

CSO Partnership 
for **Development Effectiveness**

eBULLETIN

The CSO Partnership is an open platform that unites CSO voices from around the world on the issue of development effectiveness.

CONTENTS MAY-JUNE 2016

- 1 Global Secretariat: UEDC
- 2 Global Secretariat:
All Secretariats' Meeting
- 3 Migration, Diasporas,
and Development
Cooperation
- 4 Update from FfD-IBON
- 5 Stories from the Regions
- 6 Stories from the Sectors
- 7 Community eBulletin

1

CPDE hosts lab session on Universalising Effective Development Cooperation at the EDD

Global Secretariat

For more information, please contact secretariat@csopartnership.org

Universalising EDC

Universalising Effective Development Cooperation (uEDC) was the theme of CPDE's brainstorming lab session at the 2016 European Development Days in Brussels, Belgium last June 16. uEDC is the framework which seeks to make global policies on development cooperation bear fruit for the people at the ground, while ensuring that people's issues and ground realities will be reflected and influential in crafting global policies. It also speaks of partnerships that ensure the delivery of results. The partnership, which is based on participatory methods on partnership and democratic ownership, exercises mutual accountability to be effective partners and become accountable to the people for the results. uEDC strengthens the call for all development actors such as governments, CSOs and others, who want to act on behalf of the people, to be accountable to the people and society for the results of their actions. The framework also reminds development actors to fulfill and empower the poor and the marginalised to claim their rights.

The uEDC framework is based on the four principles of: (1) democratic country ownership; (2) focus on development results; (3) inclusive development partnerships, and; (4) transparency and mutual accountability, consistent with other agreed international commitments on human rights, decent work, gender equality, environmental sustainability and disability. These are the cornerstones of the Busan Partnership Document, the outcome document of the Fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan in 2011.

In particular, uEDC is envisioned to tackle critical issues such as making stakeholders accountable for the commitments they made since Accra, Paris, and Busan as well as aspiring to alleviate the negative impacts of (1) weakening role of states as duty bearers; (2) shrinking space for civil society organisations (CSOs), and; (3) unregulated role of private sector in development cooperation.



Along with Chris Burns from Burnstorm Communications as the moderator, CPDE invited 5 panel speakers from different development stakeholders to stress the need for development partners to fulfil their commitments, and ensure that their development cooperation will translate to results that promote genuine development.

Session 1, titled “Unfinished Business”, was led by Tetet Lauron, CPDE Co-chair, and Rosalinda Bento Pais of the European Commission (EC). The session was drawn heavily on how the unfinished work from Paris to Busan can relate to Agenda 2030, and how the experiences of people and stakeholders of all forms of development cooperation can contribute in enriching discussions around uEDC. Tetet mentioned the backtracking a number of donor countries on their commitments to provide official development assistance (ODA) to developing countries, while Rosario noted the difficulty of enforcing accountability and dealing with changing governments. Both speakers gave country experiences on how development cooperation, when used positively or negatively, impacts people at the ground. Tetet, who comes from the Philippines, shares how ODA given to her country was used to fuel development aggression against the people. In some provinces in the Philippines, development projects clad in ODA and private investments result to plunder of resources and displacement of indigenous peoples and peasants.

Session 2, which focused on “Evolving Trends,” explored the impacts of EDC to Agenda 2030 and addressing peoples’ realities. Joan Lanfranco of the International Trade Union Confederation discussed the role of civil society, including trade union groups, as liaison between development projects and local groups. Cornelius Hacking from Task Team on CSO Development Effectiveness and Enabling Environment mentioned (1) how it was only in Busan in 2011 that the role of civil society as independent development actors was emphasised; (2) that enabling environment recognises the importance of CSOs in contributing to development, and; (3) EDC starts with an enabling environment and universalising it means it has to be part of the Agenda 2030, including being part of the indicator framework. Pedro Guzman from the People’s Coalition on Food Sovereignty highlighted the importance of South-South cooperation and triangular cooperation in (1) providing creative capacity for developing countries to find solutions to their development problems; (2) achieving the 2030 Development Agenda, and; (3) ultimately reinforcing international cooperation for development.

Panel discussions emphasised the idea that development cooperation can only be effective when there is an enabling environment and inclusive development which foster accountability and transparency of all actors involved. Universalising EDC means that everyone has to work together in making it felt at the country and global level, starting with including it in the 2030 Agenda.

Aside from the lab session, CPDE also organised a village stand named “Making Development Cooperation Work for the People.” The stand was used to promote CPDE’s current work on uEDC, and soft launch the CSO Accountability Test (CAT). The CAT was a project of the CPDE, under the WG on CSO Development Effectiveness (CSO DE), to serve as a self-assessment tool for CSOs to measure their own implementation of the Istanbul Principles on CSO DE.

CPDE at the EDD



CPDE units' coordinators and focal points gather for the pilot

All Secretariats' Meeting

For more information, contact
membership@csopartnership.org

Members of the CPDE Coordination Committee (CC) gathered in The Hague, Netherlands for the 9th CC meeting on 20-22 June 2016. The said CC meeting was important in finalising the CPDE's Strategic Planning process, agreeing on the platform's advocacy priorities, and continuing CPDE preparations for the Second High Level Meeting of the GPEDC. Aside from CC members, also present in the meeting were regional coordinators, working group leads and members of the CPDE HLM2 Core Group.

Pilot ASM held

For the first time, coordinators and focal points of CPDE Regions, Sectors and Working Groups gathered in Den Haag, The Netherlands for the CPDE All Secretariats Meeting (ASM) on 22-24 June 2016. The said meeting was facilitated by members of the Global Secretariat (GS) to have detailed discussion on the successes, good practices, and learning, as well as challenges faced in implementing CPDE programmes among and within constituencies.

Discussions during the ASM were divided into the different CPDE work streams, with inputs from responsible GS staff members and complementary break-out sessions to gather actual experiences and recommendations from the implementing units. The session on CPDE programmes, led by CPDE EC Programme Manager Amy Padilla, was important in answering the particularities and complementarities of the EC-SIDA Action and MDP. In particular, the session was useful in addressing concerns on constituency planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting for the two programmes.

The succeeding discussion on policy and advocacy led by Farida Bena and Stephen Tan, CPDE Policy and Advocacy Officers, attempted to clarify 'Universalising Effective Development Cooperation' by providing a working definition of the framework. This definition was debated and further elaborated by the units in relation to the actual work of their constituencies. In an effort to systematise the platform's communications work, the session on the CPDE Communications Component was utilised to review the different CPDE communications initiatives at different levels, and solicit recommendations from the units.

The discussion on CPDE protocols, membership engagement and outreach reviewed the platform protocols in light of the Strategic Planning process. Jodel Dacara, CPDE Membership Engagement Officer, presented identified gaps and challenges in constituency-level coordination, as identified by the Global Secretariat, vis-à-

vis the protocols and actual implementation. Outcomes during the break-out session were recommendations for strengthening membership engagement, participation, and inclusion. Eden Gallardo, CPDE Capacity Development Officer, presented on the CPDE capacity development initiatives under the EC-SIDA Action which were divided for Regions and Sectors. The break-out session was used to flesh out details of the said initiatives, and solicit preliminary ideas for implementation.

Last session was a discussion on Programme Performance Management and Compliance. Roberto Pinauin, CPDE Programme Manager, led the discussion seeking to level off on the targets of the two parallel programmes by comparing the EC-SIDA Action and MDP. He presented progress on the platform's work through the Performance Management Framework and the CPDE Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Cycle. Roberto clearly pointed the challenges met by the platform, esp in reporting, and solicited recommendations and commitments from the different implementing units that these issues will be resolved by this year.

The meeting ended on a high note with recommendations to make the platform work more efficiently. The Secretariats see the value of having sessions like this in the future to develop trust among each other, and enable collective work in attaining the platform's objectives.



Migration, Diasporas, and Development Cooperation

Contributed by the International Migrants Alliance and the Asia Pacific Mission for Migrants



Photo by International Business Times

People are on the move. But in most cases, moving en masse is caused by economic, environmental, political and social triggers impinging on their human rights, and putting them in a condition very much vulnerable to abuses, exploitation and worse, violations of their basic rights.

Currently, an estimated 250 million people live in a country outside of their country of birth. This is 3.4 percent of the world's population. Of all international migrants, 6 percent are refugees.

Commonly, migrants and diasporas (pertaining to the immigrant population) can be found in the more developed countries of North America, Europe and in Middle East particularly among the Gulf Cooperation Countries. Most of them come from the global South – countries that are mostly underdeveloped or are developing.

Estimates suggest that migration will continue to be in an upward path. Meanwhile, the lack of resolution of a number of conflicts around the world—including decisive actions to avert disasters stemming from slow-onset climate change – will also mean that refugees will continue to look for safer havens.

By their very nature, the plight of migrants, diaspora and refugees are multi-country concerns. It is about origin and destination, and even of transit; about causes of displacement and situation of the displaced; about return and conditions for safe and sustainable return, and; about their rights as citizens of the country where they are from and as people – many as workers – in the country where they live and work.

Relations of migration to official development assistance (ODA) largely remain as an unexplored theme. However, it is widely accepted that migration is caused by development problems in countries of origin.

**ODA and
migration**

In fact, the first UN High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development in 2006 reported that:

Participants felt that it was essential to address the root causes of international migration to ensure that people migrated out of choice rather than necessity. They observed that people often had to migrate because of poverty, conflict, human rights violations, poor governance or lack of employment.

(United Nations General Assembly or UNGA, 2006, p2, para # II.9)



If it is recognised as a necessity – due to lack of sufficient and sustained livelihood, access to social services, environmental dangers and risks, and a genuinely peaceful living – migration should then be a barometer for development. Based on steady increase in the number of international migrants (not even counting the refugees), steps have not been taken including leveraging of ODAs to curb forced migration and promote a movement of people that is of choice and an exercise of rights.

Some of the top ODA recipients in the world are also counted as some of the top origins of migrants including Afghanistan, India, Bangladesh, Turkey, Vietnam and Palestine (West Bank and Gaza). Major sources of migrants such as Philippines, Mexico and Indonesia also receive significant ODA from donors.

While aid alone will not resolve forced displacement, its possible use to mitigate such phenomenon is not fully utilised but, unfortunately, even distorted as ODAs are channelled to support programmes that reinforce the conditions of economic want that results to forced migration, or are not leveraged to defuse political conflicts creating armies of refugees.

Aid and Refugees

The “refugee crisis” in Europe has spurred the rise in ODAs according to the Organisation for Economic Development and Cooperation (OECD). In 2015, aid budget totalled \$131.6 billion dollars or a 6.9% increase from 2014.

It should be noted, however, that OECD member countries’ spending on refugee-related expenses has been considered as part of the ODA for the first year after the arrival of the refugees. OECD reported that if the \$12 billion spent to cope with the increase in refugees is removed from the total aid (ODA) budget increased merely by 1.7%.

As compared to 2014, money allotted for processing of refugees rose from 4.8% to 9.1% of aid budgets in 2015. While some OECD countries like Australia, South Korea and Luxembourg did not include refugee-related costs in their ODA, others like Austria, Greece, Italy, The Netherlands and Sweden saw 20% of their ODA allotted for refugee costs.

Although the allotment of funds for managing the influx of refugees is a commendable step, lumping such funds in the ODA should be a cause of concern as the artificial increase has actually not been earmarked for development projects in underdeveloped and developing countries that should include programmes that will mitigate the forced displacement of people as refugees from these countries.

Remittance of migrants and diasporas is the single biggest economic link between their countries of origin and countries of destination. Global remittances in 2015 has reached to US\$601 billion with over two-thirds going to developing countries. Remittance is projected to further increase in 2016 to US\$610 billion and to US\$636 billion in 2017.

Remittance is taking the centre stage in intergovernmental discussions on the relations of migration to development together with other economic links of migrants and diasporas to their home country such as visits, tourism, capital investments and community projects.

Amidst the excitement of governments over remittance – its sheer volume, resilience, upwards trend despite weakened economies of some countries, etc. – such discussions should not be made at the expense of providing enough space and formulating more concrete resolutions to address comprehensive human rights issues of migrants. More so, it is still the duty of governments to provide sustainable employment and industries, with liveable wage so as to curb the need of citizens to work abroad.

Development cooperation must also target resolution of conflicts, promotion of peace, and heightened border security.

Aid and Remittances

Migrants and diasporas are worth more than the remittances they send. They have issues and national contributions both to the country of origin and of destination beyond remittance and other finances they generate.

While the Agenda 2030 commits to some positive outcomes for migrants such as decent work, non-discrimination and gender equality, it is a source of concern that concrete indicators are more focused on remittance-related targets. Worse, such targets are subsumed under the goal relating to inequality between countries which can be interpreted to mean remittance-driven development.

Agenda 2030 – the global ambitions for a sustainable development – promises to “leave no one behind.” Let its promise bring forth a condition where no one is forced to leave at all.

Agenda of migrants and diaspora on development cooperation

In October 2015, representatives of global, regional and national organizations, with the support of the CSO Partnership on Development Effectiveness (CPDE) met in Istanbul, Turkey to initiate discussions on the place of migrants and diaspora in the development cooperation discourse.

While it is recognized that further discussions are needed especially with taking stock of the impacts of aid and development effectiveness to migrants on the ground, the workshop did provide valuable insights that should be further explored alongside developing the advocacy of migrants and diasporas on development issues.

For the International Migrants Alliance (IMA) and the Asia Pacific Mission for Migrants (APMM), to migrate is a fundamental human right and conditions that shall enable its practice should be enhanced. Migrants and diaspora have comprehensive human rights that should be upheld within the whole cycle of their migration – origin, transit, destination, and even return.

To this end, IMA and the APMM believe that: 1. Aids must be channeled to developing a condition without forced migration; 2. Participation of grassroots migrants and diasporas organizations to development policy formulation, implementation and review must be enabled; 3. Migration policies must be transformed from security-based and remittance-driven, to one based on human and labor rights, and; 4. Private sector facilitation of migration and service delivery must be regulated.

For the IMA and the APMM, to migrate is a fundamental human right and conditions that shall enable its practice should be enhanced.

For development cooperation to be truly effective, it must lead to lessening – if not elimination – of the causes of forced displacement including economic triggers, political conflicts, and climate change-induced migration. It must pave the way for a kind of migration that is based on human rights and enhances the potentials of migrants (and their families) as development actors both in the country where they live and work, and in their home country that they may opt to come back to.

As a sector, opportunities for migrants and diasporas to take part in development policy discussions, formulation, implementation and review have been very few. While internationally, there have been occasional openings for migrants and diasporas - especially from the grassroots - to engage governments, efforts to outreach to them in the national level are limited, if not nil.

In host countries, migrants and diasporas are excluded from official consultations and processes affecting their condition. This is even worse for temporary migrants whose political and civil rights are severely curtailed due to their immigration status. Governments of countries of origin have also not provided sufficient and sustained spaces for migrants and diasporas organizations to take an active part in policymaking for nation-building.

Through institutionalising a constituency of Migrants and Diasporas within the CSO Partnership on Development Effectiveness (CPDE), the IMA and the APMM are looking forward to the sector's broad and active participation in ensuring a development cooperation in all levels that addresses concerns of migrants and diasporas, and their relations to development concerns of other sectors.



CPDE breakout session on issue of migration and diasporas, Global Migrants and Diaspora Meeting on Rights and Development Effectiveness

Strengthening rural women's livelihood opportunities through empowerment in community land stewardship and accountability in agricultural investments in Ghana

Article by NETRIGHT¹

Introduction

Land is an important socio-economic asset for many people across the globe. It is essential in sustaining livelihoods and wealth generation. Its importance also shows in the fact that it gives security and voice to people who have it. However, women and men do not have the same degree of access, control and ownership to land despite belonging to same communities from which they derive their productive livelihoods.

Women play various roles in land development and natural resource management due to their involvement in agriculture, home gardening, food gathering or wood harvesting. Yet, they have been entangled in different forms of tenure insecurity, both as wives and in their relations with wider kin. In addition, women and other vulnerable groups are frequently excluded from day-to-day land administration and governance at all levels, local through national as landholding systems have been integrated into wider markets. Women's exclusion is often linked to economic, socio-cultural, religious and also very practical issues that affect their participation. However, the equitable representation and participation in land administration requires the interests of all segments of the population.

The project '*Strengthening rural women's livelihood opportunities through empowerment in community land stewardship and accountability in agricultural investments in Ghana*' was therefore commissioned by NETRIGHT, and funded by IIED to deepen knowledge and understanding of the problems of gender equitable land governance in order to contribute to the transformation of gender relations through greater voice, ownership and control of lives, assets and livelihoods. It also aimed at providing evidence on entry points and approaches to promote gender-inclusive equitable community land stewardship. In addition, it sought to provide opportunities for downwards accountability in agricultural investments. Primary data was collected in four communities - Apemenim (Ashanti Region), Bawjiase (Central Region), Dodowa (Greater Accra Region) and Wamale (Northern Region).

Roadblocks Hindering Gendered Equitable Land Governance

Many cultures see girls as transient beings who at a point would leave the family and therefore do not ascribe permanent land rights to them. This sense of transiency is deeply rooted in cultures such that there are proverbs which speak to the fact that when a woman gives birth to a girl, she perpetuates the lineage of another family rather than the family into which she gets married. Women's land access is therefore based on consanguinity (family) and affinity (marriage). Marriage entitles women to land resources but death of partner or dissolution of marriage many a time invalidates the entitlement.

Socio-cultural norms have played major roles in how women and men relate to land.

Network for Women's Rights in Ghana (NETRIGHT) is a women's rights and economic justice advocacy network working to promote gender equality in national policies, programmes and processes at the national level and beyond. The network focuses on three core issues economic justice; natural resources (land and the extractives – oil and gas, mining) and movement building.

Women are mainly the ones who are culturally excluded from taking part in land related interactive platforms. Therefore, a multifaceted approach is needed to enhance women's participation in land governance platforms at the local and national levels.

The interplay between marriage and children is also important to note in how it manifests in property relations. Male children are considered a very critical means of entitlement for women's access to land especially after the death of husbands; in addition to the legitimacy of the marriage and also the children. Above all, good behaviour on the part of the woman is also considered for entitlements.

Other sociocultural challenges include protocols which require women to bring men when going through land transactions and the belief that women should not own landed property which forces women to unwillingly sign away their rights. Religious beliefs have equally played important roles in shaping the comportment of women and men and how this defines their participation in land governance platforms. The claim that women have no track record in decision making platforms and therefore could not be part of land governance platforms and the fear of threats - real or superficial from male contenders has also become a major impediment.

Strengthening Women's Voice in Land Governance

Various projects and programme to facilitate women's participation in land governance platforms have been instituted by state and non- state actors. At the national level, the Phase 2 of the Land Administration Project has integrated gender strategies in its activities which include gender sensitive data gathering, ensuring inclusive participation at sensitisation and dialogue sessions, ensuring gender sensitivity in the design and monitoring of the project, organising consultative fora for traditional female leaders and the training of personnel of land institutions in gender issues.

At the community level, NGOs have designed interventions to address some of the constraints women face such as the Colandef/MiDA systematic land titling project aimed at enhancing tenure security for various land users in the Awutu-Senya District of the Central Region, Grassroots Sisterhood Foundation's (GSF) sensitisation programme on women's land rights in the Nantong Traditional Area in the Northern Region, WiLDAF's legal literacy programme for women and community leaders at Suhum in the Eastern Region. In addition, the Land Resource Management Centre (LRMC) has developed land tools to help spouses and other land users secure land transfer agreements as well as the Civil Society Coalition on Land's (CICOL) engagement with traditional leaders on land issues. It is important to note that all these programmes have integrated inclusiveness in their designs thereby enhancing women's participation. The study found that these projects yielded tremendous benefits to women, men and the project communities at large. These projects could find linkages and build synergies to enhance upscaling and replication within a specific context.

Conclusion

Participatory land governance and administration are important for livelihood sustenance of all who rely on land. But, socio-cultural norms have remained the pillar on which participation in local level land governance practices are derived. Women are mainly the ones who are culturally excluded from taking part in land related interactive platforms. Therefore, a multifaceted approach is needed to enhance women's participation in land governance platforms at the local and national levels. These include women equipping themselves with information and knowledge on land rights, governance, administration and management, female leaders building networks across the country to help in information sharing, NGO project strategies making youth inclusion in sensitisation programmes a priority to enhance intergenerational knowledge transfer.

4 Update from FfD-IBON

Inaugural FfD Forum: Missed potentials

For more information, please contact jmalonzo@iboninternational.org



**IBON International engages in capacity development for people's rights and democracy around the world. It strengthens links between local campaigns and advocacies to international initiatives and brings development issues from the international arena in a way that peoples' organizations and social movements can engage with at country level.*

(New York, 21 April 2016) – Insufficient preparations, limited time allocation and a disappointing outcome document marked the inaugural ECOSOC Financing for Development (FfD) Forum, held from 18-20 April 2016 at the United Nations Headquarters in New York, which was meant to initiate a follow-up process for the FfD Conferences (from Monterrey, Doha, to Addis Ababa). FfD covers domestic resource mobilization, international public resources such as aid, private finance, debt, trade, systemic issues, technology, and data and monitoring.

While civil society organizations welcomed the FfD Forum, the shortcomings cast shadow on the potentials of the annual review process to play its role in addressing structural issues, reforming global economic governance, and contributing to fundamental changes needed in the global economic system in line with human rights and sustainable development.

This first FfD Forum lacked a transparent preparatory process (which simply consisted of two meetings called 'retreats') and was cut to only three days instead of the mandated five days. The inadequate time given to the Forum hampered the necessary visioning of the follow-up process, particularly the formulation of a medium-term plan of work for the coming years. While the FfD process is critical in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, developing countries see it as an independent process, in contrast to the views of developed countries like Japan, US, Australia, New Zealand, and the European Union that deem the FfD process merely an annex of the 2030 Agenda.

The outcome document called "intergovernmentally agreed conclusions and recommendations," consisting of four paragraphs, lacked substance and failed to highlight urgent issues or even draw from the discussions at the Forum. As a process meant to follow-up on the implementation of FfD commitments, the final outcome document of the Forum failed to articulate clear mechanisms and steps to ensure that concrete and decisive actions are taken.

In a briefing session with CSOs, business sector and other institutional stakeholders on 19 April, the co-facilitators (Benin and Croatia) admitted difficulty in the outcome document negotiations. While developing countries wanted a range of issues to be included, said Ambassador Jean-Francis Regis Zinsou of Benin, some developed countries did not want substance and just wanted to lay the ground for future Forums.

The Forum also launched the first Inter-Agency Task Force (IATF) report on FfD, which only maps the Addis Ababa Action Agenda commitments and action items and lays down how the Task Force will monitor their implementation in the years ahead. CSOs asked that future reports of the IATF consult a variety of sources of information and implement mechanisms for civil society engagement.

For the Forum to realize its potential and serve its purpose, it should be able to address current issues in the global economic, political, social, and environmental situation, such as advancing inclusive international cooperation for a fairer global tax system, financial secrecy issues recently highlighted by the Panama papers, and setting international standards for all private sector financing modalities and actors to adhere to human rights and sustainable development principles. Aside from monitoring implementation, advancing a normative agenda must be a key part of the FfD follow-up process.

Enabling Environment Country Report: Shrinking Civic Space in Zimbabwe

5 Stories from the Regions

For more information, please contact meja@roafrica.org

The Zimbabwe Enabling Environment study was conducted by The National Association of Youth Organizations (NAYO) that envisions a repositioned, redefined and enhanced role for youth in community, national and regional developmental processes. The report acknowledges the Busan Partnership Document which affirms CSOs role as independent development actors in their own right, and highlights within the context of Zimbabwe issues, particularly enabling environment and spaces for civic participation. The advent of the new constitution sets a window of hope in strengthening the development effectiveness agenda within the country as the constitution promotes civic participation, guarantees the freedom of assembly and association, promotes human rights and fosters good governance. These are critical for CSOs engagement, participation and development work. Zimbabwe has ratified various human rights instruments which include the following:

1. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR);
2. International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR);
3. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW);
4. African Charter on Human and Peoples' Right and;
5. Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights on the Rights of Women in Africa

These provide guarantees for CSOs to enjoy rights to association, peaceful assembly and expression allowing for their work to progress smoothly.

Since 2013, the current government has made efforts to engage with CSOs, as well as the international community. For instance, Zimbabwean CSOs were consulted in the process of the preparation of the Zimbabwe Agenda for Sustainable Socio-Economic Transformation (ZimAsset) in the last quarter of 2013. The government is in the process of aligning laws and has continued to make use of old laws, some of which have reinforced a restrictive environment on the part of CSOs.

It is important to note that Zimbabwe has placed frameworks both at law and policy to regulate the work of CSOs. However, most of these have come under sharp criticism for restricting the environment of CSOs. Succinct examples of draconian legislation include: the Public Order and Security Act (POSA) and the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (AIPPA) which work hand in glove curbing freedoms of assembly; association; media and access to information and the Zimbabwe Youth Council (ZYC) Act and Statutory Instrument (S.I) 4 which both curtail youth rights to freedom of association limiting the growth of vibrant youth movements within the country. Owing to the continued stance by government of suppressing the work of CSOs, the report highlights the plight of CSOs working in Zimbabwe sharing recent cases which demonstrate the urgent need for CSOs to be supported. It notes the disappearance of human rights activist and journalist Itai Dzamara, the continued arrests of CSO leaders and denial of the right to peaceful assembly of CSOs such as Women of Zimbabwe Arize (WOZA). The report offers recommendations based on best practice within the region and the lived realities of CSOs that were engaged in the process of creating the country report.



The report was recently highlighted at the global day of action that took place in Zimbabwe that drew more than 150 participants, with the EU ambassador as the guest of Honor; other notable guests being Dr. Cephas Zinhumwe of NANGO, Dr. Patson Dzamara the brother to abducted Itai Dzamara, leaders of 13 political parties, the church, private sector, students and among other international partners.

Read more [here](#). Download full report [here](#).

Bolivian NGOs strive for promoting greater transparency and effectiveness in their institutions

Union Nacional de Instituciones para el trabajo de Accion Social (UNITAS) - Bolivia

For more information, email direccionunitas@redunitas.org

A national course for CSO facilitators entitled "NGOs and their Effectiveness as Actors in Development" was held in the city of La Paz from 3-6 May. This initiative is a continuation of the process promoted by the National Union of Institutions for Social Action Work (UNITAS) as the country focal point of the CPDE in the framework of the project: "Strengthening Civil Society: Better democratic participation through greater effectiveness and transparency," executed with the support of Welthungerhilfe - German Agro Action.

The Practitioner's Guide for the Implementation of the International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness developed by the former Open Forum guided the training. It contains a globally-validated methodology to address different situations and realities using educational and recreational items. It enables the knowledge, identification, and ownership of each of the Istanbul Principles for its implementation at the organisational level, as well as the use of different mechanisms for promoting an enabling environment for CSOs.

The training process to promote greater legitimacy and institutional sustainability in the current context began with active participation through dynamic analysis, videos, outdoor activities and collective reflection, and ended with the achievement of expected results. Over 30 representatives of 14 national networks and NGO platforms strengthened their skills and capacities for the implementation of the International Framework.

Mexican CSOs in the Second Monitoring Round of EDC commitments¹

DECA and Equipo Pueblo- Mexico

For more information, please contact laurabecerra@equipopueblo.org.mx

¹ Article based on Mexico Focal Point report: DECA, Equipo Pueblo, submitted in April 2016, in the framework of CPDE initiative

² The survey was conducted considering the planned methodology and suggested questions for this process at the global level, based on the 2015-2016 Monitoring Guide and the paper addressing relevant questions for civil society.

CPDE Mexico Focal Points DECA and Equipo Pueblo participated in the Second Monitoring Round of Effective Development Cooperation (EDC) commitments. Various official sources were consulted in order to establish a reference framework on aid flows in Mexico. A survey for an online consultation was defined, focusing on Indicator 2 and on Indicators 3, 7 and 8 of the intended methodology. The survey, which has 25 questions, was disseminated to CSOs, thematic networks, researchers, and experts linked to aid and development issues.²

These CSOs engage in monitoring the establishment of 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development, Financing for Development, and World Summits on Development and Climate Change. All these organisations are articulated to follow up intergovernmental negotiations on the SDG at the UN.

On the other hand, lobbying sessions were held with two institutions of the Federal Government from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs: i) The General Directorate for Liaison with Civil Society Organisations (DGVOSC); ii) The Mexican Agency for International Development Cooperation (AMEXCID) to explore possible joint actions. On 2 April, at the premises of the Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a Civil Society Forum was held to present and validate the results of the online survey. This forum was attended by leading organisations on the subject, CSO networks and academia; in addition to the focal point of the Agency's Social Council and AMEXCID and DGVOSC representatives, who reported on the governmental process within the framework of the second round.

The process was based on the monitoring guide methodology and following the suggested questions about Indicator 2 (four modules), as well as other questions on Indicator 3 on Public-Private Dialogue (PPD), Inclusive reviews (Indicator 7) and Gender Perspective (Indicator 8).

Main outcomes on CSO enabling environment

General considerations are structured according to the set of 25 questions:

Considering the Priority Indicator, the organisations observe that the engagement in the definition of priorities, objectives and goals for the country's development aid do exist but are still limited, ad hoc and not inclusive of all actors/sectors. Existing spaces or mechanisms (councils) are not binding; thus, the actual opportunities for incidence are weak.

FIRST MODULE.

Space for multilateral dialogue on national development policies

The Mexican government engages CSOs through occasional consultations or on an ad hoc basis, meaning the spaces or mechanisms currently used do not have the formal strength and effectiveness to present views and proposals. Of the respondents, 25% did not identify any consultation space. Occasional training opportunities were identified for a multi-stakeholder dialogue, but 40% of the respondents do not recognise them, implying that opportunities for influencing public policy on aid are limited and selective.

SECOND MODULE.

CSO development effectiveness: accountability and transparency

The fact that just over half of respondents identified mechanisms for CSO transparency and accountability is a marker that the reports Mexican CSOs must submit have no visibility or that this information is not disseminated through the websites. More than half (54%) of respondents believe that CSOs do report their financial statements.

It was also revealed that in the country, it is not perceived that the Istanbul Principles and post-Busan agreements are facilitating CSO enabling environment.

On Indicator 2

Assessment of CSO enabling environment. Civil society operates within an environment which maximises its engagement in and contribution to development

THIRD MODULE.

Official Aid Development with CSOs

Consultation of aid providers is conducted only occasionally or on an ad hoc basis, and some respondents believe it does not happen at all. There is a general understanding that no policies or actions are implemented to create a CSO enabling environment, at least in a steadily manner. Of the respondents, 30% think that the creation of this enabling environment is not on the political dialogue agenda or that still too few efforts are made.

FOURTH MODULE.

Legal and Regulatory Framework

In this case a legal and regulatory framework is recognised, allowing the operation of CSOs, but their rights are unevenly and insufficiently fulfilled. Moreover, it does not facilitate their access to resources. A high percentage (71%) of respondents think that such a framework marginalises certain groups.

The questions are aimed at assessing the scope, inclusiveness, and transparency of public-private dialogue (PPD). It has to be noted that almost 75% of respondents doubt that PPD is able to include all private sector stakeholders, which are not transparent. Few respondents perceive that they occur within the framework of government development planning.

The engagement of non-governmental actors and local authorities in aid reviews is scarce and infrequent in the country. If launched, assessment exercises are not publicised in a timely and formal manner.

There is a core number of CSOs that monitor the budget and expenses for gender balance, but about half of respondents believe that this monitoring has yet to be systematised. Relevant organisations occasionally have the opportunity to submit their views, but the government still fails to effectively identify priorities in defining resources for gender equality and the advancement of women.

Indicator 3: Engagement and contribution of the private sector to development

Indicator 7: Mutual accountability among development co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews sector to development

Indicator 8: Gender equality and women's empowerment

Trends and Challenges

The monitoring results confirm that creating a setting for CSO engagement with an acceptable legal framework that recognises them as actors of public interest is not sufficient, considering the different dimensions of an enabling environment: (i) economic-related to the resources needed for their performance; (ii) political-recognising freedom of association and facilitating spaces for government-civil society dialogue, and; (iii) cultural -- the degree of recognition or acceptance of the civil society itself.

Progress has been made in the country, but not enough to declare that there are mechanisms in place for monitoring Busan commitments. However, an increasing number of regional organisations or networks, such as the ones where Equipo Pueblo is engaged (ALOP and the Mesa de Articulación de Asociaciones Nacionales y Redes de ONGA LAYC), have been positioning the Enabling Environment framework as the benchmark to assess CSO working conditions in Mexico and the way they engage with their federal and local governments.

It has to be noted that, in recent years, inspiring experiences and mechanisms for civil society engagement have emerged within new regional/global processes, which have been formalised by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the driving institution for Mexico's foreign policy.

Sustaining those spaces or mechanisms is indeed an everyday challenge as the shifting of representatives or officials, and/or of engagement rules, jeopardises their management quality and most importantly civil society's engagement and advocacy opportunities.

An obvious recommendation is to continue promoting and supporting CSO processes in each country to improve the quality of their engagement, as well as the political dialogue quality to generate effective spaces for advocacy and responsibility. Our country engages several global processes where strategic decisions are taken about country development at different levels. CSOs engage these processes in Mexico; they have been proactive in the Summits of Heads of State and Government, on the Environment, Financing for Development, the SDGs and Agenda 2030, among others. These showcase the interest and dynamism of Mexican civil society, which take position and offers alternatives to the government ahead of the negotiations in these regional spaces.

6 Stories from the Sectors

Youth

For more information, please contact cordiesiks@gmail.com.

Kenya holds Development Effectiveness training for youth organisations

National Association for Youth Organisations-Africa (NAYO), currently Global CPDE Youth Coordinator, together with some African youth organisations met in Kenya for a training on Development Effectiveness. NAYO, which was represented by its Clusters Coordinator Mr. Macdonald Munyoro, is expected to conduct a regional training for the Southern African Development Community (SADC) region and the national level to allow youth people to understand DE issues for effective policy engagement with the government.

Youth4SDGs Road map crafted

Over 100 youth organisations convened at the offices of National Association of Youth Organisations- Africa (NAYO-Africa) to craft the way forward on SDGs in Zimbabwe. As noted by the UN Secretary General, the youth forms the key basic tenet for the successful implementation of SDGs. Youth platform called Youth 4 SDGs was mooted with NAYO as the coordinator and NANGO Youth Sector as the Advisor. About seven organisations were voted into the Youth Group Coordinating Committee. These organisations represent community-based youth organisations, youth living with disabilities, youth networks, students and children, among others. The platform is expected to roll a national program to popularise, educate other fellow young people on the importance of SDGs at the same time holding the government accountable on their implementation. The Youth 4 SGD Working Group will also work with #YouthPower and NAYO to maximise on impact.

Labour

New publication: The development effectiveness of supporting the private sector with ODA funds



The development effectiveness of supporting the private sector with ODA funds



Research Paper – 2016

Development funding is increasingly being channeled through Development Finance Institutions. These national institutions are particularly solicited when using development aid money to free up further investment, known as leveraging. When used well, these tools have the potential to allow sectors of developing countries' economies that would not otherwise attract investment to strengthen and expand. However, this publication highlights a number of alarming shortfalls in how these institutions operate that can seriously undermine international development goals.

This new report, entitled *The development effectiveness of supporting the private sector with ODA funds* examined nine Development Finance Institutions (DFIs). Five case studies provided a background for the study which found that DFI practice is lacking in three vital areas:

“In order to obtain a good and independent idea of what the development impacts are on the ground, there is a need for performance standards and monitoring systems to be accessible.”

Ownership

Promotion of local ownership has been repeatedly highlighted as a fundamental requirement of development projects. In clear contradiction of this principle, the majority of the DFIs examined had policies that expressed a preference for supporting the interests of the donor country. In the case of COFIDES (Spain) and OPIC (USA) they go as far as requiring that any investment they make benefit their national (donor) companies. It is no coincidence that these are two of the only DFIs that are part owned by private national stakeholders. This sort of private donor input needs to be addressed as it evidently creates a bias that leads to the compromising of development interests. The concept of ownership also extends to setting the aims of projects. However, not one of the DFIs require that either developing country governments or local social partners be consulted in setting out the aims of a project.

Development results

In order to obtain a good and independent idea of what the development impacts are on the ground, there is a need for performance standards and monitoring systems to be accessible. There is currently too strong a reliance on self-reporting and limited monitoring indicators. The ability of workers to get organised and raise a complaint to the relevant body is also questioned. This reflects a broader approach of DFIs to labour standards as distinct from development goals. This outlook is symptomatic of a general contempt for labour interests among DFIs which is otherwise illustrated by the fact that none of them require the board to feature a workers' representative. It is widely recognised that offshore financial centres have a negative impact on developing countries. It is astounding then that 75% of CDC's (UK) investments went through jurisdictions that are among the 20 most secretive.

Mutual accountability

Meanwhile, accountability flows in only one direction. There is a need for stakeholders to have access to essential information and for complaint procedures to be systematically put in place in order for the opinions of the beneficiaries to be heard. Reporting standards are insufficient across the board which challenges the transparency of the DFIs' work.

In light of these findings, the current performance of DFIs is unsatisfactory. Examples of best practice can lead the way to a sustainable approach to the use of financial tools for development. We will be joining our voices to this call.

“There is a need for stakeholders to have access to essential information and for complaint procedures to be systematically put in place in order for the opinions of the beneficiaries to be heard.”

New publication: The Worker and Trade Union Major Group's submission to the HLPF

The High Level Political Forum (HLPF) will take place from the 11th to the 20th of July 2016 in New York. It is mandated to provide political leadership, guidance and recommendations on the 2030 Agenda's implementation and follow-up, keep track of progress, spur coherent policies informed by evidence, science and country experiences, as well as address new and emerging issues.

The growing inequality in the world is perhaps the single most imposing barrier to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) laid out by the 2030 Agenda. It may come as no surprise that the deepening of this inequality has been accompanied by an erosion of labour institutions. There are countless examples of the role that social dialogue can play in helping reverse this trend and tackle inequality.

“Leaving no one behind” means tackling inequality. The Worker and Trade Union Major Group's submission to the HLPF looks at just what steps can be taken to do so.

Trade Unions at UNECE meeting on follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda

TUDCN's Joan Lanfranco and Goda Neverauskaite of the Pan-European Regional Council of ITUC/ETUC (PERC) attended the Executive Committee meeting of the UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). Held in Geneva on the 10th of May 2016, it discussed the region's plans for SDG implementation and follow-up.

This meeting discussed the regional follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda, in view of complementing the global follow-up task of the High-Level Political Forum, to take place in New York in July 2016. The session mainly discussed the plans and initial steps of UNECE member states' governments to implement and follow-up on the SDGs, based on the results of a Regional SDG Survey, and possible future modalities for regional reviews. Four EU member states will be giving voluntary reviews on their implementation and follow-up of the SDGs (Estonia, Finland, France, Germany). Non-EU countries Switzerland, Montenegro and Norway will also volunteer at the HLPF.

National delegates agreed on the need for greater coherence on SDGs implementation between UNECE and EU, as well as other regional organisations such as the OECD and the Council of Europe. There was also common agreement that UNECE should serve as hub for implementation and review peer-learning among member states.

Civil society including trade unions raised concerns about the preparedness of most UNECE countries to implement the 2030 Agenda, as well as in the lack of involvement of civil society national implementation plans. CSOs demanded to emulate the UN set-up of major groups and other stakeholders in future regional meetings on SDG review, in order to ensure a transparent process. Read the CSO common position [here](#).

Trade unions demanded the follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda to be based on mutual accountability and democratic ownership, ensuring genuine participation and social dialogue as a pillar to ensure ownership of policy processes. The labour movement made clear its national, regional and global mobilisation towards the same objectives: ensuring workers and their families have access to a decent life and a decent job in a healthy environment, while securing the needs and ensuring opportunity for future generations. Read the trade union position [here](#).

The next UNECE Commission Session (25-27 April 2017) will serve as next year's Regional Forum on Sustainable Development.

Trade Union Confederation of the Americas (TUCA) passed a resolution on development policy

At its annual congress which took place from the 26th to the 29th of April, the Trade Union Confederation of the Americas (TUCA) passed a resolution on development policy. The resolution highlights 5 principles of development policy (Resolution 4 is available in English on page 130 of the congress outcome document):

- a. The central role of the State in the design, implementation and evaluation of development policy
- b. The potential for different forms of cooperation (North-South, South-South and Triangular), to promote human rights and reshape the historical asymmetries between North and South.
- c. The need for an evaluation based on a broad range of indicators.
- d. The role of the PLADA as the fundamental benchmark for defining, implementing and evaluating development policies and cooperation of States.
- e. Their commitment to strengthening the Trade Union Development Cooperation as a key space for training, information sharing and strategy-building to enhance trade union influence on development and cooperation policies.



7 Community Bulletin

CPDE Report to the Public 2015 is out!

In 2015, CPDE engaged meaningfully in the Global Partnership and the Post-2015 processes. The platform's efforts to influence the policy discussions and engage in the negotiations brought considerable outcomes in further enhancing the implementation of effective development cooperation at all levels. Among these notable outcomes were the recognition of the need for human rights-based approach to development and inclusivity in decision-making and multi-stakeholder dialogues. Aside from its policy engagement and advocacy, capacity development activities were sustained among the platform constituencies. CSO Development Effectiveness and Accountability had been continuously propagated among the platform's constituencies through a number of trainings and workshops on these issues, and this raised the awareness of members on the need to implement the Istanbul Principles and International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness.

While 2015 had been a remarkable year for development, there remains to be a challenge in effecting effective development for 2016, most especially in light of the Second High Level Ministerial Meeting of the GPEDC later in the year.

For more information, read the [2015 Report to the Public](#). The report is available in English, French and Spanish.

2015 in Review: Development Effectiveness in the Global Partnership and 2030 Agenda



REPORT TO THE PUBLIC

CIVIL SOCIETY CONTINUING CAMPAIGN
FOR EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT

2015

CSO application process to participate in the Second High Level Meeting (HLM2), now open

CPDE is now calling for applications for CSO participation in the Second High Level Meeting (HLM2) of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) to be held in Nairobi, Kenya from November 28 to December 1, 2016.

The deadline of application is on 1 August.

For full information on the selection process and criteria, please refer to the document "Selection Process for CPDE Delegation" found on the CPDE website.

If you are interested in participating in the GPEDC HLM2 and other CSO events, please fill out the three forms (annexes 1-3) and send these back to your Regional Secretariat OR Sectoral/Constituency.

For CPDE non-members, please send your accomplished forms to the Global Secretariat addressed to the CPDE Global Coordinator – Reileen Dulay (secretariat@csopartnership.org). More information are available [here](#).

Upcoming CPDE events

**CPDE at the
2016 World Social Forum
Montreal, Canada**

**CPDE Coordination
Committee Meeting
25 November 2016**

**4th CPDE
Global Council Meeting
26 November 2016**

The Istanbul Principles Five Years after (IP+5): Civil society development effectiveness and accountability in a changing landscape

CPDE, through its Working Group on CSO Development Effectiveness, will host a one-day activity during the World Social Forum in Montreal, Canada in the days of August 9-14, 2016. CPDE will take this moment to socialise the Istanbul Principles and discuss issues relating to CSO effectiveness and accountability during the WSF.

The WSF is the largest gathering of civil society and social movements to find solutions to the problems of our time. Started in 2001 in Brazil, the WSF is an open meeting place for reflective thinking, democratic debate of ideas, formulation of proposals, free exchange of experiences and interlinking for effective action, by groups and movements of civil society that are opposed to neoliberalism and to domination of the world by capital and are committed to building a planetary society directed towards fruitful relationships among Humankind and between it and the Earth.

This one-day activity on CSO effectiveness and accountability will be characterised by: (a) plenary inputs and open discussions, including presentations on the Action Research on CSO DE and Accountability; (b) exhibit/marketplace stand to showcase different initiatives on the IP; and (c) on-site facilities for organizations to do their IP self-assessment checklist and be part of the #accountable2people campaign.

The WSF activity will be spearheaded by the CSO DE WG, working closely with the Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC). This activity is envisaged as a build-up to generate momentum for a much larger activity on CSO Days on Development Effectiveness and Accountability that will be organised in 2017.

Save the Date

The IXth edition of the Black Sea NGO Forum (31 October- 2 November 2016)

The IXth edition of the Black Sea NGO Forum will take place between the 31st of October - 2nd of November 2016 and will build on the results of the previous editions, supporting the consolidation of its 10 thematic working groups according to the Strategic Framework for Civil Society Cooperation in the Black Sea Region finalised last year.

Moreover, the Black Sea NGO Forum will host the CPDE European Regional Meeting, continuing the collaboration with CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness - CPDE to bring more visibility of the development effectiveness agenda at regional level, while at the same time bring the discussions on the most important issues for the Black Sea Region in the global context of development.

Enabling environment for CSOs will continue to be a theme of interest for this year's edition the Black Sea NGO Forum, as it became a cross-cutting priority of the strategic framework for civil society cooperation in the region, being a pre-requisite for fostering development and developing regional cooperation initiatives.

The event will take place in one of the Black Sea countries covered by the Black Sea NGO Forum. The final location, agenda and concept of the event, as well as details about the application procedure for participants will soon be made available, so please check our website and Facebook page regularly.

For further information, please contact us at forum@blackseango.org.