

Terms of Engagement: How to better engage in Multi-Stakeholder Initiatives

January 15 - 16, 2015

Overview and Agenda

We frequently think of civil society organizations (CSOs) as principled organizations advocating for the best of all worlds. Similarly we imagine businesses as driven by “bottom line” concerns with profit. The participation of these organizations in multi-stakeholder initiatives (MSIs) is somewhat puzzling, as MSIs aim to govern or to generate some degree of sustained collective management around an initiative. Equally interesting is the participation of governments in MSIs, where they engage non-state actors on a peer-to-peer basis rather than using a top-down regulatory approach. Yet MSIs are an increasingly common tool for governing a wide range of transnational issues—even those with an impact on violence and conflict, where the primacy of states has traditionally been assumed.

This workshop aims to address three broad questions key to understanding how these different actors engage in MSIs and with what effects:

What are the roles of CSOs, businesses, and governments in MSIs?

What are the alternative models and trajectories of different MSIs?

Under what conditions are MSIs likely to generate their intended effects?

We focus specifically on a group of MSIs that have aimed to curb abuses in potentially violent arenas: the Kimberly Process, the Extractives Industry Transparency Initiative, the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights, the International Council on Mining and Metals, and the International Code of Conduct for Private Security Service Providers. We examine the typical roles of actors fundamental to the three pillars common in MSIs, look at the trajectory of these five initiatives, delve into common questions about resources, longevity, and institutionalization of MSIs, and finally focus on how we should best think about their relative effect, impact, or success.

Though we will have particular people speak briefly to kick off discussion for each panel, we imagine most of those in the room will have something to say relevant to each panel. We will thus limit speakers to 10 minutes each so as to allow plenty of time for back and forth during each session. We will also operate under “Chatham House” rules so that participants have nothing to prevent them from speaking freely. Though there will be a workshop report, it will be a summary of the discussion without attribution.

This workshop is a collaboration between the Josef Korbel School’s Sié Center and the Daniels School of Business at the University of Denver and the Geneva-based Center for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF). It is supported by the Society for the Advancement of Management Studies, the University of Denver’s Social Science Foundation, and DCAF.



UNIVERSITY of
DENVER

JOSEF KORBEL SCHOOL of
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES



DANIELS
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
UNIVERSITY of DENVER



DCAF
a centre for security,
development and
the rule of law

SOCIETY FOR THE
ADVANCEMENT OF
MANAGEMENT
STUDIES

Thursday

Fritz Knoebel School of Hospitality Management Room 211
University of Denver

4:00 - 6:00 p.m.

Panel I: What are the roles of CSOs/Businesses/Governments in MSIs?

Chair: Deborah Avant, Sié Chéou-Kang Center for International Security and Diplomacy, Josef Korbel School of International Studies, University of Denver

Rémy Friedmann, Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs

Jason Pielemeier, U.S. Department of State

Angela Rivas Gamboa, Fundación Ideas para la Paz

Carlos Salazar, Socios Perú

Mark Wall, Barrick Gold Corporation

- ◆ What governance roles does each actor play?
 - CSO: Advocacy, implementation, data gathering, other?
 - Business: Provider, client, partner, other?
 - Government: Regulatory, client, negotiator, other?
- ◆ Are there differences between the orientations of local, national, and transnational CSOs/businesses/governing bodies?
- ◆ What strategies does each actor employ in engaging in different MSIs?
- ◆ What concerns does each actor have about MSIs?
 - How can civil society and business be engaged without compromising their missions?
 - What are the differences between more developed and less developed countries in MSIs? What are ways that governments support MSIs?

Friday

Fritz Knoebel School of Hospitality Management Room 211
University of Denver

9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

Panel II: Alternative Models and Trajectories

Chair: Anne-Marie Buzatu, Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces

Sarah Altschuller, Voluntary Principles Secretariat

Kristi Disney, Sustainable Development Strategies Group

Michael Dougherty, Illinois State University

Virginia Haufler, University of Maryland

Andy Orsmond, International Code of Conduct Association Secretariat

- ◆ What are some of the design issues associated with current MSIs? (e.g., Kimberly Process, Voluntary Principles, the CME (Mining and Energy Committee, Colombia), International Council on Mining and Minerals, the Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative, the International Code of Conduct for Private Security Providers, etc.)
- ◆ What would alternative formulations of “multi” stakeholder initiatives look like?
- ◆ Are there ways to change the approach/design/strategy to better support meaningful engagement while safeguarding independence?

12:00 - 1:00 p.m.

Lunch

1:00 - 3:00 p.m.

Panel III: Resources and Institutionalization

Chair: Deborah Avant, Sié Center, University of Denver

Luke Danielson, Sustainable Development Strategies Group

Alan Donohue, Triple Canopy

Jennifer Griffin, George Washington University

'Kemi Okenyodo, Cleen Foundation

Meg Roggensack, Georgetown University

Friday, continued

- ◆ How have participants addressed the longevity, sustainability and institutionalization of stakeholder engagement?
- ◆ How are MSIs "resourced"? What are the different issues faced by MSI stakeholders?
- ◆ Is longevity always needed? Different purposes may require more or less long term involvement for MSIs.
- ◆ How has institutionalization taken place (for example, corporate governance in the context of crisis management)?

3:00 - 3:30 p.m.

Break

3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

Panel IV: Gauging Effectiveness

Chair: Tricia Olsen, Daniels College of Business, University of Denver

Kenneth Abbott, Arizona State University

Amelia Evans, Institute for Multi-Stakeholder Initiative Integrity

Scott Jerbi, The Graduate Institute Geneva

Amol Mehra, International Corporate Accountability Roundtable

Kendyl Salcito, NomoGaia

- ◆ When are MSIs effective?
- ◆ Do differing interests/incentives from stakeholders inform both engagement strategies and, perhaps, defining "success" or impact?
- ◆ How does the Protect, Respect, Remedy framework influence this conversation? Could it serve as a baseline for gauging effectiveness?
 - Other (assurance) frameworks?
 - Additional metrics/tools to use?