

**Intergovernmental Forum on Mining,
Minerals, Metals and Sustainable
Development (IGF)**

Task Force on Future Funding Report

2012



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	7
1. Introduction	10
1.1 The Task Force on Future Funding.....	10
1.2 Current Status of IGF	11
1.3 Founding IGF Operational Principles and Procedures	11
2. Options for Funding	13
2.1 Multi-donor Trust Fund.....	13
2.2 A Membership Fee.....	14
2.3 Alliance with another Organization.....	15
2.4 Become a Non-for-Profit Network	15
3. Examples of International Organizations: Governance and Funding Management	16
3.1 United Nations Development Group’s Multi-partner Trust Funds.....	16
Governance	17
Funding Management.....	18
3.2 International Nickel Study Group: Membership Fee.....	19
Governance	19
Funding management.....	20
3.3 United Nations Forum on Forests and Sponsoring Network	20
Governance	21
3.4 Global Water Partnership: Financial and Sponsoring Network	22
Governance	23
Funding Management.....	23
3.5 Southern and Eastern Africa Mineral Development Center: A Regional Initiative	24
Governance	25
Funding Management.....	25
4. Final Considerations	26

Appendices

Appendix 1. Summary Table: International Organizations	27
Appendix 2. Illustrative Annual Budget Estimate for the IGF	30
Appendix 3. Member Countries for the IGF – 2012	31
Appendix 4. Task Force on Future Funding Membership	32
Appendix 5. Consulted Websites	33

Abbreviations and Acronyms

CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
DAO	Delivering-as-One
DFAIT	Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada
DFID	United Kingdom Department for International Development
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council of the United Nations
EITI	Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
FMOG	Fiduciary Management Oversight Group
GC	Governing Council
GWP	Global Water Partnership
GWPO	Global Water Partnership Organization
IGF	Intergovernmental Forum on Mining, Minerals, Metals, and Sustainable Development
ICMM	International Council on Mining and Metals
IFF	Intergovernmental Forum on Forests
ISG	International Study Groups
INSG	International Nickel Study Group
IPF	Intergovernmental Panel on Forests
JPOI	Johannesburg Plan of Implementation
JP	Joint Programme
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
MOF	Management Oversight Framework
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPF	Mining Policy Framework
MPTFs	Multi-Partner Trust Funds
NLBI	Non-Legally Binding Instrument
NPO	Nonprofit Organizations
SAA	Standard Administrative Arrangement
SCO	Standing Committee of Officials
SEAMIC	Southern and Eastern Africa Mineral Development Centre
TF	Task Force on Future Funding
TOR	Term of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDAFs	United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks
UNDESA	United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
UNFF	United Nations Forum on Forests
UNSUC	United Nations Special Units on Commodities
WB	World Bank
WEF	World Economic Forum

Executive Summary

This report was prepared by the Task Force on Future Funding of the Intergovernmental Forum on Mining, Minerals, Metals, and Sustainable Development (IGF). It analyses different types of funding in order to present feasible solutions to be considered by IGF Member countries during the Annual Meeting from the 16-18 October 2012, which will take place in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Task Force on Future Funding (Task Force) was established at the 2011 Annual Meeting of the IGF. The Task Force's mandate was to "define the type of funding required to support the IGF into the future, and to explore options for securing that funding". To fulfill this mandate, over the last ten months the Task Force undertook the task of analysing, discussing, sharing opinions and ideas to be addressed at the 2012 Annual Meeting. These results are articulated in this Report, which will serve as a starting point for discussions by IGF Members and Observers in order to arrive at a consensus on how to ensure the sustainability and effectiveness of the IGF, and on how to meet its mandate and best serve the interests of its membership.

The Report is based on the central premise of the IGF which is to "enhance and promote the contribution of the mining, minerals, and metals sector to sustainable development", and ensure that its functions are consultative, advisory, and based on the principles of voluntary partnership. The Terms of Reference of IGF do not create any legally binding obligations between or among its Members, as well as its recommendations or decisions. The Rules of Procedures state that the "activities are financed through voluntary contributions of its Members and intergovernmental organizations. Other entities, as accepted by the Executive Committee, may make

contributions to finance specific activities approved by the General Session."

The Task Force highlights that a central issue to be addressed is how can IGF achieve self-sufficiency, as it would be neither prudent nor sustainable for the IGF to be dependent on only one or two key donors, as it has to date. The challenge facing the IGF is how to guarantee a predictable revenue stream in order to support both operational expenditures and program implementation. An included indicative budget (Appendix 2) indicates that the IGF requires over \$US 1.0 million to serve its membership as currently mandated.

The Report is organized as follows. Chapter 1 gives an overview on the IGF, and the context that has led to the creation of the Task Force. Bearing in mind that the States have the sovereign right to exploit their own mineral resources, IGF has conducted policy dialogue on the main issues concerning the mining sector in order to set a common direction on how to achieve sustainable development in mining.

Chapter 2 examines different types of funding and highlights key related questions for consideration by the IGF membership. Five different types of funding models are presented. The funding models are: Multi-donor Trust Fund, Membership Fee, Alliance with another International Organization, and Become a Non Profit Network Organization. A briefing on each funding option and key questions for consideration are highlighted as follows:

Multi-donor Trust Fund – This model of funding requires that one or more donor organizations contribute to the funding of the IGF and its Secretariat. In order to adopt this model, two questions for consideration

are key: (1) The IGF currently does not have legal status, which could preclude it from utilizing a multi-donor trust fund. Does the membership desire a more formalization of IGF entity, which could entail a change to its governance structure and related financial accountability mechanisms? (2) Would the membership support UNCTAD as a potential host for the Trust Fund?

A Membership Fee – One mechanism to utilize is the levying of membership fees to its members, including potentially to the private sector as well (and they could be labeled as corporate sponsorships). Two questions for consideration are key: (1) Does the membership support the premise of a membership fee? (2) Does the membership support the premise of corporate sponsors providing resources to support IGF expenses and work programs? Is this compromising to the original intent of the IGF, considering that without such support, the sustainability of the IGF may be at risk?

Alliance with another Organization – This option entails the incorporation of the IGF into another existing organization, which could realize several benefits including the potential elimination of a stand-alone Secretariat and perhaps solve the issue of the IGF not currently being a legal entity, which hampers its revenue management and generation capability. This option would not eliminate the need to fund activities and so may not represent a stand-alone option. Two questions for consideration are key: (1) Does the membership want to maintain the IGF as a separate entity with an independent Secretariat, or would it see a benefit of it being incorporated into the framework of an existing organization? (2) Are there other organizations that might be a beneficial host for the IGF?

Become a Non Profit Network Organization – The formal definition of a nonprofit organization (NPO) is one that uses surplus revenues to achieve its goals rather than distributing them as profit or

dividends. Most countries have laws that regulate the establishment and management of NPOs, and that require compliance with corporate governance regimes (i.e. must have controlling staff or boards). A model the IGF could emulate is one employed by the Global Water Partnership (GWP). It is an intergovernmental organization that relies on voluntary contributions from member governments and sponsors. The network provides knowledge and builds capacity to improve water management at all levels and works with key stakeholders to design strategic approaches to improved water management. This model has the advantage of extending the level of participation from the current membership to a wider group. A key question for consideration is: (1) Does the membership wish the Task Force to investigate this option further, recognizing that such a model entails the formalization of the IGF as a legal entity, with all of the associated legal and reporting requirements?

Chapter 3 provides details on similar international organizations and gives information on these organizations' structures (nature, objective, scope, governance management, governance structure, funding mechanism, and funding management). These international organizations are examples of how each funding model presented in Chapter 2 was adopted and implemented by those organizations. The organizations examined are: the United Nations Development Group's Multi-partner Trust Funds, the International Nickel Study Group, the United Nations Forum of Forests, the Global Water Partnership, and the Southern and Eastern Africa Mineral Development Centre. A summary table is included to facilitate comparison among those different organizations (Appendix 1).

Chapter 4 sets out recommendations made by the Task Force to the IGF in order to support short to long-term sustainability and ensure the continuity of its activities toward

enhancing and promoting the contribution of the mining, minerals, and metals sector to sustainable development, as well as to broaden its scope in a sustainable manner.

In conclusion, the Task Force and the IGF Secretariat propose to the country Members

and Observers (non member countries, entities, and organizations) to share their ideas and opinions regarding this Report during the IGF Annual Meeting in October 2012.

1. Introduction

The importance of mineral resources to many countries is recognized worldwide. The main goals toward sustainable development in mining are to maximize the positive social and economic impacts while to minimize the negative environmental and social impacts of the sector. In order to pursue those goals the main challenge is to reinforce the capacity of producing countries to benefit from their natural resources in the long-term in a social, environmental, and economic sustainable manner. States have the sovereign right of to exploit their own resources.

Aiming to support good governance of the mining sector at all levels, collaboration and partnerships alliances between the public and the private sector are significantly increasing in the last years. Financial and technical assistance from the international community also play an important role in the improvement of governance in minerals resources-rich developing countries.

In this scenario, the roles that IGF has played are to conduct policy dialogue on the main issues concerning sustainable development in the mining sector, to set a common sense on how to achieve sustainable development in mining.

Aiming to enhance coordination among all relevant institutions related to the sector, and to address information and communication through an interactive network of multi stakeholders, the IGF stresses the need to provide from within a regular budget; the adequate resources to undertake its administrative secretariat functions and to develop a future agreed work programme.

The IGF has been in operation since 2005 without benefit of sustained funding. It is becoming clear that the current funding model has its limitations and that a more predictable source of funding is required to ensure that the IGF can continue to provide a platform for information sharing, policy discussion and to act a catalyst for advancing the conversation on issues related to mining governance more globally. To come to a decision as to what approach the members may wish to pursue requires an analysis of the potential challenges or opportunities associated with several potential funding models and options, which in turn is dependent on the type and scope of work the IGF will decide to take on. The work of the Task Force on the Implementation of the Mining Policy Framework (MPF) to be concurrently discussed at the October 2012 General meeting needs to be duly considered in this regard.

1.1 The Task Force on Future Funding

The Task Force on Future Funding was created at the IGF Annual Meeting of 2011, with a mandate to “define the type of funding required to support the IGF into the future, and to explore options for securing that funding.” To fulfill this mandate, the Task Force undertook the task of analyzing, discussing, sharing opinions and ideas to present feasible solutions, presented as options to be considered by the Member countries during the Annual Meeting in October 2012.

The premises for this work were based on the current administrative documents of IGF that state both non-legally binding and voluntary-based natures, with a special attention to its Terms of Reference and the Rules of Procedure. This report was developed based on analyses of the IGF’s documents, an examination of the governance and funding management structures of

other similar international organizations and considered input from members of the team. The resulting work was undertaken bearing in mind that, as stated in the Terms of Reference, the objective of IGF is “to enhance and promote the contribution of the mining, minerals and metals sector to sustainable development”, and that its functions are consultative, advisory, and based on the principles of voluntary partnership.

1.2 Current Status of IGF

In 2002 the World Summit on Sustainable Development met in Johannesburg, South Africa to assess progress made since the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in 1992. A number of countries with an interest in mining decided to take action to change the perception of mining as a threat to development and to demonstrate that mining can be a potentially significant driver of development. The outcome of this initiative was the inclusion of mining in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI). This insertion projects a positive perspective and identified priorities that need to be addressed to enhance the contribution of mining to sustainable development. To mobilize and coordinate efforts to implement the JPOI, a partnership was formed amongst interested countries. This voluntary partnership ultimately led to the inauguration of the IGF in 2005.

There are currently 45 members of the IGF (Appendix 3). Canada hosts the Secretariat and the country Members elect a Chair and five Vice-Chairs for a period of two years at the General Session. The Chair, five Vice-Chairs, and the Head of the Secretariat (as an ex officio member), constitute the Executive Committee. Malawi currently holds the Chair together with Vice-Chairs from Africa (Tanzania), Asia (Mongolia), Caribbean/South America (Dominican Republic), Europe and C.I.S. (Russian Federation) and North America (Canada).

The IGF is internationally recognized as the only global intergovernmental policy forum of its kind where governments can regularly come together to discuss issues related to mining. The members of the IGF developed a document recognized by the United Nations and supported by a large number of countries and multi-level stakeholders: The Mining Policy Framework (MPF). To achieve the stated objectives of the IGF, countries are now being encouraged to examine how they may implement the best practices provided by the MPF into their national approach to mineral resource development.

1.3 Founding IGF Operational Principles and Procedures

The Terms of Reference of IGF do not create any legally binding obligations between or among its Members, as well as its recommendations or decisions. The Rules of Procedure state that the activities are financed through voluntary contributions of its Members and intergovernmental organizations. Other entities, as accepted by the Executive Committee, may make contributions to finance specific activities approved by the General Session. The current Terms of Reference are clear on several points that can have a bearing on funding options:

- 1) The IGF is by definition an intergovernmental forum open to Member States of the United Nations. Countries are to be represented by their ministry or agency with primary responsibility for the development of the mining minerals or metals sector.

- 2) Relevant United Nations bodies and specialized agencies, and governments not members of the IGF but that are Member States of the United Nations, as well as other relevant intergovernmental organizations may, as determined by the Members, be invited to participate as observers in the Forum.
- 3) Membership in the Forum does not create any legal or other financial obligation.

These three points have implications for how and under what conditions the IGF can collect funding from its membership. Unlike other permanent bodies of the UN or similar agencies, there is no regular annual membership fee to offset the costs of operation. Members and observers in the Forum make voluntary commitments towards covering the costs of meetings and the running of the Secretariat.

To date, Canada has covered the costs of a dedicated Secretary to the IGF, hosting the web site and managing events. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) has co-hosted and arranged for meeting rooms and interpretation for the preparatory meeting prior to the launch of the IGF as well as for each of the annual sessions since 2005 as well as for the preparatory meetings prior to the launch of the IGF. While this model proved expedient in terms of getting the Forum up and running quickly to meet the 2010/2011 UN Commission on Sustainable Development mining review deadline for input, it is clearly now not sustainable moving forward.

In addition to the Secretariat function and hosting of meetings, many developing country members have required financial assistance to ensure their participation. These costs have been covered in the past through the voluntary contributions from members, most notably the United Kingdom (DFID) and Canada (CIDA and DFAIT). Several non-members, most notably Germany and France, have also contributed to the funding of participants. Support was also given in some years by the United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA). The social functions associated with the annual sessions have been sponsored by the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM) and more recently by the World Economic Forum (WEF).

Dependence on one or two donors in any given year has proved challenging, often resulting in serious questions as to whether an annual session will be held. In terms of how funding should be obtained for the work of the IGF, the Rules of Procedure are clear:

“The activities of the Forum will be financed through voluntary contributions of its Members and intergovernmental organizations. Other entities, as accepted by the Executive Committee, or if appropriate, referred to the Members, may make contributions to finance specific activities approved by the General Session.”

This opens the door for funds to be obtained from members or from intergovernmental organizations. However, it does not allow for corporate sponsorship or direct funding from non-governmental agencies. The current Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure therefore give a clear starting point for the discussion within a framework premised on voluntary and intergovernmental financial support.

The IGF country Members are able to amend these terms as long as there is consensus amongst the membership. All possible options are open for analysis and discussion, including a model that could conceivably accept funding from sources other than from governments,

recognizing that by doing so, it could fundamentally change the nature of the organization and its objectives.

2. Options for Funding

The Task Force on Future Funding premise is that the IGF needs to work towards a model of self-sufficiency in order to provide certainty to the membership and to avoid the current ad-hoc approach, which limits the ability of the group to advance its objectives. The implication of this is that either the members pay all of costs or they pay some of the costs and receive financial support from outside donors.

Given the experience to date, it would appear to be neither prudent nor sustainable for the IGF to be dependent on only one or two key donors. Self-sufficiency could be achieved through a number of measures (some that would require a change to the current Terms of Reference) and several options have been proposed for consideration:

- One or more donor organization(s) contributes to the funding of the Forum and its Secretariat through some form of multi-donor trust fund.
- A membership fee for members is levied (flat fee, % of mineral production, of GNP per capita, etc.) to cover operating costs, in full or in part. Members would agree to pay for their own costs to attend meetings.
- The IGF entering into an alliance with an existing organization (International Study Groups, Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative, and World Bank affiliated group).
- The IGF becoming a not-for-profit network organization.

Any one or combination of these options requires thorough examination of the implications for each approach, including the need to create and staff a permanent Secretariat, associated costs and some form of legal status for the IGF.

The Task Force has included a proposed preliminary budget to provide members some insight into the estimated cost of running a Secretariat in Canada (Annex 1). While the proposal is based on a number of assumptions for costs, it provides a useful starting point to begin the conversation about funding.

2.1 Multi-donor Trust Fund

Some preliminary discussions were held on the margins of the annual session in conjunction with UNCTAD to start discussions of how a trust fund approach could be established to fund the activities of the IGF. As a model, this approach has the advantage of not requiring a change to the current terms of reference. A fund held and managed in trust by UNCTAD would require some form of formalized agreement between the two organizations and several questions would need to be addressed, such as:

- Would the IGF need to become a legal or some other formal entity to enter into an agreement with the UNCTAD as the administrator of the fund?
- How would the fund be administered (governance structure)?
- What would be the associated administrative costs?

- Could non-governmental organizations or industry make contributions?
- Who would be responsible for soliciting the pledges to the fund?
- Would member countries be taking on any potential liabilities associated with the fund?

Once these questions have been addressed, the Secretariat could initiate discussions with potential donors such as:

- National development assistance agencies (i.e. UK DFID, USAID, DG Development etc.)
- Regional Development Banks (i.e. Inter-American Development Bank, African Development Banks, etc.)
- Foundations (i.e. The Clinton Giustra Sustainable Growth Initiative)
- World Bank (WB)
- International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM)
- World Economic Forum (WEF)

One potential advantage to this approach would be to widen the scope for potential observers to the IGF and a vehicle for delivery of the outcomes for the work of the members. Members of the IGF itself would likewise be invited to make voluntary contributions to the fund as national circumstance allow.

2.2 A Membership Fee

The Terms of Reference now stipulate that the IGF does not confer any financial obligations on the part of the membership. In the event the IGF were to seek an annual financial contribution from the members, the only mechanism to do so would be on a voluntary basis. Members could agree to an annual budget and seek contributions to cover the expenses of the group.

The Secretariat would be directed to administer the expenses and a process for financial accountability would be required. While this has the advantage of potentially bringing in some revenue to offset the costs, it is unlikely that most members would have the financial capacity to make the necessary contributions to sustain the organization over time.

If, on the other hand, the members are willing to entertain the notion of a mandatory membership fee, then such an approach would require a negotiation of new Terms of Reference that would define the fee, how it is administered and clearly outline the obligation that members would be required to make in terms of joining, or more importantly, leaving the group. As well, the private sector, including major companies, could be invited to join the IGF, and with membership, be offered various levels of sponsorship e.g. Gold Member (US \$1 million), Silver Member (US\$750,000) and Bronze Member (US\$500,000).

International organizations such as the International Study Groups are funded by membership dues, and has specific terms of reference that clearly defines the financial obligations of the membership such as:

- When to set the financial year (i.e. January to December)
- How to assess contributions according to an agreed scale
- Rules for new members and how that affects existing memberships
- What currency to be used
- How to establish the budget approvals process

- How to address delegations expenses

In addition to financial considerations, the International Study Group members also have a formal headquarters agreement that is negotiated with the host country, provisions for salaries and benefits for the Secretariat (including pay-scales, taxation arrangements, etc), elections of officers of the group, official languages, and provisions for members to leave the group and provisions for ending the group itself.

Since the terms of references create both financial and legal obligations on the part of the member, countries are essentially entering into a treaty commitment and must seek official approval from their parliament to join. While the rate of payment can vary from country to country, based on the size of a country's industry (everyone splits 50% of the cost of the organization and the rest is assessed on a formula that considers production and trade), the application of these terms and conditions apply equally to all members.

One advantage to such an approach (i.e membership dues) is that the IGF would be self-financing and independent. However, shifting priorities and budgetary constraints can put member governments in a situation where membership is in question. It would also require that observer status for non-members be monitored more closely so that paying members receive priority. Large corporate sponsorships, if accepted, would need to be carefully managed as to not leave the impression that the IGF mandate was being unduly influenced by corporate interests. Obligatory membership fees could potentially limit participation and the overall reach of the IGF.

2.3 Alliance with another Organization

This option would eliminate the need to establish a stand-alone Secretariat, but would also require that some other organization that already has a mandate be willing to take on the role of managing the IGF. It would not eliminate the need to fund activities and so may not represent a stand-alone option. Several organizations have the potential to take on the work of the IGF. These could include, but are not limited to the following organizations:

- The international metal study groups (International Lead and Zinc Study Group, the International Copper Study Group, the International Nickel Study Group)
- The Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI)
- Special Unit on Commodities of UNCTAD
- The Canadian International Institute for Extractive Industries for Development

This option could be explored as something to consider for joint meetings regardless of whether either Option 1 or Option 2 is chosen. Should members choose this option, it is understood that the very nature of the organization would need to change to meet the terms of the alliance. The IGF would lose some of its independence, but might also gain wider influence.

2.4 Become a Non-for Profit Network Organization

The formal definition of a Nonprofit Organization (NPO) is one that uses surplus revenues to achieve its goals rather than distributing them as profit or dividends. Most countries have laws that regulate the establishment and management of NPOs, and that require compliance with

corporate governance regimes (i.e. must have controlling staff or boards). There usually are requirements set by the host country regarding detailing their income and expenditure publicly. The process to establish the IGF as a NPO could be lengthy, and a host country would have to be found.

A model that could be considered is the one employed by the Global Water Partnership Organization (GWPO) Based in Sweden, the GWPO is an intergovernmental organization that relies on voluntary contributions from member governments. It is a not-for-profit network that is open to all organizations involved in water resources management, developed and developing country government institutions, agencies of the United Nations, bi- and multi-lateral development banks, professional associations, research institutions, non-governmental organizations and the private sector. The network provides knowledge and builds capacity to improve water management at all levels and works with key stakeholders to design strategic approaches to improved water management.

Such a model requires a well-defined governance structure, and formal mechanisms for the management of the funds, approval for the work programme, and accountability proceedings. Members are required to sign a Memorandum of Understanding that outlines their obligations. This model has the advantage of extending the level of participation from the current membership to a wider group.

3. Examples of International Organizations: Governance and Funding Management Structures

Considering that the option of funding chosen by an international organization is only a part of a complex structure, the following details on international and regional organizations (nature, objective, scope, governance management, governance structure, funding mechanism, and funding management) are meant to provide the IGF membership with examples of how other similar entities achieved relative organizational and financial stability. The following organizations are examples of how each funding model presented in the previous chapter were adopted and implemented by these organizations.

3.1 United Nations Development Group's Multi-partner Trust Funds

The UN system is stepping up its efforts to enhance coherence and efficiency at the country and global levels and to increase joint UN activities. Against this background and in the context of humanitarian, transition, reconstruction and development programmes, the UN system, national authorities and Contributors/Partners are establishing Multi-Partner Trust Funds (MPTFs) and Joint Programmes (JPs) that use the pass-through fund management model.

MPTFs and JPs are designed to fit the realities of a specific country or global situations. They are established on common core principles and strategies such as:

- Involve a broad range of stakeholders, including national authorities, Contributors/Partners, and Participating UN Organizations in the decision-making process, as appropriate;
- Build on existing frameworks or plans rather than creating new, parallel structures;
- Strengthen aid effectiveness through coordination and harmonization of interventions to ensure increased coherence, efficiency, reduction of management and reporting burdens and associated transaction costs;
- Ensure that the funding, operations and implementation modalities provide for full transparency and accountability;
- Focus on expedient delivery with concentrated focus on results.

MPTFs are generally established to support specific country and/or global strategic priorities that are defined in national or global strategic plans such as UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs), Delivering-as-One (DaO) and similar Strategic Documents/Frameworks.

The objective is to ensure that MPTFs and JPs reflect and respond to the needs on the ground as defined by the National Government in consultation with UN Country Teams, Contributors/Partners and other stakeholders. The objectives and scope of an MPTF are defined to ensure government ownership and alignment with established national priorities and plans.

Monitoring and evaluation, and effective programme delivery modalities are included so that planned results are achieved. The strategic objectives, governance arrangements, allocation criteria, and other parameters are elaborated in the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the particular MPTF/JP using a generic UNDG ToR.

Governance

Multi-Partner Trust Funds (MPTFs) are generally established with a multi-tier governance structure that promotes strong National and UN inter-agency coordination, including peer and technical reviews, and collaboration with national governments and contributors/partners.

The UNDG organizations have developed a generic MPTF architecture that permits quick MPTF set-up and operation. The mechanism allows appropriate flexibility in the structure, composition and operations of the MPTF-constituting bodies in response to country or situation-specific contexts. This enables the UN system to quickly deploy available systems for the rapid mobilization of the technical, operational and administrative capacities of the UN and the expeditious approval and implementation of projects and programmes.

While Participating UN Organizations operate under the governance and accountability framework of their own organization, MPTFs have the following common governance elements:

- A policy body, comprising national authorities, the UN (and the World Bank where it is involved) and contributors/partners, as appropriate, that sets fund policy;
- A Steering Committee or similar entity that makes funding decisions, comprising national authorities, Participating UN Organizations, and usually contributors/partners (usually the two bodies are combined in a single entity);
- A technical secretariat that reviews programs and projects submitted for funding, either by using the capacities of Participating UN Organizations grouped by sector or thematic

cluster (e.g., employment, education, health, agriculture) or by establishing a stand-alone Steering Committee Support Office (Technical Secretariat) that will service the above two bodies.

Funding Management

In order to harmonize and strengthen the fiduciary management oversight of Multi-Partner Trust Funds (MPTFs), an Oversight Framework has been developed by the United Nations Development Group (UNDG). In the context of MPTFs, oversight is defined as “the supervision of inter-agency MPTF activities of entities participating in MPTFs, with joint authority and responsibility to control, or exercise significant influence over, the inter-agency fiduciary decisions emanating from the operations of the MPTFs”. The UNDG MPTF Fiduciary Management Oversight Framework (MOF) consists of:

- A Steering Committee, or similar governance entity, at the national level, which is responsible for providing strategic guidance, oversight and monitoring of country-level MPTFs or JPs. The Steering Committee also makes funding decisions, and responds to queries and issues from the Participating UN Organizations. It is generally chaired by the Resident Coordinator and a Government representative and includes Heads of UN Agencies and may include designated representatives of Contributors/Partners;
- A Fiduciary Management Oversight Group (FMOG) at headquarters, which provides oversight and guidance to individual MPTFs and JPs on financial accountability, fund management, and assurance issues of an inter-agency nature. When agreement cannot be reached at the country and/or Steering Committee level, issues may be raised to the FMOG for resolution. The FMOG also reviews deviations from the standard MoU and SAA;
- A UNDG Advisory Group at the Assistant Secretary-General level, which takes high-level policy and operational decisions relating to MPTFs. Fiduciary management matters that cannot be resolved at the FMOG level are referred on an exceptional basis to the Advisory Group.

Multi-Partner Trust Funds (MPTFs) usually use the pass-through fund-management modality. Under this arrangement, Participating UN Organizations appoint an Administrative Agent (AA) through a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) as their administrative interface with donors.

Under the pass-through fund management option, two or more organizations develop a JP, identify funding gaps and submit a JP document to donor(s). If the donor(s) and Participating UN Organizations agree to channel the funds through one Participating UN Organization, then the pass-through modality applies. The UN organization channeling resources (the Administrative Agent) will be selected jointly by all Participating UN Organizations in consultation with the Government. The common work plan clearly indicates the activities to be supported by each of the Participating UN Organizations. The indirect costs to be charged by each organization are reflected in the respective budgets. The programmatic and financial accountability rests with the Participating UN Organizations and national or subnational partners managing their respective components of the JP.

The Administrative Agent subsequently signs a Standard Administrative Arrangement (SAA) with contributors/partners, and receives, administers and transfers the funds to Participating UN Organizations in accordance with the MOU and SAA. Participating UN Organizations assume

full programmatic and financial accountability for the funds received from the Administrative Agent, operating under their own individual financial regulations and rules.

3.2 International Nickel Study Group: Membership Fee

The International Nickel Study Group (INSG) is an autonomous, intergovernmental organization established in 1990 and located in Lisbon, Portugal. Membership comprises nickel producing, using and trading countries. The main objectives of the Group are:

- To collect and publish improved statistics on nickel markets (including production, usage (consumption), trade, stocks, prices and other statistics such as recycling), with the aim of improving market transparency [publications];
- To publish other information on nickel, such as data on industry facilities and environmental regulations [publications];
- To provide a forum for discussions on nickel issues of interest to nickel producing and using (consuming) countries and their industries, including environmental issues;
- To undertake economic analysis of nickel markets and related topics.

The International Nickel Study Group focuses on statistics, including the production of a Monthly Bulletin on World Nickel Statistics and a World Directory of Nickel Production Facilities. These regular outputs are publicly available at small cost. Other outputs, which generally are available to members only, include:

- A semi-annual, short-term forecast of nickel production, consumption, and the marked balance;
- An annual review of new developments in nickel mining, smelting, and refining as well as closures;
- An annual compilation of existing of proposed regulations regarding environmental, health, and safety concerning nickel.

The International Nickel Study Group meets twice a year in April and October, usually in Lisbon, Portugal. All INSG meetings are private and open only to government and industry representatives from member countries. Non-member countries with significant interests in nickel are occasionally invited to observe INSG meetings in order to encourage them to join. Permanent industry association observers and invited observing organizations may also attend.

Governance

As the INSG is an intergovernmental organization, its members are governments of nickel producing, consuming and trading countries or other intergovernmental organizations responsible for implementing international agreements. The INSG consists of:

- A General Session of members which is the governing authority of the INSG;
- Subordinate Committees such as the Standing, Finance, Environmental and Economic, and Statistics Committees responsible for debating, approving and reviewing the Group's work program, as well as for serving as the medium for discussions.

- A Secretariat, the Executive Head of which is the Secretary General, consisting of professional staff located in the Group's Headquarters in Lisbon, Portugal.
- An Industry Advisory Panel consisting of industry representatives of member delegations and invited observers.

Funding Management

Membership obligations include contributing to the Group's operating costs, submitting statistics and other information as agreed by the Group as a whole, and participating in meetings of the Group.

The Secretariat already receives data on nickel production, trade, stocks and apparent consumption from some prospective members, although further improvements are always welcomed. The Group's annual budget is apportioned under a formula whereby each member pays an equal share of 50 % of the budget, plus a share of the remaining 50 % according to its importance in international nickel trade.

The INSG Terms of Reference allow for arrangements to maintain contact with other intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations and private sector institutions. These may be invited to attend INSG meetings either periodically or as permanent observers, and to cooperate in the exchange of information on nickel.

Observing organizations have no financial obligations to the Group but are expected to reciprocate in inviting the INSG to certain of their own meetings. Organizations that have permanent observer status with the INSG include the Nickel Institute, Eurometaux, Eurofer and UNCTAD. Countries and their governments cannot be designated permanent observers but may be invited to observe a limited number of meetings.

3.3 United Nations Forum on Forests: UN Subsidiary Body

In October 2000, the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations (ECOSOC), in its Resolution 2000/35 established the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF), a subsidiary body with the main objective to promote "the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests and to strengthen long-term political commitment to this end" based on the Rio Declaration, the Forest Principles, Chapter 11 of Agenda 21 and the outcome of the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests/ Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IPF/IFF) Processes and other key milestones of international forest policy. The UNFF is an intergovernmental policy forum that has universal membership, and is composed of all Member States of the United Nations and specialized agencies.

Following intense negotiations, the Seventh Session of the Forum adopted the landmark Non-Legally Binding Instrument on All Types of Forests (NLBI) on 28 April 2007. The instrument is considered a milestone, as it is the first time Member States have agreed to an international instrument for sustainable forest management. The instrument is expected to have a major impact on international cooperation and national action to reduce deforestation, prevent forest degradation, promote sustainable livelihoods and reduce poverty for all forest-dependent peoples. The NLBI was adopted by the UN General Assembly on 17 December 2007.

In order to achieve its main objective, the following principal functions have been identified for

the UNFF:

- To facilitate implementation of forest-related agreements and foster a common understanding on sustainable forest management;
- To provide for continued policy development and dialogue among Governments, international organizations, including major groups, as identified in Agenda 21 as well as to address forest issues and emerging areas of concern in a holistic, comprehensive and integrated manner,
- To enhance cooperation as well as policy and programme coordination on forest-related issues
- To foster international cooperation and to monitor, assess and report on progress of the above functions and objectives
- To strengthen political commitment to the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests.
- Enhance the contribution of forests to the achievement of the internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals, and to the implementation of the Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development and the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, bearing in mind the Monterrey Consensus of the International Conference on Financing for Development;
- Encourage and assist countries, including those with low forest cover, to develop and implement forest conservation and rehabilitation strategies, increase the area of forests under sustainable management and reduce forest degradation and the loss of forest cover in order to maintain and improve their forest resources with a view to enhancing the benefits of forests to meet present and future needs, in particular the needs of indigenous peoples and local communities whose livelihoods depend on forests;
- Strengthen interaction between the United Nations Forum on Forests and relevant regional and sub-regional forest-related mechanisms, institutions and instruments, organizations and processes, with participation of major groups, as identified in Agenda 21 and relevant stakeholders to facilitate enhanced cooperation and effective implementation of sustainable forest management, as well as to contribute to the work of the Forum;

The IPF/IFF processes produced a body of more than 270 proposals for action towards sustainable forest management, known collectively as the IPF/IFF Proposals for action. These proposals are the basis for the UNFF Multi-Year Programme of Work and Plan of Action, various themes of which are discussed at annual UNFF Sessions. Country- and Organization-led initiatives also contribute to development of UNFF themes. Multi-stakeholder dialogues are an integral part of the agenda at UNFF sessions, allowing major stakeholders to contribute to the forest policy forum.

Governance

The UNFF is guided by a Bureau headquartered in New York, USA, and serviced by a compact secretariat that also serves as a secretariat for the Collaborative Partnership on Forests. The Collaborative Partnership on Forests was established in April 2001, following the recommendation of ECOSOC. This innovative partnership of 14 major forest-related international organizations, institutions and convention secretariats, works to support the work of

the UNFF and its member countries and to foster increased cooperation and coordination on forests.

UN Forum on Forests is a subsidiary body of the Economic and Social Committee, with universal membership. As such, it is composed of all member states of the United Nations and Member States of specialized agencies, with full and equal participation, including voting rights. Member States of the UNFF have designated a UNFF National Focal Point within their government. These focal points are compiled into UNFF National Focal Point List.

Member States contribute to the UNFF process through dialogue culminating in the annual session of the UNFF. Member States also are invited to provide voluntary reports to each UNFF session. The UNFF Secretariat, as mandated by UNFF, has provided a suggested format for the national reports.

The UNFF Bureau consists of one Chairperson and four Vice-Chairpersons in accordance with the principle of equitable geographical distribution. The Bureau members are elected at the end of each UNFF session from among the members of UNFF. The Bureau has several responsibilities including the follow up of decisions made at UNFF sessions, preparation for the subsequent session as well as the management and organization of sessions. Further, the Bureau chairperson represents the UNFF in various fora.

3.4 Global Water Partnership: Financial and Sponsoring Network

The Global Water Partnership (GWP) was created to advocate for the implementation of the Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM), the coordinated development and management of water, land, and related resources in order to maximize economic and social welfare without compromising the sustainability of vital environmental systems.

GWP is a global action network with multiple stakeholders from many sectors, which provide a platform to facilitate dialogues that result in changes to policies, laws, and institutions. It also provides the intellectual leadership for an integrated approach to water resources management. The knowledge created by the network is shared at global, regional, national and local levels.

GWP helps countries to connect water resources planning with operations at different scales – from transboundary to local – so that actions are coherent and sustainable. Instead of taking the traditional development approach in which projects are often not connected, GWP works with many stakeholders so that capacity is built in institutions for long-term changes in how water is managed.

The main requirement for membership is that Partners agree to adhere to the core values. GWP Partners, and all GWP regional entities, agree to strive for inclusiveness, openness, transparency, accountability, respect, gender sensitivity and solidarity. The values underpin meaningful dialogue among people with different interests and mindsets, and strengthen GWP's neutral stance and credibility. Solidarity is at the heart of GWP's development endeavors and is essential to its commitment to the poor and disadvantaged.

The Global Water Partnership's vision is for a water secure world. The mission is to support the sustainable development and management of water resources at all levels. And GWP believes that an integrated approach to managing the world's water resources is the best way to pursue

this vision—a vision that encompasses all of life. GWP takes its guiding principles from the Dublin and Rio statements (1992), from the Millennium Assembly (2000), which gave rise to the Millennium Development Goals, and from the World Summit on Sustainable Development (2002) Plan of Action, which set a target for the preparation of Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) and Water Efficiency plans. Over time, GWP has adapted and elaborated these principles to reflect international understanding of the 'equitable and efficient management and sustainable use of water'.

Governance

The global secretariat, based in Stockholm, Sweden, provides overall support and coordination to the network. The Secretariat supports the Executive Secretary, the Technical Committee and other GWP Committees, and the Regional Water Partnerships in governance, finance, communications, planning, and operational management of programmes and administration. The Secretariat manages finances and reports on funding received at global level. It also helps the Partnership exchange knowledge and resources, and ensures communication and coherence across the Network. In overall the Global Water Partnership Organization (GWPO) is:

- An intergovernmental agency hosted by the Government of Sweden.
- Managed by the Executive Secretary reporting to the Steering Committee.
- Accountable to the Steering Committee that directs policy and approves the work programme and budget.
- Overseen by the Sponsoring Partners – the founding members – the ultimate decision-making body that appoints the Steering Committee.

The Global Water Partnership (GWP) is a dynamic, not-for-profit action network with over 2,550 Partner organizations in 161 countries around the world. The network has 80 Country Water Partnerships and 13 Regional Water Partnerships.

The network is open to all organizations involved in water resources management: developed and developing country government institutions, agencies of the United Nations, bi- and multi-lateral development banks, professional associations, research institutions, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector.

GWP's action network provides knowledge and builds capacity to improve water management at all levels: global, regional, national and local. The Partnership helps countries to connect water resources planning and operations at different scales— transboundary, regional, basin, national and local—so that actions are coherent and sustainable.

Instead of taking the traditional development approach in which projects are often not connected, GWP works with numerous key stakeholders to design strategic approaches to improving water management. This builds local capacity in the long term. GWP does not operate alone; indeed its networking approach provides a mechanism for coordinated action and adds value to the work of many other key development partners.

Funding Management

External support agencies meet twice a year to engage in a strategic dialogue with the GWP on the water priorities that need to be addressed and the criteria for providing financial assistance. Financing Partners make their contributions to the Partnership (Core and Programmatic Funds).

The Sponsoring Partners are the States and international organizations that signed the Memorandum of Understanding establishing the Global Water Partnership Organisation (GWPO) in 2002 – the intergovernmental organization which is the legal representative of the GWP Network. The Sponsoring Partners appoint the Chair, members of the Steering Committee and the Auditor. A full audit of the financial management and transactions of the Organization (Annual External Reviews) is conducted by External Auditors.

3.5 Southern and Eastern Africa Mineral Development Centre: A Regional Initiative

The Southern and Eastern Africa Mineral Development Centre's (SEAMIC) main objectives are:

- To facilitate the access to and provision, co-ordination and harmonization of mineral resources development support services in the sub-region.
- To establish, where relevant, sub-regional networks of programmes and services and to promote regional collaboration.
- To promote indigenous mineral based industrialization.
- To promote awareness on the potential of the mineral sector's contribution to the economic and social development of the sub- region.
- To promote responsible investment and free flow of capital, labour, goods and services for mining sector development in the sub-region.
- To facilitate the promotion of mining prospects with the highest potential for economic and social impact.
- To facilitate the harmonization of mineral sector's policies and legislation in the sub-region.

SEAMIC aims to be a Centre of Excellence and Significance that can provide specialised services for the mineral industries and the overall development of the sector in the region. It accomplishes this by:

- Promoting public awareness of the potential of the mining sector's contribution to both the economic and social development of the sub-region.
- Facilitating the efficient exploitation of mining prospects with the highest potential for economic and social impact.
- Promoting responsible investment and encouraging the free flow of capital, labor, goods and services for sustained mining sector development in the sub-region.
- Facilitating the harmonization of mineral sector policies and the legal framework surrounding mineral activities as well as and to improve the competitiveness of legal and fiscal regimes across countries in the sub-region.
- Promoting indigenous capacity and mineral resource - based industrialization. and
- Facilitating access, co-ordination and harmonization of mineral resources development and associated support services within the sub-region, and the establishment of sub-regional networks of programmes and services.

Governance

SEAMIC is overseen by a Governing Council (GC), which consists of the Ministers responsible for mining of the member states. The GC, whose chairmanship rotates, meets once a year. At these meetings, SEAMIC's annual report of the previous financial year (July - June) - together with a working plan for the following financial year - are discussed and approved. In addition, other matters, related to the policy and the operations of the Centre, are also discussed. The decision making of the GC is guided by a Standing Committee of Officials (SCO), comprised of the permanent secretaries or equivalent officers in the ministries of mines of the SEAMIC member states. The SCO prepares the GC meeting in more technical details. The SCO meeting is chaired by the Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) or his representative.

The Board of Directors, on behalf of the Governing Council, have overall responsibility of monitoring, advising, supporting and oversee the execution of the Centre's activities according to an annually approved work programme and take all necessary steps to ensure the effective and rational execution of the work programme. The Board of Directors is composed of the following members:

- Representative of the host country;
- Representative of the highest contributing country;
- Representative of the Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA)
- Representative of the Private Sector;
- Representative of the donors supporting the Centre; and
- The Director General of the Centre who is the Secretary of the Board.

The Representatives of the host country, the highest contributing country and the Economic Commission for Africa are appointed by the Governing Council; and representatives of the private sector and the donors supporting the Centre are appointed by their respective communities upon the request of the Minister responsible for mineral resources development of the host country.

The Board of Directors meet at least three times a year and may hold extraordinary meetings at the request of its Chairman or one-third of its members. The Board of Directors reports to the Governing Council through the Standing Committee during its annual meeting. The Current Members of the Board of Directors are the following:

- Angola – representing the highest contributing member – the Chairman
- UNECA – Vice Chairman
- Tanzania – representing the host country – Member
- Tanzania Chamber of Mines – representing the Private Sector – Member
- Delegation of European Commission – representing donors – Member
- The Director General – Secretary

Funding Management

Member countries pay a fee to belong to the organization. The SEAMIC member states with the assistance of several development partners have built a very well equipped facility in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

4. Final Considerations

The most important issue facing the IGF at this time is how to develop a long-term funding structure to assure its functioning and sustainability. The challenge is how to secure predictable IGF funding taking into account both its nature and purpose – the IGF is an intergovernmental Forum and its main objective is “to enhance and promote the contribution of the mining, minerals and metals sector to sustainable development.”

To help meet the aforementioned change, the Task Force on Future Funding recommends to the membership the establishment of a multi-stakeholder funding mechanism that would enable the IGF to maintain and advance its core mandate. If agreed, the criteria for a multi-stakeholder participation of Member countries, Non-member countries, donors and sponsors (as Partners) to IGF should include the creation of a commonly agreed Future Work Plan for IGF, and a Financial Management process based on mutually agreed transparent and verifiable accounting mechanisms. The strategic objective of the Future Work Plan would include the implementation of the Mining Policy Framework in interested resource endowed countries.

Regarding the governance and the implementation of the Future Work Plan, the Secretariat of IGF should play a full role in policy and programme development, implementation and monitoring, and evaluation of the commonly agreed upon strategies and goals.

Concerning IGF funding and budgetary management, the decision to select one or a combination of fund management options should be based on the effective, efficient and timely implementation of the proposed Future Work Plan for the IGF, which needs to be managed with minimal transaction costs for national Members, potential donors and sponsors (Partners).

The Funding Management could be undertaken by the IGF Secretariat, which would follow up with the Member countries and on implementation of the Future Work Plan, under the guidance and authority of the IGF Executive Committee. The IGF Secretariat would engage in resource mobilization and in the implementation of the Future Work Plan, in consultation with governments and partners, and would be accountable for narrative and financial reporting to all Members and Partners. The Funding Management would also include external audits. Upon consultation, the IGF Secretariat would take appropriate measures to publicize the outcomes of the Future Work Plan.

Appendix 1. Summary Table: International Organizations		United Nations Development Group	International Nickel Study Group	United Nations on Forests	Global Water Partnership	Southern and Eastern Africa Mineral Centre
Organization	Nature	UNDEP Multi-partner Trust Funds (MPTFs) are designed to fit the realities of a specific country of global situations.	INSG is an autonomous international organization and its membership comprises nickel producing, using, and trading countries.	UNFF is an intergovernmental policy forum that has universal membership and is composed of all member states of the UN and specialized agencies.	GWP is a global action network, with multiple stakeholders from many sectors, which provides a platform to facilitate dialogues that result in changes to policies, laws and institutions. It also provides the intellectual leadership for an integrated approach to water resources management.	SEAMIC, is an independent regional centre of knowledge and information for southern and eastern Africa established in 1977. Founder Member States are Ethiopia, Mozambique and Tanzania, later on joined by Angola, the Comoros and Uganda. Kenya joined the Centre in 2006. The Sudan is the new member of the Center joining in 2010. Membership is open to all other African countries.
	Objectives and Scope	MPTFs are defined to ensure governments' ownership and alignment with established national priorities and plans.	INSG objectives are to collect and publish improved statistics on nickel markets, provide a forum for discussions on nickel issues and undertake economic analysis of nickel markets and related topics.	UNFF is a Subsidiary UN Body with the main objective to promote the management, conservation, and sustainable development of all types of forests and to strengthen long-term political commitment to this end.	GWP was created to advocate for the implementation of the Integrated Water Resources Management. GWP helps countries to connect water resources planning with operation at different scales so that actions are coherent and sustainable.	SEAMIC's focus is to become a Centre of Excellence and Significance able to provide specialised services for the mineral industries and the overall development of the sector in the region. Main objectives are to promote socio-economic and environmentally responsible mineral development in eastern and southern Africa.

		United Nations Development Group	International Nickel Study Group	United Nations on Forests	Global Water Partnership	Southern and Eastern Africa Mineral Centre
Governance	Management	MPTFs are generally established with a multi-tier government structure that promotes strong national and UN inter-agency coordination including peer and technical reviews, and collaboration with national governments and contributors/partners.	The General Session is the governing authority of the IGSG. The Secretariat is headquartered in Lisbon, Portugal.	UNFF is a subsidiary body of the UN Economic and Social Committee. UNFF is guided by a Bureau headquartered in New York, USA.	GWP is an intergovernmental agency hosted by the government of Sweden, managed by the Executive Secretary reporting to the Steering Committee and overseen by the Sponsoring Partners.	SEAMIC is a regional African organization based in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, under the umbrella of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA).
	Structure	Policy Body Steering Committee Technical Secretariat	General Session Subordinate Committees Secretariat Industry Advisory Panel	The Bureau consists of one Chairperson and four Vice-chairpersons in accordance with the principle of equitable geographical distribution.	Global Secretary Executive Secretary Steering Committee Sponsoring Partners Partners	Director General (with a secretariat) Board of Directors (comprising the main funding countries) Standing Committee of Officials (comprising senior officials representing all member countries)

		United Nations Development Group	International Nickel Study Group	United Nations on Forests	Global Water Partnership	Southern and Eastern Africa Mineral Centre
Funding	Mechanism	Pass-through Fund	Membership Fee	UN Subsidiary Body	Financial and Sponsoring Partners	Membership Fee, provision of cost-effective services
	Management	UN Oversight Framework	Group's annual budget is apportioned under a specific formula. ¹	UN Subsidiary Body	A full audit is conducted by External Auditors	The Administration and Finance Section provides support and technical services under direct supervision of the Director General.

¹ The Group's annual budget is apportioned under a formula whereby each member pays an equal share of 50% of the budget, plus a share of the remaining 50% according to its importance in international nickel trade.

Appendix 2. Illustrative Annual Budget Estimate for the IGF

ASSUMPTIONS:	
* Annual General Meeting in Geneva	
* Regional Meetings - 1 per region around major events	
* All costs are in Canadian \$s	
* Salaries are based on Canadian Public Service pay scale	
* UNCTAD Administrative fees are 13% of total budget (i.e. if UNCTAD manages the multi-donor trust fund)	
IGF Secretariat Expenses: (note currently in-kind by CIDA)	
Salaries plus benefits for IGF Secretariat role	\$350,000.00
Travel for Secretariat staff	\$40,000.00
Office expenses (rent, equipment, services, etc)	\$25,000.00
Hospitality	\$6,000.00
Reports, promotion and information material, translation, etc	\$60,000.00
Professional fees (e.g. auditing, legal, insurance)	\$12,000.00
Other costs: financial, administrative, software, equipment, etc.	\$8,000.00
Website Maintenance	\$1,000.00
Total Expenses for Secretariat Role	\$502,000.00
Other Expenses associated to IGF: (note currently in-kind by CIDA and others)	
Travel costs for IGF Executive members to attend meetings and represent IGF interests	\$50,000.00
Contracts to advance IGF work	\$150,000.00
Expenses related to annual meeting (rooms. Interpretation, etc.)	\$25,000.00
Expenses related to two regional meeting (rooms. Interpretation, support services, etc.)	\$50,000.00
Special meetings of IGF Committees	\$25,000.00
Participation of delegates from developing countries: Annual meeting	\$200,000
Participation of delegates from developing countries: Regional meeting (one/region/year)	\$160,000
Participation at special events associated with UN, conferences, etc. (travel for member to represent IGF at special meetings that have been approved by IGF Executive)	\$10,000.00
Board meetings and related costs (including travel for directors)	\$4,000.00
Total Other Expenses for IGF	\$674,000.00
UNCTAD Expenses to support IGF	
Salaries for IGF support (currently in kind, however indicative costs for temporary staff to support annual meetings as indicated)	\$44,000
UNCTAD Administrative Costs (13% of total costs if UNCTAD manages Trust Fund)	\$158,600.00
Total UNCTAD Expenses	\$202,600.00
Total IGF Funding Required	\$1,378,600.00

Appendix 3. Member Countries of the IGF - 2012

Africa

Botswana
Burkina Faso
Burundi
Ethiopia
Gabon
Ghana
Kenya
Madagascar
Malawi
Mali
Mauritania
Morocco
Mozambique
Namibia
Niger
Nigeria
Republic of Guinea
Senegal
Sierra Leone
South Africa
Swaziland
Tanzania
Uganda
Zambia

Asia

India
Mongolia
Papua New Guinea
Philippines

Caribbean/South America

Argentina
Bolivia
Brazil
Dominican Republic
Guatemala
Honduras
Jamaica
Peru
Suriname
Uruguay

Europe and the C.I.S.

Kazakhstan
Kyrgyz Republic
Romania
Russian Federation
United Kingdom

North America

Canada
Mexico

Appendix 4. Task Force on Future Funding Membership

Member States

Jackeline Gonçalves de Oliveira, Brazil
(Chair)

Patrick Chevalier, Canada

Emile Kaboré, Burkina Faso

Octavio Lopéz, Dominican Republic

Moses Masibo, Kenya

Nikolay Miletenko, Russia

Observer countries

Louis Maréchal, France

UNCTAD

Alexei Mojarov, Special Unit on
Commodities

Private Sector

Jan Klawitter, AngloAmerican

Civil Society

Nadine Grant, Plan Canada

Secretary

Andrew Dawe, Canada
Secretary of the IGF

Appendix 5. Consulted Websites²

**Intergovernmental Forum on Mining,
Minerals, Metals and Sustainable
Development**

[<http://www.globaldialogue.info/>](http://www.globaldialogue.info/)

**United Nations Development Group
Multi-partner Trust Office**

[<http://mptf.undp.org/>](http://mptf.undp.org/)

**International Study Groups: Nickel
Study Group**

[<http://www.insg.org/>](http://www.insg.org/)

United Nations Forum on Forests

[<http://www.un.org/esa/forests/>](http://www.un.org/esa/forests/)

Global Water Partnership

[<http://www.gwp.org/>](http://www.gwp.org/)

² All information, documents, and reports gathered to develop this report were publicly available on the websites until 20 August 2012.