

---

# **Open Forum for CSO Development Effectiveness**

---

Report from the  
Swedish National  
Consultation  
17-18 November 2010

---



# Table of Contents

<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. SUMMARY INFORMATION ON THE CONSULTATION</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. POLITICAL CONTEXT AND THE CONSULTATION PROCESS</b>	<b>5</b>
THE POLITICAL CONTEXT	5
THE CONSULTATION PROCESS	5
<b>3. KEY ISSUES DISCUSSED</b>	<b>9</b>
POLITICAL RECOGNITION AND COLLABORATION WITH A DIVERSIFIED CSO COMMUNITY	10
ALIGNMENT AND HARMONISATION	10
SUPPORT FOR GRASS-ROOTS ORGANISATIONS AND MOVEMENTS	11
LONG-TERM COMMITMENT AND FUNDING	11
DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES IN RISK MANAGEMENT	11
SHARING OF KNOWLEDGE, MUTUAL LEARNING AND REPORTING	12
TRANSPARENCY AND MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY OF CSOs	12
NATIONAL ADAPTATION AND ADJUSTMENTS OF THE ISTANBUL PRINCIPLES	113
<b>4. COMMITMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>14</b>
4.1 NATIONAL INTERPRETATION AND ADAPTATION OF THE ISTANBUL PRINCIPLES	14
4.2 ADDITIONAL PRINCIPLES FOR CSOs IN THEIR ROLES AS DONORS	15
4.3 RECOMMENDATIONS ON ENABLING CONDITIONS	16
<b>5. DIALOGUES WITH NON-CSO PARTICIPANTS</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>6. NEXT STEPS</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>ANNEXES</b>	<b>21</b>
ANNEX 1: AGENDA FOR THE CONSULTATION	22
ANNEX 2: LIST OF PRESENTATIONS	25
ANNEX 3: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	26

## Abbreviations

AAA	Accra Agenda for Action
CSO	civil society organisation
EU	European Union
HLF	High Level Forum
MoFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency

# **1. Summary information on the consultation**

## **Date and venue of consultation**

Stockholm, Sweden, 17-18 November 2010

## **Agenda for the consultation**

See Annex 1

## **List of presentations made**

See Annex 2

## **Number of participants**

110

## **Participants' list**

See Annex 3

## **Name and e-mail of report writer**

Göran Eklöf, [goran@context.nu](mailto:goran@context.nu)

## **For more information and documentation, please contact:**

CONCORD Sweden, [info@concord.se](mailto:info@concord.se), [www.concord.se](http://www.concord.se)

## **2. Political context and the consultation process**

### **The political context**

Sweden has a long tradition of strong support for development cooperation. The official target to provide 1 percent of GDP was set already in 1968 (to be reached in 1975), and although it has rarely been honoured the level of Swedish aid has been between 0,7 and 1 percent of ODA for the past several decades. The 2011 budget allocation to CSOs is 1,5 billion SEK (appr. 165 m€, 215 mUSD) – a slight increase over the previous year, but a significantly smaller share of ODA than a decade ago.

Civil society organisations (CSOs) have played an important role in Swedish development cooperation from the start. The importance of civil society for poverty reduction and for defending the rights of poor and marginalised groups is confirmed in the Policy for Global Development that was adopted by the Swedish parliament in 2003. The policy lays the foundation not only for Swedish Development cooperation but also for coherence between all policy areas in support of an equitable and sustainable global development.

The four-party alliance that came to power after the 2006 elections still abides by the coherence policy, but has initiated significant changes in the development cooperation programs. The number of countries with bilateral programs has been reduced, and the role of a broader range of development actors (private sector, research) is being emphasised.

There is a significantly stronger focus on measurable results, control and measures against corruption. As a result, Swedish CSOs are experiencing an increasing burden of administrative and procedural requirements.

CSOs also feel that their work is increasingly being put in question, and that there are fewer opportunities for consultation and dialogue with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA) and Sida. At the same time, Sweden has been playing a leading and proactive role in promoting CSO participation in the international aid effectiveness dialogue both before and after Accra, and continues to provide considerable support to both BetterAid and the Open Forum consultation processes.

### **The consultation process**

The national consultation process in Sweden has been coordinated by a Steering Group with representatives from eight CSOs and CSO platforms.

CONCORD Sweden has served as the secretariat for the consultation process, and facilitated the practical arrangements around the two workshops that have been held.

Two members of the Steering Group participated in the first Open Forum Global Assembly, as members of the Global Facilitation Group, in Istanbul, in their capacities as delegates of international organisations.

## Preparatory workshop

A preparatory workshop was held on 7 October 2010, with 30 participants representing 14 Swedish CSOs and platforms. On this occasion, CSOs were in particular encouraged to send their controllers and staff/members that are active in the CSO networks on planning monitoring and evaluation (the PUU network).

The aims of the workshop were to:

- suggest principles for improving the effectiveness of Swedish CSOs
- develop proposals for enabling conditions that will help CSOs improve their effectiveness, and
- clarify the roles and added value of Swedish CSOs in development cooperation

Before the meeting, the Steering Group had distributed a 5-page briefing on the background to the Open Forum, which covered the Paris Declaration and the discussions leading up to the Accra HLF, and explained the background and roles of BetterAid and the Open Forum for CSO Development Effectiveness.

Introductory presentations were made on the Open Forum process and its results so far, and on the political context in which Swedish CSOs are engaging in development cooperation. Participants then listed what they perceived to be the most important roles and added values of Swedish CSOs as development actors, as partners, and as donors/channels of aid. The added value in relation to funds that are obtained from official sources was considered particularly important to identify, as such donors are increasingly channelling funds to Southern CSOs via embassies and/or pooled funds in the recipient countries. The added values of Swedish CSOs were believed to include:

- The capacity to build links with poor and marginalised groups and organisations in the South, as a basis for campaigns and advocacy that target decision makers and the public in the North
- A better understanding of the partner organisations and their constituencies, based on identification, common interests and experiences
- A potential for better monitoring and control due to more diversified and complex interactions with the partner organisations and their peers
- A potential for more synergies (including South/South exchanges) between supported organisations and programmes
- Support to a broader diversity of Southern CSOs, as a reflection of the diversity of the Swedish CSO community.

The preparatory workshop also discussed principles for CSO development effectiveness, and listed the most important external conditions that are necessary for CSOs to be effective. The results of these discussions were incorporated into an expanded version of the background briefing<sup>1</sup>, which was distributed to CSOs in advance of the National Consultation workshop.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Open Forum on CSO Development Effectiveness. Underlag till den svenska konsultationen 17 och 18 november 2010.* Available in Swedish only. <http://concord.se/page.asp?id=542>

## National consultation workshop

The Swedish National Consultation Workshop was held on 17-18 November, with a total of 110 participants representing:

- 30 Swedish development CSOs and platforms
- the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sida and one other government authority (12 participants)
- parliamentarians (4), the private sector (3), academia (2), and foundations not directly involved in development cooperation (2).

The first day of the consultation was for CSOs only, while other development actors were invited to participate in the discussions during day 2.

The aims of the consultation were:

- to agree on a contextualised set of principles for the development effectiveness of Swedish CSOs
- to agree on a set of additional principles for the effectiveness of CSOs specifically in their roles as donors, to guide Swedish CSOs and to serve as an input to the international debate
- to develop proposals for enabling conditions that are necessary for CSOs to perform effectively as development actors, as a starting point for a dialogue with other development actors.

### *Day 1*

After introductory presentations on the international Open Forum process, the Swedish consultation process and the objectives of the workshop, participants were divided into groups to discuss how the [Istanbul principles](#) could be interpreted and applied – with necessary adjustments – in the Swedish context, and principles that need to be added or clarified with regard to the roles of CSOs as donors. Group discussions in the afternoon centred on the enabling conditions that need to be in place in order to facilitate CSO development effectiveness.

The results of these discussions were synthesised and presented to the plenary. The meeting endorsed the proposed set of national interpretations and modifications of the Istanbul principles, as well as three additional principles for CSOs in their roles as donors. The meeting also endorsed a set of seven recommendations for an enabling environment for CSO effectiveness, as an input into the dialogue with other stakeholders during Day 2.

Summing up the results of the first day, Franz Berger (CONCORD Europe) commented that the discussion represented the first attempt to test and adapt the Istanbul principles to national realities, and that the results were very satisfactory. He believed that the proposed principles for CSOs as donors provided valuable input to similar discussions in other European countries in the coming months, as well as to the further discussions among international CSOs.

### *Day 2*

After a brief introduction on the Open Forum Process and the roles of multiple actors, a presentation was made on behalf of the State Secretary for development cooperation<sup>2</sup> on the positions of the Swedish government.

A representative of the CSO community then presented the results so far of the international Open Forum process (primarily the Istanbul Principles), and the conclusions from the first day of the national consultation workshop (the agreement on national implementation of the Istanbul principles, principles for CSOs as donors, draft recommendations on enabling conditions) and the process forward toward HLF-4 in Busan. This was followed by a panel discussion between representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA), Sida and the CSOs.

The afternoon session started with a panel discussion with representatives of four Members of Parliament, who all represent different parties in the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The contributions and views expressed by MoFA, Sida and the MPs are summarised in section 5.

After a brief introduction to the issue of enabling conditions for CSO development effectiveness, participants then split into groups for discussions on what such conditions imply in the Swedish context. While the outcomes of these group discussions were not reported back to the plenary, the main points have been synthesised and integrated into the presentation in sections 3 and 4.3 below. These discussions will be followed up in a continued dialogue between Swedish CSOs and other development actors.

In parallel to the group discussions on enabling conditions, a group of 20 CSO representatives discussed how to carry the process forward after the national consultation workshop. The results of these discussions were presented to the plenary in the closing session. The main points are summarised in section 5 below.

---

<sup>2</sup> Helen Eduards from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA) replaced State Secretary Joakim Stymne, who was unable to attend as planned. Helen Eduards is Head of Department for Management and Methods in Development Cooperation at the MoFA



### 3. Key issues discussed

Due to the time constraints of a 2-day consultation, issues that relate primarily to the principles for CSO development effectiveness were only discussed by the CSOs themselves, as well as during the panel debates with MoFA/Sida representatives and parliamentarians. The multi-stakeholder group discussions focused on issues that primarily relate to an enabling environment for CSOs.

CSO development effectiveness was discussed on the basis of the principles adopted by the Open Forum General Assembly in Istanbul in September, as well as the discussions during the preparatory workshop for the Swedish national consultation. The Istanbul principles were seen to enhance and support the CSOs' own values and integrity as development actors in their own right.

The value of having these principles to adhere to was emphasised especially in a context where the role and added value of Swedish CSOs as partners within the development sector is increasingly being questioned, and where the actors who most effectively "deliver aid" are prioritised by back-donors on the basis of their understanding of aid effectiveness.

In line with the recognition by the Open Forum of the need for interpretation and adaptation of the Istanbul principles to national contexts and realities, the discussion mainly focussed on the implications of the principles to Swedish CSOs (including Swedish chapters of international organisations). Given that the roles of Swedish development NGOs include a role as donors (of funds obtained both from private and public sources), a part of the discussions was devoted to the need for elaboration and addition of principles and guidelines that specifically address this.

Many of the issues that were discussed during the consultation related to different dimensions of CSO development effectiveness: both to the principles that CSOs themselves identify to guide their work in their different roles, and to the condition that other development actors need to ensure are in place to enable CSOs to be effective. These dimensions are closely interlinked: for example, appropriate and enabling government policies make it easier for Swedish CSOs to be good donors and provide better conditions for partner CSOs to be effective as agents for development. This forms the foundation for partnerships that enable development effectiveness.

In this chapter these different dimensions of each issue are not always separated. The recommendations that the consultation workshop endorsed (see section 4 below) are, however, addressed to each of the actors in their specific roles.

Views that were expressed by non-CSO participants in their presentations and in the panel discussions are highlighted in section 5. However, it is not possible to identify contributions made by non-CSO participants, in the group discussions.

The following section is a summary of the group discussions on the interpretation and applicability of the Istanbul principles.

## **Political recognition and collaboration with a diversified CSO community**

The Accra Agenda for Action recognises civil society as important development actors in their own right, and states make a commitment to deepen their collaboration and engage with civil society in open and inclusive dialogues on development policies.

Swedish civil society is diversified, and organisations are playing multiple roles – not only as donors to and partners with CSOs in the South and the East, but also in mobilising public engagement, promoting innovation and development of ideas and approaches, and as informed dialogue partners, watchdogs and advocates in relation to the state and the market. In these roles CSOs monitor not only the aid policy development and implementation by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the aid agencies but also – in line with the commitments of the Swedish Policy for Global Development and the EU's coherence policy – the contribution of to development and poverty reduction of policies in all other subject areas. The responsibility of the state to regulate markets was specifically mentioned in this context.

Participants emphasised that in order to maximise the contribution to aid effectiveness and quality, the dialogue between CSOs and Sida/MoFA must be open and structured, with the role of each actor well defined and recognised. Swedish CSOs possess significant knowledge and experience, and also provide links to the knowledge and experiences from CSOs in the South and the East. An open and transparent dialogue with CSOs also strengthens democracy and ownership of Swedish policy.

Participants identified a need for more dialogue on the modalities for Sida's support to Swedish CSOs, such as procedural requirements on auditing and reporting. This was seen as important for maintaining a climate of mutual trust not only between MoFA/Sida and Swedish CSOs, but also between Swedish CSOs and their partners in the South and East.

## **Alignment and harmonisation**

In the past few years, Swedish CSOs have been experiencing an escalation of new requirements and demands from back-donors. While they understand that stricter requirements and controls can sometimes help improve the quality of aid and the results it produces, they can also see how inappropriate design and/or application of such requirements risk undermining some aid efforts. Transparent and flexible frameworks and systems promote partnership and learning, and contribute to better development results. Swedish CSOs want to see a reasonable minimum standard for requirements, with more space for adaptation to the realities that CSOs operate in.

The multitude of different programmatic approaches, processes and administrative requirements of the institutional donors pose a major burden on the Southern and Eastern CSOs that receive support from their Swedish CSOs counterparts. Swedish CSOs have the ambition to align their support to the strategies and administrative systems of their partner organisations. When this is not possible, they at least want to harmonise their requirements and – as appropriate, considering the diversity of civil society – their programmatic approach with other donors.

However, the extent to which CSOs are able to live up to these commitments depends, in part, on whether Sida and other back-donors are setting up reasonable requirements and harmonising requirements and procedures among themselves.

## **Support for grass-roots organisations and movements**

Many of the Swedish CSOs have a long tradition of member-based and democratic organisations and popular movements, and work with development partners with similar characteristics. Similar support is provided also by Swedish CSOs with a different background and structure.

Providing direct support to social movements and marginalised groups at the grass-root level is important, as it cannot be assumed that they can always be reached via other CSOs – civil society is also affected by hierarchic power structures and social inequalities.

As the Swedish Policy for Global Development emphasises the rights and perspectives of the poor, it is essential that the requirements that are applied on grants to Swedish CSOs allow them to work with and support such groups. But many Swedish CSOs are finding that the design and/or implementation of the requirements from their back-donors are making this increasingly difficult. The requirements are to some degree limiting the overall aim with support to CSO pluralism - set out in the Swedish Policy for Support to Civil Society in Development Countries within Swedish Development Cooperation.

## **Long-term commitment and funding**

Swedish CSOs give priority to building long-term partnerships for development, and aim to provide process-oriented, long-term resources for their partners in the South and the East. The preferred form of financing is through core support – whenever this is possible and appropriate, which is not always the case. Core financing strongly promotes ownership with the receiving organisation and ensures alignment with their own priorities and systems. Sufficient levels of core support have the added advantages of facilitating long-term development of organisations and their capacities, reducing the administrative burdens, and encouraging coordination between donors.

In order to live up to these commitments, Swedish CSOs depend on the provision of predictable donations and grants on terms that allow them to develop and maintain such partnerships and provide funding on the terms that are most suitable to the recipients. To this end, Swedish CSOs would come to an agreement with Sida and MoFA principles on long-term financing for their partners, based on management and reporting at a comprehensive level

## **Division of responsibilities in risk management**

Risk and risk management were discussed from several different perspectives, and consensus was reached on the need for common understanding, learning and shared responsibility with regard to the risks that are associated with CSO development cooperation.

Development cooperation will always be associated with risks, and much of the most urgent work is to be found in areas and contexts – such as countries in situations of conflict and with weak institutions – where the levels of risk may be very high.

It was noted that stronger local ownership of programmes may in some cases lead to increased levels of risk. Implementation of the principle of democratic ownership, as it is expressed in the AAA, implies that these risks need to be accepted, but also underscores the importance of transparency and the democratic participation of civil society in all aspects of development policy. Specifically with regard to risk, civil society plays an essential role in monitoring programmes and budget processes and in holding governments to account.

Members and constituencies have the same role in relation to the CSOs that manage development funds.

One group highlighted the need to be more explicit in showing the linkages between management of risks and partnerships built on trust and mutual accountability, arguing that true partnership is the most effective way of counteracting and reducing risks. Such partnerships ensure transparency and foster an environment that is supportive to discussing risks, to developing strategies to minimise them, and to taking action whenever problems occur.

It was concluded that risks need to be mutually acknowledged and addressed, and the roles and responsibilities in managing risks must be clearly defined within all partnerships – be it between CSOs and Sida, or between Swedish CSOs and their CSO partners. This common responsibility also includes sharing of the consequences in cases where risks materialise and result in failures or losses.

### **Sharing of knowledge, mutual learning and reporting**

Concern was expressed that reduced levels of funding for information, learning and sharing may undermine these efforts and pose a threat to the quality of aid as well as the relationships between Swedish CSOs and their partners. There was also concern over increasingly prescriptive reporting requirements that are not always well adapted to the character and objectives of the programs that CSOs are conducting, or suitable for capturing their results.

The Swedish CSOs emphasise the importance of learning and sharing of knowledge in order to achieve development effectiveness. Many of them have their own roots in a tradition of popular movements, with a strong emphasis on popular teaching, development education, solidarity and mobilisation on international issues. There is a strong belief that a high level of awareness and engagement among the Swedish public is essential for upholding a quality of development cooperation that can contribute to sustainable change.

CSOs participating in the consultation seek to monitor and communicate results of the programs they support together with their partner organisations. Proper analysis, evaluation and assessment of results require a high degree of understanding of the context in which programmes are implemented, as well as of the objectives and roles of the CSOs that are involved. Change can often be slow and non-linear, and the results are not always easy to quantify. Rights-based programmes may require a different understanding of results and other methods of assessment than traditional aid programs. Developing and applying such tools should be a joint undertaking between all development partners.

The reporting from programs that are partly funded with grants from the back-donors of Swedish CSOs is usually required to conform to the instructions and formats that these donors define. The CSOs would like to see reporting requirements that are more flexible in relation to the specific circumstances of each development intervention, and allow for a deeper analysis of long-term and complex development results. It was suggested that the assessment and reporting of results should be the subject for a continuous and structured dialogue between Sida/MoFA and the CSOs.

### **Transparency and mutual accountability of CSOs**

Swedish CSOs agree that in their roles as donors, they must uphold a commitment to transparency and accountability vis-à-vis their partners in the South and East. The objectives

and strategies of each organisation, as well as the criteria against which partners are selected and funding is allocated, should be known to all partners. The parties of a partnership should jointly reflect on power relations.

The issue of representativity and legitimacy of the organisations was also discussed. Democratic structures and values, as well as strong ties and accountability to constituencies, were proposed as parameters that contribute to the legitimacy of CSOs.

## **National adaptation and adjustments of the Istanbul Principles**

In addition to issues discussed above, participants in the Swedish consultation process identified a number of specific points where they felt that there was a need for clarification of the Istanbul Principles, or where they were found to not sufficiently capture the understanding of certain issues within the Swedish CSO community. The discussions and suggestions revolved around the following main points:

### **→Relations between rights holders and duty bearers**

It was suggested that the language on rights could be strengthened by acknowledging and emphasising individuals as rights holders, and by also spelling out the responsibilities of duty bearers to defend, respect and promote human rights. It was also suggested that stigmatising language, such as labelling people as “marginalised” and “poor”, should be avoided.

### **→Economic justice for poverty eradication**

With reference to the first Istanbul principle, a proposal was made to add economic justice to the list of rights that CSOs need to promote.

### **→Mainstreaming of the principle of non-discrimination**

It was suggested that the non-discrimination perspective needs to be strengthened and applied in relation to all the Istanbul principles as part of a rights based approach. All different grounds for discrimination – age, disability, sexual identity, sex, ethnicity or other factors – need to be understood. CSOs need to address not only discriminatory practises, but also the root causes of discrimination – such as oppressive power relationships – in all programming.

### **→Clarifications on gender equity and equality**

The second Istanbul principle, which issues of gender and the rights of women and girls, was seen to provide too limited perspectives on these issues. Gender inequality, as well as problems related sexual identities and sexuality, need to be understood and addressed as in the context of power relations. The need to work on gender issues and attitudes with men and boys should also be made explicit. Harmful practices need to be challenged, but within a culturally sensitive framework.

### **→Climate and the right to sustainable development**

In the fourth principle, on sustainable development, participants wanted to see more explicit mention of climate justice and the need to address all aspects of climate change (( from mitigation and adaptation to disaster risk prevention and management) ) from a right to development perspective.

The proposed amendments to, and interpretations of the Istanbul Principles are presented in section 4.1 below.

## **4. Commitments and recommendations**

The national consultation workshop resulted in agreement on three sets recommendations and commitments as the basis for a collective effort to enhance the development effectiveness of Swedish CSOs.

- A national interpretation and adaptation of the Istanbul Principles
- Proposed additional principles for CSOs in their roles as donors
- Recommendations on enabling conditions

Relevant parts of these agreements will also be communicated and advocated for in the continued dialogues within international Open Forum process and other relevant fora.

### **4.1 National interpretation and adaptation of the Istanbul Principles**

The CSOs that participated in the Swedish national consultation workshop endorsed the Istanbul CSO Development Effectiveness Principles, and committed to implementing them with the following additions, clarifications and interpretations:

#### **The Preamble**

The preamble should express recognition of the multiple roles of civil society as development actors, including as an innovative force for ideas, mobiliser, informed dialogue partner and watchdog in relation to the state and the market.

The principle of non-discrimination is universal and applicable in the interpretation and implementation of all other principles.

#### **Principles**

##### **1. Respect and promote human rights and social justice**

Add that CSOs are effective as development actors when they:

- promote economic justice for poverty eradication
- strengthen rights holders and hold duty bearers accountable
- promote responsibility of the state to regulate markets
- promote sustainable development

##### **2. Embody gender equality and equity while promoting women and girl's rights**

Add that CSOs are effective as development actors when they:

- address the role of power relationships for gender equity and equality, and in relation to sexual and gender identities (including lesbian/gay/bisexual/transsexual rights)
- mainstream gender into all activities, and also work specifically with men and boys on gender issues

### **3. Focus on people's empowerment, democratic ownership and participation**

Add that CSOs are effective as development actors when they:

- address coherence between different policy areas to ensure development and poverty eradication (as expressed in the Swedish Policy for Global Development and the EU:s Policy Coherence for Development commitment)

### **4. Promote Environmental Sustainability**

Add that CSOs are effective as development actors when they:

- promote climate justice, and address all climate change issues ( from mitigation and adaptation to disaster risk prevention and management) from a right to development perspective

### **5. Practice transparency and accountability**

This principle should include an explicit commitment to making efficient use of available resources and implementing policies against corruption.

### **6. Pursue equitable partnerships and solidarity**

Add that CSOs are effective as development actors when they:

- practice shared responsibility, based on mutual trust and accountability, for risk, risk management and responses to failures and losses
- respect the ownership of programs by the implementing partner
- recognise and openly discuss power relations in the partnership

### **7. Create and share knowledge and commit to mutual learning**

Add that CSOs are effective as development actors when they:

- address capacity development and organisational development needs among all partners (also in the North)
- respect and promote the tradition of popular movements, popular teaching, development education, and mobilisation for international solidarity.

### **8. Commit to realizing sustainable change**

Add that CSOs are effective as development actors when they:

- base their work on long-term commitments to partnerships and beneficiaries
- ensure that the use of resources is effective and in contributing to development results
- ensure that results and effects are properly shared and reported

## **4.2 Additional principles for CSOs in their roles as donors**

The Swedish national consultation workshop endorsed the following three additional principles referring to CSOs in their roles as donors. These will guide the work of Swedish

CSOs, and are proposed to complement the Istanbul Principles as guidance for all CSOs that provide funding for partners in developing countries.

❖ **We commit to alignment and harmonisation parting from each and every partner organisation's specific conditions**

When possible we commit, in our role as a donor, to align with partner organisations' strategies and administrative systems. When this is not possible, we commit to harmonise our administrative requirements and, where desirable, harmonise our programmatic approach with other donors. We will also set clear limits ensuring reasonable requirements that are in line with the civil society's diversity and uniqueness.

❖ **We commit to process-oriented, long-term funding**

We commit to, as much as possible, provide process-oriented, long-term resources for our partners' operations, capacities and organisational development including monitoring and risk management.

❖ **We commit to the principles of transparency and mutual accountability as a donor**

We commit to transparency, which means that we monitor and communicate results together with our partner organisations. Our partner organisations should perceive our objectives, strategies and criteria on which we base selection of partners and funding as clear and transparent. We commit to the principle of mutual accountability, which means that we will openly reflect on power relations, challenge ourselves as donors as well as our legitimacy and be open for criticism from partners and others.

These principles are shared with other Northern and international CSOs and the Open Forum at the international level, for consideration in the further discussions leading up to the second Global Assembly and HLF-4 in Busan in November 2011.

## **4.3 Recommendations on enabling conditions**

The national consultation workshop endorsed the following seven recommendations, which identify conditions that the Swedish CSOs believe are essential conditions that will enable them to be effective as development actors. The recommendations are primarily addressed to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Sida, but may also be relevant to other agencies and institutions. The recommendations will guide Swedish CSOs in their further dialogue with these development actors.

The Swedish CSO community requests that other development actors provide, ensure or promote (as applicable):

### **1. Political recognition and collaboration**

- Political recognition of the value of collaboration and an open dialogue with a diversified Swedish civil society, where the roles of each actor is well defined

### **2. Transparent processes and a structured dialogue** between MoFA/Sida, other donors and civil society actors on:



- Politics and policies for development, so that our knowledge and experiences are taken advantage of.
- Procedural requirements on issues such as on auditing and reporting

### **3. Division of labour and risk management**

- Common understanding, learning and shared responsibility with regard to the risks that are associated with CSO development cooperation

### **4. Long-term funding**

- Implementation of agreed principles on long-term financing, based on management and reporting at a comprehensive level

### **5. Alignment and harmonisation**

- Back-donors harmonise among themselves and apply reasonable requirements that allow us to align with the strategies and administrative procedures of our partner organisations, or to harmonise with other donors

### **6. Reporting of development results**

- Dialogues on results should contribute to an efficient use of resources, mutual learning and change.

### **7. Support for grass-roots organisations and movements**

- Based on the Policy for Global Development<sup>3</sup> – in particular its emphasis on the perspectives of the poor – and on the government's policy for support to civil society within development cooperation<sup>4</sup>, back-donors will apply reasonable requirements that allow us to work with and support – directly or through other local organisations – the organising of marginalised groups at the grass-root level.

---

<sup>3</sup> Sweden's policy for global development. <http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/3102/a/18434>

<sup>4</sup> Pluralism. Policy for Support to Civil Society in Developing Countries within Swedish International Development Cooperation. <http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/574/a/131360>

## 5. Dialogues with non-CSO participants

In the presentation on day 2, the State Secretary for Development Cooperation informed that in the run-up to Busan, Sweden will be focusing on three issues that it believes are necessary prerequisites for a successful implementation of other parts of the aid effectiveness agenda: transparency, accountability and a stronger focus on results. Sweden welcomes the decision by the WP-EFF to maintain a focus on implementation of the aid effectiveness commitments, rather than to broaden the agenda to development effectiveness.

It is the governments' view that the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) establish aid effectiveness principles that are relevant to all donors, including the Swedish CSOs. The recognition of civil society in the AAA also implies greater responsibility to pay continued attention to aid effectiveness within the broader context of development effectiveness. Sweden will continue to support the participation of civil society organisations in the aid effectiveness discussion, has taken the lead on these issues in the donors' group.

The Government's new policy for support to civil society in developing countries<sup>5</sup> emphasises pluralism and diversity, a strong focus on poverty and rights-based approaches. Sweden wants to see a better harmonisation among donors of the aims and modalities for support to civil society and give priority to providing core support for CSOs. The systems for support should be transparent and coherent.

The Istanbul principles, as well as the interpretations and additions made by the Swedish CSO consultation, were very well received by representatives of the Swedish MoFA and Sida. In the panel discussion MoFA commented that in their view the Istanbul principles did not sufficiently mirror the principles and commitments of the Paris Declaration, but that this gap had been closed through the development of additional principles for Swedish CSOs as donors. The new principles also mirrored the priorities of the Swedish government for Busan.

Sida noted that although the Open Forum General Assembly had started to sort out the implications of the Istanbul principles for the different roles played by CSOs, the Swedish consultation had taken the discussions on CSOs as donors forward in a constructive manner. Sida suggested that it would be important for Swedish CSOs to promote their views on gender in the continued international discussion on the Istanbul principles.

MoFA expressed appreciation of the proposed recommendations on an enabling environment for CSO development effectiveness. Sida informed that the message for Busan from the Task Team on Civil Society Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment, which Sweden is heading, will be emphasising the importance of broad-based democratic ownership and proposals on an enabling environment for CSOs. With regard to alignment and harmonisation, the Task Team is analysing at the requirements and demands donors put on CSOs and how they are carried forward, as a basis for developing principles for harmonisation. Sida wants to encourage more peer review of the practices of individual donors. MoFA challenged the Swedish CSOs to use the government's CSO policy against it if they feel that the government is failing on harmonisation.

In the panel debate between members of the parliamentary Foreign Affairs Committee, the MPs from the four parties that participated (Centre Party and Christian Democrats

---

<sup>5</sup> [Pluralism. Policy for Sweden's support to civil society in developing countries within Swedish development cooperation](#). 10 september 2009.

representing the ruling Alliance, and the opposition Green and Left Parties) all agreed on the importance of CSOs in development cooperation.

Both Alliance parties support an increase in the share of ODA that goes to CSOs. The Christian Democrats also propose that donations to CSO aid programs should be made tax deductible. The Alliance parties also stressed the role of the private sector for development, and highlighted recent Government initiatives to engage private corporations in development cooperation. The Centre Party representative explicitly welcomed the proposed seven recommendations on an enabling environment for CSOs.

The opposition parties suggested that the work of CSOs could be better supported by:

- taking better advantage of the competence and experiences of CSOs, i.e. by restoring the level of grants for their information work in Sweden, engaging in structured dialogue processes and inviting CSO representatives to be members of Government delegations to more international meetings
- guaranteeing access to predictable long-term funding
- adapting requirements and procedures to the different realities and conditions that CSOs work in, and the needs of small organisations in particular.

## 6. Next steps

On the basis of discussions in a group of 20 CSO representatives, the meeting agreed on the following main points for carrying the consultation process and dialogue between development actors forward:

- The steering group that coordinated the preparations for the national consultation process was given a refreshed mandate to continue and facilitate the dialogue and contacts with Sida, MoFA and MPs in the Foreign Affairs Committee, as well as with the Open Forum process at the European and global levels. Some members of the group will need to be replaced, due to other commitments, and the group may also be expanded. All participating CSOs were invited to propose suitable persons to CONCORD-Sweden.
- A follow up meeting to the national Open Forum consultation will be organised in February or March. One of the aims will be to discuss further the Swedish contributions to the European Open Forum meeting that is scheduled for the spring of 2010, and to the second Open Forum Global Assembly in June 2011.

Additional points that came out of the discussions among the 20 CSOs were:

- All Swedish development CSOs are encouraged to continue to engage actively in the process.
- The group of Directors of Swedish framework organisations<sup>6</sup>, as well as the CSO Controller's and method and evaluation networks, need to actively engage with and provide support to the Steering Committee
- A time-table will be developed as a basis for further planning towards Busan. for the work. Some key events to be considered are the OF European meeting and the second Global Assembly.
- The Swedish Coherence Policy, Policy for Global Development should be promoted as a good example in the Open Forum discussions

Forms for evaluating the national consultation process have been distributed to all participants in the national workshop together with this report. The results will be presented in a separate document.

---

<sup>6</sup> Larger CSOs that receive grants directly from Sida, as opposed to smaller organisations that receive theirs through Forum Syd or other platforms.

## **ANNEXES**

**ANNEX 1: Agenda for the consultation**

**ANNEX 2: List of Presentations**

**ANNEX 3: List of Participants**

## ANNEX 1: Agenda for the consultation



### Agenda for the Swedish Consultation

**17-18 November 2010**

**Venue: Brygghuset, Stockholm**

#### **17 November**

**9:00-9:30 The Open Forum process globally and in Sweden**

Presentation of the international process

*Franz Berger, CONCORD Europe*

**9:30-10:00 Civil society development effectiveness**

Presentation of the Swedish Open Forum process and the objectives of the consultation

*Eva Ekelund, Church of Sweden*

**10:00-12:00 Principles for effectiveness of Swedish civil society as actors, donors and channels of aid**

Group discussions

**12:00-13:00 Lunch**

**13:00-15:30 Enabling conditions for civil society development effectiveness**

Group discussions

**15:30-16:30 Summary of principles and enabling conditions**

Presentations from the groups

Discussions and agreements on principles and recommendations

**16:30-17:00 The process forward at the international level**

Summary of the day and the way forward

*Franz Berger, CONCORD Europe*

**18 November**

**9:00-09:15 The Open Forum process globally and in Sweden**

Presentation of the international process, with a focus on the role of multiple actors

*Franz Berger, CONCORD Europe*

**9:15-9:45 Development effectiveness and the role of civil society in effective development cooperation**

*Joakim Stymne, State Secretary to the Minister for Development Cooperation (presented by Helen Eduards, Head of the Department for Management and Methods in Development Cooperation)*

**10:00-12:00 Development effectiveness, enabling conditions and enhanced interaction among actors**

Presentation of conclusions from Day 1

Panel discussion and dialogue on principles for CSO development effectiveness as actors, donors and channels of aid; and on enabling conditions

*Tomas Brundin and Per-Ola Mattsson (Ministry of Foreign Affairs), Lena Ingelstam (Sida), Ulrika Modéer (Diakonia)*

**13:00-14:00 Panel discussion with parliamentarians:**

**Enabling conditions for CSO development effectiveness and the roles of other actors**

Bodil Ceballos (Green Party), Staffan Danielsson (Centre Party), Robert Halef (Christian Democrats), Hans Linde (Left Party)

**14:00-15:30 Enabling conditions for Swedish CSO development effectiveness and the roles of other actors**

Introduction

*Franz Berger, CONCORD Europe*

Group discussions (including one group discussion on Next steps)

**15:30-16:30 Next steps**

Summary of group discussion and conclusions by the Steering Group

Brief presentation on BetterAid and Open Forum

## **ANNEX 2: List of Presentations**

### **17 November**

#### **1. Presentation of the international process.**

*Franz Berger, CONCORD Europe*

#### **2. Presentation of the Swedish Open Forum process and the objectives of the consultation.**

*Eva Ekelund, Church of Sweden. (In Swedish)*

### **18 November**

#### **3. The Open Forum process globally and in Sweden.**

*Franz Berger, CONCORD Europe*

#### **4. Development effectiveness and the role of civil society in effective development cooperation.**

*Joakim Stymne, State Secretary to the Minister for Development Cooperation. Presented by Helen Eduards, Deputy Director-General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (In Swedish)*

#### **5. Development Effectiveness according to the Swedes.**

*Ulrika Modéer, Diakonia. (Parts of the presentation in Swedish)*

**Electronic copies of the presentations are available from [info@concord.se](mailto:info@concord.se)**



## **ANNEX 3: List of Participants**

### **LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

#### **Open Forum National Consultation workshop**

#### **Stockholm, Sweden, 17-18 November 2010**

Persons marked \* only participated during the second day of the consultation

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
1. Ulrik Jennische	Afrikagruppna
2. Anders Ahlqvist	Afrikagruppna
3. Berit Wiklund	Afrikagruppna
4. Jenny Nilsson	Afrikagruppna
5. Hélène Boëthius	ALEF
6. Petra Flaum*	Baseline consulting
7. Cecilia Karlsson	BLLF
8. Ilyas Khan	BLLF
9. Franz Berger	CONCORD Europa
10. Peter Sörbom	CONCORD Sverige
11. Andrea Petitt	CONCORD Sverige
12. Magnus Falklöf	CONCORD Sverige
13. Karin Haglind	CONCORD Sverige
14. Göran Eklöf	Context
15. Dorrit Alopaeus-Ståhl	Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation
16. Tom Alberts*	Devpro AB
17. Petra Zäther Strader	Diakonia
18. Cecilia Ängelid	Diakonia
19. Annika Andersson	Diakonia
20. Ulrika Modeer	Diakonia
21. Erik Nilsson	Diakonia
22. Eva Åberg	Diakonia
23. Krister Korsgård	Diakonia
24. Joel Ahlberg*	Folke Bernadotte Akademin
25. Annica Sohlström	Forum Syd
26. Annika Holmberg	Forum Syd
27. Inger Björk	Forum Syd

28. Keiko Nagano	Forum Syd
29. Elisabet Brandberg	Forum Syd
30. Maud Johansson	Forum Syd
31. Krister Holm	IBON
32. Karin Svedberg*	Ideell Arena
33. Sara Fallström	Individuell människohjälp
34. Bo Paulsson	Individuell människohjälp
35. Thomas Ericsson	Individuell människohjälp
36. Noemi Ferrando Meneses	Inincate
37. Helen Richard	IOGT-NTO
38. Malin Wallin	Kooperation utan gränser
39. Viveka Carlestam	Kooperation utan gränser
40. Katarina Vlachos	Kvinna till kvinna
41. Barbro Ullberg Gardell	LO Gotland
42. Christer Wälinara	LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd
43. Eva Hjul	LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd
44. Patrik Bergvall	LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd
45. Lena Kjellberg	LSU
46. Göran Ek	Naturskyddsföreningen
47. Sandra Hallström	Naturskyddsföreningen
48. Olle Burell	Palmecenter
49. Anna Sundström	Palmecenter
50. Magdalena Agrell	Palmecenter
51. Madeleine Goni	Palmecenter
52. Elsa Anderman	Palmecenter
53. Rosie Grenklo	Plan Sverige
54. Annika Malmborg	Plan Sverige
55. Mia Heelas Haglund	Plan Sverige
56. Lisa Sjöblom	Plan Sverige
57. Cecilia Severin	PMU InterLife
58. Kati Hirvonen	PMU InterLife
59. Niclas Lindgren	PMU InterLife
60. Mikael Jägerskog	PMU InterLife
61. Sven-Olof Möller	PMU InterLife
62. Martin Kihlström*	Postkodstiftelsen
63. Mia Wiklund	RFSU
64. Julia Schalk	RFSU
65. Pia Engstrand	RFSU
66. Karin Nilsson	RFSU
67. Hans Linde*	Riksdagen
68. Staffan Danielsson*	Riksdagen

69. Robert Halef*	Riksdagen
70. Bodil Ceballos*	Riksdagen
71. Vibeke Jørgensen	Rädda Barnen
72. Tove Strömberg	Rädda Barnen
73. Jesper Wiklund	Rädda Barnen
74. Monica Billgren	Shia
75. Fredrik Stockhaus	Shia
76. Roland Håkansson	Shia
77. Dag Jonzon*	Sida
78. Alex Muigai*	Sida
79. Petra Burcher*	Sida
80. Lisa Hällström*	Sida
81. Lena Ingelstam*	Sida
82. Magdalena Flemström*	Sida
83. Mattias Jonsjö*	Sida
84. Karin Fallman*	Sida
85. Tonya Lilburn	SOS barnbyar
86. Gunvor Ngarambe	Stockholms FN-förening
87. Tomas Eriksson*	Student
89. Eva Hägerstrand	Svalorna Indien Bangladesh
90. Adriana Holmberg Milea	Svalorna Indien Bangladesh
91. Monica Erwér	Svalorna Indien Bangladesh
92. Maja Permerup	Svalorna Latinamerika
93. Christer Ormalm	Svenska Afghanistankommittén
94. Jonas Wikström	Svenska FN förbundet
95. Jens Petersson	Svenska FN förbundet
96. Carl-Henrik Jacobsson	Svenska kyrkan
97. Eva Ekelund	Svenska kyrkan
98. Birgitta Rosén	Svenska kyrkan
100. Els-Marie Carlbäcker	Svenska missionskyrkan
101. Eva Christina Nilsson	Svenska missionsrådet
102. Anders Malmstigen	Svenska missionsrådet
103. Viktoria Isaksson	Svenska missionsrådet
104. Lena Boberg	Svenska missionsrådet
105. Christine Söderberg	Svenska missionsrådet
106. Katarina Eriksson*	Tetrapak
107. Tomas Brundin*	UD
108. Per-Ola Mattsson*	UD
109. Helen Eduards*	UD
110. Mia Melin*	Uppsala Universitet