

**Agenda Item 2: IPPF Footprint and MA Governance Reform**

**Summary:**

This paper provides an update on the status of the IPPF footprint and flags a few areas where current or future input from the Board would be appreciated. It also reports back on results of the governance reform initiative and seeks guidance on how to ensure a continuous reform and review process.

**Action Required:**

The Board of Trustees is requested **to discuss and make recommendations** to the Secretariat with regards to the questions raised.

## **Background**

At the previous Board meeting, it was agreed that at the next meeting the trustees will have a thematic discussion on IPPF's "footprint". This discussion will be interconnected with MA governance reform, in the context of the Federation as "a living organism", requiring constant renewal to remain relevant and to achieve its purpose. This presents an opportunity for the Board of Trustees to play a role in defining optimal way to shape the Federation's footprint together with an MA governance reform that follows a feminist agenda.

## **IPPF Footprint**

In May 2019, IPPF had 133 Member Associations, working in 144 countries (this figure considers the 12 countries that were part of the Caribbean Family Planning Affiliation-CFPA). Additionally, IPPF was working with 28 Collaborative Partners in 21 countries where it did not have a Member Association. Hence, the total number of countries in which IPPF was working at that time was 165.

Three years along the line from the departure of the former Western Hemisphere Region (WHR), IPPF now have 118 Member Associations, working in 123 countries, this also accounts for the six countries that are part of the Caribbean Family Planning Affiliation. Working with 31 Collaborative Partners in 26 countries where there is no Member Association brings the total to 149 countries where IPPF is active. The formation of the Americas and the Caribbean Region in place of WHR is leading to the admission of new Member Associations there. We have prioritised countries for expansion where the gaps / needs are greatest and those with important policy influence beyond their borders. Every new member / country is a big effort (identification, selection, due diligence, induction, support) and takes time. The term collaborative partners is used here to cover quite a broad range of partners, some of which are on their way to becoming a member and others who are rather purely implementing or (mostly regional) advocacy partners with no intention or possibility of ever becoming a member.

Over the years, certain MAs have become irrelevant, non-compliant with membership standards or underperformed for various reasons and have left through expulsion or resignation. Having heard past guidance from the MC and Board we are looking to make separation decisions more agile, while respecting due process. We want to minimise the impact on those we are here to serve. At this meeting, the board will consider cases where recommendation for expulsion have been submitted through the membership committee.

At the time of WHRO's separation this Board made very explicit that remaining a global federation, one that embodies the universality of sexual and reproductive rights and global solidarity was a strategic choice. This view of membership as a dynamic rather than a static condition comes with risk and opportunities and might in future require some procedural changes. We think it is important to hear the Board on these issues and for it (and Membership Committee) to have regular visibility of both entry and exit of Federation members as well as of collaborative partners that work in close alignment with it.

## **MA Governance Reform**

One of the recommendations from the Independent Governance Review Committee was that the reform of global and regional governance structures be followed by review and reform of MA's governance where appropriate.

In this vein, the Global Initiative on MA Governance Strengthening was launched in the spring of 2020, to ensure that the participating MAs are equipped with the best governance arrangements that will enable sound and effective decision making, free of any bias or conflict of interest with the best available expertise. It is anticipated that such transformations will ensure governance is aligned to advancing our shared SRHR mandate and improve operating efficiencies.

### ***Approach and strategies***

The Global MA Governance Initiative was designed in two phases - analytical (phase 1) and implementation (phase 2). A secretariat support team was formed to manage the project. This team facilitated learning and sharing exchanges among the MAs that were part of the initiative through online round tables and one to one MA support.

Grants of (up to) USD 22,000 (i.e., USD 10, 000 for phase 1 and USD 12, 000 for phase 2) were made available for all MAs participating in the global initiative. Phase 1 was an individualised diagnosis (review) by an independent consultant and phase 2 was for implementation of recommended changes. A total of 23 MAs were supported.

Learning sessions such as online roundtables were organised to discuss governance strengthening and to share key learnings from reform processes separately for the MAs under various rounds and consultants engaged in governance analysis. The sessions brought together Presidents, young board members and CEOs from the participating MAs as well as the consultants from the three phases.

### ***The Outcomes:***

The below data and outcomes are provided from those MAs that completed reforms.

### ***Pre-reform practices and structures:***

- Traditional way of electing boards with limited scope for vetting and screening
- Predominantly larger boards filled with only volunteers from membership with limited diversity in terms of skills and expertise, etc.
- In some cases, practices such as board constituted by Presidents or Chairpersons
- Multi-layers governance structure with regional and branch governing boards
- Disruptive transitions due to lack of continuity or to certain extent continuous terms for some trustees
- Maximum tenure 15 years or in some cases up to 27 years and for branch structures non-cumulative terms.

### ***What has changed in these MAs:***

The reform by and large resulted in putting in place better systems and processes to improve board quality in terms of skills, expertise and diversity. The key changes are provided in the following table:

What's new or improved	Benefits
All MAs ensured a better nomination process by establishing Nomination and Governance Committee or a similar structure, also ensured that this body is independent and accountable to their highest governing body, General Assemblies and National Council in case of Federated MAs.	Expected to have more streamlined board recruitment, appraisal and re-appointments with increased transparency using a skill matrix approach.
Almost all MAs embraced the concept of diversity and inclusion in the boardroom focusing on members skills and expertise. Among them, a majority (73%) created a hybrid board with inclusion of external members with full voting rights.	Allowing MAs to have necessary skills and diversity and increased transparency with trustees free of any ties with a particular constituency.
For better financial oversight larger MAs had either established or revamped finance, audit and risk committee. This is the case in 80% of the participated MAs.	Ensures better financial oversight by Boards.
Of the ten MAs with region/branch structure <sup>1</sup> 50% decided to remove regional governance bodies. <sup>2</sup>	Reduces conflicts and cost benefits and priority for programme volunteering in field.
Most MAs have put in place a system of rotating board members by limiting consecutive terms to maximum two terms and reduced the maximum cumulative term to 12 years. Around 25% of MAs retained a 15-year tenure.	Able to infuse fresh blood and rotate members.
Some of the MAs decided to adopt a staggered process for board appointments to address continuity issues, however this number is significantly low, only about 23%.	Able to address the board continuity and maintain organisation memory.
Most organisations introducing provisions for holding virtual meetings.	Ability to arrange quick meetings when needed and address the budget issues due to minimal costs.

This process is over and with it the opportunities for the Secretariat to push and engage on governance reform processes significantly diminished. For the Board to consider its role and the Secretariat's in igniting and supporting processes that lead to better and more feminist membership governance.

<sup>1</sup> Mozambique, Uganda, India, Pakistan, Mali, Malawi, Cameroon, Nigeria, Indonesia, Sudan

<sup>2</sup> Cameroon, Mali, India, Pakistan and Uganda