6. Global Partnerships

In February 2010 UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon delivered the report “Keeping the Promise” on shortfalls and successes in achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). This concluded that despite progress in some areas, many goals were unmet due to the lack of commitments on implementation:

“The shortfalls in progress towards the Millennium Development Goals are not because they are unreachable or because the time is too short, but rather because of unmet commitments, inadequate resources, lack of focus and accountability, and insufficient interest in sustainable development. This has resulted in failure to deliver on the necessary finance, services, technical support and partnerships.”

These shortfalls have been aggravated by the global financial and economic crises since 2008 and the resulting shift of political attention and public resources, both nationally and globally, towards crisis management.

As a consequence, Ban Ki-moon called for a “new pact to accelerate progress in achieving the Goals in the coming years among all stakeholders”, and listed as one of the key success factors: “Effective global partnerships, involving all relevant stakeholders, including donor Governments, local communities, non-governmental organizations, the private sector and foundations, with mutual accountability of all stakeholders.”

The idea of global multi-stakeholder partnerships builds on the reality that governments do not address global problems alone. Partnerships are seen as pragmatic, solution-oriented, flexible, efficient and unbureaucratic, all claimed as essential at a time of scarce resources.

The move towards this kind of partnership is not a new phenomenon but dates from the early 1990s. The collapse of the state socialist project, the dominance of a neo-liberal ideology which has pushed for less state intervention, deregulation and privatization, together with overwhelming global problems notably in the environment and health sectors, have opened the way for increasing integration of non-state actors into international politics.

The Rio Conference in 1992 was a key event in this regard, with its recognition that major groups of society were an integral part of achiev-
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ing sustainable development. Under the heading “strengthening the role of business and industry”, its action programme “Agenda 21” deals expressly with the positive contribution of industry to development, stating that: “Governments, business and industry, including transnational corporations, should strengthen partnerships to implement the principles and criteria for sustainable development.”

Ten years later, at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg, over 200 partnership initiatives between public and private actors, the so-called “Type–2–Outcomes”, constituted an integral part of the official process. They ranged from a Dutch initiative to clean up second-hand bikes from Europe for resale in Africa, to a global initiative by a US company to enrich flour with iron to improve nutrition.

According to Jonathan Lash, former president of the World Resources Institute, these partnerships marked the beginning of a new era in solving global problems:

“This Summit will be remembered not for the treaties, the commitments, or the declarations it produced, but for the first stirrings of a new way of governing the global commons—the beginnings of a shift from the stiff formal waltz of traditional diplomacy to the jazzier dance of improvisational solution-oriented partnerships that may include non-government organizations, willing governments and other stakeholders.”

In June 2004, the Cardoso Panel, a panel of eminent persons appointed by UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, presented its report, entitled “We the Peoples: Civil Society, the United Nations and Global Governance”. Under the heading “Investing more in Partnerships,” the report includes recommendations that are aimed explicitly at strengthening partnerships at the UN—politically and financially: “The Secretariat should foster multi-constituency processes as new conduits for discussion of United Nations priorities, redirecting resources now used for single-constituency forums covering multiple issues.”

At the intergovernmental level, the UN General Assembly has been engaged with the topic explicitly since the year 2000. This was on the initiative of the government of Germany, whose primary goal at the time was to support Kofi Annan’s Global Compact. Since then, the topic has been an established item on the General Assembly’s agenda, under the heading “Towards Global Partnerships”.
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Between 2010 and 2012, and under the banner of the MDGs, the engagement of the UN in the partnership boom expanded in several directions. The UN Secretary-General was actively involved in the creation of several new global partnerships in the areas of health, education, nutrition and energy. They include:

» **Every Woman Every Child**, which seeks to save the lives of 16 million women and children by 2015;

» **Committing to Child Survival: A Promise Renewed**, which aims to reduce the under-5 mortality rate to fewer than 20 deaths per 1,000 live births in all countries by 2035;

» **Sustainable Energy for All**, which aims to provide universal access to modern energy, double the global rate of improvement in energy efficiency and double the share of renewables in the global energy mix;

» **The Zero Hunger Challenge**, which calls for universal access to adequate food year-round, steps to prevent childhood stunting, a sustainable transformation of food systems, a doubling of productivity and incomes among smallholder farmers and drastic reductions in food losses and waste;

» **The Global Education First Initiative**, which is supposed to raise the political profile of education and seeks to ensure access and improve the quality of learning;

» **Scaling Up Nutrition**, a global movement to reduce malnutrition and child stunting.

In contrast to the hundreds of existing public-private partnerships at international level, the new partnerships are larger in function and level of ambition. According to the Secretary-General: “they expand on traditional partnerships by significantly increasing available resources, improving the effectiveness of their use and increasing policy and operational coherence.”

However, this assessment of the advantages of global partnerships seems to be less based on empirical research than a profession of faith, and lacks a thorough power and interest analysis of the actors involved. Have these initiatives really mobilized new and additional resources, particularly from the private sector? Have they increased policy coherence? Have they contributed positively to the realization of the UN mandates? And how have they influenced (inter-) governmental policy-making and affected the role of the UN?

The rest of this chapter examines these questions by taking a closer look at three of the most prominent global partnerships: Every Women Every Child, Sustainable Energy for All, and Scaling up Nutrition. It then describes the recent (unsuccessful) attempt by the Secretary-General to
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scale up UN capacity to engage in multi-stakeholder partnerships by creating a new UN Partnership Facility.

**Every Woman Every Child**

At the UN Millennium Summit in 2000 governments emphasized the importance of reducing child mortality (MDG 4) and improving maternal health (MDG 5). In the following years, UN and some civil society organizations established several alliances to promote the implementation of these MDGs: in 2000 the Healthy Newborn Partnership was set up, anchored within Save the Children USA; in 2004, the WHO created the Partnership for Safe Motherhood and Newborn Health; and in the same year UNICEF launched the Child Survival Partnership. In September 2005 these alliances joined forces under the new name of the Partnership for Maternal, Newborn & Child Health (PMNCH). Three years later, WHO, UNAIDS, UNFPA, UNICEF, UNIFEM (since 2010 UN Women), and the World Bank established the H4+ Partnership in order to accelerate progress within the UN system towards achieving MDG 4 and MDG 5.

Despite all these joint efforts, progress in the implementation of MDGs 4 and 5 remained slow. In September 2010 the UN Secretary-General launched a new initiative—Every Woman Every Child (EWEC), an “unprecedented global movement that mobilizes and intensifies international and national action by governments, multilaterals, the private sector and civil society to address the major health challenges facing women and children.” This initiative was taken to operationalize the Global Strategy for Women’s and Children’s Health, which was formulated by the UN Secretary-General the same year. Its key areas address actions to enhance financing, strengthen policy and improve service delivery for women’s and children’s health These include:

» Support for country-led health plans, supported by increased, predictable and sustainable investment;

» Integrated delivery of health services and life-saving interventions—so women and their children can access prevention, treatment and care when and where they need it;

» Stronger health systems, with sufficient skilled health workers at their core;
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Innovative approaches to financing, product development and the efficient delivery of health services;

Improved monitoring and evaluation to ensure the accountability of all actors for results.

Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon launched EWEC not as a new organization or another vertical fund with its own programmes but as an initiative (or in his own words a “movement”) to raise public awareness and political support, and as a catalyst to mobilize financial and non-financial commitments from governments, the private sector, NGOs, foundations and multilateral organizations.

**Governance**

In contrast to other global partnerships and multi-stakeholder initiatives, EWEC has neither a formal governance structure nor a separate secretariat. A team in the Executive Office of the Secretary-General heads the work of EWEC and ensures political support for the Global Strategy and its implementation. The team receives financial support from several governments (including Canada, Norway and the UK) and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The UN Foundation is in charge of coordinating the commitments made by the private sector. The PMNCH supports the coordination of the EWEC movement, and the H4+ Partnership organizations serve as lead technical partners for the EWEC and the Global Strategy for Women’s and Children’s Health. Since 2010 several new institutions have been established in the context of EWEC.

They include:

- **The Commission on Information and Accountability for Women’s and Children’s Health**, co-led by President Kikwete of Tanzania and Prime Minister Harper of Canada, which developed an accountability framework to track resources committed to advancing the Global Strategy.

- **The independent Expert Review Group (iERG)** to review the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission on Information and Accountability. Since 2012, the iERG has submitted several reports to the UN Secretary-General on the results and resources related to the Global Strategy and on progress in implementing the Commission’s recommendations.

- **The Commission on Life-saving Commodities for Women and Children**, co-led by then President Jonathan of Nigeria and Prime Minister Stoltenberg of Norway, that formulated recommendations to increase)
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the production and dissemination of and demand for life-saving medicines to vulnerable women and children around the world.\footnote{171}{Cf. www.everywomaneverychild.org/networks/life-saving-commodities.}

\textbf{The Innovative Working Group (IWG),} which serves as the primary platform for private-sector engagement in the EWEC initiative. IWG will catalyze the initiation and enable the scaling of innovations across technological, social, financial, policy and business domains.\footnote{172}{Cf. www.who.int/pmnch/activities/secretariats/innovationgroup/en/.}

The group published several reports and strategy documents, including a guide for companies (Private Enterprise for Public Health) that provides information about the health needs of women and children in developing countries to help companies from various business sectors to identify investment opportunities.\footnote{173}{Cf. Innovation Working Group (2012).}

\section*{Funding}

In 2010, the Global Strategy identified a financial gap of US$88 billion to cover direct costs and health system costs for programmes and services targeting reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health (RMNCH) between 2011 and 2015 in 49 focus countries.\footnote{174}{Cf. UN Secretary-General (2010), p. 11. The countries are Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Democratic Republic of Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Eritrea, Ethiopia, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Kenya, Democratic Republic of Korea, Kyrgyz Republic, Lao PDR, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, Uzbekistan, Vietnam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.}

Since then, total financial commitments to the Global Strategy for activities relating to women’s and children’s health have risen from US$40 billion pledged at the UN Summit on the MDGs in September 2010 to US$59.8 billion in May 2014, according to EWEC’s 2015 progress report.\footnote{175}{Cf. EWEC (2015b), p. 82.}

However, a substantial part of this amount is double-counted. For example, a bilateral donor commitment to a global health partnership like GAVI may be reported as an EWEC commitment by both the donor and the partnership. Thus, the real sum of all commitments, once doubled-counted figures are removed, is estimated by the Partnership for Maternal, Newborn & Child Health (PMNCH) to be around US$45 billion.\footnote{176}{Cf. PMNCH (2014), p. 8.} Of this amount, only US$22 billion is considered to be new and additional financial commitments made after the launching of EWEC.

Of these new and additional commitments, US$13 to 17 billion is targeted to the 49 Global Strategy focus countries. Albeit substantial, this increase in funding covers only 15 to 19 per cent of the US$88 billion funding gap identified for RMNCH between 2011 and 2015. And to
date, only a portion of these commitments has been translated into actual disbursements.

Together with the increase in financial commitments, the number of “commitment-makers” has tripled, from about 100 in 2010 to more than 300 in 2014. Among them are not only governments and international organizations but also many NGOs, foundations, global partnerships and private companies.

The top 20 list of the largest commitments reflects this broad range of actors with GAVI and the Global Fund, the Governments of Nigeria, India, Indonesia and the UK, and the international NGOs Save the Children and CARE heading the list (see Table 19).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment-maker</th>
<th>Commitment US$ millions</th>
<th>Constituency group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 GAVI</td>
<td>7,599</td>
<td>Global Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Nigeria</td>
<td>7,580</td>
<td>MICs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 United Kingdom</td>
<td>6,590</td>
<td>HICs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 The Global Fund</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>Global Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 India</td>
<td>4,375</td>
<td>MICs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Indonesia</td>
<td>2,406</td>
<td>MICs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Save the Children</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 CARE</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Population Services International</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Norway</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>HICs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Australia</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>HICs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 World Vision International</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Merck</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 United States of America</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>HICs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 World Bank</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>Multilaterals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Ghana</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>MICs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Canada</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>HICs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Netherlands</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>HICs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Marie Stopes International</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Business sector commitments to EWEC

The EWEC Progress Report 2015 states that “(o)ne of the signal achievements of the Global Strategy has been its success in mobilizing the private sector to join in the global push to prevent deaths among women and children” and that the private sector has made “substantial contributions” to the success of the Global Strategy. However, the question is how to define “success” and “substantial”. So far, 65 private companies have made commitments in support of EWEC, and according to the Innovative Working Group over 1,000 innovative technologies for reproductive, maternal and child health totaling US$255 million in investments are currently in the research and development pipeline.

A noticeable example is the pharmaceutical company Merck’s commitment to spend US$840 million for EWEC-related activities, *inter alia* through their HIV prevention and treatment and childhood asthma programmes and the donation of human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccine. In addition the company committed a total of US$500 million over ten years through its initiative Merck for Mothers. GlaxoSmithKline (GSK), in collaboration with WHO committed a total of one billion doses of albendazole medicine each year in order to create universal access to deworming for all school age children in Africa. Johnson & Johnson committed US$200 million over five years to improve survival rates and quality of life for women and children through developing and donating medicines, supporting sanitation and water initiatives, providing health information to new and expectant mothers via mobile phones, and expanding health worker training programmes.

However, many business sector commitments have been vague and lacking information about scale, time frame and specific actions. Beyond anecdotal evidence, there is no disaggregated reporting about the implementation of the commitments and the actual disbursements, nor any systematic evaluation and impact assessments. Given the lack of transparency and information no reliable assertions can be made about the additionality of the provided resources and their real impact on the ground.

A series of “Business Impact Stories” published by EWEC look like public relations brochures of the respective companies. For instance, the leaflet on Nestlé states:

“Nestlé committed in 2011 to Every Woman Every Child to strengthen its business-related activities and programs to promote gender equality, capacity-building and education for women and girls. Nestlé’s Women’s Empowerment initiatives are integrated in

---

178 Cf. ibid. p. 36.
179 Cf. ibid. p. 59.
the company’s shared value approach and result in increased penetration, footprint and additional volume for Nestlé; strong and emotional links with consumers; increased loyalty to the company; a shortened supply chain & improved traceability; sustainable sourcing and enhanced trust with all stakeholders.”

Several EWEC commitment-makers are international business associations whose primary goal is to promote the commercial interests of their members. An example is the International Zinc Association (IZA), which represents companies active in the mining and production of zinc, such as Glencore and BHP Billiton Marketing Asia PTE LTD.

IZA’s proclaimed mission is to support and advance zinc products and markets and to develop and promote a positive image for zinc. Its commitments to EWEC are fully in line with this marketing strategy by partnering with the Clinton Health Access Initiative (CHAI) to increase the use of zinc in the state of Uttar Pradesh, India; by partnering with UNICEF to support the Peruvian Ministry of Health to expand life-saving zinc interventions; and by working within the mining community to raise awareness and funding for zinc and oral rehydration salts (ORS) programmes globally.

In sum, the financial contributions of the business sector to the EWEC movement have remained rather limited so far. According to EWEC’s progress report, 2015 private companies made only a small fraction—2.7 per cent—of all financial commitments in support of EWEC. This corresponds to an amount of less than US$1.6 billion for the five-year period 2011–2015, or on average US$320 million per year worldwide. This is by no means sufficient to close the current gap in financing for reproductive, maternal, newborn, child and adolescent health (RMNCAH). According to World Bank estimates for 2015, the gap for 63 low- and lower-middle-income countries is US$33.3 billion.

Funding gaps and fragmentation

One of the positive results of the Global Strategy and the subsequent EWEC activities has been the improved monitoring and tracking of spending for women’s and children’s health at the country level. Initial analyses in some of the 49 EWEC focus countries found that despite the increase in donor and national government spending, individual households still fund the bulk of RMNCAH expenditures. In the analysed
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low-income countries, out-of-pocket payments by households account for 41 per cent of financing, while external donors contribute on average 37 per cent, national governments 15 per cent and private domestic funders (NGOs, corporations etc.) 7 per cent. The WHO warns in its report on accountability for women’s and children’s health 2014:

“[...] out-of-pocket payments by households often remain the greatest source of funds spent on RMNCH, despite many countries making these services nominally free or heavily subsidized. Out-of-pocket payments are the most inequitable source of health financing, preventing many people from seeking needed services and pushing many who purchase them into poverty.”

The EWEC progress report 2015 underlines this point:

“The financial and practical consequences of out-of-pocket spending by financially strapped households highlight the need for additional public sector financing and for exploration of social protection models that meet health needs while minimizing household financial burdens.”

And the WHO concludes: “Despite global momentum, RMNCH is still not high enough on the political agenda in many countries and globally, and resources do not appear to be increasing sufficiently.”

This is the case although the number of global financing mechanisms for RMNCH has increased substantially in recent years. They include, inter alia, Family Planning 2020, the H4+ Partnership, the Health Results Innovation Trust Fund, the Thematic Trust Fund for Maternal Health, the Global Programme to Enhance Reproductive Health Commodity Security, the Bridge Fund, the Pledge Guarantee for Health and the RMNCH Trust Fund.

EWEC claims that “(a)mong the most salient achievements of the Global Strategy is to bring coordination, coherence and strategic focus to global efforts to prevent women’s and children’s deaths”. But the authors of a concept note on a new Global Financing Facility in support of EWEC clarified this, concluding:

“However, despite the recent efforts to strengthen coordination, the multitude of financing initiatives still causes fragmentation in financing streams at the country level. National governments routinely devote considerable resources to managing multiple parallel initiatives and the associated planning and reporting needs
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of the multiple partners supporting RMNCAH services. […] Fragmentation also leads to suboptimal distribution of resources globally. Some countries receive disproportionately high levels of support while others are ‘donor orphans’. 195

At a high-level event on EWEC in May 2015, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon emphasized the accomplishments of the EWEC movement in the past five years, but he admitted that this progress is fragile and the work remains unfinished so far. 196 As a consequence, he announced an update of the Global Strategy and the establishment of another funding mechanism in support of EWEC under the auspices of the World Bank.

Global Strategy 2.0 and Global Financing Facility

The new Global Strategy for Women’s, Children’s, and Adolescents’ Health, which will be launched at the Post–2015 Summit of the UN in September 2015, is seen as the “front-runner platform” for the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) related to RMNCAH in the period 2016 to 2030. 197 However, while the Strategy regards the SDGs as the “overarching framework”, it is intended to put forward only “a limited number of ambitious high-level targets, ideally a total of nine”. 198 According to the Zero Draft, the Global Strategy will “clearly articulate and distinguish the core targets that EWEC will deliver, from secondary targets that EWEC will help deliver, e.g., other SDGs relevant to the EWEC goals […].” 199

The final decision about the core targets that are chosen out of the full list of SDGs is not taken by the UN General Assembly but by the UN Secretary-General (based on “broad stakeholder consultations”). The UN General Assembly is used only as the stage to launch the renewed Global Strategy in September 2015. And in May 2016 the World Health Assembly will be asked for formal endorsement of the new Strategy.

Every Woman Every Child will continue after 2015 under the leadership of the UN Secretary-General with a limited focus on global advocacy, communication, and the mobilization of political engagement, facilitated by the UN Foundation. In addition, a new Global Financing Facility (GFF) in support of EWEC will be established outside of the UN. The creation of the GFF was initiated by the World Bank and the Governments of Canada, Norway, and the United States, announced at the UN General Assembly in September 2014, and officially launched in July 2015, at the Financing for Development Conference in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
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The GFF is expected to play a key role in RMNCAH financing and will serve as a major vehicle for financing the proposed SDG on healthy lives. It is probably the most important new funding mechanism for the SDGs and the Post–2015 Agenda, similar to the Global Fund or GAVI. According to the World Bank:

“[...] the GFF acts as a pathfinder in a new era of financing for development by pioneering a model that shifts away from focusing solely on official development assistance to an approach that combines external support, domestic financing, and innovative sources for resource mobilization and delivery (including the private sector) in a synergistic way.”

The new facility aims to close the financing gap in RMNCAH spending, which, as mentioned above, is estimated to be around US$33.3 billion in 2015. It aims to mobilize additional funding through the combination of grants from a new GFF Trust Fund, financing from the International Development Association (IDA) and the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), and the crowding-in of additional domestic resources, particularly from the private sector. The architects of the GFF explicitly support the mix of public and private funding of health systems:

“To improve RMNCAH outcomes, we need an integrated health system approach that looks for the best solutions, regardless of whether they are provided by the public, private sectors or both in meaningful collaboration with each other. [...] The GFF can support scaling up efforts of mainstreaming mixed health systems approaches in RMNCAH at the country, regional and global levels.”

A total of 63 low- and lower-middle-income countries are eligible to receive GFF funding. In the first phase four “frontrunner” countries (DR Congo, Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania) will receive funding. In the next phase five to ten additional countries will be selected. According to the GFF Business Plan, the GFF operates at country level through multi-stakeholder platforms, led by the national government but with the full involvement of the private sector, civil society, multilateral and bilateral donors and foundations. The existence of such a multi-stakeholder country platform is regarded as an indispensable eligibility criterion.

The World Bank plays a convening role for the GFF, and the GFF Trust Fund is fully integrated into World Bank operations, with a small secretariat based at the World Bank in Washington, D.C. However, the central decision–making body of the GFF will be the GFF Investors Group.
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a multi-stakeholder body with 20–25 representatives from participating countries, bilateral donors, multilateral institutions and partnerships, the private sector, private foundations, and NGOs.

The concept of the GFF was developed under the guidance of the GFF Working Group, whose composition indicates what the membership of the GFF Investors Group may look like. The GFF Working Group was chaired by the Government of Norway, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the World Bank, and had 28 members, including representatives of GAVI, the Global Fund, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, and the UN Foundation. Only three governmental representatives from the global South were involved (Ethiopia, Burundi and DR Congo).

A smaller GFF Trust Fund Committee is embedded within the GFF Investors Group with decision-making power on Trust Fund allocations. Membership in the Committee will be limited to the donors in the Investors Group and its Chair or Vice-Chair. Current plans do not envisage any role on the Committee for partner countries or civil society organizations from the global South.

A model for financing the Sustainable Development Goals?

Under the cloak of the EWEC initiative and a multi-stakeholder structure, the governance of the GFF seems to be dominated by traditional donors and private foundations. Important decisions about the financial support of national health strategies are taken at the sole discretion of the GFF Investors Group. But the GFF Investors Group is a self-selected, exclusive body and not subject to intergovernmental oversight and mutual accountability mechanisms, not even through the World Bank.

Nevertheless, the GFF will be instrumental in consolidating the role of the World Bank as a key financing institution for the 2030 Agenda, while leaving only a marginal role for the UN. The GFF in support of EWEC is a particularly striking example of the shift from inclusive multilateral decision-making within the UN to global club governance in exclusive “partnerships”.
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Sustainable Energy for All

Sustainable Energy for All (SE4All) is yet another striking example of the emerging trend of gradually shifting (“outsourcing”) activities from the UN to a multi-stakeholder body positioned outside the UN system, while still using the name and reputation of the UN. 205

The SE4All initiative was launched by UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon in September 2011 in response to the declaration by the UN General Assembly of 2012 as the International Year of Sustainable Energy for All.206 The initiative has three major goals to be achieved by the year 2030:

1. Ensure universal access to modern energy services;
2. Double the global rate of improvement in energy efficiency;
3. Double the share of renewable energy in the global energy mix.

With this initiative the Secretary-General entered the difficult terrain of energy. A decade before, at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg 2002, governments failed to agree on any meaningful goals related to sustainable and renewable energy. In response, groups of like-minded countries launched various multi-stakeholder partnerships to promote renewable energy, such as the Renewable Energy Policy Network for the 21st Century (REN21) and the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Partnership (REEEP). A few years later, in January 2009, the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA) was founded as an independent organization outside the UN system.

Within the UN system, UN-Energy was initiated in 2004 as a mechanism to increase engagement and to promote system-wide collaboration in the area of energy. 207 Three years later, Kandeh Yumkella, then Director-General of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), was elected as Chair of UN-Energy. From 2008 to 2010, Yumkella also chaired the UN Secretary-General’s Advisory Group on Energy and Climate Change (AGECC). This group recommended in its report in April 2010, the launch of a global campaign in support of “Energy for Sustainable Development”.208 The report recommended only two major goals: ensuring universal energy access by 2030 and reducing global energy intensity by 40 per cent by 2030.209 It did not mention increasing the use of renewable energy as a separate goal. The report also highlighted the role of partnerships with the private sector and recommended:
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“Implementing more public–private partnerships (PPPs) that have the potential to accelerate deployment of technologies that improve energy efficiency and/or enhance energy access […] These could be akin to successful PPPs in the global public health arena and could catalyse a scaling up of funding for research, development, and commercial demonstration of low-carbon technologies, especially to close the energy access gap.” 210

The Advisory Group report also recommended that the UN system should make “Energy for Sustainable Development” a major institutional priority and should strengthen UN-Energy. 211

When the UN Secretary-General launched the SE4All initiative a year later, he took up many of the recommendations of his Advisory Group and added as a third major goal the doubling of the share of renewable energy in the global energy mix. But as his Advisory Group had done previously, he avoided offering a clear definition of the term ‘sustainable energy’. This linguistic vagueness carries the risk that unsustainable energy sources such as ‘advanced fossil fuel technologies’ or even nuclear energy will be green-washed and blue-washed and further promoted, avoiding the concerns raised by local communities amongst others. Furthermore, SE4All’s use of the term ‘renewable energy’ explicitly encompasses hydropower and bio-fuels. 212 But huge hydropower projects often have negative effects on the local population and the environment, and large-scale production of bio-fuel not only threatens food security, but also has detrimental effects on soil quality and can enhance global warming through massive deforestation.

In order to operationalize his initiative and to develop a Global Action Agenda, Ban Ki-moon decided not to use and strengthen the existing UN-Energy network but to appoint a new High-Level Group on Sustainable Energy for All to “mobilize a broad range of stakeholders who can catalyse commitments and form partnerships.” 213

The High-Level Group played a crucial role in the initial phase of SE4All in shaping its content and direction. Business interests were strongly represented in the group. Half of the 36 members came from the private sector, including the group’s co-chair Charles Holliday, chairman of the Bank of America, and, inter alia, top managers from Accenture, Renault-Nissan, Siemens, and Statoil. In contrast, civil society was represented only through Sanjit ‘Bunker’ Ray of the Barefoot College, India. 214

210 Cf. ibid., p. 11.
211 Cf. ibid., p. 12.
212 Cf. UN Secretary-General’s High-Level Group on Sustainable Energy for All (2012c), p. 9.
213 Cf. www.un.org/wcm/content/site/sustainableenergyforall/.
214 Cf. the list of HLG members: www.un.org/wcm/content/site/sustainableenergyforall/home/members.
In addition to participating in the deliberations of the High-Level Group, the business actors also provided financial support. As the Report of the Co-Chairs from September 2012 pointed out, “(t)he Sustainable Energy for All initiative has depended on generous contributions from its supporters,” including, in addition to a few government donors, the UN Foundation, Masdar (the Abu Dhabi Future Energy Company), the Bank of America, First Solar, Johnson Controls, Veolia Environnement, and the International Copper Association.\textsuperscript{215} In addition, the consulting firm Accenture and the Norwegian oil company Statoil seconded senior managers to the Sustainable Energy for All secretariat, and Statoil designed the Sustainable Energy for All logo.\textsuperscript{216}

In April 2012 the High-Level Group presented its Global Action Agenda, which identifies 11 “high-impact areas” to mobilize public and private actions and specific commitments towards achieving the three SE4All objectives—energy access, energy efficiency, and renewable energy.\textsuperscript{217} The Action Agenda emphasizes particularly the SE4All business case, stating: “These actions will do much to eradicate energy poverty. They will also lead to sustainable growth, the development of new markets, the creation of new businesses and jobs, and increased global prosperity. The opportunities amount to trillion-dollar markets.”\textsuperscript{218}

The Agenda also reflects, once more, a reliance on multi-stakeholder partnerships:

“The initiative will ‘change the game’ by introducing new public-private partnerships built from constructive dialogue on policy, investment, and market development by governments, businesses, and civil society. It brings together the global convening power of the United Nations, the ability to mobilize bold commitments and leverage large-scale investment, and a rapidly expanding knowledge network.”\textsuperscript{219}

The UN Secretary-General characterized the SE4All initiative explicitly as a “multi-stakeholder partnership between governments, the private sector, and civil society.”\textsuperscript{220} Consequently, the multi-stakeholder design is also a key feature of the governance structure of the initiative.

\textsuperscript{215} Cf. UN Secretary-General’s High-Level Group on Sustainable Energy for All (2012a), p. 26.
\textsuperscript{216} Cf. ibid.
\textsuperscript{217} Cf. UN Secretary-General’s High-Level Group on Sustainable Energy for All (2012c), p. 4. Recommended action areas include seven sectoral ones: (1) modern cooking appliances and fuels; (2) distributed electricity solutions; (3) grid infrastructure and supply efficiency; (4) large-scale renewable power; (5) industrial and agricultural processes; (6) transportation; and (7) buildings and appliances; and four “enabling” ones: (1) energy planning and policies; (2) business model and technology innovation; (3) finance and risk management; and (4) capacity building and knowledge sharing.
\textsuperscript{218} Cf. ibid., p. 3.
\textsuperscript{219} Cf. ibid., p. 4.
\textsuperscript{220} Cf. www.se4all.org/our-vision/our-objectives.
Governance

The Co-Chairs of the High-Level Group, Charles Holliday and Kandeh Yumkella, underlined in their report in September 2012 the need for the SE4All initiative to create a structure and a process that will sustain it going forward. At the same time they made clear that they had

“[…] no appetite for a new institution or centralized bureaucracy […]. Rather, we envision a distributed global network that collaborates with existing institutional structures and initiatives, taking full advantage of available delivery mechanisms and the diverse capacities of partners, including international institutions, businesses, and civil society organizations.” 221

In response to the report, the UN-Secretary-General set up a governance structure for the SE4All initiative, which is composed of 1) an Advisory Board, 2) an Executive Committee, 3) the Special Representative and Chief Executive, and 4) the Global Facilitation Team, which supports the Chief Executive.

» The **Advisory Board**, co-chaired by the UN Secretary-General and the President of the World Bank, gives strategic guidance to the initiative.

» The 11-member **Executive Committee** is the key decision-making body of the initiative. It provides policy guidance and operational oversight to the Chief Executive. Charles Holliday heads the Committee.

» Kandeh Yumkella was appointed by the UN Secretary-General as **Special Representative and Chief Executive** of the SE4All initiative. Until his resignation in June 2015 he led the overall coordination of the initiative and oversaw the work of the Global Facilitation Team.

» The **Global Facilitation Team (GFT)** serves as the SE4ALL secretariat. It has offices in Vienna and New York and a staff of approximately 26 (in 2014).

Actors from the business sector are well represented on the Advisory Board and Executive Committee, which provides strategic guidance on the implementation of the SE4All initiative. Among the members of the Advisory Board are, *inter alia*, top-level officers of Accenture, Acciona, Enel, Shell, Statoil, and the World Economic Forum. In addition, three of the four Committees constituted by the Advisory Board are co-chaired by business leaders: the Energy Efficiency Committee by Accenture Resources, the Renewable Energy Committee by Acciona, and the Finance Committee by Bank of America Merrill Lynch.

---

221 Cf. UN Secretary-General’s High-Level Group on Sustainable Energy for All (2012a), p. 2.
Many members of the Finance Committee are representatives of multilateral development banks and the financial industry, including Citigroup, Goldman Sachs and the Blackstone Group. A first report of the Committee from June 2014 demonstrates how they shape the discourse about sustainable energy finance. While the report acknowledges that investment from both public and private sectors is essential to achieve the three SE4All goals, it concentrates almost exclusively on approaches to scaling-up and attracting private sector investment. The Committee identified four broad investment themes that, in its view, have the potential to scale up finance for sustainable energy:

- Green bonds market development
- Structures that use Development Finance Institutions’ (DFIs) de-risking instruments to mobilize private capital
- Insurance products that focus on removing specific risks
- Aggregation structures that focus on bundling and pooling approaches for small-scale opportunities

The Committee estimates that: “By accelerating progress across the four themes, SE4All could mobilize US$120 billion incremental new annual investment by 2020.”

The Committee also specifies that public finance should be used primarily to systematically deploy “de-risking instruments” such as blended capital-focused financing mechanisms that help mitigate risks for private investors. In other words, governments and DFIs should guarantee, for instance by providing “catalytic first loss capital”, that banks and institutional investors can make the expected profits from their investments in sustainable energy. In fact, this approach follows the widely criticized principle of “privatizing gains—socializing losses.”

Funding

Similar to other global partnerships, SE4All does not regard itself as a new funding agency. However, one of the main objectives of the initiative is to mobilize (financial) commitments and to catalyse additional financial resources in support of SE4All.

In order to assess the overall amount of funds mobilized through SE4All, three different types of funding can be distinguished:

1. Financial commitments reported to SE4All;
2. Contributions to the SE4All Multi–Partner Trust Fund;
3. Financial contributions to support the Global Facilitation Team of SE4All.

---

223 Cf. ibid., p. 8.
224 Cf. ibid., p. 9.
225 Cf. ibid., p. 7.
Commitsments

A main feature of the SE4All initiative is its endeavour to mobilize financial and non-financial commitments from public and private actors to implement the three goals. Its 2014 Annual Report states that voluntary commitments to SE4All amounted to some US$300 billion, including more than US$50 billion from the private sector and investors. The rest—by far the largest share—came mainly from governments, international organizations and multilateral development banks. The report adds that preliminary reporting from partners suggests that more than US$70 billion of the commitments have already been invested.

The SE4All website lists all commitments with limited general information by governments, private sector and civil society organizations. Around 100 commitments are made by a broad range of private companies, including Nike, Philips, Siemens, Total, Unilever, BASF, Procter & Gamble, SAB Miller, and BMW. Only a few commitments by the private sector are quantitative financial commitments, such as that of the Bank of America to provide US$50 billion (in fact only US$35 billion to support the goals of SE4All over a period of ten years, see Box 7). Many commitments are focused on improving energy efficiency, increasing the use of renewables, or reducing greenhouse gas emission. Microsoft, for example, committed itself to achieving carbon neutrality in Microsoft’s business operations in over 100 countries by the end of 2013.

Commitments are also reported by governments. An example is the Power Africa initiative by US President Barack Obama, with the stated aim of doubling the number of people in sub-Saharan Africa with access to power by committing more than US$7 billion in financial support and loan guarantees over a five-year period. In September 2014, SE4All signed an Aide Memoire for cooperation with Power Africa. Forbes magazine wrote after the launching of the initiative in 2013, that “General Electric will be perhaps the biggest beneficiary of that $7 billion.” The chair of the US Export-Import Bank allegedly tweeted in this regard: “$7B plan to power up @General Electric.” Among others, General Electric will build a 1,000 mw power plant in Ghana fueled by natural gas. All of these commitments appear more like business as usual than like sustainable and affordable initiatives that can achieve the SE4All goals without detrimental effects on the climate.

---

227 Cf. www.se4all.org/tracking-progress/commitments.
228 Cf. www.se4all.org/commitment/carbon-neutrality.
SE4All underlines that accountability is a critical aspect of the initiative. For this reason it published an Accountability Framework in order to “enable transparent recognition and tracking of voluntary commitments to the initiative, facilitating feedback and learning.”  

However, there are no effective mechanisms in place to monitor and review the implementation of the commitments and to hold the commitment-makers accountable. The information provided on the SE4All website is insufficient to determine whether the commitments are really new and additional, if they are translated into actual investments, and, most importantly, their impact on the ground. Often commitments by private companies are not time-bound, or have a timeframe of ten years, like the Bank of America’s commitment (see Box 7). Thus, these commitments appear more ambitious than they are.

The tracking of the commitments is undertaken by the Global Facilitation Team once a year via an online form. The results are not published and there is no independent verification. Without verifiable information, the reported success figures of US$300 billion or US$50+ billion in commitments from the private sector are meaningless.

However the SE4All practice of mobilizing and listing commitments does a good job of promoting the visibility of the participating companies. The SE4All team is explicit about this in reaching out to companies about enhancing their global recognition: “By submitting your commitment SE4All will recognize your efforts in dedicated events, press releases and online communication.”

**Box 7**

**Bank of America—a pioneer in sustainable energy financing?**

One of the largest commitments reported to SE4All has been made by the Bank of America. Bank of America commits as part of its environmental sustainability strategy US$50 billion through “a wide range of financing tools including lending, equipment finance, capital markets and advisory activity, carbon finance, and advice and investment solutions for clients.”  

Whereas in most documents SE4All claims the total US$50 billion to be committed under SE4All, Bank of America states that (only) approximately US$35 billion will be allocated to SE4All’s objectives over ten years, or on average US$3.5 billion per year.

In November 2013, as part of the commitment Bank of America issued the “first ever corporate green bond” in the amount of US$500 million to finance energy efficiency projects and invest in renewable energy projects. Additionally, Bank of America played a leading role in the development of the Green Bonds Principles that “recom-

---


No effective mechanisms are in place to monitor and review the implementation of commitments.
mend transparency and disclosure and promote integrity in the development of the Green Bond market.”

However, it is questionable how “green” the Green Bonds really are. Critics argue that the Green Bonds Principles do not give a definition of ‘green’ or sustainable and do not set minimum environmental standards for supported projects. Their transparency and disclosure requirements remain weak and do not follow a “comply or explain” approach.

Despite its commitments to SE4All, Bank of America is heavily involved in financing of environmentally destructive projects. According to Friends of the Earth US the Bank of America has financed, for instance, Wilmar International with US$110.97 million in loans since 2010. Wilmar International is the world’s largest palm oil trader and has been accused of being directly and indirectly involved in the large-scale destruction of rainforests, violent evictions of local farmers and other crimes. In 2012, Newsweek ranked the company as least sustainable among the 500 largest publicly traded companies.

Furthermore, Bank of America is one of the most important financiers of the coal industry. Between 2005 and 2013 Bank of America financed the coal industry with €6.56 billion in underwritings and loans, which puts Bank of America in third place among banks financing the industry, behind Citi Group and Morgan Stanley.

These few examples suggest at least a potential conflict of interest between Bank of America’s business operations and its engagement in the SE4All initiative.

The SE4All Multi-Partner Trust Fund

In November 2012 SE4All established a special Multi-Partner Trust Fund (SE4All MPTF) in order to mobilize financial support for the activities directly related to the initiative. UNDP is responsible for the administration of the SE4All MPTF through its MPTF Office.

The SE4All MPTF has two funding windows. Under the Global Window, the Trust Fund supports activities undertaken by the Global Facilitation Team. Under the Country Level Technical Assistance and Capacity Building Window, the Trust Fund provides seed funding for sustainable energy projects at the country level.

To date, the financial support for the SE4All MPTF has been modest. Between November 2012 and May 2015 only the Governments of Denmark, Sweden, Germany and Iceland provided voluntary contributions totaling US$7.2 million (see Table 20). Recipients were, in addition to the Global Facilitation Team in the Executive Office of the

---

Global Facilitation Team Funding

The Global Facilitation Team received support not only through the Multi-Partner Trust Fund but also through direct and in-kind contributions. As of 31 December 2014, the SE4All initiative received a total of US$16.7 million to finance GFT activities. Contributions came from the European Union and the Governments of Denmark, Germany, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom. In addition, various forms of in-kind support were received. France, for instance, supported the team with four seconded staff, Denmark funded a long-term advisor, and Austria is providing office space in Vienna.

It is noticeable that the operational activities of SE4All within the UN are funded completely by traditional bilateral donors. While the initiative received some ad hoc support from corporations and private foundations in the first phase (see above), these are not listed as funders of the regular activities of SE4All.

One of the main funders, the Danish government, identified the significant risk of losing support from the private sector and concluded in an internal grant document on SE4All:

“The relatively open and loose structure of SE4ALL has evolved mainly through ad hoc management decisions by the GFT. This flexibility has created opportunities, which have been used to e.g., engage the private sector to leverage investments in modern energy solutions. The interest of the private sector may, however, decline, if it does not continue to experience an added value from SE4ALL. The donors of SE4ALL have therefore agreed to focus on streamlining the governance structure to secure the movement in the longer term, and to focus on strengthening the inclusion of the private sector.”  

Moving SE4All out of the UN

When UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon inaugurated the office of the Global Facilitation Team of SE4All in Vienna in November 2014, the UN press release called this “a historic milestone in the United Nations [...].”

Concurrently the UN Secretary-General announced that the long-term institutional structure for the SE4All initiative will include the establishment of an international not-for-profit organization under Austrian law in the course of 2015. This means that SE4All and its governance and decision-making structure will be shifted almost completely out of the UN. As such, it will further weaken the intergovernmental oversight and the monitoring and review of the SE4All commitments.

So far the funding of the operational activities of SE4All and its Global Facilitation Team have been primarily provided by governments. It seems that private companies gave financial support only in the initial phase of the initiative. Nevertheless, business representatives play a leading role in the governance bodies of SE4All. The outsourcing of SE4All from the UN will probably further strengthen their involvement.

For the UN this decision is not a milestone but a stumbling block and may lead to the weakening of its future role in the area of sustainable energy.

The fundamental objective of SE4All—to increase energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy resources on a large scale—is certainly welcome. In fact, it is a necessary precondition for limiting global warming and for the decarbonization of the global economy. However, the response of the UN to this challenge through the SE4All initiative is inadequate with regard to its concept, its governance structure and the mobilization of new and additional resources.

244 Cf. www.se4all.org/2014/11/03/unsg-ban-ki-moon-inaugurates-se4all-office-vienna/.
245 Cf. UN General Assembly (2014), para. 49.
The linguistic vagueness of the term ‘sustainable energy’ carries the risk that even certain fossil fuel technologies, nuclear power plants, and huge hydropower projects can be labeled as ‘sustainable.’ SE4All’s decision-making structure is unbalanced and lends disproportionate weight to US companies, particularly the Bank of America. Whether substantial new and additional resources, particularly from the business sector, have been mobilized through SE4All cannot be determined. Implementation of commitments is tracked superficially only, and there is no independent verification. In any case, only very few commitments reported by the business sector to SE4All are quantitative financial commitments.

Scaling Up Nutrition

In early 2008, the medical journal *The Lancet* published a series of articles on maternal and child undernutrition, financed by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The final piece in the series looked into the system of governance and funding of the international nutrition system. The authors (among them Saul S. Morris from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation) heavily criticized this system as being “fragmented and dysfunctional” and stated that funding provided by international donors to combat undernutrition “is grossly insufficient and poorly targeted.”

They concluded:

“The problems of the international nutrition system are long-standing and deeply embedded in organisational structures and norms. The international community needs to identify and establish a new global governance structure that can provide greater accountability and participation for civil society and the private sector.”

The call of the authors helped mobilize increasing international efforts to improve coordinated action on nutrition. These culminated in the launching of the strategy paper “Scaling Up Nutrition—A Framework for Action” in April 2010 at a high-level event during the Spring Meeting of IMF and World Bank, co-hosted by the Governments of Canada and Japan, USAID, and the World Bank.

The strategy paper describes the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) initiative as a “public good” and the “product of a broad informal partnership and an intensive program of work that included a series of face-to-face consultations hosted by the Center for Global Development, the International Conference on Nutrition, the European Commission, the United Nations Standing Committee on Nutrition, USAID, UNICEF, WFP, WHO, and the World Bank.” The work has been made pos...
Global Partnerships

sible by financial support provided, again, by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, as well as the Government of Japan and the World Bank.

The strategy paper was endorsed by more than 100 organizations and public-private partnerships, including several UN programmes and specialized agencies as well as universities and CSOs. Furthermore, representatives of Royal DSM, PepsiCo, Coca-Cola and Mars Chocolate participated in the launching event.

Building on this framework paper, a 12-person Task Team developed a Road Map for SUN, which was launched in a side event at the High-level Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly Summit on the MDGs in September 2010. The side event on Partnering to Reduce Child Undernutrition: 1,000 Days: Change a Life, Change the future was organized by the Governments of Ireland and the USA and the speakers included UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, then US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton as well as Maria Eitel, President of the Nike Foundation and Muhtar Kent, President and CEO of the Coca-Cola Company.

The overall goal of SUN is to eliminate all forms of malnutrition, based on the principle that everyone has a right to food and good nutrition. Currently, SUN is active in 54 countries plus the Indian state of Maharashtra and its actions focus on improving feeding practices and behaviours (including encouraging exclusive breastfeeding up to six months of age), fortification of foods, direct provision of micronutrients, and the treatment of acute malnutrition.

SUN has identified four strategic objectives, to be achieved in four processes and whose success is measured by 21 progress markers. The four areas cover network building, aligning policies and legal frameworks with the aims of the initiative, building a common results framework, and tracking financials and resource mobilization.

Governance

The current institutional structure of SUN was established in early 2012 under the aegis of UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon. However, SUN does not regard itself as a new institution but as a global movement uniting governments, UN organizations, CSOs, and businesses to combat undernutrition.

250 Ibid., pp. 13f.
SUN is coordinated by a **Lead Group**, administered by the SUN Movement Secretariat based in Geneva and New York, and organized through five independent actor-networks:

Members of the Lead Group are appointed by the UN Secretary-General and are “collectively responsible for the functioning of the Movement. The group serves to improve coherence, provide strategic oversight, improve resource mobilisation and ensure collective accountability across the SUN Movement.”

The Lead Group is chaired by Anthony Lake (Executive Director of UNICEF) and includes Tom Arnold (Interim Coordinator of SUN) and David Nabarro (Coordinator of SUN and Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General for Food Security and Nutrition). The Lead Group’s membership is composed of eight members from SUN countries, four members from bilateral donor agencies, two members from civil society organizations, two members from the business sector (currently Vinati Bali, CEO and Managing Director of Britannia Industries Ltd., and Paul Polman, CEO of Unilever), two members from international organizations, and four members from foundations and alliances.

The **SUN Movement Secretariat**, based in Geneva and New York and hosted by the UN Office in Geneva and UNDP respectively, is the administrative centre of the initiative. Operating under the guidance of the Lead Group, it has no operational role, but is tasked with facilitating joint action and contact among countries and networks.

On the operational side, SUN features Country Networks at the level of participating countries. They are complemented by autonomous global networks that represent various types of “stakeholders” in SUN: a Civil Society Network, a UN System Network, a Donor Network and a Business Network. These networks act independently, each with its own governance structure and mandate. For the Civil Society and UN System networks, the task is mainly to coordinate and align strategies, efforts and resources of the respective participants (see Box 8). The same is true for the Donor Network, which brings together governmental donors as well as big private donors, specifically the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the Children’s Investment Fund Foundation.

---

257 In August 2014 David Nabarro was made Senior UN System Coordinator for Ebola Virus Disease and replaced by Tom Arnold as Coordinator ad interim of SUN for the duration of this appointment.
259 In previous years, the Secretariat drew upon additional administrative arrangements in Rome hosted by IFAD (offices and bank account). Cf. SUN Movement Secretariat (2013), p. 6.
The United Nations System Network for Scaling up Nutrition Mandate

“The SUN UN Network for Nutrition harmonises and coordinates United Nations agencies involvement in the SUN Movement to improve efficiency and maximize opportunities for impact.” […]

“The SUN UN Network for Nutrition is led by the UN Standing Committee on Nutrition (UNSCN) and the UN REACH Partnership. The UN Network for Nutrition brings together the global level UN normative platform for policy and technical harmonization with country level coordination in support of national nutrition plans and joint UN efforts.”

“The UN Network for Nutrition will actively seek to broaden its network, and advocates for an increased number of actively engaged UN agencies and international organizations in the SUN Movement that have specialized expertise in nutrition or indirectly contribute to reducing malnutrition.” […]

“To improve the efficacy and impact of SUN countries’ scaling-up nutrition efforts, the UN System Network will continue to: […] Convene the dialogue of the UN system agencies and international organizations […] Harmonise the response of the UN system in terms of coherent policy and technical guidance […] Foster and contribute implementable solutions and guidance […] Influence International Forums: Coordinate input into intergovernmental mechanisms such as the World Health Assembly (WHA) and the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) and international forums such as the G8 or G20.”

Members

Strategic direction for the UN System Network for SUN comes from the four programmes and agencies most involved in nutrition policies: FAO, WHO, UNICEF and WFP. Beyond that, “all UN agencies are welcome to join the UN System Network for SUN. UN Agencies and international organizations join the UN System Network for SUN by joining the UNSCN [UN Standing Committee on Nutrition].” Currently, the following organizations are listed as members of UNSCN: Bioversity International, FAO, IAEA, IFAD, PAHO, UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, UNCEB, UNICEF, UN-DESA, WFP and WHO.

Corporate engagement in SUN is organized in the SUN Business Network, established to mobilize business efforts in support of scaling up nutrition. Private-sector interventions at the country level include the production of fortified food and the promotion of nutritionally healthy behaviour among employees. The Business Network supports SUN countries to incorporate business concerns into their nutrition strategies. It promotes market-led solutions to improve nutrition, such as “tax exemptions for food fortificants and premixes.”

Furthermore, the Business Network organizes advocacy meetings around major events, such as the World Economic Forum in Davos.\textsuperscript{265}

In order to ensure that the SUN participants are maintaining a common purpose and mutual accountability seven general Principles of Engagement\textsuperscript{266} have been developed. In addition, the Lead Group commissioned a document to support the prevention and management of conflicts of interest among SUN participants. Global Social Observatory (GSO) received support from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation to develop such a document and a related toolkit. They were published in 2014.\textsuperscript{267}

**Finance**

One of the four strategic objectives of SUN focuses on the efforts of national governments and multi-stakeholder platforms to mobilize increased financial resources for nutrition. However, SUN does not regard itself as a funding agency but as an initiative to catalyse additional financial resources in response to country needs. In order to assess the overall amount of funds mobilized through SUN, three different types of funding can be distinguished:

1. Financial commitments by SUN partners, for programmes related to the SUN objectives;
2. Contributions to the SUN Multipartner Trustfund, a fund for assisting countries in nutrition specific interventions;
3. Financial contributions to support the SUN Movement Secretariat.

How demanding it is to actually calculate the amount of money that is raised by SUN is underlined in the Inception Report of the current independent evaluation of SUN. It states:

“Estimates of the costs of scaling up are substantial […], but SUN has sought to act as a catalyst rather than a conduit for funding. Funds directly related to SUN […] are comparatively small, and the amount of money mobilized by SUN is a challenging evaluation question in itself.”\textsuperscript{268}

Nevertheless, rough estimates can be offered based on the information given in the SUN progress reports.

---

\textsuperscript{265} Cf. for instance http://sunbusinessnetwork.org/news-items/scaling-up-nutrition-business-network-high-level-breakfast-davos/.
\textsuperscript{267} Cf. Global Social Observatory (2014a) and (2014b) and http://scalingunupuncture.org/about/principles-of-engagement-2/preventing-and-managing-conflicts-of-interest.
Commitments

In its 2014 progress report, prepared by the SUN Secretariat, the initiative is very careful in calculating an overall figure for the commitments made in the context of SUN, a departure from previous reports. For instance the 2013 report stated: “over $23bn of new domestic and external financial resources have been committed with the expectation that more will be available once successes are demonstrated.”

This number, however, is not directly attributable to the activities or even the members of SUN, but rather summed up pledges made at the Nutrition for Growth event in the UK in June 2013 during the country’s G8 presidency. Since then, SUN has been more careful to make claims only about their actual “turnover”.

Commitments by donors are tracked through the **Donor Network**. The network currently comprises representatives of the following countries, international organizations and private foundations: Australia, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Canada, Children’s Investment Fund Foundation, Denmark, European Union, France, Germany, Inter-American Development Bank, Ireland, Japan, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the USA. For these donors, the 2014 progress report lists commitments and disbursements for what are called “nutrition specific” and “nutrition sensitive” programmes and activities. According to the report total nutrition specific investments (disbursements) among reporting donors increased from US$325 million (2010) to US$411 million (2012). In the same period, nutrition-sensitive investments increased from US$937 million to US$1.1 billion.

SUN’s conclusion: “Investments in nutrition seem to be on a positive upward trend. With analysis only available for two years, however, it is not possible, at this point, to reach any definitive conclusions.”

Nor is it possible to verify that the activities of SUN contributed to the mobilization of new and additional public resources for nutrition-related development programmes.

It is even more difficult to assess the commitments of the corporate sector. The SUN Business Network lists commitments from a total of 117 companies (as of March 2015). Among them are 38 transnational corporations with global commitments and 79 companies that have made or have publicly pledged to develop commitments at national level in SUN countries. According to the SUN Business Network, the commit-

---

270 “Nutrition specific” expenses are those covered by the OECD-DAC Creditor Reporting System (CRS) code 12240, cf. SUN (2014), p. 38. For what constitutes “nutrition sensitive” expenses, SUN developed its own, very complex methodology, ibid.
271 These sums exclude the US figures, which used a different methodology.
273 38 of them are Zambian companies which only registered their interest in developing commitments to scaling up nutrition in Zambia at a SUN Business Network launch event on 7 November 2014.
Commitments are registered from corporate giants such as the BASF chemical corporation to local enterprises like ZIMVITAMINS. They vary in size and specificity. For example, Bel Group, one of the largest global cheese producers, expresses its commitment as follows:

“The Laughing Cow cheese in SUN countries has been fortified in calcium & vitamin D for several years. Throughout that time, Bel has made it available to lower-income families by ensuring the sale of individual portions for example. Bel is committed to report on the number of people receiving the fortified product each year.”275 With this, Bel says, it will reach 13 million people by the end of 2020.

As most commitments by the business sector are not quantified in financial terms, it is not possible to assess how much money is raised or spent additionally compared to what companies are doing anyway,276 or to assess any commitments beyond a business strategy to gain access to new markets.

The SUN Movement Multi-Partner Trust Fund

The SUN Movement Multi-Partner Trust Fund was established in March 2012 by several UN organizations and a few donors

“[…] to ensure that catalytic grants reach governments, UN agencies, civil society groups, other SUN partners and support organizations. […] It is not designed to be a vertical nutrition fund for large scale investments in food and nutrition security, nor to replace existing funding pathways at country level—it is a fund to be used for catalytic actions to enable, initiate or develop SUN Movement activity at country or regional level, and provide appropriate global-level support, when other funding is not available.”277

So far, the volume of the fund’s resources has remained rather limited. In the first three years of its existence, only three donors made contributions: DFID, Irish Aid and the Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation (SIDA). Their contributions totaled about US$10 million (see Table 21).

276 There are a few exceptions: Pepsico, for example, has committed US$ 3.3 million to the WFP for a specific project, Bel has made a commitment of € 2.5 million for local associations. For more, see http://sunbusinessnetwork.org/business-commitment/.
MPTF funds support projects in 24 countries as well as regional and global projects. Each of the projects has been implemented by a partner agency or coalition (usually civil society organizations like Save the Children or CARE as well as local NGOs and coalitions) with the supervision of a UN organization (UNICEF, UNOPS, WFP, or WHO).

The MTPF is administered by the UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office.278

Table 21

The SUN Multi-Partner Trust Fund (in US$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributor</th>
<th>Deposits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>5,860,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Aid</td>
<td>429,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDA</td>
<td>3,798,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,087,658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient Organization</th>
<th>Transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>1,336,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>2,050,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>4,728,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>1,048,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,164,115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Funding of the SUN Movement Secretariat

While the offices of the SUN Secretariat are hosted by the UN Office in Geneva and UNDP in New York, the budget of the Secretariat is not part of the budgets of the UN or UNDP, but is fully funded by extra-budgetary resources. Major donors are the governments of Canada and Ireland, the European Union, and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. France and Unilever seconded staff to the SUN Secretariat (see Table 22).

Table 22

Contributions to the SUN Movement Secretariat (Donor contributions received (January 2011—June 2014) and expected (July 2014—December 2015) in US$, as of December 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Share in Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1,670,751</td>
<td>1,795,332</td>
<td>3,466,083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,466,083</td>
<td>16.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>2,214,423</td>
<td>2,425,023</td>
<td>2,271,024*</td>
<td>113,551*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,024,021</td>
<td>33.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>159,363</td>
<td>92,838</td>
<td>95,109</td>
<td>347,309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>347,309</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200,000*</td>
<td>1,213,245</td>
<td>13,245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,213,245</td>
<td>5.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>877,325</td>
<td>496,894</td>
<td>596,026</td>
<td>615,595</td>
<td>542,741*</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,128,582</td>
<td>15.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronutrient Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td>48,356</td>
<td>48,356</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>430,700</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,285,700</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unilever</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 staff**</td>
<td>1 staff**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>140,575</td>
<td>712,025</td>
<td>401,929</td>
<td>352,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,606,530</td>
<td>7.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Foundation</td>
<td>1,028,287</td>
<td>1,573,838*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,602,125</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total per year</strong></td>
<td>1,017,900</td>
<td>5,678,456</td>
<td>3,606,189</td>
<td>7,837,276</td>
<td>2,582,130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,721,951</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

—cash (received and expected)


* Expected contributions; may be under negotiation or subject to adjustment at closure of grant or to official exchange rate applied by treasury.
** Direct secondment.

The Bottom Line

The weaknesses and the fragmentation of the global nutrition system have been an undisputed fact, but SUN has not worked to overcome this fragmentation. Rather it has added to the proliferation of global partnerships on food security and nutrition, such as the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN), the Micronutrient Initiative (MI), the Flour Fortification Initiative (FFI), the New Alliance on Food Security and Nutrition and many others.

Meanwhile the UN System Standing Committee on Nutrition, which claims to be “the food and nutrition policy harmonization forum of the United Nations”, remains weak and underfunded.\(^\text{279}\) In fact, its function has been reduced to serving as the UN System Network for SUN.

---

\(^{279}\) Cf. Longhurst (2010) and (2012) and www.unscn.org. For comparison only, the secretariat of the UNSCN, hosted by WHO in Geneva, comprises of four officers, while the SUN secretariat includes more than 20 professional and administrative staff, cf. SUN Movement Secretariat (2015).
Furthermore, the motives and strategies of SUN activities with business involvement need a closer look, such as plans, for example, to sell more of a fortified product being assessed automatically as a contribution to fighting undernutrition.  

Claudio Schuftan and Ted Greiner state in the Right to Food and Nutrition Watch Report of 2013:

“While SUN now says it promotes government-led initiatives, its fundamental approach is entrenched in the frequent donor-driven emphasis on market-led “product” and high-tech solutions to malnutrition, rather than on community-based solutions rooted in human rights and equity.”

A common strategy of corporations within SUN is triggering consumer behaviour change and increasing the demand for fortified and nutritious products. In other words, companies such as Mars or PepsiCo commit to create increasing demand for their own products and tapping new markets. This looks like a genuine business strategy with the blessing or even support of the UN.

Often the products themselves are questionable, but not by the UN. For example, Brittania Industries Ltd. offers fortified cookies; BASF offers “agricultural solutions to optimize agricultural production and improve the quality of food, feed and fiber” which can be anything, from pesticides to genetically modified organisms (GMO).

Fabio da Silva Gomes, Officer of the National Cancer Institute of Brazil, commented:

“[… ] companies such as BASF and Cargill are trying to imply that there are crops that are poor in nutrients and that the solution for that is providing GMO seeds or adding chemicals to the soil that will increase the concentration of certain nutrients in the produced foods. This is misleading, since it undermines agro-biodiversity and hence impoverishes the soil and dietary diversity, and it can also induce harmful overconsumption of specific nutrients. Furthermore, it drives countries to higher economic dependence, especially peasant and smallholder farmers.”

---

282 The commitment by Indofood, e.g., includes the lines “Improve availability and accessibility of high quality products distributed by Indofood, namely SUN Ibu, SUN and SUN MPasi for 1.2M children and 370,000 mothers; Improve infant feeding practices and create demand for fortified MIYCN products.” Cf. http://sunbusinessnetwork.org/business-commitment/indofoods/.
Even the efforts by SUN to not to appear as a vehicle for business interests, as for instance by adopting a conflict of interest policy,\textsuperscript{286} have been criticized for being insufficient. Judith Richter, expert on the role of corporations in international policy making, criticizes SUN’s approach towards conflict of interest policies noting that its “blurred terminology hinders SUN participants’ understanding of the ultimate aim of conflict of interest policies: i.e., the protection of integrity, independence and public trust in persons and institutions serving public interests. It obscures the fact that conflicts of interest are an important legal concept.”\textsuperscript{287}

Finally, while it is too early to assess the longer term impact of the SUN initiative, there is little evidence yet that SUN contributed substantially to increased public funding to combat undernutrition and promote food sovereignty. UN agencies and programmes have benefited only marginally through the SUN Multi-Partner Trust Fund. The comprehensive external evaluation of SUN published in May 2015 concurred:

“SUN has contributed to international efforts to mobilise funds (notably in supporting the Nutrition for Growth event in 2013), and some SUN countries have achieved moderate increases in nutrition funding, but, as SUN’s own monitoring indicates, overall progress has been very limited.”\textsuperscript{288}


\textsuperscript{287} Cf. Richter (2014).

\textsuperscript{288} Cf. Mokoro Ltd. (2015), p. xii.
Spotlight: Ban Ki-moon’s proposal for a UN Partnership Facility

In his report “A life of dignity for all” from July 2013 the Secretary-General noted that “multi-stakeholder arrangements have proven successful” and that he has “put forward a proposal to Member States for a new United Nations Partnership Facility.”

First introduced in January 2012 in the Secretary General’s Five-Year Action Agenda, the proposed facility would:

1. **Scale up UN capacity to engage in transformative multi-stakeholder partnerships** with the private sector, civil society, philanthropists and academia across a broader range of issue areas, by creating a new UN Partnership Facility, which will catalyse commitments and promote accountability.

2. **Consolidate functions to create a coherent capacity for partnering consisting of the Global Compact and the UN Partnership Facility** and coordinate system-wide partnership efforts.

3. **Enhance UN capacity to engage with traditional and new constituencies** using the full range of outreach tools, including social media.

In August 2012, the UN inter-agency Partnership Focal Points group identified four critical gaps in UN capacity, which the partnership facility would fill through:

1. **Accelerating and upscaling the full potential of multi-stakeholder initiatives** such as those currently overseen by the Secretary-General’s office, including Every Woman Every Child and Sustainable Energy for All so as to affect change at the country level.

2. **Providing common partnership support services**, focused on: strategic matchmaking and incubation services; project design and delivery; resource mobilization; contractual obligations; monitoring and evaluation; capacity building; knowledge management and information sharing.

3. **Ensuring accountability, integrity and transparency**, by facilitating due diligence methods; streamlining reporting and auditing; developing and monitoring policies on pro bono, brand management and in-kind assistance; and creating modalities for transparency on all partners to ensure the preservation of UN mandates.

4. **Creating a partnership focal point network** to: develop common knowledge and engagement platforms; jointly identify capacity gaps; coordinate partnership policies and best practices; facilitate

289 Cf. UN Doc. A/68/202, para. 69.
enhanced dialogue with intergovernmental processes; develop and engage partner constituencies; and strengthen delivering as one through partnership at the global and country levels.\textsuperscript{291}

The proposal went through a number of revisions before its presentation to Member States as an item in the proposed budget for 2014–2015, where it was estimated to cost US$1.5253 million, with an extra US$12.8559 million coming from extra-budgetary sources.\textsuperscript{292}

For the biennium 2014–2015 the UN Secretary-General set the following benchmarks:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{Minimum of 250 new partners} from government, business, finance, philanthropic organizations or civil society will engage and commit to multi-stakeholder initiatives
  \item \textbf{Minimum of 110 multi-stakeholder partnership programmes implemented} through United Nations entities in-country
  \item \textbf{One or two new transformational multi-stakeholder partnerships} on cross-cutting priority issues established.\textsuperscript{293}
\end{itemize}

The UN Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) offered an ambivalent assessment, saying the proposal needed further development and in subsequent debates, some governments insisted on a substantive as well as budgetary discussion on the proposal. Some members of the G77 wanted to ensure the intergovernmental oversight and accountability of all partnerships with UN involvement and presented a detailed list of criteria to be included in the revised proposal.

Confronting these reservations, the UN Secretary-General finally withdrew his proposal for a Partnership Facility. In a letter to the Chair of the 5th Committee, dated 27 March 2015, a spokesperson stated that: “as negotiations among Member States on the establishment of such an entity reflected significant differences and a lack of consensus, the Secretary-General no longer wished the Committee to consider or take action on proposals relating to it.”\textsuperscript{294}

\textsuperscript{291} Taken from UN inter-agency Partnership Focal Points group (2012): Concept Note—A UN partnership mechanism, August 2012 (internal paper).
\textsuperscript{292} Cf. UN Doc. A/68/6 (Sect. 1), 21 May 2013, p. 71.
\textsuperscript{293} Cf. UN Doc. A/68/7, Table I.2.