

The Review of Civil Society Policy Forum:

Comments/Feedback Received as of February 2016

Dear IMF/WB CSO Teams:

I understand you would like to our input on the following issues:

1. What is your main goal/objective when organizing a specific seminar at the Civil Society Policy Forum? If you have organized CSPF seminars in the past, please share your views on what has worked and what could have been done differently.

Our goal in organizing a specific seminar is usually to share current research and project results that we would like WBG and gov't officials to be aware of and engaged on. We have found, however, that the vast majority of attendees are other CSOs, and typically the only WBG or IMF staff who attend are invited speakers or panelists. For that reason, we no longer see the CSPF as particularly useful for our engagement with the Bank or Fund.

2. In recent years, we have had more requests for CSPF seminars than slots available. How should the IMF/World Bank/CSOs agree on the best sessions to choose for the Policy Forum? How do we fit 80+ entries into about 40 or so slots, while ensuring the inclusion and representation of a diverse range of global CSOs?

Some proposed seminars are duplicative and those should be combined. Others are of limited interest...perhaps there could be an advance sign-up for folks to indicate interest and those that are of interest get the time slots? Another solution would be to lengthen the working day, and offer some seminars in early evening hours.

3. Do you think it would be useful to have different types of formats to allow for more diverse engagement (e.g., high-level panels with audience interaction; closed-door roundtable meetings; small-scale conversations with experts)? If so, please share your thoughts on specific session formats that you think could work and which you would like to see adopted.

Yes, it would be useful to have different types of formats to allow for more diverse engagement, particularly high-level panels with audience interaction and small-scale conversations with experts

Thanks & regards,

Ladd

Lawrence F. Connell

Director, Multilateral Programs, Conservation International
2011 Crystal Drive, suite 500, Arlington, VA. 22202 USA

700 19th St NW,
Washington, DC

RE: Feedback on the CSO Policy Forum at the Spring and Annual Meetings of the IMF and World Bank

New Rules for Global Finance would like to thank the both CSO teams at the Fund and Bank for their continued commitment to consultation, and willingness to identify how to genuinely strengthen engagement between civil society and the Bretton Woods Institutions. We look forward to the outcomes from this consultation, and building upon this process to ensure civil society plays a role in, what Madame Lagarde has called, the "new multilateralism". Our specific comments are laid out below.

Sincerely,


Noted

Nathan Coplin
Deputy Director,
New Rules for Global Finance

Feedback on the CSO Policy Forum at the Spring and Annual Meetings of the IMF and World Bank

- 1. What is your main goal/objective when organizing a specific seminar at the Civil Society Policy Forum? If you have organized CSPF seminars in the past, please share your views on what has worked and what could have been done differently.**

The goals for specific seminars will vary. Usually we intend to get a message to the institutions (WB, IMF), and hope to reach governments and media, as well as CSO partners. We would like to reach senior officials (govts, IFIs) and broad international outreach (Media first, also CSOs).

Occasionally we have used the forum to release a publication (Reports on International Financial Governance and Impact, 2013 and 2014).

We are generally satisfied with CSO and IMF/WB CSO staff; seldom does media or government officials or senior officials of IFIs attend. Too often the audience is so small we wonder about the utility of the seminar. Once we were able to get real-time web posting for the joint UN-WB anti-corruption work. Some kind of video record should be available, if not for real time posting then for subsequent posting on the IFI websites....or at least a link from the official website(s) to an IFI-CSO page. We would really recommend that the CSO agenda be easily accessible on the Annual/Spring Meetings websites; that a hard copy of the agenda be included in the welcome folder for **ALL** who attend the meetings—government, media, CSOs; videos made of all events;

2. In recent years, we have had more requests for CSPF seminars than slots available. How should the IMF/World Bank/CSOs agree on the best sessions to choose for the Policy Forum? How do we fit 80+ entries into about 40 or so slots, while ensuring the inclusion and representation of a diverse range of global CSOs?

If this is a genuine CSO Policy Forum, the WB and IMF should not dominate the event schedule. For example, the CSPF at the 2015 Spring Meetings featured more than 20 events sponsored by the World Bank and IMF. That was nearly half the sessions. From the perspective of civil society, this really harms the credibility of this forum as a space for genuine dialogue, and it turn impacts global CSO's decisions to participate – especially for Global South organizations who may decide to use limited resources in more productive ways. Almost all CSOs would welcome help in inviting/including people from the IFIs to participate as panelists or audience, but competition between CSO proposals and IFI proposals is totally unfair when the selection panel is wholly IFI!

In the UN I have participated in selections for individual CSO reps: criteria were public; we nominated ourselves to serve as “judges” and had to score each one according to the established criteria. The final decisions were based on gender and regional representation; any additional criterion should/could be the relevance of the proposed topic to the central theme of the meetings (including, possibly, how Irrelevant that theme might be.....!) Selection cannot be solely up to the discretion of IFI staff.

Including Civil Society into the “official” schedule:

One CSO session (ideally one a day!) should be in the official schedule; if that seems too hard, then ensure CSO on every panel in public forum—even as every CSO panel has an official/staff of the IFIs. We understand that including CSO sessions into the official schedule presents the challenge of selecting “who” will get the coveted official slot? One possible way to address this is to establish a CSO advisory/selection committee (similar to what the UN has done) who would be responsible for selecting the session(s). Here is how it might work:

- 1) Bank-Fund Staff invite interested CSOs to participate in a CSO Advisory/Selection Committee for AMs
- 2) Bank-Fund staff determines number of slots that will be included in official program schedule.
- 3) Bank-Fund set deadline for proposed sessions (earlier than the CSPF deadline)
- 4) Organizations that submit proposals cannot participate in the CSO selection/advisory committee
 - a. Other criteria for joining the committee, such as those used in UN selection processes, could be determined by public consultation. This consultation should also identify the criteria, or scoring system, for selecting which sessions are included into the “official” schedule.
- 5) Bank-Fund staff coordinates 2-3 conference calls for CSO committee to explain selection criteria, to review proposals and decide on final sessions.
- 6) Any proposal not selected will be automatically submitted to the CSPF, in line with the principle of “first come, first served” – unless it conflicts with criteria for regional and thematic diversity.

- 3. Do you think it would be useful to have different types of formats to allow for more diverse engagement (e.g., high-level panels with audience interaction; closed-door roundtable meetings; small-scale conversations with experts)? If so, please share your thoughts on specific session formats that you think could work and which you would like to see adopted.**

Sorry, I hadn't thought of the different types of formats—I guess that could work. I would be especially interested in small-scale conversations with experts if they are really experts we could not access on our own. The closed-door round tables seem appropriate only for sensitive issues that must be off the record—CSOs or IFIs or Governments could request; the closed-door roundtable to discuss the format of the CSPF clearly was useful in getting this conversation started and continued on a serious level. Another idea that has gained some support from civil society is an opportunity for stakeholders to meet with IMF Executive Directors. The CSPF already includes a CSO Roundtable with World Bank Executive Directors. Could this not be done with IMF EDs? This could be a closed-door, off-the-record event – but it should not be limited to only “Civil Society Fellows.”

Jo Marie Griesgraber; New Rules for Global Finance; 2000 M St., NW, Washington, DC, 20036; USA;
Nathan Coplin; New Rules for Global Finance; 2000 M St., NW, Washington, DC, 20036; USA;

Dear IMF

Thank you for asking for feedback on your guidelines for consultation with civil society. I hope I'm not too late to make one brief submission:

Given the importance of persons with disabilities as a target group for achieving sustainable economic growth,* ADD International recommends that the guidelines cover how to make civil society consultations accessible to persons with disabilities, including by:

- Reaching out to local organisations of persons with disabilities. NGOs such as ADD can advise on the leading DPOs in a given locality, to ensure you reach those that are most representative and have most legitimacy (e.g. ensuring the views of women with disabilities are represented).
- Ensuring that meetings and information are designed to be accessible to persons with disabilities, for example by providing information in alternative formats, and by ensuring venues are physically accessible. A good three-page guidance note on how to do this is [here](#).

* For example, it has been estimated that some low- and middle- income countries may lose up to 7% of their GDP through the exclusion of persons with disabilities from the labour force (Buckup, The Price of Exclusion, 2009)

Thank you again for asking for comments. Please let me know if it would be helpful to have any further information.

Best wishes,

Polly Meeks

ADD International

The Foundry, Oval Way, London SE11 5RR

ADD International

The Old Church School, Butts Hill, Frome BA11 1HR, UK.

Contact: add@add.org.uk – www.addinternational.org

Registered Charity no. 294860. Company limited by guarantee no. 2033925

Sir,

thank you for organizing this consultation on the CSPF. On behalf of erlassjahr.de (Jubilee Germany, see contacts below) I would like to make the following comments to your three questions:

1. We see the SCPF as an opportunity to organize a thematically focused dialogue with first delegations, secondly ED's, third IFI staff and fourth CSO colleagues. Therefore the CSPF will be the more useful to us, the closer it is to the meetings themselves and the less separate it is in terms of timing and venue.
2. Efficiency and legitimacy of the selection process could be enhanced by the institution of a „CSO ombudsperson“ in the selection process, and also in the broader and more general issues of the CSPF. Such a person could be selected from among those organizations that have organized events in - say - the last five years. Although a perfectly democratic and transparent election may be difficult to organize among such a broad and diverse group of stakeholders, I am sure that sufficient support for a representative from the CSO community could be achieved. Through the last years, some colleagues have already shown a high degree of commitment to interact with the IFIs on behalf of all of us, even without any formal mandate.
3. Yes, a more diverse set of options for CSPF events would be welcome. Generally, the forum should be moved as close as possible to the official meetings, f.i. by having a few events, which thematically overlap with parts of the official program, jointly organized by IFIs and CSPF participants - rather than having a big „official“ and an often smaller CSPF event of the same topic.

Kind regards

Jürgen Kaiser

erlassjahr.de - Politische Koordination

Carl-Mosterts-Platz 1

40477 Düsseldorf/www.erlassjahr.de

Request for Feedback on the Civil Society Policy Forum at the Spring and Annual Meetings of the IMF and World Bank

LILIA INFELISE

ARTES | Strumenti per l'innovazione

Via Castiglione, 80, 40124 Bologna, Italy

W www.artes-research.com

Bologna 12th February 2016

1. What is your main goal/objective when organizing a specific seminar at the Civil Society Policy Forum? If you have organized CSPF seminars in the past, please share your views on what has worked and what could have been done differently.

I have not organised but I have attended CSPF and I have found the following critical aspects to be considered in order to improve this opportunity given to discuss the on-field implementation of the IMF and WB programmes. Too many white people and organisations based in the so-called developed economies as speakers and too many Africans are just attending, with few capacity to express their point of view on the progress realised. This may unfortunately show in a very impressive way a failure of decades of investments in developing countries by NGOs and an incapacity in building an African committed leadership, performing at the highest standards advocacy and influencing capabilities. The seminars were all organised in a very traditional way, with a lot of time given to the speakers and a very limited time given to the attendees. For these reasons, I think it is vital to change this and increase the number of speakers and panel coordinators coming from Sub Saharan Africa and offer a larger set of models for the encounters and the debates.

2. In recent years, we have had more requests for CSPF seminars than slots available. How should the IMF/World Bank/CSOs agree on the best sessions to choose for the Policy Forum? How do we fit 80+ entries into about 40 or so slots, while ensuring the inclusion and representation of a diverse range of global CSOs?

I would suggest to define a set of selection criteria which help reduce the number and increase the mutual learning benefit. Specifically, I would suggest to give strict guidelines and to anticipate selection criteria. Guidelines/selection criteria could concern:

☐ **priority themes, with an open space to unforeseen (innovation often comes from outside the established contexts)**

☐ **priority actors**, both as organisers and as target audiences

I would suggest to open the door to less traditional actors in civil society, such as NGOs and give priorities to multi-sectoral international partnership such as PPP involving research centres, businesses, governmental bodies.

☐ **innovation in methodologies** in order to enhance the outcome value and the rate of active participation.

3. Do you think it would be useful to have different types of formats to allow for more diverse engagement (e.g., high-level panels with audience interaction; closed-door roundtable meetings; small-scale conversations with experts)? If so, please share your thoughts on specific session formats that you think could work and which you

would like to see adopted.

Yes I agree for more diverse engagement such as high-level panels with audience interaction, closed-door roundtable meetings, and small-scale conversations with experts. I would also suggest the following model:

1. Showcases of very innovative and transferable best practices, previously selected according to the above mentioned criteria, involving all key protagonists /stakeholders in the presentation and pre-registration by all who would attend, ask questions and take contacts for future developments.
2. Key authoritative stakeholders invited to discuss pre-selected papers (on policies, new strategies, new programmes, ...).
3. Roundtable to collect multi-sectoral, multi-actor and multinational point of view.

We would like to seek your input on the following issues:

1. What is your main goal/objective when organizing a specific seminar at the Civil Society Policy Forum?
 Our main goal is to voice some issues concerning our community, in order to get better attention from public authorities in our country, and to motivated other communities in the world to take action on moving the public agenda around issues concerning to the most disenfranchise.
 I did request to organize CSPF seminars in the past meeting in Lima; it was not accepted, due to the lack of space available. They suggested me to present it at the next one spring meeting 2016 in Washington, D.C:
- 2- How should the IMF/World Bank/CSOs agree on the best sessions to choose for the Policy Forum?
 You should be acting as a facilitator, among different organization, in order to co-cheer a session.
- 3-Please share your thoughts on specific session formats that you think could work and which you would like to see adopted.
 I agreed very much with the format presented for Lima.
 I prefer participative and integrative sessions.

Name of sender: Sarah Zapata

Organization you represent; Fundacion PAMFA

Address; Calle Mella no. 55 norte, Bani, Provincia Peravia, Dominican Republic

Note. It would be very helpful if at the time considering countries representatives participant at the meeting, on need for scholarship to attend at the event, to consider the disaggregated data about that country. In developing countries persist to much Inequity on the wealth distributions. Due to that situation, a lot of grass root organizations interested on attending to the meeting, don't have the resources to pay they travel expenses.



Submission to the IMF and World Bank Request for Feedback on the Civil Society Policy Forum at the Spring and Annual Meetings of the IMF and World Bank

In the following submission, the IMF and institutions of the World Bank Group, including the International Finance Corporation, will be referred to as the BWIs, or Bretton Woods Institutions.

This consultation represents a welcome opportunity to begin a process of dialogue over the renewal of the Civil Society Policy Forum (CSPF) at the Spring and Annual Meetings of the IMF and World Bank.

We are pleased to note commitments from BWI staff following the 2015 annual meetings held in Lima, Peru to ensure concerns raised in 2015 regarding the CSPF are addressed. We welcome the openness to providing a long-term location for the CSPF that returns it to the Bank's or Fund's main buildings and ensures the CSPF becomes easily accessible to accredited media representatives, once current renovations are completed to the IMF headquarters building. Similarly welcome is the intention to provide greater visibility for the scheduling of events at the CSPF and to make the official CSPF website easier to find on the official website. This dialogue is necessary to enable clear guidelines to emerge for how the CSPF is managed and how seminars are proposed and organised. To ensure that the CSPF is impactful and contributes meaningfully and positively to how the IMF and World Bank Group conduct their work, it is imperative that this process maximises the CSPF's visibility and the autonomy of civil society participants and enables the widest possible participation for civil society and other participants.

As part of these consultations, a meeting with the CSPF organisers that is open to all civil society that wishes to participate should be established and made a permanent feature of all future CSPFs to provide a forum for dialogue on these issues and any on-going questions. An example of the value of such a permanent dialogue is shown by the decision to relocate the CSPF in 2014 to the World Bank Group's I building, with highly negative consequences for the CSPF's relevance, visibility, legitimacy and therefore impact. This was profoundly discouraging to many members of civil society, inhibiting their ability and willingness to devote the significant time and resources required to attend the CSPF.

1. *What is your main goal/objective when organizing a specific seminar at the Civil Society Policy Forum? If you have organized CSPF seminars in the past, please share your views on what has worked and what could have been done differently.*

The objectives for organising CSPF seminars naturally vary according to context, subject and intended audience. All of these factors need to be considered to support CSO objectives when CSOs seek to organise a CSPF seminar. Audiences include other civil society organisations, BWI management and officials (including executive directors and their advisory staff), visiting government officials, and media representatives. In order to reach these audiences organisers require the CSPF to be highly visible and easily accessible to all of those groups.

A common, prime objective of CSFO seminars is to present evidence of, and experiences from, those affected by the work of the BWIs which contradicts IMF/WB policies, assertions or intended outcomes, to any or all of the audiences listed above. A key to effective events is that they are not subject to pressure from any of the BWIs to conform to pre-existing expectations or official narratives about the issue in question. The sensitivity and gravity of some of the issues

that the CSPF has been used to address require that the CSPF not be reduced to a channel for Bank or Fund public relations or other communications objectives. Such events are more appropriately organised by the BWIs in their formal events series that occur during the Spring and Annual meetings, alongside the CSPF.

Thus for the seminars organised by CSOs to work they must be designed and chosen independently, by the CSOs themselves, free of any interference from the BWIs. Seminars in the CSPF organised by the BWIs themselves can confuse the audiences participating in the CSPF, bringing into question the independence and integrity of the CSPF itself. Similarly, the apparent ignorance of most media representatives of the presence of the CSPF diminishes its impact and importance to CSO participants, discouraging civil society participation in the longer term. This is exacerbated by the physical distance and security constraints placed upon media representatives who have been unable to attend the CSPF without significant prior notice in the current structure of meetings held in Washington D.C. Given their existing constraints and the overall reduced size of media delegations at the formal meetings, this combination of factors drastically reduces the impact of CSPF seminars.

An effective aspect of CSPF seminars is the encouragement of senior BWI staff to participate as speakers at CSO-organised seminars. This could be further improved by encouraging senior management figures to make themselves similarly available. Furthermore, establishing this as a general principle would assist in encouraging staff to participate even in seminars where BWI activity or policy is subject to strong criticism. It is disappointing that in the past staff have cited concern over the critical nature of some CSPF seminars as a basis to decline participation in these events, which runs counter to the purpose of a CSPF which is impactful and the BWIs' objective that the CSPF benefits from a wide and varied range of participants.

2. *In recent years, we have had more requests for CSPF seminars than slots available. How should the IMF/World Bank/CSOs agree on the best sessions to choose for the Policy Forum? How do we fit 80+ entries into about 40 or so slots, while ensuring the inclusion and representation of a diverse range of global CSOs?*

The prior system of first-come first-served seminar booking worked adequately to achieve fairness and clarity for CSOs hoping to participate in the Forum and organise a seminar. The fairness was achieved because there was a simple online booking system that was open to all, equally. This also provided certainty, which is a key necessity when considering the significant financial (as well as visa) constraints that NGOs wishing to attend CSPF meetings confront. Thus maximising certainty as early as possible is a prerequisite of a fair and inclusive system. Thus it should not be for the BWIs to choose which seminars are legitimate, but rather a process of consultation should be used to develop guidelines to assist civil society to structure seminars in ways that are appropriate to the CSPF's goals. Such guidelines would assist the BWI staff organising the CSPF to objectively and constructively provide input to potential civil society participants.

Secondly, a system which allows IMF or World Bank staff to determine which proposed seminar topics and events may be held at the CSPF risks permitting inappropriate interference with CSOs' autonomy and acting as an indirect, even if inadvertent, mechanism to silence legitimate criticism and concerns from civil society groups, communities and their stakeholders. It is important to understand that in this regard the appropriate accountability of the BWIs may itself be lacking, and as such the CSPF and the seminars can act as an invaluable safety valve to permit issues to be raised which senior officials from the BWIs or their member governments were otherwise unaware of, either through their attendance or participation in seminars, or via subsequent media coverage. The concern over ensuring a diverse range of civil society participates in the CSPF is of course legitimate. It is however a task of the BWIs *and* civil society groups themselves to encourage and make known the presence of the CSPF as a legitimate forum to participate with the institutions and to seek to raise awareness of issues, and hold the institutions to account. Excessive control, or interference, by the BWIs in seminar selection discourages the broadening of participation as it calls into question the autonomy and independence of the CSPF as a location for legitimate criticism and advocacy. It is our experience that the

limitations of the Forum as currently established, and in particular changes instituted without consultation in 2015, are the principal obstacle to greater participation, including the lack of clarity until very shortly before the meetings themselves as to whether seminars have been accepted and will go ahead. However, this must be treated as a separate issue to the question of whether the proposed topics for seminars at any particular CSPF meeting are similar, or overlapping. Over the course of many spring and annual meetings, it is natural that major policy questions that are often time-bound (for example periodic governance and quota reforms with specific deadlines, or consultation processes) may result in many proposed seminars on ostensibly similar questions at the same CSPF. This in itself is not illegitimate, as it must be remembered that civil society is inherently a diverse and multi-representational community that seeks to address a broad range of issues, but also single issues from a wide range of perspectives.

3. *Do you think it would be useful to have different types of formats to allow for more diverse engagement (e.g., high-level panels with audience interaction; closed-door roundtable meetings; small-scale conversations with experts)? If so, please share your thoughts on specific session formats that you think could work and which you would like to see adopted.*
- A broader range of formats would be broadly speaking welcome, as would greater availability of staff and officials for meetings of all types, public and private. A particular emphasis should be placed on the availability of executive board members and their staff, senior management and officials from the existing oversight mechanisms of the BWIs, including the Compliance Adviser Ombudsman, the Independent Evaluation Office and the Inspection Panel. It should be noted, however, many of the activities of civil society groups during spring and annual meetings extend far beyond the Forum. In particular, direct contact between civil society groups and executive board members and their staff should not be entirely mediated by Bank or IMF civil society liaison or other communications staff. Many of these channels are well established, legitimate and necessary mechanisms for dialogue between civil society groups and their country or regional representatives whose job it is to oversee the work of the BWIs. Such interaction would be undermined were they to be facilitated by BWI staff when the subject of such meetings is often oversight of the institutions and the staff themselves.

February 2016

Sent by Sargon Nissan, of behalf of the Bretton Woods Project and signatories listed below.

Sargon Nissan, IMF Programme Manager; The Bretton Woods Project

33-39 Bowling Green Lane, London, United Kingdom EC1R 0BJ

Signatories

Afrodad www.afrodad.org

Arab NGO Network for Development www.annd.org

Bank Information Center, BIC www.bankinformationcenter.org

Both Ends www.bothends.org

Bretton Woods Project www.brettonwoodsproject.org

Centre of Concern www.coc.org

Centre national de coopération au développement, CNCD-11.11.11 www.cncd.be

Derecho Ambiente y Recursos Naturales DAR www.dar.org.pe

Eurodad

International Planned Parenthood Federation, IPPF www.ippf.org

International Trade Union Confederation www.ituc-csi.org

New Rules for Global Finance www.new-rules.org

Urgewald www.urgewald.org

Name of sender: Tiago Stichelmans
 Organization you represent: Eurodad
 Address: 18-26 Rue d'Edimbourg, 1050 Bruxelles
 Country: Belgium

1. What is your main goal/objective when organizing a specific seminar at the Civil Society Policy Forum? If you have organized CSPF seminars in the past, please share your views on what has worked and what could have been done differently.

Our main goal when organising a seminar at the CSPF is to discuss different positions, share information and debate a specific topic with members of the civil society as well as with officials from the IMF and the World Bank, and representatives of member states attending the Spring or Annual meetings. We also aim at reaching out to journalists for them to cover the different positions at stake on a particular subject. In this regard, what could be improved is the visibility of the events organised at the CSPF as well as access to officials and journalists. A better location, near the main events, would be a great improvement to the CSPF.

2. In recent years, we have had more requests for CSPF seminars than slots available. How should the IMF/World Bank/CSOs agree on the best sessions to choose for the Policy Forum? How do we fit 80+ entries into about 40 or so slots, while ensuring the inclusion and representation of a diverse range of global CSOs?

First of all, we believe that clear guidelines to submit proposals are very important. Second, it is important to improve the timeframe for submitting and confirming the events that will take place at the CSPF as the opposite represent a major constraint for our presence as well as the presence of our colleagues from Southern countries (notably for visa purpose). Third, regarding the issue of too many events for too few slots, we believe that it is more fair to allocate slots according to the time of submission for the events, on a first-come, first-served basis.

3. Do you think it would be useful to have different types of formats to allow for more diverse engagement (e.g., high-level panels with audience interaction; closed-door roundtable meetings; small-scale conversations with experts)? If so, please share your thoughts on specific session formats that you think could work and which you would like to see adopted.

Yes, it would be useful to have different formats available as the different events have different objectives. Increasing the CSO access to official events would be particularly useful to give the chance to CSOs to share their views and debate with decision makers. Within the CSPF, it would be useful to have different formats: high-level panels, small-scale conversations with experts, and closed-door roundtable meetings. Given the different logistic requirements of these sessions, we believe that it is important that the IMF/WB CSO team provides the necessary support to the organisers, by providing the necessary contact details of the IMF/WB panellists to be invited (specially high-level speakers) and, if it is needed, providing simultaneous interpretation service to enable the meaningful participation of colleagues from non-English speaking countries.

Tiago Stichelmans de Castro Freire, Networking and Policy Analyst

Comentarios para el Foro de Políticas de la Sociedad Civil en la primavera y anuales Reuniones del FMI y el Banco Mundial, Xavier Buendía, Centro de Observación Ciudadana, Ecuador

1. ¿Cuál es su principal meta / objetivo en la organización de un seminario específico en el Foro de Política de la Sociedad Civil? Si ha organizado seminarios CSPF en el pasado, por favor, comparta sus opiniones sobre lo que ha funcionado y lo que se podría haber hecho de otra manera

RESPUESTA: Consolidar una propuesta de incidencia en las decisiones del poder público, es nuestro principal objetivo en la organización de un seminario. Como organización de sociedad civil en estos siete años de trayectoria, hemos organizado 7 eventos con impactos variados pero en general los 3 puntos más altos han sido la generación de opinión pública nacional e internacional, la articulación de actores públicos, privados y de sociedad civil nacional e internacional; y, la consolidación de la propuesta de incidencia destinada al poder público. El punto que siempre intentamos mejorar es la capacidad de convocatoria, intentando motivar el interés del público en general y no sólo el especializado.

2. En los últimos años, hemos tenido más solicitudes de seminarios que CSPF ranuras disponibles. ¿Cómo debería el FMI / Banco Mundial / OSC ponerse de acuerdo sobre las mejores sesiones de elegir por el Foro de Políticas? ¿Cómo encajamos más de 80 entradas en unos 40 más o menos ranuras, garantizando al mismo tiempo la inclusión y la representación de una amplia gama de OSC global?

RESPUESTA: Generando una matriz de interés que permita generar una agenda de prioridades y la articulación de los actores en stakeholders que generen espacios de trabajo en común, sobre la base de la mayor inclusión y la más amplia representación y participación.

3. ¿Cree que sería útil tener diferentes tipos de formatos para permitir una participación más diversa (por ejemplo, paneles de alto nivel con la interacción del público; a puerta cerrada mesas redondas; conversaciones a pequeña escala con expertos)? Si es así, por favor, comparta su opinión sobre los formatos específicos de la sesión que usted piensa que podría funcionar y que le gustaría ver aprobada.

RESPUESTA: Mesa redonda incorporando las conversaciones con expertos, previa un panel de alto nivel que permita la consolidación de la Coalición Hemisférica de Sociedad Civil de las Américas por la Transparencia y el Acceso a la Información Pública.

Nombre del emisor: Xavier Buendía Venegas

Organización: CENTRO DE OBSERVACIÓN CIUDADANA, ECUADOR

Organización Miembro de:

- a). Red y Sistema Integrado de Organizaciones de Sociedad Civil de Naciones Unidas
- b). Observador de la Organización Mundial de Parlamentarios Contra la Corrupción, GOPAC
- c). Observatorio Internacional de la Democracia Participativa, OIDP.
- d). Becarios BID-OEA
- e). Coordinador Alterno para la Región Andina de la Red Latinoamericana y del Caribe para la Democracia, Red-Lad, Miembro de I Foro de Sociedad Civil de la OEA, Regional de World Movement for Democracy, WMD
- f). Expertos de la Alianza Euro -Latinoamericana de Cooperación entre Ciudades.

Our goal through the participation in the seminar is to advocate for the necessity to include a public private dialogue as a mechanism which enhances the adoption of economic reforms.

The former session of the CSPF was well organized and globally, it was interesting to be a part of such event. Mostly, it was enlightening. It is really challenging to find enough slots considering the diversity of CSOs and subjects that should be discussed, and all of them are of great importance. Maybe it could be more appropriate to choose problematics according to what the World Bank and IMF are treating priority. Every year, there are questions that are more treated than others by both institutions and diversity requires to be very specific in the choice of problematics so that there is no redundancy in the treatment of different subjects. In that way, it could be possible to avoid the misappropriation of number of entries according to slots. Having different formats of session could be interesting in that way, sessions would be dynamic and attending people would be more interactive with speakers and subjects treated. In addition to debate, interviews and round tables, there could be stand ups where the participant can present its vision through by means of an original presentation, like short movie, testimonials video, etc.

Name: Walid Bel Hadj Amor

Organization : IACE, *Bvd. principal Rue du Lac Turkana 1053 Les Berges du Lac, Tunis, Tunisia*

Country: Tunisia

1. By organizing a specific seminar at the CSPF, our organization will want to create awareness and be heard (promoting our voices and actions in a high-level policy space).
2. The IMF/World Bank and CSOs may set up together an inclusive panel to select the best sessions. The best should be the best.
3. We think that small-scale conversations with experts is a great way for proper engagement. Small is much better for sustainable development. It ensures that everyone's voice is heard and nobody is left behind in policies and development.

Thank you.

Henry Ekwuruke, Executive Director at Development Generation Africa International (DGAi) 189B Azikiwe Road, Umuahia, Nigeria

Small-scale conversations with experts organisations in the issue of gender and governance in fragile – post conflicts countries. Challenges face women working as local government administrative in the rural areas. Challenges may include lack of leadership, training, customary laws, as well as experiences etc. My questions are: Is affirmative action in this case can be good/harmful to women, development, and economics' growth and why? What is the way forward?

Associate Prof/ Asha A.Rahim A.Farag, Ph.D.
College of Social and Economic Studies, Economics Department
University of Juba, South Sudan

Kashmir Development Foundation a company set up under section 42 of the Companies Ordinance, 1984 and registered with Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan, Reg. # 0058485 1/ **Head Office:** 461, St. 7A, Ghorī Town, Phase 5, Islamabad, 47331, Pakistan; Web: www.kdfajk.org:

KDF Feedback on the Civil Society Policy Forum at the Spring and Annual Meetings of the IMF and World Bank

We are pleased to submit following feedback on behalf of Kashmir Development Foundation - an indigenous Kashmiri civil society organisation working for community development and empowering the voices of the underrepresented people and communities.

1- Although we have not organised a CSPF seminar in the past. However, our main goal/objective to organize a CSPF seminar would be to inform and influence the process in setting the community development agenda by IMF and World Bank by empowering the voices of under-represented people and communities living in disputed territories or conflict regions such as Jammu Kashmir.

2- It would be useful to run a four week on-line consultation well ahead of the Annual meetings of the IMF and World Bank with at least 5 pre-identified thematic areas and an option to suggest five additional themes for annual CSPF. These themes should have a voting option for CSOs to select. At the close of the consultation period the highest vote getting themes should get selected to propose sessions/seminar on them by CSO. The CSOs engaged in selecting the final list of ten themes should be encouraged to collaborate with each other and propose four sessions/seminar and allocated the slots under each theme accordingly.

3- The above suggested mechanism would create opportunities for CSOs not only to collaborate with each other but also come up with innovative formats for their seminars/sessions to make best use of the limited time using both physical presence of the delegates as well as use of ICT technologies for engagement of those who may not physically attend the session/seminar.

We hope our suggestions would help in increasing the meaningful participation of under-represented people and communities at CSPF.

If you need any further help or assistance please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours Sincerely

Sardar Aftab Khan

Executive Director

Kashmir Development Foundation

Anonymous Submission

1. What is your main goal/objective when organizing a specific seminar at the Civil Society Policy Forum? If you have organized CSPF seminars in the past, please share your views on what has worked and what could have been done differently.

Our main goal is to raise important issues and get them in front of an audience of policy makers, including IMF and World Bank staff. There are some sessions that are more focused on policy discussions among CSOs, but this is secondary. The biggest downside of the CSO sessions is that CSOs often feel like their viewpoints are only being heard by other CSOs instead of by the IMF and World Bank. It's not productive or inclusive. When we've held sessions featuring IMF staff (and we're grateful for the time they've given in those instances), we've found the events to be very productive. This is important. People fly to DC from all over the world to participate in these sessions. Why go through that trouble if their voices aren't being heard? IMF and World Bank staff should attend every session in some form, even as observers. Obviously not high level staff always, but somebody who can participate meaningfully even if just to ask questions or listen.

2. In recent years, we have had more requests for CSPF seminars than slots available. How should the IMF/World Bank/CSOs agree on the best sessions to choose for the Policy Forum? How do we fit 80+ entries into about 40 or so slots, while ensuring the inclusion and representation of a diverse range of global CSOs?

I think IMF/Bank staff have done a good job of trying to combine similar proposals to free up space. It's a tough logistical challenge and I give them credit for trying to make everything work in that environment.

3. Do you think it would be useful to have different types of formats to allow for more diverse engagement (e.g., high-level panels with audience interaction; closed-door roundtable meetings; small-scale conversations with experts)? If so, please share your thoughts on specific session formats that you think could work and which you would like to see adopted.

Yes. Those ideas all sound great. There's too much monotony now. Thanks for bringing those ideas to this process.