

Looking to the Future: Issues in CIDA's Long Term Strategy
A CCIC/CIDA Roundtable and Consultation
February 2001

1. Introduction

The Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC) organised a two-day Roundtable and Consultation with CIDA as an opportunity for dialogue between the NGO community and CIDA on significant issues and processes that have been part of internal discussions within the Agency over the last year. More specifically, it was meant as a specific response to CIDA's (October 2000) draft Framework for Consultation entitled *Towards a Long-Term Strategy (LTS) for Canada's International Assistance Program*. For CCIC and its members, consultations on the LTS are an opportunity to influence the direction that CIDA will define for Canada's relations with developing countries and the place of Canadian aid within these goals.

Prior to the Roundtable, CCIC organised a series of meetings with its members based on its initial response to the LTS, which was circulated widely in the NGO community and within CIDA. The *CCIC Commentary* develops a number of key messages, identifying important gaps and important implications for fundamental principles in development cooperation and implementation mechanisms. (The *Commentary* is available on the Development Policy page of CCIC's web site, www.web.ca/ccic-ccci)

The first afternoon was structured as a plenary to discuss the broad themes and principles inherent in the LTS with Len Good, President of CIDA and Gerry Barr, President CEO of CCIC, making key opening remarks. The opening panel also included Kamal Malhotra, formerly from Focus on the Global South in Bangkok, and now at UNDP, who provided some external (southern) perspectives on CIDA's LTS. At an open reception in the evening the Honourable Maria Minna, Minister for International Cooperation, reflected on upcoming international events (the Quebec Summit for the Americas) and the place of the LTS and the social development priorities in the government's approach.

The second day offered participants more time to reflect on the specific implications of the LTS through a series of parallel workshops on five themes that were introduced in each workshop by speakers from CIDA and the CCIC membership. Brian Emmett, Vice-President of Policy Branch, CIDA, made some opening remarks in plenary. Finally, Charles Bassett, senior Vice-President of CIDA, and Gerry Barr, offered some closing remarks.

The event brought together some 120 participants with a strong representation from all Branches of CIDA, a few representatives from DFAIT and the Department of Finance, and a diverse representation of the CCIC membership, including church organisations, volunteer senders, large and small development and advocacy organisations. A few external guests, including academics, consultants and other institutions were also part of the meeting. (See a list of participants in Appendix One.)

The following sections of this Report will give brief overviews of the keynote presentations and will bring together views on major themes that were raised in the workshops and plenary questions to speakers.

The Report concludes with perspectives on future directions from CIDA delivered by Charles Bassett, Senior Vice-President, at the closing of the event, and from CCIC, based on reflections within the CCIC immediately after the event.

2. Keynote Presentations

2.1 Gerry Barr, President-CEO, CCIC

Gerry Barr first observed that the October LTS draft contains many proposed directions that the NGO community can support. These include: an active policy role for CIDA and the need for policy coherence; the importance of ownership and direction from the South for development interventions; the need to get away from micro management in favour of investment in policy and partner relationships; the significant untying of procurement practices consistent with the idea of southern ownership; the proposal to rebuild Canadian ODA back towards 0.7% of GNP, with steps to achieve at least 0.35% by 2005, and the commitment to recognise in the next draft of the LTS, and a planned addendum, the role of civil society and civil society organisations (CSOs) as an important force in development cooperation.

He then focussed on three core concerns that have been raised in the CCIC *Commentary* and that represent major gaps which, if filled, would strengthen CIDA's long-term strategies.

The rationale of aid and the primacy of poverty eradication

The LTS highlights the importance of poverty reduction for CIDA. But CCIC suggests that the goal of poverty eradication is not only the right one, it is also one that Canada has committed to at the UN Millennium Summit in September 2000. It receives widespread public support, based on ethical principles and values of solidarity, in Canada and elsewhere, as indicated by surveys in the United States and Canada. The 1999 CCIC policy paper on *Renewing Canadian Aid Policy and Practice* (available on CCIC's web site – www.ccic.ca) advanced some ideas on how to structure aid to target poverty, including supporting human capital development through education and health, going to where the poor are, getting at gender dimensions of inequality, addressing redistribution of productive assets in support of livelihoods and strengthening the voice and rights of the poor. This approach for CIDA will require long-term involvement in areas and places where poverty is deepest, and might not achieve policy impact for Canada's immediate "enlightened self-interests" (as proposed in the LTS). Although NGOs recognise the importance of "global public goods" such as global economic stability, increased trade or environmental management, CCIC cautions against the potential in this focus for new aid spending to be directed away from the poorest in favour of middle income countries that have a capacity and growing interest in fuller participation in the global economy.

The importance of addressing civil society

People-centred development for poverty eradication is ultimately about recognising the rights of the vulnerable, transforming power relationships and tackling the cultural and social interests that sustain inequality. Effective aid interventions cannot be done without engaging civil society organisations and social movements directly in the programs and policies that affect their lives. Canada, through CIDA and Canadian civil society organisations, has a long history of involvement and relationship with popular organisations around the globe. These relationships have defined a distinct Canadian approach to international cooperation and have brought a wealth of innovation in our aid relationships and practices. It is fundamental that CIDA commit to a comprehensive approach to civil society in its program and policy work, affecting all aspects of international assistance.

Public Engagement

Neither CIDA nor the NGO community will achieve our goals of international development assistance, including CIDA's goal of influencing other departments' policies, without serious long-term work on public engagement in Canada. Despite the publication of a strategy for public engagement, there has been little in terms of actions and results. During the 90's, drastic cuts were made to development education and public participation, because, according to CIDA at the time, the community initiatives were largely ineffective. The problem, in CCIC's view, was not so much related to the quality of the work, but was one of scale and the fact that there were no complementary strategies with the media and the formal public education system. The NGO community raises \$500 millions each year from people who adhere to a vision of development based on the fight against poverty and injustice. There is, of course, room for improvement in our methods of raising funds and of creating images. The construction of a political and moral base of support for international development assistance simply means public engagement and it will be achieved only through strong programmatic attention on the part of *both* CIDA and NGOs to public education and participation on global issues.

2.2 Len Good, President, CIDA

Mr. Good first remarked on the fact that the number of CIDA people attending this meeting is an indication of the commitment of CIDA to dialogue. In a short presentation, he suggested that it is impossible to be very comprehensive and indicated that he would not address some of the fundamental issues raised such as the rationale for aid, the goal of poverty elimination, civil society, and public engagement.

He confirmed that this was not the end of a process; it continues to evolve and CIDA is interested and committed to genuine dialogue with its partners. He pointed out that the LTS document was meant as a bureaucratic exercise largely for government consumption, and that to date, the internal discussions have been held mostly with the geographic Branches and to some extent the Multilateral Branch, and not so much within Canadian Partnership Branch (CPB). CIDA felt the need to have these discussions about recent approaches to development cooperation by donors because, during the past decade, CIDA has been largely focused internally, managing significant budget cuts.

He said that donors drew lessons from the period of the 1980s and early 1990s, which was marked by pressure for structural adjustments, conditionalities, and lack of ownership. These lessons have started to be reflected in the OECD Development Assistance Committee's 1996 *Shaping the 21st Century*, and later in the World Bank's *Comprehensive Development Framework*. Principles such as country ownership for their own development strategies, working more closely with civil society, donor cooperation, realistic time frames, the notion of more balanced approaches between structural macro policies and social policies, are all reflected in those documents.

A lot of these lessons have also been translated fairly quickly in instruments such as the Bank's Comprehensive Development Frameworks, Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and donor-coordinated country-led Sector Wide Approaches (SWAs). The principles often get lost in the discussions on instruments that focus on whether and how well these instruments work. He believes the principles to be of utmost importance, and CIDA has to be prepared to work with other donors, with civil society and with governments of developing countries. CIDA is looking at how governments develop their own strategies and how CIDA can work within those, including how CIDA's projects fit within those priorities.

Mr. Good then provided an overview of the importance to CIDA for some of the key elements in the LTS and where CIDA hopes to take these in the months ahead.

More knowledge-based and more policy-oriented

For Mr. Good, CIDA must become more programmatic in its approach, which entails becoming more knowledge-based and more policy-oriented. To do this, CIDA needs people on the ground, who are in touch with that reality, people who are engaged locally and who will be able to provide CIDA with the necessary knowledge. In becoming more knowledge-based, CIDA staff skills have to be upgraded and the Agency must have a better handle on internal information systems. Lots of changes have occurred and progress has been made over the last year. CIDA is increasingly trying to work at project and program levels and is attempting to make the connections between the two in almost every country.

He also identified a need to rebuild CIDA's policy capacity. CIDA must be able to talk about trade, market access issues, multilateral agreements and the environment, in terms of how these broad issues fundamentally affect the interests of developing countries. CIDA should be in a position to bring the perspectives of developing countries to the table, with Finance or other government departments, when Canadian policies are being formed.

The current situation

Having reviewed internally its approaches, CIDA now feels the pressure from outside for more dialogue with partners. The LTS is evolving and the next version (due at the end of March) will address many of the gaps identified by the CCIC. The directions in the LTS are intended primarily for geographic Branches, where there is a lot to review in terms of issues like country concentration, untying, and program instruments. Although progress has been made at the bilateral and multilateral levels, a discussion with partners may now be appropriate on whether

and how NGOs will want to build themselves into the new directions. Does CIDA want to work more closely with NGOs in countries where CIDA has started to implement new directions? While we can argue that this would reinforce the general thrust within bilateral Branches and could make CIDA more effective, there is also another option. Option two might be to have NGOs do work that CIDA cannot do and that is complementary to what CIDA is doing, maybe in countries and sectors where CIDA does not work. NGOs, with the specificity of their relationship with civil society, would bring complementarity to CIDA. Over time, both options will likely be needed to be effective. Mr. Good said he did not have a strong opinion on these options, but the issue of how Canadian Partnership Branch works with NGOs warrants further discussion that is just starting.

Where to next?

Over the next year, CIDA will focus on the detail of Canadian Partnership Branch interactions with the NGO community, knowing that there are sometimes some inequities and inefficiencies that should be examined. Mr. Good said he would not comment on the fundamental issue of the rationale of aid, but he agrees that public engagement needs to be looked at more deeply. He saw a need and a commitment to come back to issues like country concentration (whether to concentrate and how to do it), untying (how far to go), the issues posed by SWAps, PRSPs, etc. He concluded by recognizing that the dialogue has not been as open as it should be to date, but suggested that CIDA needed to have internal discussions. No decisions have been taken; the Minister will be going to Cabinet in the spring to give her colleagues some directions for CIDA. He believes the timing for our dialogue is right, and that NGOs have a good sense of CIDA's initial thinking .

2.3 Kamal Malhotra, Senior Policy Advisor, UNDP

Mr. Malhotra, speaking as an individual and not as a UNDP representative, commended

CIDA's efforts and priority in moving towards being more policy oriented and what he characterised as "a micro-macro policy linking approach" to program development. For Mr. Malhotra, this approach is the only strategic way forward for all development organisations. In this regard it is important for CIDA to get much more engaged on issues such as trade, debt, global finance and global environment, from the perspective of development and from the perspective of the South.

Although there are many other positive aspects of the draft LTS, he turned his attention to a number of key concerns.

The most serious concern is an explicit assumption in the LTS that there is a broad global consensus on what makes development effective. In support of that, the OECD's *Shaping the 21st Century* is mentioned as the consensus document. For Mr. Malhotra, this begs many fundamental questions.

Whose consensus?

Whose consensus is this and why is it that most developing countries continue to put emphasis on different priorities from the G7 and the OECD? Based on his experience with the UN processes such as the Financing for Development Process (FfD), it is clear that there is no consensus between North and South governments on what are the real problems to tackle or about where to place the emphasis in seeking solutions to critical issues. This difference can be seen in the relative emphasis placed by donors on the realm of national governance versus the realm of global governance. From the perspective of the South, while recognising that there are huge problems in terms of national governance, the problems at the level of global governance, in terms of trade, debt, other global financial flows, is at the heart of a more equitable global order.

Politically, can and should an OECD document ever be the basis for global consensus? From another perspective, Mr Malhotra suggested that high level political processes at the UN, including the Millennium Summit and its Declaration, should form the basis of a global consensus that is inclusive of the concerns from the South. Very serious concerns about current patterns of globalisation need to be taken on board. These are missing from the OECD statement but are addressed in the Millennium Summit Declaration.

The "globalisation divide"

Apart from this lack of consensus from an inter-governmental perspective, Mr. Malhotra suggested that there is clearly a much bigger "globalisation divide" at a societal level symbolised by Seattle, Washington, Prague, Geneva and Porto Alegre. These questions are important. If we base future directions on the assumption of one consensus, we will have one set of strategies; if we base our analysis on the lack of consensus, we will have very different strategies. Any analysis that assumes consensus between North and South denies the reality of the divide both at the inter-governmental and societal levels.

Consensus on principles

While he agreed that there is some consensus on principles such as national ownership, and these principles are important, we have to keep in mind that very often instrumentalities are not in line with those principles. Issues such as governance and conditionality as an instrument, for example, make it very hard to implement national ownership.

Assumptions about globalisation

Mr. Malhotra pointed out that CIDA's draft LTS uses very loosely the term "globalisation", lumping the last 50 years as if it were one period. One needs to differentiate between the 1950 – 1970 period and the next period marked by the breakdown of the Bretton Woods international monetary policy. Concerns about globalisation are largely related to the latter period. The gains of last 50-year period were made largely between the 1950s and 1970s, while today, we have more Least Developed Countries than we had in the 1970s. We have to question where and when

most progress was made on poverty reduction, and many other issues. This historical perspective has important strategy implications for CIDA.

Emphasis on World Bank development thinking

The emphasis placed in the LTS on development thinking in the World Bank, is unfortunate, not because the World Bank does not generate good ideas, but, in his view, because ideas are not the monopoly of any one institution. Over the last 50 years, there has been very rich development thinking from a multiplicity of actors. Certainly within the UN, sources such as UN Human Development Reports, UNCTAD, UNICEF's *Adjustment with a Human Face*, are very important sources. There are also rich ideas from the South that do not get any mention in the LTS. CIDA should be building its analysis on a broader set of ideas from a multiplicity of institutions. This diversity of perspective is critical if one assumes, as he does, that the "globalisation divide" is real. The World Bank and the IMF in many respects have a very recent history of involvement in development thinking.

South-South modalities

CIDA and NGOs should be looking for opportunities to support South-South modalities. There is a lot of experience in the South, and we need to support that kind of interchange.

Civil society in the South

In terms of the role of civil society, in Mr. Malhotra's view, Southern organisations are in the forefront, and they must lead. The proper role of northern NGOs, bilaterals, multilaterals, including CIDA, should be to support sensitively southern capacity and southern positions. Continuing dialogue between northern and southern civil society organisations is essential. He suggested that there are important roles for northern NGOs, but one of them is not found in the aid resource transfer paradigm. Much more important is the role of northern NGOs in their own societies, and the roles of public engagement and policy influencing are fundamental roles that need to be supported. This, in his view, is not an "either/or" option, but work in the North by northern NGOs is more important. While there may be continuing roles for northern NGOs in the South, the modalities of that involvement need further attention. Some Canadian NGOs have tried to genuinely engage with southern partners, and Canadian NGOs have been at the forefront of seeking more equitable relationships, as compared to NGOs from other northern countries.

CIDA should act on some of the cutting-edge development thinking in Canada. A case in point is the issue of partnership and conditionality, as expressed for instance by Gerry Helliener in a recent paper "*Towards Balance in Aid Relationships: External Conditionality, Local Ownership and Development*".

A fundamental rationale for aid, from a southern perspective, should be solidarity with the South. The most important context has to be the asymmetries that currently exist in global governance in a whole range of areas. Addressing these issues has to be a major arena for Canadian support to southern governments and southern civil society. The goals to be supported can be found in

the Millennium Summit Declaration, which includes the 2015 targets, but also many other policies that have to do with the roles and responsibilities of industrialised countries.

Finally, in his view, the UN commitments in the 1990s have to be backed up with financial support and the 2002 UN High Level Financing for Development Process will be very important for the future of those commitments.

2.4 Brian Emmett, Vice-President, Policy Branch, CIDA

Brian Emmett commented on the origins of the LTS. The LTS was necessary because the world has been changing in fundamental ways and CIDA needs to change accordingly. He then touched on some of the factors that impact on the changes being contemplated in the LTS.

Factors Impacting Change at CIDA

First, he pointed to the unprecedented consensus in the late 1990s on the need to fight the deficit, which involved hard decisions. CIDA was one of the casualties and lost 30% of funding in cash terms.

Secondly, globalisation of the economy is underway along with the globalisation of other agendas, including the environment through multilateral conventions, health, and security. He remarked on his surprise at the critique provided by NGOs of the terms "global public goods" and "mutual interests". He referred to CCIC's quote from Nelson Mandela "*security for a few is insecurity for all*", which is a global public good rationale, and yet people are saying that this is not something we want to build on.

Third is the emergence of concern for aid effectiveness, focusing on models for doing business that are less project oriented and more focused on government institutions to get policy regimes that are right, or at least better.

Fourth, he pointed to far greater emphasis in recent Canadian public sector management on getting results, transparency and accountability. We have very comprehensive requirements to be accountable to elected representatives and to report against those goals. Today, the performance of government in terms of handling cash is under a microscope. The system is much more risk-averse than it was two or three years ago. As much as we would like to get rid of excess paper burden, the reality of our accountability is pointing in another direction.

The Role of the Private Sector

He noted that in the discussions to date with NGOs, there has not been any mention of the growing role of the private sector. Roughly speaking, for every dollar of aid that flows from the developed world to the developing world, the private sector puts \$3 to \$4 in direct investment. While the private sector's objectives are different from CIDA's or the NGOs', their role is a major issue that we should be examining. There is also the emergence of philanthropic mega institutions, like the Gates Foundation or Ted Turner, that are starting to have influence and want

to have a say in the agenda. For Mr. Emmett, it is a gap in our thinking, which is not addressed in the LTS.

Asserting a Convincing Claim for CIDA in Government

At a time when CIDA has a role to play in globalisation in terms of the increased importance of placing poverty on the agenda, CIDA can be seen as a depleted organisation. According to Mr. Emmett, CIDA has not shown an ability to assert a convincing claim to the interest and money of the average Canadian taxpayer. Under these circumstances, CIDA cannot afford to be lacking in management, approach and mission. The taxpayers are less interested in whether we are good stewards of Canadian values and are much more interested in CIDA being good stewards of Canadian money. We have to be able to show both. In order to advance our values, we have to be good managers.

That is the contextual underpinning for the review. Over time, this process has become very comprehensive. The Minister has announced an important social development agenda and CIDA has established priorities. CIDA has looked at the rationale for aid and is now looking at aid effectiveness. These changes have accomplished a major goal of removing the negative perception in government about CIDA. What remains is to build that positive, forward-looking, creative agenda that people will not be able to resist.

A Systematic but Incremental Approach to Change

Mr. Emmett cautioned that change within CIDA is easily over-emphasised. Change is going to be incremental rather than radical. CIDA will want to take a balanced approach, a portfolio of projects and program approaches that are diversified, and that are implemented in responsible ways to minimise risk to ourselves and to our partners.

Mr. Emmett proposed that new approaches be undertaken in systematic ways. CIDA and NGOs should function as continuous learning organisations, and they can do this through a very simple model of plan – do – evaluate – learn- adjust.

In the future, ideas will be as important as money to assess impact. CIDA will look to NGOs as sources of ideas, innovation and agenda setting, as much as look at them as executing agencies and partners in the business of development. He predicted that one important change would be that the number of partners will be larger and the composition of these partners will change.

Putting the southern partners in the driver's seat is the goal, but are we genuinely willing to let people go? Mr Emmett observed that this willingness is yet to be verified. It is a fundamental question for CIDA and for NGOs.

A positive proposal for coordinated donor approaches raises some questions about accountability to Parliament on the expenditure of Canadian money. Is our Auditor General going to accept audits from other donor countries? Are we going to be able to turn this assurance to developing countries?

Mr. Emmett closed by suggesting that we talk to each other too much. He urged us to spend more time talking to people who do not think about these issues. The results of public policy processes demonstrate limited public interest in development. We need to be reaching out much more.

3. Key issues raised in plenary discussions and in workshops

The discussions in plenary and in workshops are being presented in this report under the major themes that were addressed throughout the meeting. It is impossible to capture the full richness and nuances of the discussions in all of the workshops and plenary sessions, but what follows is attempting to provide the major critical points raised by NGOs as well as CIDA comments and reactions.

3.1 A donor consensus on aid effectiveness?

Participants were critical of CIDA's projection of a global consensus within the development community, not only highlighting the lack of consensus between North and South, but also the absence of consensus in the North. There is a plurality of perspectives, and in fact there is an emerging counter-consensus. Participants encouraged CIDA's LTS to recognise the legitimacy and importance of this plurality in development thinking, which would bring the Agency to situate its strategic directions, not so much in continuity with the discourse of the World Bank and the IMF, but in line with the values of many Canadians who support international cooperation. Understanding the need for continuous learning rooted in pluralism would require CIDA to balance its support for different types of programs and in many of these, civil society would play a central role.

Mr. Good responded that the differences on this issue are mainly linked to a choice of words and nuance. In his view, there is consensus on principles such as donor coordination, developing country leadership, realistic time frames and working with civil society and governments. Any attempt to extend consensus to broader issues or to approaches for implementation starts breaking down. But if relationships are built on these types of principles, and institutions like the World Bank and IMF agree, then these institutions can be challenged if they do not adhere to the principles. He suggested that an alternate position that there is no consensus leads nowhere in terms of holding major donor institutions accountable.

3.2 The Rationale for Aid

A participant noted a disturbing lack of passion in the LTS relating to the ethical obligation to help the most vulnerable, as opposed to its enthusiasm for furthering Canada's "enlightened self-interests". Discussion of the question of "enlightened self-interests" as a rationale for Canadian aid revealed some fundamental disagreements between CIDA and most NGOs. For CIDA, the emphasis is placed much more on appropriate macro-economic policies that will bring developing countries into the market economy and which will ultimately serve the interests of the poor. The thrust of the *CCIC Commentary* and the "counter-consensus" is that domestic and international markets do not operate automatically and mechanically to the advantage of the poorest, quite the contrary. The majority of Canadians moreover are motivated by a humanitarian

and humanist approach to development, supporting initiatives by and for the poor themselves, and Canadian self-interests are a secondary consideration.

Gerry Barr suggested a key distinction in terms of the rationale of long-term self-interests. If we are looking at the purpose of development cooperation to enable all developing countries to subsequently pursue "global public goods", then there is no problem. If we are posing Canadian pursuit of "global public goods" at the expense of national development strategies and at the expense of commitment to eradicate poverty, then there is a problem. All aid, which targets poverty eradication, is international cooperation, but all policy dimensions of international cooperation is more than aid, and these policies may include the pursuit of Canadian enlightened self-interests, consistent with the eradication of poverty.

An NGO participant noted that in Africa, there is only 1% of Canadian international investment, and yet Africa receives roughly 40% of the aid budget. The role of aid in international cooperation is therefore crucial for Africa. What are the prospects and implications of the LTS for maintaining a high priority for Africa, within a rationale of "enlightened self-interests"?

For CIDA, Len Good suggested the reasons for focusing on self-interests are twofold. First, Canadians are increasingly concerned with global problems that require global solutions in which developing countries must have the capacity and the interest to be involved. CIDA is trying to engage a broader section of the Canadian public on issues that concern them. The notion is obviously not meant as short-term interests in egotistical terms. According to Mr. Good, there seems to be a communications problem with the use of the term "self-interests".

Although most NGOs agree with the centrality of poverty eradication, there is a need for more discussion on whether the rationale should be broader to reflect a more holistic approach. Mr. Malhotra suggested that the goal of aid should be human development and should encompass the fight against all types of abuses to human dignity. A participant suggested, for example, that the issue of labour development and other labour related questions should be considered part of development work. In doing so, CIDA should be paying more attention to multilateral approaches within international fora like the International Labour Organisation. Others pointed out that NGOs have been involved for many years with people in areas of prolonged crises. Canadians are very supportive of this type of work that is dealing with the most vulnerable people in the most difficult situations. There needs to be assurances that CIDA will continue to support work in difficult areas in the future, even if the Canadian interests are not obvious.

Equally important in this discussion is the question of policy coherence. There are contradictory policies within government that impede what NGOs and CIDA are trying to accomplish in development cooperation. CIDA officials suggested that the Agency will keep its specificity and will try to influence other departments, specifically Finance and DFAIT to achieve policy coherence.

Mr. Good reiterated that the ethical obligation to poverty reduction is central and there is a genuine commitment within the Agency to the ethics of development, while recognising that there are other problems. Obviously the LTS is not a communications piece. It is nothing more than a bureaucratic document that was meant largely for government consumption. CIDA is not

promoting hard-nosed macroeconomics perspectives, although the private sector and issues of economic growth cannot be ignored. Equity and distribution of wealth are fundamental and central to the mandate.

3.3 Instruments for implementing strategic directions

NGO participants accepted the possibility and the importance of agreement on development principles, but were concerned that CIDA has often used implementation instruments that have been contrary to these principles. There is much less consensus on the means for development cooperation. The principles have largely been the same over the last 30 years, even if they have been reformulated. While there is a renewal of principles, has CIDA analysed why we have not been able to deliver on the principles? The NGO experience could be helpful in providing insights.

Some NGOs noted that they are increasingly in a competitive situation with the private sector and with other NGOs in the open bidding contractual environment. The result of such an environment is a trend towards short-term objectives for the winning of contracts. In the open bidding system, CIDA has become directive and much less responsive to creative ideas that could come from NGOs and their southern partners. Much learning comes from responsive types of programming, and the existing environment therefore is at odds with the notion of learning and innovating.

A multiplicity and diversity of donors are increasingly interested in national poverty reduction plans (PRPs) as an important tool to orient their programming. NGOs raised some concerns that the participatory principles behind donor approaches to PRPs are not applicable to many developing countries. NGOs have long-standing relationships with communities, and these types of relationships run the danger of being replaced by multiple donor agreements with governments. NGO relationships are built on trust, which is an essential element for successful long-term community development. How will these types of relationships be maintained in the context of donor-government programs in support of national PRPs?

Coordinated donor support for Sector Wide Approaches (SWAs) might impede the traditional pluralism of complementary approaches to development. According to NGO participants, there are two fundamental concerns regarding SWAs: Who determines the programming directions? What is the influence of donor agendas on these directions?

3.4 Local ownership

The principle of "local ownership" is complex. Participants noted that the LTS lacks clarity on what local ownership might mean in practice. Implementation of this principle has to be carefully qualified so as not to support oppressive regimes. A fundamental question is who chooses which local owners?

It was suggested that if CIDA is going to structure its program relationships in terms of local ownership, there needs to be a built-in tolerance for mistakes and adjustments. More involvement and acknowledgement is essential of the role of civil society organisations in

developing countries in forming the agenda, in policy setting and not only implementation. Such an approach has to be accompanied by a stronger recognition of the importance of strengthened leadership capacity amongst civil society partners in developing countries.

Others pointed out that local ownership implies recognising diversity and dissent as strengths. We should not be working only with those who can meet reporting requirements, and directing our engagement towards building capacity to meet those requirements. The LTS should reflect more on the synergy between civil society and CIDA supporting groups at different levels of development. Development cooperation programs require a better understanding of the relationship between civil society and governments working on poverty eradication. Governments cannot tackle poverty without citizens.

NGO participants pointed out that the purpose of CIDA core funding and responsive funding mechanisms is similar to the new approaches in the LTS relating to ownership of development strategies by partners. These mechanisms respond to the need for innovation and learning and recognise diversity, local knowledge, iterative and arms length approaches, and low-level management burdens.

CIDA officials suggested that the Agency is not intending to support a developing country whatever it intends to do. With local ownership, CIDA is attempting to better understand the intentions and plans of developing countries in terms of the vision of poverty reduction, and if CIDA agrees with these strategies, then they will support them. This does not include work in all areas and clearly CIDA does not want to get into the situation where imposing conditionalities works against local ownership. CIDA will not work exclusively with governments, and civil society organisations, North and South, are important partners.

3.5 Role of civil society and NGO policy roles

Participants pointed to a perception within CIDA, reflected in the LTS, that NGOs are merely executing agencies, and that NGOs see aid as a market in which to do business and to protect their own interests. While clearly there are many different interests involved in aid, Canadian NGOs in this discussion are more concerned about vision, values and the objectives of development, that goes beyond their own particular role.

NGO participants shared an overwhelming agreement with the concern raised by the CCIC *Commentary* on the gaps in the October draft LTS in terms of dealing with the role and place of civil society, North and South, as major actors in development.

Within the existing foreign policy environment, NGOs recognise that CIDA faces difficult political challenges. CIDA has to re-establish its credibility with Cabinet and with other federal departments. CIDA is bound by a collective government responsibility for foreign policy once Cabinet determines policy. A CIDA official pointed out that there would not be one trade policy for CIDA and another for other departments. NGOs are also engaged with other departments and will have to choose their priorities in terms of the policies they wish to influence.

Participants pointed to wider popular participation as a fact of political life. Southern organisations have claimed a much more prominent place in their own societies and in international fora. At the same time, there is a widespread frustration and sense of loss of citizenship, as public decisions are taken behind closed doors. One of the more fundamental questions is the role of Canadian civil society in supporting southern organisations to participate in the big debates at a global level. There are structural barriers to the participation of NGOs in global governance debates. For CIDA and for NGOs, it is crucial that we work at providing more space to the South. How can CIDA ensure space for Southern voices in their own policy and programming fora?

CIDA officials challenged Canadian NGOs to challenge CIDA even more than they have done in the past. NGO participants argued that CIDA fora are not as accessible as they could be. CIDA's methods and procedures for registering opinions and entering into dialogue are not obvious. The LTS is a case in point, since there is not clarity as to the process by which partners can enter into a dialogue. NGOs and CIDA need to enhance their capacity for policy dialogue.

3.6 Public Engagement

One of the voluntary sector's strengths is its ability to engage the Canadian public. While recognising the importance of being increasingly engaged in Canada, participants suggested that NGOs should not cut themselves from their engagement with NGOs and communities in the South. The sector's credibility comes from its institution and people linkages with counterparts in the South. The choice is not either working in support of southern organisations or working in the North. The question for Canadian NGOs is much more a question of how to work in the South and the quality of these relationships. The accompaniment of southern organisations can be expressed in many different ways. The connections on the ground with people's lives are essential, as are the North/South connections between people.

Participants strongly supported the fundamental importance of public engagement in Canada as a long-term strategy within a development strategy. Its purpose is not merely information, communications or education, but it is also related to Canadians' definition of how they understand their role as global citizens, influencing and participating in development. Engagement, communications and feedback need to be applied in a coherent and comprehensive framework.

Many workshop participants supported the investment of greatly increased resources in public engagement in order to enhance its effectiveness. To engage a much wider range of the Canadian public, NGOs need to be able to access the media. Currently, there are very limited resources for professional media work and there are structural barriers (i.e. who controls the media) for alternative voices to have impact on the media.

CIDA officials responded that the Agency recognises the importance of public engagement. The LTS provides partners and CIDA an opportunity to reflect on the challenges ahead and the directions the Agency should pursue in many areas, including public engagement. The Minister launched the Public Engagement Strategy in November 1999 to guide CIDA and its partners in adopting a common vision to engage Canadians. The strategy calls for the adoption of

complementary objectives and approaches, increased collaboration, improved sharing of information on best practices and the development of tools to measure progress. The Public Engagement Strategy explores the "what" (common vision) and the "how" to interact with Canadians. The discussions on the LTS Framework, particularly on the rationale for aid, will help us define the common vision that will guide our public engagement interventions. And improving the ways in which we work together in the area of public engagement is essential regardless of the outcome of the discussions. On the questions of the values-based rationale or enlightened self-interest rationale, CIDA officials commented that regardless of the outcome of discussions on the LTS, establishing relevance would be critical. Both rationales can be used to establish relevance. Finally, CIDA does not necessarily accept the notion of structural barriers that impede NGO access to the media. Other sectors, such as the environmental organisations, have been able to strongly influence the media.

3.7 Knowledge-Led Organisations

Participants noted that the LTS is vague about the source of development knowledge, its nature and its importance. "Knowledge" appears in the document as something quite static, almost as a commodity that can be acquired, rather than a fundamental part of the development process. In a more complex understanding of development knowledge, it is incumbent upon CIDA and NGOs to nurture other forms of knowledge in places where people live.

It was proposed that CIDA adjust its contract and contribution agreements to enable a more conscious investment in knowledge. This would include more investment in applied policy and programming research, in organisational learning, and in advocacy and policy dialogue. Regular opportunities for dialogue and learning can be created and the emerging "knowledge networks", such as the Civil Society Network within CIDA, should be opened up to people and organisations outside the Agency.

3.8 Accountability

In consultations, it was pointed out that we often focus on the things that are wrong in our relationship with CIDA, rather than building on the things that have been right. One of the strong points of the CIDA/NGO relationship is the acceptance of the notion of risk. In the current context, a lot of emphasis is placed on accountability and NGOs agree that this principle is important. But to what degree will increasingly regimented regimes of accountability limit the taking of risks? Are bureaucratic regimes limiting NGOs involvement in initiatives tackling poverty reduction in more difficult and complex situations or in initiatives that are exploring innovative so-far untested approaches?

While participants agreed that accountability is essential to their legitimacy, the increasing demands in terms of audits and control mechanisms are endangering their creativity and innovation in programming. Results cannot be easily assessed in the short-term, and sometimes not easily measured and attributed. More realistic time frames for the achievement of results, and a less bureaucratic approach for documenting results, would be more consistent with the approaches outlined in the LTS.

It was proposed that CIDA undertake a consultative process that would suggest solutions to issues related to implementation and accountability mechanisms, which would be based, in part, on the experiences of civil society in development. Many Canadian NGOs have developed expertise over the years in working through complex accountabilities with a multitude of partners, including southern NGOs, other governments (North and South), the World Bank, other international NGOs and donors.

Case studies and evaluations from NGO experience, with core responsive funding for NGO innovation in these areas, should inform and influence the shaping of new mechanisms being developed by CIDA as well as the structures and processes for multiple levels of accountability within them.

Participants from NGOs agreed with and supported the reported discussions that CIDA is having with Treasury Board and the Auditor General on issues of accountability. However, they also suggested that it is important that CIDA invite input from its partners. CIDA should be identifying other actors who also have a stake in negotiating the accountability framework. By engaging with its partners on these issues, CIDA will benefit from their perspectives and experience, and will be able to generate support from a wider Canadian community.

3.9 Resources

A key requirement for credible program and policy effectiveness is the sufficiency of resources allocated for ODA. All participants agreed that Canada needs to deliberately work towards the 0.7% of GNP target for aid. The finances of the government have improved. There is broad consensus on basic policies and renewed social priorities for CIDA. CIDA's long-term strategy will be incomplete if it were not to address the question of resources. The October draft makes some specific proposals for a multi-year plan to increase Canadian ODA to 0.35% of GNP, on the way to realising the goal of 0.7%. A resourcing strategy is essential.

While NGOs make significant financial contributions to their programs, it was pointed out that they face increased CIDA pressures for additional resources that are often not covered by existing agreements. For instance, NGOs have to invest their own resources for environmental assessments, professional expertise and other types of costs in program development for projects that may or may not be funded by CIDA responsive mechanisms in bilateral Branches.

According to CIDA officials, the most effective way of influencing Cabinet decision makers for increased aid resources is to demonstrate that the Agency knows where it is going, knows what it wants to do and how it will do it effectively. Decision-makers also want to be certain that the funds will be well managed. As to when and if CIDA will get an increased budget, the Prime Minister has made references to increased assistance as a government priority, but the question of how much and over what time period is still not determined.

3.10 The LTS Change Process and the Process for Consultation

Participants recognised that the need for change applies to CIDA and to Canadian NGOs, and that the kind of change required is fundamental. Restructuring CIDA is crucial to its ability to

deliver. CIDA officials pointed out that most organisations are not very insightful about their own weaknesses. We all need pressure from outside if we are going to change. CIDA therefore needs the critique and the support from inside and outside, to be motivated to change. But participants pressed CIDA on the steps it intends to take to ensure a much wider participation of NGOs, Canadians and southern partners in the process of change? One important question is the timing for public discussion or hearings on the Long-Term Strategy.

It is important for NGOs that discussions, such as this one, between CIDA and NGOs, be disseminated widely throughout the Agency to ensure that all levels of CIDA staff be made aware of the concerns and recommendations.

As to a formal public review process, it was reported to participants that the Minister is going to Cabinet in the spring with the results of this current LTS process, but at this point it is not yet clear whether there will be a major review. DFAIT is considering its own foreign policy review and whether CIDA will be part of that review is also not clear. .

4. Conclusion

4.1 A perspective from CIDA

Charles Bassett, Senior Vice-President

Mr. Bassett reviewed some of the key themes that were discussed during the two days.

Consensus

He reported that the first point that struck Len Good was that there is not one global consensus, that there are variations of consensus, and that this plurality could enrich our dialogue.

Civil society

The major accomplishments of NGOs in previous years are what NGOs have done with and for southern NGOs. The development of southern NGOs has been remarkable as well as significant. Southern organisations are pushing CIDA and northern NGOS to give them space and support and they want their northern partners to redouble efforts to influence civil society development. This emphasis is related to the need for donors to work together with civil society and with governments.

Recipient Country Leadership

The concept of having the recipient country in the driver's seat does not necessarily mean having the recipient *government* in the driver's seat. There are many countries where we would not like to see the government in the driver's seat, but there are many elements of civil society with whom CIDA would work.

Poverty Agenda

Regarding the poverty agenda and a holistic approach to development, Mr. Bassett thought that CIDA's current mandate is as good as is politically possible. One of the reasons CIDA does not want to change this mandate in the LTS, is the belief that the notion of sustainable development to reduce poverty from *Canada in the World* is effectively addressing the real issue. However, the six priorities provide some difficulties by opening up the entire field. You can do anything within those priorities and that is why CIDA needs some re-focussing.

Horizontal Programming

A lot of concerns were raised about this question of working horizontally with other donors and governments, and we have to be very careful not to do this at the expense of existing programs and at the expense of programs we want to develop in the future. The reason for horizontal approaches is to increase effectiveness, but we do not want to spend all our attention on this at the expense of the results CIDA wants to achieve in projects and programs.

Knowledge

One of the themes is the need to create space for the exchange of ideas and for the creation of knowledge. It is one of the big challenges and a challenge within the Agency and between the Agency and outside. How do we do it within programs and between ourselves and other governmental departments, partners, international organisations and recipient countries? It is such a difficult area and something that CIDA must address.

Self-interests

A major discussion point has been the distinction between the ethical imperative and self-interest. Mr. Bassett pointed out that there is no doubt that the main reason CIDA exists is because as a country we have to be there. The majority of Canadians think that Canada should be there because Canada is more fortunate than others and that we should give our support to those who are not as fortunate as we are. However, if 20% of the Canadian population is not convinced by the ethical argument and they could be convinced by the notion of self-interest, then we should use self-interest.

Consultation

This is clearly a consultation. Both informal and formal meetings are all part of a process. Mr. Bassett suggested that there is not a clearly defined process at this point because senior management at CIDA do not know exactly where our long term strategy is going and how we are going to get there.

Mr. Bassett concluded with the assurance that CIDA does not have everything written in stone. Among the principles that are written in stone is partnership, which is one of the most crucial elements of this whole move forward. CIDA cannot do it alone and NGOs are clearly among the

principal partners. NGOs have been in development as long as CIDA, sharing the same interests and NGOs have expertise that is complementary to CIDA's.

Mr. Bassett pointed out that we are prisoner to other systems; we are prisoner to the governmental system, the bureaucratic system, the Treasury Board submissions, memoranda to Cabinet, and those are presenting their own schedule that must be followed. Because CIDA must present a memorandum to Cabinet on a certain date does not imply that any discussion with our partners after that date is a sham. Several processes can go in parallel. CIDA is seeking as rich and as diverse an input of ideas as possible to get as close as possible to the best solutions.

Responding to a Changing World

Today's context is very different than in the period of the 1990s. In the latter half of the 90s, CIDA was very busy defending itself against cuts, against pressures to preserve program integrity, pressures to get into more countries, pressures to do far more projects with far less money and was not paying sufficient attention to what was happening outside. It is now a different world for CIDA and a lot of collective effort is needed to catch up.

Mr. Bassett suggested that CIDA and NGOs share the same interests and yet we spend a lot of time and energies on our differences, rather than spend time developing a common effort to get to a better end. How do we get there together? How do we benefit from each other's knowledge and interest?

Mr. Bassett concluded with the need to continue with these kinds of consultations in general terms, but also on the need to have exchanges on specific themes (such as capacity building or governance). The whole point is to learn from these dialogues.

In his view, the vision that Len Good has put forward is a vision that most people in CIDA share. It is a vision that is worthwhile; it is a collective, inclusive and comprehensive vision. It suggests a future that CIDA can share with its partners, because we can be most successful if we do it together.

4.2 A CCIC perspective

CCIC heard and received many very positive comments about the meeting and much appreciation for the openness and thoughtful participation of both CIDA and NGOs. This kind of dialogue is clearly an important and significant forum in which to have discussions at both practical and fairly high levels of abstraction. The following points relate to both process and content and were raised during or immediately following the two-day meeting.

A public and Open Process of Consultation

It was recognised that this meeting is clearly part of a longer consultation process, but at the same time, it should not and does not replace the need for broader and more public consultations, such as a public parliamentary review would provide. For NGOs, the issues discussed are

fundamental and are crucial to Canada's role internationally. They cannot be left to informal modes of discussion.

CIDA officials repeated throughout the meeting that they consider this be the front-end of the process, with continued dialogue and further consultation forthcoming. The Minister reiterated this point by stating that the process is very much in an embryonic phase. NGOs are engaged in this process in profound and thoughtful ways, and are also engaged in the long-term. It is therefore important that CIDA continue to perceive the legitimacy of our positions and continues, as Mr. Len Good has indicated, to engage in significant and genuine ways, and on diverse issues.

Long-Term Self-Interests

CIDA heard very clearly the concerns related to the emphasis placed on the pursuit of Canadian self-interests. Such a rationale for aid can be construed negatively and at the expense of the ethical obligation for the eradication of poverty. Although the mission of CIDA is not likely to be modified, the use of terms such as "self-interests" and "global public goods" need further clarification and explication.

Civil Society

NGOs continue to be concerned that there is a lack of understanding within CIDA for the place and role of civil society in all development processes. Many of the comments were made on how the new approaches can be construed as excluding civil society. Although there has been some indication that there will be some more thinking about this issue, it is still very uncertain as to how civil society will be treated in the next and final versions of the LTS.

Source of Development Thinking

NGOs were very critical of the assumptions about the existence of a consensus and the fact that the development thinking current informing the LTS is too narrowly focussed on the thinking of the World Bank and OECD. The workshop spent some time on the LTS notion of an existing consensus, and other views such as those presented by Kamal Malhotra and other participants that question this consensus, merit some further attention.

Public Engagement

CIDA and NGOs agree on the urgency of the looking at the question of how to engage the Canadian public in fundamental ways. There needs to be more investment not only in terms of financial resources, which are necessary, but there also needs to be more critical and creative thinking to elaborate a comprehensive plan to move on this issue. While communication and information are important elements, we all agree that engagement strategies and activities go much further. We all need to struggle with how to genuinely engage the Canadian public from an ethical and moral obligation perspective.

Mr. Cameron Charlebois, Chair of the Board of CCIC, closed the meeting, by thanking participants for their thoughtful contributions as well as all those who worked to make the Roundtable and Workshop possible. He expressed the commitment of CCIC and its members to continue to work with CIDA to help shape effective long-term strategic directions.

Appendix I

CCIC-CIDA Consultation February 22-23, 2001 Participants

1. Silvana Anania, YMCA Canada
2. Gerry Barr, Canadian Council for International Cooperation
3. Charles Bassett, Canadian International Development Agency
4. Pierre Beaudet, Alternatives
5. John Beggs, Canadian International Development Agency
6. Rick Bélanger, Canadian International Development Agency
7. Yves Bergevin, Canadian International Development Agency
8. Clare Bonnell, CESO
9. Andrea Paula Botto, Canadian Council for International Cooperation
10. Tony Breuer, Partners in Rural Development
11. Ray Burzynski, Canadian International Development Agency
12. Carla Castaneda, Canadian International Development Agency
13. Marcel Custeau, Canadian International Development Agency
14. Gilles Cérat Fondation, Jules et Paul –Emile Léger
15. Cameron Charlebois, CCIC Board Chair
16. Michel Chaurette, CECI
17. Andrew Clark, Canadian International Development Agency
18. Jim Cornelius, Canadian Foodgrains Bank Association
19. Robert Craig, World University Service of Canada
20. Jacquie Dale, Canadian Council for International Cooperation
21. Claire Dansereau, CUSO
22. René De Grâce, UNICEF
23. Jennifer Deveney, British Columbia Council for International Co-operation
24. Athena Dionela, Philippine Development Assistance Program
25. Pierre Dionne, Conseil international de l'action sociale Canada
26. Roger Dumelie, Canadian International Development Agency
27. Chris Eaton, Aga Khan Foundation
28. Roger Ehrhardt, Canadian International Development Agency
29. Brian Emmett, Canadian International Development Agency
30. Joanne Ferguson, Canadian Co-operative Association
31. Louise Filion, Canadian International Development Agency
32. Peachy Forbes, Philippine Development Assistance Program
33. Helen Fytche, WaterCan/EauVive
34. Francine Gagné, Canadian International Development Agency
35. Ron Garson, Canadian International Development Agency

36. H  l  ne Giroux, Canadian International Development Agency
37. Robert Gonneville, Terre Sans Fronti  res
38. Len Good, Canadian International Development Agency
39. Bruce Goodman, CoWater International
40. Nancy Gordon, CARE
41. Andr   Gosselin, Canadian International Development Agency
42. Janice Hamilton, Manitoba Council for International Cooperation
43. Richard Harmston, South Asia Partnership
44. Janet Hatcher-Roberts, Canadian Society for International Health
45. Bruno H  bert, Canadian International Development Agency
46. Dale Hildebrand, Inter-Church Action for Relief and CCIC Board
47. Barbara Hogan, Voluntary Service Overseas Canada
48. J.P. Horrigan, Canadian Jesuits International
49. Andrew Ignatieff, Anglican Church PWRDF
50. Bill Janzen, Mennonite Central Committee
51. Jill Johnson, Department of Finance
52. Daniel Joly, Canadian International Development Agency
53. Molly Kane, Inter Pares
54. Terry Keleher, Canadian International Development Agency
55. Jennifer Kitts, Action Canada for Population and Development
56. Friederike Knabe, USC Canada
57. Anne-Marie Lambert, Consultant
58. Madonna Larbi, MATCH International Centre
59. Lynda Leblanc, Canadian International Development Agency
60. Fabien Leboeuf, D  veloppement et paix
61. Oliver Lofton-Brook, Adventist Development and Relief Agency
62. John Lotssinger, Canadian International Development Agency
63. Daniel Lussier, Soci  t   de partage (SOPAR)
64. Fran  oise Mailhot, Canadian International Development Agency
65. Kamal Malhotra, UNDP
66. Blaine Marchand, Canadian International Development Agency
67. Carmina Matton, Canadian International Development Agency
68. Jean-Pierre, Mass   Fondation L  ger
69. Kevin McCort, CARE
70. Hunter McGill, Canadian International Development Agency
71. Bob Miller, Parliamentary Centre
72. Marlen Mondaca, Save the Children Canada
73. Esperanza Moreno, Canadian Council for International Cooperation
74. Gis  le Morin-Labatut, IDRC
75. Geeta Narayan, Canadian International Development Agency
76. Martha Nelems, Canadian International Development Agency
77. Francine N  m  h, AQOCI
78. Christie Neufeld, United Church of Canada
79. Lilly Nicholls, Canadian International Development Agency
80. Lambrina Nikolaou, Canadian Crossroads International
81. Anna Nitoslawska, Canadian Labour Congress

82. Kevin O'Brien, Canadian Feed the Children
83. Kelly O'Brien, Canadian Crossroads International
84. Peter Padbury, Department of Foreign Affairs & International Trade
85. John Paterson, Gems of Hope
86. Mathew Pearce, Canada World Youth
87. Yves Pétilion, Canadian International Development Agency
88. Betty Plewes, Voluntary Sector Initiative
89. Cranford Pratt, University of Toronto
90. Harry Qualman, United Nations Association in Canada
91. Melanie Quevillon, Canadian International Development Agency
92. Syed Sajjadur Rahman, Canadian International Development Agency
93. Ron Richmond, Saskatchewan Council for International Cooperation
94. Tony Rogge, Canadian Physicians for Aid and Relief
95. Alain Roy, Canadian Council for International Cooperation
96. Craig Ryan, Canadian International Development Agency
97. John Saxby, Canadian International Development Agency
98. Ruth Schneider, CUSO International Board Chair
99. Alana Scott, Operation Eyesight Universal
100. Bill Singleton, Canadian International Development Agency
101. Robert Slous, Salvation Army
102. Ian Smillie, Consultant
103. Gauri Sreenivasan, Canadian Council for International Cooperation
104. Pierre St-Cyr, Canadian International Development Agency
105. Ian Stein, Canadian Public Health Association
106. Rieky Stuart, Oxfam Canada
107. Bernard Taylor, Partnership Africa Canada
108. Nancy Thede, Rights and Democracy
109. Catherine Thompson, Foster Parents Plan
110. Ruth Thorkelson, Department of Finance
111. Brian Tomlinson, Canadian Council for International Cooperation
112. Laurier Trahan, Results Canada
113. Claire Trépanier, Canadian International Development Agency
114. Linda Tripp, World Vision Canada
115. Kathy Vandergrift, World Vision Canada
116. Alison Van Rooy, Canadian International Development Agency
117. Richard Veillette, Canadian International Development Agency
118. Pierre Véronneau, Oxfam Québec
119. Stephen Wallace, Canadian International Development Agency
120. Tom Wallace, Canadian International Development Agency
121. Gordon Walker, Results Canada
122. Vivian Williams, Canadian International Development Agency
123. Zonibel Woods, Action Canada for Population and Development
124. Mark Young, Canadian International Development Agency
125. Janet Zukowsky, Canadian International Development Agency