-sponsors for some years until funds were no longer available. The voluntary nature of membership and donations plays a strong role in ensuring that processes and decisions are made in an inclusive manner, as alienating members could be financially problematic. The 'loose coalition' approach taken by this group means that they have been criticised for appearing 'untidy', however they are rarely faced with the impasse of negotiating resolution texts and as such members feel that they 'get more done'. One stakeholder commented that "of course there are rows, but we all make friends again quite quickly because we have so much in common."

Relationship to external political events

Controversial external debates and political events are discussed and negotiated where possible within the group. Recently these have included: intellectual property rights, genetic modification of crops and carbon and climate change, which has implications for the development of agricultural technology.

Relationship to external political processes

The nature of the institutional co-sponsors means that the group has strong links with international political events such as WSSD, as well as feeding in less directly via national Governments via the regional centres and committees. There is however a balance to be struck, which is to some extent a part of the current debate, about the potential benefits of politicisation of the group's work: while it could mean more resources and a wider remit, some are concerned that without careful management it would undermine the coalition structure that exists, characterised as 'informal but successful'.

Stakeholders

Stakeholder engagement has been mainly through the research centres and GFAR, a wider stakeholder grouping open to anyone who wants to be involved, however there is a recognised element of struggle in balancing the need for equal representation and involvement at all stages of the process with the need to 'get things done'. This is currently addressed through a distinction between stakeholders and shareholders; the latter being those who have contributed funds, and who are more likely to be engaged at a 'higher' level within the group.

National governments

National governments are actively encouraged to join and engage with their local research centres. Their suggested contribution is around \$250,000 per year, although this amount is also under review. Funds can either be donated to the secretariat to administer or can be allocated directly to specific projects under the CGIAR umbrella.

Involvement of civil society and business

NGOs are not expected to donate funds and are engaged via a specific committee, they are also seen as a point of contact for non-participating stakeholders particularly at the community level. Businesses also have a specific committee, and are actively engaged at a national level.

Developing country involvement

The group has actively changed in the last decade taking on a strong North-South identity. Ten Southern countries joined the CGIAR during a renewal programme implemented in 1994. Twenty CGIAR members are from the South, up from zero in 1971, and twenty-one are from the North. Developing countries have been critical in the past of the level of funding they have received via CGIAR, however there has been an attempt to engage more fully with them and ensure a fairer division of funds. As a result, much of the criticism has disappeared recently.

Implementation

While CGIAR does not have an implementation remit, each centre creates a work plan with their members, which is passed to the Science Council for acceptance and on the secretariat for funding. While there is an element of competition for funds, there is also effort at the centre to get as many projects funded as possible, including facilitating informal partnerships within the group to support 'on the ground' work wherever possible.

Monitoring

Monitoring of each project and centre is undertaken annually using standard Log Frame assessments and internal and external auditors. The results are publicly available.

Funding

Total funding for CGIAR is \$340m per year, coming mainly from donor countries. The largest individual donors are the EU, World Bank, USAID and Japan.

Case Study C: The Global Water Partnership (GWP)

Objectives

The Global Water Partnership was established by a group of bilateral and multilateral agencies in 1996 to establish international cooperation around the issue of integrated water resource management. The stated mission of the GWP is to "support countries in the sustainable management of their water resources" while its objectives are to: clearly establish the principles of sustainable water resources management, identify gaps and stimulate partners to meet critical needs within their available human and financial resources, support action at the local, national, regional or river-basin level that follows principles of sustainable water resources management and help match needs to available resources.

The development of objectives has been a broad-based process with an emphasis on wide ranging engagement of stakeholders at a regional level, however it is recognised that around 65% of the development and agenda setting undertaken is done so centrally.

Structure

Since its inception, the GWP has built up a network of Regional Partnerships in South America, Central America, Southern Africa, West Africa, the Mediterranean, Central and Eastern Europe, Southern Asia, Southeast Asia and most recently in China. These Regional Partnerships bring various sectoral and interest groups together to identify and discuss their common water problems and to develop action plans based on the principles of integrated water resource management (IWRM).

All members of GWP are consulting partners, meeting once a year to review reports from the Steering and Technical Committees, appoint the Chair of the Partnership, and elect and appoint members of the Steering Committee. These meetings are open to all stakeholders and observers. The Steering Committee acts as a Board of Directors and meets twice a year. Committee Members are elected by the Consulting Partners and appointed for three years. There are 22 Committee Members including ex officio members.

The Technical Committee (TEC) consists of 12 internationally recognised professionals selected for their experience in different disciplines relating to IWRM. TEC provides professional and scientific support to GWP's members by performing analyses of strategic issues impacting on water management, facilitating, supporting and monitoring GWP programmes, and giving advice and guidance on IWRM priorities and development of IWRM proposals. Each member of TEC serves in their personal capacity and devotes around 30 working days per year to the task.

The GWP Secretariat is hosted by the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) in Stockholm, Sweden. It provides support to the Executive Secretary, the Technical Committee and other GWP committees, and the GWP regional partnerships in the areas of governance, finance, communications, planning, and operational management of GWP programmes and administration.

The GWP also has three resource centres: DHI-Institute of Water and Environment, Denmark; HR Wallingford, UK; and the International Water Management Institute (IWMI), Sri Lanka. These provide additional support in strategic and programme areas to the Partnership, and a range of support services to the Stockholm secretariat and TEC Chair.

Membership

GWP Membership is open to any organisation that recognises the Dublin-Rio principles and are involved with issues related to integrated water resources management.

External support agencies interested in water resources management are brought together twice a year by the Global Water Partnership to provide a forum for information exchange and debate on the water priorities that need to be addressed and the criteria for providing financial assistance to various initiatives focused around integrated water resources management. To extend the forum, GWP has recently teamed up with the Third World Water Forum and the Dialogue on Water, Food and the Environment.

External political processes

The core GWP groups have taken an active role in engaging in all international discussions relating to water, particularly the Hague Water Conference and the Bonn Water Process. Its sponsors and regional partnerships also mean it has strong links with national governments throughout the world.

Stakeholders

Stakeholder engagement comes principally through the regional partnership network, as real efforts have been made to try to move away from the traditional water management principles of the core. Membership of regional partnerships is self-proposed and free, facilitated by a simple on-line registration process. The basic objective of the partnerships is to broaden the agenda and debate about water issues within partner countries. To this end, the private sector and civil society groups are actively encouraged to join through capacity building and specific programmes.

Although national governments are, to some degree, the focus of the regional partnerships, they are considered equal members with other stakeholders within in the group. The facilitation of the development of national water strategies that are in keeping with the principles of IWRM is undertaken by all stakeholders and supported by the functions of the Secretariat where appropriate. In addition to this facilitation, individual programmes on a national level can be taken on as Associated Programmes of the GWP and additional resources allocated to it (these do not include implementation funding.)

Implementation

While the GWP does not have implementation as an objective, there is great emphasis on facilitating implementation projects in their search for funding. At an operational level, national work plans are encouraged and actively supported by the GWP secretariat.

In cooperation with the TEC Chair, the Executive Secretary is responsible for the implementation of the GWP work programme.

Monitoring

Internal programme monitoring is undertaken by the Technical Committee. External monitoring of the process and projects is undertaken by the World Water Assessment Programme in UNESCO.

Funding

Funding for the partnership comes to approximately \$15m per year, with the bulk of that coming from bilateral organisations, which are strongly represented on the Steering Committee.

Current donors to GWP are the governments of: Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom and the Ford Foundation, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), The World Bank. The largest individual funders are the UK, Dutch and Swedish governments.