

Better Aid Coordinating Group
BACG Meeting, Johannesburg, February 26/27, 2009

1. Present:

Charles Mutasa, AFRODAD
Ziad Abel Samad, ANND
Anne Schoenstein, AWID
Cecilia Alemany, AWID (Co-Chair)
Brian Tomlinson, CCIC/Reality of Aid
Jasmine Burnley, Concord
Henri Valot, Civicus
Katsuji Imata, Civicus
Bodo Ellmers, Eurodad
Suranjan Kodithuwakku, GMSL (Sri Lanka)
Josephine Dongail, Ibon Foundation
Tony Tujan, Reality of Aid (Co-Chair)

Aurelien Atidegla, REPAOC (Benin/West Africa)
Craig Fagan, Transparency International
Lars Koch, Ibis
Carlyn Hambuba, FEMNET (Kenya)
Wole Olaleye, Action Aid International (South Africa)
Nerea Barrio, WIDE

By Phone:

Jan Dereymaeker, ITUC-CSI
Gideon Rabinowitz, UK Aid Network

Regrets:

Sylvain Browa, Interaction
Roberto Bissio, Social Watch
Iacopo Viciani, Action Aid Italy
Arjun Karki, LDC Watch

2. Agenda:

- 2.1 The primary purpose of the meeting was to reach agreement on the terms of reference for the Better Aid Coordinating Group, on a three year strategic workplan, on an advocacy and communications strategy, and on a three-year budget and fundraising strategy. These notes do not reproduce the discussion, but rather focus on key points and the agreements reached during the meeting. They should be read with the “Strategy and Workplan, 2009 – 2011”, the “Communications Proposal, 2009-2011” and the “Terms of Reference (February 2009)”, which have been revised based on agreements reached at the Johannesburg meeting and are appended to these notes. Key decisions and commitments have been identified in boxes in the text.

Please note that at the Johannesburg meeting it was agreed that the CSO International Steering Group (ISG) would be renamed the **Better Aid Coordinating Group (BACG)**, which is used in these notes.

3. Strategic Workplan

- 3.1 Structure of the Workplan Discussion It was agreed that the discussion of the workplan would aim to confirm the overarching objectives, and then in each area of our work outline the specific objectives, targets and common activities and expected outputs and results. The workplan identifies the detailed proposals for each of the following main areas of work:
- Policy development;
 - Advocacy;

- Mobilization and outreach;
- Democratic Ownership and Accountability within the development effectiveness framework; and
- Development effectiveness on the road to HLF4 (2011).

3.2 Starting from the Paris ISG Meeting Agreements The starting point for the discussion of a draft workplan was the agreements reached at the meeting of the ISG in Paris in October (see the minutes of this meeting for details):

- It was agreed that the focus for the Post-Accra ISG would be on the effectiveness of development cooperation, placed within the broader framework of development effectiveness and social justice.
- There was agreement that the main target for this work will be at the international level: the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF), but also broadening to include the UN Global Cooperation Forum. There was also agreement that these efforts must be based on significant country-level monitoring, but the ISG would not have a mandate to carry out or facilitate this CSO work at the country level.
- It was agreed to request membership in the WP-EFF (now agreed by the WP-EFF) and to request systematic structured dialogue with the WP-EFF (no clear answer to date). We also suggested that the ISG needed to clarify its relationship with DAC networks where some members of the ISG have been active: Gendernet, Povnet, and Govnet.
- It was agreed that the workplan broadly would focus on monitoring the outcomes of the Accra HLF at three levels, challenging the Paris Declaration, orienting towards development effectiveness, and thinking about new indicators for progress. These areas would come together in our efforts to influence the agenda for the 2011 HLF.

These Paris ISG decisions were elaborated and refined in the Johannesburg meeting.

3.3 Political Context for Reforming Development Cooperation Tony offered a political framework for situating the future work of the BACG, setting out three generations of aid and development effectiveness reform:

- First Generation: Rome HLF focusing on donor harmonization
- Second Generation: Paris HLF and Paris Declaration with its focus on ownership
- Third Generation: Linking development cooperation to development effectiveness (HLF4?)

The AAA addresses and advances some areas of Second Generation reform (completing the notion that ownership is not just with government, but includes social actors and parliaments), but also begins to address Third Generation with statements on gender equality, enabling conditions for CSOs as development actors in their own right, and human rights. The CSOs had

identified many of their issues in Accra in relation to Third Generation reforms – impact of aid reform on gender equality, social justice, etc. The future work of CSOs is two-fold. It will be important to push for full implementation of the AAA (particularly in those areas promoted by the ISG in the Road to Accra), because there is very little implementation frameworks embedded in the AAA. Donors are ignoring much of what was agreed in framing their future agendas in the clusters (on accountability, transparency, use of country systems, south-south cooperation etc). But CSOs must also continue to work to build on Third Generation elements in the AAA and press forward an agenda that unleashes development effectiveness for HLF4.

Policies to promote development effectiveness are clearly a much broader agenda than those involving development cooperation or aid reform, where aid in fact may only make a minor contribution to development effectiveness. CSOs in advancing this agenda have a challenge to reinterpret development effectiveness (such human rights or local ownership by the poor themselves) in terms of applicable policies for the continued reform of aid architecture. A focus on aid architecture brings into play the work of the UN Development Cooperation Forum (DCF). How we work with the DCF, as CSO also involved with the WP-EFF, is a challenge to which the meeting returned later in its workplan discussions.

3.4 Overarching Goal for the Better Aid Coordinating Group: It was agreed that BACG will monitor and influence the implementation of the AAA (with a specific focus on issues in democratic ownership), while broadening the agenda from the AAA towards development effectiveness in HLF4, and addressing policies for development effectiveness in proposed reforms of international aid architecture (including the work of the DCF).

Two important changing contexts for achieving these goals were highlighted: the implications of CSO membership of the WP-EFF and the emerging global financial crisis on development cooperation and aid architecture.

3.5 Policy Development : Objectives and Activities: The overall objective for this area of work was agreed to be the articulation of key policy proposals for advancing development effectiveness in development cooperation, moving from second generation aid effectiveness reforms to third generation impact on development effectiveness.

The discussion emphasized the importance of revising the Better Aid Policy Position Paper, integrating post-Accra considerations of policy implications of development effectiveness for development cooperation and aid architecture reform. There was a caution that the notion of development effectiveness is broad, and that our task is not one of defining a comprehensive meaning for development effectiveness, but rather in understanding its relationship to development cooperation policies and aid architecture. This paper should be redrafted, drawing from the specific expertise of CSOs within the Better Aid Platform, as was our practice in the pre-Accra work.

While the Better Aid Coordinating Group will not be coordinating country level consultations on the implementation of the AAA, there was agreement that our policy positioning in the WP-EFF must be based on drawing our own policy lessons and proposals from evidence provided by CSO-led country analysis of AAA implementation. Lessons from independent parallel analysis by CSO networks and INGOs on the implementation of AAA will also be available. In the BACG analysis, it will be important to draw from CSO experience the lessons for development effectiveness in a context of limited impact of AAA on the ground. Donors and governments might be tempted to argue that this limited impact of existing agreements suggests a much less ambitious agenda for HLF4.

There was agreement that there must be robust processes for consultation on the revised Better Aid Policy Position Paper with the Platform, including the possibility of regional level consultations with CSOs in late 2009 and 2010 sponsored by the BACG (see section 3.7).

3.6 Advocacy: Objectives and Activities: It was agreed that the overarching objective in advocacy will be to influence governments and international institutions to make progress on key aid effectiveness issues, to promote a development effectiveness agenda for the 2011 HLF through CSO membership in the WP-EFF, and to move towards a more equitable multilateral forum for resolving issues of aid architecture and development effectiveness in the 2011 agenda.

The detailed workplan draws together agreements on the specific objectives for BACG advocacy as well as suggested targets to address our policy concerns. It was important to define several key issues that we wish to make progress; these issues can then determine the focus of our limited resources to the various opportunities within the WP-EFF and its clusters, although it was said that all four clusters will be relevant. It was agreed that the most important issues that follow from our work with the AAA must include democratic ownership, conditionality and tied aid, transparency, technical assistance, and mutual accountability. These issues are important for both monitoring implementation of AAA (are there relevant indicators and is there inclusive processes at country level?) and for continuing to address areas that had limited progress in the AAA (tied aid, conditionality, technical assistance, for example).

We determined that a further set of issues were critical to our overarching objective to draw the relationships between development effectiveness and development cooperation and aid reform. These included a rights-based approach to development cooperation, drawing out a social justice framework for development cooperation (e.g. taking account of human rights, gender equality and the rights of the poor), and potential emerging issues of international cooperation that might influence the agenda of the 2011 HLF on climate change and on financing for development issues arising from the global financial crisis.

The challenge for the BACG will be to undertake credible monitoring of the implementation of the AAA, while at the same time, focusing on a transformative agenda on development effectiveness for HLF4. The former will be achieved in part through the parallel Reality of Aid country level consultations in up to 50 countries, which will mobilize on-going country level multi-stakeholder processes that are country-led and in which all CSOs may participate. It will be important to have mechanisms for outreach in which the results of these processes are fed back to the BACG. Equally important for implementing the AAA will be the WP-EFF cluster work which will create pressures on donor headquarters for implementation.

3.7 Mobilization and Outreach: Objectives and Activities: The overarching objectives for mobilization and outreach will be to develop an inclusive Better Aid Platform that contribute to and understands a coherent civil society agenda on aid and development effectiveness, with strong linkages with other CSO initiatives and networks, in the lead-up to the 2011 High Level Forum.

Outreach and mobilization is related to the communications strategy which sets out specific initiatives to deepen the relationship between the activities supported by the BACG and the broader membership of the Better Aid Platform as well as engage other constituencies (other CSOs, donors, government, media) on our issues. The emphasis of the discussion was on accessible tools for communications and outreach as well as the effective use of e-media for robust engagement.

From the policy paper there are two streams: we must do advocacy work with the WP-EFF, but we must also promote this vision with our own constituencies – CSOs, people on the ground and the public. It was agreed that the policy paper be adapted through communication tools with messages that are meaningful for the various constituencies, from social movements on the ground to those directly engaged in the WP-EFF or the UN DCF.

Regional and global consultations will be important for sustaining and building momentum with the Better Aid constituency around a shared agenda; BACG can easily get consumed by activities within WP-EFF processes and loose connection with the country level work, which will be very important for mobilizing towards HLF4. Legitimacy will be key to CSO impact and must also include synergies with other independent CSO processes relating to the agenda of the HLF. Further discussion is needed to determine a BACG proposal for a parallel CSO event for HLF4 itself that is broadly inclusive and builds on prior processes for a development effectiveness agenda at HLF4.

Regional Consultations (2010) & Global Assembly (2011): In order to achieve these two goals it was agreed that the BACG will organize four regional consultations starting in 2010 to develop and propagate these themes, with the Global Assembly of the Better Aid Platform in early 2011.

3.8 Democratic Ownership and Accountability: Objectives and Activities: It was agreed that the overarching objective for this area of work will be to promote democratic ownership as a key entry point and pre-requisite for “genuine” implementation of the AAA.

Discussion focused on whether democratic ownership remained the central theme for BACG in the context of the above attention to development effectiveness. A note of caution was expressed that pressing “democratic” ownership can become prescriptive by donors for developing countries, which they rejected at Accra. It was suggested that the BACG in the coming months will have to think through the ways in which we will be addressing democratic ownership within a framework of development effectiveness. While democratic ownership remains central to the implementation of the AAA, it may not be a focal issue in the same way that it was pre-Accra. Given the scope of issues raised by both democratic ownership and accountability, it was agreed that the BACG would separate the two in our participation in the WP-EFF Cluster One (see below).

3.9 Development Effectiveness on the Road to HLF4: Objectives and Activities: It was agreed that the overarching objective for this area of work will be to develop a roadmap to 2011 in which aid architecture discussions and reform are reframed within a development effectiveness framework.

A vision for 2011 was expressed in which the notion of democratic ownership for aid relationships becomes ways that poor and marginalized populations claim their ownership of development and the discourse is not development results but rather justice results for development cooperation. This vision is the foundation for development effectiveness where ownership becomes located in local ownership. We need to ask ourselves how development cooperation can be reformed for human rights, decent work, gender equality and social justice. A key challenge will be to translate the politics of this vision and goals into development cooperation policy goals that are practical and understandable to implement post-2011. This will be the subject of the revised BACG policy position paper. In doing so, it will be important to keep in mind that HLF4 will not be crafting an action agenda similar to Accra, but will be developing a new Declaration. We must also press that the process for developing such a vision and Declaration be rooted in a more equitable political process beyond the OECD, while recognizing the weaknesses of UN processes.

4. BACG Budget

A comprehensive budget for the draft workplan was presented and revised by participants. It was agreed that the BACG will seek a budget not greater than US\$2 million over three years (July 2009 to June 2012). A proposed budget for US\$1.85 million is attached. This budget excludes a CSO Parallel Forum at the time of the HLF4. It was agreed that no funding would be accepted with conditionalities, particular those relating to security certificates.

5. Working Party Membership and Engagement with the Working Party Clusters

- 5.1 It was clarified that the Working Party has offered two positions to Better Aid on the Working Party and in relation to these two positions an invitation has been sent to the Co-Chairs to participate in the March 31st meeting of the Working Party. While these two positions are recognized and will be financed through the Working Party budget, they do not limit participation of other BACG members as part of the Better Aid delegation. However, financing will not be available from the Working Party for these additional participants. As important, will be Better Aid membership in the Executive Committee under the restructuring proposal for the Working Party.
- 5.2 It was agreed by the BACG that the Co-Chairs will be the standing representatives of the BACG in the Working Party, but that BACG would establish a delegation relevant to the agenda of each meeting. It was suggested that the BACG needs to develop criteria for the selection of additional members for our delegation, to be covered by the budget of the BACG. It was noted that the clusters may take advantage of Working Party meetings to bring together interested WP members. What can be accomplished by CSOs on the side of the meeting will be an important criteria. For example, for the March meeting it will be impossible for the Co-Chairs to cover all of the side meetings being planned.
- 5.3 It was agreed the limits to direct CSO participation in the Working Party meetings can be compensated with strong and timely communications from the Co-Chairs' and members participation at the Working Party, as well as at important side meetings, "hallway discussions" and the clusters (respecting within the BACG, indications of embargoed information). It will be important for those participating in clusters to send their own short report, in addition to any reports coming from the cluster leaders.
- 5.4 The BACG reaffirmed its objective to seek regular structured dialogue between the Working Party and the BACG over the next three years in the lead-up to the HLF4. We will have to make a case for these dialogues as the reaction to date is that they have been superseded by membership on the Working Party.

5.5 It was agreed that BACG engagement with the four Working Party cluster should be oriented by the main strategic policy goals of the BACG as outlined above and our evolving positions on development cooperation and development effectiveness. It was noted that we need to distinguish the structure of the WP-EFF clusters (with donor/developing country co-convenors) from the DAC networks (Gendernet, Povnet, Govnet etc.) that have a more permanent existence within the DAC and are clearly donor-led. But increasingly these DAC networks are linking their work to the Working Party Clusters. In addition, there are DAC-based “joint ventures” on Managing for Development Results, Procurement, Division of Labour and Capacity Development. It is still unclear the relationship of these joint ventures to the Working Party clusters.

5.6 In December some members of the BACG agreed to be a CSO contact for each of the clusters. However, the importance of the clusters requires addition members of the BACG to be active across the clusters. It was agreed that it would be important for one member of the BACG facilitate involvement in each cluster to assure that there is good coverage of the cluster participation and review of content. Participants present in Johannesburg distributed themselves among the clusters (to be augmented by others not present and those within our networks who might be interested in participating). It was agreed that this participation and the CSO focal point will be reviewed in mid-April, once we have a better idea of the cluster agendas.

Participation in the WP-EFF Clusters:

- 1) Ownership and Accountability: Jasmine Burnley (Concord); Lars Koch (Ibis); Jan Dereymaeker (ITUC-CSI); Gideon Rabinowitz (UK Aid Network)
- 2) Strengthening and Use of Country Systems: AFRODAD; Bodo Ellmers (Eurodad), Iacopo Viciani (Action Aid Italy); Arjun Karki (LDC Watch)
- 3) Promoting Transparent and Responsible Aid: Brian Tomlinson (CCIC); Henri Valot (Civicus); Karin Christiansen (Publish What You Fund)
- 4) Monitoring and Evaluation of the Paris Declaration and AAA: Anne Schoenstein (AWID); Maita Gomez (Ibon)

5.7 The co-convenors for each cluster will be producing by the end of February a Draft Scoping Paper on the intended cluster workplan for the next three years. These will be going to the Working Party meeting at the end of March for review, to be finalized at the July WP-EFF meeting.

Review of Cluster Scoping Papers: It was agreed that those BACG members who have identified their interests with a particular cluster will review its scoping paper against the BACG priority issues, make brief comments on the relevance / gaps in the cluster workplan, and make proposals on our engagement with that cluster in terms of its relevance to furthering the BACG objectives. It was agreed that these cluster scoping paper analysis will be circulated to the BACG listserv within about a week after receiving the relevant scoping paper (by March 16th if possible).

6. BACG Relationship with Coalition of Like-minded Donors

6.1 It was reported that SIDA is providing leadership to bring together a number of like-minded donors in support of the recommendations of the Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness and the implementation of paragraph 20 of the AAA. The BACG discussed the nature of its potential relationship with the group, which will be meeting in Stockholm on April 2/3. Several current members of the BACG have been invited to attend – Tony (Reality of Aid), Brian (CCIC), Jan (ICTU) and Lars (IBIS). In addition, Andreas Vogt from the Open Forum will be attending. In discussion, it was clear that this meeting will have much greater relevance to the agenda of the Open Forum than immediately to BACG. But it may also be an avenue to reinforce donor voices on issues of development effectiveness and promote CSO positions in the lead up to the HLF4. It was pointed out that the donor officials involved in the Stockholm meeting will be primarily those with a CSO mandate, not a WP-EFF mandate, which has the potential to create some confusion within these agencies.

6.2 CSO representatives attending the Stockholm meeting need to be clear about the different mandates of the CSO post-Accra initiatives and the differences between the BACG and the Open Forum. It will be important for the BACG to stress the notion that CSOs as members of the WP-EFF do not wish, nor require, a donor intermediary with the Working Party. At the practical level, however, this meeting will be important for BACG as SIDA has proposed to other donors to create a pooled fund in support financing for the Open Forum, the Reality of Aid country consultations and the work of the BACG.

SIDA Pooled Fund: We agreed that the BACG, Open Forum and Reality of Aid must sit down together to develop our position on the governance of the pooled fund to avoid donor ear-marking, on management of the proposals within the fund, and with an agreement on the ratio of support between the three proposals that will be funded through the pooled fund, based on the level of funding being sought by each.

7. **Communications Strategy**

7.1 A comprehensive communications strategy had been circulated in advance and will be revised according to the discussion at this meeting. It was proposed that a more flexible approach be adopted in relation to the newsletter with more frequency. It was proposed that there be increased amounts in the budget for translation (including for key document translation into Arabic). It was also suggested that the budget for printing and documentation be increased. It was agreed that the two listserves will be renamed as soon as possible and moved from the Reality of Aid to the Better Aid server. It was proposed that a password protected extranet be considered on the web site for draft documents under review. The web site will be a key communications tool for the Better Aid Platform. Easy and timely access to information and a simple format are essential. It was agreed that the Communications group would develop a protocol for communications with members of the BACG and with the Platform. Clear terms of reference for the communications sub-group will be important. It was agreed that Eurodad would continue to be the lead agency (executing organization) for this work supported by Civicus, Ibon and FEMNET.

8. **UN Development Cooperation Forum**

8.1 The most recent draft strategy from the Development Cooperation Forum (DCF) was distributed and discussed. It was clarified that the BACG has been offered two seats on the DCF Advisory Board and it was agreed that Civicus and Action Aid will continue to represent the BACG. The concern and interest of the Doha FfD CSO Group in the DCF was also raised and there was agreement to support their full participation in the Advisory Body. It was further agreed that the BACG needs a process to elaborate a Better Aid position on directions for the DCF.

Development Cooperation Forum: It was agreed that Cecilia will write a letter supporting the inclusion of the Doha CSO FfD Group membership on the DCF Advisory Board, which is currently being reconstituted. If the FfD CSO Group is not given a seat, then the BACG will consider giving up one of its two seats to make this possible. Cecilia will also contact the Doha CSO FfD Group directly to convey our position on this matter.

It was also agreed that Tony will draft a response to the DCF draft strategy for circulation and comment by the BACG.

9. Draft Terms of Reference for the Better Aid Coordinating Group

9.1 A draft text for the Terms of Reference were prepared in December and circulated for comment. Comments were integrated into this draft and discussed further at the Johannesburg meeting. As noted above there was agreement that the name be confirmed as “Better Aid Coordinating Group”. It was agreed that the Better Aid Platform be a highly inclusive grouping of CSOs. The Better Aid Policy Position Paper will be an important reference point for members of the Platform. But it was agreed that the Paper would not be a defining criteria for membership in Platform. Members, however, must agree not to explicitly speak against positions in the Paper. The terms of reference should be clear that the BACG is not an exclusive CSO interlocutor with the WP-EFF, the DAC or the DCF. It was agreed that the roles of the BACG would be revised to reflect our discussion that the BACG would draw lessons and analysis from independent sector and country level consultations. Finally, it was agreed that membership criteria for the BACG should be simplified while calling for north/south balance, different organizations and constituencies.

<p>Terms of Reference: Brian will revise and circulate the Terms of Reference. The goal will be to finalize the Terms of Reference by March 9th.</p>
--

10. Better Aid Secretariat

10.1 It was noted that there is currently an interim arrangement with Ibon with bridge funding from SIDA to cover the costs of this meeting and the secretariat up to June 2009. Funding is limited as SIDA wished to see the proposals from all the CSO initiatives before committing additional funds.

10.2 It was agreed that a Secretariat will be essential to coordinate the work of the BACG. Among the tasks identified are included 1) management of funds; 2) preparing the BACG meeting; 3) support and logistics for BACG meeting covered by the budget; 4) translation and coordination and distribution of documentation; 5) preparations for the Global Assembly in 2011; 6) support to the cluster focal points; and 7) liaison with the coordinator for the communications team. In carrying out these roles, it was agreed that they need not reside within one organization or one locale. Consideration will be given

to locating some of these functions in Paris and proposals by interested members should be made quickly.

Secretariat: Ibon and ITUC expressed interest in hosting some, or all, of the Secretariat functions. It was agreed that Ibon and ITUC will meet in Stockholm early April and make a proposal to the BACG on a possible division of responsibilities. It was agreed that Ibon would be requested to take legal responsibility as the fiscal agent for BACG.

11. Relationship with the Open Forum / Global Facilitating Group

11.1 The Open Forum has a mandate relating to development effectiveness specifically in relation to CSOs following from the work of the Advisory Group and paragraph 20 of the AAA. There is agreement with the GFG that the mandate of the Better Aid Coordinating Group has an overarching mandate that includes the implementation of the AAA, including paragraph 20. This overlap will require close coordination and engagement between the GFG and the BACG. There is also a need to clarify the separate purposes of parallel country level, regional and global processes for each, both to reduce transaction costs where possible, but also to be clear in front of donors about the need for distinct purposes and different CSO actors in each process. There is also an issue relating to policy space – should the GFG be directly represented in the WP-EFF and how should the GFG craft its policy dialogue on enabling donor and government conditions for CSO development effectiveness. Finally there are issues relating to competition for funds and division of pooled funds among the initiatives.

11.2 There has been a proposal that there be a joint meeting between the GFG and the BACG – but should this take place between the co-chairs, at the level of the Secretariat. There is also the question that overlapping membership on the GFG and the BACG and the implications for the participation of these members in each group (who is “we” when these members speak). Tony clarified that as co-chair of the BACG, he has consciously avoided positions of responsibility within the GFG or their Consortium. It was suggested that there be a place on our web sites where we are transparent about membership in both groups, including those in leadership positions.

11.3 Communications will be crucial to clarify with outside stakeholders and be sensitive to the implications of each initiative. Synergies and complementarity can be built by exchanging information, by inter-linking key information on each other’s web site, or by organizing at least some of our meetings back to back, including the possibilities of a

half day joint meeting, or determining together appropriate events towards HLF4. We also have to be conscious of the demands we are making on our constituencies and assure synergies if possible on national consultations or Global Assemblies.

Coordination with the GFG: It was agreed that the BACG Co-Chairs will write to the GFG Co-Chairs proposing a joint meeting of the BACG and the GFG in the afternoon of June 22nd, involving the BACG Co-Chairs and all those members of the BACG available to attend (funding to be determined if available).

12. Confirmation of Better Aid Coordinating Group Work Groups

12.1 The working groups established at the Paris meeting of the ISG were reviewed and confirmed. The mandate for each of these groups will be defined in the detailed workplan.

Membership in the BACG Work Groups:

1. Policy Development: Transparency International, AWID, Eurodad, Ibis, Action Aid, Concord, ITUC, WIDE (tbc), Social Watch (to be requested)
2. Communications, Media, Information & Translation: Eurodad, Civicus, Femnet, ITUC
3. Research, Mapping and Synthesis of Outcomes from Country Consultations: CCIC, AFRODAD, Actionaid, REPAOC, Eurodad, Transparency International
4. Fundraising and Budget Oversight: CCIC, IBON, ITUC, Interaction (tbc)
5. Outreach and Membership: Ibon, CCIC (light), REPAOC, Civicus, Femnet

13. Decisions:

13.1 At the end of the meeting, the Co-Chairs led a process to finalize decisions in a number of areas to enable BACG to progress on the work we did at this meeting.

Decisions:

1. Meeting with WP-EFF CSO Category Members: It was agreed that Tony and Cecilia will initiate a meeting with others within our WP-EFF category – parliamentary associations, foundations, and local government.

continued....

Decisions (continued):

2. Finalizing the Workplan: Jasmine will clean up language in revised workplan as processed at this meeting, to be reviewed by the BACG work groups for additions, particularly to the list of activities.
3. Finalizing the communications strategy: The Communications work group will finalize the communications strategy based on discussions at this meeting.
4. Preparation of a proposal for Stockholm donor meeting: Cecilia will coordinate the preparation of the proposal to the donor meeting in Stockholm based on the workplan and minutes from this meeting (with the support of others as needed). This proposal must be circulated in advance to SIDA to enable planning for this meeting.
5. First Draft of Policy Position Paper: It was suggested that the Policy Development work group aim to have a first draft of the revised Policy Positions Paper by the end of April.
6. Meeting of Govnet: It was agreed that Tony and Craig will coordinate participation in the Govnet meeting on March 30th in Paris.
7. Additional BACG members at the WP-EFF meeting: It was agreed that it will be possible to financially support some additional participation at the WP-EFF meeting March 31/April 1 out of the bridge fund. Proposals to participate should be sent to Jo / Tony in Ibon.
8. EU meeting on technical assistance: It was agreed that Eurodad would represent the Better Aid Coordinating Group in an EU meeting on technical assistance.
9. Bridge budget for communications: It was agreed that Eurodad would produce a bridge budget for communications for which financing may be possible from the bridge Secretariat.
10. Interim report for SIDA: It was agreed that the draft workplan and notes from this meeting will be prepared within the week to enable a preliminary report by Jo to SIDA on the bridge fund.
11. Next meeting of the BACG: A date for the next meeting of the BACG is September 24 – 25, location to be determined. This is a full meeting of the BACG and does not replace the proposed joint meeting with GFG in Prague in June.