

Dear friends,

This morning we held the Inaugural Meeting of the Advocacy Working Group (Moral Imperative). The agenda included of the following points:

1. Attendance & Introductions
2. Review and Adopt TOR for Advocacy Working Group
3. Appoint moderator and vice-moderator
4. Create sub-group of 3-4 people tasked with drafting work plan
5. Review and refine objectives and actions of the advocacy pillar
6. Work Plan Drafting Brainstorm:
 - 6.1. Poll members for their initial interests in the group and receive any suggestions
 - 6.2. Quick mapping of projects and processes for possible collaboration and coordination
 - 6.3. Discussion on possible strategies for implementation of the Framework at national, regional, and global levels
7. Set next meeting

The writings in *italics* are my personal comments (not discussed in our meeting today). I am also copying our WB and UN colleagues, as well as the convener of the inaugural meeting of the Evidence Working Group for them to be aware of our discussions.

Attendance & Introductions

Despite a relatively short notice, 12 out of 23 registered members were able to attend the meeting, which represent 52% (please see note on “quorum” below). The meeting was planned for 1 hour and lasted 1:10 minutes, using WebEx support services. Half of the participants opted to connect using their computers (*) and the other half telephone.

() Using computers in future meetings would allow participants to share screen and make Power Point presentations from their own computers, as well as draw sketches and share documents. It is suggested to use this mean, unless unable to access a computer at the time of the meeting or to limited Internet bandwidth (speed).*

Review and Adopt TOR for Advocacy Working Group (AWG)

Most of the time was used to discuss the draft ToR. Questions for clarifications were mainly related to the purpose of the document and the synergy between the different working groups

(Evidence, Advocacy, and Collaboration). During the discussions some elements were highlighted, which need further thought from the (still to be established) Steering Committee of the Moral Imperative (SCMI). The major points discussed are the following:

- a) Ensure proper interaction mechanism between the 3 working groups to foster synergy and consistency between the strategies to implement the objectives and actions included in the Action Framework. The SCMI should be the space to ensure consistency and coherency in the work of the 3 different WGs.
- b) Although a slight majority indicated preference to limit the number of members of the WG (20), some few expressed the preference for no limitation. Not all participants have expressed their preferences, as more thinking is needed. The argument to limit the number to 20 was basically to ensure that the meetings are functional and efficient, especially because they are virtual meetings. The main argument for the “no limit” was not to exclude those people and organizations that want to contribute to the topic, as the intention of the MI is to engage more organizations. It was also discussed the importance to count with UN and multi-donor representatives in the WG, as many of the activities at national level will require a multi-stakeholder approach. Some alternatives were discussed (see **suggestions** below).
- c) Issues related to quorum for the meetings were also discussed (and they also have implications for the number of member in the WG). Suggestions were made to have a minimum quorum for the meetings to take place. This suggestion raised other issue related to “qualifying” quorum, e.g. Religion representation. It was recognized that this kind of discussion should take place at the SCMI, as this may be also an issue for consideration for other WGs.

Suggestions for further consideration/approval:

- a) **Limit of members in the AWG:** To keep a core group of 20 people and allow the possibility to convene sub- groups (by region, topic, etc.), or to have “advisory groups” on issues, regions, etc. The concern is that this could be a bit messy.
 - *Using my “power” as moderator of the inaugural meeting this morning ;-) I would like to make a suggestion for your consideration on the composition and the number of members of the AWG: To establish “proxies” for each representative from FBOs. That would allow fixing the limit to 20 FBOs. The proxies should be indicated by the organizations, who would receive the same information as the main representatives to ensure they are up to date and ready to make contributions.*

- *In addition to the 20 FBOs reps, to have 3 additional seats for “multilateral organizations (2 UN-IATF-FBO + 1 World Bank) and one seat for (multi-donor coordination-governments). We would have then around 24 organizations in the WG.*
 - *To be consistent to the “rule” to keep membership in AWG (not to attend more than 2 consecutives meetings without advance notice) by “shifting” the membership to the first organization that has expressed interest in joining the AWG. The outgoing organization can again reclaim its membership, but it will be placed in the list of interested organization waiting for a seat in the AWG. In case of organizations that applied at the same time, preference for vacant positions will be for organizations representing faiths under-represented in the WG.*
- b) **Steering Committee:** The members who participated in the meeting today recommended to the facilitating group of the Moral Imperative Event on September 24 to urgently prepare a ToR for the SCMI. It will be crucial for the AWG to align its responsibilities with other WGs and the SCMI itself.

The Group agreed to **adopt in principle the ToR** as it is, recognizing that changes are necessary regarding the participation in the AWG, as well as other elements included in the upcoming draft ToR for the SCMI. A revised version will be presented at the next meeting of the AWG.

Appoint moderator and vice-moderator of AWG

Considering that not all members of the AWG were presented in the inaugural meeting (due to the relatively short notice), it was decided that all people interested in **volunteering** her/himself, **nominating** people or **suggesting** names should send the names to Rudelmar (rdf@wcc-coe.org), who will collect the names and share the results in the next meeting of the AWG. For the meantime, Rudelmar has accepted to be convening the next meeting and to be the focal person for the AWG members until the moderator and vice-moderator will be chosen (next meeting of the AWG).

It was agreed that the vice-moderator should be from a different faith from the moderator, to keep the spirit of interreligious diversity in the Moral Imperative Process.

*I suggest the **deadline** for the volunteering, nominations and suggestions of names for moderator to be November 20, 2015. I also suggest that you nominate only the moderator (up to 2 names), and the vice-moderator will be taken from the names received, based on the number of indications and the criteria of different faith from the moderator.*

Create sub-group of 3-4 people tasked with drafting work plan

As time didn't allow a proper discussion, it was agreed that all interested members to work on the AWG draft work plan should send an email to Rudelmar (rdf@wcc-coe.org). *Suggested deadline is November 8 2015.*

Review and refine objectives and actions of the advocacy pillar and Work Plan Drafting Brainstorm.

These two items of the agenda were not discussed due to the lack of time and the need to clarify other elements from the SCMI. This is one of the agenda items for the next meeting.

Set next meeting

It was agreed that the next meeting will take place on **November 23 from 9:00 to 10:30** (US East Time). It was agreed that the frequency of regular meetings will be, in principle, monthly. After the "first" meeting it will be decided to define one day in the month (e.g. last Friday of the month) to facilitate early planning for the meetings throughout the year.

I will send a separate email with a link for the video conference on November 23. Starting that day, the criteria for membership will be valid (not attending 2 consecutives meetings without advanced notice will imply to be out of the AWG).

Greetings,

Rudelmar