A toolkit for advocacy at the World Bank Group

Updated by Eurodad, October 2023

Contents

This briefing has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Union (under the 'Raising public awareness of development issues and promoting development education in the European Union (DEAR)' programme) and Bread for the World. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of Eurodad and the authors of this report and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the funders.

Introduction

This toolkit aims to support civil society in their advocacy towards the World Bank Group (WBG). In Part 1 and 2, the toolkit provides an overview of the World Bank: its main functions, its governance and how European Union (EU) Member States influence its decision-making. In Part 3, you will find guidance on locating and understanding information about World Bank activities, and in Part 4 about how civil society organisations (CSOs) can direct WBG-focused advocacy and campaign work.

The toolkit is principally targeted at CSOs based in the EU, and those working on development finance issues within the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The WBG is a key part of the international financial architecture, as the most important of the Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs). It wields huge influence over the domestic economic policies of impoverished countries through lending with conditionality, standard setting, technical assistance and policy advice. Its activities shape borrower countries' institutions and policies, and impact on a wide range of issues including education, health, social protection, inequality, private sector development, climate change resilience and environmental (un)sustainability.

This toolkit is designed to be an accessible resource for any organisation working on these issues or anyone who wants to begin or step up their advocacy towards the WBG. Given the influence the WBG will have on the global south's ability to finance and achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), it is critical for CSOs to contribute their voices to the bank's work.

A brief history of the World Bank Group

The World Bank Group now consists of five different institutions. The original bank – the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) – was created in 1944 in the wake of the Great Depression and the Second World War. Its original mandate was to support reconstruction efforts, mainly in Europe, and to help kick-start European economies after the war. Together with the International Monetary Fund (IMF), it constituted the Bretton Woods system, named after the US town where the founding conference took place.

The IBRD formally became a part of the United Nations system, but reflected the post-war power imbalances from the beginning. The USA had emerged as the world's dominant economic power, and as net creditor to their cash-starved allies through the war. Consequently the IBRD was headquartered in Washington DC; it was placed under U.S. American management and started to operate under a quota-based decision-making system. This system did note entail parity among member countries but rather made the USA the only member with an effective veto right over all major decisions. Credit allocation was never fully needs- or rules-based. It was politically determined, came with political conditions attached and went primarily to allies.

As reconstruction needs in Europe faded away, the World Bank sought new opportunities and found them in the Trikont where an increasing number of former colonies gained their independence. In 1960, the International Development Association (IDA) was founded in order to provide concessional loans and grants to the so-called developing countries. In the decades that followed, IDA played a key role in financing projects in both infrastructure and social sectors, and also in boosting external and public debt levels in poor countries.

The side effect of loan-financing development was its contribution to the 'Third World debt crisis' that emerged in the early 1980s. During this debt crisis the World Bank joined forces with the IMF to become the key promoter of 'structural adjustment programmes' (SAP) in debt-trapped borrower countries. The neo-liberal transformation they imposed consisted of deregulation, liberalisation and privatisation policies and became known as the Washington Consensus. It took until 2005 – when the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative (MDRI) was adopted – to do away with the debt overhangs that the WBG had earlier contributed to creating. The decades in between became infamous as the 'lost decades' for development.

The neo-liberal shift was also reflected in the transformation of the institution of the World Bank itself. In 1988, the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA) was set up with the mandate to insure investors from non-commercial, i.e. political, risks. The World Bank also started to channel an increasing share of resources through the International Finance Corporation (IFC), its private sector arm, to support private sector development. Last but not least, the WBG's International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) became a channel that was more often used by transnational corporations, which felt that their investor rights were in danger by state interventions. This private turn of the WBG operationalised the ideological concept of 'trickle down economics'.

Since the adoption of the UN Millennium Declaration in 2000, the WBG has increasingly highlighted poverty eradication as an objective of World Bank operations. An additional area of engagement is climate change mitigation and adaptation, which was triggered by the adoption of the Kyoto Protocol in 1997. World Bank finance became fragmented, as the WBG started to host Trust Funds whose resources are earmarked for financing specific sectors such as environment or education.

The new guiding concept of ‘Shared Prosperity’ aims to reduce inequality and thus make the World Bank attractive for justice-oriented actors

Currently, the World Bank is struggling to find its role. Due to the globalisation of financial markets, developing countries borrow increasingly from private sources. The US and Western dominance in World Bank governance has incentivised other powers to set up new MDBs – a notable example is the China-driven Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB). The World Bank has lost the quasi-monopoly it once had in development lending.

It has responded with a number of transformations that are still ongoing. The transformation to a ‘knowledge bank’ aims to shift the focus from providing finance towards providing policy advice and technical assistance. Ideologically, the WBG is trying a balance act. The new guiding concept of ‘Shared Prosperity’ aims to reduce inequality and thus make the World Bank attractive for justice-oriented actors, while the “maximize finance for development”-approach aims to mobilise private capital and thus please business-friendly groups. The outcome of this ideological battle is still uncertain and will depend upon the powers at play.

Part 1: What does the World Bank Group actually do?

In this section we look briefly at the different institutions of the World Bank Group and what they do.

The World Bank Group consists of five different organisations, as mentioned above. **The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development** (IBRD) and the **International Development Association** (IDA) primarily provide financing, policy advice and technical assistance to governments. IDA's mandate is to focus on poorer countries, while the IBRD assists middle-income and creditworthy poorer countries.

The private sector arm of the WBG consists of the **International Finance Corporation** (IFC), **Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency** (MIGA) and the **International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes** (ICSID). These institutions provide financing, technical assistance, insurance against risks to private firms and financial institutions, and help to settle disputes with governments.

Development financing with conditionality

A central activity of the World Bank is financing development in eligible countries. IDA can give grants and its loans are more concessional; IDA finance is therefore only available for the poorer countries whose Gross National Income (GNI) per capita is low (less than US$1,185 per year in 2018). Their risk of ending up in a debt crisis is a second criteria. The level of debt distress is assessed by a **Debt Sustainability Analysis**, which is jointly conducted with the IMF. The second criteria is a lesson from the Third World debt crises and aims to avoid WBG financing triggering new crises in borrower countries.

Currently, **75 countries are eligible** for IDA finance, most of them in Africa. As developing countries' economies are growing in GNI terms, fewer and fewer countries can get cheap finance from IDA. A recent critique of IDA eligibility criteria is that it does not sufficiently take vulnerabilities into account, e.g. vulnerabilities to natural disasters or pandemics, that many of the slightly richer countries are facing.

Regular IDA loans have a maturity of 38 years and carry an annual interest rate of 0.75 per cent for loans denominated in Euros, or 1.41 per cent for those in US dollars. They are foreign currency loans, which means that the borrowers carry the exchange rate risk and, despite the low costs, might face repayment difficulties if their currency collapses. According to the World Bank, **IDA provided financing of US$24 billion** in fiscal year 2018, an increase of 20 per cent compared to the previous year and a record level for IDA.

The IBRD provided a slightly lower amount of US$23 billion in the same year. IBRD lending targets middle-income countries and is more expensive. The interest rate is flexible and depends on the six-month Libor rate, to which a contractual spread of 0.5 per cent, and a front-end and commitment fee of 0.25 per cent each are added. The US$ Libor rate surged from 1.4 per cent in July 2017 to 2.5 per cent in in July 2018, so it almost doubled in just one year.

The two major financing instruments of the World Bank Group are **Investment Project Financing** (IPF) and **Development Policy Financing** (DPF). The first instrument is for projects in the area of physical or social infrastructure, the second is a form of budget support to the national government or a subnational division. The World Bank's safeguards apply mainly to project financing. DPF is necessarily more fungible – meaning that the actual activity for which the borrower uses the resources is hard to identify. The WBG agrees the use of DPF in the Country Partnership Framework, and defines prior actions (triggers) that the borrowers need to take before they receive money. Due to the very different nature of the financing instruments, CSO advocacy also needs to be adjusted depending on the instrument used. In the case of IPF, attempts to do no harm (or to do good) can take place on a project level; in the case of DPF, these take place on the broader and overarching policy level.

The financing of the WBG's private sector arm needs to be added: The IFC provides roughly US$12 billion in long-term investment financing to private business, which can be in the form of loans or equity participation. MIGA's guarantees amount to about US$5 billion per year. With these lending volumes, the WBG is by far the largest of the Multilateral Development Banks. Only the European Investment Bank (EIB) has a larger lending volume of almost €100 billion annually, but its loans go predominantly to EU Member States.

The WBG finances projects in nearly all sectors such as infrastructure, health, education and agriculture. The lines between these sectors are blurred and neither the databases of the World Bank or the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) provide very reliable information on the actual allocation. However, **according to the World Bank**, 'human development lending' – including for health and education – and 'climate-change related' finance have been on the rise recently. The WBG's move into these areas can be explained by the fact that developing countries tap other sources of finance for physical infrastructure, especially from Chinese banks.

The selection of projects to be funded should build on the **Country Partnership Framework** (CPF), which is negotiated with each borrower country for a five-year period. From there, the approval and management of individual loans goes through a **complex process**.

Safeguards and performance standards

Responding to critiques of human rights violations in or environmental damages through WBG-funded projects, the World Bank has introduced a complex set of safeguards that have evolved in several steps. In 2018 the new **Environmental and Social Framework** was introduced. This includes an **Environmental and Social Policy** for the WBG to follow, and an **Environmental and Social Standards** for borrowers to follow. It includes areas such as labour rights, pollution prevention, measures related to involuntary resettlement and the rights of indigenous people, among others. The effectiveness of these safeguards is contested by watchdog organisations such as the **Bank Information Center** or the **Bretton Wood Project**, and the recent reform has been seen as a dilution by many critical observers.

The IFC has a separate set of safeguards, the **Performance Standards on Environmental and Social Sustainability**. These are eight clusters of standards that IFC clients are to meet. They cover environmental issues but also areas such as resettlement, labour and indigenous people.

The extent of control that the WB exerts depends on the type of financial instrument. It is higher for project financing and lower for broader development policy lending or certain types of IFC support that include financial intermediaries.

Conditionality

The WBG imposes a large number and variety of conditions on borrower countries, often in close collaboration with the IMF. Over the decades, this practice has received a lot of criticism from borrower countries as well as from independent watchdogs. On the one hand, this is because lender-imposed conditionality is generally an intervention into a borrower country's sovereign affairs. On the other hand, it has also become evident that the type of conditionality imposed is ideologically and politically biased. WBG conditionality can include economic policy conditionality such as privatisations of public enterprises or liberalisation of certain sectors for foreign investors. As such it reflects a neo-liberal ideology and is responsive to the foreign economic interests of the richer countries that control the WBG and strive for market access in poorer countries. Conditionality can also make project implementation more costly and cumbersome, absorbing funding, delaying implementation and undermining development effectiveness.

WBG conditionality can be stated in very explicit ways in individual loan documents, usually in an Annex. The WBG calls these 'triggers'. They are negotiated with borrower country authorities ahead of the project and are supposed to be ambitious but achievable. Some of these 'triggers' are pre-conditions, meaning the borrower hast to meet them before the loan is disbursed. There is a **central database** that maps all prior actions.

However, conditionality is also imposed in more abstract ways, as Eurodad explored in a recent report titled "How IFIs and donors influence economic policies in developing countries". For example, the IDA allocations for different countries are based on a so-called Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA). Countries get a better CPIA score when they have an open trade regime, have weak job security for workers, or impose regressive taxes such as Value Added Tax (VAT) on their populations. Compliance then influences the amount of IDA resources that they can get. The conditionality practices of the WBG are frequently cited as the key reason why many developing countries seek alternative forms of financing, e.g. from Chinese banks or private investors. These are more expensive but come with fewer strings attached.

Technical cooperation

The WBG is a key actor when it comes to technical cooperation programmes, the training of staff and the transfer of policies and know-how, both to public sector and private sector actors. The World Bank's own Technical Cooperation (TC) is involved in a wide range of sensitive areas and government functions, including economic integration, public financial management including debt management and tax administration, investment climate and labour market sectors, infrastructure development, to name just a few. The WBG also executes technical assistance financed by other donors such as the UN Development Programme (UNDP) or bilateral agencies. TC staff often sit directly in ministries and/or are involved in drafting legislation, which is why it is a particularly sensitive area when it comes to democratic ownership.

A **survey conducted by the Reality of Aid** in 2016 found that TC remains donor-driven and is closely related to the implementing agencies' own interests. In the case of the WBG, technical cooperation is often a soft form of conditionality that accompanies World Bank loans and/or aims primarily to enable borrower countries to meet WBG-set standards and conditions. The survey also cited a case study from Sri Lanka where WBG TC promoted an export-oriented agriculture strategy, ignoring domestic food security needs. WBG TC is also vulnerable to conflict of interests: for example, the WBG is providing TC related to legal and institutional frameworks for Public-Private Partnerships (PPP units and laws) while the IFC is financially involved in PPPs.

Generally, the share of TC provided by multilateral banks has shrunk in recent decades, while the share funded by bilateral donors has increased. However, as the TC provided by the WBG affects core state functions, it should be closely watched by civil society.

Research and standard setting

A third important area of WBG activity relates to research and standard setting. The WBG produces a huge number of research outputs every year, not all of them are influential. However, the annual flagship publication in particular, the **World Development Report**, does shape opinions in the areas it covers. The 2019 report on The Future of Work already caused a scandal during the drafting phase, as **trade unions publicly complained** that the WBG refused to consult them and is seeking to promote an agenda of deregulation and informalisation of work through the report's messages and conclusions.

The WBG conducts surveillance activities in different areas. These are not less controversial. One key example is the **Doing Business Report**, an annual publication that measures the 'ease of doing business' in countries around the world along a set of indicators. Even the WBG's own **Independent Evaluation Group spotted** that the indicators simply presume that less regulation is better for doing business. So a good ranking does not assess if a country has good or bad regulation and if the type of regulation chosen meets developmental needs. While officially the Doing Business Report is simply a research and information product, **Eurodad research discovered** that the findings served to design the WBG's loan conditionality in several countries, and they influence policy choices by developing country governments.

Through its standard setting, the WBG gets substantial leverage. Often standards that the World Bank developed – originally with the intention of guiding its own operations, which are those of a multilateral development bank – are eventually considered 'best practice'. These are then copied by developing countries, or enforced in developing countries through loan conditionality and donor-driven technical co-operation.

Part 2: Who decides what the World Bank Group does?

In this section, we look at the WBG's main decision-making bodies.

The Board of Governors

The highest decision-making body of the WBG is its **Board of Governors**, made up of two representatives from each of the 189 member countries: one governor and one alternate, with each member able to appoint up to seven advisors. If the country is also a member of IFC, MIGA or ICSID, the same people are also in charge of these institutions. Countries appoint their Governors, who are usually finance ministers or development ministers, for an unspecified term. The Board of Governors has delegated most of its powers to the 25 members of the Executive Board, but is still responsible for core issues such as changing the articles of agreement, admitting new members or authorising capital increases.

The Board of Governors meets every autumn to carry out is main work, including selecting a new Chair each year. This takes place jointly with the corresponding Board of the IMF during the IMF-WB Annual Meetings. Discussions usually span a broad range of issues related to national and global macro-economic developments, as well as key development finance topics.

Decisions by the Board of Governors are taken by vote – and can be made in writing outside the annual meetings – based upon each Governor's respective **voting power** (weighted vote). Decisions need to be backed by Member States representing 85 per cent of the votes (80 per cent in the case of the IFC). Voting rights largely correspond to the shares a Member State holds. These shares are determined by a formula that slightly differs between the different institutions of the WBG. For the IBRD, it is a mix of a country's economic weight (Gross Domestic Product – GDP) with a weight of 80 per cent and its contributions to IDA with a weight of 20 per cent.

The shareholder system ensures that power within the Board of Governors rests securely with the economically most powerful countries – with the US effectively holding veto power over major decisions given its 16 per cent quota (IBRD). Remarkably, the decision-making power rests with the countries in which the World Bank does not operate. The non-borrowing countries hold 61 per cent of the voting rights at the IBRD, and 54 per cent at IDA. This means that the WBG is not owned and cannot be controlled by those countries in which WBG operations impact directly.

Critics have highlighted this structural imbalance and continue to call for reforms to WBG decision-making to give borrower countries a bigger voice. CSOs have backed developing country calls for parity in voting that would **give the borrower countries more power**, and for additional seats for African countries at the cost of European countries. The 2018 **shareholding review** has led to a slight redistribution of shares and voting rights towards developing countries whose economies have grown in recent years. However, it did not tackle the fundamental problem that the 'economic weight' of a country is the main factor that determines its influence in the World Bank.

The Development Committee

The Joint Ministerial Committee of the Boards of Governors of the World Bank and the IMF on the Transfer of Real Resources to Developing Countries – or the **Development Committee** – is an advisory body to the boards of governors of both institutions. It meets biannually – at the IMF-WB Spring and Annual Meetings – and focuses on urgent matters related to economic development, including: international trade and payments; the flow of capital; investment; and official development assistance. As such, policies on issues including debt relief or poverty reduction may be dealt with by the Development Committee as well as the International Monetary and Financial Committee – the latter is an exclusive body of the IMF.

The membership of the Development Committee extends beyond WBG and IMF governors to include development ministers. For two years its composition mirrors the constituency system of the IMF (24 members), and for the following two years, the constituency system of the World Bank (25 members). The Committee selects a chair from amongst its members, as well as an Executive Secretary who is responsible for day to day coordination work.

The Development Committee is increasingly seen as more of a World Bank committee, due to its mandate, but its discussions are intended to provide strategic guidance to the Executive Boards of both the WBG and the IMF. This guidance is issued principally through a **communiqué** summarising the outcomes of its biannual meetings.

To help CSOs make sense of the Development Committee communiqués, Eurodad and other organisations such as the Bretton Woods Project produce short analyses on their websites following the Spring and Annual Meetings. Look out for these blogposts to support your advocacy and campaign work on the WBG.

The Executive Board

The WBG **Executive Board** (the 'Board') refers formally to four separate boards – those of IBRD, IDA, IFC and MIGA. However, in practice the composition is identical – they meet as one, and they can be explained as one. The Board is currently made up of 25 Executive Directors (EDs), representing the member countries. It is chaired by the WBG President who usually delegates this role. The Executive Board deals with the day-to-day work of the WBG, meeting almost every day, and signs off on the policies and all lending and investment decisions.

EDs are based permanently in Washington DC. Seven of the world's largest economies, including three EU Member States, effectively hold permanent, single seats on the Board. These states are, by voting power: the USA, Japan, China, Germany, France, the UK and Saudi Arabia. Other states are grouped in constituencies of between two and 23 countries, broadly by geography. In principle, countries are free to choose their constituency, but in practice, changes imply a re-assessment of the entire configuration.

Each constituency elects its own Executive Director who represents their common positions at the Board. The post is either reserved for one or several of the constituency's largest members by voting power, or with the post rotating among all members. The 'Nordic-Baltic' constituency, for example, rotates its ED post amongst all eight members, although the length of time each country holds the mandate differs according to its relative voting power. Relative influence on constituency positions – not only Board decisions – is therefore also linked to voting power and the composition of the constituency, and CSOs should consider these factors strategically when approaching their national ED. High-income countries ultimately hold a majority of Board seats, and many developing countries find themselves represented by a rich country. Civil society has long pointed to the over-representation of richer countries and, as is the case in the Board of Governors, the US holds an effective veto on substantive decisions, which often require an 85 per cent majority to pass.

The President

The **World Bank President** heads the institution's staff and is also a (non-voting) chair of the Executive Board. S/he can attend Board of Governors' meetings and is responsible for the organisation and recruitment of staff. In practice, the President is often also the 'public face' of the World Bank. **IFC** and **MIGA** are headed by their own Chief Executive Officers; ICSID is led by a **Secretary-General**.

The Executive Board appoints the President for a renewable five-year term, generally by consensus rather than via a formal vote. Governors and Executive Directors may **nominate** nationals from any member country. In practice, however, the selection of the President has always been an opaque exercise governed by a **'gentlemen's agreement'** originating from the 1944 Bretton Woods Conferences, ensuring that the IMF MD is from Europe and the World Bank President from the USA. This has long been criticised by CSOs and developing countries, which have demanded a merit-based selection of the President. However, the disproportionate power of the USA and Europe at the World Bank means the unwritten policy remains. Jim Yong Kim, the 12th World Bank President, began his tenure in 2012. While previous Presidents met with CSOs on visits to Europe, to date Kim has never done so.

How do EU Member States coordinate their World Bank positions?

The constituency system in the Executive Board (which is mirrored in the Development Committee) means that EU Member States do not formally speak with a single voice at the WBG. Despite holding one-third of Board seats, and 27 per cent of vote share, they are spread over seven constituencies and three single seats, with no common EU or Eurozone representation; several are in constituencies mainly composed of non-EU countries. For example, Spain is in the Central American constituency, and Ireland is in the Canadian and Caribbean constituency. Nevertheless, EU Member States are arguably overrepresented on the Executive Board.

Despite the lack of formal EU representation on the IMF Executive Board, EU Member States do have informal mechanisms to discuss WBG policy issues, and to develop common positions. European Executive Directors meet on a weekly basis at the World Bank headquarters in Washington DC to discuss and pre-agree on pertinent issues such as major policy reforms or larger loans. EU institutions are not formally involved in WBG processes, but the European Commission (EC) has observer status in the European coordination meetings; it sends an officer from their Washington-based team.

The EC also maintains direct relations with the World Bank as both rank among the world's largest development financiers. At an operational level, EC and World Bank staff sit together in numerous sector working groups that coordinate development cooperation in borrower countries. At the political level, the presidents of the two institutions may meet to discuss policy.

Part 3: Finding out what the World Bank is saying and doing

In this section, we provide advice on how to find and understand information about WBG activities.

Country-specific documents

It can be difficult to navigate the World Bank website and find specific information, but a lot of country-specific documents and country data are gathered on individual **country pages**. These pages include the Country Partnership Strategy, research papers or blogs dealing with a given country, and the names (albeit not the contact details) of the relevant World Bank's Country Director and Country Manager.

Language is of course an issue: some documents are available only in English, and thus are inaccessible for many domestic citizens and grassroots activists in non-Anglophone countries; others are only available in relevant national languages and thus difficult to access for international activists.

Particular types of documents (e.g. **project documents**) are grouped in single, searchable databases covering all relevant countries. Finding these databases is not always straightforward, so it is worth making full use of the site's search functions.

The World Bank also has a number of **different newsletters** on different thematic topics that you can subscribe to, including one on civil society engagement. (However, it was not possible to subscribe to this at the time of writing.)

Executive Board documents

Executive Board meetings are not public, and documents and ED positions on specific agenda items are not published in advance of meetings. The **World Bank Group Board's Calendar** is the main source of information for what is going to be discussed. Calendars usually cover the upcoming three months. **Minutes of Meetings of Executive Directors** are published via the online archive. These are useful to find out which topics have been discussed and what has been approved. However, these minutes do not reflect the discussion, so they do not tell which position an individual ED took.

Executive Directors have their own websites, which differ from constituency to constituency. They can be particularly useful given that they contain the names of ED office staff, albeit not always their contact details. EDs that represent only one country often release some data related to vested national interests. For example, the **United Kingdom's ED office** publishes data on contract awards to UK firms, while the annual report of the **German ED office** contains figures for German staff employed by the WBG. The websites of EDs representing a constituency of several countries usually have selected documents for these countries.

It's worth remembering that, while decisions on a loan to a specific country tend to be discussed at a single Board meeting, policy issues (e.g. reviewing the distribution of voting rights across member countries) may need repeated discussions over a number of months. Keep in touch with the civil society team, specific staff and your respective ED and ED office staff to stay up-to-date with the progress of issues you are working on.

World Bank Group policy

The Development Committee guides the strategic policy direction of the WBG and issues a public **communiqué** after each of its biannual meetings. CSOs should review these documents after each Spring and Annual meeting to identify the political direction that the World Bank is taking and specific policy commitments. For example, the Spring 2018 communiqué covered the substantial capital increase that will boost the WBG's lending capacity in future years, and the shareholding review that leads to a slight change in Member States' voting rights.

The WBG regularly produces **policy papers** related to how it is doing its work. These range from staff conduct to guidelines on multi-stakeholder engagement or financial terms and conditions of Bank financing. These can often be a good resource to understand WBG operations in detail. Depending upon the subject matter, policy papers may be published before they are discussed by the Executive Board.

World Bank Group monitoring and research

As a key plank of the institution's work, the IMF produces a large amount of analysis on governance, finance and development issues. The central database **World Bank Open Data** aggregates a large share of the data generated by this monitoring work. Datasets often used include the **World Development Indicators** for all data related to poverty and development. Of particular relevance for development finance watchdogs and advocates are the **Global Economic Prospects**, the **International Debt Statistics** or the **Aid flows** database. As many policy- and decision-makers, as well as academics, use World Bank datasets to make decisions or build their opinions, the WBG choice about what is measured and which results are highlighted can be extremely influential.

Some monitoring exercises have direct influence as they inform World Bank lending and conditionality design. This includes the **Country Policy and Institutional Assessment** (CPIA) – the results of which are used by the IMF to set debt limit thresholds for developing countries, and thus shape how much money a country can borrow from all creditors together, not just from the World Bank. The **Doing Business Indicators** are also influential in shaping reforms of investment regulation and deregulation. Other assessments such as the **Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability** (PEFA) assessment can shape whether donors are using a recipient country's own financial systems or insist on setting up parallel implementation units in this country.

A huge volume of **research by World Bank staff** is released each year. This on a wide range of topics including economic or social policies, sector specific topics such as transport, health or education, or also country case studies on specific topics. Research is not an Executive Board output, so does not necessarily reflect official WBG policy.

Data gaps and requests

World Bank transparency has improved over recent decades. However, some gaps remain. For example, CSOs protested that, while the IFC holds comprehensive information about the activities of financial intermediaries that use IFC resources, it refuses to disclose those to watchdogs. It is also difficult to find process information about the Executive Board's work, for example, which position individual EDs took.

A lot of information is available on the World Bank website, although it is not always easy to find. The **World Bank's Civil Society Team** can help to get access to information – indeed, it is part of their role and mandate to support CSOs. Or you can follow the work of watchdogs – some are listed in the annex of this paper. A last resort option for CSOs seeking information is to **make a request** using the dedicated area of the World Bank website. Requests should usually trigger an answer within 20 days; there is an option to appeal if there is no response.

Part 4: Civil society engagement with the World Bank Group

In this section, we provide information about opportunities for CSOs to engage with the WBG and how to make the most of these opportunities.

In the past, CSOs may have found it difficult to engage with the Bretton Woods Institutions, due to the technical nature of their work, for example, or their lack of decision-making transparency. Following massive protests against World Bank and IMF policies and practices in the 1980s to the 2000s – including large-scale mobilisations outside World Bank conferences in Berlin (1988), Prague (2000), Barcelona (2001) and Oslo (2002) – both Bretton Woods institutions have worked to improve their openness to civil society, at the global and national levels.

Both institutions still have much to do to turn best practice into standard practice, but it is important to emphasise that it can be relatively easy to approach and engage with them – provided an organisation has the capacity: in terms of both financial resources and expertise. Maximising your influence requires adopting a campaign perspective, oriented by a specific issue on which the World Bank can affect change, and setting out well-defined demands. The information below is designed to help you make use of the engagement opportunities available to CSOs in this context.

A **guidance note on multi-stakeholder engagement** outlines how such engagement should work from a World Bank point of view and why is it necessary. According to the World Bank's own reporting, there are 120 CSO-facing professionals in the Washington headquarters and distributed among country offices. However, it is often difficult to find out who they are and how to contact them. The World Bank has established a dedicated **Civil Society Team** that is supposed to be the central liaison point. The website unfortunately only includes a generic email address: civilsociety@worldbank.org.

Engagement of CSOs with the World Bank goes two ways. On the one hand, advocacy CSOs try to influence WBG policy and activities, or communicate the concerns of citizens affected by WBG-funded operations. On the other hand, the World Bank is funding some CSO accountability work targeting borrower country governments through the **Global Partnership for Social Accountability**. CSO representatives also sit on the board of this Partnership, as well as on the boards of several **thematic Trust Funds** that the World Bank hosts. The chapters below focus on the needs of advocacy and watchdog CSOs that are targeting the World Bank.

Engaging at the institutional level

The Civil Society Team

This is a dedicated team consisting of four staff within the World Bank's Stakeholder Engagement Unit. It is the main contact point for CSOs, and can coordinate relations with other parts of the WBG – e.g. transmitting advocacy letters to the most appropriate department, and securing a response, or providing contact details for specific staff. Generally, the team is in charge of information sharing with CSOs, organising policy dialogue between CSO and WBG staff, and also for technical assistance to WBG staff in order to establish good practices for consultations. A dedicated **civil society website**, managed by the Team, provides information to CSOs, relevant weblinks and support for participation at the Annual and Spring Meetings.

The CSO team walks a fine line. While on the one hand it should ensure CSO inclusion and participation, it also serves a public relations function for the World Bank and is supposed to protect it from trouble and criticism. For substantial affairs affecting the World Bank it is often more effective to address the decision-maker level directly: for example, CSO-requested changes to the way the Civil Society Policy Forum (CSPF) is conducted were only addressed after a CSO coalition sent a letter straight to President Kim.

Consultations

The World Bank operates a large number of public consultations. Most of them have a national scope, and are related to the Country Partnership Framework for a specific country. Global consultations are made for changes in general World Bank policies. A recent example is the **consultation on the World Bank Safeguards**, which attracted a lot of CSO participation due to the relevance of safeguards for human rights and environmental protection. There are also consultations for certain WB lending instruments, for example, **development policy lending**.

Depending on the topic, consultations can be complex and can involve different formats, including face-to-face meetings with World Bank staff in headquarters or on country-level, videoconferences and global live chats, and calls for written submissions, among others. The WBG also organises targeted consultations with specific CSOs working on a particular issue: these organisations are generally selected through outreach by the Civil Society Team to regional networks such as **Eurodad**, or watchdog organisations such as BIC and the **Bretton Woods Project**, which can disseminate information more widely to specialist groups.

CSOs are strongly encouraged to seize the opportunities to contribute to consultations. A dedicated **consultations web page** maps the ongoing, closed and planned consultations. However, the web page is not always up to date, so it makes sense to consult other sources such as the ED offices or the **BIC website**. Consultations are an important opportunity to promote civil society positions and engage the WBG in a dialogue on specific aspects of its work. Often, a consultation topic may seem very technical: it can be useful to work with CSO coalitions and networks to develop a common contribution to a consultation, particularly where the scope of a topic is very wide. Contact partner organisations and specialist CSOs to find out whether they are intending to participate in a consultation and how your organisation could contribute. The general rule is 'the more – the merrier'. Experienced CSOs report that coalition building is an effective tool and that joint submissions backed by a larger group of CSOs are more likely to impact than individual ones.

You should also reach out directly to the staff member(s) leading work on the consultation to request a bilateral meeting/call.

Independent Evaluation Group (IEG)

The WBG's own **Independent Evaluation Group** (IEG) is an institutional channel that CSOs can use. The IEG regularly evaluates different areas of WBG policy or operations. The work programme, including a list of **upcoming evaluations**, is available online. The IEG is mandated to actively seek inputs from CSOs; this implies that CSOs can communicate their concerns to the IEG, which may or may not then share and leverage these concerns through their evaluation reports. If IEG reports share the critique and recommendations of CSOs, they give additional leverage and credibility to them. It is fair to say that the IEG offers a lot of valuable **resources from within for CSOs**; a dedicated CSO **mailing list** helps to keep up to date. However, the power of the IEG to actually shape World Bank reforms is limited and the recommendations of IEG reports are non-binding.

World Bank Inspection Panel

For CSOs that are concerned with individual World Bank-funded projects, the **Inspection Panel** is a body to work with. The Inspections Panel's role and mandate is to investigate whether IBRD and IDA are complying with their operational procedures, including their safeguards. CSOs – or even groups of at least two individuals located in a project country – can **file requests** to the panel to investigate. In exceptional cases this is also possible for CSOs from other countries than the one where the project in question is located. The Panel consists of **three members** appointed by the World Bank's Executive Board and is supported by an independent secretariat. Cases dealt with include resettlement, environmental impacts and the rights of indigenous people. After investigating a case, the panel makes recommendations to the Executive Board.

Compliance Advisor Ombudsman (CAO)

The IFC and MIGA have a separate institution whose role is, according to its **own website**, to "respond to complaints from project-affected communities with the goal of enhancing social and environmental outcomes on the ground". The Compliance Advisor Ombudsman (CAO) can be used for complaints related to operations by private firms or banks that are IFC-funded or MIGA-guaranteed. The CAO has easy eligibility criteria, and it is fairly user-friendly. It has produced its **own guides** to explain how engaging the CAO works. Essentially it acts as a dispute resolution forum between private firms on the one side and affected communities and CSOs on the other. The CAO is one of the few branches of the WBG that has multi-lingual materials, making it easier for grassroots CSOs and affected communities to get involved. The CAO is thus a key institution for CSOs that target IFC or MIGA-funded projects (not policies).

One challenge that experienced CSOs have discovered is that the IFC is increasingly using financial intermediaries to channel its money: the IFC gives money to a bank, and the bank funds the private firms. In these cases, it is difficult for affected communities to find out that IFC monies are involved. CSOs have called on the IFC to disclose more information on the activities of their intermediaries.

The Annual and Spring Meetings

The **Annual and Spring Meetings** (AM/SM) bring together many development finance actors. For several years, a Civil Society Policy Forum (CSPF) has also been organised in conjunction with the main agenda. The CSPF attracts around 600-700 CSO representatives from around the world, and can be a useful occasion to learn more about the work and priorities of the WBG, network with other CSOs and meet with WBG staff, government representatives and other stakeholders.

The CSPF features around 40 thematic CSO side events on development finance issues (see more below), as well as sessions for participants to engage directly with institutional leaders: notably, a town hall meeting with the IMF Managing Director and World Bank President and roundtable meetings with IMF/WB Executive Directors. These meetings do reflect increasing efforts by the institutions to interact with CSO attendees, but in practice they are not guaranteed strategic advocacy opportunities. The current, large-scale question-and-answer format hinders a focused dialogue, while attendance by EDs at the large roundtable meetings is often poor, or delegated to advisors. CSOs are advised to push for one-to-one meetings with their respective EDs, or for meetings with regional/constituency groupings of EDs, if aiming for more targeted policy discussions. Indeed, **CSOs have found the CSPF to be too separate from the main AM/SM agenda**, with few CSO participants in official events or space for their views. Nor does the CSPF allow for any direct CSO engagement with WBG decision-making bodies (e.g. Development Committee or Board of Governors).

The IMF-World Bank Annual and Spring Meetings

Twice a year, the IMF and World Bank host a week of policy discussions and events on national and global macro-economic issues. The Annual Meetings traditionally take place in September/October, and are anchored around the joint meetings of the Boards of Governors of the two institutions, and the meetings of the IMFC and Development Committee. The two advisory committees also convene at the Spring Meetings. The gatherings take place in Washington DC, where the institutions are headquartered. Every third year, the Annual Meetings are held in a member country outside the USA.

The Annual and Spring Meetings are major events in the global economic and financial calendar, with the Annual Meetings gathering around 13,000 participants in 2017, ranging from government ministers and officials, to representatives from international organisations, financial institutions, the private sector, media, and civil society. The scale of attendance means many country groupings, such as the G7, G20, G24 and G77 also hold meetings during the Annual and Spring Meetings and use the occasion to issue communiqués setting out key policy priorities. While the main institutional meetings are held behind closed doors, many debates, briefings, or press conferences are organised with high-profile speakers and dealing with topical development finance issues, as part of an official, public programme.

Sources: imf.org; worldbank.org

Media interest and the political significance of the Annual and Spring Meetings have both waned in recent years, but they can be a useful advocacy moment, if you have identified them as a key lobby and media opportunity within a focused campaign, and have done groundwork in advance. Take advantage of them by arranging one-to-one meetings in advance in the margins of the event (see more below). Apart from this, they are great moments to get up to speed with the latest development finance policy discussions, and the positioning of various actors – from governments to private finance institutions to other CSOs: be sure therefore to take time away from the CSPF and attend public events on the official agenda!

It's also useful to get in touch with other organisations that are working on the issues that interest you, to see what they have planned around the Annual and Spring Meetings: e.g. major campaign actions in which you can get involved.

You can find useful background policy material and practical information about the Annual and Spring Meetings, on the websites of specialised CSOs and networks such as **Eurodad**, the **Bretton Woods Project** or the **Bank Information Center**. The Eurodad Secretariat also produces an internal update for its member organisations ahead of each Spring and Annual meetings.

Advocacy at the Annuals/Springs

Meetings with EDs and WBG staff are perhaps best arranged at times other than the Annual/Spring meetings. However, repeated advocacy trips to Washington DC may not be a financially viable option for many non-US based CSOs, so it's worth trying to capitalise on the Annuals/Springs to arrange side meetings with key advocacy targets. But remember, while the sheer number of actors participating at the meetings means your targets may all be in the same place, that doesn't mean they will have the time to meet you: schedules, particularly for EDs, are packed around these times. Here are some tips:

- **Reach out to WBG staff working on your issues**: approach them well in advance to set up face-to-face meetings. Contact the Civil Society Team if you are unable to find the contact details for specific people.
- **Don't underestimate your influence**: use the media strategically to highlight your positions in advance, and make sure it is on the World Bank's radar. The WBG is notoriously averse to bad press in major outlets, and monitors its press coverage.
- **Consider an 'outsider strategy'**, particularly if the WBG or government authorities don't seem to be open to dialogue: use the Annuals/Springs for public actions or media stunts and mobilise partner CSOs to participate. It is generally best to first try to approach the WBG directly with your positions, before escalating media work. Making public noise can reduce staff's willingness to engage constructively with you; on the other hand, it can leverage public and management pressure. It should be carefully considered if the insider or the outsider strategy, or a combination of both, fits best for your purpose.
- **Reach out to your ED and their advisors**: particularly if you are from a developing country, and link your advocacy at the Annuals/Springs with your advocacy at the national level (see more below).
- **Reach out to regional EDs/constituency**: often, CSO networks may already be organising regular meetings with regional groupings of EDs – such as the CSO meetings with European EDs – so get in touch with partner organisations to find out what is already going on. If no such meetings take place, contact the relevant EDs directly, to propose that these be convened, along with other CSOs from your country/region. If you have established national contacts at finance or line ministries working on the WBG, inform them that you are making these contacts and/or holding these meetings, so they are aware that CSOs are monitoring (the country's activities at) the WBG.

Side events

One of the key ways that CSOs participate in the CSPF is by organising a side event, often in cooperation with partner organisations. This might be to launch a new report or research, to hold a panel debate on a specific aspect of WBG policy or WBG-funded project, or to strategise with other CSOs. The IMF and WBG invite proposals for events about two months in advance of the CSPF. They also take care of logistical arrangements meaning that there are no on-site room costs for the CSO. Make sure you sign up on the official **WB and IMF CSO web pages** to be alerted when submission periods are open.

Working Group

A CSPF Working Group was established in 2017 with the aim of providing CSOs with greater input into the agenda and format of the CSPF. At the time of writing, terms of reference were still being developed by the group, which brings together eight CSO representatives selected with respect to regional and gender balance. The group will ideally be available to support CSOs engaging with the Forum. (For more information, contact: **CSPFWorkingGroup@gmail.com**.)

Engaging at the EU level

There are relatively few opportunities for CSOs to engage with the WBG at the EU level, at least when compared with the IMF for which the EU has set up formal coordination mechanism such as the subcommittee on IMF-related issues in the Economic and Financial Committee (SCIMF) and the informal committee of EU countries' representatives in the IMF (EURIMF). Coordination of a joint EU position in the WBG works on a more informal basis, and so does the interaction of CSOs with them.

At the Annual and Spring meetings themselves, CSOs from the Eurodad network and allied organisations hold a regular meeting with the European Executive Directors of the WBG, coordinated in cooperation with BIC Europe and the Bretton Woods Project in CSO liaison roles. A third annual exchange between European EDs and CSOs takes place in Brussels when European EDs or their alternates come to town to liaise with EU institutions.

Sitting outside the main CSPF agenda, the meetings provide a valuable opportunity for CSOs to raise specific issues directly with the institution's European leadership, and for CSOs to address specific points from the official agenda of the Development Committee. The informal nature of these meetings allows for an interactive discussion, and for ongoing advocacy relations to be deepened. Agenda items are put forward by the CSOs attending, and discussion papers are prepared in advance. Differing constituency positions are sometimes in evidence and enable CSOs to target their follow-up advocacy more effectively. Moreover, in contrast to larger civil society-ED meetings convened as part of the official CSPF agenda, the meetings allow for a structured discussion and attendance by European EDs or their alternates is generally high.

Side events at the Annual and Spring Meetings

If you're considering organising a side event, here are some tips:

- Don't expect WBG or government representatives to attend your event just because it's on the CSPF agenda: if you want to use a side event to support advocacy, invite key staff or government officials to attend or speak. Having a WBG panellist at your event can be a good way of getting a public response to an issue. But don't use this as a substitute for one-to-one advocacy meetings!
- Check what partner organisations have planned: and try to co-sponsor a single event if you're planning similar things (e.g. a panel debate on regulating Public-Private Partnerships).
- Side events can be really useful to exchange with other CSOs: for instance, if you want to promote a new report or publication. If you want to talk strategy, then a public side event may not be the most ideal forum. Many CSOs use the CSPF to arrange strategy meetings outside the official programme: think about organising a targeted meeting and letting other organisations know.
- Manage your expectations, and the media: the CSPF agenda features many events, but few institutional/governmental representatives attend. So before you fly in a high-profile speaker, think about whether the CSPF is the right forum. If you want media attention for your event, make sure you target journalists beforehand, and circulate information in the media centre when you're at the CSPF.
- Don't forget the official programme: if a high-profile representative from your organisation will be attending the Annuals/Spring meetings, try to secure a speaking slot for them on the official seminar programme. Contact the IMF and World Bank in advance – via the Civil Society Teams if necessary – to inform them about your representative and explore the options. Work with other CSOs to lobby. If you don't get a speaker slot, you can still try to get space for an intervention from the floor.

Engaging at the national level

There are several key WBG interlocutors that are useful for national level advocacy.

Executive Directors and national representatives

One of the central ways of trying to influence the WBG's agenda through the national level, particularly for European CSOs, is to maintain working relationships with national/regional EDs and government officials working on World Bank issues. Here is some guidance on how to get the most out of your interaction with them:

- **Get – and stay – informed**: Monitor country policy frameworks and loan agreements in your region/area of concern, to know what the WBG is planning and doing. Track government positions on issues of particular importance to your organisation, and whether one party may be more aligned with civil society positions. Read what the WBG is saying about the issues you care about, and try to understand their reasoning and thinking.
- **Find out who's who**: Contact your ministry of finance/development or relevant line ministries, and identify key officials that are working on WBG issues. Establish contacts and set up regular meetings. And keep them informed of your interaction with EDs, especially where you are facing challenges.
- **Promote your work**: If your organisation produces publications and research related to WBG activities, send these to relevant government officials and your national/regional ED, to influence the agenda and ensure they are aware that you are monitoring the issues on which they work.
- **Have regular meetings with EDs**: In some countries such as the UK and Norway, regular meetings take place with the national/regional ED. Contact partner CSOs to see if corresponding meetings are taking place in your country, and try to participate. If regular meetings are not taking place, take the initiative to reach out to your national/regional ED's office directly, or through your national finance ministry, to set up meetings with CSOs, trade unions and other public interest groups.
- **And make them strategic**: In advance of your meetings, provide your ED with discussion papers laying out your positions. It can also make sense to consult the WBG Executive Board calendar to propose agenda topics that are strategically linked with what the Board will actually be discussing.
- **But remember, meetings should be a two-way thing**: Use the meetings to gather information and intelligence, as well as presenting your organisation's points of view. Try to find out how your ED's position fits with other EDs, or with WBG policy, and any other relevant information on WBG policy priorities and developments. And don't forget to ask what the WBG needs from CSOs: this is to tailor your advocacy materials accordingly, not to get the WBG to set your priorities!
- **Timing is important**: If there is media attention on a certain issue – and particularly if this is directed squarely at the WBG – seize this opportunity to address related concerns, including via your ED. For example, the exposure of a dodgy project in a country could be a good moment to address the World Bank's approach to measuring transparency and responsible financing rules.
  - NB: if you want to discuss specific, country-related issues, such as how a certain project loan is impacting a country, it can often be more useful to contact your ED between Annual and Spring meetings, rather than at the events themselves.
- **Work in coalitions**: Identify other CSOs or public interest groups that are working on WBG issues in your country/region, and get in touch to share information and explore opportunities to work together. Sign up to listservs/mailing lists coordinated by the Bank Information Center, Bretton Woods Project, Eurodad and other networks to stay informed, and to share your own work. Submitting joint positions that are broadly endorsed by the CSO community looks more impressive and can have more impact than individual ones. Setting up larger issue campaigns can also be an effective way of engaging the WBG management and relevant departments. A recent example is the Big Shift Campaign, which promotes a shift from fossil fuels to renewable energy.
- **Produce solid evidence**: Solid research and policy papers can back up your positions and make sure that they make an impact in a sustainable way. Experienced CSOs report that it has turned out to be useful to engage World Bank staff during the production processes of reports, rather than confronting them with the final output. When the research covers projects, it makes sense for the CSOs specialising in specific topics to team up with World Bank-specialised CSOs.
- **Use the right tools**: Email actions, Twitter storms, sign-on petitions, lobby letters have been mentioned as effective tools to back CSO advocacy at the WBG. However, this list is not exhaustive, so use your imagination.
- **Use the media**: Reach out to journalists and media outlets to focus attention on the work of the WBG. As mentioned above, the WBG is sensitive to bad press. Social media is increasingly used in WBG advocacy and, at least in some cases, has turned out to be an effective channel to raise awareness, educate people, reach decision-makers and ultimately create change.

Resident representatives and/or regional offices

WBG country offices are located in many countries, headed by a 'special representative' or 'head of office', sometimes leading a small team. The region Western Europe includes six offices in major capitals and is coordinated by the World Bank office in Paris, which also hosts officers in charge of countries where the World Bank has no office. The Brussels office is in charge of relationships with EU institutions and is used to host an officer for relationships with media and CSOs. However, this position is currently vacant.

Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries are part of the World Bank region 'Europe and Asia'. The WBG has an office in (almost) every country. The role of the offices in Western Europe and CEE differs, as many CEE countries are borrower countries in which the WBG operates directly, so the CEE offices have broader roles. Contact details for representatives/country offices can be found on **country-specific pages** on the WBG website, Special representatives are the main contact points for CSOs on a national level. The World Bank changes from a reactive to a proactive approach to engaging CSOs; offices are meant to engage actively with them to ensure they are included. For example, this implies that country offices can host consultations, organise meetings with senior staff or disseminate information.

A special moment for engaging with World Bank offices in borrower countries is the consultations on the CPFs. Country offices should reach out proactively to CSOs to ensure that they are consulted, but it does no harm to take a proactive approach when a consultation is coming up. Contact the offices and push for inclusion.

World Bank country offices are their link to the government. Working directly with country offices is advisable, in particular when the government is closed and difficult to work with. They are often easier to access when they know that you also have contacts in World Bank headquarters. They are also the actor that collects country information.

The IFC has its own country offices, which are in practice often integrated into the World Bank offices. The addresses of IFC regional offices and country managers are available online for **Western Europe** as well as **Europe and Central Asia** regions.

Engaging with Member States' governments and parliaments

Occasionally it is more effective to influence World Bank policies through Member State institutions rather than through direct contacts with World Bank staff. These can be relevant ministries/officers in charge of the World Bank; in most European countries this is either the finance or the development ministry. In some countries, CSOs hold regular meetings with their ministries. Occasionally, it also makes sense to involve the parliament. Parliaments are usually not directly involved, but they can put pressure on governments, e.g. through parliamentary motions and requests, to which a government may be obliged to react. In general, research and position papers on World Bank issues should be disseminated widely among government officials and MPs.

Key moments when it makes particular sense to involve ministries and parliaments in richer Member States are the **IDA Replenishment Rounds**. These take place every three years, and IDA replenishment has budgetary implications for the WBG Member States that contribute, so it needs to go through national decision-making and approval processes. IDA Replenishment Rounds are often used by Member States to demand changes to World Bank policies or funding priorities.

Influencing the World Bank's Country Partnership Frameworks

The Country Partnership Framework (CPF) is the strategy that outlines which priority sectors the World Bank Groups is planning to focus on. It also gives indications on the lending volume. The CPF is a results framework that outlines objectives, which should be aligned to the World Banks's own goals – such as shared prosperity and eradicating poverty. The CPF is informed by a Systematic Country Diagnostic (SCD). Influencing the CPF is an interim option between influencing World Bank policy overall, and individual projects. It is therefore particularly useful for CSOs working on national level.

CSOs should be thoroughly consulted in setting CPFs. This is stated in the World Bank Group Directive on Country Engagement and the World Bank's Strategic Framework for Mainstreaming Citizen Engagement in World Bank Group Operations, both approved in 2014.

The following steps should be taken:

1. Find out where and when new CPFs are developed. If the information is not on the Consultations Pages, try the Country Pages, or the Country Strategies Page.
2. Raise awareness for the need to influence the CPF with potential partners, and build an influential coalition. It often makes sense to combine national and international levels, so that you can work with national advocacy targets such as the World Bank Country Office and relevant government institutions, but also the World Bank headquarters and ED offices.
3. Decide what content you want to see and start to influence the content. It can help to point to the WBG's own strategy papers, which are often more progressive (e.g. the Gender Strategy requires that the CPF draws on a country gender assessment) as these policy commitments should be reflected in the CPF.
4. Work continuously until the strategy is adopted, and eventually check what has been considered in the CPF to evaluate your results.

Where CSOs have worked to influence the CPF, they could have remarkable impact improving these strategies. Examples include campaigns in Egypt, Peru and Tunisia that were run by local CSOs and supported by the Bank Information Center.

Source: Influencing World Bank projects before they happen. A beginner's guide to advocacy on country partnership frameworks, Bank Information Center, 2017.

Useful information sources

Afrodad	http://www.afrodad.org
Arab NGO Network for Development	http://www.annd.org/english/index.php
Asian Peoples' Movement on Debt and Development	http://www.apmdd.org
Bank Information Center	http://www.bankinformationcenter.org
Bank Information Center Europe	https://bic-europe.org
BIC Country Partnership Frameworks Advocacy Toolkit	https://bit.ly/2NhmclQ
Bretton Woods Project (BWP)	http://www.brettonwoodsproject.org
Compliance Advisor/Ombudsman (CAO) of IFC-MIGA	http://www.cao-ombudsman.org
Development Committee communiqués	http://bit.ly/2oM8k9I
Eurodad	http://www.eurodad.org
Jubilee USA Network	http://www.jubileeusa.org
Latindadd	https://www.latindadd.org
WBG Civil Society page	https://bit.ly/2CPs9Xq
WBG Country Offices	https://bit.ly/1DQ0DhU
WBG Country Partnership Frameworks	https://bit.ly/1ITALSR
WBG Consultations	https://bit.ly/2CRCTo1
WBG Executive Board calendar	https://bit.ly/2Qm8TmS
WBG Executive Board – minutes archive	https://bit.ly/2NHG99J
WBG Independent Evaluation Group	http://ieg.worldbankgroup.org
WBG projects database	http://projects.worldbank.org
WBG voting powers and constituencies	https://bit.ly/2MoLXQF

Eurodad

The European Network on Debt and Development (Eurodad) is a network of 46 civil society organisations (CSOs) from 19 European countries, which works for transformative yet specific changes to global and European policies, institutions, rules and structures to ensure a democratically controlled, environmentally sustainable financial and economic system that works to eradicate poverty and ensure human rights for all.

www.eurodad.org

european network on
debt and development

Contact

Eurodad
Rue d'Edimbourg 18-26
1050 Brussels
Belgium

Tel: +32 (0) 2 894 4640

www.eurodad.org

facebook.com/Eurodad
twitter.com/eurodad