

Proposal on Organisational Structure of GCAP post-2007

**prepared by
GCAP Future Structure Task Group**

**submitted to
GCAP International Facilitation Team, National Coalitions and other GCAP
Constituencies for comments**

4 October 2007

At the GCAP global meeting in Montevideo on 3-5 May 2007, it was decided that GCAP would continue to operate at least till 2015. With the decision, the Future Structure Task Group was formed and mandated to come up with recommendations on the future structure to be discussed at the GCAP International Facilitation Team and the larger constituencies of GCAP for review and endorsement. With this mandate, the Group started its deliberations and hereby submit its draft proposal for comments. Please see Appendix 1 for Guiding Principles and Appendix 2 for the members of the Future Structure Task Group.

We are now asking for comments and feedback to this proposal. Please send your comments to Irfan Mufti, GCAP Campaign Manager at irfan.mufti@civicus.org. As shown in the timeline (see Section 5), the deadline for feedback is **Wednesday, 31 October 2007**.

There are five sections in this document. **Section I** describes the work of the Task Group up to this point; **Section II** lays out the basic understanding and the overarching philosophy of the new structure; **Section III** spells out our proposal of the overall structure; **Section IV** highlights some key considerations in the new structure; and **Section V** discusses a way forward in finalizing the proposed structure.

I. Our work thus far

After the Montevideo meeting, the Task Group held numerous telecalls. We have examined pros and cons of different structural options as discussed in Montevideo (see Appendix 3) and set the criteria for the host organization (see Appendix 4) and discussed various aspects of the structural formation. We also identified and engaged an external resource person, Dr. Rajesh Tandon, for advice. Since the nature of the discussion was very complex and the time to conclude and make concrete recommendation was not enough, we agreed to hold a face-to-face meeting. Due to a budget constraint, we decided to invite one representative from each region as well as one from each constituency group (feminists, children & youth, workers) and INGOs. We also invited one representative from the Funders' Group for the second day. A Co-chair and relevant members of the IFT support team were convened as well.

On 29-30 August 2007, the Group met for a two-day face-to-face meeting in Oxford, UK. The Group's member list in Appendix 2 indicates who participated in the

face-to-face meeting. Prior to the face-to-face meeting, we have conducted a round of consultation through questionnaire sent to GCAP national coalitions and other constituencies to obtain feedback about the GCAP structure. 19 responses came that were used for the meeting (see Appendix 5). We also looked for models in other global civil society campaigns and coalitions and the documents were circulated to the participants that include descriptions of Global Campaign for Education, World Social Forum, International Gay and Lesbian Association and International People's Health Council.

II. Basic understanding

Throughout the work, the Group has tackled with the challenging task of fulfilling the mandate of the Montevideo Guiding Principles with regard to the relationship among national, regional and global structures. We have refined and fine-tuned the relationship as well as the elements of these structures as follows.

National Coalitions

- Within the agreed declarations of GCAP, the national coalitions are the primary building blocks of GCAP and the base for our action and cooperation.
- All efforts need to be made to strengthen national coalitions. This includes the work of INGOs and constituency-based groups (such as feminists, youths and workers) and they should facilitate effective action at the national level.
- National coalitions must have a genuine and democratic planning and decision-making process and broad-based and inclusive constituency. They must also have the capacity to do mass mobilisation.

|

Regional Structure

Regional structure fulfils the two important and interrelated functions;

- Regional secretariats work as part of global secretariat for programme implementation at the regional level as well as support for national coalitions in their respective regions.
- Regional governance mechanism sets regional action plans with regional secretariats acting as the implementing body. This may also include taking actions to influence regional political structures.

|

Global Structure

Clear global structure will facilitate action and cooperation at the national and regional levels. It will also facilitate global actions at international political moments. Global work adds value to the GCAP work because of:

- Aggregation of various GCAP activities for greater impact and global solidarity.

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-the-ground activities carrying GCAP brand gets attention of international political instruments such as the G8 summits, UN summits, IFIs meetings, etc. • . • Global resource mobilization and consolidation of global workplans. • International coordination of national/regional actions |
|---|

We also paid careful attention to the following principles as laid out in Montevideo:

- That the structure needs to secure mutual accountability and transparency, as well as clarity on decision-making, roles and responsibilities between levels and at all levels;
- That the structure needs to facilitate good communications between levels and at each level;
- That gender equity and regional representation in all our structures must be paramount;
- That there needs to be language capabilities in the structure that guarantee timely translation into the GCAP languages (English, French, Portuguese, Spanish, Arabic); and,
- That the structure needs to be flexible and light so that GCAP is able to act and react quickly.

III. Proposal

At the Montevideo meeting, the majority of participants expressed by the straw poll results and general discussion their preference for the non-formal, non-legal global structure for GCAP. Our understanding is that it is primarily based on their general assessment that GCAP's strength lies in its diversity, spontaneity, political strength and leadership, dynamism and flexibility and that legal registration would work against maintaining and furthering this very strength.

We started our work with keen awareness and attention to these sentiments and were respectful of them throughout our discussions and deliberations. Furthermore, we understand that this general sentiment was underscored by the results of the questionnaire (see Appendix 5, especially Q6). At the same time, we have come to recognize that the current structure needs to gradually evolve so as to make GCAP on the whole stronger, more democratic and more sustainable as an effective and impact-oriented anti-poverty global campaign led by civil society. Now that GCAP has decided to continue at least till 2015 and possibly longer, it is apt for us to consider this structural question with a long-term view.

With this perspective, we would like to raise three points that have implications to the legal registration question at the global level.

(1) Accountability system

We view the current GCAP structure as having weaknesses in its accountability system at various levels. On the global level, it revolves around the hosting question as described below but overall, we see a trade-off between upholding the open and flexible

structure as presently subscribed by GCAP and strengthening transparent and accountable system where who is responsible for what is clear and the responsible parties are held to account for the outcomes of activities. Although we do not deem it necessary to drastically alter the nature of GCAP structure in defense of accountability, we see a general trend for the push for more accountability at this time of the GCAP's organizational evolution.

(2) Hosting

CIVICUS, the current host of GCAP IFT support team, expressed in its May 2007 board meeting that it would be willing to house the team after the end of 2007. However, this hosting structure is bound to produce tension and conflict, not because of this particular host organization, but because of the hosting relationship in general. First, although the support team is nominally accountable to the IFT from the GCAP perspective, it is also formally accountable to the CIVICUS board and management, as it is also a program of CIVICUS, with its staff hired and finance managed by the organization. This certainly blurs the accountability of GCAP at the global level and leads to management confusion, although there are measures that can be taken to ameliorate the situation by signing a formal MOU with the host organization board, for example.

Second, it is possible, as it has happened with CIVICUS, for the support team to compete for funding against the host organization. So far, this competition has been kept minimum as the GCAP funders' group has mainly been funding GCAP themselves (not only at the global level but also regional and national levels). In 2008, we have been witnessing increased competition as GCAP started an attempt to expand its funding base.

As a practical matter, CIVICUS only agreed to house GCAP at this time of GCAP's transition (for another year, although it has not ruled out the possibility of extension) and this uncertainty is detrimental to GCAP's mid- to long-term planning. With this situation, as shown in Appendix 4, we developed a set of criteria and broadly called for an expression of interest for the GCAP's new host organization. Up to now, two organizations – Oikos, the host organization of GCAP Portugal and GCAP India -- showed interest. Although these options are worth pursuing, we do not think these options would satisfy all the criteria we have developed and the expectations for the future functioning and management of GCAP. In the case of GCAP India, it has in principle agreed to host the global secretariat but it would be unable to accommodate within the current timeframe¹.

In essence, we came to the general agreement (if not full consensus) that 1) it is useful to distinguish between the "legal" hosting and "physical" hosting; and 2) after considering different options, particularly the risks, liabilities and potential conflict the legal hosting could possibly entail, it would be unavoidable and adequate to create an

¹ A future structure task group member Amitabh Behar, who spoke on behalf of GCAP India, indicated in late September that although GCAP India had agreed in principle to host the global secretariat, it had not identified the legal host. The steering committee members of GCAP India had been in discussion but it would be at least several months before the legal host organization could be agreed. Also, India might not be an ideal location for the global secretariat as the Indian government might want to scrutinize the organization's operation if the amount of money handled by GCAP global secretariat becomes big. The regulations there might make the smooth operation of the secretariat difficult.

independent legal organization for the global secretariat, whereas the “physical” hosting (or housing) arrangements can be constructed separately. We also came to believe that, with proper structure in place, this independent legal registration could be handled with a minimum negative impact on GCAP’s strength in its diversity, spontaneity, political strength and leadership, dynamism and flexibility.

(3) Focus on the health and vitality of national coalitions

Repeatedly, we are reminded that the national coalitions are the base for GCAP. When we consider the long-term development of GCAP, we feel that some system will need to be in place to ensure that the national coalitions are broad-based, inclusive, democratically-run and outcome-driven. This will be necessary without regard to whether GCAP is legally registered at the global level, which is to say that there are other fundamental aspects for discussion than this legal registration question when we consider the long-term development of the GCAP structure.

Having deliberated on these key considerations, we the Task Group have come to the following consensus:

- **We take a *minimalist* approach and propose that the least level of formalization is presently being necessitated by the need for creating an accountable and transparent structure as well as securing the funding to continue to harvest good outcomes from various GCAP activities.**
- **We take a *gradual formalisation* approach and propose that there will be a process of 12 to 18 months where the new GCAP global structure is constructed in an open and democratic manner.**
- **As a part of these minimalist and gradual formalisation approaches, we deem it necessary at this point to legally register the mandate of the Global Secretariat (closest to Option 4 of the Montevideo straw poll, as indicated in Appendix 3) but not the whole GCAP structure.**

We propose the following as the basic framework of GCAP post-2007. Please refer to Figure A, “GCAP Global Structure.” We propose:

- That GCAP **National Coalitions** be recognized as the base of all GCAP action and cooperation.
- That GCAP identify **Global Assembly** as the ultimate *political* decision-maker of GCAP at the global level. As in Montevideo, all GCAP constituents (including national coalitions, regional secretariats, constituency-based groups, INGOs and other civil society organisations, campaign partners and the global secretariat) will be able to participate in the Global Assembly. Each Global Assembly will produce a GCAP Declaration.
- That Global Assembly elect **Governing Council** which is composed of regional and other representation. There will be a clear TOR between the Global

Assembly and Governing Council, with the latter empowered to make *political* decisions of GCAP on behalf of the former within the broad Declarations of Global Assembly.

- That GCAP form **GCAP Trust**, independent legal not-for-profit organization registered (most likely in the Netherlands, for the ease by which the registration can be done and the lightness of regulatory oversight – it does not mean that the office is physically based there), that takes care of *administrative and financial* aspects of running GCAP at the global level, including staff hiring and finance. The Governing Council elects the **GCAP Trust Board** of the GCAP Trust to oversee the functioning of the Global Secretariat.
- That GCAP Trust Board appoints **Global Secretariat** director, who is responsible for administering day-to-day operations of the GCAP global secretariat. Other secretariat staff members are hired by the director. One of the key tasks of the Global Secretariat will be to consolidate 3-4 year global workplan that should include elements from national coalitions, regional structures and constituency-based groups.
- That Global Secretariat and **Regional Secretariats** work in close collaboration and regional staff are considered part of the global team while simultaneously accountable to regional councils/facilitation groups.
- That **Monitoring and Evaluation Group** be established by the Governing Council, which will be charged with the task of monitoring whether GCAP is accomplishing the goals as laid out in the Global Assembly Declaration and GCAP Trust is fulfilling its duties of running effective and efficient operations.
- All of these components of the GCAP structure are governed by the **GCAP Charter** (a written declaration of how GCAP as a whole as a non-legal entity is governed and run, as described in this proposal), whereas the legal body of GCAP – GCAP Trust – is governed by the **GCAP Constitution** (a written stipulation by which GCAP Trust is legally managed).

IV. Key elements in the proposed global structure

We would like now to describe each component of the proposed structure in a little more detail.

National Coalitions and GCAP Constituencies

- We need to develop criteria for national coalitions that articulate values and guiding principles that guide formation and maintenance of the coalitions.
- We need mechanism for monitoring national coalitions and constituency-based groups with a clear set of criteria with respect to representation, authenticity and activity. One idea to implement this monitoring mechanism is described in Appendix 6.
- Constituency-based groups and INGOS must actively be involved in national coalitions in their activities and coalition building.

Global Assembly

- The Global Assembly will remain the main policy formation and

decision-making body of GCAP.

- It is composed of national coalitions, constituency-based groups (currently composed of Feminist Task Force/Women's Movement, Children and Youth Task Force and Workers' Movement – we will allow for other groups to be considered), INGOs and other civil society organizations, as well as campaign partners.
- The majority of voting delegates to the Global Assembly will be national coalitions (with one vote per national coalition)
- The Global Assembly takes place every 3 years

Governing Council

- The Governing Council will provide strategic guidance and implementation of GCAP mandated by the Global Assembly and its Declarations
- The Governing Council is an evolution of the current IFT.
- The number of its members will be reduced from 26 to 17.
- Its members are composed of regional representation -- Asia (3), Africa, LAC and Europe (2 each x 3), Middle East and North Africa, North America (1 each x 2), Constituency-based groups (FTF/women, Children & Youth, Workers – 1 each x 3), and INGOs (3)
- It oversees the GCAP Trust Board and is responsible for its election.

GCAP Trust Board and Global Secretariat

For the purposes of formalizing the roles of signing contracts and reporting, audits, hiring staff and other administrative and financial functions, GCAP registers GCAP Trust (pending verification of the term by legal expertise) as an independent non-profit organization. GCAP Trust will have the GCAP Trust Board and Global Secretariat. It will perform functions as mandated by the Governing Council.

- The GCAP Trust holds executive, fiduciary and legal responsibilities of the Global Secretariat.
- It is composed of nine members, of which five are elected from the Governing Council and four are at large members with specific skills (e.g. human resources, legal, accounting, etc.), nominated by the Governing Council.
- In its election and nomination, gender balance and regional considerations will be enforced.
- Its elected members must have the written support and recognition by their employers to dedicate an agreed amount of her/his time to GCAP.
- The GCAP Trust will have a Global Secretariat with professional competence.
- Functional working groups (such as mobilization task force) are convened by the secretariat at the mandate of the Trust Board, based on competency and not representation.

As previously mentioned, we see this formation as a necessary compromise within the different options presented. Again, what is registered is the mandate of the secretariat, and not the whole GCAP.

Campaign Partners

GCAP considers United Nations Millennium Campaign (UNMC) as a campaign partner and an interlocutor at the global level. There might be other institutions considered by the Global Assembly as campaign partners of GCAP.

Strategic Plan and Workplan

- GCAP needs key strategies for actions at all levels. As stated, one of its key aspect will be national coalition building with clear agendas, inclusive memberships and practical plans
- GCAP needs to develop a multi-year plan of work at all levels interlinked with each other. It will include: 1) A vision statement for 2015; 2) A three-year strategic plan; and 3) An annual plan. There is a need to initiate the process of formulation of the vision statement and the three-year strategic plan at the earliest enabling GCAP constituents to start implementing by early 2008.
- These planning documents will clearly articulate policy demands, anticipated results and methods for measuring impact and outcomes.

Funding

- The Global Secretariat will make use of the vision and strategic plan for fundraising activities. It will facilitate direct support by funders to GCAP national coalitions and regional structures.
- In order to avoid the conflict of interest, those who serve on the GCAP Trust Board will be excluded from the decision-making when it involves funding via the GCAP Trust to national coalitions and others and when those members have affiliations with possible recipients of the funding.
- GCAP national coalitions and regional structures, based on their own strategies and planning, are encouraged to pursue funding for their own activities. It will be ideal for GCAP components to be financially autonomous for the long-term.
- The Global and Regional Secretariats will facilitate information sharing with regard to the fundraising activities at various levels
- GCAP funders' group will be transformed into a Funders' Council with a broader base. It will be an informal, advisory mechanism to be consulted on the financial aspect of GCAP and assist regional and national structures as well as the Global Secretariat to identify funding opportunities and other resources for GCAP activities and workplans.

Regional Structure

- A rationale for regional secretariats is that they act as a part of the Global Secretariat for global programme implementation (including facilitation of global days of action) and national coalition support
- Each region may elect Regional Council that acts as the regional governance mechanism for which regional secretariat implements regional action plans.

V. Way Forward and Transition Measures

The following steps are envisioned to ratify this proposal.

1. On Thursday, 4 October: Proposal sent to IFT, national coalitions and other GCAP constituencies for comments and feedback
2. Thursday, 25 October: IFT meeting to comment on the proposal
3. Wednesday, 31 October: Deadline for feedback from national coalitions and other
4. By Monday, 5 November: IFT support team incorporates comments/feedback in the draft and send final draft to Structure Group for review
5. Thursday, 8 November: Final Structure Group Teleconference meeting
6. By Saturday, 10 November: Final final draft sent to IFT, national coalitions and other GCAP constituencies for endorsement
7. Thursday, 15 November: IFT meeting for sign-off

In this process, on request basis and by finding proper opportunities, the proposal is explained in regional and other face-to-face meetings by the members of the Task Group or support team members in order to clarify the key points of the proposal and the thinking behind.

The IFT support team will spearhead the efforts to carefully map out the transition plan for a smooth handover to the new governance and operational mechanism of GCAP. Currently, we view the following as the transition plan. The estimates of the timing of the steps are mentioned in parenthesis, but they are subject to further consideration and change. As such, they should be regarded as outside the scope of the proposal submitted by the Future Structure Task Group. We call for the convening of the first transitional Governing Council face-to-face meeting as early as possible, where the steps and timeline should be examined, revised as necessary and approved.

Step 1) The GCAP IFT support team will draft the initial vision statement and a three-year strategic plan (between October and December 2007)

Step 2) There will be an election of *transitional* Governing Council, with the criteria and process for the election drafted by the support team and approved by the current IFT, within the overarching spirit and principles of this future structure proposal (November-December 2007).

Step 3) The first face-to-face meeting of the transitional Governing Council, where the initial vision statement and the three-year strategic plan is approved, will be held. It will also elect the GCAP Trust Board members and nominate the *transitional* Monitoring and Evaluation Group (December 2007-January 2008).

Step 4) GCAP Trust is formed and legally registered (January-February 2008).

Step 5) The Global Secretariat is formed and its staff members (re-)hired (by February 2008 – since the current contracts of the Global Secretariat staff members will expire on 31 December 2007, they will be renewed for the short-term with CIVICUS so that there will be no gap before they are re-hired by the GCAP Trust).

Step 6) Within the overall framework of the approved vision statement and the three-year plan, an annual plan is developed by the Global Secretariat and approved by the GCAP Trust Board (February-March 2008).

Step 7) A process will start to sign an MOU between the GCAP Trust and each and every GCAP national coalition and constituency-based groups. The MOU will stipulate the mutual accountability system between the parties. There will also be similar agreements between the GCAP Trust and the regional structures (from around February 2008 for 12-18 months).

Step 8) A GCAP Global Assembly will be held with national coalitions who have signed an MOU with the GCAP Trust as voting members. It will also involve other GCAP constituencies and campaign partners. At the Global Assembly, there will be an (re-)election of the Governing Council, which will (re-)elect the GCAP Trust Board members. The Governing Council will also (re-)nominate the Monitoring and Evaluation Group. By completing these measures, the transition time will come to an end (sometime in 2009).