



FORUM POUR UNE **GOUVERNANCE**  
**DÉMOCRATIQUE MONDIALE**  
FORUM FOR **DEMOCRATIC**  
**GLOBAL GOVERNANCE**

## Civil Society and the 2010 G20 Engaged Dialogue

Contribution Agreement Number: 2010-001

### FINAL NARRATIVE AND FINANCIAL REPORT

**Date:** August 11, 2010

**To:** Mr. Ronald Garson  
Director  
G8 Summit Policy Division  
Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada  
125 Sussex Drive  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G2, Canada

**Cc.** Ms. Marie-Pier Bouchard-Valade  
G8/G20 Outreach and Communications Officer  
Summit Policy Division (G8/G20)  
Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada  
125 Sussex Drive  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G2, Canada  
[Marie-Pier.Bouchard-Valade@international.gc.ca](mailto:Marie-Pier.Bouchard-Valade@international.gc.ca)

**From:** Forum international de Montréal  
(FIM-Forum for Democratic Global Governance/  
FIM-Forum pour la gouvernance démocratique mondiale)  
5252 de Maisonneuve Blvd. West, Suite 310  
Montreal, Quebec CANADA H4A 3S5  
Tel: 1 514 499 9468  
[www.fimcivilsociety.org](http://www.fimcivilsociety.org)

**Contacts:** Mr. Nigel Martin, President  
[nigelm@fimcivilsociety.org](mailto:nigelm@fimcivilsociety.org)

Dr. Heather MacKenzie, Programme Coordinator  
[heatherm@fimcivilsociety.org](mailto:heatherm@fimcivilsociety.org)



FORUM POUR UNE GOUVERNANCE  
DÉMOCRATIQUE MONDIALE  
FORUM FOR DEMOCRATIC  
GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary .....	4
Introduction .....	6
<b>PART I. FINAL NARRATIVE PROJECT REPORT .....</b>	<b>6</b>
A. Description and Analysis of Activities and Achievements .....	6
1. June 11, 2010 Civil Society - G20 Host Sherpa Dialogue .....	6
1.1 The G20's Overall Financial Strategy, Oversight, and Reform .....	7
1.2 The G20's Public Accountability .....	8
2. June 10, 2010 Civil Society Preparatory Meeting .....	10
B. Comparison of Planned Versus Actual Activities .....	11
C. Success and Failures Meeting Project Objectives .....	11
D. Expected Result .....	13
E. Problems Encountered .....	14
F. Actions Taken .....	14
G. Lessons Learned .....	14
H. Conclusions and Recommendations .....	17
<b>PART II. FINAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT .....</b>	<b>18</b>
Introduction .....	18
A. Funds Spent .....	19
B. Final Disbursement Request .....	21

## LIST OF ANNEXES

1. CS/G20 Dialogue Agenda
2. FIM-Forum Communiqué
3. CS/G20 Dialogue: FIM-Forum Internal Report
4. Civil Society Preparatory Meeting Agenda
5. Briefing Note to Civil Society Participants
6. Democratizing Global Governance: Principles for the Engagement of Civil Society Organizations with Multilateralism
7. The FIM G8 Project: A Case Analysis of a Project to Initiate Civil Society Engagement with the G8: Nigel Martin
8. The G8-G20: Peter Hajnal
9. Civil Society Dialogue with G20 Host Sherpa: Civil Society Participant List
10. Biographical information: Participants
11. Biographical information: Observers
12. FIM-Forum Communiqué: Translations: (a) French (b) Spanish (c) Russian (d) Arabic
13. DRAFT G8-G20 Accountability: Peter Hajnal



FORUM POUR UNE GOUVERNANCE  
DÉMOCRATIQUE MONDIALE  
FORUM FOR DEMOCRATIC  
GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

## Executive Summary

On June 11, 2010, in advance of the G20 Toronto Summit, FIM-Forum for Democratic Global Governance (FIM-Forum) in partnership with the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) convened a two-hour Dialogue meeting between 19 civil society (CS) leaders, and the G20 Host Sherpas. The objectives of this Dialogue were to:

- a. Initiate legitimate and meaningful dialogue between global civil society leaders and the G20.
- b. Provide opportunities for global civil society leaders to influence the G20 agenda issues.
- c. Provide opportunities for global civil society leaders, the majority from the south, to offer to G20 leaders, their analyses of the global economic and financial crisis.

Recommendations put forward to the G20 host Sherpas by civil society leaders concerned the G20's overall financial strategy including its oversight and reform and the G20's public accountability including its engagement with civil society and its corporate accountability. Key recommendations were:

1. *That the G20 develop new financial strategies.* A key recommendation was that new financial strategies facilitate transformation of the global economy to a Green Economy. Civil society leaders stressed the critical need to go beyond the G20's predominant focus on the *quantity* of growth to examine both the *quality* and *equality* of that growth if genuine sustainable growth is to be achieved by the G20's \$1.1 trillion emergency rescue package. It was recommended that G20 give priority treatment to political issues such as investment in industrial development with an emphasis on small and medium enterprises (SMEs), trade issues, employment (and unemployment), renewable energy, poverty alleviation (MDGs), and food security.

Other related recommendations for transformation of the global economy included to: undertake a major effort to transform national economies into green economies; commit to elimination of tax havens to enable governments to use these untapped financial resources; develop new regulations for the global financial system (e.g. G20 support of a "Financial Transactions Tax" could fund key Millennium Development Goals and climate change adaptation measures; and enforce the International Labour Organization's (ILO) standards in all economies in the world.

2. *That the G20 reform the International Financial Institutions (IFIs).* Civil society leaders highlighted the need to reform the Bretton Woods Institutions, with particular attention to the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Reform should be designed to enhance their governance and to change the formula for voting. Participants pointed to strategies such as appointing more chairs of the Executive Board from poor countries, transparency in the election of the Director General, the possibility of establishing a council of ministers with greater powers, and changing the patterns of employment of staff (i.e., with more diverse origins).

3. *That the G20 seize the opportunity to construct a financial architecture that supports the social economy.* Social economies respect diverse social communities and live within the planet's boundaries. The fundamental challenge for the G20 is to change the direction of growth to support *People-Centered Economies*. This vision requires a new paradigm of development and new mechanisms and enabling incentives. Examples of this new paradigm in operation were put forward.



FORUM POUR UNE GOUVERNANCE  
DÉMOCRATIQUE MONDIALE  
FORUM FOR DEMOCRATIC  
GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

*4. That the G20 does not marginalize and undermine other multilateral institutions like the UN system.*

G20 leaders should commit themselves to support and energize multilateral institutions and the UN system in order to follow through and deliver on commitments such as the Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) and the Millennium Development Goals.

*5. That the G20 build public confidence through adoption of a G20 reporting process.* The *Accountability Report* of the G8 released in advance of the 2010 Muskoka G8 Summit, was seen as a mechanism that the G20 could also adopt in reporting the outcomes of its decisions and their consequences to the citizens of the world. Accountability reporting must be done in a transparent and timely manner allowing for broad consultation with civil society leaders and citizens. Most important, civil society leaders recommended that a multi-stakeholder approach be adopted in developing appropriate reporting criteria and methods for the G20.

*6. That the G20 collaborate with civil society leaders in pursuing its goals.* As the G20 develops its agenda over the next several years, it is important that G20 leaders recognize that civil society leaders can be valuable partners in pursuing these goals. Historically, a multi-stakeholder approach has been successful in many cases in developing shared strategies to address a range of global issues.

*7. That civil society and the G20 continue to promote stronger corporate accountability.* There has been a major change towards greater corporate transparency and accountability in recent years. Socially responsible businesses are increasingly working closely with civil society and governments to ensure public confidence in their work. It was recognized that civil society has a role to play as accountable global actors and as contributors to the G20 efforts to develop and promote effective mechanisms for corporate accountability.

*8. That civil society explores ways in which future G20 dialogues with global civil society can be made a regular part of transparent and accountable functioning of the G20 as an institution of global governance.* In carrying out its mission and mandate, FIM-Forum will support ongoing engagement of civil society with the G20. In the coming period, FIM-Forum will work to convene a G-20 Toronto post-mortem discussion between civil society participants and host Canadian authorities and will explore, with Canadian and Korean authorities ways to help ensure a constructive civil society dialogue as a part of the Korean G20 Summit in November of 2010.

Civil society participants and Canadian G20 officials confirmed that this first structured civil society dialogue with G20 host Sherpas achieved its objectives. The Dialogue has served to improve the quality of the overall consultative processes between the G-20 and civil society and, more specifically, to initiate equitable global CS input into the final G-20 agenda. While it is acknowledged that the G20 is a "work in progress", the G20 process itself has now affirmed the value of diplomatic civil society dialogue and input to informing their evolving agenda.



## INTRODUCTION

The June 11, 2010 Civil Society Dialogue with the G20 Host Sherpas, held in advance of the 2010 Toronto G20 Summit, constituted the first structured civil society dialogue to be held by a host G20 country. This CS/G20 Dialogue meeting was preceded on June 10 by a Civil Society preparatory meeting. Part I, of this Report, the Final Narrative Project Report, provides a brief analysis of these two activities and associated achievements, beginning with the June 11 dialogue. It includes a comparison of planned versus actual activities; a discussion of success and failures meeting overall Project objectives; and an analysis of the expected result, problems, and lessons learned.

Part II, the Final Financial Statement, includes the complete list of funds spent based on budgeted line items as compared to the original budget line items and a disbursement request for payment of the final amount due, less any undisbursed funds. Accompanying Annexes provide additional information and documentation associated with planning, execution of, and follow-up to, this event.

## PART I. FINAL NARRATIVE PROJECT REPORT

### A. Description and Analysis of Activities and Achievements

#### 1. June 11, 2010 Civil Society - G20 Host Sherpa Dialogue

On June 11, 2010, in Ottawa, a group of 19 civil society leaders, hosted by the FIM-Forum for Democratic Global Governance and Canada's Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), held a two-hour Dialogue meeting with Mr. Len Edwards, Canadian Host Sherpa to the Toronto G20 and Finance Sous Sherpa Mr. Graham Flack (See Annex 1: CS/G20 Dialogue Agenda). Mr. Peter Harder, former Canadian Sherpa to the G8, served as the chair for this event. This project was designed to improve the quality of the overall consultative processes between the G-20 and civil society; more specifically, it was designed to aid in the initiation of equitable global civil society input into the final G-20 agenda.

The broad objectives for the CS/G20 Dialogue Project were to:

- (a) Initiate legitimate and meaningful dialogue between global civil society leaders and the G20. The dialogue was designed to allow for a frank and respectful exchange using the tradition of the Chatham House Rule<sup>1</sup>.
- (b) Provide opportunities for global civil society leaders to influence the G20 agenda issues.

---

<sup>1</sup> According to the Chatham House Rule, *when a meeting, or part thereof, is held under the Chatham House Rule, participants are free to use the information received, but neither the identity nor the affiliation of the speaker(s), nor that of any other participant, may be revealed.* This "rule" is an aid to free discussion. It aims to provide anonymity to speakers and to encourage openness and sharing of information.



- (c) Provide opportunities for global civil society leaders, the majority from the south, to offer to G20 leaders, their analyses of the global economic and financial crisis.

The CS/G20 Dialogue meeting focused on the following two broad thematic issues that had been identified by the civil society group at a civil society preparatory session held on June 10 (Section 2 below): i. The G20's overall financial strategy and ii. Public accountability of the G20 (See Annex 2: FIM-Forum Communiqué and Annex 3: CS/G20 Dialogue: FIM-Forum Internal Report). Following is an account of the June 11 CS/G20 Dialogue which is based on the FIM-Forum Internal Report (Annex 3).

### 1.1. The G20's Overall Financial Strategy, Oversight, and Reform

The first issue addressed by CS participants was the G20's overall financial strategy, oversight, and reform. Participants felt the G20 should give priority to developing new financial strategies. Strategies should be guided by criteria that promote joint efforts for macroeconomic coordination in order to ensure a *strong* and *balanced* global recovery that leads to a *sustainable* growth path.

Specifically, strategies must strive to bridge the gaps in output and employment and ensure efficient use of resources and maximization of the potential for long-term growth. Strategies must aim for sustainability over time with solid growth potential, resistant to future shocks and consistent with sound environmental and social policies. Finally strategies must be balanced to enable growth that is available to all countries and regions worldwide and marking a trend toward convergence of living standards in the long term.

With these criteria as guides, the following three recommendations were presented:

**1.1.1** The first recommendation concerned **transformation of the global economy into a Green Economy** that supports poverty eradication and utilizing, where possible, the Stimulus Package Reform of the International Financial Institutions. Civil society leaders stressed the critical need to go beyond the G20's predominant focus on the *quantity* of growth to examine both the *quality* and *equality* of that growth if genuine sustainable growth is to be achieved by the G20's \$1.1 trillion emergency rescue package.

Given the present uneven and stagnant economic growth in various regions of the world and the declining funding commitments to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), it is imperative that the G20's various strategies for growth aim to benefit poor and vulnerable peoples. Accordingly, the G20 should give priority treatment to political issues such as investment in industrial development with an emphasis on small and medium enterprises (SMEs), trade issues, employment (and unemployment), renewable energy, poverty alleviation (MDGs) and food security. Specific actions for transformation of the global economy to a Green Economy put forward by participants included:

- Undertake a major effort to transform national economies into green economies. According to a HSBC survey, many governments did make parts of their economic stimulus packages "green." In particular, civil society participants commended



South Korea, which devoted 81 percent of its stimulus package to support investment in green-related industries and practices, and China, which used 38 percent of its stimulus funds for this purpose. In contrast, the G8 countries have provided limited support for green investments. For example, the United States devoted only 20 percent, Germany 13 percent and United Kingdom only 7 percent of their stimulus funds respectively for this purpose, according to the HSBC survey.

- Make a commitment to eliminate tax havens in order enable governments to use these financial resources.
- Develop new regulations for the global financial system. In particular, discussion focused on whether the G20 would support a “Financial Transactions Tax.” This measure could fund key Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and climate change adaptation measures.
- Enforce the International Labour Organization’s (ILO) standards in all economies in the world.

**1.1.2** The second recommendation put forward was in related to **reform of the International Financial Institutions (IFIs)**. Civil society leaders pressed the Host Sherpas on the need to reform the Bretton Woods Institutions, with particular attention to the International Monetary Fund (IMF), in order to enhance their governance and to change the formula for voting. Within the reform, participants discussed issues such as restructuring of the chairs of the Executive Board (e.g., including more chairs for poor countries), transparency in the election of the Director General, the possibility of establishing a council of ministers with greater powers, and changing patterns of employment of staff (i.e., more diverse origin and universities).

**1.1.3** Finally, civil society leaders highlighted the critical need and opportunity to promote a **financial architecture that supports the social economy**. Social economies respect diverse social communities and live within the planet’s boundaries. The fundamental challenge for the G20 is to change the direction of growth to support *People-Centered Economies*. This vision requires a new paradigm of development and new mechanisms and enabling incentives. An example is the Canadian experience with cooperatives. Argentina has created its first non-private bank, which will be a cooperative. Different approaches are emerging around the world, from North and South America, and Europe, where cooperatives contribute to between 7 percent and 20 percent of the gross domestic product (GDP). Most jobs and development of new companies is in the SME area and Social Economy areas some of these are within the NGO and Community-Based Enterprises. There is a need for a review of laws and policies to support these priorities.

## **1.2 The G20’s Public Accountability, Engagement with Civil Society, and Corporate Accountability**

Recommendations surrounding the second issue concerned G20 accountability. Discussion was focused on the G20 and UN, the G20 reporting process, engagement of civil society with the G20, and corporate accountability.



### 2.1.1 **The role of the G20 and other global multilateral bodies.** Democratic accountability of

the G20 as an institution of global governance was at the center of the civil society participant's concerns during this dialogue. The first recommendation with regard to accountability is to ensure that the G20 does not marginalize and undermine other multilateral institutions like the UN system. G20 leaders should therefore commit themselves to support and energize multilateral institutions and the UN system in order to follow through and deliver on commitments such as the Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

**1.2.2 The G20 Reporting Process.** Civil society leaders welcomed the G8's commitment to publish the first accountability report prior to the upcoming Toronto G20 Summit, and viewed this report as an important first step for ensuring greater public accountability. They emphasized that a similar approach to regular reporting by the G20 will also be important for building public confidence that the G20 is serious about implementing its commitments. It is imperative that such reporting be done in a transparent and timely manner that allows for broader consultation with civil society leaders and citizens. Most important, civil society leaders urged that a multi-stakeholder approach be adopted in developing appropriate reporting criteria and methods for the G20.

The Host Sherpa acknowledged that the key challenge of global economic cooperation within the G20 is that there is little history for this level of coordination in coming to grips with the scale and scope of this rescue mission to the global economy. How does the G20 develop a permanent capacity to manage the global economy with special attention to equity, the environment and human rights? The Host Sherpa stressed that the G20 is an evolving body. Observers are going to have to give the G20 more time to get the global economy back on its feet first.

**1.2.3 G20 Engagement with Civil Society.** Civil society leaders share the G20's commitment to promoting democratic processes, good governance and reducing corruption. As the G20 develops its agenda over the next several years, it is important that G20 leaders recognize that civil society leaders can be valuable partners in pursuing these goals. In many cases, a multi-stakeholder approach has been successful in developing shared strategies to address a range of global issues (i.e., G8 research group compliance studies; World Bank inspection panels; World Commission on Dams). This principle is now embedded at the global level in such organizations as the Global Fund and the Global Alliance for Vaccination and Immunization (GAVI).

**1.2.4 Developing Effective Mechanisms for Corporate Accountability.** There has been a major change towards greater corporate transparency and accountability in recent years. Examples include the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI), the International Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, and the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI). Socially responsible businesses are increasingly working closely with civil society and governments to ensure public confidence in their work – a belief in mutual accountability obligations.

It was recognized that civil society must be equally accountable in these processes. Civil society participants welcomed the initiative of some G20 member governments to promote stronger



corporate transparency. It was stressed that civil society leaders can contribute to the G20 efforts to develop and promote effective mechanisms for corporate accountability.

The Canadian Host Sherpa confirmed that he would convey these inputs to his fellow G20 Sherpas and will explore ways in which future G20 dialogues with global civil society can be made a regular part of transparent and accountable functioning of the G20 as an institution of global governance. FIM-Forum will contact DFAIT following the G20 Summit in Toronto to explore avenues for ensuring ongoing civil society/G20 dialogue.

## 2 The June 10, 2010 Civil Society Preparatory Meeting

The above Dialogue followed a full day of preparatory work by civil society participants. On June 10, 19 civil society leaders participated at a one - day preparatory meeting. Dr. Rajesh Tandon, Chair of the FIM-Forum Board of Directors facilitated the meeting. The objectives of this meeting were to:

- (a) Identify 2 to 3 key issues for discussion at the June 11 Dialogue meeting;
- (b) Determine the June 11 Dialogue meeting structure; and
- (c) Select spokespersons to present selected issues to the Sherpas.

**The selection and preparation of participants.** The following background documents were circulated electronically to all participants in advance of this meeting: *Civil Society Preparatory Meeting Agenda* (Annex 4); *Briefing Note to Civil Society Participants* (Annex 5); *Democratizing Global Governance: Principles for the Engagement of Civil Society Organizations with Multilateralism* (Annex 6); *The FIM G8 Project: A Case Analysis of a Project to Initiate Civil Society Engagement with the G8*; Nigel Martin (Annex 7); and *The G8-G20*: Peter Hajnal (Annex 8).

In addition to the above materials, the morning presentation at the preparatory meeting *An Inside Look at the G8 and G20* given by former Canadian Sherpa to the G8, Mr. Peter Harder was instrumental to the preparation of participants for the Dialogue. Drawing from his extensive experience with the G8, Mr. Harder gave a comprehensive outline of the evolution of the G7 and G8 agendas and the progression of the Summit process to include civil society engagement with the G8. He explained the growing relevance of the G20 and the importance and relevance of civil society engagement with the G20 and encouraged civil society to “play its role”. He also outlined obstacles to civil society engagement with the G20 including celebrity advocacy and international NGOs. Mr. Harder’s presentation was followed by a question and answer session. This session provided a rich opportunity for participants to understand and plan how they could best utilize the opportunity to dialogue with the Sherpas.

Following Mr. Harder’s orientation, participants spent the remaining time identifying the major themes they wanted to raise with the Sherpas. Once issues were agreed to, participants discussed how to structure the Dialogue to ensure focus on these two major themes and their related sub themes and to enable full participation. Importantly, the Dialogue was structured as an exchange



and designed to include many opportunities for participants to learn from the Sherpas – to hear their points of view.

This preparatory session was key to helping to set the stage for a productive and informative Dialogue. FIM-Forum selected participants and structured the preparatory session to allow for a focused and structured discussion and maximum and equitable input from participants. The civil society group and observers were carefully selected according to criteria that would help to ensure high level, broad based, frank, and diplomatic dialogue. They were expected to be discreet, to agree to follow the Chatham House Rule, and to be prepared to work for long-term, as well as short term, results. Participants (including observers and resource persons) were also present in their own capacities and did not formally represent any network or civil society organization or group. Thus, they were free to express their views under the Chatham House Rule and without the normal constraints of formally representing their organizations. All were selected because of their experience in multi stakeholder dialogues, with special emphasis on civil society/multilateral experience. Some were selected because of their expert knowledge on the chosen G20 agenda issues (See Annex 9: Civil Society Dialogue with G20 Host Sherpa: Civil Society Participant List, Annex 10: Biographical Information: Participants, and Annex 11: Biographical Information: Observers).

Finally, FIM-Forum's conference management staff (O'Donoghue and Associates), experienced in working with civil society leaders and able to organize the meeting within a very short time frame, contributed to the success of the meeting.

## **B. Comparison of Planned Versus Actual Activities**

Project activities were carried out as planned and according to the contribution agreement between DFAIT and FIM-Forum. FIM-Forum successfully organized a dialogue meeting between 19 senior global civil society leaders, the majority from the South (non-OECD countries), and the Canadian Sherpa and the Finance Deputy for the G20 process.

## **C. Success and Failures Meeting Project Objectives**

Objective 1: To initiate legitimate and meaningful dialogue between global civil society leaders and the G20.

Objective 2: To provide opportunities for global civil society leaders to influence G20 agenda issues.

Objective 3: To provide opportunities for global civil society leaders to offer, to G20 leaders, their analyses of the global economic and financial crisis.

Successes and failures meeting the above project objectives were assessed at a debriefing session following the meeting with the Sherpas. This session led to many unanticipated results and follow up activities related to achieving the project objectives. Below is an account of this debriefing session.



**Debriefing session:** *The evaluation that took place after our meeting with the Canadian Sherpa was of utmost importance to identify the future steps, and what to avoid in the future. Everyone participated in the evaluation and that gave a huge credibility.* – Civil society participant at CS/G20 Dialogue

Following the CS/G20 Dialogue, FIM-Forum held a debriefing session with the civil society participants to assess successes and failures in meeting the project objectives and to outline next steps. Overall, participants reported that the meeting was successful in that a respectful, meaningful, interactive, and frank dialogue had occurred. Participants reported that the dialogue had been a gratifying exercise in building civil society solidarity. They covered to their satisfaction all items identified at the preparatory session and had been able to offer their analyses of the global economic and financial crisis and its impacts (see above description of the dialogue). They felt that the dialogue had gone even “better than expected”, that they had “held their own”, and that, for the most part, the content of the dialogue had achieved a “high level”. They commented that their credibility had been acknowledged; that the Sherpas had been receptive and attentive to their inputs. The Sherpa feedback provided information on helpful pressure points for civil society engagement. Participants felt that they would need to be better prepared next time and must “stay tuned” regarding G20 progress on financial reform and transparency and accountability.

**Follow-up and unanticipated results.** Decisions at the debriefing session led to many unanticipated results. As mentioned above, an official joint FIM-Forum/DFAIT communiqué (English and French) was prepared by FIM-Forum and vetted by DFAIT for general distribution and for publication on the FIM-Forum website (Annex 2).

The meeting also stimulated discussion on influencing future CS/G20 processes. The importance for participants to follow up with their own governments and to test the positions of the G20 countries was stressed.<sup>2</sup>

Following up with the South Korean government and civil society and with DFAIT were seen to be important next steps for FIM-Forum. It was further suggested that FIM-Forum compile 7 to 8 good examples of CS engagement with multilateral practices to add to best practices for future CS/G20 work.

One participant, Dr. James Riker of the University of Maryland, volunteered to prepare an internal summary document of the meeting (See Annex 3). There was a high level of commitment, on the part of civil society participants, to continue the work with their national constituencies. Within two weeks following the dialogue, participants produced the following unanticipated outputs: i. the communiqué was translated by participants into Spanish, Arabic, and Russian and distributed widely to global civil society networks (See Annex 12: FIM-Forum

---

<sup>2</sup> Participants at the Dialogue continue to apprise the FIM-Forum Secretariat of follow up meetings that they are having with government officials in their home countries.



FORUM POUR UNE GOUVERNANCE  
DÉMOCRATIQUE MONDIALE  
FORUM FOR DEMOCRATIC  
GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

Communiqué Translations: (a) French, (b) Russian, (c) Spanish, (d) Arabic,) and ii. Peter Hajnal, resource person for the project prepared a draft analysis of *The G8 Accountability Report* that had been released in advance of the Muskoka G8 Summit. Mr. Hajnal's analysis was circulated to participants (See Annex 13: DRAFT *G8-G20 Accountability*: Peter Hajnal).

CS participants understood and appreciated that the G20 is a “work in progress” and that establishing a regular, structured CS/G20 dialogue is a long-term project. Participants felt that the dialogue had made a good “first impression” with G20 officials. Hopefully, this first meeting will lead to future CS/G20 dialogue.

**Other work to do.** There remains a long way to go with respect to democratization of the G20 processes. At the debriefing, participants stressed the need for more focus and substance in CS/G20 dialogue following this initial session. Education of the “new 12” as they integrate into the G8 was seen to be a possible area for civil society to address. Participants were also mindful of the new tensions emerging between the, possibly conflicting or overlapping, roles of the United Nations and the G20. They saw these evolving roles as another area for civil society monitoring and influence. FIM-Forum follow up and debriefing with DFAIT was stressed as an important next step.

#### D. Expected Result

*The Montréal international Forum's dedicated team brought together civil society representatives from around the world in record time and delivered on a program focused on the issues at stake for the G-20 Summit. The event's focused approach on a limited number of issues. But nevertheless central to the G-20 Summit priorities, was unique and simulating. Rest assured that I will be reporting back to G-20 Sherpas on the results of this meeting.*

*This consultation is part of Canada's effort to reach out to a global network of stakeholders, to take into account views and innovative insights from civil society and to give it an opportunity to shape the G-20s' thinking. By working together on common goals, we can accomplish far more than we could alone. Canada is pleased to have initiated the first G-20 civil society outreach activity and hopes that it sets the stage for future consultations.*

– June 14, 2010, Mr. Leonard J. Edwards, Sherpa to the 2010 Toronto G20 Summit

The stated expected result was to *improve the quality of the overall consultative processes between the G-20 and civil society and, more specifically, to initiate equitable global CS input into the final G-20 agenda.* By all accounts, this dialogue was seen to be a successful first collaboration between civil society and G20 host officials. As discussed above, CS participants saw this dialogue to be a positive initial step for what will be a long-term process toward achieving equitable CS input into the G20 agenda. In addition to the above official comments by



Mr. Edwards, informal post-dialogue feedback from G20 officials and from the Chair of the meeting also indicated that the meeting was a positive initial step, toward establishing an ongoing CS/G20 dialogue.

### **E. Problems Encountered**

A short timeframe for organizing and convening this event was a problem in the sense that additional time may have allowed FIM-Forum to identify and convene the maximum participation of 25 civil society participants as per the contribution agreement with DFAIT. An initial project submission to convene both CS/G8 and CS/G20 dialogues was made by FIM-Forum in November of 2009. Subsequent decisions and negotiations led to FIM-Forum's May 4, 2010 submission to convene the CS/G20 dialogue. A verbal agreement for FIM-Forum to proceed was reached in late May and the contribution agreement between FIM-Forum and DFAIT was signed on June 8.

This project was however successfully conducted despite the time limitation of less than three weeks from its commencement in Late May to the June 10 Civil Society Preparatory meeting and the June 11 CS/G20 Dialogue.

### **F. Actions Taken**

A critical factor contributing to overcoming time constraints and ensuring the success of this project was the strong commitment on the parts of FIM-Forum, the invited participants, and DFAIT management and staff, to holding this dialogue. This commitment facilitated effective collaboration and cooperation between FIM-Forum and DFAIT. FIM-Forum's experience convening civil society from the global south; its experienced conference management team able to take over on very short notice; and DFAIT resources, essential for obtaining visas for participants on short notice, also contributed to the success of this project.

### **G. Lessons Learned**

Following are lessons learned for sustaining and improving future CS (diplomatic) dialogue processes with the G20 and other multilateral bodies.

**Coalescence of a Diverse Civil Society Grouping:** This project brought together a very diverse group of 19 civil society leaders, from different cultural contexts and geographical and issue areas. Yet, they coalesced within a short time to focus on the tasks of defining two overarching themes and agreeing upon a structure for the Dialogue with the host Sherpas. A key lesson learned that was reported by participants was that it is possible for a diverse group to coalesce within a short time. Several elements, discussed below, contributed to this: the preparatory session, FIM-Forum's criteria for selection of participants, and FIM-Forum's convening and facilitating capacities.



Preparation of participants: The briefing documents (Annex 5, 6, 7, and 8) and the June 10 preparatory session (Annex 4) were designed to help bring participants to a shared level of understanding regarding the evolution of civil society engagement with the G8/G20 processes. This educational/capacity building component along with the preparatory session designed to enable full participant “ownership” by defining the Dialogue content and structure were critical to setting the stage.

Criteria for selection of participants: The civil society group was carefully selected according to criteria that would help to ensure high level, broad based, frank, and diplomatic dialogue. In effect, while they came from a diversity of backgrounds and contexts, they had qualities in common. Participants (including observers and resource persons) were chosen in their individual capacity and did not formally represent any network, issue, or position. All were selected because of their experience in multi stakeholder dialogues, with special emphasis on civil society/multilateral experience. Some were selected because of their expert knowledge on the chosen G20 agenda issues. Participants were expected to be discreet, to agree to follow the Chatham House Rule, and to be prepared to work for long-term, as well as short term, results. (See Annex 9: Civil Society Participant List, Annex 10: Biographical Information: Participants and Annex 11: Biographical Information: Observers).

FIM-Forum’s convening and facilitation capacities: The strong convening capacity of FIM-Forum ensured that a high level of civil society knowledge and experience would be brought to the table. FIM-Forum’s experience as a facilitator and disseminator of civil society knowledge and experience also helped to ensure a productive and informative dialogue within the limits of the two hours available. Finally, FIM-Forum’s professional conference management staff (O’Donoghue and Associates), experienced in working with civil society leaders and able to organize a complicated international meeting within a very short time frame, ensured that the complicated logistics did not interfere with achieving the substantive objectives of the Dialogue.

**Affirming the value and role of civil society diplomacy.** FIM-Forum is developing a growing niche in what it terms “civil society diplomacy”. It is FIM-Forum’s conviction that there is a role for diplomacy capacities when civil society engages with the multilateral system. This successful CS/G20 dialogue has affirmed and strengthened FIM-Forum’s commitment to development of its civil society diplomacy niche. It was clear that civil society participants and the G20 Sherpas and officials benefitted from this type of dialogue.

It is FIM’s conviction that civil society will never speak with one voice. Thus, FIM-Forum supports a multifaceted civil society approach to influencing multilateral bodies and democratization of global governance. Without excluding other forms of non-violent engagement, there is a valuable place in CS/multilateral engagement for civil society diplomacy and dialogue. Indeed, as was illustrated in the willingness and good faith of invitees to the CS/G20 Dialogue, it is important for some segments of civil society to see themselves as participants in a diplomatic exercise. Within a diplomatic context, civil society actors provided helpful, well-constructed and articulated insights and suggestions for the Canadian host Sherpas to bring back to their colleagues. This type of input, accessible only through diplomatic dialogue,



FORUM POUR UNE GOUVERNANCE  
DÉMOCRATIQUE MONDIALE  
FORUM FOR DEMOCRATIC  
GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

is an important resource, both for civil society and for government officials. Through diplomatic dialogue, civil society actors can collaborate with governments and multilateral bodies in all arenas, including finance as was demonstrated at this CS/G20 Dialogue meeting. FIM-Forum will continue to support development of civil society diplomatic capacities and of this unique method for convening and facilitating structured civil society engagement with global multilateral actors and bodies.

**The growing strength of civil society in emerging democracies.** Using its network FIM-Forum was able to identify and bring to the Dialogue civil society leaders from China and Saudi Arabia. The quality and input of the two leaders gives hope that there is a growing and increasingly empowered civil society in these two countries. FIM-Forum has strengthened its capacity to draw from these emerging civil society networks.

**The value and importance of the global indigenous community to democratization of global governance.** The CS/G20 Dialogue included a participant and an observer from the Mohawk Nation. This was the first time that FIM-Forum included members of the global indigenous community in an event. Given FIM-Forum's vision of democratic global governance, inclusion of this global community (indeed a community without regional boundaries, and often-missing voices in the multilateral arena) is essential. The preparatory meeting and CS/G20 Dialogue were substantially enriched and informed by this indigenous presence. FIM-Forum will strive to include indigenous peoples in their future convening.

**Civil society representivity and improving FIM-Forum communications.** According to extensive surveys of those who have attended FIM-Forum fora, the organization's mission and niche are well understood and supported. FIM-Forum is less well understood by those more removed from its activities. It has been critiqued, for example, for its "non representative" approach to facilitating the CS/G20 Dialogue. FIM-Forum has taken steps to more effectively communicate (to a broader constituency) its unique niche and the rationale behind its approach as a non-representative and non-aligned convening body. Specifically, it has launched a five-year (2010 - 2014) Strategic Plan and Results Framework. Key to implementing this plan is effective communication of its mission and niche.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> With respect to communicating FIM-Forum's mission and addressing the, sometimes thorny, issue of civil society representivity, FIM-Forum does not claim to represent civil society, civil society issues, organizations, or networks in any way. FIM-Forum restricts the meaning of civil society representivity to situations where spokespersons have been formally mandated to speak on behalf of a clearly identifiable group (Annex 6). Civil society organizations and leaders are part of the participative aspect of democracy, complimenting the representative aspect. They cannot claim to represent "the people" in the way that parliamentarians and democratic governments can. Civil society organizations represent those who have mandated them to carry out their mission. This includes memberships, constituencies, and Boards of Directors or overseers. It is FIM-Forum's position that civil society practitioners and their organizations, alliances, and networks should be rigorous in identifying and communicating whom they represent and to whom they are accountable.

Thus, within the democratic context, civil society organizations are accountable to those they can claim to represent and, conversely, represent those to whom they are accountable. Civil society activists and organizations have full citizen rights, as the participatory component of democracy, to champion values, issues, and causes and to propose solutions to problems that affect citizens. While they cannot claim to represent issues, beliefs, peoples, or causes in general, activists working to democratize global governance can capture and reflect the voices of the disadvantaged and marginalized - those who are not represented or are under-represented in the global arena. Given their direct impact on multilateral bodies and on democracy development, those working to democratize multilateral bodies are responsible to accurately and faithfully reflect these voices.



## H. Conclusions and Recommendations for Future CS-G20 Dialogue

In conclusion, participants and Canadian G20 officials confirmed that this first structured civil society dialogue with G20 host Sherpas achieved its objectives. Civil society participants were able to speak to all points identified through their preparatory process and, as Mr. Edwards confirmed, the results of the meeting were reported to all G20 Sherpas. Thus, FIM-Forum, in partnership with DFAIT, successfully initiated a legitimate and meaningful dialogue between global civil society leaders and the G20. Global civil society leaders were provided an opportunity to influence G20 agenda issue and to offer, to G20 leaders, their analyses of the global economic and financial crisis. This dialogue has served to improve the quality of the overall consultative processes between the G-20 and civil society and, more specifically, to initiate equitable global CS input into the final G-20 agenda. While it is acknowledged that the G20 is a “work in progress”, the G20 process itself has now affirmed the value of diplomatic civil society dialogue and input to informing their evolving agenda.

In addition to recommendations on the finance and accountability themes put forward by civil society participants at the CS-G20 meeting (Section A) participants recommended: *That civil society explore ways in which future G20 dialogues with global civil society can be made a regular part of transparent and accountable functioning of the G20 as an institution of global governance.* To this end, FIM-Forum will:

- Compile 7-8 examples of best practices of civil society engagement with multilateral processes. Various documents have been developed (See Annexes 8, 12, and 13). Others will be identified for development to help build civil society capacity to engage with the G20 (e.g. participants expressed the importance of studying the impacts on the roles and responsibilities of UN and the G20 as the G20 mandate evolves and enlarges beyond issues of the economy and global finance).
- Work with civil society leaders to support monitoring of G20 progress on peer review.

In the near term, FIM-Forum will pursue the following activities:

- Convene a G-20 Toronto post – mortem discussion between civil society participants and host Canadian authorities.
- Initiate an effort, amongst global civil society practitioners and Canadian and Korean authorities, to help ensure a constructive civil society dialogue as a part of the Korean G20 Summit in November of 2010.



FORUM POUR UNE GOUVERNANCE  
DÉMOCRATIQUE MONDIALE  
FORUM FOR DEMOCRATIC  
GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

## PART II. FINAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Below, in Section A, is a complete list of funds spent based on budgeted line items as compared to the original budget line items. According to the June 7, 2010 FIM-Forum - DFAIT Contribution Agreement, DFAIT will make a contribution with respect to the Project, of a sum up to, but not to exceed, **CAD \$ 122,663.00**. One accountable advance for 61,331 \$CAD has been made to Forum international de Montréal. The total Project cost was 101,628 \$CAD. Thus the amount owing to FIM-Forum, based on receipted expenditures for completion of this Project, is **40,155 \$CAD**. Section B of this Final Financial Statement includes a Final Disbursement Request in this amount.

In general, with the exception of travel, budgeted and actual costs were closely aligned. As noted, travel costs were lower than anticipated. There were three fewer civil society participants than budgeted for and, overall, airfares were lower than expected for such late international bookings.



## A. Funds Spent

### Civil Society and the 2010 G20 Engaged Dialogue: Contribution Agreement Number: 2010-001

**Table 1: Funds spent as compared to amounts originally budgeted**

ITEMS		Originally Budgeted	Funds Spent
<b>1. Civil society participants (22) [note 1]</b>			
Travel and visas: 22 x \$3,000 [note 2]	66,000		36,766
Lodging: 3 nights x 22 x 174.02 [note 3]	11,485		10,093
Meals and incidentals: 3 days x 22 x \$84.50 [note 4]	5,577		7,307
Transportation to Sherpa meeting (8 taxis x \$10 x 2)	160		103
<b>Sub total</b>		<b>83,222</b>	<b>54,269</b>
<b>2. Venue, June 10 and 11: Preparatory meeting</b>			
Meeting Room: 2 days x \$1469	2,938		2,840
<b>Sub total</b>		<b>2,938</b>	<b>2,840</b>
<b>3. Hospitality, June 10/11: Preparatory Meeting</b>	2,464		2,868
June 10: cont. breakfast, 2 breaks, 1 lunch for 22			
June 11: cont. breakfast for 22			
June 11: Sherpa meeting	200		210
<b>Sub total</b>		<b>2,664</b>	<b>3,078</b>
<b>4. One (1) Resource person for preparatory civil society meeting</b>			
<b>June 10:[note 1]</b>			
Travel from Toronto to Ottawa return airfare:	400		359
Lodging: 2 nights x 174.02	348		348
Meals and incidentals: 2 days x \$84.50	169		175
Professional Services	500		500
<b>Sub total</b>		<b>1,417</b>	<b>1,382</b>
<b>5. FIM Staff (2): [note 5]</b>			
Project management	11,700		14,200
Identification of international participants/communication	4,500		4,500
Research coordination	2,300		2,300
Documentation preparation: CS preparatory meeting agenda, CS dialogue programme, principles document, background documents.	2,000		4,665
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>20,500</b>	<b>25,665</b>
Travel Montreal - Ottawa return rail (2 x \$70) [note 6]	140		727
Lodging: 2 nights x 2 x 174.02 [note 7]	696		870
Meals and incidentals: 2 days x 2 x \$84.50 [note 8]	338		849
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>1,174</b>	<b>2,446</b>



<b>6. Contractual staff (2):</b>			
Event management	2,472		2,472
Communications	610		637
Registration/Housing	1,580		1,580
Administrative	1,106		2,025
Travel Logistics/Expense Claims/Fin. Report	3,589		3,589
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>9,357</b>	<b>10,303</b>
Travel Mansonville, QC - Ottawa return by car (632 km x 56.5 cents/km)	357		467
Lodging: 2 nights x 2 x 174.02	696		696
Meals and incidentals: 2 days x 2 x \$84.50	338		340
		<b>1,391</b>	<b>1,503</b>
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>122,663</b>	<b>101,486</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>122,663</b>	<b>101,486</b>

Notes:

[1] The actual number of civil society participants was 19.

[2] Included in this total are: a) 1,000\$ CAD to cover costs to participants incurred due to delay in reimbursement of their funds (i.e. local Bank Transfer charges and fluctuations in currency exchange rates) and b) the undisbursed amount of 3,220.37\$ CAD for travel costs for participant Neville Gabriel (South Africa). FIM-Forum is awaiting his receipts for airfare Durbin- Ottawa- return.

[3] The total number of hotel nights for civil society participants was 58.

[4] This amount includes additional receipted expenses for taxis, meals, and incidentals and for the group dinner (in the amount of 1,245\$CAD) that was held for participants on July 10.

[5] Ten (10) additional staff working days were required post event for document preparation, including preparation of the financial and narrative reports.

[6] This amount includes Mtl. – Ottawa return travel of FIM-Forum’s Financial Officer and car rental for Mtl. – Ottawa return travel of FIM-Forum staff (including document transportation). Original plan for staff to travel by rail had to be changed.

[7] Includes one additional night for FIM-Forum’s Financial Officer (total 5 nights).

[8] Includes FIM-Forum Staff/CEO representation not originally budgeted.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nigel Martin, President/CEO



FORUM POUR UNE GOUVERNANCE  
DÉMOCRATIQUE MONDIALE  
FORUM FOR DEMOCRATIC  
GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

## B. Final Disbursement Request

**Project Title : Civil Society and the 2010 G20 Engaged Dialogue  
Contribution Agreement Number : 2010-001**

5252 de Maisonneuve Blvd. W  
Suite 310  
Montréal, Québec  
H4A 3S5

August 11, 2010

This request is for **40,155\$CAD** as final payment toward the total costs of planning and implementation of the project: *Civil Society and the 2010 G20 Engaged Dialogue* which took place June 11, 2010 in Ottawa Canada.

FIM identification number Canada: 14360 3702  
FIM identification number Québec: 1023608924

### Bank information:

Name of bank: Banque Laurentienne du Canada  
Address: 4848 Sherbrooke Street West  
Westmount (Québec) H3Z 1G8  
Account name: Le Forum International de Montreal (FIM)  
Account number: 049748001  
Transit number: 00311  
Institution no.: O39  
SWIFT code: BLCMCAMM

---

Nigel Martin,  
President/CEO

## **ANNEXES**

**ANNEX 1: CS/G20 Dialogue Agenda**

**DRAFT AGENDA**

**Civil Society Dialogue with G20 Host Sherpa**

**Friday, June 11, 2010, 10:45 – 12:45**

**Location: Room A 8126, Lester B. Pearson Building**

**Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT)**

***Chaired by Mr. Peter Harder, Former Canadian Sherpa to the G8***

- 10:45 – 10:55      INTRODUCTIONS**  
Mr. Len Edwards: Host Sherpa to the Toronto G20  
Mr. Tiff Macklem: Finance Sous Sherpa to the Toronto G20
- 10:55 – 11:00      WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION OF THE CHAIR**  
Dr. Rajesh Tandon, Chair of the Board, FIM-Forum for Democratic Global Governance
- 11:00 – 11:10      INTRODUCTION: FIRST THEMATIC ISSUE**  
Spokesperson TBA
- 11:10 – 11:45      DISCUSSION**
- 11:45 – 11:55      INTRODUCTION: SECOND THEMATIC ISSUE**  
Spokesperson TBA
- 11:55 – 12:35      DISCUSSION**
- 12:35 – 12:45      CLOSING COMMENTS**  
Mr. Len Edwards  
Dr. Rajesh Tandon  
Mr. Peter Harder
- ADJOURNMENT**

## ANNEX 2: FIM-Forum Communiqué

### Civil Society Dialogue with the Host Sherpa to the Toronto 2010 G20 Summit COMMUNIQUE, June 21, 2010

On Friday June 11 in Ottawa, Canada, nineteen civil society leaders from around the world engaged in a dialogue with Mr. Leonard Edwards, the Canadian Host Sherpa for the forthcoming G20 Summit in Toronto, and Finance Sous-Sherpa Mr. Graham Flack. The focus of the dialogue was accountability of the G20 to the citizens of the world. Since the beginning of the financial crisis in 2008, G20 leaders have met three times and have taken a number of important decisions to support the economic recovery and reform the global financial system: Washington (November 2008), London (April 2009), and Pittsburgh (September 2009). The G20 Summit in Toronto (June 26-27, 2010) will follow on the heels of the G8 Summit in Muskoka (June 25-26, 2010).

Organized by FIM Forum for Democratic Global Governance (based in Montreal), this dialogue with the Canadian Sherpa was the first ever structured civil society dialogue with the G20 summit host. As the G20 acquires a growing influence in shaping decisions related to global governance, it is of utmost importance that civil society voices from around the world are heard by G20 leaders such that the G20 and its leaders conduct themselves in ways that deepen democratization of global governance institutions, processes, and decision-making.

Over this past two years, the G20 has focused its attention primarily on issues related to the rescue and repair of the global economy. The Toronto G20 Summit is focusing on implementation of commitments taken at previous summits, including the *Framework for Strong, Sustainable and Balanced Growth*. The engagement of civil society leaders with the Canadian Host Sherpa and Finance Sous-Sherpa thus focused on specific issues related to macroeconomic policies.

During the dialogue it was pointed out that implementation of various bailout and rescue packages in different countries have angered citizens around the world as taxpayers' funds have been seen to be utilized to 'bail out' those institutions (banks and others) which have been responsible for causing the financial crises. Civil society participants asked that the G20 utilize stimuli for the transformation of national and global economies into 'green economies that eradicate poverty'. The design of the future architecture of global economic institutions should be such that its primary support is for food security, employment, and the social economy (which provides livelihoods to more than a billion people around the world). This architecture will require clear and transparent regulation of global financial flows.

One of the major decisions taken by the G20 in its London meeting was reform of the World Bank and the IMF (International Monetary Fund), including greater capital infusion and broader mandates to them to support the global economy. While the World Bank has made incremental improvements in voting rights, reforms in the IMF are still being resisted. The G20 had announced that strengthening of the capital base and the new roles of these International Financial Institutions (IFIs) was conditional upon key governance reforms of the IFIs. Civil society participants advocated that G20 leaders ensure that full reform of IFI governance

structures and mechanisms is completed by the end of 2010 at the latest. Reforms include implementing open, transparent, global, professional, and competitive procedures for recruitment of heads of these institutions.

Democratic accountability of the G20 as an institution of global governance was at the center of the civil society participants' concerns during this dialogue. The first concern with regard to accountability is to ensure that the G20 does not marginalize and undermine other multilateral institutions like the UN system. G20 leaders should therefore commit themselves to support and energize multilateral institutions and the UN system in order to follow through and deliver on commitments such as the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). G20 leaders should publicly signal their support for agreements on climate change and human rights, especially the rights of women and of indigenous peoples.

After years of civil society engagement with the G8, various models and forms of effective dialogue and constructive engagement between the G8 and civil society globally have evolved. Civil society leaders asked the Canadian Sherpa to negotiate ways in which such practices can be carried forward to the G20. In particular, the forthcoming *Accountability Report* of the G8 was seen as a mechanism that the G20 could also adopt in reporting the outcomes of its decisions and their consequences to the citizens of the world.

The Canadian Host Sherpa will convey these inputs to his fellow G20 Sherpas and will explore ways in which future G20 dialogues with global civil society can be made a regular part of transparent and accountable functioning of the G20 as an institution of global governance.

Dr Rajesh Tandon  
Chair, FIM Forum for Democratic Global Governance

Mr. Nigel Martin  
President & CEO, FIM-Forum for Democratic Global Governance

**FIM-Forum is grateful to Canada's Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) for their financial support for this event.**

## ANNEX 3: CS/G20 Dialogue: FIM-Forum Internal Report

### Toronto G20 Summit: Report on June 11 Civil Society Dialogue with G20 Host Sherpa

**Summary:** *A group of civil society leaders from 17 nations hosted by the FIM-Forum for Democratic Global Governance and Canada's Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) held a Dialogue meeting with Mr. Len Edwards, Host Sherpa to the Toronto G20 and Finance Sous Sherpa Mr. Graham Flack, in Ottawa on 11 June 2010. Mr. Peter Harder, former Canadian Sherpa to the G8, served as the chair for the Dialogue. This meeting constituted the first structured civil society dialogue held by a host G20 country. The Host Sherpa welcomed the views of civil society participants. He emphasized that these consultations are important to G20 summitry and that he would be reporting on the outcomes of this Dialogue to his G20 Sherpa colleagues.*

*The Dialogue meeting focused on two broad thematic issues: (1) the G20's overall financial strategy, its oversight, and the reform of the international financial institutions; and (2) the public accountability of the G20, its engagement with civil society, and corporate accountability. It was clear that many would like the G20 to succeed as a mechanism of democratic global governance. This event was seen to be a positive beginning to establishing ongoing civil society dialogue with the G20. Following the G20 Summit, FIM-Forum and Canadian G20 officials will meet to explore ways in which future G20 dialogues with global civil society can be made a regular part of transparent and accountable functioning of the G20 as an institution of global governance.*

#### FIRST THEMATIC ISSUE: FINANCIAL STRATEGY, OVERSIGHT, AND REFORM

To begin the Dialogue, civil society leaders emphatically stated that there is a lack of clarity and considerable suspicion that the economic stimulus fund efforts are putting too many public resources in the hands of those who are the source of the global financial crisis. The G20 should give priority to developing a new financial strategy that promotes joint efforts for macroeconomic coordination in order to ensure a strong and balanced global recovery that leads to a sustainable growth path. Specifically, discussion focused on the following criteria to guide the G20's overall financial strategy:

- **Strong:** in a manner sufficient to bridge the gaps in output and employment, ensuring efficient use of resources and maximizing the potential for long-term growth;
- **Sustainable:** sustained over time with solid growth potential, resistant to future shocks and consistent with sound environmental and social policies; and
- **Balanced:** growth that is available to all countries and regions worldwide, marking a trend toward convergence of living standards in the long term.

Discussion focused on three issues:

### **1. Transformation of the Economy into a Green Economy that Supports Poverty Eradication, Utilizing, where possible, the Stimulus Package**

Civil society leaders stressed the critical need to go beyond the G20's predominant focus on the *quantity* of growth to examine both the *quality* and *equality* of that growth if genuine sustainable growth is to be achieved by the G20's \$1.1 trillion emergency rescue package. Given the present uneven and stagnant economic growth in various regions of the world and the declining funding commitments to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), it is imperative that the G20's various strategies for growth benefit poor and vulnerable peoples. Accordingly, the G20 should give priority treatment to deep political issues such as investment in industrial development with an emphasis on small and medium enterprises (SMEs), trade issues, employment (and unemployment), renewable energy, poverty alleviation (MDGs) and food security. Specifically, the G20 should:

- Undertake a major effort to transform national economies into green economies. According to a HSBC survey, many governments did make parts of their economic stimulus packages “green.” In particular, civil society participants commended South Korea, which devoted 81 percent of its stimulus package to support investment in green-related industries and practices, and China, which used 38 percent of its stimulus funds for this purpose. In contrast, the G8 countries have provided limited support for green investments. For example, the United States devoted only 20 percent, Germany 13 percent and United Kingdom only 7 percent of their stimulus funds respectively for this purpose, according to the HSBC survey;
- Make a commitment to eliminate tax havens in order enable governments to use these financial resources ;
- Develop new regulations for the global financial system. In particular, discussion focused on whether the G20 would support a “Financial Transactions Tax.” It would be a shame if the Europeans go ahead by themselves as Chancellor Merkel has suggested. This measure could fund key Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and climate change adaptation measures; and
- Enforce the International Labour Organization's (ILO) standards in all economies in the world.

### **2. Reform of the International Financial Institutions**

In the discussion, civil society leaders pressed the Host Sherpa on the need to reform the Bretton Woods Institutions, with particular attention to the International Monetary Fund (IMF), in order to enhance their governance and to change the formula for voting. Within the reform, participants discussed issues such as restructuring of the chairs of the Executive

Board (e.g., including more chairs for poor countries), transparency in the election of the Director General, the possibility of establishing a council of ministers with greater powers, and changing patterns of employment of staff (i.e., more diverse origin and universities). We would be interested in your views on these proposed reforms.

### **3. A Financial Architecture that Supports the Social Economy**

Finally, civil society leaders highlighted the critical need and opportunity to promote an economy that respects diverse social communities and lives within the planet's boundaries. The fundamental challenge for the G20 is to change the direction of growth to support *People-Centered Economies*. This vision requires a new paradigm of development, new mechanisms and enabling incentives. An example would be the Canadian experience with cooperatives. Argentina has created its first non-private bank, which will be a cooperative. Different approaches are emerging around the world, from North and South America, and Europe, where cooperatives contribute to between 7 percent and 20 percent of the gross domestic product (GDP).

Most jobs and development of new companies is in the SME area and Social Economy areas some of these are within the NGO and Community-Based Enterprises. There is a need for a review of laws and policies to support these priorities.

## **SECOND THEMATIC ISSUE: PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY, ENGAGEMENT WITH CIVIL SOCIETY, AND CORPORATE ACCOUNTABILITY**

### **1. G20 Reporting Process**

Civil society leaders welcomed the G8's commitment to publishing the first accountability report prior to the upcoming Toronto G20 Summit, and viewed this report as an important first step for ensuring greater public accountability. They emphasized that a similar approach to regular reporting by the G20 will also be important for building public confidence that the G20 is serious about implementing its commitments. It is imperative that such reporting be done in a transparent and timely manner that allows for broader consultation with civil society leaders and citizens. Most important, civil society leaders urged that a multi-stakeholder approach be adopted in developing appropriate reporting criteria and methods for the G20.

The Host Sherpa acknowledged that the key challenge of global economic cooperation within the G20 is that there is little history for this level of coordination in coming to grips with the scale and scope of this rescue mission to the global economy. How does the G20 turn into a permanent capacity to manage the global economy with special attention to equity, the environment and human rights? The Host Sherpa stressed that the G20 is an evolving body. Observers are going to have to give the G20 more time to get the global economy back on its feet first.

### **2. Engaging with Civil Society**

Civil society leaders share the G20's commitment to promoting democratic processes, good governance and reducing corruption. As the G20 develops its agenda over the next several years, it is important that G20 leaders recognize that civil society leaders can be valuable partners in pursuing these goals. A multi-stakeholder approach has been successful in many cases in developing shared strategies to address a range of global issues (i.e., G8 research group compliance studies; World Bank inspection panels; World Commission on Dams). This principle is now embedded at the global level in such organizations as the Global Fund and the Global Alliance for Vaccination and Immunization (GAVI).

### **3. Corporate Accountability**

There has been a major change towards greater corporate transparency and accountability underway in recent years. Examples include the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI), the International Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, and the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI). Socially responsible businesses are increasingly working closely with civil society and governments to ensure public confidence in their work – a belief in mutual accountability obligations. It was recognized that civil society must be equally accountable in these processes. Civil society participants welcomed the initiative of some G20 member governments to actively promote stronger corporate transparency. It was stressed that civil society leaders can contribute to the G20 efforts to develop and promote effective mechanisms for corporate accountability.

## ANNEX 4: Civil Society Preparatory Meeting Agenda

# DRAFT AGENDA Civil Society Preparatory Meeting

Thursday, June 10, 2010, 9:00 – 5:00  
Laurier Salon, Ottawa Marriot Hotel, 100 Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario

*Chaired by Dr. Rajesh Tandon, INDIA, Chair of the Board, FIM-Forum*

- 07:30 - 08:30      **CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST** ..... *Foyer Lower Level*
- 09:00 - 09:20      **Welcome and Opening Comments**  
Mr. Nigel Martin, Dr. Rajesh Tandon
- 09:20 - 09:45      **Introduction of Civil Society Participants**
- 09:45 - 10:45      **An Inside Look at the G8 and G20  
Discussion and Question Period**  
Mr. Peter Harder, Former Canadian Sherpa to the G8
- 10:45 – 11:00      **HEALTH BREAK**..... *Foyer Lower Level*
- 11:00 - 12:30      **The June 11 Civil Society Dialogue with the  
G20 Host Sherpa: Setting Our Agenda**  
Participants and Resource Persons
- 12:30 – 13:30      **LUNCH BREAK**..... *Albert Salon*
- 13:30 - 15:00      **The June 11 Civil Society Dialogue with the  
G20 Host Sherpa: Setting Our Agenda (continued)**  
Participants and Resource Persons
- 15:00 – 15:15      **HEALTH BREAK** ..... *Foyer Lower Level*
- 15:15 - 17:00      **Decisions: Agenda Items, Selection of Spokespersons  
for Tomorrow’s Dialogue with the G20 Host Sherpa**  
Participants and Resource Persons
- 17:00                **ADJOURNMENT**
- 19:00                **DINNER**  
Location to be announced

## ANNEX 5: Briefing Note to Civil Society Participants

### FIM-Forum Briefing Note to Civil Society Participants

Dear Colleagues,

This briefing note describes FIM-Forum for Democratic Governance's (FIM Forum's)<sup>4</sup> approach to facilitating civil society dialogue and quiet diplomacy with multilateral bodies. Specific reference in this note is to the June 11, 2010 civil society dialogue with the Canadian host Sherpa, Mr. Len Edwards, and the Finance Sous Sherpa, Mr. Tiff Macklem, to the June 27 – 28, 2010 G20 – Summit.

*FIM-Forum's mission is to democratize multilateralism through innovative approaches to mobilizing civil society practitioner knowledge that enable the missing voices of civil society to inform policy, impact practice, and improve intergovernmental efforts to eradicate poverty, injustice, and inequality.*

FIM-Forum was established in 1998 as an international, knowledge-based Non Governmental Organization. Since then, FIM-Forum has developed a unique niche as a broker of civil society practitioner knowledge and as a facilitator of informal dialogue and quiet diplomacy – a form of Track Two Diplomacy. FIM-Forum is a non-partisan, neutral convening body committed to global civil society capacity- and constituency- building. While FIM-Forum itself does not advocate, it believes in the inherent value and importance of multilateralism, and of the voices of civil society from the Global South, to the democratization of global governance. FIM-Forum provides unique learning opportunities for global governance actors, through its convening and quiet diplomacy activities and through supporting the creation and dissemination of civil society practitioner knowledge. In order to ensure that FIM-Forum's program is adaptive and responsive to priorities that reflect its Global and Southern bias, the majority of FIM-Forum's Directors are civil society leaders from the Global South.

The June 11 civil society dialogue with the Canadian host Sherpa to the 2010 G20 Summit falls within FIM-Forum's mission to facilitate informal diplomatic dialogue between civil society leaders, the majority from the Global South, and multilateralism. This meeting is an important opportunity to initiate legitimate and meaningful dialogue between global civil society leaders and the G20, a new and influential global multilateral grouping. The dialogue will be designed to provide opportunities for global civil society leaders to dialogue directly with the Canadian host Sherpa Mr. Len Edwards. Through Mr. Edwards, our message will be communicated to all G20 Sherpas. FIM-Forum anticipates that this beginning will lead to a longer term process of civil society engagement with the G20.

This first civil society - G20 host Sherpa dialogue will be framed within FIM-Forum's principles for civil society engagement with multilateral organizations<sup>5</sup>. It will follow a format similar to the one instituted by FIM-Forum at the first civil society - G8 dialogue, held in Canada in 2002 in advance of the Kananaskis, Alberta, G8 Summit. This successful civil society dialogue led to a growing openness on the part of G8 officials to dialogue with civil society and some form of dialogue with civil society has become an annual G8 tradition.<sup>6</sup> For the first time in Russia in 2006 all G8 Sherpas participated in a "Civil-G8" Dialogue. While the FIM-Forum Board of Directors is pleased with the pioneering role that FIM-Forum was able to play with the G8, there is a growing concern that these dialogues have become normalized and that Southern-based civil society voices have become marginalized.

Therefore, the format for this first civil society - G20 dialogue has, from the outset, been predicated upon the principle that the June 11 dialogue will be an occasion for civil society leaders, the majority from the Global South, with strong solidarity from their Northern counterparts, to dialogue *directly* with the G20 host Sherpa. The following elements will help to frame the June 11 dialogue:

**Quiet Diplomacy and the Chatham House Rule:** FIM-Forum believes that, through the application of diplomatic skills and the adoption of distinct diplomatic methods, civil society can make critical contributions to democratization of global governance.

According to the Chatham House Rule, *when a meeting, or part thereof, is held under the Chatham House Rule, participants are free to use the information received, but neither the identity nor the affiliation of the speaker(s), nor*

---

<sup>4</sup> Forum international de Montréal (FIM) adopted its new name – FIM - Forum for Democratic Global Governance in April 2010.

<sup>5</sup> *Democratizing Global Governance: Principles for the Engagement of Civil Society Organizations with Multilateralism*. The FIM Secretariat, Montréal, November 2009. [www.fimcivilsociety.org](http://www.fimcivilsociety.org)

<sup>6</sup> Martin, N. (2008). The FIM G8 Project: A Case Analysis of a Project to Initiate Civil Society Engagement with the G8. Published in J. Walker & A.S. Thompson (Eds.). *Critical Mass: The emergence of global civil society*. Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

*that of any other participant, may be revealed.* This “rule” is an aid to free discussion. It aims to provide anonymity to speakers and to encourage openness and sharing of information.

In order to facilitate dialogue, and in keeping with FIM-Forum’s principles for good practice, the June 11 meeting will be conducted under the Chatham House Rule.<sup>7</sup> FIM-Forum’s principles for engagement with multilateral bodies champion quiet diplomacy. Diplomacy occurs in a context where those with divergent values and agendas can work together. Diplomacy focuses on building relationships and bridges toward constructive communication and collaboration. It fosters understanding and respect for others’ experiences and points of view and requires a commitment to frank, honest, and open exchange.

**Representivity and civil society participation in their personal capacities:** In the context of FIM- Forum’s principles, the term “to represent” is restricted in meaning to situations where spokespersons have been formally mandated to speak on behalf of a clearly identifiable group. Accordingly, all civil society participants at the G20 host Sherpa dialogue are invited to participate in their personal capacity.

**FIM-Forum’s conditions for undertaking to convene this dialogue:** When undertaking to convene this dialogue in partnership with the Canadian Ministry for Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), the FIM-Forum Board of Directors and DFAIT agreed to the following conditions:

- Throughout the process of planning and facilitating this dialogue, every effort must be made to ensure that FIM-Forum is not perceived in any way as a spokes group for, or gatekeeper of, global civil society.
- Although Canada is hosting the June 2010 G20 meetings, the proposed consultation is not intended, in any way, to meet a specific Canadian agenda. These consultations are an effort to deal with global governance as a whole.
- The civil society G20 host Sherpa dialogue project is intended to improve the quality of the overall consultative processes between the G20 and civil society and, more specifically, to initiate equitable global civil society input into the final G20 2010 agenda.
- This project should not convey, directly, or indirectly, any legitimacy onto the G20 as a *democratic* global governance structure.

**G20 June 2010 themes as forwarded to FIM-Forum:** The following themes were provided by G20 organizers to assist civil society participants to prepare their input to the June 11 host Sherpa dialogue:

1. Building a new approach to international economic cooperation and addressing the root causes of the crisis through implementation of the Pittsburgh *Framework for Strong, Sustainable and Balanced Growth*;
2. Fully implementing stimulus measures;
3. Resisting protectionism and promoting open markets through concrete measures;
4. Continuing reforms to financial and regulatory systems so that we minimize future risks;
5. Continuing governance reforms to international financial institutions and multilateral development banks to ensure that they are legitimate, credible and can effectively respond to global challenges; and
6. Providing these institutions with adequate resources so that they can fulfill their responsibilities in ensuring a more even recovery for those who are most vulnerable.

June 4, 2010 - The FIM-Forum Secretariat

---

<sup>7</sup> See <http://www.chathamhouse.org.uk/about/chathamhouse.org.uk>.

## **ANNEX 6: Democratizing Global Governance: Principles for the Engagement of Civil Society Organizations with Multilateralism**

The FIM Secretariat  
Montréal  
November 3, 2009

*Principles for the Engagement of Civil Society Organizations with Multilateralism*, hereafter referred to as CSOs, is intended for local, national, regional, and international civil society organizations networks, alliances, and coalitions, who are working to democratize the activities, programmes, policies, and practices of multilateral institutions and of the multilateral system.

A key mission of Forum international de Montréal (FIM) is to capture and disseminate strategies and lessons learned by these activists. *Principles for the Engagement of CSOs with Multilateralism* was developed in response to a realization, within the FIM network, of the need to build upon the strategies and lessons that FIM has captured since its' inception in 1998 and to create general principles for good practice.

*Principles for the Engagement of CSOs with Multilateralism* represents FIM's reflections and experience. They are drawn from practitioner experience and knowledge documented in FIM case studies and reports, discussed at FIM conferences and fora, and reported in an international survey of civil society leaders. These principles aim to capture the highest possible, or ideal, values and standards of conduct for CSO engagement with the multilateral system. They are premised upon the following FIM convictions: (1) Democratized multilateralism, at all levels from regional to sub global to global, is a necessary condition for attaining democratic global governance and (2) Active engagement of CSOs with multilateralism is essential to achieving this vision.

FIM does not in any way claim to represent the opinions of CSOs in general or of civil society at large. We hope however that these principles for good practice will help to spark and inform CSO reflection on values and standards, both for engagement and, where necessary, disengagement with multilateral institutions.

This document is a "living" work in progress and will be further developed by FIM through ongoing input from civil society activists. It presents the following eight *Principles for the Engagement of CSOs with Multilateralism*:

1. That CSOs build and maintain local to global and global to local links.
2. That CSOs document and disseminate their practitioner knowledge.
3. That CSOs embrace the full diversity of their Sector.
4. That CSOs understand the broad context of global governance.
5. That CSOs are willing and able to engage, and to disengage, diplomatically with those who do not share their vision of the common good.
6. That CSOs are actively committed to their long term vision and goals.
7. That CSOs are open and transparent about who they represent and to whom they are accountable.
8. That CSOs align their practice with their values.

We welcome your comments.

# Democratizing Global Governance: Principles for the Engagement of Civil Society Organizations with Multilateralism

## Definitions:

*Global Governance:* The overseeing of agreements, made amongst a plurality of sovereign states, that are lawfully binding for these signatory states, and that have global impacts.

*Democratize Global Governance:* To implement a process whereby citizens and or their elected representatives participate directly in all facets of global governance including the preparation of public policy and the planning, implementation, and monitoring of any ensuing legislation.

*Civil Society:* The sector of society, distinct from the State and the Market, where citizens, through their relationships with one another, pursue a shared vision of the common good and of a just world where all beings have a peaceful and harmonious life.

*Principle:* A fundamental standard of good conduct based upon values that can be shared by a community of practice.

*Civil Society Organization (CSO):* Groups such as community groups, non-governmental organizations, labour unions, Indigenous Peoples' organizations, charitable organizations, faith-based organizations, professional associations, and foundations that pursue common purposes.

*Multilateralism:* Multiple countries working in concert with each other on a given issue.

## The Principles:

1. *That CSOs build and maintain local to global and global to local links.*

The wisdom, experience, and knowledge of the people form the roots of democratic global governance. Indeed, local cultures are the guardians of universal values that need to be upheld by the international community and infused into dialogue at all levels. Successful and sustainable regional and international democratization processes are grounded in people's values and in the dynamics and realities of their local and national struggles and priorities. This principle asserts that CSOs at these local and national levels constitute the broad and essential base for civil society credibility and legitimacy and for achieving sustainable change and reform at all levels of the multilateral system. Indeed, the most significant changes occur at international as well as national levels when reform efforts are buttressed, if not driven, by domestic, well organized, and informed civil society. Building and maintaining CSO linkages from this local base to the global arena and back to the local is fundamental to democratization of global governance.

Robust local to global and global to local links serve to ground CSO dialogue and action in the realities of the people. Such linkages enable a balanced flow of information and provide the overall coherence and context essential for informed action and shared guidance. These linkages are the mechanisms that allow CSOs, working at regional and global levels, to draw from local and national realities. Local to global linkages also make it possible for regional and international activists to inform activists at local levels as to how their priorities both affect, and are affected by, the broader regional and international contexts.

This principle recognizes that democratization of global governance is impeded by the marginalizing effects of the imbalance of power and influence between CSOs working at local and national levels and more powerful and influential international CSOs. Actions that serve to mitigate this power imbalance include: conducting rigorous local to global analyses; building local to global civil society coalitions, alliances, networks, campaigns, and multi stakeholder partnerships; transfer of knowledge and financial resources from larger, richer CSOs to smaller, poorer CSOs; and utilization of new and emerging information and communications technologies.

2. *That CSOs document and disseminate their practitioner knowledge.*

Documentation and dissemination of CSO experience, knowledge, and lessons learned is foundational to good practice and to the democratization of global governance. CSOs need to reflect upon and learn from the past, share their lessons and strategies with the wider community, and systematically transfer this knowledge to the next generation.

The current deficit of accessible civil society knowledge and wisdom extends from the local to the global, impeding progress toward democratic governance at all levels of society. A recognized, valid, and legitimate practitioner knowledge base is essential for CSOs to be able to communicate effectively within the diversity of its own Sector and beyond. CSOs require capacities to conscientiously document and share their experience and knowledge in forms that are widely accessible.

While the new social media will democratize access to, and production of, knowledge, it behooves CSOs to develop methodologies, language, symbols, and tools that are both distinct to the Sector and accessible. Such methodologies need to be appropriate for capturing and conveying civil society's unique perspectives, knowledge, experience, values, and visions.

Civil society practitioner experience, analyses, visions, and values should be disseminated in a timely fashion to be systematically debated and shared around the world. Practitioner knowledge should avoid jargon and unnecessary mystification of the important and complex issues concerning global governance and aim to serve and inform the citizenry in general as well as professional civil society activists, academics, donors, and multilateral officials.

Civil society knowledge networking and collaboration, as well as professional development opportunities, including opportunities to develop a distinct scholarship of practice, are avenues for civil society to meet its responsibilities to document and communicate what it has learned. Importantly, civil society actors ought to be proactive in legitimizing their practitioner experience and research by placing knowledge that is rooted in their communities at the forefront of their reports and analyses.

3. *That CSOs embrace the full diversity of their Sector.*

Democratization of global governance is a global civil society objective, approached from a diversity of civil society perspectives, and spanning local to global levels. This diversity is civil society's defining quality and strength. Diversity fosters the richness of dialogue and the generation of fresh ideas that hold the potential for peace and harmony for all earth's beings. Full inclusion of all voices and levels and of the ever increasing diversity of civil society's issues, causes, and points of view is a necessary condition for achieving democratic global governance. To value civil society diversity is to value and empower civil society as a multifaceted Sector as well as the coalitions, alliances, and networks that advance its purposes and activities.

CSO purposes and activities encompass the entirety of human aspirations, concerns and problems. This diversity is reflected in the many configurations of citizens associations including: traditional tribes or castes, religious, membership (e.g. professional associations, trade unions, workers or women's rights groups, self-help groups), and Non Governmental Organizations (often advancing larger social causes). These configurations often advance specific causes and issues and this singular focus can be the most effective way to address many global governance issues. Single issue approaches can be counterproductive however when change has far reaching, often global, implications for the earth and for humanity. The "silo" approach is not sufficient in itself.

Given that humanity now lives within the increasing complexity of an interconnected, globalized world, CSOs working to democratize global governance ought to be able to consult and collaborate across the broad spectrum of diverse civil society issues and organizations and to work effectively outside the bounds of the familiar. This principle recognizes that the complexity of diversity and the demands of inclusiveness can also be limiting factors that slow progress. In order to address this reality, and for CSOs to be able to release the power and strength of its diversity, CSOs require the capacity to communicate, collaborate, and negotiate across its Sector. Solutions to global problems require the ingenuity that is only possible through balancing the tensions of diversity. In the face of divergent points of view, CSOs require capacities to both acknowledge and affirm their common purpose and to value and preserve the diversity of points of view essential to healthy democratization. The more that the multiplicity of voices of the Civil Society Sector is heard, the closer humanity will be to achieving democratization of the multilateral system and of global governance.

#### *4. That CSOs understand the broad context of global governance.*

Democratization of global governance is a systemic project where all seemingly separate issues are part of a larger, interrelated whole. The capacity of CSOs to understand and to work within this broad political, social, and economic context is essential to the achievement of democratic global governance. These contexts include: the diverse and changing social and political realities of people living and working in their communities, the academic community, individual governments, donors, and other actors engaged in democratization of global governance. CSOs must also be aware of, and sensitive to, the various linkages and interrelationships amongst these contexts.

Critically, in order to influence multilateral policies, programmes, and practices, CSOs must understand multilateralism as a concept and phenomenon as well as the specific multilateral agencies and representatives that they wish to influence. Understanding the broader context requires a willingness and ability to do the needed research and to listen and learn from others with different, and sometimes conflicting, concerns and agendas. An understanding of multilateralism and the multilateral system as a whole is the basis for sharp analyses, well constructed agendas, timely and viable solutions, and informed advocacy efforts.

The more diligently civil society practitioners strive to understand the contexts surrounding their work the more effective they will be as leaders able to identify contradictions within and amongst sectors, organizations, and communities and within and between multilateral institutions. Informed and effective civil society leadership reduces unnecessary duplication of effort and reveals blocks to progress.

5. *That CSOs are willing and able to engage, and to disengage, diplomatically with those who do not share their vision of the common good.*

In addition to advocacy capacities, CSOs require diplomacy capacities that will enable them to engage directly with those persons or institutions with which they might otherwise avoid dialogue. In the face of an increasingly complex globalized world, CSOs need to be able to engage, as credible and legitimate “civil society diplomats”.

CSOs working to democratize global governance pursue a shared vision of the common good and of a just world where citizens and/or their elected representatives participate directly in all facets of global governance. Given this inclusive vision, CSOs need to be willing and able to work directly with those who do not share their vision. This includes governments, multilateral bodies, corporations, institutions, and individuals.

To date, democratic oversight of powerful multilateral institutions and systems has failed. This is evidenced by the ongoing global crises that threaten the well being of the earth and of all beings. As these crises increase in severity and global impact the need for CSO diplomacy skills grows more urgent. CSOs must be able to engage in skilled, formal, and informal diplomacy at the highest levels.

Diplomacy occurs in a context where those with divergent values and agendas can work together. Diplomacy focuses on building relationships and bridges toward constructive communication and collaboration. It fosters understanding and respect for others’ experiences and points of view and requires a commitment to frank, honest, and open exchange.

Through the application of diplomatic skills and the adoption of distinct diplomatic methods (e.g. the *Chatham House Rule* as an aid to free discussion) CSOs can make critical contributions to democratization of global governance that only they can make and that will be lost without diplomacy. Through diplomacy it becomes more possible to constructively address global concerns and well being and to prevent the tragedies and global crises that CSOs, working locally, are often the first to experience and to predict.

CSOs engaged in diplomatic dialogue with multilateral organization(s) can choose to constructively disengage with these agencies. Before deciding to disengage, CSOs must thoroughly assess their own engagement in the diplomatic process. Only when convinced that they have exhausted every viable diplomatic option and that no further diplomatic progress is feasible should CSOs, temporarily or permanently, disengage.

6. *That CSOs are actively committed to their long term vision and goals.*

Sustained change and measurable progress toward the vision of democratization of global governance can take years and even generations. CSO commitment over the long term is essential to achieving this vision. This principle values CSO patience and persistence. It warns of the danger and counter-productiveness of cynicism which can take hold of beleaguered civil society activists. It also stresses the importance for CSOs to challenge and change their own policies and practices, as well as the policies and practices of donor communities, which focus on short term results only and ignore or devalue the long term vision and goals of democratization.

CSO commitment to democratization of global governance is expressed through action. Actions include the diligent maintenance of CSO histories and institutional memories. Commitment to the long term also requires maintenance over time of effective working relationships across the civil society

Sector and with governments and donors. Importantly, CSO commitment includes assessment and evaluation of internal performance and effectiveness and of progress toward global democratization.

Formal follow up surveys and studies and benchmarking, including global benchmarking, provide to CSOs and to their partners, evidence of the medium and long term results and impacts of their programmes and activities. Evidence, gathered over the long term, illustrates the enduring lessons and incremental progress that can be seen only through the perspective of time.

Active commitment to the long term goal of democratized global governance renews CSO faith and hope and rejuvenates the shared vision of the common good and of a world where all beings have a harmonious life.

*7. That CSOs are open and transparent about whom they represent and to whom they are accountable.*

CSO openness, honesty, and transparency regarding who they represent and to whom they are accountable are critical factors for establishing and maintaining CSO legitimacy and credibility. Civil society practitioners and their organizations, alliances, and networks should be rigorous in identifying and communicating who they represent and to whom they are accountable.

In the context of these principles “to represent” is restricted in meaning to situations where spokespersons have been formally mandated to speak on behalf of a clearly identifiable group. CSOs are the participative, as opposed to the representative, aspect of democracy. They cannot claim to represent “the people” in the way that parliamentarians and democratic governments can. CSOs represent those who have mandated them to carry out their mission. This includes: memberships, constituencies, and Boards of Directors or overseers. Thus, within the democratic context, CSOs are accountable to those they can claim to represent and, conversely, CSOs represent those to whom they are accountable. CSOs cannot claim to represent causes.

Civil society activists and organizations do have full citizen rights, as the participatory component of democracy, to champion values, issues, and causes and to propose solutions to problems that affect citizens. While they cannot claim to represent issues, beliefs, peoples, or causes in general, CSOs working to democratize global governance can capture and reflect the voices of the disadvantaged and marginalized and of those who are not represented or are under-represented. Given their direct impact on multilateral bodies and on democracy development, CSOs working to democratize multilateral bodies are responsible to accurately and faithfully reflect these voices.

*8. That CSOs align their practice with their values.*

The *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* offers to CSOs common standards of human conduct for all of the world’s people. CSOs singularly, and in their various configurations of alliances and networks, should strive to uphold these universal principles in all policies and practices.

We recognize that the actions of civil society activists and CSOs are not always consistent with their stated goals and values. Direct application of ideal standards in real-world situations can seem impractical and is sometimes very difficult to achieve. Practice, unlike theory, is affected by complex contextual factors and does not always fully reflect the principles and ideals of civil society actors or CSOs. It is nevertheless imperative for CSOs to articulate their ideals and values, to champion the highest standards of conduct, and to strive consciously and systematically to meet these standards. Indeed, given the nature and function of CSOs as embodying a “civil” Sector committed to advancing the

common good, CSOs must maintain their legitimacy and credibility in the public, private, governmental, and multilateral spheres, in order to realize their very meaning and purpose. Close alignment of practices and stated values is essential to CSO credibility and legitimacy.

Alignment of CSO practices, policies, and values is achieved through ongoing self assessment, evaluation, and improvement. Willingness on the part of CSOs to self reflect, to identify gaps between their values and actions, and to strive continuously and courageously to be true to their principles is the great hope for a harmonious and peaceful world for all beings.

**ANNEX 7: The FIM G8 Project: A Case Analysis of a Project to Initiate Civil Society Engagement with the G8: Nigel Martin**

[this article is inserted in the original printed copy of this report]

Martin, N. (2008). The FIM G8 Project: A Case Analysis of a Project to Initiate Civil Society Engagement with the G8. Published in J. Walker & A.S. Thompson (Eds.). *Critical Mass: The emergence of global civil society*. Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

## **ANNEX 8: The G8-G20 and Civil Society: Peter Hajnal**

# **THE G8-G20 AND CIVIL SOCIETY**

*Peter Hajnal  
University of Toronto  
2 June 2010*

## **The G8**

The annual gathering of leaders of the major industrialized countries known as G8 (Group of 8) emerged in response to serious economic and financial problems in the early 1970s. Its first summit met in 1975 (that year as G6 with France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the UK and the US as members). Canada joined the group the following year, thus forming the G7 was formed. After a long process, Russia joined in 1998, and the Birmingham summit that year was the first G8. The European Union has been a participant since 1977.

The agenda of the G8 has grown incrementally, beginning with a rather narrow economic and financial focus. It gradually added terrorism, the environment, energy, health, and many other global issues. In addition to the leaders' meetings, a broader G8 system has evolved, including ministerial gatherings (finance, foreign affairs, development, health, labour, environment and others) and expert groups and task forces.

## **The Sherpas**

The leader of each G8 country (and the European Union as participant) has a personal representative, known informally as "sherpa", after the Nepalese Sherpa guides who take expeditions to the mountain summits. Leaders depend on the work of their sherpas. Each national sherpa team includes two sous-sherpas (for finance and for foreign affairs) and other supporting members. The sherpas meet several times a year to prepare for the forthcoming summit. They do not issue public statements on their meetings which are always confidential. During the summit they work intensively, and are usually present in the meeting room with the leaders, taking notes of the discussions. They also give public briefings to the media at the summit, and follow up after each summit.

The 2001 Genoa G8 summit established the position of Personal Representative for Africa (APR). APRs and their assistants have met regularly ever since. They are not usually referred to as sherpas.

## **The Role of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)**

Because the G8, unlike the UN and most other international organizations, is not based on an intergovernmental agreement and has no permanent secretariat, there is no established institutional mechanism to govern its interaction with other actors including civil society. Nevertheless, there has been lively and varied interaction. This has taken various forms: government consultation with civil society groups, alternative summits, street demonstrations, petitions and a variety of other action, as well as some instances of multistakeholder partnerships involving governments, international organizations and non-state actors (nonprofit civil society and the business sector).

In the early years of the summit (1975-1980) there was only limited interaction between CSOs and the G7. Nevertheless, of the two sides, it was civil society that first recognized the power of the G7 and the need to address issues of concern; this resulted in alternative summits, street demonstrations and some other CSO activities in the period 1981-1994. It was in 1995 at the Halifax summit that the G7, on its part, took public notice of civil society in its official communiqué. Finally, starting with the 1998 Birmingham summit (the first true G8 summit), the era of well-established, systematic G8 contacts with a stronger and more sophisticated civil society began and have continued to this day. Sherpas have been actively involved in consultations with representatives of civil society, starting with the 2002 Kananaskis summit.

## **The G20**

The Group of Twenty (G20) began at the level of finance ministers and central bank governors in 1999 in response to the 1997/98 financial crisis. By then it had become clear that the G8 countries could not tackle economic and financial problems without the full participation of systemically important emerging economies. This was seen as striking a good balance of representativeness and efficiency. Members of the G20 are the G8 countries plus Argentina, Australia, Brazil, China, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, South Africa and Turkey. The European Union is the 20<sup>th</sup> member.

In response to the financial crisis that erupted in 2008, then US president convened the first G20 meeting at the leaders' level in Washington, DC, on November 14-15, 2008. The second summit took place in London on April 1-2, 2009, and the third in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania on September 24-25, 2009. At the Pittsburgh summit, the heads proclaimed their grouping to be the major co-ordinating body for economic and financial questions, thus taking over a crucial part of the G8's portfolio. The relationship between the G8 and the G20 is in flux but, for the time being, the two continue to co-exist.

The G20 finance ministers and central bank governors continue their own regular meetings. In addition, the G20 leaders have established various expert and working groups. The G20 leaders also have their own sherpas with their teams (not necessarily organized the same way as the G8 sherpa teams). For most G8 members of the G20, the Sherpa for both G8 and G20 is the same person; the exception is Germany.

Two G20 summits are scheduled for 2010. The Toronto G20 summit of June 26-27 follows on the heels of the Muskoka G8 summit (June 25-26); it will be co-chaired by Canada and South Korea (which holds the 2010 G20 presidency). The second G20 summit is to take place in Seoul, South Korea on November 11-12 under the sole presidency of the host country. The Toronto summit will focus on finance and the economy; tentative agenda includes global imbalances, economic growth, stimulus and exit strategies, regulation of financial institutions, tax havens, levies on banks, and reform of international financial institutions.

## **G20-Civil Society Relations**

CSO relations with the G20 are not as well developed as in the case of the G8 but they are maturing rapidly. Some examples: just before the Washington summit, trade union leaders from the twenty G20 countries met with several G20 leaders and other officials, and with the heads of the IMF and the World Bank; before the London summit, the British consulate in Istanbul hosted a roundtable meeting of civil society representatives; and in Pittsburgh there were street

demonstrations as well as a People's Summit. Another example of a different approach is a policy paper, *What's Missing in the Response to the Global Financial Crisis?*, based on a 2009 conference that was co-hosted by the Halifax Initiative, the North South Institute, the University of Ottawa and the School of International Development and Global Studies. The paper presents recommendations to the June 2010 G8 and G20 summits on the international financial system and international financial institutions.

## **The Back-to-Back G8 and G20 Summits in June 2010 - Challenges and Opportunities**

Because the G8 and G20 summits are both taking place this month, civil society confronts special challenges, including the allocation of resources and expertise, the sometimes unclear distinction between the agendas of the two summits, and so forth. The questions may well be asked: Which summit to focus on – one or the other or both. How to reconcile the need for NGOs to be at other major conferences as well (for example, the September Millennium Development Goals review summit at the UN)? Does the potential civil society impact on the G8/G20 justify the effort and expenses? What about the value of media exposure?

CSOs are rising to such challenges through multi-faceted activities already in progress or planned. Some examples: there will be a People's Summit on June 18-20 in Toronto, a Religious Leaders' Summit on June 21-23 in Winnipeg. Street demonstrations and other mobilization will proceed in Toronto. A "Civil G8" NGO dialogue with G8 sherpas was held in Vancouver on April 15-16, and three parliamentary roundtable discussions took place in Ottawa on April 20, 26 and 27. The AT THE TABLE campaign was launched in March by Make Poverty History and other Canadian and global CSOs. The present G20 sherpa dialogue in Ottawa is an important part of all this.

## **Prospects for the November G20 summit in Seoul, South Korea**

South Korean President Lee Myung-bak announced on January 28, 2010, in a keynote address to the World Economic Forum, that his priority for the 11-12 November Seoul G20 summit will be development. This will present good civil society opportunities for advocacy and other action. It is also significant that this will be the first G20 summit not held in a G8 country. Korean civil society is already gearing up for a series of G20-related events in preparation for the Seoul summit. There may be a civil society-G20 dialogue in the works. Major Korean CSOs have begun preparations for a series of events under a People's Summit a week before the Seoul G20 Summit.

## **ANNEX 9: Civil Society Dialogue with G20 Host Sherpa: Civil Society Participant and Invited Observer List**

### **PARTICIPANTS**

**Mr. Jafar Alshayeb**  
Saudi Arabia

**Ms Binny Bintarti Buchori**  
Indonesia

**Mr. Kenneth Atsenhainton Deer**  
Mohawk Nation

**Mr. Michael Felix Dodds**  
United Kingdom

**Mr. Neville Arnold Kerr Gabriel**  
South Africa

**Dr. Gerd Burkhard Gnärig**  
Germany

**Dr. Azza Kamel Mohamed Abdelmeguid**  
Egypt

**Mr. Thierno Hameth Kane**  
Sénégal

**Dr. İbrahim Mensur Akgün**  
Turkey

**Mr. Paul Vincent O'Callaghan**  
Australia

**Dr. James V. Riker**  
United States

**Dr. Rajesh Tandon**  
India

**Ms Elena Topoleva-Soldunova**  
Russia

**Mr. Juan Manuel Vazquez Blanco**  
Argentina

**Ms Judith Wiley**  
Canada

**Ms Verena Winkler**  
European Union

**Mr. Ming Zhuang**  
China

**Mr. Peter Harder**  
Chair

### **OBSERVERS**

**Ms Ethel Côté**

**Mr. Joseph Deom**

**Mr. Peter Hajnal**

**Mr. Bruce Moore**

**Ms Shirley Hawa Nibi**

### **FIM-FORUM STAFF**

**Mr. Nigel Martin**

**Dr. Heather MacKenzie**

## **ANNEX 10: Biographical information: Participants**

### **Jafar Alshayeb – SAUDI ARABIA**

Jafar Alshayeb was educated in the US and studied at the Universities of Southern Colorado and Middle Tennessee State. Mr. Alshayeb is a regular commentator and analyst of local politics and reform issues in many influencing Arab press and media channels. He heads local charity foundations and youth programs and sponsors “Tuesday Cultural Forum” aiming to set ground for dialogue on different social and political issues such as civil society, human and minority rights and democratization. He participated in the National Dialogue Initiative in Saudi Arabia and serves as an active member in the National Society for Human Rights (Saudi Arabia), Arab Forum for Dialogue and Citizenship (Lebanon), Network of Democrats in the Arab World (Morocco), Global Network for Local Governance (India), Arab Network for Tolerance (Lebanon). Mr. Alshayeb is an elected Chairman of Qatif Municipal Council in the Eastern Province and also chairs Rights Activists Network, a national human rights organization.

### **Binny Bintarti Buchori – INDONESIA**

Binny Buchori is the founder and Senior Advisor of Perkumpulan Prakarsa, Centre of Welfare Studies, Indonesia. She served as Executive Director at Perkumpulan Prakarsa since its foundation in 2005- to May 2010. Under her leadership Prakarsa has done two studies on globalization focusing on how Indonesia could strengthen its role in the reformation of International Financial Institution, and reinforce its economic diplomacy to gain benefit from globalization. Prior to her position in Perkumpulan Prakarsa, Binny led an umbrella organization , INFID (International NGO Forum on Indonesian Development), from 1998-2004. As the director of INFID, Binny led a national and international campaign on debt relief for Indonesia, engaged in dialogues with the Government of Indonesia and International Financial Institution. Binny has taken part in many international seminars and workshops both as speaker and active participant, including workshop Partnership for Development organized by WILTON PARK West Sussex, UK, 16-18 April 2008, Partnership for Development speaker on Promotion of Pro Poor Budget in Indonesia, Manchester Institute of Innovation Research, University of Manchester, April 2008, speaker Australian Aid to Indonesia, Sydney, Mei 2008, Panelist, “The Changing Role of the State” conference, held by the Economic Research Forum, Cairo – Egypt, 23-25 April 2005 , Panelist, “The Changing Role of the State” conference, held by the Economic Research Forum, Cairo – Egypt, 23-25 April 2005 , and speaker on Indonesian Debt at Public Forum ( in conjunction with annual World Bank-IMF meeting), Prague, 2000.

Binny Buchori is a graduate of Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia on English Literature and obtained her master at the College of Librarianship, University College of Wales, United Kingdom, 1988.

### **Kenneth Atsenhainton Deer – MOHAWK NATION**

Mr. Deer is a member of the Bear Clan from the Mohawk community of Kahnawake and Secretary of the Mohawk Nation at Kahnawake. He is the former editor of The Eastern Door, an award-winning and independent newspaper serving his community. Mr. Deer has been active at the community level for many years in the areas of education, recreation and indigenous rights. He has been involved for 16 years in education as an education counselor, high school principal, co-founder of the First Nations Education Council and co-founder and co-chairman of the National Indian Education Council in Canada.

For the last 23 years he has worked as a political activist and has been heavily involved in the Indigenous International Movement at the United Nations in Geneva and New York. He attended most of the meetings on the development of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and organized the Indigenous Caucus in both Geneva and New York.

Mr. Deer was also the Chairman/Rapporteur of the UN Workshop on Indigenous Media in New York in December of 2000. He was a member of the Board of Directors for the Quebec Community Newspapers Association from 1999-2001. Mr. Deer also represented the Indigenous Media Network during the preparations for the World Summit on the Information Society which took place in Tunis in November 2005. He is a member of the Indigenous ICT Task Force which operates [www.indigenoussportal.com](http://www.indigenoussportal.com). He also attended the World Conferences against Racism and the World Summit on Sustainable Development. Mr. Deer has been appointed by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights to the Board of Trustees of the UN Voluntary Fund on Indigenous Populations from 2009 to 2011. He recently received a National Aboriginal Achievement Award in 2010 for Media and Communications. He is currently the owner of Deer Communications, a consulting company on media, international affairs and Human Rights.

#### **Michael Felix Dodds – UNITED KINGDOM**

Felix Dodds is the Executive Director of Stakeholder Forum for a Sustainable Future. He has been active at the United Nations since 1990 attending the major World Summits. He has also been to all the UN CSD. He has set up three global NGO coalitions for UN Conferences, Summits and Commissions these are the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (1993), the UN Habitat II (1995) the WHO Health and Environment Conference (1999).

He co-chaired the NGO Coalition at the UN Commission on Sustainable Development from 1997 to 2001. He introduced Stakeholder Dialogues through the UN General Assembly in November 1996 for Rio+5 and helped run some of the most successful ones at Bonn Water (2001) and Bonn Energy (2004).

He has written or co-edited: Energy and Climate Change Insecurity; Negotiating and Implementing Multilateral Environmental Agreements, Human and Environmental Security, How to Lobby at Intergovernmental Meetings - Mine is a Cafe Latte, Earth Summit 2002 - A New Deal, Multi-stakeholder Process on Governance and Sustainability, Into the Twenty First Century - An Agenda for Political Realignment. He occasionally writes for the Green Room of the BBC.

#### **Neville Arnold Kerr Gabriel – SOUTH AFRICA**

Neville Gabriel was born in Durban, South Africa. He matriculated with distinction before completing a Bachelor of Social Sciences degree at the University of Cape Town. After a year's retreat and community service in an impoverished rural village in South Africa's KwaZulu-Natal province, he returned to studies at both the University of Natal (philosophy) and St Joseph's Theological Institute (theology) concurrently, graduating with Honours in Social Sciences (cum laude) from the University of Natal.

In 1997 he joined the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference (SACBC), as part of the founding team of its Parliamentary Liaison Office in Cape Town. At the same time, he co-founded the Jubilee 2000 South Africa coalition for debt cancellation as part of the global Jubilee movement. He served variously as national secretary, national executive committee

member and spokesperson of Jubilee 2000. He later moved to the SACBC headquarters in Pretoria as its first Secretary for Economic Justice. In 2001 he was appointed as the coordinator of the SACBC Justice and Peace Department. During that time he was instrumental in establishing the Denis Hurley Institute for International Solidarity and Peace.

In 2005 he joined Oxfam as its southern Africa regional media and advocacy coordinator, before being appointed as the founding executive director of the Southern Africa Trust. The Trust is an independent regional agency that supports deeper and wider policy engagement between governments and non-state actors to overcome poverty in Southern Africa.

Neville is a non-executive director of the Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa (OSISA) and the African Forum on Debt and Development (AFRODAD), a member of the board of the Goedgedacht Forum for Social Reflection, and a senior fellow of the Synergos Institute.

### **Gerd Burkhard Gnärig – GERMANY**

Dr. Burkhard Gnärig has been Executive Director of the Berlin Civil Society Center since April 2007. Burkhard has over 20 years' experience of international cooperation and management of civil society organisations. From 1998 to 2007 he was CEO of International Save the Children Alliance located in London. Before joining Save the Children, Burkhard has been CEO of Greenpeace Germany and terre des hommes Germany. Furthermore, Burkhard has worked for the German Development Service (DED) as a field director in Papua Neuguinea.

Until mid 2009, Burkhard held the voluntary position of Chair of the Board of Save the Children Germany. Moreover, he has been Board Chair and/or Board Member of civil society organisations in Italy, Switzerland, India, Korea and Japan. Burkhard has actively participated in a number of major UN conferences as well as at the World Economic Forum in Davos.

### **Azza Kamel Mohamed Abdelmeguid – EGYPT**

Social Development and Gender consultant with twenty years experience working in developing and industrialized countries in conceptualizing, planning, implementing, and evaluating projects in the social development field, governance and women's projects for various public, private and non-governmental organizations. Experienced trainer and technical assistance provider in a wide area of gender, women, civic education and governance issues. Previous work experience in human rights, community health, nutrition education, and environment issues. Extensive experience in, designing training programs and in monitoring and evaluation techniques as well as qualitative social science needs assessment.

I have worked professionally in the areas of gender, civic education, and human rights with various organizations including GTZ, International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), Save the Children USA (SCF), Near East Foundation (NEF), ADF and various NGOs in the Middle East. Over the past 20 years, I have planned, implemented and evaluated programs for a diverse list of clients, , UNICEF, NEF, UNDP, SCF, Ford Foundation, IPPF, CEDPA, Egyptian Swiss Development Fund, Social Fund for Development, etc

### **Thierno Hameth Kane – SENEGAL**

Thierno Kane has been reputed as a founder and leader of grassroots organizations in Senegal, his native country, as well as an adviser and activist for a number of NGOs/CSOs in Africa and

worldwide. He has specialized in issues of popular participation and adult education, and has long experience in tripartite dialogue and partnership between CSOs, governments and the donor community in Africa and internationally.

Thierno has served as executive director and chairman of CONGAD (Conseil des ONG d'Appui au Developpement), the North/South umbrella of NGOs in Senegal.

He is a former global chair of CIVICUS (World Alliance for Citizen Participation).

He has been on the boards of a number of CSOs, such as the International Group for Grassroots Initiative (IGGRI) and the Development Group for Alternative Policies (D-GAP). In 1998, he launched the UNDP Regional Programme, "Civil Society Empowerment for Poverty Reduction in Sub-Saharan Africa" and led the programme as regional coordinator /chief technical adviser for two years.

From August 2004 to January 2010, he served as Director of UNDP Civil Society Division in New York.

Thierno Kane has been the author of a wide range of articles on NGO issues and grassroots matters and participated in numerous conferences and seminars. He graduated from Dakar University.

### **İbrahim Mensur Akgün – TURKEY**

Mensur Akgün is the Director of the Global Political Trends Center (GPoT) and the department chair at Istanbul Kültür University, International Relations department. He has been the director of the Foreign Policy Program at the Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation (TESEV) since 2002. He is also a columnist at the daily Referans. He received his bachelor's degree first from the Middle Eastern Technical University and secondly from Oslo University in the fields of International Relations and Social Anthropology respectively. He completed his master's degree in Political Science at Oslo University and his doctoral studies at Boğaziçi University in Istanbul. Many of his earlier publications are in the field of International relations and Turkish foreign policy.

### **Paul Vincent O'Callaghan – AUSTRALIA**

Paul O'Callaghan has held leadership positions in three national, civil society organizations in Australia over the last decade, including as CEO of Reconciliation Australia, as Executive Director of the Australian Council for International Development (2005-09) and as Deputy CEO of the National Disability Services umbrella organization. He was actively involved in regional and global civil society processes from 2005-09, representing the Oceania region in several international processes and participated in meetings leading up to the Accra High Level Forum. He was a founding member of the Global Facilitation Group of civil society organizations and helped to create an Asia-Pacific civil society/World Bank dialogue process in 2006-07. Paul was a co-founder of the Australian Development and Disability Forum and was responsible for negotiating an historic industrial agreement with Australia's Trade Union Council to create job opportunities for people with disability.

Previously, Paul served as Australia's Ambassador to Samoa and to the South Pacific Regional Environment program (1997-2000). He also had diplomatic postings in Malaysia and Thailand, where he was also Australia's Deputy Representative to the Economic and Social Commission

for Asia and the Pacific. He is a member of Australia's Nonprofit Roundtable Board, the National Anti-Poverty Week Steering Committee and is an advisor on international development to the Australian Catholic University.

### **James V. Riker – UNITED STATES**

James V. Riker is Director of the Beyond the Classroom Program at the University of Maryland. Dr. Riker has led multi-stakeholder consultation processes involving civil society leaders, scholars, and policy-makers, and served as a consultant to the Ford Foundation, New Rules for Global Finance Coalition, the Asian Pacific Development Centre (APDC, Malaysia) and the Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ANGOC, the Philippines). He is the author of *Promising Visions and Strategies to Advancing Global Democracy* (FIM, 2005), and co-editor of *Restructuring World Politics: Transnational Social Movements, Networks, and Norms* (University of Minnesota, 2002), and *Government-NGO Relations in Asia* (MacMillan, 1995). He serves as an advisory board member for the International NGO Forum on Indonesian Development (INFID) in Indonesia; is a board member for the Forum International de Montréal (FIM) in Canada; and is a board member of Citizens for Global Solutions' Education Fund in Washington, D.C.

### **Rajesh Tandon – INDIA**

Rajesh Tandon (India) is an internationally acclaimed leader and practitioner of participatory research and development. He founded the Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), a voluntary organisation providing support to grass roots initiatives in South Asia, twenty-six years ago, and continues to be its Chief Functionary since 1982. A Ph.D. from Case Western Reserve University and an electronic engineer (IIT) Kanpur with a graduation in management (IIM Calcutta), Dr. Tandon has specialised in social and organisational change. A renowned authority on participatory research, Dr. Tandon has championed the cause of building organisations and capacities of the marginalised through their knowledge, learning and empowerment. For his distinguished work on Gender Issues, the Government of India honoured Dr. Tandon with the Prestigious Award in Social Justice in March, 2007. The University of Victoria, Canada, awarded Dr. Tandon the degree of 'Doctor of Laws (Honoris Causa)' in June 2008 in recognition of his pioneering work in the area of civic engagement, governance and community based research.

### **Elena Topoleva-Soldunova – RUSSIA**

Graduated from the Moscow State University of Lomonosov, MA in Philology, Elena has additional education in social marketing (California State University, USA, Education Development Center, Boston, USA). From 1994 till present, she has been the director of the non-profit organization Agency for Social Information. ASI is the only professional agency in Russia which regularly covers and promotes activities of the non-profit sector and socially responsible business, and disseminates information about NGOs and responsible companies to more than 700 federal and regional media, hundreds of Russian non-profit organizations, national and local authorities, corporations and universities through its regional network.

Elena draws on her extensive experience in management, journalism, public relations, and marketing to stimulate cooperation between NGOs, the business community, and government.

ASI acts as a liaison between these sectors by providing roundtables, conferences, competitions, and exhibitions to promote interaction and collaboration.

Elena is an active member of NGO community in Russia; she is a member of the Board of the Russian Human Rights Fund, Charitable Foundation “Life’s Line” and the Partnership of Russian Community Foundations. She is also one of the members of the international working group on developing the guidelines for NGO sustainability reporting (Global Reporting Initiative, NGO supplement). Elena has covered the changing role of NGOs in Russian society for numerous publications.

She was one of the Russian experts who were the first to introduce Russian companies to the concepts of CSR and sustainable reporting. She personally does a lot to encourage the business sector to become more responsible, transparent and accountable. She promotes the Global Compact principles and Global Reporting Initiative’s guidelines with Russian companies, encourages their involvement in international discussion of CSR, and facilitates dialogue between corporations and their stakeholders. Since 2010 Elena has become a member of the Civic Chamber of the Russian Federation, she is a co-chair of the Working Group on development of charity in RF.

### **Juan Manuel Vazquez Blanco – ARGENTINA**

Juan Manuel Vazquez Blanco is an Economist University of Buenos Aires (UBA) and holds a Magister in Public Administration (UBA) thesis in analysis.

His social activist work includes: Vice president of the student Union (FUBA), Graduate member of the UBA’s School of Economics board (2008-2009); member and advisor of social movement related to cooperative and mutualist movement and of the worker-Recovered Enterprises movement; Director of several Volunteer Programs, National Ministry of Education. His international experience includes XXII IUSY Congress/Lillehammer, Noruega, 1997; XII CLAE/La Habana, Cuba, 2000; 2nd. FSM/Porto Alegre, 2002; VI FSM/Caracas, 2006).

He contributed to the creation of Argentina's Museum of Foreign Debt and the Posgraduate Studies Program at UBA (2005-2006) and UNSAM (2009-2010) in Social Economics.

He serves as Advisor in numerous capacities including to: the Argentine’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs; to the President of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Argentine Congress (2008-2010); the National Ministry of Economy for Local Government Assistance; the National Ministry of Economy supporting the design of the National Development Strategy; the Urban Hygiene Ente. Ministry of Environment, Government of the Autonomous City of Buenos Aires; and the Federal Investment Council and the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Employment of the Province of La Rioja.

At CEUR(Center for Urban and Regional Studies) he served as Associate Coordinator in the technical assistance project “Regional Clusters”and the Undersecretary for Small and Medium Enterprises and Regional Development of the Nation, Ministry of Economy. He was Secretary at the University Extension Department of the School of Economics, University of Buenos Aires from 2004-2006; Head of Institutional Management of the Department of Graduate School of Economics, University of Buenos Aires from 2002 to 2004; Member, Bicentennial Political Economy Forum, 2010; and Member of the Federal Network of National Universities in Plan Fénix Regional Economies group.

Currently, Mr. Vazquez Blanco is Associate Professor of Social Economy and Employment, School of Social Sciences, at the University of Buenos Aires and Associate Professor of Argentina's Social Structure, chair of honor - the Honorary Professor Dr. Alejandro Rofman. Department of Economics, School of Economics, University of Buenos Aires. He was Associate Professor in Posgraduate Programs in UNSAM and UBA from 2006 to 2009.

### **Judith Wiley – CANADA**

Judith Wiley has over 30 years experience in the not for profit sector, including as CEO for YWCA Canada and the Canadian Society of Association Executives. She has served on the board of directors for many charities and NGOs, including the Canadian Physicians for Aid and Relief (CPAR) and as chairperson for the Canadian Council for International Cooperation. Ms Wiley has worked in many different countries, and has lived in Guyana, South America and Barbados where she worked with the Central Government and the Caribbean Development Bank respectively, to improve management and governance practices. Ms Wiley maintains a consulting practice that focuses on board development, strategic planning and change management with the international non profit sector.

### **Verena Winkler – EUROPEAN UNION**

Verena Winkler is a political scientist, educated in Germany and graduated from Hamburg University. Working as Policy Advisor with Eurostep on EU development policy and institutional reform as well as on the role of EU in international forums (G20, UN) on international development and global governance questions together with global civil society. Prior to this, she was working i.a. with the European Parliament. As a speaker, she has been participating in many seminars and conferences on civil society dialogue with governments and EU's role in the international sphere. Verena has actively participated in a number of major UN conferences and global civil society forums taking place around these issues.

### **Ming Zhuang – CHINA**

Ming Zhuang is the executive coordinator of China Participatory Governance Network, a network committed to citizen participation and democratic local governance, with members consisting of civil society organizations, non-government agencies, academia, and government officials all across China. Ming's action and research focus on the civil society and citizen engagement, social development and public policy. He is a China Fellowship Program researcher in Beijing on subjects of democratic accountability and vulnerable groups, and now a visiting scholar of Development, Inequality and the Global South at Brown University.

## **THE FIM STAFF**

### **Nigel Martin**

Nigel Martin is the founding President of the Montréal International Forum (FIM), an international NGO think-tank operated out of Montréal. FIM is a global alliance of individuals and organizations with the goal of improving the influence of international civil society on the United Nations and the multilateral system. A graduate of Mount Allison University, Mr. Martin has over

30 years experience in the NGO community in Canada and elsewhere and has been Executive Director of several NGOs. These include the Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC) in Ottawa, Euro Action Accord in London (UK), and OCSD and Oxfam-Québec in Montréal. He began his career with the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) in 1971. Mr. Martin was the initiator and founding co-President of the original World Bank / NGO Committee. He has served on several Boards of Directors and is currently on the board of the Carol Foundation in Toronto. He is also a founding Board member of The Mothers' Trust.

### **Heather MacKenzie**

Heather MacKenzie is currently responsible for programme coordination and research at Forum international de Montréal (FIM). She holds a Ph.D (2007) in Education from Concordia University and Master's degrees in Educational Technology and Counselling Psychology. Heather has worked in the private, higher education, and not for profit sectors and has extensive experience as an adult educator, counselor, consultant, and facilitator. She has worked voluntarily in her community in a Women Shelter and Centre providing mental health services to women and youth. Before joining FIM, Heather worked for 12 years as an educational and faculty developer in the higher education sector. At Forum international de Montreal, Heather brings her experience to bear at the international level in the area of building global democracy through building the knowledge capacity of civil society activists and organizations. Her professional and research interests are fostering universal human security and well-being and building personal, professional, and institutional capacity.

## **ANNEX 11: Biographical information: Observers**

### **Éthel Côté**

Éthel Côté has been active in the economic, social, cooperative and cultural fields for more than thirty years. Ms. Côté holds a Canadian University Certificate in Agricultural Leadership (CALL 2001) and obtained a Master in Community Economic Development from Concordia University. She participated in several fact finding missions in Europe and Latin America to investigate the cooperative movements, the mobilization and socio-economic consensus-building processes, and the impact of globalization on the socio-economic development of rural communities in these countries. Ms. Côté participated in capacity building and skills strengthening missions in Mali, Niger, Senegal, Morocco and Democratic Republic of Congo for the social and solidarity economy movements of these countries and was also part of the organizing committee for the third and the fourth World Conference on Globalization and Solidarity held in Dakar in 2005 and in Luxembourg in 2008. In addition to teaching Community Economic Development at Boreal College in 2005, Concordia University (2003-2007) and Hearst University (2008), during the last few years she joined the Canadian Center for Community Renewal (CCRC), who is committed to crafting solutions and adaptations to the critical challenges stemming from climate change and peak oil. CCRC priority is working with communities to increase their resilience, especially their capacity to equitably meet their needs for food, energy, finance, shelter, and sustainable livelihoods. Employing a wide range of organizing, planning and enterprise ownership formats, CCRC emphasizes strengthening the self-reliance of local and regional economies as a key task of transition.

Awards Received : Grade de Chevalier de la Pléiade / Dialogue des cultures- Order of the Francophonie, Paris, France; Honor Co-op Award; First CIWARA in Recognition of Excellence in Development – RENAPESS – Mali, Africa

Volunteer: International Committee – Canadian Community Economic Development Network; Founding Member – Économie solidaire de l'Ontario; Member of North America Intercontinental Network of Promotion of Social Solidarity Economy –RIPESS; Administrator – Canadian Crossroad International; Founding Member of Social Enterprise Council of Canada; Steering Committee of Social Enterprise World Forum and President of a Community - Newspaper The Musketeers.

### **Joseph Deom**

Joseph Raronhianonha Deom is a Mohawk from Kahnawake, an Indian Reserve near Montreal. Educated in New York as his father was a structural steel ironworker, Joe received his Civil Engineering Degree at CCNY and worked for a major construction company achieving the status of Project Superintendent of multi-million dollar projects.

He maintained his contact with his home at Kahnawake and married there, eventually moving back to raise his children. He has four children and eleven grandchildren. Joe established a successful consulting engineering firm with his son, Robert who has taken over the firm since Joe has retired.

Since his return to Kahnawake in 1975, Joe has been active in the community as a member of the School Committee, the Cultural Centre, and as an activist for Native rights. He now has more time to devote to the preservation of Mohawk language and culture and the promotion and protection of Native inherent rights.

## **Peter Hajnal**

Peter I. Hajnal is Research Fellow, Munk School of Global Studies, University of Toronto, former co-investigator of the EnviReform project, and retired international documentation library specialist and retired Adjunct Professor, Faculty of Information Studies, University of Toronto. His past experience includes 10 years at the United Nations (Dag Hammarskjöld Library, New York, 1962-68 and 1970-74, 25 years as librarian at the University of Toronto, and 11 years as adjunct professor at the Faculty of Information Studies, University of Toronto. A member of the G7/G8 Research Group of the University since 1988, he attended twelve summits. He is also a member of the Academic Council on the United Nations System, and has a life membership in the American Library Association.

He was consultant in evaluating the Dag Hammarskjöld Library of the UN; establishing the library of the Southeast European University at Tetovo, Macedonia (supported by the OSCE and the EU); assessor of the 2005 G8 Stakeholder Consultation for Chatham House; and advisor to the Forum international de Montréal on relations with the G8 and to the Civil G8 project in 2006 in Russia. He has been active as advisor to the Graham Library, Trinity College, University of Toronto, in acquiring, organizing and managing a diverse collection of G7/G8-related documents, publications, multimedia material.

In addition to a number of articles, book chapters and conference presentations, he is author or editor of nine books, most recently *Civil Society in the Information Age* (Ashgate, 2002); *Sustainability, Civil Society and International Governance: Local, North American and Global Perspectives* (Ashgate, 2006; co-edited with John Kirton); and *The G8 System and the G20: Evolution, Role and Documentation* (Ashgate, 2007). His UN-related writings include *Directory of United Nations Documentary and Archival Sources* (Academic Council on the United Nations System and Kraus International Publications, 1991) and *International Information: Documents, Publications and Electronic Information of International Governmental Organizations* (Libraries Unlimited, vol. 1: 1997, vol. 2, 2001). His current research involves a study of civil society's influence on the accountability of the G8 (part of a larger study of the accountability of international institutions of global governance).

## **Bruce Moore**

Bruce Moore is the Former Director of the International Land Coalition (1998-2008), an alliance of the UN system, IFI's and Civil Society. He is the previous Director of CHF Partners in Rural Development. Currently he is a Member of the Board of Directors of North-South Institute (Ottawa), FIM-Forum, Terra Institute (USA) and the Society for International Development. He is a Social Activist, Lecturer and Author.

## **Shirley Hawa Nibi**

Shirley Hawa Nibi is Director, Public Policy, Women and Development, of Grassroots Africa. GrassRootsAfrica, founded in 2002, has its head office in Madina in Accra, an office for Northern Ghana and Burkina Faso located at Bolgatanga in the Upper East region and three research offices located in Navrongo, Garu and Berekusu. They work to advance the human rights of the poor especially women and seek to influence policy in favour of women's equality and contribute to broader social and economic well-being in West Africa. GrassRootsAfrica accomplishes this mission, in partnership with others, through research, capacity building, and

advocacy on issues affecting marginalised and vulnerable communities with special focus on women's economic, health, and social status.

## **ANNEX 12: Translations of FIM-Forum Communiqué:**

**(a) French (b) Russian, (c) Spanish, (d) Arabic**

**(12 a)**

### **Dialogue de la société civile avec le sherpa canadien du sommet du G20 2010 à Toronto COMMUNIQUÉ, 21 juin 2010**

Le 11 juin à Ottawa, au Canada, vingt leaders de la société civile de partout dans le monde ont rencontré M. Leonard Edwards, le sherpa canadien du sommet du G20 qui se déroulera sous peu à Toronto, ainsi que M. Graham Flack, sous-sherpa aux finances. La discussion a porté sur la reddition de comptes du G20 auprès des citoyens de la planète. Depuis le début de la crise financière en 2008, les dirigeants du G20 se sont réunis trois fois pour prendre plusieurs décisions importantes en vue de soutenir la reprise économique et réformer le système financier mondial : à Washington (novembre 2008), à Londres (avril 2009) et à Pittsburgh (septembre 2009). Le sommet du G20 de Toronto (26 et 27 juin 2010) suit immédiatement le sommet du G8 de Muskoka (25 et 26 juin 2010).

Organisé par le Forum du FIM pour une gouvernance démocratique mondiale (établi à Montréal), ce dialogue avec le sherpa canadien était le premier dialogue structuré jamais organisé entre la société civile et l'hôte du sommet du G20. Alors que le G20 influe de plus en plus sur les décisions relatives à la gouvernance mondiale, il est primordial que ses dirigeants entendent la voix de la société civile de partout dans le monde pour que le G20 et ses dirigeants se comportent de manière favorable à la démocratisation des institutions, mécanisme et processus décisionnels de la gouvernance mondiale.

Depuis deux ans, le G20 s'est surtout employé à sauver et rétablir l'économie mondiale. Le sommet du G20 de Toronto se concentre sur la mise en œuvre des engagements pris aux précédents sommets, dont le *Cadre pour une croissance forte, durable et équilibrée*. La rencontre des leaders de la société civile avec le sherpa canadien et le sous-sherpa aux finances a donc porté sur des enjeux précis liés aux politiques macroéconomiques.

Lors du dialogue, on a souligné que les programmes de sauvetage et d'aide financière mis en œuvre par divers pays avaient soulevé l'ire des citoyens partout dans le monde, furieux de voir les fonds publics utilisés pour renflouer les institutions – banques ou autres – responsables des crises financières. Les participants de la société civile ont demandé au G20 d'utiliser des mesures de stimulation visant à transformer les économies nationales et mondiales en « économies vertes qui éradiquent la pauvreté ». La nouvelle architecture des institutions économiques mondiales devrait avant tout appuyer la sécurité alimentaire, l'emploi et l'économie sociale (qui assure la subsistance de plus d'un milliard de personnes dans le monde). Cette architecture suppose aussi une régulation claire et transparente des flux financiers mondiaux.

L'une des décisions majeures du G20 à sa rencontre de Londres était la réforme de la Banque mondiale et du FMI (Fonds monétaire international), dont l'injection accrue de capital et l'élargissement des mandats afin de soutenir l'économie mondiale. Si la Banque mondiale a

apporté des améliorations progressives quant au droit de vote, le FMI résiste encore aux réformes. Le G20 avait annoncé que l'accroissement de l'apport en capital et le renouvellement des rôles étaient conditionnels à la réalisation de réformes clés dans la gouvernance des institutions financières internationales (IFI). Les participants de la société civile ont appelé les dirigeants du G20 à s'assurer que la réforme complète des structures et mécanismes de gouvernance des IFI soit terminée d'ici la fin 2010 au plus tard. Et cela comprend la mise en œuvre de procédures ouvertes, transparentes, mondiales, professionnelles et concurrentielles pour recruter les chefs de ces institutions.

La reddition de comptes démocratique du G20 à titre d'institution de la gouvernance mondiale était au cœur des préoccupations des participants de la société civile lors de ce dialogue – notamment l'assurance que le G20 ne marginalise ni ne sape le travail d'autres institutions multilatérales, dont le système des Nations unies. Les dirigeants du G20 doivent donc s'engager à soutenir et revitaliser les institutions multilatérales et le système des Nations unies afin d'assurer le suivi et la réalisation d'engagements tels que le Nouveau partenariat pour le développement de l'Afrique (NEPAD) et les Objectifs du millénaire pour le développement (OMD). Les leaders du G20 doivent faire savoir publiquement qu'ils appuient les accords relatifs aux changements climatiques et aux droits de la personne, notamment ceux des femmes et des peuples autochtones.

Des années de collaboration ont permis l'émergence de formules et modèles favorisant l'efficacité du dialogue et le caractère constructif des rapports entre le G8 et la société civile mondiale. Les leaders de la société civile ont prié le sherpa canadien de négocier des moyens de transposer ces pratiques au G20. Ainsi, le rapport de reddition de comptes remis sous peu par le G8 est un mécanisme qui pourrait aussi servir au G20 pour rapporter les résultats de ses décisions et leur portée sur les citoyens du monde.

Le sherpa canadien transmettra ces commentaires à ses homologues du G20 et étudiera des moyens d'assurer que les futurs dialogues du G20 avec la société civile mondiale deviennent un élément normal du fonctionnement transparent et responsable du G20 à titre d'institution de la gouvernance mondiale.

Le président du Forum du FIM sur la gouvernance démocratique mondiale,  
Rajesh Tandon

Le président-directeur général du Forum du FIM sur la gouvernance démocratique mondiale,  
Nigel Martin

**Le Forum du FIM remercie le ministère des Affaires étrangères et du Commerce international (MAECI)  
du Canada de son appui financier à cet événement.**

## 12 (b)

### Диалог гражданского общества с шерпой принимающей стороны саммита «Большой двадцатки», г. Оттава, Канада, 11 июня 2010 г. Коммюнике, 21 июня 2010 г.

11 июня, в пятницу, в г. Оттава (Канада) двадцать лидеров гражданского общества со всего мира приняли участие в диалоге с Леонардом Эдвардсом (Leonard Edwards), шерпой Канады – принимающей стороны саммита «Большой двадцатки», который состоится в г. Торонто, а также с финансовым су-шерпой Грэхамом Флэком (Graham Flack). Центральной темой диалога стала подотчетность «Большой двадцатки» перед гражданами мира. С начала финансового кризиса в 2008 году состоялись три встречи лидеров «Большой двадцатки» - в Вашингтоне (ноябрь 2008 г.), в Лондоне (апрель 2009 г.) и Питтсбурге (сентябрь 2009 г.) и приняли ряд важных решений по содействию восстановлению экономики и реформированию глобальной финансовой системы. Саммит «Большой двадцатки» в г. Торонто (26-27 июня 2010 г.) пройдет вслед за саммитом «Большой восьмерки» в Мускока (25-26 июня 2010 г.).

Организованный Монреальским международным форумом за демократичное глобальное управление (FIM Forum for Democratic Global Governance), этот диалог с шерпой Канады стал первым структурированным диалогом гражданского общества с принимающей стороной саммита «Группы двадцати». Так как влияние «Большой двадцатки» на принятие решений, касающихся мирового регулирования, растет, чрезвычайно важно, чтобы голоса гражданского общества всего мира были услышаны лидерами «Группы двадцати». В этом случае можно ожидать, что поведение «Большой двадцатки» и ее лидеров будет укреплять демократизацию институтов глобального управления, процессов и процедур принятия решений.

В течение последних двух лет «Группа двадцати» фокусировала свое внимание, прежде всего, на вопросах спасения и восстановления глобальной экономики. Саммит «Большой двадцатки» в Торонто будет посвящен вопросам выполнения обязательств, взятых на себя на предыдущих саммитах, включая «*Рамочное соглашение об уверенном, устойчивом и сбалансированном экономическом росте*» (*Framework for Strong, Sustainable and Balanced Growth*). В связи с этим, общение лидеров гражданского общества с шерпой принимающей стороны и финансовым су-шерпой Канады было посвящено особым вопросам макроэкономической политики.

В ходе диалога было отмечено, что реализация различных мер по выходу из кризиса и восстановлению экономики разных стран вызвала гнев гражданского общества по всему миру, так как средства налогоплательщиков использовались для спасения тех институтов (банков и пр.), которые были повинны в возникновении финансового кризиса.

Представители гражданского общества попросили «Группу двадцати» стимулировать преобразование национальных и глобальных экономик в «зеленые экономики, искореняющие бедность». В будущем структура глобальных экономических институтов должна содействовать, прежде всего, продовольственной безопасности, занятости населения и созданию социальной экономики (которая способна обеспечить средствами

существования более миллиарда людей по всему миру). Такая структура требует ясного и прозрачного регулирования глобальных финансовых потоков.

Одним из ключевых решений, принятых «Группой двадцати» на встрече в Лондоне, стало решение о реформировании Всемирного банка и МВФ (Международного валютного фонда), включающее в себя большее вливание капитала и расширение мандата организаций для поддержки глобальной экономики. И если Всемирному банку удалось поэтапно достичь положительных изменений в сфере права голоса, то в МВФ реформы все еще встречают сопротивление. «Группа двадцати» заявила о том, что укрепление ссудного капитала этих международных финансовых институтов зависело от основных реформ системы их управления. Представители гражданского общества настаивали на том, чтобы лидеры «Большой двадцатки» обеспечили полноценное реформирование управленческих структур и механизмов международных финансовых институтов, самое позднее, к концу 2010 года. Реформы включают в себя внедрение открытых, прозрачных, глобальных, профессиональных и конкурсных процедур подбора и утверждения кандидатур на пост главы каждого института.

Одним из центральных вопросов, в связи с которым представители гражданского общества выражали свою обеспокоенность, была демократическая подотчетность «Группы двадцати» как института глобального управления. Первый вопрос о подотчетности касался необходимости обеспечить наличие у «Большой двадцатки» такого отношения к другим многосторонним институтам – таким, как система ООН, - которое бы не позволяло игнорировать их или подрывать их деятельность. В связи с этим лидеры «Группы двадцати» должны взять на себя обязательства по поддержке и содействию активной деятельности многосторонних институтов и системы ООН с целью выполнения таких обязательств, как обязательства в рамках Нового партнерства в интересах развития Африки, а также достижения поставленных целей, например Целей развития тысячелетия. Лидеры «Большой двадцатки» должны публично демонстрировать свою поддержку соглашениям в области изменения климата и соблюдения прав человека, особенно прав женщин и коренных народов.

После многих лет взаимодействия гражданского общества с «Группой восьми» появились различные модели и формы эффективного диалога и конструктивного сотрудничества между ними по всему миру. Лидеры гражданского общества обратились к шерпе Канады с просьбой обсудить варианты использования подобных практик в «Большой двадцатке». В частности, готовящийся публичный отчет «Группы восьми» (Accountability Report of the G8) – это тот механизм, который «Группа двадцати» может адаптировать и использовать для отчетности о результатах принимаемых ею решений и их последствиях для гражданского общества всего мира.

Канадский шерпа донесет высказанные предложения другим шерпам стран «Большой двадцатки» и рассмотрит варианты проведения в будущем диалогов «Группы двадцати» с мировым гражданским обществом на регулярной основе в качестве составной части прозрачной и подотчетной деятельности «Большой двадцатки» как института глобального управления.

Д-р Раджеш Тэндон (Rajesh Tandon)

Председатель, FIM Forum for Democratic Global Governance

Найджел Мартин (Nigel Martin)

Президент и высшее должностное лицо, FIM-Forum for Democratic Global Governance

## 12 (c)

### Toronto G20 Summit: Report on June 11 Civil Society Dialogue with G20 Host Sherpa

---

**Resumen:** Un grupo de líderes de la sociedad civil procedentes de 17 países organizado por el FIM- Forum for Democratic Global Governance y el Departamento Canadiense de Asuntos Exteriores y Comercio Internacional (DFAIT) celebró un encuentro de diálogo con Len Edwards, Sherpa anfitrión para el G-20 en Toronto y el Sous Sherpa del área Canadiense de Finanzas, Graham Flack, en Ottawa el 11 de junio de 2010. Peter Harder, Sherpa de Canadá en el G-8, presidió el encuentro. Esta reunión constituyó el primer diálogo estructurado de la sociedad civil llevado a cabo por un país anfitrión del G-20.

La reunión de diálogo se centró en dos cuestiones temáticas: (1) La estrategia financiera global del G-20, su supervisión, y la reforma de las instituciones financieras internacionales, y (2) la “responsabilidad en la rendición de cuentas” públicas (public accountability) del G-20, su compromiso con la sociedad civil y la “responsabilidad en la rendición de cuentas” corporativas (corporate accountability). Este evento fue visto como un primer paso positivo para establecer un diálogo permanente con la sociedad civil con el G-20. Después de la Cumbre del G-20, la FIM-Forum y los funcionarios canadienses del G-20 se reunirán para estudiar la forma en que los futuros diálogos del G-20 con la sociedad civil global se pueden hacer una parte regular de funcionamiento transparente y responsable del G-20 como institución de gobernanza global.

---

El viernes 11 de junio en Ottawa, Canadá, veinte líderes de la sociedad civil de todo el mundo participaron en un diálogo con Leonard Edwards, el Sherpa canadiense anfitrión para la próxima cumbre del G20 en Toronto, y Sous-Sherpa del área de Finanzas, Graham Flack. El foco de la reunión estuvo puesto en la “responsabilidad en la rendición de cuentas” del G-20 a los ciudadanos del mundo. Desde el comienzo de la crisis financiera de 2008, los líderes del G-20 se han reunido tres veces y han adoptado una serie de decisiones importantes para apoyar la recuperación económica y la reforma del sistema financiero mundial: Washington (noviembre de 2008), Londres (abril de 2009), y Pittsburgh (septiembre, 2009). La Cumbre del G-20 en Toronto (26 a 27 de junio, 2010) seguirá los pasos de la Cumbre del G8 en Muskoka (25 a 26 de junio, 2010).

Organizado por la FIM-Foro para la Gobernanza Global Democrática, (con sede en Montreal), dicho encuentro fue el primer diálogo estructurado de la sociedad civil con un país anfitrión de la cumbre del G-20. A medida que el G-20 adquiere una creciente influencia en la formación de las decisiones relacionadas con la gobernanza mundial, es de suma importancia que las voces de la sociedad civil de todo el mundo sean escuchadas por los líderes del G-20 de manera que el G-20

y sus dirigentes se orienten a profundizar la democratización de las instituciones, procesos y toma de decisiones de la gobernanza global.

Durante estos dos últimos años, el G-20 ha centrado su atención principalmente en las cuestiones relacionadas con el rescate y la recuperación de la economía mundial. La Cumbre del G20 de Toronto se centra en la aplicación de los compromisos asumidos en las cumbres anteriores, incluido el Marco para un crecimiento fuerte, sostenible y equilibrado. El intercambio de los líderes de la sociedad civil con el anfitrión Sherpa de Canadá y el Sous-Sherpa de Finanzas de ese país se concentró en cuestiones concretas relacionadas con las políticas macroeconómicas. Durante el diálogo se señaló que la aplicación de los diversos planes y paquetes de rescate en diferentes países ha irritado a los ciudadanos de todo el mundo, especialmente por forma en como los fondos de los contribuyentes se ha considerado que se utilizarán para "rescatar" las instituciones (bancos y otros) que han sido responsables de la crisis financiera. Los presentes por la sociedad civil pidieron que el G-20 utilice estímulos para la transformación de las economías nacionales y de la economía global en "economías verdes" o sustentables para erradicar la pobreza. El diseño de la futura arquitectura de las instituciones económicas mundiales debe ser tal que su apoyo principal es destinado a la seguridad alimentaria, el empleo y la economía social (que proporciona medios de vida a más de mil millones de personas en todo el mundo). Esta arquitectura requiere de una regulación clara y transparente de los flujos financieros globales.

Una de las decisiones más importantes tomadas por el G20 en su reunión de Londres fue la reforma del Banco Mundial y el FMI (Fondo Monetario Internacional), incluyendo el incremento de capital y atribuciones más amplias a su alcance para apoyar a la economía mundial. Si bien el Banco Mundial ha llevado a cabo mejoras incrementales en los derechos de voto, las reformas en el FMI siguen siendo resistidas. El G-20 había anunciado que el fortalecimiento de la base de capital y las nuevas funciones de estas instituciones financieras internacionales (IFI) fue condicionada a la reformas de la gobernanza de las instituciones financieras internacionales. Los miembros de la sociedad civil que participaron del Encuentro abogaron por que los líderes del G20 garanticen que la reforma completa de las estructuras de gobernanza y los mecanismos de las instituciones financieras internacionales se completen hacia el final de 2010 a más tardar. Las reformas incluyen la implementación de procedimientos abiertos, transparentes, globales, profesionales y competitivos para la contratación de los equipos de esas instituciones.

La responsabilidad democrática en la rendición de cuentas (Democratic accountability) del G-20 como institución de gobernanza global estaba en el centro de las preocupaciones de los participantes de la sociedad civil durante este encuentro. La primera preocupación en lo que respecta a la responsabilidad es asegurar que el G-20 no margine ni debilite otras instituciones

multilaterales, como el sistema de la ONU. Los líderes del G-20, por tanto, se comprometen a apoyar y dar impulso a las instituciones multilaterales y el sistema de las Naciones Unidas con el fin de seguir adelante y cumplir con compromisos como la Nueva Alianza para el Desarrollo de África (NEPAD) y los Objetivos de Desarrollo del Milenio (ODM). Los líderes del G20 deben hacer público y efectivo su adhesión a los acuerdos sobre el cambio climático y los derechos humanos, especialmente los referidos a los derechos de las mujeres y de los pueblos originarios. Luego de años de participación de la sociedad civil con el G-8, varios modelos y formas de diálogo efectivo y de compromisos constructivos entre el G8 y la sociedad civil a nivel mundial han evolucionado. Los líderes de la sociedad civil solicitaron al Sherpa canadiense que se negociaran las formas en que tales prácticas pueden ser llevadas al G-20. En particular, el próximo Informe de Responsabilidad en la rendición de cuentas del G-8 fue visto como un mecanismo que el G-20 también podría adoptar en los informes de los resultados de sus decisiones y sus consecuencias a los ciudadanos de todo el mundo.

El Sherpa canadiense transmitirá estos aportes a los respectivos sherpas de los países del G-20 y estudiará las formas en que los futuros diálogos del G-20 con la sociedad civil global se pueden constituir como una parte regular de funcionamiento transparente y responsable del G-20 como institución de gobernanza global.

Dr Rajesh Tandon  
Chair, FIM Forum for Democratic Global Governance

Mr. Nigel Martin  
President & CEO, FIM-Forum for Democratic Global Governance

**12 (d)**

-  
-

(Forum

International de Montreal)





## ANNEX 13: DRAFT G8-G20 Accountability: Peter Hajnal

### G8-G20 ACCOUNTABILITY

*Peter Hajnal*  
*University of Toronto*  
*14 July 2010*

The Muskoka G8 summit held on 25-26 June 2010 had been dubbed in advance the “accountability summit” by the Canadian host government. Indeed, accountability was a principal theme at the summit, along with Prime Minister Stephen Harper’s maternal and child health initiative.

G8 accountability has long been a concern for civil society organizations (CSOs), think tanks, some G8 governments and, more recently, to the G8 itself which came to realize that much of its claim to legitimacy rested on the fulfilment of its promises and that it would be held accountable for its actions to those who are affected by those actions (or lack of actions as the case may be) – not just in G8 countries but global populations, including the marginalized.

A number of CSOs and think tanks have assessed G8 performance for some time before the G8’s self-assessment exercise started. For example, the G8 Research Group at the University of Toronto has, since 1996, issued compliance reports on summit commitments. Its assessment of implementation of G8 undertakings at the 2005 Gleneagles summit identified 212 commitments and selected 21 of those for detailed evaluation; these included, among others, peacekeeping, good governance, HIV/AIDS, official development assistance, transnational crime, climate change, and tsunami relief.<sup>8</sup> Another evaluation of fulfilment of the Gleneagles commitments has been undertaken since 2006 by the Debt AIDS Trade Africa (DATA) group. In its latest annual report, released in 2010, DATA assesses progress on debt cancellation, development assistance, trade and investment, HIV/AIDS and other infectious diseases, child survival, primary education, and agriculture.<sup>9</sup> Another example is Transparency International, which has monitored the G8’s role on fighting corruption.<sup>10</sup>

Previous G8 steps in this direction included an accountability report on G8 anti-corruption commitments at the 2008 Hokkaido summit and a *Preliminary Accountability Report* at the 2009 L’Aquila summit<sup>11</sup> which, taking a sectoral approach, tracks commitments and their

---

<sup>8</sup>G8 Research Group (2006) *Gleneagles Final Compliance Report*. <[www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2005compliance\\_final/2005-g8compliance-final.pdf](http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2005compliance_final/2005-g8compliance-final.pdf)>

<sup>9</sup> *The DATA Report 2010: Monitoring the G8 Promise to Africa* (2010). <[www.one.org/report/2010/en](http://www.one.org/report/2010/en)>

<sup>10</sup> See, for example, Transparency International (2007). *G8 Progress Report*. <[www.transparency.org/publications/publications/g8\\_progress\\_report](http://www.transparency.org/publications/publications/g8_progress_report)>

<sup>11</sup> G8 (2009) *G8 Preliminary Accountability Report*. <[www.g8italia2009.it/static/G8\\_Allegato/G8\\_Preliminary\\_Accountability\\_Report\\_8.7.09,0.pdf](http://www.g8italia2009.it/static/G8_Allegato/G8_Preliminary_Accountability_Report_8.7.09,0.pdf)>

fulfilment on food security, water, health and education. At that summit the G8 leaders established the G8 Accountability Senior Level Working Group, tasking it with: identifying key development-related G8 commitments since the Gleneagles summit; identifying indicators for assessing those commitments; developing a reporting methodology; exploring ways of measuring the impact of G8 commitments beyond merely assessing progress; consulting with the OECD and other organizations with expertise in data manipulation and reporting; preparing their report for G8 leaders in time for the Muskoka summit; and making recommendations on regularizing (“institutionalizing”) accountability practices after Muskoka.

How well did the 88-page *Muskoka Accountability Report*<sup>12</sup> fulfil this ambitious mandate? The working group identified and analyzed 56 development-related commitments, most of which were made at the Gleneagles summit, some as far back as Kananaskis in 2002, and others at summits subsequent to Gleneagles. The 56 commitments are grouped in nine thematic areas: aid, aid effectiveness and debt relief; economic development; health; water and sanitation, food security; education; governance; peace and security; and environment and energy. The main sources of the report are “data and narrative evidence” from G8 governments themselves and from what the report calls “relevant” international organizations, mostly OECD/DAC. The report arrives at a fairly positive self-assessment.

On aid (Theme I), the report notes that G8 spending on ODA to Africa has increased by about 50%, reaching almost \$30 billion in 2008, representing 70% of global (G8 and non-G8) ODA. This still leaves an acknowledged shortfall of \$18 billion from all donors. For individual G8 countries the record is mixed. Canada is on track to reach its (rather modest, I add) commitments. France has made steady progress in increasing its aid, having doubled its ODA since 2000. Italy is off-track but it “reconfirmed commitment” toward achieving the 0.7% ODA/GNI target. Japan fell short. Russia is on track for debt cancellation. The UK is on target. The US has met its commitment one year early; and the EU as a whole showed slower-than-expected progress.

This reveals some problems of reporting. First, country-to-country reporting is uneven, seemingly based on differing emphases and data selection. Particularly striking is the case of Russia which is not an OECD member and thus basing its report on national statistics. This makes comparability difficult. Second, being a self-assessment of G8 governments, the report necessarily uses diplomatic language, contrasted with, say, the DATA report which is free to criticize countries that have fallen behind, even though DATA, too, largely bases its report on OECD statistics. Third, there is a problem of time-lag (a problem both for the G8 and DATA): OECD statistics are at least a year behind so reporting is not quite up-to-date. Fourth, the *Accountability Report* does not adjust for level of ambition of commitments – admittedly a difficult challenge but one that should not be beyond the G8’s capacity.

---

<sup>12</sup> G8 (2010). *Muskoka Accountability Report*. <[http://g8.gc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/muskoka\\_accountability\\_report.pdf](http://g8.gc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/muskoka_accountability_report.pdf)>

I will comment on the rest of the report's themes more briefly in the interest of time and space. But some of the problems noted above, under Theme I, are applicable to the other themes as well.

Theme II, economic development, comprises the sub-themes of remittances; trade and development; and infrastructure and investments. The report notes progress in some areas but acknowledges that more needs to be done. While the report as a whole is quite good at identifying commitments (the first item of the working group's mandate), it is striking under this theme that some "commitments" are not very firm: "working toward the objective...", "we will work to achieve..."; "we welcome the initiative..." That said, the tables and charts illustrating this section show increasing G8 aid-for trade flows and the report catalogues important G8 national programmes in this area. And "key findings and lessons learned", ending this and the other thematic sections, is a useful and concise summing-up.

Theme III, health, identifies some firm commitments, including promises of specific amounts to fight infectious diseases and build stronger health systems in developing countries. These commitments, too, are set out in the framework of the Millennium Development Goals. The report notes that, if current contributions continue on the present scale, the G8 will meet its commitment to provide \$60 billion by 2012. Financing the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria is more problematic and remains a concern. On child mortality, there has been a global reduction, but maternal deaths remain high.

On water and sanitation assistance (Theme IV), the G8 has mobilized some \$18 billion for 2002-2008. On food security (Theme V), the record is more mixed and the report acknowledges the difficulty of assessing the contributions of G8 countries, since this sector is strongly dependent on the private sector and civil society, not just on governments.

On education (Theme VI), the report notes G8 support (for example, for the Education for All initiative) but laments the adverse impact of the financial crisis on education financing (an impact, by the way, that is also evident, for example, on food prices). This is one of the few sections that present, in a tabular form, comparative figures for pledges and actual disbursements – a good way to assess compliance with commitments. Doing this consistently throughout the report would have enhanced its usefulness significantly.

On governance (Theme VII), G8 commitments centred on anti-corruption measures – support for good governance in Africa, and building capacity in this sector. The report cites the African Peer Review Mechanism as a good example of accountability, but this really touches on accountability by African states and not by the G8 *per se*.

On peace and security (Theme VIII), the G8's role has played out mostly in capacity-building, post-conflict reconstruction and support for African peacekeeping programmes. The report notes that "limited but important progress has been made."

On environment and energy (Theme IX), the report remarks on some G8 contributions but, as for climate, it essentially passes the ball to the UN process (notably the Copenhagen Accord and the forthcoming Cancún COP16). On energy, some progress is noted but the report acknowledges that other targets, for example on biodiversity, "will not be met in 2010."

In its conclusions, the report sees a positive overall balance in the G8's progress on meeting its commitments but notes that in some areas "it has further to go to fully deliver on its promises." The recommendations emphasize the importance of improving transparency in reporting by using a comprehensive and consistent methodology, but the working group, in the body of the report, shows the difficulty of advancing this objective. Laudably, the working group underlines that G8 commitments must be assessed in a multi-year context, and the report goes some way toward that. Wisely, it cautions that "aspirational and policy commitments" make them difficult to track and report ... in any meaningful or quantifiable manner."

A final observation: it is known that in the process of compiling this *Accountability Report* G8 officials talked with, and looked at, the work of CSOs and think tanks that have accumulated a good record and built useful experience in G8 performance evaluation (see, for example, the G8 Research Group, DATA and Transparency International, all cited above). Yet, other than rather general references to civil society, there is no explicit acknowledgement in the report of the role of these groups.

To sum up: the *Accountability Report*, despite inherent problems, is an important step in improving G8 accountability (including transparency). It is an honest effort within the confines of what a governmental body (as the G8 is) can do diplomatically. So, CSOs will have a continuing role in prodding the G8 toward greater accountability.

If the G8 builds on the findings and resources of *Accountability Report* in a meaningful and comprehensive way, that will be welcomed by all. But, judging by the *Muskoka Declaration* issued at the end of the G8 summit,<sup>13</sup> the leaders, despite referring numerous times to accountability, signalled their intention to devote future accountability reports to specific sectors rather than treating accountability comprehensively; the 2011 accountability report will focus on health and food security only.

What about the G20? Accountability (democratic, open accountability) in that larger group is more problematic, yet there are some encouraging early signs that this may happen. One way the G20 could move toward this would be to allow public reporting of the IMF/World Bank mutual assessment reports done for G20 countries beyond the partial release of these at the Toronto G20 summit.<sup>14</sup> This is another goal that CSOs could advocate.

---

<sup>13</sup> G8 (2010). *G8 Muskoka Declaration: Recovery and New Beginnings* <[http://g8.gc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/declaration\\_eng.pdf](http://g8.gc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/declaration_eng.pdf)>

<sup>14</sup> International Monetary Fund (2010). *G-20 Mutual Assessment Process: Alternative Policy Scenarios; A Report by the IMF Staff* <[www.imf.org/external/np/g20/pdf/062710a.pdf](http://www.imf.org/external/np/g20/pdf/062710a.pdf)> and World Bank (2010). *G20 and Global Development: Report prepared by Staff of the World Bank for G20 Growth Framework and Mutual Assessment Process* <<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DEC/Resources/G20Framework&MAP-WBReport-TorontoSummit-2.pdf>>.