



COUNTRY OWNERSHIP

MOVING FROM RHETORIC TO ACTION





FOREWORD

“Country Ownership” has become a standard part of the aid reform lexicon and a key principle in the current thinking on sound and sustainable development. Although many organizations, and importantly, the Obama administration, share a commitment to support country ownership, a wide range of interpretations and differing methods for its promotion have led to disjointed discussions and approaches.

To bring clarity to this issue, InterAction, an alliance of nearly 200 U.S.-based international relief and development nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), convened the best thinkers and practitioners on country ownership to outline its core elements and develop recommendations for the U.S. government.

Over the course of five months in 2011, InterAction met with member NGOs, U.S. government officials, congressional staff, and policy experts, drawing on their extensive experience to produce this policy paper. This paper reflects the consensus position of InterAction members that participation of both citizens and government in development efforts is at the heart of country ownership, allowing for better targeting of resources, strengthened accountability, and ultimately increased sustainability and success.

On behalf of InterAction, I want to thank all those who contributed to this paper, including: Polly Byers, project consultant; Filmona Hailemichael of InterAction; and the members of our aid reform and aid effectiveness working groups who shaped this important consensus document, laying the groundwork for a consistent approach to moving country ownership from rhetoric to action.



Samuel A. Worthington
President and CEO
InterAction

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|----|-------------------------------------|
| 3 | Introduction |
| 4 | Partnership, Not Patronage |
| 4 | Addressing the Challenges |
| 6 | Role of U.S. NGOs |
| 6 | Core Elements of Country Ownership |
| | I. An Enabling Environment |
| | II. Transparency and Accountability |
| | III. Consultation |
| | IV. Participation |
| | V. Capacity Building |
| 15 | It Begins at Home |
| 16 | Recommendations |

[\ 'trü\ \'kən-trē\ \'ō-nər-,ship\]

“True country ownership is
the full and effective participation of a
country’s population via legislative bodies,
civil society, the private sector, and
local, regional and national government in
conceptualizing, implementing, monitoring
and evaluating development policies,
programs and processes.”

–InterAction Aid Effectiveness Working Group

INTRODUCTION

“COUNTRY OWNERSHIP” HAS BECOME PART OF THE MANTRA of international development rhetoric, routinely highlighted as a key principle of good development practice. Although practitioners and researchers have confirmed that broad-based participation is critical to sustainability, there is a wide range of interpretations of the meaning of the term “country ownership.”

The purpose of this consensus paper is to present InterAction’s definition of country ownership, to outline its core elements, and to provide recommendations and guidance for ensuring meaningful stakeholder participation in U.S. government development processes.

At the simplest level, participation of both citizens and government in development efforts is at the heart of country ownership, allowing for better targeting of resources, strengthened accountability among the various stakeholders, and ultimately increased sustainability and success. Empowering and supporting effective states and citizens to take responsibility for their own development, using local systems and local resources to help countries become less reliant on external assistance, is key to “smart development.” Effective use of development assistance results in communities experiencing change they believe is good, in which they have a voice, and are committed to sustaining.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE U.S. GOVERNMENT

1. Develop a clear definition and operational guidelines for inclusive ownership.
2. Create a transparent, consistent plan to ensure civil society engagement in consultations.
3. Expand the State Department’s diplomatic support for an enabling environment for civil society organizations.
4. Initiate a policy dialogue with U.S. NGOs on country ownership.
5. Ensure transparency of all U.S. foreign assistance by publishing aid data to the Foreign Assistance Dashboard.

PARTNERSHIP, NOT PATRONAGE

BUILDING ON COMMITMENTS MADE UNDER THE PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATION, country ownership has been promoted in many of the Obama administration’s major development policy initiatives, including the first Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review and the Presidential Policy Directive on Global Development, which provided a strong mandate for country ownership by pledging to “reorient our approach to prioritize partnership from policy conception through implementation.” The USAID Forward management reforms have also facilitated host country engagement and increased the flexibility of local actors.

We are adopting a model of development based, as President Obama has said, on partnership, not patronage.

—U.S. Secretary State Hillary Rodham Clinton
January 6, 2010, speech, *Development in the 21st Century*

Other more recent U.S. government initiatives, such as Feed the Future (FTF) and the Global Health Initiative (GHI), have espoused a strong commitment to country ownership. USAID has reinstated the practice of developing multiyear country strategies, now called Country Development Cooperation Strategies (CDCSs), which are supposed to be informed by “broad-based consultation.” However, the mixed experience of NGOs with FTF and the CDCSs to date underscores the challenges of increasing broad-based country ownership.

ADDRESSING THE CHALLENGES

INTERACTION AND ITS MEMBERS APPLAUD THE RECENT U.S. COMMITMENTS to integrate stakeholder participation into its global development programs. However, the lack of a common understanding about what country ownership, including a “whole of society” or “democratic ownership” approach, entails and how to achieve it has led to disjointed debates and undermined a consistent approach to the issue.

Not surprisingly, increasing country ownership and stakeholder participation poses considerable challenges, reorienting and changing the dynamic of the aid relationship. One common problem is the requirement for fast results by many donors, versus the longer time frame typically necessary to pursue true country and societal ownership. This is especially challenging where capacity and structures may have to be developed to allow for meaningful participation, inherently a long-term process. While consultation with a national government is a necessary component of effective country ownership, aligning with a government’s development plan is not sufficient and, depending on the country, can actually harm the interests of poor and marginalized populations.

A related challenge is the requirement for an ongoing process in which donors engage with their country partners to design, implement and monitor programs and policies. The approach and type of engagement needs to adapt to different country contexts: in a country with weak governance or in conflict, for example, supporting country ownership will require more capacity building and time than in an MCC country with effective governance and a commitment to reducing poverty. Other constraints include the level of host country commitment and capacity, availability of donor resources, and donor tolerance for corruption and misuse of funds.

Outside groups, such as donors and international NGOs, who can also act as donors, often play important roles in catalyzing local civil society groups to help get them “to the table” and engage actively in the development process. Donors can exercise a critical role in advancing country ownership that emphasizes a whole of society approach with their ability to convene groups, particularly in repressive or restrictive environments where international donor pressure may be necessary to promote greater inclusion.



Photo Credit: Rolando Villanueva

ROLE OF U.S. NGOs

FOR INTERACTION MEMBERS, THE IMPORTANCE OF COUNTRY OWNERSHIP IS OF PARTICULAR SALIENCE. For most NGOs, promoting broad-based country ownership is a core part of their mission and moral commitment to poverty alleviation. Far from an abstract principle, it is founded on years of experience, often working as donors in developing countries to build local capacity and engaging in participatory development. InterAction's endorsement of country ownership is therefore central to its member's commitment, not only to the aid effectiveness agenda, but more broadly to the goal of development effectiveness.

NGOs have long advocated and been the pioneers in applying participatory approaches and using local resources—people, systems and knowledge—to support sustainable development and social accountability mechanisms. InterAction members work in partnership with local NGOs and civil society organizations (CSOs), and increasingly play a supportive role to local groups that are now running programs formerly run by international NGOs. Many also serve as major donors, engaging the participation of local actors in their programs.

As a result of years of experience in participatory approaches and developing the capacity of local organizations, InterAction members have a significant interest and contribution to make to the U.S. government's evolving understanding and approach to country ownership. In the current era of shrinking aid budgets, mounting financial, food and climate crises, providing assistance in a way that strengthens and empowers local capacity becomes ever more critical.

CORE ELEMENTS OF COUNTRY OWNERSHIP

ALTHOUGH COUNTRY OWNERSHIP MAY LOOK VERY DIFFERENT depending on the country context, an accumulating body of evidence points to the following universal elements that effectively support country ownership:

- I. An enabling environment
- II. Transparency and accountability
- III. Consultation
- IV. Participation
- V. Capacity building

I. AN ENABLING ENVIRONMENT

An enabling environment is the broad backdrop that generally determines whether development assistance fails or succeeds. It allows for the range of stakeholders to meaningfully participate in development programming and take ownership of the process. InterAction defines the concept in three categories:

1. Elements provided by governments consistent with existing commitments in international and regional legal instruments that *guarantee fundamental rights* (e.g., freedom of expression and association, right to operate free from unwarranted state interference, etc.).
2. Elements provided by *donor governments to CSOs* in the donor country and to both international and local CSOs in partner countries (e.g., through strategic engagement with CSO, policy dialogue, policies and funding).



“When a government puts up a law and says, we would like to have all NGOs, when they meet and have more than 30 people, to have a permit from the local security chief, that is not an enabling environment. So to me civil society space, is nothing but creating conditions that allow your citizens to flourish.”

—Richard Ssewakiryanga
Executive Director of the Uganda National NGO Forum

3. Elements provided *by partner governments to CSOs* in the development context (e.g., true participation in formulation, implementation and evaluation of national development strategies, policy dialogue and practice).¹

In the lead up to the Busan 4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, concerns have been raised by civil society actors that a more restrictive environment, as opposed to an enabling environment, has emerged in some countries for civil society organizations. Over the past two years, excessive restrictions have been placed on civil society in more than 90 countries, and many civil liberties have eroded in the name of security, according to recent research.²

CASE STUDY

RESTRICTING PUBLIC SPACE

Recent experience in Cambodia has highlighted the importance of an enabling environment and the ability of local groups to publicly advocate for their ability to work freely. In 2011, a draft law on NGOs and associations that would pose serious restrictions on civil society and severely impede development efforts prompted a coordinated response of nearly 700 groups by the Cooperation Committee for Cambodia. The draft law, perceived to “control the rights of citizens to organize and express themselves,” and instituting complex registration procedures with no safeguards to appeal denials of registration, prompted a range of civil society groups to publish a petition to the government, with support from international and national organizations. The committee cited four main areas of concern in the third draft:

1. Registration is mandatory and complex, rather than voluntary and simple.
 2. There are no safeguards to ensure that either denials of registration or involuntary dissolutions are imposed objectively.
 3. The law does not include a time period for an appeals process for the denials of registration.
 4. Key terms in the law are left undefined, and many sections are vague.
-

II. TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Comparable, comprehensive, timely and accessible information for stakeholders is essential for effective engagement in the development process. Information-sharing by both governments and donors helps not only governments manage and take ownership of their own development, but equally importantly helps civil society, legislatures and others hold governments accountable.

As a first step, donor countries need to provide clear information about their plans and programs in recipient countries to allow government, civil society organizations and citizens in turn to be more effective and accountable in managing aid resources. There are endless examples of situations in which countries have little idea of where aid dollars are going. In some cases, it is a problem



of the information not getting to the right place or governments lacking the capacity to manage information from multiple donors, but in others information has not been communicated effectively. Gender and social analysis reveals the importance of using a variety of media outlets to communicate effectively with a diverse set of stakeholders, including rural organizations, women's organizations and indigenous groups.

USAID and the Department of State have made significant progress on the issue of aid transparency—the U.S. Foreign Assistance Dashboard, with USAID and Department of State foreign assistance information, is one example—but it is still a mixed picture across agencies. Among U.S. agencies, the MCC has the most accessible and transparent information-sharing system, having been designed with that goal from the outset. The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria is even more transparent, which in turn requires a greater donor tolerance for risk. Notably, the U.S. has just become a co-chair of the newly formed Open Government Partnership, a partnership of 46 countries to promote open government, citizen engagement and transparency, in which the U.S. has made a specific commitment to aid transparency as part of its country plan.

International and local civil society have also advocated for transparency, acting as aid watchdogs through initiatives such as Publish What You Fund, Publish What You Pay (for extractive industries—see box), and the International Budget Project, among others. In preparation for the High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan, the “Make Aid Transparent” campaign demonstrates public demand for increased transparency, having been endorsed by 97 organizations and signed by over 5,800 people from 125 countries. International NGOs, particularly when they are donors, also need to increase their level of transparency. Recent efforts initiated by InterAction, such as the Haiti Aid Map, the mapping of U.S. NGO food security programs and the Horn of Africa Aid Map, need to be expanded.

Some governments are now using sophisticated aid management information systems, but basic methods of providing information in appropriate languages may still be the most effective approach in certain situations. In a well-known example in Uganda, a public expenditure tracking system pioneered in 1996 revealed significant problems in non-wage primary education spending. In response, the government launched an information campaign nationally and at the district and school levels, using media and posting public spending information at schools. A follow-up survey three years later indicated that non-wage education spending rose from 20 percent to over 90 percent as a result of the information campaign.

CASE STUDY

TRANSPARENCY IN ACTION

The Publish What You Pay coalition promotes transparency in the extractive industries to ensure that oil, gas and mineral wealth contributes to development and poverty alleviation. The U.S. organization is part of a global coalition of over 350 NGOs in 50 countries promoting the public disclosure of revenues, contracts and other financial transactions related to the extractive industries, thereby allowing people to hold their governments accountable for managing the revenues.

Specifically, the coalition’s objectives are:

- 1) To increase extractive industry revenue transparency and to promote accountability for the use of natural resource revenues, and
- 2) To address the growing problem of contracts between extractive industry companies and host governments that supersede or erode national environmental laws, investment regulations and citizens’ rights.

In the U.S., the coalition recently joined with developing country activists and investors to call on the Securities and Exchange Commission to issue final rules to implement the landmark Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, passed in 2010. The law requires oil, gas and mining companies listed on U.S. stock exchanges to publish what they pay to U.S. and foreign governments for oil, gas and minerals, potentially shedding light on billions of dollars in payments from oil and mining companies to governments.

III. CONSULTATION

A key component of participation, consultations are typically the initial way of engaging affected stakeholders. Consultations are the primary vehicle to solicit the input and expertise of the local stakeholders, generally the closest to the issues facing the country. Effective consultations, engaging a wide range of stakeholders and encouraging a diversity of input, are important because they ensure that program and strategy designs are well informed and grounded in the local context, helping avoid the need for costly fixes later.

Recent analysis of participatory approaches in FTF highlight the critical importance of stakeholder consultation, but also indicate that the purpose, potential, principles and process for multi-stakeholder engagement are generally not well understood or applied. One of the most common weaknesses tends to be a limited, or “one-off” engagement, with no follow up, and often perceived by CSOs as superficial exercises. Similarly, consultations that don’t include a diversity of groups—such as rural organizations, women’s groups and indigenous populations—or don’t start at the initiation of the program design process can also pose problems.

At the other end of the spectrum, incorporating many of the lessons learned, MCC has elaborated its “Guidelines for the Consultative Process,” approaching consultation as a “two-way communication” about compact development and implementation. MCC defines a consultative process as:

“a series of consultations that have been strategically organized to provide and collect information from stakeholders regarding compact development or implementation. The purpose of this process is to establish a sustainable mechanism for effective civic (and other public) engagement in the Compact. Consequently, it should make as much use of existing domestic institutions and processes as possible, and avoid one-off efforts to gather information from citizens or civic groups through forums that cannot be re-convened later.”⁶



The critical issue for many NGOs and CSOs is what happens as a result of the consultations, with the goal being to *move from consultations to actual participation*. In that regard, the MCC guidance notes that the “the information gathered in these consultations should contribute directly to the country core team’s prioritization of obstacles and/or sectors for intervention.”⁷ In many situations, however, consultations with limited inclusiveness, scope and accountability have tended to substitute for establishing real development partnerships.

In addition to in-country consultations, consultations in the U.S. can bring a broader U.S. constituency and nongovernmental perspective to bear on development issues and help guide policy development. Many international NGOs have decades of experience working in countries on sectoral issues, and can offer insight based on long relationships strengthening the capacity of local organizations. They also serve as catalysts for stronger relations between CSOs and local and national governments. Despite the potential contribution of U.S. NGOs, there has not been a structured process or forum to solicit NGO input into U.S. policy or strategy development. USAID should engage U.S. NGOs as part of its effort to implement a country ownership strategy that aligns U.S. private donors and advances a whole of society approach. For their part, U.S. NGO-funded efforts that work in partnership with local actors must fit within the U.S. government’s approach to country ownership.

CASE STUDY

ENGAGEMENT GAP

Recent research by InterAction on the administration’s Feed the Future Initiative and its consultation processes indicated that, despite the emphasis in many key documents on the importance of engaging local civil society, there was a clear “engagement gap.” Reports indicated that the consultation process often had limited opportunities for participation, resulting in a wide variability in the quality and scope of stakeholder participation. The research highlighted the need for clear operational guidance, and offered an illustrative list of consultation benchmarks to strengthen participation:

- Is there a plan, process, timeline and lead agency for consultations?
 - Are consultations held regularly to inform the project, receive feedback, etc.?
 - Are consultations inclusive, participatory and held in appropriate venues?
 - Is there adequate dissemination of information and notice to prepare for consultations?
 - Do consultations encourage the competition of ideas?
 - Are consultations transparent, with clear expectations, communication strategies for minutes and other information?
 - Are actions taken as a result of consultations?
 - Are consultations credible to the participants and general public?
-

IV. PARTICIPATION

At the broadest level, effective participation entails enabling stakeholders to have substantive input and involvement in decision-making throughout development processes intended to benefit them. Participatory approaches provide the crucial foundation for sustainable development, ensuring that the broad spectrum of society, including marginalized people and those living in poverty, are involved in and have a stake in development processes and plans.

Many elements are necessary to achieve effective participation, such as an enabling environment and access to timely and accurate information, as outlined above. In addition, strong processes and mechanisms for stakeholder engagement and the capacity for local organizations to engage, as illustrated below, are critical components to participation. Donors and international NGOs can play a critical role in convening a diverse range of civil society organizations, including women's groups, rural organizations, and others.



Photo Credit: Leonardo Bezerra Lincomi

CASE STUDY

A PARTNERSHIP MODEL

The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria (Global Fund), to which the U.S. is a major donor, has been successful in a growing number of countries using a “Country Coordinating Mechanism” (CCM). CCMs work as country-level multi-stakeholder partnerships comprised of public and private members (governments, donors and NGOs), which develop and submit grant proposals to the Global Fund based on priority needs at the national level. Since the creation of the Global Fund, CSOs have had voting rights on its Global Board. CSO representatives led the effort to require true participation, after initial vague guidelines did not result in effective CSO engagement. The experience of CCMs still varies by country, but overall the process reflects strong progress in advancing participation.

V. CAPACITY BUILDING

In many cases, partner country groups and institutions may require additional support to effectively lead their development processes. In these cases it is necessary to develop or enhance the capacity of these organizations, in whatever areas necessary—financial, administrative, governance or other—to support their ability to effectively participate in the development process.



Effective capacity building can take years, and can appear to slow down development efforts—running up against the demand for quick results—but there is strong evidence that taking sufficient time to develop capable partners inevitably yields more sustainable and effective development results.

Photo Credit: David Darg

PARTNERING FOR IMPACT

The PATH Malaria Control and Evaluation Partnership in Africa (MACEPA) partners with national governments, civil society and other stakeholders to eliminate malaria in Africa. MACEPA invests directly in country-level action, working side by side with national governments, NGO and UN agency program partners, the Roll Back Malaria Partnership, and other major partners to drive down rates of infection caused by parasites that carry malaria, preventing many malaria-related illnesses and deaths. One of the keys to MACEPA's success is an emphasis on evidence-based approaches that strengthen country leadership.

Countries that partner with MACEPA work through a cycle of planning, alignment of resources, coordinated implementation, and monitoring and evaluation to scale up and then maintain longer-term malaria control and prevention, with the ultimate goal of elimination. Based on best practice and lessons learned from work with national partnerships, MACEPA helps countries improve program implementation and empowers national governments to pursue elimination, ensuring they will continue to have the capacity to maintain efforts in the long-run. MACEPA was established in 2005 with funding from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

CASE STUDY

IT BEGINS AT HOME

FUNDAMENTALLY, THE GOAL OF INCREASING THE COUNTRY OWNERSHIP OF development programs is about empowering stakeholders to achieve sustainable development and making countries accountable to their populations for development efforts. The challenge for the U.S. is to give partner countries the tools and support to meaningfully engage in the development process, responsibly and effectively—from design and prioritization through implementation and evaluation—while still remaining accountable to U.S. government, and ultimately to American taxpayers.

The U.S. can start by holding itself accountable for supporting one clear common approach to promoting country ownership. Currently, the MCC, USAID, and State Department all have different systems, some more articulated than others, making them difficult to compare or effectively evaluate. As the fundamental foundation for effective and sustainable long-term development, the U.S. should move from rhetoric to practice and establish a common and inclusive definition of country ownership, supported by guidelines and criteria to implement and track its progress.



Photo Credit: Benjamin Rusnak

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE U.S. GOVERNMENT

To move forward and develop a consensus on what country ownership means, how it is achieved and how it can be measured, InterAction recommends that the U.S. take the following steps:

- 1. Develop a clear definition of inclusive country ownership, supported by operational guidelines and accountability mechanisms.** Guidelines should be applicable to all U.S. agencies implementing development assistance, and would help ensure that stakeholder participation is consistent and not left to the discretion of individual agencies or missions.
- 2. Create a transparent, consistent plan to ensure civil society engagement in consultations** on Feed the Future, the Global Health Initiative, Country Development Cooperation Strategies and other new development initiatives. A standard plan should be developed for inclusive, participatory, ongoing engagement of civil society, including feedback mechanisms to measure the impact and effectiveness of engagement.
- 3. Expand the State Department's diplomatic support for an enabling environment,** working with host governments, international and host country CSOs and other implementation partners, to establish formalized mechanisms to ensure adherence to guidelines. The State Department has been taking a proactive approach to promoting and protecting an enabling environment for civil societies around the world and should seek allies in this effort in Busan and beyond, highlighting that civil and political rights are necessary for economic and social rights to be realized.
- 4. Initiate a policy dialogue with U.S. NGOs to monitor the ongoing implementation** of country ownership principles in current U.S. initiatives. The dialogue should be structured and participatory, allowing for exchange about best practices on key issues such as local consultation, project governance mechanisms, capacity building and use of country systems.
- 5. Ensure transparency of all U.S. foreign assistance programs,** not just those managed by USAID and the State Department. Of the 12 departments, 25 agencies and almost 60 federal offices that manage foreign assistance programs, only two are included in the new Foreign Assistance Dashboard. All U.S. agencies should be required to compile and submit their aid information in a manner that is comparable across U.S. agencies, and compatible with the international standard.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ InterAction Policy Paper: Enabling Environment for CSOs: An Opportunity to Lead, June 2011
- ² Civicus; Civil Society: The Clampdown is Real; Global Trends 2009-2010: http://www.civicus.org/content/CIVICUS-Global_trends_in_Civil_Society_Space_2009-2010.pdf
- ³ The Open Government Partnership: <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/>
- ⁴ Make Aid Transparent: <http://www.makeaidtransparent.org/>
- ⁵ DevelopmentGateway: <http://www.developmentgateway.org/programs/aid-management-program>
- ⁶ Millennium Challenge Corporation, Guidelines for the Consultative Process, February 2009: <http://www.mcc.gov/documents/guidance/guidance-2010001005001-consultativeprocess.pdf>
- ⁷ Ibid

REFERENCES

- Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness, *Civil society and aid effectiveness*, 2008.
<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/ACCRAEXT/Resources/4700790-1208545462880/AG-CS-Synthesis-of-Consultations.pdf>
- CAADP Working Group on Non State Actor Participation; Guidelines for Non State Actor Participation in CAADP Processes, Jan. 2011: <http://www.caadp.net/pdf/Guidelines%20-%20Non%20State%20Actor%20participation%20in%20CAADP%20processes.pdf>
- CDA Collaborative Learning Projects, *Feedback Mechanisms in International Assistance Organizations*, 2011, http://www.cdainc.com/cdawww/pdf/other/lp_feedback_research_report_Pdf_1.pdf
- CDA Learning Projects, The Listening Project; Whose Development? Aid Recipients Perspectives on Ownership: http://www.cdainc.com/cdawww/pdf/issue/lp_perspectives_on_ownership_Pdf.pdf
- DevelopmentGateway; South-South cooperation: http://www.developmentgateway.org/dg_uploads/pdfs/south-south_cooperation_-_may_2011.pdf
- DevelopmentGateway; Aid Management Program: http://www.developmentgateway.org/dg_uploads/pdfs/aid_mgmt_program_results_in_brief_-_may_2011.pdf
- Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis: <http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/>
- InterAction Policy Paper: Enabling Environment for CSOs: An Opportunity to Lead, June 2011
- InterAction Policy Brief: Creating Strong Stakeholder Engagement in Feed the Future: Suggested Strategy and Guidelines, Aug. 2011: <http://www.interaction.org/sites/default/files/Creating%20Strong%20Stakeholder%20Engagement%20in%20FF.pdf>
- InterAction Policy Paper: Suggestions on Consultation Benchmarks, July 2010
- InterAction Policy Paper: Country Ownership, August 2011
- Long, Carolyn, 2001, *Participation of the Poor in Development Initiatives. Taking Their Rightful Place*, (UK and USA, Earthscan Publications Ltd)
- Long, Carolyn and Duvvury, Nata, "Civil society and accountability promotion in the Global Fund", *Building Global Democracy? Civil Society and Accountable Global Governance*, edited by Jan Aart Scholte, (Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press), 2011
- Make Aid Transparent: <http://www.makeaidtransparent.org/>
- Millennium Challenge Corporation, Guidelines for the Consultative Process, February 2009
- Millennium Challenge Corporation, Working Paper: MCC's Approach to Country Ownership, February 13, 2009
- Save the Children, Alison Grossman and Jennifer Rigg, "Getting the House in Order", Monday Developments, July 2011
- Catholic Relief Services, Paul Miller, "Paradigm Whiplash or Genuine Reform?" Monday Developments, July 2011
- Oxfam America; Ownership in Practice: The Key to Smart Development, 2010
- Open Forum for CSO Development Effectiveness, June 2011: *Siem Reap Consensus on the International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness*
- Open Government Partnership: <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/>
- PEPFAR, Partnership Framework Guiding Principles: <http://www.pepfar.gov/guidance/framework/120513.htm>
- Publish What you Pay: <http://www.publishwhatyoupay.org/>
- Save the Children; Planning for Locally Led Development: Reforming U.S. Development Planning Processes: www.savethechildren.org/planning
- Save the Children; Consultation & Participation for Local Ownership What? Why? How? www.savethechildren.org/consult

INTERACTION MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS

ACDI/VOCA
Action Against Hunger USA
ActionAid International USA
Adventist Development and Relief Agency International (ADRA)
African Medical & Research Foundation
African Methodist Episcopal Service and Development Agency (AME-SADA)
Africare
Aga Khan Foundation USA
Air Serv International
All Hands Volunteers
Alliance for Peacebuilding
Alliance to End Hunger
American Friends Service Committee
American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee
American Jewish World Service
American Near East Refugee Aid
American Red Cross International Services
American Refugee Committee
AmeriCares
America's Development Foundation (ADF)
Americas ReliefTeam
Amigos de las Américas
Ananda Marga Universal Relief Team
Baptist World Alliance
Basic Education Coalition (BEC)
Bethany Christian Services International, Inc.
B'nai B'rith International
BRAC USA
Bread for the World
Bread for the World Institute
Brother's Brother Foundation
Buddhist Tzu Chi Foundation
Campaign for Innocent Victims in Conflict (CIVIC)
CARE
Catholic Relief Services
CBM
Centre for Development and Population Activities (CEDPA)
Center for Health and Gender Equity (CHANGE)
CHF International
ChildFund International
Christian Reformed World Relief Committee (CRWRC)
Church World Service
Communications Consortium Media Center
Concern America
CONCERN Worldwide U.S., Inc.
Congressional Hunger Center
Counterpart International
Creative Learning
Development Gateway
Direct Relief International
Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund (DREDF)
The Eagles Wings Foundation
Easter Seals
Educational Concerns for Hunger Organization (ECHO)
Education Development Center (EDC)
Episcopal Relief & Development
Ethiopian Community Development Council
Family Care International
Food for the Poor (FFP)
Freedom from Hunger
Friends of ACTED
Friends of the Global Fight
GOOD360
Giving Children Hope
The Global Food Banking Network
Global Fund for Children
GlobalGiving
Global Health Council
Global Links
Global Resource Services
Global Washington
Habitat for Humanity International
Handicap International USA
Heart to Heart International
Heartland Alliance
Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society
Heifer International
Helen Keller International
HelpAge USA
Helping Hand for Relief and Development
Holt International Children's Services
Humane Society International (HSI)
The Hunger Project
Information Management and Mine Action Programs (IMMAP)
INMED Partnerships for Children
InsideNGO
Institute for Sustainable Communities
Interchurch Medical Assistance, Inc. (IMA World Health)
International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC)
International Center for Not-for-Profit Law
International Center for Research on Women (ICRW)
International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES)
International Fund for Animal Welfare
International Housing Coalition (IHC)
International Medical Corps
International Medical Health Organization (IMHO)
International Orthodox Christian Charities (IOCC)
International Relief & Development
International Relief Teams
International Rescue Committee (IRC)
International Social Service—United States of America Branch, Inc
International Youth Foundation
IntraHealth International, Inc.
Islamic Relief USA
Jesuit Refugee Services USA
Jhpiego – an affiliate of The Johns Hopkins University
Keystone Humane Services International
Korean American Sharing Movement
Latter-day Saint Charities
Life for Relief and Development
Lions Clubs International Foundation
Lutheran World Relief
Management Sciences for Health (MSH)
MAP International
Medical Care Development
Medical Emergency Relief International (Merlin)
Medical Teams International
MedShare International
Mercy Corps
Mercy USA for Aid and Development
Millennium Promise
Mobility International USA
National Association of Social Workers
National Peace Corps Association
ONE Campaign
One Economy Corporation
Operation Blessing International Relief and Development Corporation
Operation USA
Outreach International
Oxfam America
Pact
Pan American Development Foundation
Pan American Health and Education Foundation (PAHEF)
PATH
Pathfinder International
PCI-Media Impact
Perkins International
Phelps Stokes
Physicians for Human Rights
Physicians for Peace
Plan USA
Planet Aid
Plant with Purpose
Population Action International
Population Communication
Presbyterian Disaster Assistance and Hunger Program
Project C.U.R.E.
PCI
ProLiteracy
Refugees International
Relief International
Religions for Peace
Resolve Uganda
RESULTS
ReSurge International
Salvation Army World Service Office
Save the Children
Seva Foundation
Society for International Development (SID)
Solar Cookers International
Solidarity Center
Stop Hunger Now
Transparency International USA
Trickle Up Program
Unitarian Universalist Service Committee
United Methodist Committee on Relief
United Nations Foundation
United States International Council on Disabilities (USICD)
United Way Worldwide
USA for UNHCR
U.S. Climate Action Network (USCAN)
U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants
U.S. Fund for UNICEF
VAB (Volunteers Association of Bangladesh)
Water Aid America
Water for South Sudan
WellShare International
WFP USA
Winrock International
Women for Women International
Women Thrive Worldwide
World Concern
World Connect
World Hope International
World Learning
World Neighbors
World Rehabilitation Fund
World Relief
World Resources Institute (WRI)
World Society for the Protection of Animals
World Wildlife Fund
World Vision

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

Center for Justice and Peacebuilding, Eastern Mennonite University
Enough Project (a project of Center for American Progress ("CAP"))
Global Master's in Development Practice Secretariat of the Earth Institute at Columbia University
Moynihan Institute of Global Affairs at Maxwell School of Syracuse University, The Transnational NGO Initiative
The NGOLD Center at Northern Illinois University