FTI Board Composition

Roles and responsibilities of the Board is likely to impact on what kind of Board we need!

We have not looked at or resolved:

1. The composition of Committee (s)
2. The exact composition of the constituencies
3. How the CSO constituency should be constituted

Recommendations and suggested decisions:

1. Partner countries should be given more influence including equal number of seats and/or votes on the Board. *(WG rec seats*)
2. (Approve in principle one of the three models… To be discussed later)
3. Constituency based board system (present system abolished)
4. Donor seats linked to financial contribution, i.e. size should matter (but not be the only factor)

Cont.

5. Partner and donor governments should be responsible to form their respective constituencies
6. (Decide on a new structure of the board by the end of 2010, coming into force late 2010 or mid 2011)
7. Decide on the establishment on a finance/technical committee.
8. Approve that partner countries serving on the Board are assisted with capacity to enable their effective participation in the Board. *Secretariat in discussion with the Chair to implement/take this forward within reasonable costs*

Model 2

- In total 17-19 members.
  Issues to consider:
- would we need more members? 4 CSO seats? One more UN seat*? If focus is on an effective board that makes decisions on funds, a majority of the WG believes 3 and 1 is advisable. If focus is on inclusion it would be valuable to have them on.*
- Six seats for partner countries right away!

Cont. Model 2

- How should the CSO seats be divided between south and north? Who else in addition to GCE?
- Should EC have a permanent seat or should it be considered a donor? *A donor, as would Foundations*
- Non-affiliated seats (e.g. a potential donor or "a champion for education")? *Maybe later.*

Cont.

- WB should form a constituency with the regional Banks (WB lead)
- WEF should organize the private sector constituency

The way forward

- Time plan. Can we have constituencies and other outstanding issues (e.g what committees needed) decided by next Board meeting? *Yes*
- Do we need to appoint a partner country and a donor to initiate the formation of constituencies in these groups? *Yes*.
- What about other/the CSO constituency? *(probably needs further discussion)*

Cont.

- Do we need some guidance/rules & regulation re how to conduct board work, incl how and when rotation should take place? *Secretariat, possibly in collaboration with a few Board members, could be responsible*
- How do we take the work with a finance/ technical committee forward?

That's it! *Yes*

Model 1.

- In total 11 members of the Board:
  4 donors, 4 partner countries, 1 CSO, 2 multilateral (WB and Unicef/Unesco)
- The WG believes that this model is too small as constituencies would become fairly large, several committees will be needed and ownership amongst those not on the Board may decrease

Model 3.

- 27 members including an Executive Committee: 6 partner countries, 6 donors, 4 CSOs, 4 multilaterals, 5 non-affiliated, 1 private sector, 1 foundation
- WG feels that this would be the most inclusive board. Would possibly allow for new ideas through non-affiliated. Costly and without an EC it would be difficult to reach decisons.