

Background Paper

Review of thematic (multi-)stakeholder networks

PREPARED FOR THE ANNUAL GENERAL ASSEMBLY 2019

By

Abbie Yunita
Melanie van Driel
Dr. Marjanneke Vijge

Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development,
Utrecht University, The Netherlands

Table of Contents

Executive summary	2-3
Background and context	4-6
Situating the role of donor networks in a changing development space	
Structures and functions of selected networks	
Research objective and questions: Conditions for network's effectiveness	
Learning from other networks: Identifying conditions for effectiveness	6-12
Common agenda	
Shared measurement	
Mutually reinforcing activities	
Continuous communication	
Backbone Support	
Lessons learned for the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development	12-15
References	15
Annex	16-39

Executive Summary

This background paper details preliminary insights into the role of networks in a changing world, as new actors, needs, priorities and challenges enter and influence the development space. Its primary objective is to learn from, and reflect on, the experiences of the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development (hereafter the Global Donor Platform) and selected networks working in key sectors of rural development. The focus of this paper is therefore twofold:

1. To understand the adaptability of networks to existing and emerging challenges and opportunities in the development space.
2. To assess how this adaptability explains networks' effectiveness in meeting their various mandates.

This paper is based on desk research of reports, publications, and evaluations produced or commissioned by six networks with varying mandates, organisational structure, and programmatic work. These documents show the ways in which these networks have evolved with changes in their respective areas of work. These networks are:

1. The Scaling Up of Nutrition (SUN) Movement
2. Global Alliance for the Future of Food
3. Climate and Land Use Alliance
4. The Donor Committee for Enterprise Development (DCED)
5. Committee on World Food Security (CFS)
6. Universal Health Coverage 2030 (UHC 2030)

This research is supplemented by four interviews with secretariat staff from the Donor Committee for Enterprise Development, the Global Alliance for the Future of Food, the Committee on World Food Security, and the Global Donor Platform; as well as members survey data from the Global Donor Platform. The selection of the networks was based on – among other factors – networks' mandate, membership, structure, and approach. All networks share important similarities with the Global Donor Platform. The similarities between, as well as the differences among the networks are instructive to assess the ways in which the features, functions and structures of networks affect their evolution (adaptability) and output and outcome (effectiveness). The aim is to foster a constructive dialogue among members, reflecting on – both retrospectively and prospectively – the purpose, function and trajectory of this network to remain relevant in the development space within which it operates.

This paper is organised around five conditions through which adaptability and effectiveness could be enhanced, that have also informed the Global Donor Platform Member Survey (inspired by Turner et. al. 2012). Although the conditions for effectiveness are interdependent and cumulative, Table I delineates key findings regarding each condition for the sake of clarity.

Table I: Key findings**Conditions for effectiveness and lessons for the Global Donor Platform**

Common agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Redefining a common agenda/purpose in a changing development space requires iterative, dynamic, collaborative processes.● Clarifying shared principles, commitments and/or joint evaluation frameworks around the Global Donor Platform's strategic focus can foster ongoing reflection and rearticulation of a common purpose.● Communicating internally (within the Platform) and externally (with other stakeholders and partners) can inform the strategic reorientation of the Platform and enhance its internal and external legitimacy.
Shared measurement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Embedding processes of evaluation in the work of the Global Donor Platform can assist in responding effectively to changing priorities in the development space.● Experiences from other networks indicate that shared principles can enable ongoing evaluation, encouraging members to consistently reflect on the question: <i>is this activity or program aligned with the principles of our platform?</i>, when making strategic decisions.
Mutually reinforcing activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Formal and informal partnerships add value by i) taking stock of changing circumstances; ii) identifying areas where multiple stakeholders diverge and converge; iii) (re)defining a common agenda; and iv) improving decision-making and programming in a cross-sectorial way.● Further clarifying the structure of the Global Donor Platform, including the procedures and rules that distinguish between different types of members and partners can help manage activities and interactions, and maximise coordination and collective output.
Continuous communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Improving procedures for continuous communication at the thematic working group level can improve intra- and inter-working group coordination, ensuring ongoing learning and mutually-reinforcing activities within the network. Facilitating ongoing communication in these fora is also necessary to retain members' engagement.● Thematic working groups may benefit from documenting their activities with partners, to enable them to evaluate the types of partnerships and what methods of engagement yield the best strategic outcome.● A regular mandatory renewal of membership can enhance the quality of communication among members, because those who renew are generally more engaged in the network.
Backbone support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● The size, funding and composition of secretariats affect the capacity of the Secretariat to perform its backbone function. It is important to reflect on and clarify what members can expect from the Secretariat, taking into account available financial and human resources.● The Secretariat can play a role in enhancing institutional memory, enabling a network to learn from past experiences in dealing with present and future challenges.

Background and context

Situating the role of donor networks in a changing development space

The Global Donor Platform was formed in 2003 to respond to a need: to amplify the profile of rural development on the donor agenda, following several years of relative decline in public investments in the agricultural sector. The challenge of rural development remains enormous today, and realising the ambitions of the 2030 Agenda requires further investment in rural areas. However, mobilising resources for rural development is no longer enough. Until recently, much discussion on poverty, health, gender, land use, production and consumption, decent work, biodiversity and migration has taken place in isolation. There is now a growing consensus that rural development and agriculture must account for the multidimensional factors that affect the lives, livelihoods, and landscapes in rural areas.

As a convener of donors and partners, the Global Donor Platform can tackle new challenges in rural development and coordinate for informed policy and programming, through building consensus, formulating joint approaches, and fostering aid effectiveness. The network's main functions - knowledge sharing, networking and advocacy – constitute important means through which coherence and alignment across sectors can be realised. Peer learning, together with networking with other stakeholder groups, can illuminate the complexity of issues facing rural development and help re-articulate the network's work and priorities (including the work of its members), thereby providing a robust foundation for effective advocacy.

New global aspirations and the resulting changes in the development space provide challenges as well as opportunities. While some changes are beginning to take form, the policy and institutional architecture within which the donor community is embedded remain largely bounded in silos. This considered, this paper discusses key conditions that shape a network's ability to adapt to changing circumstances in the development space, which is conceptualised as a main determinant of a network's effectiveness.

Structures and functions of selected networks

In terms of their structural properties, the Donor Platform shares most similarities with the Global Alliance for the Future of Food and the Donor Committee for Enterprise developments (DCED). These networks were initiated by member organisations, which continue to play a role in driving the strategic directions of these networks. They comprise of a single or a few stakeholder groups, and their interactions are largely mediated by their secretariats. These networks also share similar functions, including but not limited to convening relevant actors, knowledge exchange and advocacy. The Scaling Up of Nutrition (SUN) movement, Universal Health Coverage (UHC) 2030 and Committee on World Food Security (CFS) are *multi-stakeholder* networks, with significantly more complex organisational arrangements. The Scaling Up of Nutrition movement, for example, is country-led and supported by a constellation of networks, one of which is the Donor Network. The Scaling Up of Nutrition movement thus exists and operates within a multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral environment, both globally and nationally, to meet its objectives. Contrary to Scaling Up of Nutrition, the Climate and Land Use Alliance has a small and stable membership. It functions to identify funding opportunities and make high impact grants within its geographic and thematic focus, but also convenes a growing network of public and private actors to mobilise

action for sustainable forest and land use. What these networks share in common is the presence of backbone support, mostly in the form of a secretariat. It must be noted, however, that the staff/member ratio differs across networks. This, together with factors such as funding and staff composition (administrative or technical) may affect a Secretariat's ability to carry its backbone function. In extensive cross-country networks like the Scaling Up of Nutrition movement, the secretariat works in close cooperation with the Movement Lead Group and Executive Committee in providing backbone support to members, implying that backbone support can be provided jointly. Table II shows the membership and functions of the six networks in this paper.

Table II: Membership and functions of the selected networks

Network	Membership	Functions	Member/staff ratio
Global Donor Platform	Donor organizations	Advocacy, knowledge sharing, networking	40/7 (5.7)
Scaling up of Nutrition	Multi-stakeholder	Bring people together; coherent policy; align programs around a common results framework; financial tracking and resource mobilisation.	61/21 (2.9)
Global Alliance for the Future of Food	Philanthropic foundations	Forge insights and strengthen evidence; convene key actors and facilitate meaningful dialogues; stimulate action for change	25/7 (3.5)
Committee on World Food Security	Multi-stakeholder	Coordinate and convene actors around the four dimensions of food security	130/9 (14.4)
Donor Committee for Enterprise Development	Bilateral and multilateral donors; foundations	Fund mobilisation; knowledge sharing	22/7 (3.1)
Climate and Land Use Alliance	Philanthropic foundations	Makes high-impact grants to innovative projects at the global level and across forested regions, primarily focused on Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico, and Central America.	4/8 (0.5)
Universal Health Coverage 2030	Multi-stakeholder	Advocacy; knowledge sharing; promote accountability	100+/13 (7.6)
Compiled from Scaling Up of Nutrition 2018; Climate and Land Use Alliance 2018; Global Alliance for the Future of Food n.d.			

Research objective and questions: Conditions for network's effectiveness

As networks comprise autonomous organisations, they require some form of governance to ensure members engage in a mutually supportive way and maintain legitimacy, both internally and externally. The paper identifies critical areas where networks must strike a balance between integrating new concerns, issues and actors in the development space on the one hand; and remaining coherent and mindful of their mandates and members on the other. It focuses on balancing tensions between inclusiveness and efficiency, internal and external legitimacy, and flexibility and stability (see Provan and Kenis 2007), all of which are salient for responding effectively to the increasingly complex and interconnected socio-ecological systems that shape, and are shaped by rural development.

This paper explores how network governance can strengthen adaptability and effectiveness, focusing on five conditions for effective collaboration: 1) common agenda; 2) shared measurement; 3) mutually reinforcing activities; 4) continuous communication; 5) backbone

support. These conditions are synergistic and must be treated as parts of an integrated whole to ensure collective action exceeds what the members each could have achieved working independently. The discussion around these conditions is framed around a twofold inquiry:

- 1) How do networks promote and sustain collaboration?
- 2) How do they adapt to changes in the environment within which they operate?

Table III - Five key conditions for adaptability and effectiveness of networks

Condition	Definition
Common agenda	All members have a shared vision for change including a common understanding of the problem and joint approaches to solving it through agreed upon actions.
Shared measurement	Consistent evaluation ensures that efforts remain aligned and members hold each other accountable.
Mutually reinforcing activities	Activities can be differentiated while still being coordinated through a mutually reinforcing plan or framework for action.
Continuous communication	Consistent and open communication is needed within and across networks to build trust, maximise synergies, and appreciate common motivation.
Backbone support	Creating and managing collective impact requires a separate organisation(s) with staff and a specific set of skills to serve as the backbone for the entire initiative and coordinate participating organisations, agencies and actors.

Adapted from Turner et al. 2012

Learning from other networks: Conditions for adaptability and effectiveness

Common agenda

Networks often emerge through a shared purpose, in order to strive towards a collective end by means of conscious coordination, enhanced learning and more targeted and efficient use of resources (Provan and Kenis 2007). Over time, the aspirations, needs or objectives of networks evolve with changing knowledge and/or social and political goals. A clear example of a network that adapted its form (and name) to changing political goals is Universal Health Coverage 2030. The network, previously labelled the International Health Partnership (IHP+), broadened its scope and base of partnership after the adoption of the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Universal Health Coverage 2030 asks its members to endorse the network's key mandate and issues as laid down in the UN Global Compact - a pact to encourage businesses worldwide to adopt sustainable and socially responsible policies, and to report on implementation. This is used as a way to ensure that the network is based on a common agenda.

Reorienting and clarifying a common agenda or a shared understanding is crucial to working collaboratively. This requires an iterative process of dialogue among members as well as non-members to ensure that networks can sustain legitimacy among remain relevant in a changing

environment. In this context, dynamic approaches to redefining common goals or agendas can help foster other conditions for networks' effectiveness, whilst ensuring that collective impacts resonate beyond the networks themselves.

Box 1

2050: Visions for Global Food Systems Transformation

The Global Alliance for the Future of Food crowd-sourced input to inform its Visions 2050. The aim was to capture innovative ideas and practices for food systems transformation in a participatory way. "There is no single vision, but multiple visions for food systems transformation, and we wanted to encourage public participation in this so we crowd-sourced some ideas of what food systems could look like" (Interview, Ruth Richardson, 28.5.2019). Submissions were analysed, synthesised and presented to Global Alliance members in early 2019. Visions 2050 will inform the work of the Global Alliance, with the potential to serve as tools for others working to create sustainable food systems.

Such dynamic approaches are illustrated, for example, by the call for 'Visions 2050' initiated by the Global Alliance for the Future of Food (see Box 1). Similarly, the SUN Movement Strategy 2016-2020 is a product of extensive consultation among UN agencies, donors, and hundreds of not-for-profit organisations and business actors within the vast Scaling Up of Nutrition movement. Along the same vein, the Climate and Land Use Alliance invests in external engagement with governments, private sector and other partners to inform where and to whom it issues grants to realise member foundations' shared commitment (Wells et al. 2017). In addition, in the wake of the 2008 global food crisis, the Committee on World Food Security

realised it needed to change in order to adapt to the changing circumstances in the global food system (Interview, Cordelia Salter, 28.05.2019). It initiated a reform process to allow non-members to take on an advisory role within the network. This culminated in a 'civil society mechanism' and a 'private sector mechanism', to ensure that the development of a shared vision amongst members is informed by a myriad of viewpoints. This also means that the network's policy documents and decisions are more in sync with the realities that third parties face 'on the ground'.

Responding and adapting effectively to changes in the development space also require networks to balance stability in their organisational structure and flexibility to account for diverse (often divergent) interests and priorities. The inclusion of multiple stakeholder groups into the Committee on World Food Security led them to clearly delineate rules to 1) distinguish between different types of members; 2) define procedures associated with participation, detailing how different members can participate in the decision making process. This reform allows the Committee on World Food Security to strike a balance between stability and flexibility, allowing them to expand their knowledge base to inform decision-making while keeping the decision-making body small. The Global Donor Platform has already clarified the definitions and criteria for different kinds of actors engaged in the Platform. Moving forward, however, further defining and articulating what this means for members, associate members, strategic partners, and operational partners can help ensure that activities and interactions within the Platform are aligned to its strategic focus and work plan. This, in turn, can foster mutually-reinforcing activities grounded in a common agenda / purpose.

An important lesson from the scoping exercise, however, is that striving towards long-term work plans or reforming the structural properties of a network will only add to a network's effectiveness, if they are perceived as necessary by the members and the backbone organisation (the secretariat and other supportive staff). The Donor Committee for Enterprise Development, for example, came to the conclusion that members preferred flexibility over fixed, detailed long-term work plans (Interview, Jim Tanburn, 23.05.2019).

Shared measurement

Shared measurements are fundamental to ensuring accountability to the commitments and goals of the network. Shared measurements refer to the processes that ensure that the activities of a given network are aligned with its shared agenda, commitments or objectives. Continuous reflection on what has been achieved, what gaps remains, where opportunities lie, and what challenges exist is particularly pertinent in ensuring adaptation to a changing development space. Evaluation is often done sequentially, but novel approaches are emerging to facilitate ongoing evaluation within networks to align the activities of members and adapt to changing circumstances. For example, for the Global Alliance for the Future of Food, evaluation is not sequential or an after-thought, but rather *embedded* within its work (Box 2).

Shared measurements are often grounded in shared principles that hold networks together. In principles-driven networks, such as the Global Alliance, shared principles are central to reporting and evaluation processes (Interview, Ruth Richardson, 28.05.2019). The working groups of the Global Alliance, for example, are required to report on how the Global Alliance's shared principles inform the network's work as both evaluation and diagnostic tools. Taken as a whole, these principles are used as a diagnostic 'checklist' that guide the Global Alliance's work, determining what projects and initiatives the Global Alliance and their members engage with. As mentioned in the previous section, Universal Health Coverage 2030 uses the *UN Global Compact* as the prerequisite for inclusion in the network membership, as well as the network's advocacy and engagement strategies. In this way, it can be categorized as a tool for the evaluation of activities of platform members.

Box 2

The role of evaluation in the Global Alliance for the Future of Food (Interview with Ruth Richardson)

Evaluation is a building block of our work and it happens at all levels (alliance and working group levels), at all times. This facilitates an ongoing and enhanced learning process, identifying and shaping critical questions, ideas, and further evaluation needs as they emerge. An evaluator is present in most of our activities, including in meetings, to identify key themes and provide directions in real time.

Along a similar vein, the Scaling Up of Nutrition movement's ten principles constitute the glue that holds a vast and growing network together, providing guidance in mitigating conflicts of interest and cooperating effectively toward a common goal (Scaling up of Nutrition 2016). In other instances, measurements refer to the collection and collation of data within the membership of a network to gauge whether the activities of members are aligned. For example, the Scaling Up of Nutrition movement launched a Joint Assessment Framework

(JAA) in 2015. Framed around the movement's strategic objectives, the Joint Assessment Framework encourages member countries, together with country networks and other stakeholders, to reflect, align efforts, and (re)shape priorities (Scaling Up of Nutrition n.d.). Likewise, the Climate and Land Use Alliance evaluates all climate and land use grants issued by its member foundations and those managed by the alliance to ensure coherence in the network's overall programming.

Mutually reinforcing activities

In dynamic environments animated by diverse actors, facilitating mutually reinforcing activities demands expanding the knowledge base, learning and advocacy beyond members. All networks examined in this paper collaborate with private, public and civil society partners inhabiting the broader development space to enhance the relevance of what they do. Some networks formalise these partnerships, but most are organised in an informal and ad-hoc basis. Both formal and informal partnerships add value to networks, helping them to understand better the wider contextual changes affecting their work, subsequently enabling them to coordinate and adapt their activities in a responsive and proactive manner. To this end, networks often convene diverse stakeholders through thematic dialogues, with a view to taking stock of challenges, opportunities, practices, and actors relevant to the purposes and functions of networks.

The Global Alliance for the Future of Food, for example, convened multiple stakeholders on the issue of resilient seed systems in response to its members' request in 2018. As a contentious theme that cuts across issues of food security, farmers' welfare, intellectual property rights and trade, the purpose of convening stakeholders was to identify areas of divergence (disagreements) and convergence (agreements). This helped the network to find common ground through which a shared action framework was produced. This framework has been taken up by the members of the network to inform their work and is used by the Global Alliance as an advocacy tool at the global level. Similarly, the Global Alliance's involvement in the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity for Agriculture and Food (TEEB AgriFood) - a UN Environment Initiative - has also helped the members of this network to holistically evaluate the economic and non-economic values of eco-agri-food systems in their investment decisions, going beyond simplistic metrics such as 'per-hectare productivity' (Interview, Ruth Richardson, 28.05.2019)

The aforementioned call for submissions for 'Visions 2050' by the Global Alliance is another way to engage new partners and work effectively in a cross-sectorial way. Such an approach invites ideas from new partners and stakeholders who would normally not participate in policy dialogues. In a changing and complex development space, inviting participation from more actors through non-conventional means (such as crowd sourcing) allows greater flexibility in the formulation and design of policies.

Continuous communication

Amplifying the impacts of networks and adapting to changing circumstances requires both internal communication with members and external communication (or outreach) with non-members. Interactions and continuous communication amongst members and other participants are at the core of collaborative arrangements. Most selected networks have mechanisms in place that determine the frequency of interactions and level of engagement

among their members, including in annual meetings, quarterly calls, newsletters, and online knowledge platforms. Such regular communication streams are conducive to 1) anticipating emerging challenges and opportunities; 2) discussing and integrating important issues into a shared action framework (as illustrated by the Global Alliance's resilient seed systems initiative); 3) improving decision-making and alignment of activities.

Most communication within a networks is facilitated by the Secretariat. However, members' engagement is often voluntary. To stimulate ongoing communication within networks, work streams can create added-value. Such working groups are often, if not always, initiated and led by members. While their objectives somewhat vary, they are some of the most active fora where members interact, develop strategies, engage external partners and allocate resources to address a particular problem. Bottom-up and needs-based, working groups stimulate consistent and engaged participation from members. In the Donor Committee for Enterprise Development, four or more members can initiate a new working group. In this network, initiators or working groups often pool their own funding. This means that 1) members are more likely to invest their time and effort; and 2) members who initiate the establishment of a new working group can hold each other accountable. Similarly, each impact area in the Global Alliance defines its own activities and raises funds on an ad-hoc, as needed basis. For example, when members decided to do something around the externalities of food systems, they raised considerable funds for the study on the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity for Agriculture and Food (TEEB AgriFood) (Interview, Ruth Richardson, 28.05.2019).

Once a thematic work stream of working group has met its goals and objectives, it should reflect and learn from its experiences to reorient or reform its work plan. The secretariat can facilitate this process of reflection, addressing how thematic working groups can change or renew themselves in accordance with changes in the development space. As much of the work and content of the Global Donor Platform are produced in thematic working groups, communicating about lessons learned and remaining challenges can improve the overall relevance and effectiveness of the Platform.

Within the donor community, flexible approaches to membership, member retention and interaction can facilitate a more organic communication process. For example, a regular mandatory renewal of membership can enhance the quality of communication among members, because those who renew are generally more engaged in the network. Fee-based membership can also serve as an indication of a network's perceived effectiveness. The Donor Committee for Enterprise Development, for example, sees the flexibility for its members to opt in and out of its membership by yearly renewal as an additional tool to reflect on its effectiveness, contributing to an ongoing process of improvement. This has resulted in 10-15 stable, core members, with other members changing over time (Interview, Jim Tanburn, 23.05.2019). This system allows the network to welcome new members and so regularly introduce new knowledge, issues and enthusiasm, thus balancing the need for stability (through core membership) and flexibility (through welcoming new members to the network). Likewise, the Global Alliance has had a stable and active membership since its formation, with all members paying an annual membership fee that funds the secretariat and key activities within the network. For the Global Alliance, annual membership fees provide robust and stable funding to the secretariat, enabling it to create and maintain strong flows of communication and perform its convening and advocacy role within and beyond its membership.

Beyond communication within networks, continuous communication and engagement with external partners and other stakeholders help networks to adapt effectively to change. For some networks, maintaining a stable core membership whilst communicating with partners on a regular basis helps them to coordinate their work more effectively while enhancing learning (Box 3).

Box 3
About membership extension in the Climate and Land Use Alliance (Wells et al. 2017)

An external evaluation of this network states that it has “wisely resisted temptations to expand the Alliance significantly” in avoiding the administrative and reporting burden of a larger membership. It does, however, incentivise key actors to work together through external engagement and support activities such as tenure reform and corporate campaigns that other donors do not engage in.

Another way to consistently and collaboratively communicate and advise decision-making within a network is through an advisory body, as illustrated by the World Committee on Food Security. The advisory body meets every two months to gain input from stakeholders at regional, sub-regional and local levels to advise the executive. This then informs decision-making during its annual meeting, as diverse viewpoints have already been synthesised and considered during the meetings of the Board and advisory body (Interview, Cordelia Salter, 28.05.2019).

Backbone Support

All analysed networks engage with members predominantly through their secretariat. Backbone support both brings and holds members together. This is crucial in realising the other aforementioned conditions that influence the effectiveness of networks. Secretariats can fulfil three important functions:

1) Coordination in networking, knowledge sharing and advocacy

Secretariats’ engagement with members’ input and requests, and coordination with members and partners are important to anticipate future developments and subsequently include relevant new issues and themes into the networks’ agendas. In profiling emerging issues, developing new content, and responding to members’ requests, backbone organisations can increase members’ engagement, and also the adaptability and effectiveness of networks. As such, the way a secretariat manages and responds to members’ input can significantly impact a network’s effectiveness. The interviewee from the Donor Committee for Enterprise Development describes the interaction between members and the secretariat as contributing most to the network’s effectiveness (Interview, Jim Tanburn, 23.05.2019).

2) Communication with members and partners

Backbone organisations also play a vital role in managing and mediating communication with members and partners through diverse means. Effective communication procedures enable backbone organisations to respond to members’ input in a timely manner. One organization

that prides itself on responding to member input is the DCED. For example, any request or idea received from a member agency is quickly answered, and where appropriate worked on. All those actively involved in the work of DCED (about 70 people) are interviewed approximately every two years, to learn more about the trends they see in their work, and the ways in which DCED can assist them in meeting the demands implied. Members can therefore feel that their changing needs are being accommodated and responded to.

Box 4

How secretariat composition supports cooperation in the Committee on World Food Security

The multi-agency secretariat of the Committee on World Food Security aims to balance staff from FAO, IFAD and WFP. The fact that the secretariat represents multiple agencies gives a powerful message to members that cooperation between these agencies is important and can be capitalised on. This is likely to have a positive effect on intra-network cooperation, but also stimulates extra-network interactions.

The staff composition of the backbone organisation plays an important role in strengthening communication and organisational coherence. Secretariat composition that includes representatives of member organisations can facilitate efficient lines of communication between member organisations and networks, as in the case of the CFS (Box 4).

3) Strengthen institutional memory and knowledge management

Secretariats can enhance knowledge management and institutional memory. Building a repository of knowledge through documentation can illuminate why and how networks have evolved, and how they can utilise this to address future

challenges. This may serve as a pull-factor to increase members' engagement. For example, in case of high staff turnover within member organisations, network secretariats can positively influence the engagement of new focal points through its knowledge products, providing a real asset for new focal points to engage and participate in the network, and effectively communicate to their member organisations.

Lessons learned for the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development

This section draws out the most relevant lessons for the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development. It focuses on how the Platform can adapt effectively to change and remain relevant to its members and the wider community of practice working in agriculture and rural development. These lessons are centred on the ways in which networks can stimulate key conditions for effective collaboration and adaptation: common agenda, shared measurement, mutually reinforcing activities, continuous communication and backbone support. In recognising the interlinkages between these conditions, the lessons below do not clearly delineate between them, but rather treat them as an integrated whole, making explicit the interconnections between them.

Lesson 1: Common agenda, strategy and commitments should unfold and evolve through collaborations within and outside of the Platform's membership. The Platform has responded to new development aspirations by aligning its new vision and strategic focus with Agenda 2030, moving towards more holistic and territorial approaches in its work. However,

simply aligning towards new political priorities may not be enough to ensure its relevance and value added. The Platform and its thematic working groups thus need to be both proactive and reactive, enabling it to adapt to changes in the present, and anticipate change and form a response. This means that moving from strategy to joint approaches requires facilitating networking and knowledge sharing internally and externally. This does not mean that the Platform need to expand its membership per se. Inviting broader multi-stakeholder participation can be facilitated through establishing strategic and operational partnerships around topical issues, linked to the strategic focus of the Platform. This can cast the net wider, allowing flexibility to learn about emerging issues and opportunities, whilst maintaining the interests of the core members of the network.

To clarify and redefine a common purpose within the Platform, a set of shared principles or a joint framework for action can serve as an important coordination and evaluation tool. Although not articulated as shared principles, shared commitments already exist within the Platform. For instance, in the thematic working group on Land Governance, the ‘Code of Conduct on Country-Level Coordination’ help to foster complementarity across members’ national programmes (Interview, Romy Sato and Laura Barrington, 28.05.2019). Furthermore, regular peer review and information sharing enable an ongoing learning process to assist members to proactively act on emerging issues and opportunities. This can serve as an example for other thematic working group and the network as a whole to help improve intra- and inter-working group coordination and clarify shared commitments.

Lesson 2: Shared principles, agreed by members, can help align the work of members and serve as strategic evaluation and diagnostic tools. Shared principles can pave a normative foundation upon which members collaborate and engage in policy and programming in a mutually reinforcing manner. Articulating shared principles helps maintain a common purpose while serving as an evaluation and accountability framework, as illustrated by the Global Alliance for the Future of Food and the Scaling Up of Nutrition movement. Shared principles can help members to navigate where, when and how their resources could be most impactful in realising shared objectives, acting as a diagnostic ‘check-list’ for decision-making. Applying shared principles can also help members to evaluate whether their work is aligned with the vision and strategies of the network. Within the Global Donor Platform, shared principles may facilitate synergies across Thematic Working Groups, and align the Thematic Working Groups with the Platform’s Strategic Plan 2016-2020. Shared principles should be evaluated through their application, and therefore are not fixed. As such, applying shared principles in policy and programming can guide adaptation through an ongoing evaluation, exploring and identifying changing contexts within member organisations and the environments they engage in.

Important to note is that establishing shared principles require consensus by all members. In the case of the Global Alliance for the Future of Food, these shared principles were negotiated in the initial stage of its formation, a culmination of two months of facilitated meetings between members (Patton 2018). Articulating shared principles paved a common trajectory before the activities, projects, or goals of the Global Alliance for the Future of Food became fully defined. Shared principles also enable the Global Alliance for the Future of Food to develop and adapt through ongoing (re)evaluation of its shared principles, situated in a dynamic context of food systems transformation. This does not mean, however, that shared principles cannot be negotiated at a later stage. A seventh principle is currently being

considered by the Global Alliance for the Future of Food, based on a common thread that was observed throughout the submissions it received for 'Visions 2050'. This suggests that the establishment of shared principles can be informed through inviting participation from other relevant stakeholders.

Lesson 3: Flexible membership procedures can be used as an additional evaluative tool for Platform effectiveness. The Committee on World Food Security, for example, makes attendance in the platform a requirement for continued membership. The Donor Committee for Enterprise Development, on the other hand allows its members to 'vote with their feet' by yearly membership renewal, which is perceived as a concrete way to evaluate platform effectiveness. In both cases, procedures are designed to allow new, energetic members to join and bring new issues to the fore, as well as to allow members to leave that are not anymore connected to the aim of the platform. For the Global Donor Platform, it is important to balance the aim to be inclusive and the aim to be effective. Any procedure contributing to the effectiveness of the Global Donor Platform should allow these facets.

Lesson 4: Participatory structures to influence decision-making can increase the effectiveness of annual meetings. As clearly mentioned in the example of the Committee on World Food Security, the creation of an advisory group to the Platform's Bureau can make decision-making in the Platform more effective. The advisory body might be established by choosing regional (geographic) representatives who are then asked to communicate their input and discussion points to their constituencies after meetings.

Lesson 5: The Platform's capacity to coordinate, network and learn largely depends on the functioning of the Secretariat. Multi-year funding can help the Secretariat to provide backbone support. In particular, the Secretariat fulfils two important functions.

The first function relates to ***documentation and managing content produced and commissioned by the Donor Platform.*** This is important to enhance collaborative processes, organisational learning and institutional memory. The Platform's evolving vision, work streams and strategies for rural development are driven by external factors (such as changing global aspirations affecting the development space) and internal factors (such as changing members' organisational structure or priorities). Documentation of processes through which the network has evolved or dealt with change since its formation, combined with the knowledge contents it produces overtime, is a great asset to ensuring the effectiveness of the Platform. Strengthening the management of such records will enable the Donor Platform to reflect on past experiences and trends, helping to address challenges in the present and anticipate future changes. This helps to foster continuity in the work of the Platform, especially in an environment where internal changes are not uncommon, such as change or reduction in Secretariat staff and changes in representatives from member organisations. This, in turn, can 'pull' emerging donors to engage with the Platform. This knowledge asset can also strengthen advocacy efforts within and outside of the Platform by using it for the production of background documents, anticipating and addressing emerging issues. The role of the Secretariat as backbone to the network is crucial in this.

A second important function is the ***cross-sectoral exchange and communication between members mediated by the Secretariat.*** The Secretariat plays a critical role in convening other stakeholders to enhance knowledge sharing and learning. It carries member-driven work plans, provides follow-up and supports thematic working groups to enhance their collective

impacts. With its networking, knowledge sharing and advocacy capacities, the Secretariat helps to facilitate cross-sectoral exchange between members and partners to foster mutually reinforcing activities, while better capturing new issues and opportunities. The size, composition, and funding of the Secretariat significantly impact the adaptive capacity, and therefore effectiveness of the network. The Secretariats of the Global Alliance and the Donor Committee for Enterprise Development, for examples, receive robust funding from mandatory annual membership fees. Within the Global Donor Platform, the reduction in the size of the Secretariat has direct bearing on the number of thematic working groups it can carry and the support it provides to existing working groups (Interview, Romy Sato and Laura Barrington, 28.05.2019). Ensuring adequate human and financial resources will enable the secretariat to perform its roles efficiently and effectively, and enhance the added-value of the network overall.

References

- Climate and Land Use Alliance. 2018. “Priorities and Focus 2018-2022.” [file:///Users/Abbie/Downloads/CLUA-Priorities-2018_2022%20\(2\).pdf](file:///Users/Abbie/Downloads/CLUA-Priorities-2018_2022%20(2).pdf)
- Global Alliance for the Future of Food. “What we do.” <https://futureoffood.org/about-us/what-we-do/>
- Patton, Michael Quinn. 2018. *Principles-Focused Evaluation: The Guide*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Provan, Keith and Patrick Kennis. 2007. “Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management and Effectiveness.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. doi: 10.1093/jopart/mum015.
- Richardson, Ruth. Interviewed by Abbie Yunita, Utrecht (via Skype), May 28, 2019.
- Salter, Cordelia. Interviewed by Melanie van Driel, Utrecht (via Skype), May 28, 2019.
- Scaling Up of Nutrition. 2016. “Sun Movement Strategy and Roadmap (2016-2020).” https://scalingupnutrition.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/SR_20160901_ENG_web_pages.pdf
- Scaling Up of Nutrition. 2018. “Annual Progress Report 2018.” https://scalingupnutrition.org/wp-content/themes/elision/pdf/SUNPR-2018/SUN_Report_EN_2018.pdf
- Scaling Up of Nutrition. 2018. “SUN Movement Annual Progress Report 2018.” https://scalingupnutrition.org/wp-content/themes/elision/pdf/SUNPR-2018/SUN_Report_EN_2018.pdf
- Tanburn, Jim. Interviewed by Melanie van Driel, Utrecht (via Skype), May 23, 2019.
- The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB). 2018. *Measuring what matters in agriculture and food systems: a synthesis of the results and recommendations of TEEB for Agriculture and Food’s Scientific and Economic Foundations report*. Geneva: UN Environment.
- Wells, Michael P., Marisa Camargo, Bernd Cordes, Pernille Høltedahl, Susanne Leloup, Matthew Lewis, and Carmen Tavera. 2017. “2016 Evaluation of the Climate and Land Use Alliance: Summary for External Distribution.” <http://www.climateandlandusealliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/CLUA-Evaluation-Report-Summary.pdf>.

Annex

Background information on the networks selected for this background paper

Scaling Up Nutrition Movement	
What is their member composition? And how large is their membership?	<p>The SUN movement comprises of:</p> <p>SUN countries: 61 nations, and the Indian States of Jharkhand, Maharashtra and Uttar Pradesh.</p> <p>SUN networks (multi-sectoral, multi-stakeholder):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) civil society network (in 39 SUN countries), hosted by Save the Children UK, representing over 2000 organisations. 2) business network, co-convened by Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition and World Food Programme. 3) UN network: UN Network leverages the nutrition resources, skills, expertise and knowledge of its member UN agencies, programmes and funds to support convergence along the six pillars of the <u>United Nations Decade of Action on Nutrition 2016-2025</u> in support of national nutrition efforts; responsible for translating and achieving UN nutrition commitments in SUN countries. 4) donor network <p>Stewardship and support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task team • Secretariat • Lead groups <p>Note that SUN is a broadly defined partnership (or movement); participants in the movement are deemed to share common objectives with regard to nutrition, and there are no defined boundaries between what they do in their capacity as supporters of SUN and other actions that may also have a bearing on SUN's objectives.</p>
Which mandates and objective(s) do they have?	<p>Vision: end malnutrition in all its forms. Strengthen political commitments and accountability.</p> <p>Four strategic objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The creation of an enabling political environment, with strong in-country leadership, and a shared space (multi-

	<p>stakeholder platforms) where stakeholders align their activities and take joint responsibility for scaling up nutrition;</p> <p>2) The establishment of best practice for scaling up proven interventions, including the adoption of effective laws and policies;</p> <p>3) The alignment of actions around high quality and well-costed country plans, with an agreed results frameworks and mutual accountability;</p> <p>4) An increase in resources, directed towards coherent, aligned approaches.</p>
What is their governance structure?	<p>In essence, the SUN movement comprise of multi-stakeholder networks working collaboratively to support multi-sectoral, state-driven initiatives to scale up nutrition. Within each SUN Country, the government nominates a <u>SUN Government Focal Point</u> who convenes multi-stakeholder platforms (MSPs) that bring together actors from all sectors that are relevant to nutrition.</p> <p>Network liaison and coordination is the responsibility of SUN Coordinator, Lead Group, Executive Committee and the Secretariat.</p>
How do members interact (level, modes, tools/formats and frequency of interactions)? How long do they exist?	<p>1) Since 2012, annual global gatherings for SUN countries and networks to share progress, lessons learned, exchange ideas, and identify opportunities ahead</p> <p>2) Since 2016, networks meet every 12 weeks to discuss progress and emerging issues, enabling them to respond to new challenges and opportunities in a timely manner.</p> <p>3) Regular conference calls</p>
What are their factors of success and of challenges?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Leadership and coordination ● Country ownership ● Encourages multi-stakeholder, multi-sectoral processes, accounting for the multi-dimensional factors that contribute to hunger and malnutrition and addressing the institutional gap that exist in a highly fragmented governance architecture. ● Ongoing communication and interaction between members ● Independent evaluation in 2014 to take stock of what's been achieved and how to progress further. It looked at its institutional structures, ways of working and decision processes, and

	<p>assessed the way the Movement is governed and its theory of change.</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The goodwill it has built up and the experience it has gained since it was launched. This is embodied, not least, in the progress there has been in establishing the support networks and in the capability demonstrated by its Secretariat. 2) There has also been notable progress (supported by the Multi-Partner Trust Fund) in strengthening country-level civil society networks. 3) Its transparency and willingness to address difficult issues, such as conflicts of interest within the movement. 4) It has been reasonably efficient in its use of resources, which are modest in proportion to the potential benefits of improved nutrition. 5) Its adaptability and willingness to learn from experience. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Monitoring and evaluation framework needs to be more rigorous 2) Assumption that country-level structure should mirror global ones 3) Insufficient clarity in its approach 4) Changes of the ways SUN works are not always communicated well across the movement <p>SUN was formalised in 2012, but the initial idea was proposed in 2009.</p>
<p>How have they adapted over time to pressures/changes in the development space (innovations)?</p>	<p>M&E is the process through which the movement adapts its strategy and structure overtime, tracking progress, lessons learned, challenges and successes overtime. The concept of Communities of Practice (CoPs) was introduced [in 2014] as an innovative platform for planning, costing, implementation and monitoring, building on organisational and institutional capabilities.</p> <p>M&E is intended to foster accountability; and learning and adaptation, enabling change to occur at two levels:</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Impact level: the number of those lifted out of malnutrition. 2) Outcome level: changes in the multi-stakeholder, multi-sectoral architecture towards readiness in scaling up nutrition. <p>A Joint Assessment framework was launched in 2015 to encourage countries to reflect on their progress, framed around the SUN movement's four strategic objectives.</p>
How are they funded? Approximately, how large is their budget?	<p>SUN countries and networks raise their own funds.</p> <p>The SUN Movement Secretariat is funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Canada, the European Union, France, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States. Human resource capacity has been made available by France. The activity plan and budget of the SUN Movement Secretariat supports the implementation of the SUN Movement Strategy and Roadmap (2016-2020).</p> <p>The 2016-2020 provisional budget incrementally increases from \$5,078,580 in 2016 to \$6,912,584 by 2020. In 2017, the Secretariat's total expenditures amounted to USD 6,118,632: with 49% spent for Personnel, 36% for General Operating Expenses, 8% for Travel, 1% for Contracts, less than 1% for Goods and Equipment and 6% for Fees.</p>
How many staff are in the Secretariat or supporting team?	21 staff members
What are the tasks performed by the Secretariat or supporting team? How do they interact with network members?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based in Geneva, the SUN Movement Secretariat liaises with SUN Countries and collects information about how they are making progress towards the four strategic objectives. The SUN Movement Secretariat works to foster the sharing and learning of experiences across the Movement between SUN Countries and SUN Networks. • Works in close collaboration with the SUN Coordinator, also based in Geneva.
<p>Sources: compiled from the SUN's Annual Progress Report 2018; SUN Movement Strategy and Roadmap 2016-2016 and other information available on the SUN Movement's website https://scalingupnutrition.org/.</p>	

Global Alliance for the Future of Food	
What is their member composition? And how large is their membership?	An alliance of philanthropic foundation, comprising of 25 members
Which mandates and objective(s) do they have?	<p>Vision: healthy, equitable, renewable, resilient and culturally diverse food and agriculture systems shaped by people, communities and their institutions.</p> <p>Mission: leverage our resources to help shift food and agriculture systems toward greater sustainability, security and equity.</p> <p>Objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) forge new insights and strengthen evidence for global systems change 2) convene key food systems actors and facilitate meaningful dialogue 3) stimulate local and global action for transformational change to realize healthy, equitable, renewable, resilient, interconnected, and culturally diverse food and agriculture systems shaped by people, communities, and their institutions. <p>Impact areas of work: agroecology, health and wellbeing, and true cost accounting (climate is launching as a 4th area of work - not yet on the website).</p> <p>The work of the alliance is guided by 6 shared principles: healthfulness, renewability, diversity, resilience, equity, and interconnectedness.</p>
What is their governance structure?	<p>The work of the alliance is supported by a coordinating secretariat and a steering committee, working closely with one another to support the strategic direction of the Alliance.</p> <p>The coordinating secretariat is headed by an Executive Director, who plays a leadership role within the Alliance.</p>
How do members interact (level, modes, tools/formats and frequency of interactions)? How long do they exist?	<p>Regular meetings, conference calls and events. Each group working on a specific impact areas meet more regularly.</p> <p>The Alliance was established in 2012.</p>
What are their factors of success?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Mobilises significant resources and has a vast network. 2) Commissions and publishes studies on key issues facing food and agriculture, to understand the linkages across

	<p>multiple sectors affecting the food system. The most recent is on the health benefits of a sustainable food system.</p> <p>3) Assesses philanthropic financial flows in the food system.</p> <p>4) Establish a wide network with other actors.</p>
How have they adapted over time to pressures/changes in the development space (innovations)?	<p>They adapt through constant evaluation, using a technique called developmental evaluation.</p> <p>Their shared principles are also used as an evaluation tool, and a diagnostic 'check list', which guides decisions on what projects, initiatives or investments to engage in.</p>
How are they funded? Approximately, how large is their budget?	<p>Thematic impact areas raise their own funds, so funds are raised when there is a need, which comes with some challenges, but also allows for a more dynamic, flexible process.</p> <p>The secretariat is funded by members' contributions.</p>
How many staff are in the Secretariat or supporting team?	<p>Steering committee: 12 people, some from member philanthropic organisations.</p> <p>Coordinating secretariat: 7</p>
What are the tasks performed by the Secretariat or supporting team? How do they interact with network members?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Convenes international dialogues, bringing together stakeholders from local to global levels. The alliance has hosted two such dialogues, the last one in May 2017, with participation from 250 experts and leaders. 2) Commissions studies 3) Collaborate with actors outside of the alliance, 4) Global advocacy such as TEEB (The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity) on their work on true-cost accounting. 5) Coordinate the 2050 Vision (initiated last year but not yet finalised) 6) Leadership by the Executive Director 7) Responds to members' request, including exploring topical issues.
<p>Sources: compiled from the Global Alliance for the Future of Food website, https://futureoffood.org/ and an interview with Ruth Richardson, 28.05.2019</p>	

Climate and Land Use Alliance (CLUA)	
What is their member composition? And how large is their membership?	<p>The member foundations of the Climate and Land Use Alliance are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the ClimateWorks Foundation

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) the David and Lucile Packard Foundation 3) the Ford Foundation 4) the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation. <p>Aligned foundations fund projects that support the Alliance strategy, but have no formal MoUs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Margaret A. Cargill Philanthropies 2) Good Energies Foundation
Which mandates and objective(s) do they have?	<p>Mission: The Climate and Land Use Alliance seeks to realize the potential of forests and land use to mitigate climate change, benefit people, and protect the environment.</p> <p>Objectives: mobilise resources for sustainable land use and forest management. Members agree to coordinate a portion of their grant making to biodiversity protection, reduce emissions for forest loss, and livelihood protection for poor rural communities and indigenous people.</p> <p>What they do:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) CLUA makes high-impact grants to innovative projects at the global level and across forested regions, primarily focused on Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico, and Central America. Grants on: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) effective land use policy and finance b) secure community rights and management c) deforestation and conflict-free agricultural commodities. d) strong standards and transparency for extractive industries and infrastructure e) awareness of forest and lands as climate solutions 2) Informed by the experiences of grantee partners, it also works to advise and convene a growing network of public and private sector allies to galvanize the international community to action to conserve and more sustainably use forests and lands. 3) At the international level, CLUA supports through grants and external engagement on the following issues: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) International forest policy and funding b) Secure land and resource rights

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) Deforestation and conflict-free commodities d) High standards for infrastructure and extractives e) Awareness of forests as climate solutions.
What is their governance structure?	<p>Key elements of CLUA's governance and management are the Alliance Board, the Executive Director and the Program Team led by the Director of Programs. The CLUA Initiatives for Global, Brazil, Indonesia and Mexico and Central America each have a separate coordinator. Each Initiative team include program officers from the foundations who are responsible for grant making in the relevant area, as well as consultants hired for programmatic purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Alliance management: 10 people 2) Initiative leads: 4 people 3) Program team: 26 people 4) Board: 8 people
How do members interact (level, modes, tools/formats and frequency of interactions)? How long do they exist?	<p>Some of CLUA's staff are also staff of member foundations.</p> <p>CLUA directly manages grants by ClimateWorks (Packard is a contributor). All grants are reviewed and approved by the Alliance management, with recommendations from the Director or Programs. CLUA grants funded by Ford, Packard and Moore are reviewed, approved and disbursed based on their own grant making procedures.</p>
What are their factors of success and of challenges?	<p>Through grants, they support policy and practices across levels and sectors to improve land and forest use.</p> <p>Small, dedicated memberships and team</p> <p>Reflexivity and learning: reports and publishes on critical issues in land use and forest management</p>
How have they adapted over time to pressures/changes in the development space (innovations)?	<p>First evaluation was in 2012, with a follow up in 2016-2017. The follow up evaluation considered CLUA's responses to the 2012 evaluation, as well as reviewed grants issued between 2012 and December 2015.</p> <p>The thematic focus is expanding to cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) natural carbon capture 2) healthy diets/healthy planet

How are they funded? Approximately, how large is their budget?	No information.
How many staff are in the Secretariat or supporting team?	Program team: 26 people
What are the tasks performed by the Secretariat or supporting team? How do they interact with network members?	No information.
Sources: Compiled from Wells et al. 2017; CLUA 2018; and CLUA's website (http://www.climateandlandusealliance.org/)	

Global Donor Platform for Rural Development	
<p>What is their member composition? And how large is their membership?</p> <p>Question: when does the need arise for the Platform to engage with partners? Do partnerships help to adapt to changing circumstances? What do partnerships contribute for members of the Platform?</p> <p>What, in your opinion, are the factors that contribute to the effectiveness of the Platform, and what might be roadblocks to increased effectiveness?</p>	<p>40 members: bilateral development agencies, international finance institutions, multilateral development organisations and foundations.</p> <p>The Platform furthermore engages with 'partners' (see below) that are invited to nominate a contact person as the official link to the Platform.</p>
<p>Which mandates and objective(s) do they have?</p> <p>Question: What attempts have been made in the past to address the changing composition of actors that is supposed to engage in advocacy for the Platform? What are the main ways in which the Platform and its members engage in advocacy currently. How is this different from earlier advocacy efforts?</p>	<p>Vision: prosperous and sustainable rural communities underpinning global food and nutrition security.</p> <p>Mission: To enhance the impact of development investments in agriculture, food systems and rural livelihoods through informed policy and programming.</p> <p>Functions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Knowledge sharing 2) Networking 3) Advocacy <p>Objective: the Platform provides a space where members can discuss existing and emerging issues, challenges and opportunities for the programming and financing for rural development.</p> <p>Strategic Focus:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Agenda 2030: SDGs provide the overarching framework for the Platform's 2016-2020 strategy. 2) Agricultural and Rural Transformation: Rural transformation focuses on the process of improving economic growth,

	<p>social inclusion and the management of the environment within which rural people make their living. This includes recognising the importance of rural-urban linkages, migration and remittances and the role of agriculture as one of the principal generators of economic growth of the rural space.</p>
<p>What is their governance structure?</p> <p>Question: how does informal membership relate to a membership fee? Is there a way in which members 'renew' their membership? How does it affect engagement that some members might be on the board and others not because they do or do not pay the membership fee? Is it correct that you can be a member without paying this fee and the can be left out of the board?</p> <p>What are the key discussion points that arise during the meetings of the board?</p> <p>Questions: how do you coordinate advocacy when both focal points and representatives of member organizations who are not contact points both represent the Platform?</p>	<p>Members: Informal membership, 40 organisations</p> <p>Focal points: represent members and keep colleagues in their organisations and their NGO/private sector constituencies informed about new developments in the international community and the Platform outcomes. Contact points actively participate in the formulation of joint Platform policies and work programmes. They may speak on behalf the Platform at international events. The work streams of the Platform involve a great number of representatives of member organisations who are not the contact points.</p> <p>Co-chairs: two co-chairs are elected by the board members and serve for two years. The Platform co-chairs are also chairing the board.</p> <p>Board: the Board is the Platform's main decision-making body and comprises the contact points of all Platform members who pay an agreed annual membership contribution. Unless otherwise specified, decisions are taken by two-thirds majority vote. Physical board meetings are convened at least once a year following the Annual General Assembly in January/February of each year and one virtual board meeting in June of each year.</p> <p>Partners: the Platform enters into partnerships with research institutions, farmers' organisations, civil society organisations, global and regional networks and global initiatives and private sector networks which share a common interest in agriculture and rural development. Each partner organisation nominates a contact person to serve as the official link to the Platform. Representatives from partner organisations are invited to engage in the work streams of the Platform and attend Platform meetings.</p>

	<p>Secretariat: The secretariat is the management unit of the Platform to support the implementation of the annual work programme, for which it has executive authority. The secretariat is hosted by the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) of Germany and administered by the German International Cooperation Agency (GIZ) in Bonn/Germany. The Platform Secretariat is empowered to act within the framework of the agreed annual work plan with executive authority according to the Strategic Plan 2016 – 2020. The Platform Secretariat's principal task is to support the Platform membership in carrying out the three principal function of the Platform, namely knowledge sharing, advocacy and networking. The secretariat works very closely with the Co-Chairs on strategic directions of the Platform and supports the working groups of the Platform on specific themes of common interest and engagement in international events.</p>
How do members interact (level, modes, tools/formats and frequency of interactions)? How long do they exist?	The Platform convene an annual general assembly, where members interact, exchange ideas, and (re)set priorities.
What are their factors of success and of challenges?	<p>Success:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Established by lobbying of actors to increase investments; <u>bottom-up initiative</u> 2. <u>Integration of external developments</u> (see change over time) - e.g. declarations, agendas - into aims of the organization <p>Challenge:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Translation of new developments into the structure, activities and membership composition of the Platform; <u>knowing what changes imply for operations</u> 2. How to cope with the fact that the initiators have been replaced by representatives of members that might not have the <u>initial enthusiasm</u> or connections of their predecessors. 3. Possibly, placing the Platform in the context of a <u>broader set of platforms</u> that have arisen in the post Agenda 2030/SDG era, combining different themes (possibly including rural development).
How have they adapted over time to pressures/changes in the development space (innovations)? What kind of changes to the Platform structure	After the foundation in 2003, the Platform aimed to lobby for increased public and private investments in agriculture and rural development.

<p>arose respectively from the 2005 Paris Declaration, the 2012 Agenda 2030 and the Paris Agreement 2015?</p>	<p>The main influences experiences seem to have been;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the experiences of the international community (2005) 2. Agenda 2030 (2012) 3. Paris Agreement (2015) <p>This mostly seems to change the broader frame within which its original mandate should be realized, it is unclear exactly how this had led to organizational changes.</p>
<p>How are they funded? Approximately, how large is their budget?</p>	<p>The initial indicative budget is based on signed- and forecast contributions as well as on any roll-over budget from the previous year, the Platform indicative budget may be adjusted in the course of a year based on the development of contributions and/ or activities.</p> <p>Actual costs in 2017 totalled € 1.010.000,10</p> <p>Eleven members have a signed contribution agreement regarding member year 2017.</p> <p>Members tend to increasingly enter into a multiannual agreement instead of concluding an agreement regarding a single member year only.</p>
<p>How many staff are in the Secretariat or supporting team?</p>	<p>The Secretariat, managed by German International Cooperation (GIZ) in Bonn, consists of <u>seven permanent members</u>;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) the secretariat coordinator ii) a finance officer iii) administrative officer iv) policy advisor v) communications advisor vi) agricultural and rural development advisor vii) office manager <p>The secretariat also has two interns.</p>
<p>What are the tasks performed by the Secretariat or supporting team? How do they interact with network members?</p>	<p>The Secretariat:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the implementation of the annual work programme 2. Supports members in carrying out the three principal function of the Platform (knowledge sharing, advocacy and networking) 3. Supports the working groups on specific themes of common interest and engagement in international events 4. Works with the Co-Chairs on strategic directions of the Platform

UCH2030	
<p>What is their member composition? And how large is their membership?</p>	<p>UNCH2030 is a multi-stakeholder platform, inviting anyone who promotes UHC to join including; governments, international organisations, civil society organisations, the private sector, academia, and media.</p> <p>The larger ‘movement’ of UCH2030 is comprised of <u>two types of ‘members’</u>:</p> <p><i>a) Partners</i></p> <p>The post-transformation UCH2030 is said to draw its membership from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) 82 countries and territories, ii) multilateral organizations and global health initiatives including the African Development Banks, a host of UN organizations and several financial facilities and funds. iii) Philanthropic organizations including the Bill & Melinda Gates, Rockefeller and UN foundation iv) Twenty-five civil society organizations <p>There is no financial contribution required, but all partners are requested to endorse the Global Compact, which requires an official communication to the Secretariat from a senior representative.</p> <p><i>b) Related initiatives</i></p> <p>Related initiatives comprise existing partnerships, alliances and networks that focus on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Strengthening comprehensive or specific areas of health systems (12 org.) with the goal of universal health coverage ii) As well as initiatives that focus on specific diseases or population groups to facilitate a more integrated approach (7 org.) to strengthening accountability and advocating for equitable and sustainable progress. iii) The UHC Coalition explicitly promoting UHC <p>There is no official procedure to becoming a related initiative mentioned publicly</p>
<p>Which mandates and objective(s) do they have? What is their governance structure?</p>	<p>Vision: to create a shared vision and strengthen health systems for universal health coverage.</p> <p>Mandate: although the platform came into existence in 2007, a UNGA resolution issues on 12 December 2012, noting progress to universal health coverage (UHC) as a priority</p>

	<p>for international development is seen as the point where the UN officially recognized the importance of UHC, facilitating the activities of what was then still called IHP+.</p> <p>The platform mentions as its mandate: mobilising political support for the aims, objectives and activities of the partnership, and leading by example by adherence to the commitments of the Global Compact at global and country levels.</p> <p>Governance structure: Multi-stakeholder platform with stakeholders engaged in the decision-making processes of the platform.</p> <p>The main governance structures are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Steering Committee</u> (20 members representing constituencies within UHC): strategic decisions and oversight related to mandate. Ad hoc observers sometimes invited. The steering committee meets two times a year. 2. <u>Reference Group</u>: includes senior technical representatives from any interested signatory and related initiatives. Discusses work plan and potential collaborations. Teleconferences four times a year. 3. <u>Technical working groups</u>: multi-stakeholder expert groups working on the basis of an aim of the work plan. Not time-bound. 4. <u>Civil Society Engagement Mechanism</u>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Three CSO representatives to the UHC2030 Steering Committee from global, national and grassroots organisations. - A global CSO advisory group, linking global and local inputs and providing technical guidance. - A secretariat, hosted by a CSO with two full-time employees to implement the work plan and ensure coordination and communication across the structures. - National groups, with focal points from existing CSO health platforms. - Regional focal points, to support national groups and promote exchange across countries. <p>Aims to focus on the most vulnerable.</p>
--	--

	<p>5. <u>Related Initiatives</u>: voluntary and open engagement, focus on strengthening comprehensive or specific areas of health systems.</p> <p>6. <u>Core Team (Secretariat)</u>: manages the daily operations in line with the agreed work plan and budget, under the oversight and guidance of the Steering Committee.</p>
<p>How do members interact (level, modes, tools/formats and frequency of interactions)? How long do they exist?</p>	<p>Members are envisioned to interact around three main activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Advocating political commitment to UHC; frame emerging priorities, identify bottlenecks and propose collective recommendations ii) Facilitate accountability iii) Knowledge sharing between all stakeholders and between relevant stakeholders across regions <p>These interactions are realized through various modes of engagements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Individual progress tracking: is taken forward by the Health Data Collaborative and its working groups. 2. Country level assistance, especially for middle and least developed countries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Technical working groups: time-limited and made up of technical experts from among partners and associated initiatives. <p>Working groups are divided supposed to deliver on one of the priority areas identified in the UHC2030 work plan and therefore fall into several themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public financial management. 2. Support to countries with fragile or challenging operating environments 3. Sustainability, transition from external financing, and health system strengthening 4. Health systems assessment 5. Multi-sectoral action <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Multi-stakeholder policy dialogues Here, they promote the 'Seven behaviour' guidelines, a tool UHC things will improve country-level prioritization. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Sharing information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) UHC news updates via website and mail from the organization b) Partners are invited to blog and share resources on the platform website

	<p>4. Annual ‘rallying point’: UHC day (December 12th annually) with the aim to rally the UHC movement and have advocates to share experiences and call on policymakers to make bigger investments.</p> <p>5. UHC day campaigns: in 2018, UHC provided micro-grants to 60 multi-stakeholder day campaigns around the world under the auspices of UHC Day.</p>
What are their factors of success and of challenges?	<p>One major advantage of the platform seems to be that has connected itself to major UN-initiatives. The initial platform was connected to the MDG efforts, and the transformation of the platform was done to connect the initiative to the SDG efforts.</p> <p>This allows it to associate with a host of existing initiatives and presumably attracts actors who are also associated with the theme of UHC in relation to the MDGs in the first phase of its existence and the SDGs in the currently phase of its existence and see it as a platform to both contribute to existing goals as well as to the enduring goals of UHC.</p> <p>The main challenge of the platform is to maintain the initial aim of the platform: UHC, in the phase of the strategy outlined above. Because the UHC platform has associated itself with Goal setting endeavours at the global level, it might also have made its proliferation dependent upon the proliferation of Goal setting endeavours. Currently, the platform has changed its name to UCH2030, implicating that before 2030 it needs to reconfigure or rebrand itself if it does not want to become obsolete.</p>
How have they adapted over time to pressures/changes in the development space (innovations)?	<p>Until the transformation of the platform, IHP+ relied on the 66 signatories of the International Health Partnership Global Compact as its main partners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Foster better coordination between global aid donors ii) Help developing countries improve their national health systems and iii) Support health priorities of developing countries. <p>These aims were mostly directed towards the</p>

	<p>MDGs, of which commentators have mentioned that they were overtly focused on developing countries.</p> <p>The Core Team of the IHP+ hosted a transformation process between September 2015 and June 2017, where Steering Committee Reviews, the initial 66+ partners came to a joint vision paper where a post 2017 vision was presented.</p> <p>Compared to its earlier objectives, the thereafter established UHC2030 platform focuses more on the transition towards the SDG as a guiding set of objectives. The platform thus seems to have broadened its scope, from developing countries to a more global scope, with the option for participants to focus on specific diseases as long as it can be connected to the overall goal of UHC.</p>
How are they funded? Approximately, how large is their budget?	<p>The budget for the year 2017 was 6,839,693 USD after an initial revision. The organization approves budgets as 'biennium' meaning that they essentially set a budget for two years where funds are allowed to travel when they are not used.</p> <p>The 2017 programme of work was fully funded with contributions of the European Commission, the governments of Japan, Luxembourg, and Spain, as well as the Rockefeller Foundation.</p> <p>The largest area of expenditure is for UHC2030 governance, oversight and operations.</p> <p>WHO and the World Bank contributed substantial in-kind support to the operations of UHC2030 in terms of staff time, office and oversight inputs. Staff costs for both WHO and the World Bank are allocated across the work programme, based on inputs to each activity. Overall, they represent 26% of total costs.</p>
How many staff are in the Secretariat or supporting team?	<p>The core team - secretariat is co-hosted by the WHO and the World Bank, who provided substantial in-kind support to the operations in terms of staff time, office space and oversight inputs.</p> <p>Both delivered a co-lead for the secretariat.</p>

	<p>These co leads each have a small team, jointly comprising the secretariat.</p> <p>After an enlargement throughout the year 2017 <u>the WHO team</u> had six professional staff, one junior professional officer and one administrative assistant.</p> <p><u>The World Bank team</u> had seven staff engaged in varying roles. Communication were provided through a part-time consultant and a part-time World Bank member of staff.</p>
What are the tasks performed by the Secretariat or supporting team? How do they interact with network members?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Secretariat manages the process of becoming a member (partner or related initiative) of the platform. As mentioned earlier, aspiring members are asked to let a highly placed representative contact the Secretariat to prove that they have signed the Global Compact and as proof of their commitment. 2. The Core Team manages the daily operations in line with the agreed work plan and budget, under the oversight and guidance of the Steering Committee. 3. Network members are included in the Steering Committee that oversees the secretariat, and network members are said to be involved in decision-making procedures of the platform. 4. Network members were included in the transformation process described above that led to the development of a new format, mandate and vision for the platform.
Sources: UHC2030, https://www.uhc2030.org/ .	

Committee on World Food Security (CSF)	
What is their member composition? And how large is their membership?	<p>The Committee is and intergovernmental and international multi-stakeholder platform for all stakeholders.</p> <p>The platform divides between three groups:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Members (130)</u>: Member States of FAO, the IFAD or the WFP and non-Member States of FAO that are Member States of the United Nations. 2. <u>Participants</u>: representatives of UN agencies

	<p>and bodies, civil society and non-governmental organizations and their networks, international agricultural research systems, international and regional financial institutions and representatives of private sector associations and private philanthropic foundations.</p> <p>3. <u>Observers</u>: other interested organizations relevant to its work</p> <p>To give an indication of the <u>size of this network</u>, an attendee overview from the 45th CFS conference hosted by FAO in Rome, October 2018:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Members: 114 2. Non-Member States: 10 3. Participants: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) 13 United Nations Agencies and Bodies b) 106 Civil society organizations c) 6 International agricultural research organizations d) 1 International and regional financial institutions e) 79 Private sector associations and private philanthropic foundations 4. Observers: 65 organizations
<p>Which mandates and objective(s) do they have? What is their governance structure?</p>	<p>Mandate: CFS was set up in 1974 as the United Nations intergovernmental body to serve as a forum for review and follow up of food security policies. CFS is still the only body within the UN wide system specifically tasked with dealing with food security and nutrition policy.</p> <p>Objective: The CFS Reform, endorsed by all members in 2009, redefines CFS's vision and roles. It aims at constituting the foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform for a broad range of committed stakeholders to work together in a coordinated manner and in support of country-led processes towards the elimination of hunger and ensuring food security and nutrition for all human beings.</p> <p>Governance structure: The Committee reports to the UN General Assembly Through the Economic and Social Council and to FAO Conference.</p> <p>It comprises four main structures:</p>

	<p>1. <u>The Bureau and its Advisory Group</u>:</p> <p>a) The Bureau is the executive of the Committee comprising of a chairperson and twelve member countries selected from 7 world regions.</p> <p>b) The Advisory group helps the Bureau advance the Committee's objectives in particular to ensure linkages with different stakeholders at regional, sub-regional and local levels and to ensure an ongoing, two-way exchange of information. It is made up of representatives from the 5 different categories of CFS Participants: UN, Civil Society, Research institutions, Financial Institutions and the private sector.</p> <p>2. <u>The Plenary</u>: central body for decision-taking, debate, coordination, lesson-learning and convergence. Held yearly (see membership)</p> <p>3. <u>The High Level Panel of Experts</u>: provide independent, scientific knowledge-based analysis and advice when requested. Used for policy discussions. Its main components are:</p> <p>a) A steering committee: internationally recognized experts in a variety of food security and nutrition-related fields.</p> <p>b) Roster of experts: used for project-based teams to analyse and report on issues related to food security and nutrition.</p> <p>4. <u>The Secretariat</u>: includes staff from FAO, IFAD and WFP. Its task is to support the Plenary, the Bureau and Advisory Group and the HLPE in their work. Hosted at FAO in Rome.</p>
<p>How do members interact (level, modes, tools/formats and frequency of interactions)?</p> <p>How long do they exist?</p>	<p>The interaction between members of the CFS is structured around the four dimensions of food security - availability, access, utilization and stability.</p> <p>Members engage in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Annual CFS Conferences 2. Multi-stakeholder consultations, forums and information sessions and intersessional events that can be: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Regional: these often include consultations on the CFS Voluntary Review Framework. b) Focused on a specific topic. <p>This work feeds into the CFS plenary decision-making processes whose outcome is then reported yearly to the UN General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).</p>

	<p>After the reforms of 2008-2009, the CFS has added mechanisms through which Civil society organizations and private sector organizations can engage in the work of the platform:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) 2. The Private Sector Mechanism (PSM) <p>The Platform has also sought to have its actors engage in a broader network than its own platform, for instance through the organization of side-events during the UN's High-Level Political Forum for Sustainable Development.</p>
What are their factors of success and of challenges?	<p><u>Success:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear guidelines on stakeholder engagement, in which they differentiate between the roles members and other participants have during meetings. Expectation management. - Relevant output; expert advice of which it is known for participants that it will be used as input for policymaking in UN-fora. - Ability to - with the cooperation of members - change when endogenous circumstances arise <p><u>Challenges:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Level of ambition in overall objectives. Claiming the ambition to become the most inclusive platform is bound to backfire and create (unreasonable) expectations amongst participants about the way in which their input will be used. Expectation management. - The paradox between self-organization of the Civil Society and Private Sector Mechanisms and the need to connect these mechanisms to the overall objectives of the platform. Although the Mechanisms are supposed to consult with the CSF governing bodies about their engagement, it is unclear what kind of steering role these bodies can and may take, and what the eventual influence of the outcomes of the Mechanisms might be.
How have they adapted over time to pressures/changes in the development space (innovations)?	<p>The committee underwent a reform in 2009 to ensure that the voices of other stakeholders were heard in the global debate on food security and nutrition.</p> <p>A major transformation in 2009 was the creation of the High Level Panel of Experts mentioned above, as well as the introduction of the CSM and PSM mentioned above, and</p>

	clear guidelines for participation.
How are they funded? Approximately, how large is their budget?	<p>CFS receives its primary funding equally from:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FAO 2. The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) 3. The World Food Programme (WFP). <p>Additional contributions are provided by resource partners on a voluntary basis to support specific CFS workstreams and activities. This includes the work of the CFS High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE), and the CFS Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) which are both funded entirely through voluntary contributions.</p> <p>The 2018 required budget was estimated at 5,690,000 USD. However, as is the case for the UHC2030 the organization also works with bienniums. For the biennium 2018-2019 about 4 of the 10 million required still needed to be collected through 'extra-budgetary' resources.</p>
How many staff are in the Secretariat or supporting team?	<p>The secretariat includes staff from FAO, the IFAD and the WFP. Currently, the secretariat comprises of nine people. The committee attempts to balance these representatives, as they provide valuable communication channels with the different constituencies of the platform. However, the location of the secretariat - in the FAO building - skews the composition of the secretariat towards a higher number of FAO personnel.</p>
What are the tasks performed by the Secretariat or supporting team? How do they interact with network members?	<p>The Secretariat works under the auspices of the Conference of members, thereby basing most of its activities on the input of network members. On the basis of the input of the network, the Director-General directs the secretariat.</p> <p>The overall task of the Secretariat defined in the Committees rules of procedure are to support the Plenary, the Bureau and Advisory Group and the HLPE in their work by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Receiving, translating and circulating documents, reports and resolutions of <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Yearly Conference b) The commissions and committees 2. To prepare the records of proceedings 3. To perform other work the Conference or any of its commissions or committees requires.

Sources: *Committee on World Food Security*, available from <http://www.fao.org/cfs>; Interview, Cordelia Salter, 28.05.2019

The Donor Committee for Enterprise Development (DCED)	
What is their member composition? And how large is their membership?	<p>The DCED has 22 members. Members include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) National Development Agencies ii) Ministries or Departments of Foreign Affairs iii) International Organizations and UN Agencies iv) Foundations <p>Two notable exceptions are the 'Governments' of Belgium and Switzerland who are as such mentioned as members.</p>
<p>Which mandates and objective(s) do they have?</p> <p>What is their governance structure?</p>	<p>Mandate: DCED was established informally in 1979, when its first members met at a meeting convened by the World Bank. In 2009, members agreed as their vision to make the DCED an independent and respected inter-agency point of reference for knowledge, data and agreed standards on the role of the private sector in development.</p> <p>Objective: its current objective is to bring funding and inter-governmental agencies together to learn from practical experience about the most effective ways to fulfil the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by creating economic opportunities and jobs for the poor.</p> <p>Governance structure: Four main components of the governance structure are mentioned:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>The annual meeting</u>: highest governing body, approving thematic groups and annual work plans and determining the strategic direction. Decides on membership applications and elects the ExCo. 2. <u>The Executive Committee and Co-Chairs (ExCo)</u> (5 members including 2 co-chairs): board taking decisions not reserved to the Annual meeting, providing thematic group oversight and guiding the Secretariat. 3. <u>Working groups</u>: forums to tackle specific issues, identify best of upcoming practices, and provide a networking platform for member agency staff. 4. <u>Secretariat</u>: Implements the strategy and overall activities of the platform, including

	knowledge management, advocacy and external engagement.
How do members interact (level, modes, tools/formats and frequency of interactions)? How long do they exist?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Through the Annual Meeting, which is also the highest decision-making platform of the network 2. Through thematic working groups. Currently there are six working groups covering the following themes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Results Measurement 2. Business Environment Reform 3. Market Systems Development 4. Private Sector Engagement 5. Green Growth 6. Women's Economic Empowerment These working groups provide a platform for the staff of the members to tackle specific issues and exchange best practices. They meet quarterly. 3. Information sharing in multiple formats: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Newsletters for members: 4 in 2018 b) DCED/BEAM Seminars; 1 in 2018 c) Events: apart from physical workshops also including online events. d) Member visits: 4-5 times a year Events, visits and seminars are often based on knowledge requested by members.
What are their factors of success and of challenges?	<p><u>Success:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Small platform: only 22 members. Easier to build trust, keep up close connections and have members interact. - Initiated by a recognized IO with expertise related to the aim of the platform. Ability to rely on institutional context of the World Bank. - Ability to formalize over time, but still being able to change mandate and objectives when new initiatives arise, such as the SDGs, to link efforts to current developments. <p><u>Challenges:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To combine platform-structure - that might profit from flexibility - with increasing formalization. The fit between aim and structure. - Membership contributions might limit participation in the platform, especially as there is no differentiation between types of members emphasized. The fit between funding and participation. - The latter might mean that the platform is

	self-centred and does not rely on other potential partners as much as the previously mentioned platforms.
How have they adapted over time to pressures/changes in the development space (innovations)?	<p>After its informal creation in 1979, the platform increased formalization in 2004 with the introduction of a secretariat and membership fees, supplemented with a constitutional charter and executive in 2006.</p> <p>Although there were already discussions about the platform's main objectives around 2001, the year 2009 was the starting point of a new discussion about the aim of the platform, resulting in its current objectives.</p> <p>After the adoption of the SDGs in 2015, the platform adapted its mandate to include the most relevant SDGs.</p>
How are they funded? Approximately, how large is their budget?	<p>Members of the DCED pay a membership fee, which was introduced in 2004. These are paid into a Trust Fund administered by the International Finance Corporation (IFC). This is a trust fund part of the structure of the World Bank.</p> <p>UN Members pay a fee of \$10.000</p> <p>Non-UN Members pay \$45.000</p> <p>The platform also receives additional funds and <i>ad hoc</i> funds for working groups from its members.</p>
How many staff are in the Secretariat or supporting team?	<p>The Secretariat is based in Cambridge, UK, and has seven members. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A coordinator 2. Deputy Coordinator 3. Assistant Coordinator 4. BEAM Exchange director 5. BEAM Exchange Digital Community Manager 6. Results Measurement specialist 7. Monitoring and evaluation specialist
What are the tasks performed by the Secretariat or supporting team? How do they interact with network members?	<p>The DCED Secretariat was introduced in 2004. It implements the strategy of the DCED under the guidance of the ExCo. As part of its implementation tasks defined above it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Communicates results and impacts of PSD. 2. Is responsible for financial management and reporting. <p>In addition to their role during annual meetings, they <u>interact with members</u>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. About the results of PSD measurement.

	<p>2. In the form of technical support: which happens through the technical helpline established for members.</p> <p>3. Through their role in the coordination of field-level programmes.</p> <p>In general, the secretariat responds to requests of members as fast as possible, and calls member request a driving force behind the platform.</p>
<p>Sources: <i>Donor Committee for Enterprise Development</i>, https://www.enterprise-development.org/; Interview, Jim Tanburn, 23.05.2019.</p>	