

**CCIC
CODE OF ETHICS**



**A Story
of Partnership
and Progress**

CCIC would like to thank the following people for their contributions to this story: Rick Arnold, Gerry Barr, Ron Elliott, Penny Fancy, Andrew Ignatieff, Esperanza Moreno, Karen Takacs, Susan Walsh, June Webber, and Barbara Wood.

Jennifer Fry is the primary author of this document with editing contributions from Anne Buchanan, Peter Puxley and Ann Simpson.

Additional information about the CCIC Code of Ethics program, including copies of the Partnership principles and standards in Arabic, English, French, Portuguese or Spanish, is available on the Ethics section of the CCIC web site at www.ccic.ca

© 2008 Canadian Council for International Cooperation

CCIC CODE OF ETHICS

A STORY OF PARTNERSHIP AND PROGRESS

In 2004, the Canadian Council for International Co-operation (CCIC) took the extraordinary step of adding a set of Principles and Standards regarding North-South Partnerships to its *Code of Ethics*. In doing so, it created a document unique in the world – one that sets the bar high for members and their partners.

This is the story of how CCIC and its members came to clarify and codify a collective understanding of what equitable partnerships mean and how they can be achieved.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH PARTNERSHIP

CCIC members and Southern civil society organizations (CSOs) entered the new millennium conscious of a shifting power dynamic. The old Northern donor/Southern recipient paradigm had been losing credibility and steam for some time. Northern and Southern organizations had been learning, through shared experience, that equitable relationships were the key to meaningful, sustainable development. Increasingly, CCIC members and Southern CSOs were forging *partnerships* based on honesty, trust and mutual respect.

The concept of partnerships was an informally accepted ideal among many CCIC members – one that evolved through years of experience of working in solidarity with Southern organizations. The hope was that all members would eventually share the same ideal. There were often spirited discussions between council members about how to shift the power dynamic. Questions would fly over where the *energy* was coming from, or who had the *leadership* in a development project. The answers more often than not, involved Southern ownership, and leadership on the ground by those who rightly, and most inextricably, are involved in the circumstances. There was always the notion of mutual partnership.

Meanwhile, there was a growing desire to formalize that ideal, to record the vision and ethical principles that should guide those partnerships. One reason was to make sure all members were working towards the same goals, “because when we talked about partnerships before,” says one member, “we often meant very different things.” Another reason was to guide those organizations that were still moving in the direction of a more equitable relationship.

While such a move was often discussed by members, they didn’t tackle it immediately, as they realized writing such a document would require serious debate and intensive consultation – a commitment of time and energy few CSOs could make, given their own day-to-day demands.

The Unitarian Service Committee (USC) is an example of a CCIC member that has been working through partnerships for years. It was at founder Dr. Lotta Hitschmanova's insistence that the USC has *never* used expatriates to run programs overseas. The philosophy was all about sustainability, says USC's Executive Director Susan Walsh. "If you really want things to last, people have to own those processes. If you have outsiders setting up and running programs, you don't develop expertise; ways of operating that are not indigenous to the area might not work over the long term. The program may end up being dependent on the outsider running the show, and when that person leaves, everything falls apart." Over the years, the results of working through local partners have been remarkable. These experiences have led to ongoing shifts in the partnership dynamic.

For example, USC has been helping to meet basic needs in Indonesia since 1975. In 1983, through local partners, it established USC Indonesia, primarily to help provide clean water and sanitation and to promote sustainable agriculture. In 1998 – following the downfall of General Suharto's 32-year dictatorship – USC Indonesia transformed itself into an autonomous organization called SATUNAMA. Not only did the new entity continue to meet basic needs, it also began to develop new skills and expertise in promoting democratic development.

The partnership has matured even further in the last decade, with SATUNAMA becoming a leader in training community leaders, government officials and local organizations in the principles of democracy and good governance. SATUNAMA is raising more than 80 per cent of its own funding, and USC estimates it will soon be completely independent. "We've shifted our relationship," says Susan Walsh, "to where operational funding is no longer the core of our partnership."

For USC, partnership in Indonesia has meant that local actors have the freedom not only to run their own programs, but to evolve in a new direction as well. "It's a new type of relationship," says Susan Walsh. "They don't have to be what we're about anymore."

At the same time, while most CCIC members were steadily moving towards an equitable partnership model, others were not. For the latter, a move towards this new power balance would mean a fundamental shift in attitude and practice. One member recalls the early characterization of the North-South power dynamic as "an inherent imbalance in the relationship, no matter what we did. We have the majority of the money, there seemed to be no way to balance it out. That made us reluctant to take on the challenge." It was clear, once they undertook the task, it would not be a simple one.

Ultimately, it was the new political climate of the post-September 11th era that pushed CCIC and its members into action. The terrorism threat around the world, and the Canadian government's hastily devised "security agenda", cast suspicion on the type of partnerships CCIC was trying to create. In short order, new legislation introduced by the federal government made it clear that any Canadian organization found to be deliberately or inadvertently aiding a person or group with links to terrorism could lose its charitable status, or even risk forfeiture of assets. CCIC members working in countries with internal conflicts (especially on humanitarian missions) were instantly vulnerable – their work with people on one side or another in the conflict could easily be seen as helping insurgents or terrorists.

One CSO spokesperson recalls CCIC members “hearing all sorts of advice from lawyers: be careful about advocacy, be careful what you say, it could jeopardize your charitable status. But at the same time, our partners in the South were saying: be strong in your political statements.”

More subtle was the inherent understanding in Canada’s new anti-terrorism legislation, reinforced by other charity laws, that control of aid money had to stay firmly in the North – which would undermine the new power dynamic Council members were forging with their overseas partners. Couple that frustration with worry about running afoul of the law, and CCIC members had the impetus they needed to adopt the issue of partnership in a formal and systematic way at the 2002 Annual General Meeting.

The CCIC membership gave emphatic support to the continued pursuit of equitable partnerships, and sought at the same time to articulate the relationship with overseas partners in a way that would respond to the challenges associated with the new security concerns in Canada. It was an effort to reinforce the commitment to Southern partners as legitimate civil society organizations, and to treat them with respect so to avoid having them automatically viewed as potential terrorists.

This was not to be done in a legal document. Members “did not want to create never-ending due diligence tools or have to consult more lawyers.” Instead, they wanted – in a climate that was very tense – a natural answer from CCIC that articulated the standards and principles to which members were committed. And they would be held to account – not by the law – but by other CCIC members.

ENHANCING THE CODE

Council members saw CCIC’s *Code of Ethics* as the place to enshrine the vision and ethical principles to guide their partnerships. The Code was designed originally to symbolize the desire for CCIC members to work together towards higher levels of ethical understanding and practice.

Members struck a Drafting Committee in the spring of 2002 to begin exploring how to enshrine partnership principles and standards in the code. Participants were nominated from the membership and also drawn from CCIC’s Ethics Review Committee. The idea was to mix ethical expertise with civil society organizations’ practical on-the-ground knowledge. The Committee agreed to follow the existing structure of the Code: just as there was a set of development principles, the goal was to create a set of partnership principles. And just as the Code included a set of conduct standards on governance, finances, fundraising and human resources the Committee wanted to create a set of standards on partnerships.

The Committee realized immediately there was a difficult task ahead, because it didn’t appear that any civil society organization in the world had ever tackled a partnership vision quite like this. Two Committee members took the initiative to create draft documents. They combed through existing codes from NGOs around the world, tracked down everything written about partnerships, and listened as members described their own experiences working in concert with Southern organizations. Their

combined efforts resulted in a preliminary set of both principles and standards. The Committee debated those preliminary ideas in e-mail exchanges and face-to-face meetings, before hammering out an initial draft document.

The process was iterative. The Committee absorbed and debated feedback from members, created new versions, and sent each version out again for comment – by e-mail, and in face-to-face discussions across the country.

The feedback was generally positive. Many members said that the ideas reflected the principles and values that already guided the work they were doing with Southern partners. But it is no surprise that other members struggled with some of the new ideas, trying to understand how they would adapt their practices to such a model.

THE CHALLENGES

The elements to consider were legion, and ranged from the practical to the esoteric. All comments and criticism were given fair consideration by the Committee, and the membership. These are some of the more memorable issues discussed:

- Many members wanted to know: *Who* should be considered partners? CIDA? Other Northern NGOs? What about Southern governments? The private sector? “We were, for example, seeing the trend towards partnerships with the private sector beginning to be promoted at the time by CIDA,” recalls one of the drafters. Council members decided that because an important reason for codifying the principles was to respond to the security agenda’s possible impact on relations with Southern civil society organizations, the focus must be on members’ relations with those groups. An explanation was written into the introduction of the Partnership Principles to make that clearer.
- Many wondered whether partners in the South should be asked to react to an early stage of the Partnership document, and perhaps to help shape some of its components. In other words, was this a Northern document, or did CCIC and its members expect to have a Southern buy-in to the principles and standards? Those in favour argued for a face-to-face North-South gathering specifically to discuss the Partnership Principles and Standards. The arguments against involved the expense and time it would take to involve Southern partners. Some wondered: *Which* Southern partners should be approached for buy-in? What were the expectations for compliance, given the fact that no global monitoring structure was in place? Others argued that the Code was a Northern document to guide Northern actions, so there was no real need to involve the South at all.

In the end, members agreed that it was to be a CCIC members’ document. Those CSOs wishing more could use the Partnership Standards and Principles as a base from which to negotiate an innovative relationship with any of their partners.

Since the Standards and Principles *would* affect Southern organizations, though, there was consultation. But it was to be a Canadian document, not a North-South shared document. The consultations involved sending the draft document to Southern colleagues in Asia, Africa, the Americas, and personal visits to CSOs in Brazil and Costa Rica by CCIC's Deputy Director, Esperanza Moreno. The feedback about the process was very positive, with groups commending CCIC for undertaking the challenge. Esperanza Moreno found that many of the organizations she met with "were experiencing pressures similar to those of Canadian CSOs in the new era of heightened security and the terrorism scare", so they understood and appreciated the steps being taken by CCIC to equalize the North-South dynamic in the face of demands to do the opposite. She also found that CSOs in the South were busy pursuing their own partnerships. One NGO in Brazil, for example, offered a description of its partnerships with local groups as a "strengthening of a network or movement, rather than a technical mechanism for transferring funds."

- Some members resisted mention of the power imbalance in the new elements of the Code. A member of the Drafting Committee says: "Some felt the power imbalance was meaningless, that it didn't exist because they were buddy-buddy with their Southern partner. They felt the issue shouldn't be raised or written into the document in black and white. Others felt it was obvious – those who have the money get the final say." But most Council members considered the idea to be at the very heart of what they were trying to achieve. They felt that while it is true that funding is an important element of power in the relationships, the dynamics are more complex than simply saying that those with the money hold the power. Canadian organizations have their own vulnerabilities, and increasingly partners are working in collaborative ways on policy and programming issues, implicating both parties in the outcomes. The reality is that a mutual dependency exists, and so should be acknowledged by partners.

In the end, members pushed for this forceful statement in the Standards: *Strong partnerships include action to address inequalities due to power imbalances. Partners shall identify and attempt to adopt concrete measures to enhance equitable relations.*

- Early drafts of the Standards – the section that most directly affects organizations – drew criticism from many Council members for being too prescriptive. They felt there were many aspects of their relationships that were difficult to define and hard to pursue in the normative ways outlined in the drafts. It was suggested that the level of detail in the Standards would limit the potential to have different kinds of partnerships. For example, the draft called for a written memorandum of understanding initially, to fully spell out, in detail, the expectations for the partnership. One Council member says there were, "initial discussions where some groups were opposed to writing things down, putting it in writing. We understood, having written contracts for relationships can be tricky." In the end, it was agreed that the requirement was too bureaucratic and formal, that it reinforced the "contract" mentality, and that there are some places in the world where putting such detail in writing could actually be risky for local organizations. The Committee changed the Standard to allow instead for members to develop their own negotiated agreements with partners as they saw fit. Instead of insisting that partnership agreements be written, the Standards call for them to be *mutually acceptable* and *signed*. Other Standards were changed to make them less prescriptive as well, as the Council and its members sought a Code that would provide support to

organizations needing guidance on partnerships, but also provide room for innovation within an ethical framework.

- The idea of codifying the beginning, middle and end of a partnership was a giant leap for many members, and met with significant discussion. One member of the Drafting Committee remembers, “Before, you just had the partner write up a project proposal, you made the payment, and what else do you need? It was common that if a Canadian NGO ran out of money – funding was cut off, simple as that.” The effect on the Southern partner could be devastating. But many Northern CSOs balked at making the terms of the partnership more explicit, arguing that they needed flexibility to accommodate changes to their own funding situations.

In the end, it was agreed that, to lend some predictability to the partnership, the standards would include specified “timelines for evaluating whether and how the partnership shall continue”. This would help both sides be clear about where they stood, and make sure that development funds were being used as agreed. Those regular “check-ins” could also serve to alert the Southern partner to potential problems with future funding. The member of the Drafting Committee says, “If you’re adhering to the Code, then theoretically you’ve done a number of things to help your partner, you build in an assessment at a certain date, so it’s not a surprise, and that assessment could lead to continuing or ending the relationship. It’s an understanding – both partners know where they stand.”

The Committee also included several Standards that call for an orderly end to a partnership. The Code requires that plans to wind down a partnership be included in the initial agreement, and that there be a negotiated contingency plan should “catastrophic circumstances” jeopardize a funding partnership. In short, under the Code, a Northern partner can’t just terminate a partnership – there must be a respectful, organized and well-thought-out ending to it.

Some thought that Southern partners should be given a specified grace period – one suggestion was for a year – before funding was cut, to allow for time to find alternate funding. Most members felt that stipulating such time frames would be impossible, given the often capricious nature of funding for CSOs. Another idea that arose in discussions involved a members’ guarantee of bridge financing for their partners in the event of a severe shortfall in funds. In feedback, members and even Southern colleagues were very clear that this was asking too much, and the idea was dropped, with a recommendation that it be revisited in future discussions.

- Some members had difficulty imagining how the new Standards and Principles would work “out in the field”. One ethical question involved how to avoid returning to the old North-South paradigm to enforce the agreement. Northern CSOs didn’t want to burden their Southern partners excessively with reporting requirements, using funding “as a stick to keep the Southern partner in line”. Small Southern CSOs can face challenges in providing written reports, as one CCIC member spokesperson notes. “We require written reports from our Southern partners,” she says, as part of signed contracts. “Often those reports don’t show up. The partner usually has valid excuses: they are tiny and poor, with all of their members out in the field actually doing the work. Taking one person away from that work could represent a huge sacrifice for the project. You have to see it from their perspective, maybe they’re in Afghanistan and their office is bombed. Maybe they have

an old, non-functioning computer. Maybe there is a fluctuation in currency and they don't know how to figure out the money."

At the same time, she notes, "we, the Northern NGO have auditors wondering how the money was spent. We have a responsibility to our donors, who've given out of the goodness of their hearts, who want to know where the money went." CCIC members came to recognize that pushing for adherence to signed agreements was crucial to balancing power by making both partners equally responsible. Northern CSOs may have to give Southern partners more time or money to get the report written, to help them fulfill their side of the agreement, but "we can't let them off the hook, it was a condition of the original agreement, and they signed on to it." Solving such dilemmas through mutual agreement is the true hallmark of a partnership.

- The question of how to deal with inclusiveness and diversity required many discussions before Committee members and the membership were satisfied. One Committee member explained how, "Words such as *understanding differences* were considered, and then thrown out, because it was felt that no one could fully understand every culture or religion in the world. The word *tolerance* was also considered and then discarded, as it implied putting up with something even if you don't like it". Instead, the Committee chose the word *respect*, "because you don't have to understand it, or tolerate it, you just acknowledge the difference and that everyone has the right to be different". The Standards reflect that sentiment: "Respect for differences – including cultural, religious, socio-economic and political differences – shall be the hallmark of every partnership." To balance that, the Committee also chose to add this to the Partnership Principles: "partnerships should be formed in a *spirit* of inclusiveness that respects and promotes the value of diversity."

UNIQUE VISION FOR PARTNERSHIP

It took two years of consultation and revision for CCIC members to achieve a satisfactory set of Partnership Standards and Principles. Members ratified the revised *Code of Ethics* in May 2004.

What exactly had CCIC and its members created? CCIC President Gerry Barr reflects on what enshrining the Partnership Principles and Standards in the *Code of Ethics* gives the membership:

This is a response of a whole sector of how to relate to partners in the field. Doing this in a careful, open way is as good as it gets... it allows sector actors to engage in a coherent way in the face of a challenge. It creates a harbour in a tempestuous debate where NGOs can find resources to engage.... Its utility goes way past the precipitating context [the heightened concerns for security and the impact of anti-terrorism legislation, post-September 11, 2001] in which we found ourselves. This is a sector-articulated vision for equitable relationships, mutual accountability, transparency, risk-sharing, sharing trust, and appreciation of differences.

The original goal was to balance the North-South power dynamic, and that is spelled out clearly. There are expectations that Canadian organizations will sit down with Southern partners, have a conversation about what they are working towards together, come to an agreement and sign off on it.

Formalizing partnerships by spelling out vision, goals, roles, what happens when there is disagreement, etc. helps ensure that organizations put in practice the principle of equity. Canadian Crossroads International (CCI), for example, engages in long discussions about what each organization can do and what each can bring before they enter into agreements to work together. As Karen Takacs, Executive Director for the organization says, "The principles outlined in the Code embody our values of reciprocity and equity. While we had already developed agreements with partners, there were some things outlined in the standards that we would want to include in our agreements. We see this as an ongoing process for improvement in our discussions with partners. After all, we do have power, and even if we come with good intentions, it's possible for us to have undue influence on the work on the ground".

Over the past 8 years, CCI has undertaken a dramatic rethinking of what it does and how it does it. The organization has changed completely, primarily around the notion of how it works with partners. One of the fundamental changes is that rather than playing its former matchmaker role, finding counterparts in Canada for overseas partners, CCI now identifies Canadian groups and brings overseas partners to a "partnership shopping visit". The Southern partners decide who they want to work with, and how they want to work. Perhaps they want to have a Canadian volunteer, or a South-South exchange, or bring someone to Canada, for example. "As much as funding allows", says Karen Takacs, "we try to be flexible in ways that best support these kinds of international linkages. If a partner has decided they want to have a volunteer come to work with them, then they develop the position and criteria, review the résumés and sit in on the interviews."

During one such partner visit among women's rights groups, the African groups had chosen their partners, but they wanted to be able to continue to work with the other groups they had met. CCI now recognizes that there are many ways to promote solidarity without being formal partners. Women's rights is an area that allows groups who share similar goals, values and visions to come together as equals. Despite each group working in very different circumstances, they have been able to inspire one another. Issues such as women's rights and AIDS are truly global issues and, according to Karen Takacs, there is a lot to learn from one another. "Our organization has resources and expertise to share, but we're not the only experts".

CCI is living its vision for equitable partnership. While it sees these new ways of working as a more natural evolution, the changes have been profound. Nevertheless CCI understands that "it's an ongoing process and we're still figuring it out".

To date, no CCIC member has been challenged in the way initially feared after Canada enacted its anti-terrorism legislation. As Gerry Barr explains, the Standards and Principles will be a useful framework for debate – a template for response. The enhanced Code can also help create a united front for Canadian CSOs, demonstrating solidarity on issues of values and ethical practices.

Some members remain concerned and seek stronger measures to protect against the exacting legal problems presented by the anti-terrorism legislation. The more complex legal aspects of the new legislation are followed closely by CCIC through its membership in the International Civil Liberties Monitoring Group (ICLMG), a coalition set up shortly after the legislation was enacted.

COMPLIANCE

Once the revised Code was in place, it was then up to CCIC members to go through their own organizational practices, examine them against the Partnership Principles and Standards and report back to CCIC as to whether they were in compliance. This is part of CCIC's regular *Code of Ethics* self-certification process. Council members reported, for example, on whether they shared a common cause with their partners and had mutually acceptable signed agreements, with built-in time-lines for evaluation, and so on. Because some of the standards were "pushing the envelope", it was natural that some members said they "weren't there yet". Among the areas for improvement identified by members, and yet to be negotiated with partners, were how best to deal with conflict resolution, timelines for evaluating the partnership, and procedures for ending the partnership. For those who did feel they were in full compliance, the certification process reinforced their sense of being on the right track, and offered them the opportunity to explain and share what they'd learned from their own experiences.

As member organizations seek to improve their practice, the Principles give them inspiration. "We cannot achieve all of its ideals – but we *aspire* to achieve them," says one spokesperson. Those that have already complied with the Standards are encouraged to go further – to continue to seek to improve their practice and to share their experiences with other CCIC members.

Many members see the self-certification process as a positive one. It can be complex and time-consuming, but they find it to be a continuing test of the quality of their partnerships. They appreciate the reflection the process demands, because, while they may be in compliance now, "if staff changes, or circumstances change, these things [Principles and Standards] will continue, they won't be dropped. We're glad it's there."

The Canadian Nurses Association (CNA), the national professional voice representing more than 129,000 Canadian registered nurses, not only endorsed the CCIC Partnership Principles, but took the further step of incorporating them into its own Position Statement on International Health Partnerships. This statement spells out how the organization positions itself in its operations, and reinforces its core values. The Association found the Partnership Principles to be consistent with its organizational values and the nature of the work it does to advance global health and equity.

The spirit of partnership between CNA and the nursing associations of developing countries extends beyond the funding of projects. As it collaborates with national nursing associations and other health experts around the world, June Webber, Director of International Policy and Development at CNA says the Association finds that, "our partnerships bring to us in Canada a lot of learning from the South as well as supporting capacity-strengthening among the nursing profession internationally". The position statement helps the Association as it negotiates new international health partnership agreements, and spells out that "encouraging and establishing international health partnerships to advance global health and equity is part of CNA's commitment to social justice".

A LIVING DOCUMENT

CCIC members are very proud when they describe what they have accomplished with the Partnership Principles and Standards: “a tremendous product”, “an important step forward, gets us away from the charity-based model to a model based on solidarity”, “it just made sense, it fit with what we were already doing with our partners, it forces you to check in with what you are doing”.

CCIC members are adamant that the Partnership Principles and Standards not be “left on a shelf”, as one member of the Drafting Committee put it. “When we were working on it, it was alive, everyone knew about it. It should be a living, working document, brought out every couple of years at board meetings to remind people of what it’s all about”.

The North-South power dynamic continues to shift in ways that have little to do with money, and everything to do with partnership. CCIC member, CoDevelopment Canada (CoDev) experienced a graphic demonstration of this in 2005 during the labour dispute involving teachers in British Columbia. Many of its Southern partners – including teachers’ unions in Argentina, Mexico, Guatemala and Honduras – took it upon themselves to demonstrate at Canadian embassies, or meet with embassy staff to show solidarity with their B.C. counterparts. Unions in Brazil, Ecuador, Costa Rica, Panama and Peru wrote letters to the Canadian government supporting the teachers. As Barbara Wood, Executive Director of CoDev says, “It illustrates the mutual, reciprocal nature of our partnership – it transcends money, we are looking for things people have in common.”

There is every intention for Council members to review and update the new sections of the Code. Now that they have gone through the compliance process and thought about how their partnerships relate to the Standards in the Code, they’ll be better equipped to answer questions like: Is it too much? Not enough? Is something else needed?

After all, the philosophy behind the CCIC *Code of Ethics* is one of shared learning. Together, Council members can help one another to build more equitable partnerships.

APPENDIX

PARTNERSHIP PRINCIPLES¹

CCIC's collective experience has taught that establishing and maintaining relations with civil society organizations on the basis of partnership is key to achieving development outcomes in accordance with CCIC's Development Principles.

For the purpose of this section, partnerships refer to relations between CCIC members and civil society organizations--not individuals or governments--where a mutual agreement has been established committing each organization to a set of agreed principles and actions over an extended period of time².

Building on the Development Principles in Section 2.2, CCIC and its member organizations are committed to the following additional principles applying to partnerships:

- a) Partnerships should be vehicles for long term accompaniment that support the right of peoples to determine and carry out activities that further their own development options, through their civil society organizations.
- b) Partnerships should advance and exemplify the full realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms, social justice, equitable distribution of global wealth and environmental sustainability.
- c) Partnerships should be built on shared visions and goals for society which imply mutual support and solidarity beyond the implementation of specific programs and projects.
- d) Partnerships should be formed in a spirit of inclusiveness that respects and promotes the value of diversity.
- e) Partnerships should embody equity. Acknowledging that inequalities often exist as a result of power dynamics, especially in funding relations, partners should strive for equitable partnerships.
- f) Partnerships should be dynamic relationships built on respect and honesty, in which partners strive for better understanding and appreciation of one another.
- g) Partners should be transparent and accountable to one another.
- h) Partners should respect one another's autonomy and constraints and strive to foster a climate of mutual trust in all their partnership activities.
- i) Partners should endeavour to learn from one another and facilitate the sharing of knowledge.

¹ Excerpt from CCIC Code of Ethics

² While these principles may not apply to other types of relationships that CCIC members enter, they may be helpful to guide such relationships.

PARTNERSHIP STANDARDS³

Partnerships with civil society organizations should be established based on the CCIC “Principles of Development” and “Principles of Partnership” as provided in section 2 above and may be enriched by additional development principles proposed and agreed upon by common accord.

3.1.1 INITIATING A PARTNERSHIP

- a) Partnerships shall be based on a sense of common cause built on an understanding of each organization’s values, beliefs, goals, objectives and constraints.
- b) Partnerships shall be backed by mutually acceptable signed agreements, demonstrating that all parties have negotiated objectives, expectations, roles, responsibilities, and contributions to the partnership.
- c) Agreements between partners shall ensure shared responsibility for attaining the negotiated goals, objectives and stated outcomes.

3.1.2 MAINTAINING AND STRENGTHENING A PARTNERSHIP

- a) Strong partnerships include action to address inequalities due to power imbalances. Partners shall identify and attempt to adopt concrete measures to enhance equitable relations.
- b) Partners shall strive to deepen their understanding of one another through transparent sharing of information. The activities relating to the partnership shall be open and accessible to the other parties, while respecting the right of individuals to privacy.
- c) Respect for differences -- including cultural, religious, socio-economic and political differences - shall be a hallmark of every partnership.
- d) Partners shall engage in regular and open communications for the general health of the partnership and to ensure that all partners are properly represented and that no organization unilaterally speaks on another’s behalf.
- e) Organizations shall give credit to their partners’ contributions, respect intellectual property rights and acknowledge appropriate ownership of products and results arising from partnership initiatives.
- f) Healthy partnerships are strengthened by prompt and constructive responses to differences of opinion that may arise between organizations. Partners shall proactively agree how conflicts shall be handled.

³ Section 3.1 of the Code of Ethics

- g) Partnership agreements shall specify timelines for evaluating whether and how the partnership shall continue.
- h) When a transfer of funds occurs within a partnership, there shall be a negotiated and jointly signed contract within which there are mutually agreed upon reporting requirements to ensure that all parties use development funds as agreed.
- i) In the event of catastrophic circumstances, such as a major shortfall in funds available within a funding partnership, all parties shall promptly implement a mutually negotiated and agreed upon contingency plan.

3.1.3 ENDING A PARTNERSHIP

- a) Terms, conditions and appropriate procedures for ending the partnership shall be included in the partnership agreement.
- b) In the event of unforeseen circumstances, all partners shall endeavour to maintain the same standards of conduct when winding down the partnership as were agreed upon for the operations of the partnership.