

**Civil Society Networks in Global Governance:
Models for Participation in the IMF and the WTO.**

Report on DFID Research Project Number R7629

*Peter Willetts
Professor of Global Politics
City University, London
April 2003*

Disclaimer:

The UK Department for International Development (DFID) supports policies, programmes and projects to promote international development. DFID provided funds for this study as part of that objective, but the views and opinions expressed are those of the author alone.

1. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 The Definition of a Non-Governmental Organisation	1
1.3 Distinguishing between Advocacy and Governance Networks	1
2. METHODS	3
3. FINDINGS	3
3.1 NGO Participation in the CSD and Stakeholder Dialogues	3
3.2 NGO Participation in the GEF	4
3.3 The Legitimacy of NGO Participation	4
3.4 The Fragility of Governance Networks	5
3.5 Good Governance as a Public Good	6
4. DISSEMINATION	7
4.1 Work with Non-Governmental Organisations	7
4.2 Contacts with Policy-Makers	7
4.3 Conferences	8
4.4 Project Website	8
4.5 Future Activities	8
5. LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	8
5.1 Articles	8
5.2 Lectures	9
5.3 Website Reference Materials on the International Economic Institutions	9
5.4 Website Reference Materials on the United Nations Relations with NGOs	10
6. APPENDICES	11
6.1 List of Abbreviations Used	11
6.2 Methodological Details	11
6.3 Summary Responses to the Attitude Questions in the Five Surveys	16
6.4 Policy Recommendations to Global Institutions with an NGO Consultative System	21
6.5 Policy Recommendations to the IMF, the World Bank and the WTO	21
6.6 Policy Recommendations to Governments	22
6.7 Policy Recommendations to Non-Governmental Organisations	22

1. Background and Objectives

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 The project sought to investigate the nature of the involvement of NGOs in the policy-making processes of intergovernmental institutions. The aim was to assess what lessons could be learnt from existing practices to provide a basis for making recommendations for NGO participation in the international economic institutions. The research was conducted from October 2000 to September 2002.
- 1.1.2 When the project was designed, the intention was to compare NGO participation in the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) with their participation in the World Bank NGO Committee and to conduct related surveys. During the first year of the project, it became clear that work on the World Bank could not proceed as planned. There were no facilities for access to the Bank's headquarters during its meetings. The Annual Meetings in September 2001, when the main fieldwork was due, were cancelled and during 2001, the World Bank NGO Committee formally ceased to exist.¹ As a result, it was agreed to transfer the fieldwork to the Global Environment Facility (GEF).
- 1.1.3 The aim of the project was to assess the "success" of NGO participation, defined in terms of the legitimacy of the processes for those engaged in them. The history of the institutional arrangements was studied and surveys of the attitudes of both government delegates and NGO representatives were undertaken with structured questionnaires. During the research the opportunity arose to attend and use a version of the same questionnaire at the Southern NGO Summit on Sustainable Development in Algiers. In addition, open-ended in depth interviews were undertaken in New York and Washington with a number of key international NGO leaders. As the aim was to ask what lessons the CSD and GEF models provide for the possibility of NGO participation in the World Bank, the IMF and the WTO, the arrangements at these three institutions were also studied.

1.2 The Definition of a Non-Governmental Organisation

- 1.2.1 It is necessary to point out that the term "non-governmental organisation" is an essentially-contested concept. As a result, at the start of the project, an article was written on *What is a Non-Governmental Organization?*² For the purposes of this report, an NGO is taken to be a body that is eligible for registration under the UN's statute for consultative arrangements between NGOs and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).³ This use of the term includes trades unions, religious bodies and other groups in civil society that are often not seen as being NGOs.

1.3 Distinguishing between Advocacy and Governance Networks

- 1.3.1 It is now commonplace for NGOs to form global networks to maximise their impact on agenda-setting, policy formulation and policy implementation on global issues. It is an

¹ In December 2000, the NGOs and the Bank agreed plans for a World Bank Civil Society Forum. Although the first Forum was expected to be held in 2001, a planning meeting in December 2001 did not even establish the basic framework for its organisation. For the background, see www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/NGOWG/INDEX.HTM.

² P. Willetts, "Non-Governmental Organisations", a ten-thousand word essay in the *UNESCO Encyclopaedia of Life Support Systems*, (Oxford: EOLSS, 2002). Available at www.eolss.net and also at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/CS-NTWKS/NGO-ART.HTM.

³ ECOSOC Resolution 1996/31 of 25 July 1996, governing relations authorised under Article 71 of the UN Charter. Available at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/NGOS/RES31-96.HTM.

important conclusion of this research that proper understanding of their impact requires conceptual and practical distinctions to be made between two types of networks:

- *an advocacy network* is created when a group of NGOs work as a political coalition to mobilise support for a common set of values and/or pursue a common policy goal; and
- *a governance network* is created when a group of NGOs co-operate to assert their right to participate and to enhance the effectiveness of their participation in a specific policy-making forum.⁴

1.3.2 These two are ideal types. In practice, a network focusing on a global institution may have some combination of the two functions. Nevertheless, there are examples that come close to the ideal types. IBFAN was the prototype for a series of global advocacy networks and CONGO has operated since the beginning of the UN as a governance network.

1.3.3 A governance network will engage in such tasks as

- providing information on the structure, policies and activities of the intergovernmental institution,
- ensuring that NGO participation rights are understood and utilised,
- raising funds for representatives from developing country NGOs to attend,
- training NGO representatives in the necessary skills for lobbying, and
- arranging facilities for NGO consultations, receipt of documents and access to decision-makers.

1.3.4 The following networks are each the best approximation to a governance network with respect to the global institutions covered by this research.

- The CSD NGO Steering Committee was established in 1994.
- The GEF NGO Network became an integral part of the Global Environment Facility, when it was restructured in 1994.
- The World Bank NGO Committee was established in 1981 to promote consultations with the Bank's staff. The NGO participants in this Committee worked together in an independent NGO Working Group.
- The International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD) was established in 1996. While it primarily provides information and research reports, the Centre does also facilitate interaction between NGOs and the WTO.

1.3.5 There is no governance network for the International Monetary Fund. The Bretton Woods Project acts as a high-quality information source, and is strongly biased towards covering

⁴ The concept of an advocacy network is well-established, and is the central focus of M. E. Keck and K. Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders*, (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1998). Advocacy networks and the broader concept of social movements are given priority in M. Edwards and J. Gaventa (eds.), *Global Citizen Action*, (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2001). This book also pays some attention to governance and makes a distinction between advocacy and engagement strategies "which aim to support a process of dialogue rather than simply lobbying" (p. 10). A very experienced activist, Cyril Ritchie, has reflected on the different roles undertaken by NGO networks: see 'Coordinate? Cooperate? Harmonise? NGO Policy and Operational Coalitions', in T. G. Weiss and L. Gordenker, *NGOs, the UN and Global Governance*, (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1996). Similar questions are raised by L. D. Brown, S. Khagram, M. H. Moore and P. Frumkin, 'Globalization, NGOs and Multisectoral Relations', in J. S. Nye and J. D. Donahue, *Governance in a Globalizing World*, (Washington DC: Brookings Institution, 2000). There is an important discussion of the legitimacy of NGO participation in global governance, in M. Edwards, *NGO Rights and Responsibilities. A New Deal for Global Governance*, (London: The Foreign Policy Centre, 2000). However, none of the literature on networks nor the much wider literature on global governance uses the concept of a governance network.

the Bank more than the Fund. Jubilee 2000 was highly focused on the work of the IMF, but it was an advocacy network and not a governance network.

2. Methods

2.1.1 Fieldwork was undertaken at three sessions of the CSD, three sessions of the GEF Governing Council, two sessions of the Spring Meetings of the World Bank and the IMF, various NGO activities associated with these sessions and other events where WTO policy-makers related to NGOs. For more details see Section 6.2.

2.1.2 The fieldwork consisted of observing the operation of the institutions, collecting official and unofficial documents, holding in depth interviews with key NGO leaders and conducting formal surveys with structured questionnaires. The following five surveys were completed

- 68 interviews of government delegates to the CSD
- 22 interviews of NGO representatives in New York at the CSD
- 29 interviews with NGO representatives in Algiers at the Southern NGO Summit
- 39 interviews with Members or Alternates from the GEF Governing Council
- 34 interviews with representatives at the GEF NGO Consultations

In the summary findings below, the results for the New York and Algiers surveys will be referred to collectively as the CSD NGO representatives.

2.1.3 The questionnaires covered the current status and previous experience of the respondents within the institutions and their attendance at other global environmental meetings. The main method of assessing attitudes was to offer respondents an attitude statement and to ask them to make a choice between 1) Agree Strongly, 2) Agree, 3) Neutral, 4) Disagree, or 5) Disagree Strongly. In the summary findings below, choices 1 and 2 are aggregated as “agree” and choices 3 and 4 as “disagree”. Tables of responses to the attitude statements are given, in full, in Section 6.3.

2.1.4 In addition opportunities were taken in New York, Washington DC and London to conducted unstructured in depth interviews, predominantly with the leaders of international NGO networks, but also some with international officials. A list of these interviews is given in Section 6.2.

3. Findings

3.1 NGO Participation in the CSD and Stakeholder Dialogues

3.1.1 At the CSD, access for NGOs is governed by the UN’s statute for consultative arrangements, but the procedures in the Commission are significantly different from those in other ECOSOC bodies. The NGOs are expected to organise themselves within the nine “major groups”, specified in *Agenda 21*.⁵ From the third session of the CSD in 1995 (CSD-3) to the ninth session in 2001 (CSD-9), the NGO Steering Committee effectively fulfilled most of the functions of a governance network and provided an umbrella for a variety of groups, that they called issues caucuses, to engage in lobbying on specific

⁵ *Agenda 21* is the popular name given to the *Programme of Action for Sustainable Development*, one of the five major documents produced by the UN Conference on Environment and Development in June 1992 at Rio de Janeiro. Section III covers the responsibilities of nine major groups in promoting sustainable development. They are women, children and youth, indigenous people, NGOs, local authorities, trades unions, business and industry, the scientific and technical community, and farmers. At the UN this becomes logically incoherent, as “NGOs” are one of the nine major groups, all of which are represented by NGOs that have consultative status. Participation in major groups cross-cuts participation in issue caucuses.

issues. The diverse range of NGO activities included providing reports, leaflets and various other types of position papers to the government delegates; holding “side-events” to promote NGO dialogue with delegates; creating daily news reports on the proceedings; co-ordinating strategy and lobbying; making contributions to the debates; and promoting text for inclusion in the official resolutions and decisions of the CSD.

- 3.1.2 It was particularly impressive to see the “stakeholder dialogues”, when for several meetings the official debate was dominated by NGOs from the relevant major groups. This was physically evident, with the NGOs taking the tables in the centre of the conference room and the government delegates being moved temporarily to the sides.

3.2 NGO Participation in the GEF

- 3.2.1 The sessions of the Governing Council of the GEF were shorter, smaller-scale and more technical events. The pattern is for the NGOs to meet privately for one day and to hold Consultations on the next day with the staff and Council Members, before the official sessions in the last three days of the week. The NGO Consultations were attended throughout by a senior member of staff and for at least an hour by the Chief Executive Officer, but attendance by Members was low. In the official sessions, the NGOs have five passes to the conference room that are used in rotation by different NGO representatives according to their concerns with the various agenda items. The NGO representatives were seated as participants and allowed to contribute to the debates.

3.3 The Legitimacy of NGO Participation

- 3.3.1 It had been assumed that there would still be some controversy over the presence of non-state actors in intergovernmental policy-making forums. This was not the case. The surveys showed that both the government delegates and the NGO representatives in both the CSD and the GEF Council took it totally for granted that NGO participation was a fully legitimate, routine, institutionalised process. Just one delegate in the CSD mildly questioned the presence of NGOs.
- 3.3.2 In response to the statement that “Overall the major groups system in the CSD works well” or “Overall NGO relations with the GEF work well”, just 10% of the government delegates at the CSD and 5% of the GEF Members disagreed, while three quarters agreed in each case. The NGO representatives were less enthusiastic about the system, with less than half in either the CSD or the GEF agreeing that the system worked well. Much stronger support for the existing system was evident in responses to statements that the CSD stakeholder dialogues or the GEF NGO consultations were a “waste of time”. Over 80% of CSD delegates, GEF Members and GEF NGO representatives rejected this view, and just over a half the CSD NGO representatives rejected it, with a third remaining neutral. (Tables 12 and 13.)
- 3.3.3 In addition it was widely believed that NGOs made a difference to the policy outcomes. Majorities of all groups of respondents agreed that “NGOs add issues that governments would ignore during debate in the UN / GEF”. As this implicitly criticises governments, it is not surprising that larger proportions of NGOs than government officials endorsed the statement. The majorities became overwhelming when the attitude was tapped in a less prejudicial manner, by responses to the statements that “Major groups / NGOs add nothing new to debate ...”. The explanation was clear – majorities of 85% to 96% agree that NGOs “add expertise” to the debates. (Tables 2, 9 and 14.)
- 3.3.4 The direction of NGO influence was shown, with more than 80% of each group of respondents agreeing that “NGOs force the North to pay more attention to development questions”. Similar large majorities, except for a drop to 64% among CSD government

delegates, agreed that “NGOs force the South to pay more attention to environmental questions”. (Tables 7 and 8.)

- 3.3.5 The view that “NGOs genuinely represent a significant section of the public” was endorsed in all the surveys (Table 6). Similarly, one commonly expressed negative view that “Most NGO leaders are arrogant and only represent themselves” was clearly rejected. (Table 3.)
- 3.3.6 North-South divisions showed in four of the surveys not having a majority either way on “The large global NGOs really only represent Northern interests”, while two-thirds of the NGO representatives in Algiers did endorse this view. However, all groups of respondents clearly agreed that “Developing country NGOs are underrepresented now (in the CSD major groups) / (at the GEF)”, with larger majorities at the UN than in the GEF. (Tables 1 and 5.)
- 3.3.7 While the role of transnational corporations may be vilified in street demonstrations, a majority of all five groups of respondents supported the involvement of “business and industry” in these global institutions. The majorities were larger among government officials than among NGO representatives. They were also larger at the CSD, where business and industry is already one of the nine major groups, than in the GEF, where they are excluded. (Table 4.)
- 3.3.8 In the GEF, there was criticism of the low quality of NGO contributions to the work of the Council, but there was compensation for this by the assertion of their importance to the planning, implementation and evaluation of GEF projects.

3.4 The Fragility of Governance Networks

- 3.4.1 During the period of the research, it became apparent that most governance networks are very fragile. The CSD NGO Steering Committee disintegrated in May 1991 and its rump was supplanted by most NGOs joining a new Sustainable Development Issues Network (S-DIN). The GEF NGO Network did not work effectively and faced significant internal conflicts, resulting in it having three different people take on the role of its Global Focal Point in as many years. Finally, the NGO Working Group on the World Bank lost much of its support during the 1990s and ceased to operate at the global level from December 2001.
- 3.4.2 These governance networks have faced many problems. Personal rivalries and animosities have caused divisions in the leadership. Real or imagined differences in perspectives between large, well-resourced NGOs from developed countries and small, under-resourced NGOs from developing countries produce North-South antagonisms. Different expectations about the role of the network, inadequate resources restricting activities and jealousies towards those who have greater access to resources can all cause disputes. However, such problems are not sufficient to destroy a network.
- 3.4.3 A governance network will face continual threats to its cohesion and its continued existence if attempts are made to treat it as an advocacy network. When a group of NGOs each wishes to influence an intergovernmental organisation, the *only* thing they will *always* have in common is the desire to participate in the policy-making process.
- 3.4.4 It is invalid in principle and disruptive in practice for any NGO committee to claim to speak on behalf of the whole of global civil society. NGOs are very diverse. When a current issue on the agenda of a global institution taps a fundamental divide, any attempt by an NGO committee to issue a joint statement supported by *all* NGOs will generate conflict within the committee and/or between the committee and its wider constituency. The only legitimate and practical basis for NGO joint statements is for the statement to be issued in the name of those NGOs who have taken an explicit decision to endorse it.

Breakdown of CSD NGO Steering Committee

- 3.4.5 Advocacy networks can exist within governance networks, so long as those advocating a particular political position do not claim to speak on behalf of all the members of the governance network. Recognition of the difference between the two networking functions requires this practice to be maintained even when there does happen to be consensus among all those who are present. The failure to differentiate the functions is the fundamental reason why the CSD NGO Steering Committee could not continue in existence. Indeed, the structure of this committee, with Northern and Southern Co-Chairs for the main committee and for each of the issue caucuses within it, was based on the false premise that the Steering Committee could act as an advocacy network and governance network simultaneously.

The Problem of Funding

- 3.4.6 There is a second fundamental problem about global civil society networks engaging with intergovernmental institutions. If they are to be truly global, they require significant financial and personnel resources to be allocated to the maintenance of the network. National NGOs from the North and large international NGOs can allocate funds for travel and accommodation, if they give global meetings sufficient priority. However, national NGOs from the South and small international NGOs generally cannot finance their own participation.
- 3.4.7 The gradual decline of the World Bank NGO Working Group shows that the first casualty of inadequate funding is reduced levels of participation at the global level by developing country NGOs. Some from the South may gain access through sponsorship and support by large Northern NGOs. When this occurs outside a global network, it represents a new form of North-South hierarchical relations. The opportunities for South-South contact are lost. It was evident from the survey of developing country NGOs in Algiers in March 2002 that many present had been able to attend their first global forum, because funding had been made available by the Algerian government. They had experience and understanding of sustainable development issues at the country level, but few had been able to contribute in any manner at the global level.

3.5 Good Governance as a Public Good

- 3.5.1 Kaul, Grunberg and Stern have identified a variety of global public goods.⁶ They conclude that a participation gap between intergovernmental co-operation and the need for wider engagement of developing country governments, business and civil society helps explain the underprovision of global goods. Closing the participation gap is seen as instrumental to the achievement of global public goods rather than of intrinsic value.⁷ However, the argument should be pushed further. At the country level, good governance and democracy are seen as public goods in their own right. Good global governance, in the form of political equity, democratisation and wider participation in global institutions, is also of intrinsic value as a global public good.⁸

⁶ See the conclusion on 'Concepts, Policies and Strategies', by I. Kaul, I. Grunberg and M. A. Stern, who are the three editors of *Global Public Goods. International Co-operation in the 21st Century*, (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press for UNDP, 1999).

Questions about the role of non-state actors and about financing global public goods will be given more attention in I. Kaul, P. Conceição, K. le Goulven and R. U. Mendoza (eds.), *Providing Global Public Goods. Managing Globalization*, (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press for UNDP, forthcoming in 2003).

⁷ Kaul et al explicitly assert, on p. 485, "Co-operation is not an end in itself – it is a means to an end".

⁸ It is recognised that global political equity and global democratisation are complex contested concepts, but it is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss them.

3.5.2 On this basis, the provision of NGO governance networks, associated with global institutions, is a global public good. The principle is well-established politically, as it is now a global norm that all intergovernmental institutions should have some system for NGO participation.⁹ This research also shows that such systems can achieve very high legitimacy. However, we have seen there are practical problems in maintaining the financial viability of governance networks. Most potential funders have a substantive orientation: they want to see “results on the ground” and are reluctant to fund the overhead costs of organisations. Yet, governance networks, *by definition*, will not directly produce substantive results. A major shift in attitudes is needed, so that funding of the overhead costs of governance networks is seen as the direct provision of a global public good.

4. Dissemination

4.1 Work with Non-Governmental Organisations

4.1.1 Access to the semi-public events at the World Bank and IMF Spring Meetings was gained under the auspices of the International Council for Social Welfare and in return articles on the politics of the Bretton Woods institutions were written for three editions of their quarterly, *Social Development Review*, (see 5.1.3-5 below). Contacts with the ICSW are being maintained.

4.1.2 During preparation for and engagement in the fieldwork, contacts were developed with a great variety of NGOs, but particularly the Bretton Woods Project, Oxfam International and Development Gap. Initially they were briefing me, but as I made progress it became a two-way dialogue.

4.1.3 Each of the interviews with the 85 NGO survey respondents involved explaining the nature of the project. The in-depth unstructured interviews involved extensive exchange of ideas.

4.1.4 Presentations have been made at the Global Development Forum in March 2003 and to a local UNA in the London area in October 2002.

4.2 Contacts with Policy-Makers

4.2.1 The annual Wilton Park conferences on the WTO provided a major opportunity to engage with the policy-making community on international trade questions. Dr Supachai was present both years and I did some work for him in writing up his presentations, (see 5.3.7-8 below).

4.2.2 Personal exchanges have been held with World Bank, WTO and UN staff and members of FCO Policy Analysis Department. The paper on the IMF was sent to John Drage of the International Finance Division of the Bank of England. In March 2003, a general presentation on NGOs was given to the Royal Defence College. In the same month, assistance was given to a retired FCO Research Analysts preparing a presentation at a Franco-British Council Seminar.

⁹ For an argument that NGOs have acquired international legal personality with the right to participate, see P.Willetts, “From “Consultative Arrangements” to “Partnership”: The Changing Status of NGOs in Diplomacy at the UN”, *Global Governance*, Vol. 6, 2000, pp. 191-212. For recognition that this norm is not universally obeyed, see P.Willetts, “Remedying the World Trade Organisation's Deviance from Global Norms”, a presentation for the Colloquium on Global Governance at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on 20 September 2002, available at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/CS-NTWKS/CSGG0902.HTM.

- 4.2.3 Each of the interviews with the 107 governmental respondents involved explaining the nature of the project. In-depth unstructured interviews with World Bank, WTO and UN staff involved extensive exchange of ideas.

4.3 Conferences

- 4.3.1 Many contacts were made at academic conferences. An interim analysis of the survey of CSD delegates was given to BISA Global Environmental Change Group and a related paper was given to the ISA. A presentation was made at London Metropolitan University.
- 4.3.2 GASPP was structured to promote North South dialogue among both academics and NGOs. It was particularly useful to engage with Edward Oyugi of the Kenyan Social Watch Coalition, Nicola Bullard of Focus on the Global South and Miloon Kothari of Habitat International Coalition.

4.4 Project Website

- 4.4.1 At the start of the project, I had no knowledge whatsoever about creating web pages, but I learnt to write HTML and developed a substantial personal website, (see Sections 5.3 and 5.4, below). It has been publicised through some 500 business cards and via various networks, such as the BISA Global Environmental Change Group and the UK Trade Network. The UN Information Centre in London and the FCO Policy Analysis Department have been informed about the site. Effort has been put into ensuring that the web pages achieve hits by Internet search engines. From unsolicited e-mail contacts, it is evident that this has been successful.

4.5 Future Activities

- 4.5.1 Negotiations were initiated in autumn 2002 with the Foreign Policy Centre, to publish a monograph highlighting the main results of the research and the policy recommendations. There were delays in establishing the intellectual, financial and administrative basis for the collaboration, including doubts expressed by DFID, later withdrawn. Producing this monograph is now my personal priority for the summer of 2003.
- 4.5.2 Despite delays in the writing, it is still intended that a one-day conference on the maintenance of governance networks, targeted at NGO professionals in Britain, will be held in 2003. This will be used both to present the project's results and recommendations and also to stimulate a debate among NGOs.

5. List of Publications

Some working papers and two major public lectures, totalling 43,000 words, have been published. In addition, extensive work has been done on the website and the first statistical analysis from the five surveys is given below in Section 6.3. A more comprehensive research report should have been ready by now. The Foreign Policy Centre Monograph, mentioned above, will be produced this summer. No other research will be undertaken until an academic book on governance networks and some more specialised articles based on this research have been completed.

5.1 Articles

- 5.1.1 "Non-Governmental Organisations", a ten-thousand word essay in the *UNESCO Encyclopaedia of Life Support Systems*, (Oxford: EOLSS, 2002), available at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/CS-NTWKS/NGO-ART.HTM

- 5.1.2 “The International Monetary Fund as a Political Institution”, a ten-thousand word essay in the *UNESCO Encyclopaedia of Life Support Systems*, (Oxford: EOLSS, 2002), available at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/CS-NTWKS/PWUNESCO.HTM
- 5.1.3 “The Spring Meetings of the IMF and the World Bank, April 2001”, *Social Development Review*, Vol. 5, No. 2, June 2001, pp. 25-6. Also available at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/CS-NTWKS/APR-2001.HTM
- 5.1.4 “The Fall Meetings of the IMF and the World Bank, November 2001” *Social Development Review*, Vol. 6, No. 1, December 2001, pp. 27-9. Also available at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/CS-NTWKS/NOV-2001.HTM
- 5.1.5 “The Spring Meetings of the IMF and the World Bank, April 2002” *Social Development Review*, Vol. 6, No. 2, June 2002, pp. 24-6. Also available at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/CS-NTWKS/APR-2002.HTM

5.2 Lectures

- 5.2.1 “Can Globalisation be Tamed?”, the transcript of a City Insights Lecture, delivered before an invited audience at City University on 13 February 2002 at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/CS-NTWKS/GLOB-LCT.HTM
- 5.2.2 “Remedying the World Trade Organisation’s Deviance from Global Norms”, a presentation for the *Colloquium on Global Governance* at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on 20 September 2002, at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/CS-NTWKS/CSGG0902.HTM or www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/CS-NTWKS/CSGG0902.DOC

5.3 Website Reference Materials on the International Economic Institutions

The materials have all been presented in a common format. Some were produced during the project. Some are copies from other sources, but these are not all available elsewhere. Together with the articles, it is hoped this represents a significant resource for those wishing to learn about the institutions, particularly from an NGO perspective.

- 5.3.1 List of the Bretton Woods Institutions
www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/CS-NTWKS/REF-INFO.HTM#InstList
List of Other Important Organisations in the Politics of International Finance
www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/CS-NTWKS/REF-INFO.HTM#OtherOrgs
List of Official Websites on the IMF and the World Bank
www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/CS-NTWKS/REF-INFO.HTM#websites
List of NGO Websites on the IMF and the World Bank
www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/CS-NTWKS/REF-INFO.HTM#NGOwebs
- 5.3.2 Basic information on the NGO Working Group on the World Bank and the proposal for a Civil Society Forum
www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/NGOWG/INDEX.HTM
- 5.3.3 Speech by Gordon Brown, UK Chancellor of the Exchequer to the Federal Reserve Bank, New York on 16 November 2001, calling for doubling of aid and reform of the international financial system., at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/PIE-DOCS/GB161101.HTM or www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/PIE-DOCS/GB161101.DOC
- 5.3.4 Responses by the IMF to Joseph Stiglitz after the publication of his book *Globalization and Its Discontents*, in July 2002, at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/PIE-DOCS/STIG-ROG.HTM, or www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/PIE-DOCS/STIG-ROG.DOC

- 5.3.5 Letter from InterAction, signed by 22 NGOs, to the President of the World Bank, 14 April 2000, disassociating these NGOs from the street demonstrations outside the Bank-Fund Spring Meetings, at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/PIE-DOCS/IA-0400.HTM
- 5.3.6 E-Mail from Drop the Debt to its supporters, 3 August 2001, reporting on the closure of the Drop the Debt campaign and on its participation in the demonstrations at the Genoa G8 summit in July 2001, at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/PIE-DOCS/DD-0701.HTM
- 5.3.7 “The Global Trading System: Where do we go from here?” – notes on a presentation by Dr Supachai Panitchpakdi, WTO Director-General Designate, at a Wilton Park Conference, *Poverty Eradication: Meeting International Targets* on 5 July 2001, at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/CS-NTWKS/WTO-0701.HTM
- 5.3.8 “The Doha Development Agenda” – notes on a presentation by Dr Supachai Panitchpakdi, WTO Director-General Designate at a Wilton Park conference, *Prospects for the New Trade Round* on 11 July 2002, at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/CS-NTWKS/WTO-0702.HTM
- 5.3.9 President Clinton’s speech to the WTO Ministers, Seattle, 1 December 1999, at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/PIE-DOCS/CLNT1299.HTM
- 5.3.10 Links to Oxfam’s “Make Trade Fair Campaign” and to the Trade Justice Movement, at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/PIE-DOCS/INDEX.HTM

5.4 Website Reference Materials on the United Nations Relations with NGOs

The comments under Section 5.3 also apply to these materials.

- 5.4.1 The United Nations statute for NGOs, Economic and Social Council Resolution 1996/31 of 25 July 1996, at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/NGOS/RES31-96.HTM
- 5.4.2 The list of NGOs in consultative status with ECOSOC, as of August 2002, at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/NGOS/NGO-2002.HTM
- 5.4.3 The list of NGOs in consultative status with ECOSOC, as of August 2001, at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/NGOS/NGO-2001.HTM
- 5.4.4 A graph of the numbers of accredited NGOs, each year from 1945 to 2002, at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/NGOS/NGO-GRPH.HTM#graph
- 5.4.5 A note on the Roster of NGOs attending the Commission on Sustainable Development, at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/NGOS/NGO-GRPH.HTM#note
- 5.4.6 The record of the changes in the names of the three categories of NGOs, at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/NGOS/NGO-GRPH.HTM#categories
- 5.4.7 The numbers of NGOs accredited with the UN each year from 1945 to 2002, at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/NGOS/NGO-GRPH.HTM#data
- 5.4.8 The graph, the note, the name changes and the raw data, in a single Word file, at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/NGOS/NGO-GRPH.DOC
- 5.4.9 Links to information on the UN of most relevance to NGOs, at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/NGOS/NGO-HOME.HTM#Sources
- 5.4.10 List of Websites for NGO Networks, at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/NGOS/NGO-HOME/#Networks
- 5.4.11 Article by Peter Willetts, ‘From “Consultative Arrangements” to “Partnership”: The Changing Status of NGOs in Diplomacy at the UN’, *Global Governance*, Vol. 6, No. 2, 2000, pp. 191-212, at www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/NGOS/PWGG2000.PDF

6. Appendices

6.1 List of Abbreviations

BISA	British International Studies Association
CONGO	Conference of Non-Governmental Organisations in Consultative Relationship with the United Nations
CSD	United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development, a functional commission of the UN Economic and Social Council
ECOSOC	United Nations Economic and Social Council
FCO	Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom
GASPP	Globalism and Social Policy Programme, jointly run by Sheffield University and STAKES, the National Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health, Helsinki
GEF	Global Environment Facility, an intergovernmental institutional to fund the protection of the global environmental commons
IBFAN	International Baby Foods Action Network
ICSW	International Council for Social Welfare
IMF	International Monetary Fund
ISA	International Studies Association (the main academic body in the USA)
IPPF	International Planned Parenthood Federation
NGLS	Non-Governmental Liaison Service, an inter-agency programme of the UN system that facilitates NGO participation and dialogue with the UN system
NGO	Non-governmental organisation (meaning any group eligible for recognition at the UN, including trades unions, churches, business associations, etc)
PC	Preparatory Committee
SAPRIN	Structural Adjustment Participatory Review Network
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNED-UK	United Nations Environment and Development, UK Committee, now renamed Stakeholder Forum for Our Common Future
WFUNA	World Federation of United Nations Associations
WSSD	World Summit for Sustainable Development, Johannesburg, 26 August - 4 September 2002
WTO	World Trade Organisation

6.2 Methodological Details

6.2.1 List of Fieldwork Activities

Access was gained to observe the operations of the institutions, obtain documents and interview official and NGO participants at the following events

- CSD ninth session, New York, April 2001
- CSD acting as the Preparatory Committee for the World Summit for Sustainable Development, New York, first and the third sessions, respectively PC1 in May 2001 and PC3 in March-April 2002
- Southern NGO Summit on Sustainable Development, Algiers, March 2002

- GEF Council 17-19th sessions, Washington DC, May and December 2001 and May 2002
- World Bank and IMF Spring Meetings, Washington DC, April 2001 and April 2002
- NGO Working Group on the World Bank, Steering Committee, London, October 2001
- World Bank NGO Joint Facilitation Committee, Washington DC, December 2001
- Structural Adjustment Participatory Review International Network (SAPRIN) NGO conference on the World Bank, Washington DC, April 2002
- Wilton Park conferences on the WTO, July 2001 and July 2002, and on the International Development Targets, September 2001
- WTO NGO Symposium, Geneva, April 2002

6.2.2 List of In-Depth Unstructured Interviews and Participant Observation Meetings

A variety of situations provided significant data on the relations between NGOs and the intergovernmental institutions. The following list covers lengthy interviews and briefer exchanges with participants in the institutional processes, consultations with academics undertaking similar research and attendance as an observer at related events.

- 12 Dec 00 Brief exchanges with Mark Malloch Brown, UNDP, re: World Bank and NGOs.
- 15 Apr 01 Consultation with Beth Schaefer, US academic working on NGOs at the CSD
- 17 Apr 01 Interview Michéle Ferenz, consultant for UN on CSD stakeholder dialogues
- 19 Apr 01 Interview Barbara Adams, NGLS, re: CSD and NGOs.
- 2 May 01 Interview Robert Pollard, experienced Quaker activist, re: CSD history
- 3 May 01 Interview Cyril Ritchie, Environment Liaison Centre International
- 11 May 01 Interview Rajen Awotar, re: break up of CSD NGO Steering Committee
- 19 June 01 Interview Dr Ingar Brueggemann, Director-General of IPPF, re relations with WB
- 5 July 01 Brief exchanges with Dr Supachai, WTO Director-General Designate, re: transparency in the WTO
- 13 July 01 Consultation with Zoe Young academic working on the GEF, re: her fieldwork
- 23 Aug 01 Interview Tom Bigg, formerly of UNED-UK, re: the history of the CSD NGO Steering Committee
- 13 Sept 01 Meeting of the UK Trade Network, planning for Doha
- 18 Sept 01 Interviewed John Clark, re: World Bank NGO Unit and WB NGO Committee
- 23 Oct 01 Meeting of NGO Working Group on the World Bank, Steering Committee
- 7 Nov 01 Meeting of Nancy Birdsall and Ed Scott with London academics and NGOs on plans for the Centre for Global Development, a new Washington-based think-tank.
- 12 Nov 01 Interview Jane Covey, Chair of the NGO Working Group on the WB, 1997-1999.
- 15 Nov 01 Telephone exchange with Sirpa Pietikainen, Chair of WFUNA, on its relaunching.
- 5 Dec 01 Interview Jan-Gustav Strandenaes, Global Focal Point GEF NGO Network
- 12 Dec 01 Interview Navroz Dubash, World Resources Institute, re: US NGOs and WB
- 13-4 Dec 01 Meeting of World Bank NGO Joint Facilitation Committee, Washington DC
- 5 Feb 02 Exchanges with Dr Ingar Brueggemann, Director-General of IPPF, re WSSD PC2
- 7 Mar 02 Meeting UK Trade Network committee
- 24 Mar 02 Interview David Brown academic/activist on World Bank NGO relations
- 29 Mar 02 Consultation with Carolyn Stephenson, US academic specialising on NGOs
- 3 Apr 02 Interview Cyril Ritchie, Environment Liaison Centre International
- 16 Apr 02 Interview Boni Biagini, GEF NGO Officer
- 21 Apr 02 Exchanges with Oxfam International Washington campaigners.
- 22 Apr 02 Exchanges with John Audley, Carnegie Endowment, on NGOs at the WTO

- 24 Apr 02 Interview with Eric Swanson, World Bank staff, on indicators for the Millennium Development Goals
- 24 Apr 02 Interview with Doug Hellinger, SAPRIN, on their relations with the World Bank.
- 29 Apr 02 Exchanges with NGO and government representatives at three-day WTO NGO Symposium in Geneva
- 30 Apr 02 Interview Bernard Kuiten, NGO officer, WTO secretariat
- 15 May 02 Interview Rachel Kyte, former GEF NGO Global Focal Point
- 16 May 02 Meeting of US NGOs with Margolis, Assistant Secretary of State for sustainable development
- 16 May 02 Interview Jeffrey Barber, one of founders of CSD-NGO Steering Committee
- 16 May 02 Brief exchanges David Barker, former GEF NGO Global Focal Point
- 16 May 02 Interview Boni Biagini, GEF NGO Officer
- 25 June 02 Interview Tom Bigg of IIED on NGO activities at Bali, WSSD, PC4.
- 27 June 02 Consultation with Julian Disney, former President of ICSW
- 28 June 02 Interview Felix Dodds, former Northern Co-Chair NGO-CSD Steering Committee
- 11 July 02 Brief exchanges Dr Supachai, WTO Director-General Designate, re: NGO access to the WTO
- 26 July 02 Consultation with John Foster, North-South Institute, (Canadian NGO).
- 19 Sept 02 Interview Hans Peter Werner, External Relations Division WTO
- 19 Sept 02 Interview Neil McMillan, lead person on WTO at UK Permanent Mission
- 20 Sept 02 Interview in Geneva John Garrison, World Bank, Civil Society Team.
- 20 Sept 02 Interview at International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development, Geneva
- 20 Sept 02 Attended Colloquium on Global Governance, Geneva, September 2002
- 23 Sept 02 Interview in London, Matthew Lownds, FCO desk officer for WTO.
- 31 Oct 02 Attended briefing of the FCO by Ramesh Thakur, on the UN Secretary-General's report of 23 Sept on "Strengthening the United Nations". (Reform proposals include a review of UN-NGO relations.)
- 6 Nov 02 Attended UK Consultation by World Bank on *World Development Report 2004, Making Services Work for Poor People*.
- 17 Dec 02 Interviewed Jan-Gustav Strandenaes, The Development Fund (Norwegian NGO), re: the foundation of the Sustainable Development Issues Network
- 20 Jan 03 Attended launch of the first Global Accountability Report, by One World Trust.
- 29 Jan 03 Interview Tom Bigg of IIED on the World Summit for Sustainable Development.
- 11 Mar 03 Consultation with Denys Correll, Executive Director, ICSW

6.2.3 Coverage of the Surveys

Each of the five questionnaires was designed for self-completion, in case direct access to respondents could not be gained. In practice, virtually all were completed by face to face interviews. This was beneficial in being able to record remarks made during the interviews and probing for wider comments at the end.

- A) *Interviewing government delegates to the CSD* was easier than expected. There were no outright refusals, but one young woman delegate was instructed by her head of delegation to demand the return of her questionnaire. Another head of delegation stopped the interview half-way through, apparently through embarrassment at lack of familiarity with the system. A greater number of interviews was conducted than had been anticipated, as some were possible not just before and after the meetings, but also while the CSD was in session. A total of 68 delegates from 58 countries were interviewed.

The sample included a mix of senior experienced diplomats and more junior staff, from a variety of roles. Seven of the respondents had served or were currently serving on the Bureau of the Commission, which means they held a crucial leadership role. The

average number of sessions attended was just over two. This was low, because as many as 63% were attending their first session. However, one respondent had attended every year and another had only missed one session, while 28% had attended three or more sessions.

There was no possibility of taking a random sample of the delegates, as the lists of delegates are not issued until late in the session and even then are highly unreliable. Nor is it clear which countries are represented, as some desks appeared to have country labels, but remained empty for the two sessions. The decision was taken to take a quota sample of the UN's regional groups.¹⁰ The distinction between members and non-members of the Commission, although delineated by the seating arrangements, was not as distinct in the political processes. Delegates from both member and non-member countries were interviewed. Given the small sample size, the regional distribution was only slightly skewed, with a slight over-representation of the Western European and Others Group and under-representation of the Eastern Europeans. The sample was distributed as follows.

Comparison of the Sample with the UN and CSD Memberships

	UN Members	CSD Seats	UN %	CSD %	Sample % by country	Sample % by people
African	53	13	28	25	29	26
Asian	54	11	29	21	21	21
Latac	33	10	17	19	19	19
East Europe	22	6	12	11	7	6
WEOG	27	13	14	25	24	28
Total	189	53	100	100	100	100

- B) *Interviewing NGO representatives at the CSD* was more difficult than expected. Many said they were too busy when first approached. Some, but not all, agreed to be interviewed later. It had been hoped that the CSD NGO Steering Committee would provide some mechanism for sampling, both the NGOs present and those who were unable to attend the CSD sessions, but that was not possible. The Committee virtually disbanded in May 2001.

Fortunately, an invitation was received to attend the Southern NGO Summit on Sustainable Development in Algiers in March 2000. This event was organised by the Southern Caucus of the CSD NGO Steering Committee in New York, as a preparatory event for the World Summit for Sustainable Development. Virtually all participants had all their costs met by the Algerian government, which meant a proportion were attending their first international meeting.

There were only two full working days in Algiers, but 29 interviews were obtained and another 22 were obtained a fortnight later at the CSD in New York. Six of the 29 in Algiers had previous experience of the CSD. The same questionnaire was used for the two groups of respondents, so there are totals of 51 answering general questions and 28 for questions assessing the working of the CSD system.

Clearly the samples were not random nor even allocated within quotas. The process of waiting in an area where people are moving around and systematically sampling those who go past in a particular time period is known as a convenience sample. Given the refusals in New York and the nature of the Algiers conference, the sample was biased

¹⁰ Each elected body in the UN is now specified as being composed of a specified number of members from each of the five regional groups. The composition of the CSD, as shown in the table, is given in ECOSOC Decision 1993/207 of 12 February 1993.

towards NGO representatives with limited experience of global policy-making. The respondents were a reasonable spread of the regions, with 51% from Africa, 14% from Asia, 14% from Latin America and the Caribbean and 22% from North America and Western Europe.

- C) *Access to Members of the Governing Council of the GEF* was dependent upon obtaining an NGO security pass. This was done in December 2001. Because the Council only meets for two days and delegates pay close attention to its agenda, obtaining interviews was more difficult than at the UN. The aim had been to interview the universe of 64 Members and Alternates. In the event only 50 were present and 29 were interviewed. A further five were carried out, after the Council ended, with delegates based in Washington or London. It had been hoped to obtain near complete coverage by further interviews in May 2002. Unfortunately I had not appreciated how my position had depended on good relations with the head of the NGO Network. Between December and May there was a coup within the Network, with the result that I was only able to gain access for one day and only five more interviews were obtained. Nevertheless, the overall total of 39 interviews is a substantial proportion of the official decision-makers who actually attend.
- D) *The NGO representatives at the GEF* were available over a longer time period. The time lost when access was denied to government representatives was utilised to increase the number of interviews with NGO representatives. In May 2002, a total of 23 of the 32 present were interviewed. In addition, a further 11 had been interviewed in December 2001, but were not present in May. Again this is a good proportion of the attenders.

6.3 Summary Responses to the Attitude Questions in the Five Surveys

Substitute here as pp. 16-20 the five pages of tables printed from the Excel file, ATTITUDE.XLS

6.4 Policy Recommendations to Global Institutions with an NGO Consultative System

- 6.4.1 Each intergovernmental institution should recognise and support a *single* governance network, open to all recognised NGOs, as their interlocutor for the management of the consultative arrangements. (See Section 1.3.) Large complex institutions might have separate networks for separate subsidiary bodies.
- 6.4.2 The policy framework covering the role of the network, procedures for recognition of NGOs, participation rights and codes of conduct should be agreed by both the institution's governing body and the NGO governance network. The agreed framework should provide authority for evolution in the arrangements by consensus. There should be suitable delegation on both sides for agreeing detailed day-to-day practices. (See Sections 3.1-3.2.)
- 6.4.3 No policy position from NGOs should be circulated as a printed document or published on the institution's website, unless it contains a list of NGO representatives who have each explicitly authorised their approval of the statement. (See Section 3.4, especially paras. 3.4.4 and 3.4.5.)
- 6.4.4 Each intergovernmental institution should consider providing an office at their headquarters and the salary for one full-time professional person to administer the NGO governance network. This person should be appointed by the network and act solely under the authority of the network. (See Section 3.5.)
- 6.4.5 Each intergovernmental institution should consider establishing a permanent fund to finance participation by representatives from developing country NGOs in the consultative arrangements. Allocation of such funds would be decided by the NGO governance network, under agreed rules and subject to independent audit. (See paras. 3.4.2, 3.4.6, 3.4.7 and 3.3.6.)

6.5 Policy Recommendations to the IMF, the World Bank and the WTO

- 6.5.1 The global economic institutions should cease deviating from global norms and establish some formal system for consultation with NGOs, recognising that over time this will be seen as legitimate by both governments and NGOs. (See paras. 3.3.1-3.3.2, 5.2.2 and 5.3.5.)
- 6.5.2 Much time and effort could be saved initially by giving automatic recognition to NGO applicants that already have consultative status with the United Nations. Other specialist NGOs could then be considered on their individual merits. (See paras. 1.2.1 and 5.1.1 and Section 5.4.)
- 6.5.3 The general policy recommendations, given above for existing consultative systems, should also apply to the global economic institutions, at the level of both the governing body and the regular boards and committees.
- 6.5.4 The first step for each institution would be to ask the Conference of Non-Governmental Organisations in Consultative Relationship with the United Nations (CONGO), in co-operation other relevant networks, to convene a meeting to establish a governance network for all UN-recognised NGOs interested in relating to the institution.
- 6.5.5 The resulting NGO network would become autonomous from CONGO and its steering committee would reach agreement with the institution on all aspects of the definition and operation of the arrangements for consultative status.
- 6.5.6 Practical constraints on time and space for NGO participation should be handled in agreement with an NGO governance network, building on experience from the UN CSD and the GEF with dialogues, consultations and limited direct participation. (See Sections 3.1-3.2.)

6.6 Policy Recommendations to Governments

- 6.6.1 Governments should acknowledge that a system of NGO consultative arrangements is now a norm for global institutions and is seen as highly legitimate both in the UN and in an international financial mechanism, the Global Environment Facility. (See Section 3.3 and para. 5.4.11.)
- 6.6.2 Governments should see support for civil society participation in global governance as a general global public good, rather than a question of *ad hoc* political tactics. (See Section 3.5.)
- 6.6.3 Governments should accept the need for some system of NGO consultative arrangements to be established in those institutions – the IMF, the World Bank and the WTO – that do not currently have one, to enhance their transparency, their legitimacy and their consideration of wider sustainable development issues. (See Section 3.3.)
- 6.6.4 Governments should be willing to allocate some resources, both through the budgets of global institutions and directly from their own budgets, to funding civil society participation in global governance. As a global public good, such funding should assist with the administrative costs of an NGO governance network and the participation by representatives from developing country NGOs in meetings of global institutions. (See paras. 3.4.2, 3.4.6, 3.4.7 and 3.3.6 and recommendations 6.4.4 and 6.4.5.)

6.7 Policy Recommendations to Non-Governmental Organisations

- 6.7.1 All NGOs should recognise the difference between advocacy networks and governance networks. They should also recognise their common interest in supporting an NGO governance network, irrespective of their differences with other NGOs on the substantive issues. (See Section 1.3.)
- 6.7.2 All NGOs participating in a global institution should recognise the obligations to join, to contribute some funds and to participate in the corresponding governance network. (See Sections 3.4 and 3.5.)
- 6.7.3 An NGO governance network should provide assistance, on an equitable basis within the limits of available resources, to all NGOs that desire to participate in a global institution, irrespective of their stance on the issues. (See paras. 3.4.3 to 3.4.5.)
- 6.7.4 The officers, the steering committee and any subsidiary bodies of an NGO governance network must be explicitly denied the right to adopt positions on issues on behalf of the network. The only positions adopted by governance networks should cover the procedures and operations of consultative arrangements. (See paras. 3.4.3 to 3.4.5.)
- 6.7.5 All NGO statements by permanent or *ad hoc* issue caucuses should be endorsed by authorised representatives of specific NGOs. If asked, governance networks should assist in publication and distribution of joint statements, without that implying any endorsement of the statements. (See paras. 3.4.3 to 3.4.5.)
- 6.7.6 An NGO governance network should draft and adopt by consensus a Code of Conduct for NGOs in their relations with the relevant global institution. This Code would cover the obligation of NGOs solely to accredit representatives authorised to speak on their behalf, to act with probity in the use of financial and other resources, and to behave in a manner that is appropriate within a diplomatic forum. (See para. 3.4.2.)
- 6.7.7 Northern NGOs and governance networks should provide and seek funds for participation by developing country NGOs in global institutions and global networks. (See paras. 3.4.6 to 3.4.7.)