Community Resource Exchange

Analysis of Consultation Feedback and Changes to CRE Design

Contents

Introduction

One thing 2020 laid bare is our need for connection--not just in our personal lives but in our work. How do we find each other? How do we help each other? Connection is at the heart of the community resource exchange (CRE). The CRE's mission is to ensure that communities facing harmful international investment and development activities do not lack for allies and resources in their fight to defend their rights and their environment. It is premised on the belief that the interests behind those activities are no match for the power, passion, and skills we possess collectively, if only we could harness them in a coordinated manner.

2020 also taught us that we have to deal with the emergency in front of us and simultaneously build systems that prevent and help us respond better to those emergencies in the future. And so even while we fight harmful investment and development projects, we also have to think about how to fight better and smarter tomorrow. The CRE is our response to that challenge.

The CRE was created collaboratively through two rounds of in-depth consultations (including online surveys, several interviews and focus groups) reaching around 400 unique participants, over a period of two and half years. The purpose of the first round of consultations was to assess the need for the CRE and generate ideas for a draft design. The purpose of the second round of consultations was to get input on the draft design. After the completion of the second round of consultations, funding was secured for a three-year pilot of the CRE to test its design.

This report provides an analysis of all the feedback that we received in this second round of consultations, how it was used to shape the CRE and its pilot, and what questions need to be tested in the pilot.

Executive Summary of Consultation Feedback and Changes to CRE Design

The response we received to the draft design -- in both quantity and quality -- indicate interest in and excitement about the CRE, especially as it came during a difficult year for everyone. There was overwhelming support for the mission of the CRE to help facilitate better connections and the principles centering communities. Respondents also saw the CRE's tremendous potential for on-the-ground and systemic change.

While the draft design seemed to be a good starting point for most respondents, there were a lot of suggestions for improvement. At times, suggestions conflicted with each other or repeated elements from the draft design. The CRE consultation team consisting of 10 organisations made substantial changes to the design to: simplify and clarify the language in the design; reflect a more horizontal relationship among all collaborators; define the scope of the system to international investment and development activities; identify several ways to ground the system in the national context; and streamline the types of facilitation offered.

The three-year pilot of the CRE, hosted by the Coalition for Human Rights in Development, will now test the design, with some modifications (noted in the boxes in the design at the end of the report). The lessons learned from the pilot will be used to improve the CRE, hopefully beyond the life of the pilot. The feedback received throughout this process and the people who have generously shared their perspectives and ideas will continue to be the CRE's most valuable resources.

What follows is a summary of the feedback that we received on the draft design, changes made to the design in response to the feedback, and questions for the pilot to take forward. The final design is included in the annex.

Summary of Feedback

The CRE responds to a real need for collaboration around community-led rights struggles around development finance/investment. Respondents overwhelmingly expressed support for the CRE proposal as a means of meeting a real need for collaboration across a diversity of groups, geographies, and strategies to facilitate collective action in support of community struggles. There was excitement about having a system that responds to the challenges of powerful and diverse economic actors and that can connect different actors, bridge gaps in expertise, and increase capacity and coordination. Many felt it was a compelling innovative idea, appreciated the participatory process for its creation, and expressed interest in continuing to be involved.

> *"It aims to answer a deep need for research and sharing knowledge in a way that strengthens networks, joint strategies and mutual support. I see how it can contribute in the territory, I see how students from Pluriversidad Ch'horti' can achieve more training along the way, I see ways of collaborating personally and from the Ch'orti' Institute in the future – and how it can have multiplier effects on the country and the region."*

The most common positive aspects mentioned included the following:

- Brings together diverse groups and strategies for collaboration and collective action
- Fills an important gap/need supporting communities around development and financial actors
- Facilitates exchange of knowledge, learning and capacity
- Centers communities
- Democratic, participatory process and structure
- Innovative idea, mission and principles

Respondents had a lot of questions, many of which can be addressed through clarifications in the revised design. 70% of respondents did not report a dislike. Of the concerns raised, some will be addressed in the revisions and others will hopefully be alleviated in implementation by, for example, demonstrating value added. We also have to be comfortable with the fact that not everyone will want to participate in the CRE. The main issues of concern raised are:
- Unclear additionality: Not sure what it adds. Unless significant new money is involved, it will be diverting funds from existing efforts. The potential for the CRE to step on spaces where there is already strong civil society support. Where does the CRE mandate begin and end?
- Accessibility: How will it meet those with greatest need? Does it reach those rural communities who don't have access to resources/connections? How will communities know what type of support they need?
- Structure and Decision-making: How will CRE be accountable to communities? The current structure seems top-down, complex, and bureaucratic. The secretariat has too big a role. A strong concentration of responsibilities at the international and regional level.

Background of CRE Consultation Process

In 2018, we launched an ambitious project. We wanted to change how we--communities and their allies--worked together. We see corporations with an array of resources at their disposal: lawyers, media consultants, engineers, etc. We dreamed of developing a system so that communities fighting international investment and development projects could readily mobilize allies to support them.

In 2019, we conducted a survey to see if others saw a need for a system to improve how we connect. We wanted to know what strategies communities are currently using to defend their rights and environment, and how they connect with others to use those strategies. We grouped the strategies into six categories: corporate and financial research; access to remedy; community organizing; advocacy and campaigns; scientific and technical expertise; and security for human rights defenders. 120 people — from 41 countries evenly distributed geographically, speaking over 80 languages and working on a wide range of issues, from human rights (73%) to corporate accountability (42%), environment (39%), indigenous rights (24%), health (9%), and labour (7%) — responded to the survey. Following the survey, we held a series for consultations (in Abidjan, Côte D'Ivoire; Bangkok, Thailand; Cordoba, Argentina; and Washington DC, United States) and three online webinars, with about 160 people from around the world to share the results of the survey and solicit their input.

We found that people are collaborating with each other on many strategies, but we also heard that communities face challenges finding the right ally to work with them, particularly on more specialized strategies. We heard overwhelming support for the idea of creating a system to help us connect better with each other.

Armed with all of this feedback, in October 2019, we organized a three-day workshop with a group of seven NGO representatives from Asia, North America, Africa, Latin America, and Europe to prepare a draft design for a community resource exchange. The drafting team was assisted remotely by the rapid response team, a group of 12 people worldwide who followed progress through online meeting notes and provided feedback to questions posed by the drafting team. At the end of three days, the drafting team had coalesced around one model for the community resource exchange.

Beginning in 2020, interrupted by the pandemic, we consulted on the draft design for the community resource exchange. This consultation included an online survey, interviews and focus group discussions. We had 107 responses from across the world on the design of the survey.

There were also inter-personal consultation efforts involving interviews and focus groups conducted with a total of 81 individuals from community groups, indigenous peoples organizations, grassroots groups, national, and regional organizations. The Uganda consultations involved 35 individuals (78% female) through in-person interviews and focus group discussions with community leaders and individuals affected by development projects in the roads and oil and gas sectors. The Guatemala consultations involved virtual focus groups with 33 persons (78% male). Participants included 27 indigenous authorities and five grassroots leaders involved in a diversity of investment-related struggles. The Philippines consultations were phone interviews with five individuals (three female, two male) involved in community-based struggles, and also affiliated with national organizations. The international consultations involved interviews with eight individuals from Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Armenia, Brazil and Chile. Participants (five female, three male) included local,

national, and regional organizations that partner to support community-led efforts around specific development projects.

Below we provide a detailed description of the analysis from the feedback we received from the survey and consultations on the draft CRE design, and how the feedback has been incorporated into the design.

Detailed analysis of Consultation Feedback and Changes to CRE Design

1. Group
Which best represents your group?

Survey:

Category	Summary
Summary	Respondents focus on: National (32%), International (31%), Regional (22%), Local (13%) and Other (2%).

In-person/Virtual Consultations:

The consultation on the CRE design included four different consultation efforts involving interviews and focus groups conducted with a total of 81 individuals from community groups, indigenous peoples organizations, grassroots groups, national, and regional organizations.

2. Region
In which region is your group based?

Survey:

Category	Summary
Summary	Respondents are based in: South America (16.8%), North America (14%), South Asia (13.1%), Central America and Caribbean (13.1%), South East Asia and Pacific (11.2%), East Africa (8.4%), Western Europe (7.5%), West Africa (4.7%) and other locations (12%).

In-person/Virtual Consultations:

Participants were from Guatemala, the Philippines, Uganda, Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Armenia, Brazil and Chile

3. Principles
Are these the right principles?

Survey:

Category	Summary
Summary	54% of respondents agreed; 46% proposed other principles (including missing principles and reiteration of existing CRE principles)

Principles proposed (including missing principles and reiteration of existing CRE Principles) (Categorized)		
Category	**Total responses (/57)**	**Summary of responses**
Practical, useful, simple	6	Principle that CRE must be useful and effective, simple and not bureaucratic, and should adapt as needs/ collaborators change.
For and by impacted communities	8	Principle that CRE should work closely with communities, including in its development and implementation, and be made for communities to access and utilize.
Capacity-building	4	Principle that CRE should build expertise and capacity of communities to facilitate local knowledge and advocacy.
No duplication/ replacement	2	Principle that CRE should not duplicate/ replicate existing organizations, and that CRE works with existing organizations and networks.
Broader impact	4	Principle that CRE should learn from its work to strengthen other campaigns.
Self-responsibility of participants	1	Principle that participants work towards CRE's common goals.
Recognize diversity	9	Principle that CRE should recognize and accommodate diversity, including geographic and cultural diversity, language, gender, different worldviews and indigenous peoples.
Accessibility	2	Principle that CRE should be accessible, particularly for women and vulnerable groups.
Access to remedy	2	Principle that CRE should provide access to remedy.
Access to information	1	Principle that CRE should provide access to information.
Recognize human rights/ SDGs	4	Principle that CRE should comply with human rights law and SDGs.
Confidentiality	1	Principle on confidentiality.
Collaboration	6	Principle on collaboration and sharing of resources and expertise.
CRE review/ M&E	2	Principle that the CRE itself must be periodically reviewed and evaluated.
Security/ protection of HR defenders	4	Principle that the CRE must protect human rights defenders; CRE must have a strategy for such protection, including emergency assistance.
Other: define "resource"	1	Suggestion to clarify criteria and scope of 'resource' in CRE Principles.

4. Additional Comments, Questions, and Observations
Before moving to the next section, do you have any other comments, questions, or observations on anything in this section?

CQOs (Categorized)			
Category	**Sub-Category**	**Total responses (/44)**	**Summary**

CRE mission	Mission wording	6	Several suggested changes to CRE Mission wording.
	"Two-way exchange"	1	Suggested change from 'two-way exchange' to multi-part collaborations.
	"Strategy areas"	1	Suggested change to the wording for strategy areas.
	"Build capacity"	2	Consider communities' capacities and requirements; capacity-building of participants.
	"Mobilizing resources"	1	Clarify meaning of 'mobilizing resources' and 'resource allocation'.
	"Evidence base"	3	Suggested changes to the wording related to 'build an evidence base'.
CRE Principles	"Co-created"	2	Support for CRE being co-created by participants.
	Complement, not replace/ duplicate	3	Concern about replication/ duplication of CRE with existing organizations/ networks.
	"Skills, experience, expertise"	3	Various comments, including: community should retain ownership of skills/ expertise; how to evaluate skills.
	"Resource allocation"	2	Clarify meaning of 'mobilizing resources' and 'resource allocation'.
	Review/ M&E	2	Suggestions to periodically monitor and review CRE principles.
	Simplicity	2	Suggestions to simplify CRE Principles.
General comments	Collaboration	5	Various comments/ questions, including: are collaborations one-off or long-term?; collaborations should be targeted and respond to community needs.
	Community involvement	3	Support for community involvement in CRE, including consideration of access/ technological limitations.
	Implementation	5	Various comments, including: information in vernacular languages; use of guidelines to assist participants to use the CRE; implementation of CRE.
	Ensuring safety	1	Clarify how CRE will ensure the safety of information and participants.
	Broader impact	1	Consider CRE's broader impact, namely impact of development on (particularly indigenous) communities.
Other	1 question about how CRE build team was chosen and CRE outreach.		

In-person/Virtual Consultations:

Several consultation reports stressed the need to ensure that these principles are really put into operation and practice so that the CRE recognizes that communities have their own expertise, considers them collaborators, not only requesters, and ensures that the exchange is horizontal rather than hierarchical. There was also feedback to ensure that communities actually control the collaborations, use of funds, governance etc. Two of the consultations stressed the need for principles of transparency and accountability to communities.

Changes to Final Design:

In general, there was a lot of support for the principles, and in particular the focus on community leadership, co-creation, and exchange. However, the suggestions for improvements also reiterated some elements already included in the principles, such as centering communities, building expertise and capacity, and not duplicating existing efforts and networks. It might signal that respondents, perhaps based on previous experiences, are concerned that the CRE won't live by them. There is also some tension between the overall suggestion to simplify the language and wanting to be more explicit and descriptive to reassure people of the intention to be inclusive and community-centered.

- Changes made to the design:
  - Language simplified.
  - Language added to emphasize community leadership and bullets re-ordered to give those principles more prominence.
  - Emphasized the facilitative role of CRE to alleviate some concerns about duplication of existing efforts.
  - Eliminated terminology that could be misinterpreted to value professional expertise over community expertise/experience.
  - Added a principle on accessibility, transparency, and simplicity.

Questions for pilot:

- How will you use these principles in decision-making and evaluation activities?
- What kinds of public materials can be produced to show accountability to these principles?
- Are they the right principles? Is there something missing?

5. Structure

Does this structure make sense? What do you like about it? What questions do you have about it?

Does this structure make sense?	
Category	**Summary**
Does the CRE structure make sense? [Some respondents said that the structure made sense, but also added comments about improving the structure - so there is overlap here]	72% of respondents agreed; 60% disagreed and/ or made comments to improve CRE structure; 5% did not respond.

What do you like about it?

Structure – Positives (Categorized)		
Category	**Total responses (/53)**	**Summary**
Global network/ diverse regions	5	Like that CRE is a global referral network with diverse geographic regions; good structure from local to regional to international.
Regional focus	6	Like CRE's regional focus/ focal points, to ensure efficient and strategic collaborations.

Collaboration	11	Like the collaboration between different CRE actors, including local/ regional/ international communities and organizations.
Comprehensive/ informative	4	Like CRE's coherent, informative and cohesive structure.
Database	1	Like CRE's database of information.
Supports HRDs	2	Like that CRE supports human rights defenders.
Diagram	2	Like the clear diagram of CRE Principles.
Secretariat's role	2	Like CRE structure, including role of Secretariat and decentralization.
Appropriate/ responsive	2	Like that CRE is responding to current challenges.
Bottom-up approach	4	Like grassroots/ bottom-up approach, which encourages ownership and participation.
Simple/ clear/ logical	11	CRE structure is simple, clear and logical.
General positive comments	3	CRE is described as fantastic.

What questions do you have about it?

Structure - Other comments/ concerns (Categorized)		
Category	**Total responses (/99)**	**Summary**
Opportunity/ ongoing costs/ funding	5	Concerns about funding, resources and opportunity costs.
Complement, not duplicate/ replace	3	Concerns about duplication of existing networks; suggestion that it may be better to grow/ fund existing networks rather than create CRE.
Requesters	12	Concerns/ questions about requesters, including: vetting processes to ensure requesters are legitimate; who can be a requester?; how would requesters find out about CRE?; whether requesters with similar issues can be joined together?
Scale/ scope	4	Concerns about management of CRE with broad scope and workload.
Secretariat/ international focal points	12	Concerns about Secretariat/ IFPs, including their role, leadership, funding and workloads.
Regional focal points	8	Concerns about RFPs, including leadership, workloads, and connection to national level. Suggestion for sub-regional FPs.
Collaborator issues	9	Concerns about collaborations, including: capacity to assist; conflict/ competition between collaborators; compensation; selection. Suggestion for inclusion of socially responsible investors as collaborators.
Distinction between participants	10	Questions about what participants do, including: distinction between nodes/ RFP; distinction between network/ nodes/ civil society; link between regional/ national levels; whether applicants can also be collaborators. Suggestion for national FPs.
Review/ M&E	2	Suggestion for M&E of CRE itself.

Strategy areas	4	Questions about the interaction between the strategy areas; specific questions about particular areas.
Independence/ transparency	4	Concerns about ensuring CRE transparency.
Implementation/ access	9	Concerns about CRE implementation, including: language barriers; need for community trust of and participation in CRE; meaningful consultation; free and prior informed consent.
Diagram	6	Questions about CRE structure diagram, including not understanding the differences between the levels.
Security	3	Concerns about ensuring the security of CRE database and human rights defenders involved in CRE.
Other	8	Various concerns/ questions, including: SOMO's role in CRE?; need to ensure participation of women; CRE response time?; prioritization of applications?

6. Role

Is there any role that is missing?

Category	Summary
Is there any role that is missing?	51% of respondents said yes, there was a role missing; 49% said that no role was missing.

Missing roles (Categorized)			
Category	Sub-Category	Total responses (/50)	Summary
Internal processes	Fundraising	2	Questions about fundraising and donors.
	Administration/ resource allocation	4	Questions about who will undertake administrative role (resources, funding, distribution of funding/ resources/ information)
	Review/ M&E/ accountability	7	Suggestion to monitor and evaluate all participants.
	Broader impact/ institutional learning	2	Suggestion to document individual cases and focus on how these cases can more broadly influence policy.
	Capacity-building / training	3	Questions about CRE training, learning and capacity-building.
	Outreach	4	Suggestion that an outreach/ communication/ promotion role is missing.
	Approach to remediation	1	Suggestion for a role/ procedure for collaborations.
Participants	Regional focal points	2	Suggestion for RFPs to be hosted/ advised by active members; for Asia FP.
	National focal points	6	Suggestions for national/ sub-regional FPs.
	National/ local assistance	7	Suggestions for increased national/ local involvement, such as NHRIs and local facilitators.

	Participant communication/ collaboration	6	Questions about communication between participants, including: role of FPs?; knowledge exchanges.
	Requester support	1	Suggestion for role to support applicants.
Specific groups	Investors	2	Suggestions to include socially responsible investors.
	Women	2	Suggestions to include role of women.
	Indigenous peoples	1	Suggestion to include role of indigenous people.

Comments on CRE strategy areas (Categorized)		
Category	**Total responses (/10)**	**Summary**
General	1	Suggestion for Secretariat to have 1 expert per strategy area.
Corporate/ financial research	1	Suggestion for improvement of existing corruption networks to be added to corporate/ financial research area.
Access to remedy	1	Consider adding remediation, including filing complaints and ICJ, to access to remedy area.
Community organizing	1	Suggestion to add conflict management/ mitigation to community organizing area.
Advocacy and campaigns	5	Various suggestions for advocacy and campaigns area, including: filing complaints to UN bodies; targets for advocacy; transparency; legal representation.
Security support for HRDs	1	Suggestion for community groups to be included in security support for HRDs.

In-person/Virtual Consultations:

Three consultations were generally in support of the proposed structure, though they raised some concerns. The Guatemala consultation expressed more significant reservations. Three consultations raised the concern that the proposed structure might be too bureaucratic and unable to respond to urgent requests for assistance, and that processes and language may be too complex or time-consuming.

A related and primary concern of at least three of the consultations was that the structure and process shouldn't be too centralized. There was concern that the secretariat may be playing too big a role in terms of decision making and assessment of requesters, in effect, restricting access.

All of the consultations stressed that the CRE should have some sort of a presence at the national level, not just the regional and international. International participants suggested there should be partners on the national level involved in the assessment of requests to provide context. Uganda participants suggested that temporary arrangements and structures could be established at the national level until permanent facilities could be established. For participants of the Guatemala consultation, this was a major concern, with the recommendation that the CRE include the construction of national networks of frontline movements and collaborators that with national focal points can establish priorities, make

connections, and inform strategies. They stressed that the locus or context should be of nations, peoples and territories, which may differ from administrative borders.

A majority of the consultations stressed the importance of treating communities as experts and collaborators, and ensuring horizontal exchange. The Guatemala consultation expressed substantial concern that this principle was not operationalized in the dichotomy of requester and collaborator and the lack of space for co-creation or use of existing community methods of collaboration and exchange.

Changes to Final Design:

- Identified a distinct role for national nodes who are grounded in national contexts.. The organization hosting the RFP (now called Regional Facilitators) could serve as a national node. The nodes may help review requests, identify collaborators, assist in due diligence, and serve on regional grant working groups.
- Eliminated the "requester" as a category in order to demonstrate horizontal relationships. All participants are referred to as collaborators. Once a collaborator makes a request, then he/she/they will sometimes be referred to as a requester where that helps advance the CRE Principles.
- To address concerns about bureaucracy, added text on hosting the system and its components in existing organizations or networks.
- Renamed the International Focal Point to be CRE Coordinator, which better describes the role and addresses concerns about hierarchy.
- Renamed Regional Focal Point to be CRE Regional Facilitator (RF), which better describes the role as facilitating collaborations.
- Added regional grant working groups as an additional component in the structure. They will make the funding decisions.

Questions for the pilot:
- Is the Coalition the appropriate network to continue to host the secretariat of the CRE?
- The pilot will use the Coalition's structures as a foundation to build the regional grant working groups. How will the Coalition transition from the CEP Working Group to the regional grant working groups?
- The national nodes need further development:
    - How many national nodes can be identified for a three-year period?
    - Do additional resources need to be mobilized to support the role of national nodes?
    - Is the national node sufficient? Does there need to be a more substantial national role?

7.A. Individual requests

The draft assumes that the request would come from a group of people. Do you think an individual community member should be able to submit a request?

Category	Summary
Summary	70% of respondents said yes; 30% said no.

Caveats to responses	
Category	**Summary**
Caveats to 'yes' response in favor of individual requesters (4 responses in total)	Caveats include: individual must have consent to act on community's behalf; individual must be vetted; individual can only act when there is no other option; individual can

	request to allow community to consider claim, but community must act.
Caveats to 'no' response against individual requesters (3 responses in total)	Caveats include: depends on circumstances; must have flexibility for exceptional cases; a group – not necessarily community – must support application.

7.B. Individual requests

Explain your response

For individual requests		
Category	**Total responses (/62)**	**Summary**
(For many reasons) only an individual acts	26	Individual may act for many reasons, including: motivation; capacity; lack of influence in community; isolation; afraid to be part of group.
Individual represents community	17	Individual may be trusted/ have consent/ be delegated to represent community.
Emergency responses/ HRD's safety	4	CRE should accommodate individual HRDs that need emergency assistance.
Community uninformed/ unorganized/ lack of accessibility	6	Some communities are not informed/ organized and experience accessibility barriers (internet/ language); communities may not be formed and only an individual can act.
Accessibility	4	Allowing individuals/ communities to submit requests increases accessibility and is more public/ open / democratic.
Other	1	Concern about 'high cost in the model of registration of applications'.
Suggestions	4	Several suggestions made, including: allow individual to submit request then CRE should evaluate request; encourage communities to submit directly rather than through intermediary.

Against individual requests		
Category	**Total responses (/28)**	**Summary**
Importance of community support/ ownership/ representation	15	Community should request because: individuals often don't represent the community; promotes community ownership, participation and accountability.
Overwhelming CRE	3	Concern that allowing individuals to request could overwhelm CRE; community requests would ensure that more advanced/ better coordinated requests would proceed.
Group involvement means stronger/ legitimate claim	8	Community requests would be stronger/ more advanced/ more legitimate.

Suggestion: Define "group"	2	Suggestion to define 'group of people', including as 3 people or more people.

In-person/Virtual Consultations:

The consultations were split on the question of whether the CRE would accept requests from individuals or only collectives. The Philippines consultation supported collective requests to provide more accountability and governance, while the Guatemala consultation supported allowing requests from individuals given that investors and governments often divide and intimidate communities. The Uganda consultation narrowly favored collective requests. It was stressed that there should not be a requirement that requesters be registered organizations. While the Guatemala consultation proposed a focus on requests from indigenous peoples and territories, the Uganda consultation participants stressed that the CRE should be more inclusive and not restrict support to specific groups or categories of people.

Changes to Final Design:

- No restrictions on who can request Tier 1 support.
- Requests for tier 2-3 collaborations would have to demonstrate support from people who are directly affected by the international investment.
- For requests involving financial support, priority will be given to requests that show the support of a collective. Exceptions will be made for requests involving security support for human rights defenders.

Questions for Pilot:

- It would be useful to identify what metrics to track, such as the number of people who make the request.
- Identify a moment, perhaps mid-way through the pilot, to revisit eligibility criteria depending on whether the experience has been that they are too strict or loose.

8. Accountability

How can the system ensure that the request comes from or is accountable to the affected communities?

Responses (Categorized)		
Category	**Total responses (/127)**	**Summary**
Vetting by Secretariat/ regional focal point/ collaborators	20	Requesters can be vetted/ verified by CRE participants.
Intake process/ due diligence	21	Implement an intake system and conduct due diligence (evidence, reference checks, community support).
Vetting by national/ local networks/ CSOs	29	Requesters can be vetted/ verified by national/ local networks and CSOs.

Community involvement, including letter	32	Accountability ensured by active community involvement, including: letter signed by community leaders; questionnaire; evidence.
Visit community	9	Accountability ensured by visiting the community/ fieldwork.
Ongoing monitoring	6	Accountability ensured by ongoing monitoring of request.
Other	10	Various issues raised, including: ensuring request is an issue of great concern to community; involvement of NHRIs; need for grassroots involvement; importance of engaging with vulnerable communities.

In-person/Virtual Consultations:

Consultations expressed the tension between the need to verify that the requester has the consent of the community, and ensuring that the CRE can act quickly to respond to urgent needs. Another issue raised was sensitivity to the requester's security. Uganda respondents suggested the use of references, while International consultation participants advocated that the CRE partner with trusted civil society actors in each country who could provide a deeper overview of the requester and the community's struggle. Guatemala similarly stated that the assessment and evaluation of requests should be undertaken by national networks with input from collaborators.

Changes to Final Design:

Barring funding for travel or the secretariat's direct engagement with the community, most respondents said the secretariat should triangulate/verify information with national and sub-regional groups or require an endorsement from trusted 3rd parties. Some ideas for due diligence were to have an intake call with the requester or community, questionnaire, video evidence, signed attestation or meeting notes (security concerns), or other vetting processes. There may be some due diligence at intake, and some throughout the process. For instance, RFPs (now called Regional Facilitators) could do an initial assessment with national nodes, but collaborators could do additional due diligence before the match is finalized or funds disbursed.

- Added the requirement of demonstrating the consent of those affected when the request is not submitted directly by them.
- Added a role for the national node in conducting due diligence on requests for tier 2 and 3 collaborations.

Questions for the Pilot:

- What will the detailed procedures be for vetting requests for self-funded tier 2 collaboration? For collaborations requesting financing?
- What is the role of the national node in vetting requests?

9.A. Eligibility
If needed, the scope should be limited to requests by communities facing impacts from activities financed by…?

Category	Summary
Summary	65% of respondents said any international investment (e.g. companies, development financiers, export credit agencies); 19% said development finance institutions (national and international development banks); 5% said

both international investment, development finance institutions and others (companies); 11% answered other.

9.B. Eligibility

Before moving to the next section, do you have any other comments, questions, or observations on anything in this section?

CQOs (Categorized)		
Category	**Total responses (/33)**	**Summary**
Groups to include in scope	6	Other groups to include in scope: local CSOs; labor rights groups; women; people with disabilities; vulnerable groups; indigenous peoples.
For limited scope (only DFIs)	2	Reason for limited scope: broad scope may make expertise more difficult to find. If there is a limited scope a check will be needed to help communities identify involved DFIs.
For broad scope (any international investment)	7	Reasons for broad scope, including: not all ASEAN countries are financed by IFIs; private investment increasingly important; clarity for CRE requesters.
Comments on scope generally	4	General comments on CRE scope, including: limitation of scope based on seriousness of impact; suggestions if demand for CRE exceeds supply.
Comments on accessibility/ transparency	5	Comments on CRE accessibility/ transparency, including: importance of promotion/ awareness of CRE; process requests diligently; collaborators must be independent from government/ corporations.
Other	9	Various comments/questions, including: will database be public?; importance of requester safety; whether CRE will include OECD NCPs?; importance of CRE complementing existing networks.

In-person/Virtual Consultations:

The Uganda consultation suggested the limit of "any international investment", but stressed that national investments should be addressed, and that urgency is an important factor. The Philippines consultation also preferred "any international investor", but stressed that the paramount consideration is impact on communities, not type of investor, and those in the midst of a struggle should have priority. The Guatemala consultation asserted that rather than the type of investment, priorities should come from the national networks' strategic priorities unless there is a global campaign based on a specific investor.

Changes to Final Design:

- Defined eligible scope of request for collaboration as those related to any international investment or development activity, including those financed by national development banks.

Questions for the Pilot:

- Given funder priorities, is it necessary to restrict or prioritize funding to requests involving DFIs?

● Given many requesters will lack information about the actors involved in the project affecting them, what kind of capacity is needed by CRE staff to conduct that research and/or what capacity is needed among collaborators to fill that gap?
● It would be useful to track how many requests require and/or are benefited by corporate and financial research prior to a collaboration.

10. Collaborators

What should collaborators be required to commit to when added to the roster?

Responses (Categorized)			
Category	Sub-Category	Total responses (/149)	Summary
Precursor requirements	An NGO	1	Must be non-profit.
	Demonstrate expertise	11	Must demonstrate expertise (provide CV/ experience/ skills).
	Feedback to CRE	3	Must provide feedback to CRE (regular calls/ updates).
	Resource/ time commitment	19	Must commit a certain amount of resources/ time.
Ethical commitments	CRE Principles	9	Must commit to abide by CRE principles.
	HR/ ethics	19	Must commit to comply with human rights law and ethical standards, including gender equality, do no harm, transparency, impartiality, accountability.
	Privacy/ confidentiality	7	Must maintain confidentiality of CRE, including information and participants/ requesters.
	Share expertise/ resources	7	Must collaborate and share expertise/ experience/ knowledge.
Accountability to communities	Accountability to communities	11	Must be collaborative and community-centered, and act according to a community's interests.
	Capacity building	6	Must build local capacities and share information/ resources with communities.
	Safety/ security	2	Must be attentive to community safety/ security.
Requirements for requests	Responding to requests/ timeliness	16	Must respond to requests in a certain timeframe.
	Availability	5	Must be available to respond to requests. Suggestion for a certain number of responses per year.
Requirements for carrying out a partnership	Agreements	8	Must have agreements in place for all CRE participants, detailing rights and responsibilities.
	Time commitment	3	Must commit to assisting in a certain timeframe and duration.
	Communication/ records	7	Must provide updates on work; attend meetings; keep records; update CRE database.
	Complete assignment	3	Must support requesters to the end of the assignment.

	Deadlines	2	Must meet deadlines.
	Evaluation	2	CRE collaborators must be evaluated; collaborators must also report back on assistance provided to requesters.
Other	Recognition of contribution	2	Suggestion to recognize collaborator assistance, such as through public gratitude, training, networking.
	Other comments	6	Various comments, including: share roster of collaborators.

In-person/Virtual Consultations:

Among the criteria for collaborators, respondents stressed confidentiality, integrity, a proven track record, transparency and accountability to the community. The International consultation raised the importance of mutual trust and goal alignment, requiring open discussion on expectations and possible consequences and costs. Participants also stressed the need to value local knowledge, approaches, realities and timelines, listening to the community rather than coming with readymade solutions.

Changes to Final Design:

This question was meant to solicit information about what people/groups should commit to in order to be considered a collaborator. Many of the suggestions received, however, are more relevant for specific requirements once a collaboration has been established. Those will be taken up in the next section.

- Clarified the language in definition of collaborator: They will have agreed to be generally available to entertain requests from the CRE, to keep their contact information up to date, and to follow the CRE principles (e.g. community-centered, accountable collaboration and capacity building).
- As mentioned in previous sections, the requester category has been eliminated. Everyone is considered a collaborator. All collaborators can make a request. Once a collaborator makes a request, then he/she/they will sometimes be referred to as a requester for greater clarity.
- The database will only be accessible to RFPs (now called Regional Facilitators) and national nodes, given the sometimes sensitive information it might contain.

Questions for the Pilot

- What level of flexibility or formality is appropriate for a person or group to be considered a collaborator?
- Are there additional commitments or information needed from collaborators in order to facilitate successful collaborations? Conflict of interest information (i.e. funding sources), for example?
- Is there demand to make the full database public? Is it possible to make part of the database public?
- Is it possible to make an online form for collaborators to update their information?

11. Connections
Are these the right distinctions, support levels, requirements?

Category	Summary

Summary	64% of respondents agreed; 25% disagreed and/or had additional questions/comments; 11% did not respond.

Comments (Categorized)			
Category	**Sub-category**	**Total responses (/48)**	**Summary**
Issues	Complicated/ complex	10	Seems complicated, complex and prescriptive.
	Not reflective of reality	3	Tiers don't reflect reality of how collaborators work.
Fix issues later	Fix issues later	4	Suggestions to implement CRE as proposed and fix any problems that arise later.
Questions/comments	Tier 1	4	Comments/ questions about Tier 1, including: what happens if response exceeds 5 hours?; does Tier 1 involve information requests and screening?
	Tier 2	2	Questions about Tier 2, including: its scope; focus on corporate mapping/ financing.
	Tier 3	4	Comments/ questions about Tier 3, including: how to ensure community ownership?; its scope.
	Tier 4	2	Comments/ questions about Tier 4, including: its scope; financial cap.
	General comments about Tiers	6	Several general comments about Tiers, including: CRE operating as an informal referral system; work performed outside CRE system by collaborators; proposal for changing tiered structure; need to provide time period for all Tiers; outputs of Tiers.
	Unique/ emergency cases	3	Suggestions for a separate mechanism for urgent/ unique assistance.
	Returning requesters	1	Question about how returning requesters are treated by CRE.
	Recommendations / other	9	Several recommendations/ comments, including: importance of structure of regional FPs; need for national remedies; concerns about funding; suggestion for restructuring of Tiers.

In-person/Virtual Consultations:

Guatemala participants pushed back against the idea of limited exchanges of requests and collaborations, instead pointing to the need for space for intercultural dialogue, discussion, reflection, exchange, and co-creation. Participants stressed the need to provide the space for communities and participants to reflect on their previous experiences with collaborations and the quality and type of collaboration that can best meet their needs. The Guatemala and

International consultations additionally identified several overarching strategic approaches or challenges within the different strategy areas.

Changes to Final Design:

- Removed the language that the RFP (now Regional Facilitator) will prepare an MoU for the collaboration. Instead, the RFP (now Regional Facilitator) will ensure that roles, activities, and budgets are clarified and documented. Added a reference that the discussion should include how the experiences and outputs can be used following the collaboration (from the suggestions in the previous section). The collaborators can do this without the help of the RFP (now Regional Facilitator) if they prefer. But to have a successful collaboration, the collaborators must start with a shared understanding of commitments.
- Added language to clarify that the collaborators are co-creating a plan of action to eliminate the concern that collaborators responding to a request will impose a strategy.
- Removed language in Tier 1, defining it by the number of hours needed to provide a response.
- Removed Tier 2, which offered investment chain mapping. Instead, it is included as a possible first step in the next tier, "Facilitated Collaboration."

Questions for the Pilot:

- There are concerns that the demand will exceed capacity and that the funding available will be insufficient to ensure additional capacity. Is there a way for the CRE to document where the biggest gaps are in terms of capacity so that this information can be shared with funders? Is it possible/desirable to create a roster of funders that collaborators could be referred to if additional funding is necessary? Or if such rosters already exist, (for e.g. Civicus, Namati, others) it would be good to map existing databases of funders.
- How useful are the RFPs (now Regional Facilitators) in clarifying the parameters of the collaboration? Or would it happen without them?
- As mentioned above, the capacity to respond to requests for corporate/financial mapping needs to be defined. Groups identify that strategy as one in which they lack the capacity to do themselves. One assumption is that many groups will request support to do the mapping as a way of identifying other available strategies.

12. Prioritization
Given finite resources, how should requests be prioritized?

Responses (Categorized)			
Category	**Sub-Category**	**Total responses (/148)**	**Summary**
By Tier	Tier 1/2	3	Prioritize smaller/ basic requests.
	Tier 3/4	3	Prioritize Tier 3 or 4.
According to CRE strategy	Likelihood of success/ impact	5	Prioritize by likelihood of success (securing remedy, delivering objective) or impact.
	Broader impact/ advocacy	22	Strategic prioritization by broader impact of case (policy change, assist regional/ global advocacy).

By requester	Commitment/ organization	9	Prioritize by commitment of CRE participants (included demonstrated community commitment and organization).
	Need assistance/ no alternatives	8	Prioritize requesters who most need assistance, including: requesters without other alternatives/ support; financial need.
	Prioritize grassroots/ community organizations	4	Prioritize requests from grassroots / community organizations.
	Prioritize vulnerable groups	8	Prioritize requesters that are particularly vulnerable, including: (indigenous) women; children; elders; indigenous people; people with disabilities; by geographic location.
By urgency	Security/ safety/ threat to life	12	Prioritize requests where there is a threat to human security/ safety/ life.
	Imminence/ severity of harm/ impact	57	Prioritize by imminence and severity of (potential) harm/ impact, including: number of people affected; severity of violation/ damage.
General suggestions/ comments	Wait and see	2	Suggestion to implement CRE as proposed and fix any issues later.
	Criteria/ matrix for decisions	12	Several suggestions to prioritize by various criteria/ matrix.
	Other	3	Other comments, including: prioritize by order of arrival.

In-person/Virtual Consultations:

[There was no specific feedback from consultation meetings on this question]

There was most support for prioritizing requests based on the following criteria:
- urgency
- severity of need and/or harm, requests with acute risk of immediate physical violence, conflict, safety and security of defenders, livelihood/resources
- magnitude of harm (number of people)
- vulnerable groups: indigenous peoples, women, children, elders, persons with disabilities
- impact: likelihood of securing remedy or meeting community's goals
- impact: likelihood of contributing to systemic/strategic policy and accountability campaigns, potential for positive change beyond the community

There was substantial support for the following criteria:
- need: communities who have not received previous advocacy support, lack other options, are unconnected to support systems, lack capacity
- likelihood of success: organization of the community, visibility of community initiative, requests coming directly from communities (or by grassroots coalitions)

And some support for the following:
- priority themes, strategies, locations, national context
- early intervention / preventive measures
- long-term commitment of both requester and collaborator

Changes to Final Design:

- Added language that requests will be processed on an on-going basis.
- Added a section on funding decisions that leave it to the regional grant working groups to publish how they will prioritize funding requests. The procedures for requesting funding will be consistent across regions.

- The pilot will not be able to provide emergency funding. Instead the Regional Facilitators can direct people to the organizations that provide emergency support for HRDs.

Questions for the Pilot:

- Based on the requirements of funders, will funding be restricted to requests involving DFIs?
- Can regional grant working groups develop different approaches to decision-making?
- Is there a need to develop a matrix to help prioritize requests that do not need funding? i.e. if there are too many requests to handle in a timely way?

13. Guidance

Some requesters may not know what strategies will best meet their needs. How can the system help them identify what support to request? Who -- either within or outside the system -- is best placed to provide that assistance?

How can the system help them identify what support to request?			
Category	**Sub-category**	**Total responses (/55)**	**Summary**
Support for requesters	Preliminary/ intake assessment	11	Support should be provided through the intake process (interview, survey, discussions with collaborators).
	Strategy support/ assessment	25	Strategic support should be provided by CRE participants (identification of resources, tailored strategies).
General support	Training	3	Requester training and capacity-building.
	Outreach/ communication	7	Outreach to requesters by CRE collaborators; promotion of CRE by collaborators.
	Written materials/ publications	6	Provide simple written information on CRE to requesters.
Other	Other	3	Other comments, including: requesters should be able to focus on outcome sought rather than type of support.

Who -- either within or outside the system -- is best placed to provide that assistance?			
Category	**Sub-category**	**Total responses (/83)**	**Summary**
Internal CRE participants	Secretariat	5	Secretariat is best placed to assist.
	International focal point	3	IFP is best placed to assist.

	Regional focal point/network	19	RFPs/ networks are best placed to assist.
	National assistance/ CSOs	11	National FPs/ CSOs are best placed to assist.
	Collaborators/ nodes	16	Collaborators/ nodes are best placed to assist.
	Requesters/ communities	5	Requesters/ communities (which have used CRE) are best placed to assist.
Other – Internal/external to CRE	Facilitators/ experts	17	Facilitators/ experts/ advisors are best placed to assist.
	Volunteers	1	Volunteers can assist.
Other	Other	6	Other comments, including: whether assistance is internal/ external to CRE doesn't matter – experience matters; interference should be kept to a minimum.

In-person/Virtual Consultations:

The consultation revealed a diversity of opinion regarding how the CRE should support requesters who might not know what strategy or collaborations they seek. There was a sense that the CRE should provide guidance on different strategies and have an understanding of the influence of different actors. This could be done through a diagnostic tool together with advice from regional focal points, collaborators or other participants, networking communities facing similar struggles and supporting dialogue and exchange, or local nodes. The Philippines consultation suggested guidance could also come from a neutral assessor at the national level, while the Guatemala consultation proposed that guidance should be delivered through existing national networks and spaces for exchange that communities are already using.

Changes to Final Design:

- No changes were made to the design. CRE staff will work with communities and other collaborators to help identify what support to request as part of the intake process.

Questions for the Pilot

- Would it be possible to develop a diagnostic tool, either a general one or tailored to the region, that helps communities understand what types of strategies are available? Or a module that could be used in community workshops?
- Can the national node assist with this?
- It would be important to track how many requests require assistance in thinking through strategies.

14.A. Collaboration facilitation

Inevitably, disagreements may arise among the collaborators, or concerns regarding the representation of the requester etc. Other than noting these concerns and factoring them into future requests and matchmaking, should the system have any role in addressing such concerns?

Category	Summary

Should the system have any role in addressing such concerns?	64% of respondents said yes; 7% said no; 8% said maybe; 17% did not respond or were unsure; 4% did not respond to the question.

Reasons for CRE involvement in disagreements		
Category	**Total responses (/8)**	**Summary**
Required by funder/ MOU	1	May be required by funder/ written agreement (MOU).
Serious concerns/ conflict	2	Disagreements may be serious (lack of consent, violation of CRE principles, collaborator contributed to concerns, etc.) and need to be resolved.
Avoid conflict escalation	3	Disagreements that cannot be resolved between parties must be resolved in order to prevent counterproductive conflict escalation.
Other	2	Other comments, including: need for consensus by regional/ national networks; paramount importance of security within CRE.

Reasons against CRE involvement in disagreements		
Category	**Total responses (/5)**	**Summary**
Too busy/ inappropriate for CRE	4	CRE will be too busy; not the CRE's role to be involved in disagreements.
Other	1	Collaborators should disengage if there are concerns.

Suggestions for what CRE involvement in disputes should look like		
Category	**Total responses (/59)**	**Summary**
MOU/ agreement	4	Have a written agreement / MOU between participants from the outset.
Protocol/ procedure	23	Have CRE standard operational procedure (written document of rules; requiring regular meetings/ calls between participants; dispute and complaint system).
Regional/ national focus point involvement	5	RFPs/ national FPs to assist.
Secretariat involvement	5	Secretariat to assist.
Dispute resolution/ mediation mechanism	14	Dispute resolution mechanism, including: independent committee; mediation.
M&E/ post-dispute procedure	4	Disputes to be recorded to ensure continuous learning/ M&E of CRE.
Community involvement	4	Ensure community involvement in disputes.

In-person/Virtual Consultations:

Two of the consultations supported the idea that the secretariat should have some role in conflict resolution.

Changes to Final Design:

- No changes made to design. If the community and collaborators cannot resolve the issue and seek assistance, the Secretariat should provide some support in convening a discussion. If the issue cannot be resolved, the parties can exit. The community should be free at any time to exit or to choose another collaborator.

Questions for the Pilot

- Should this question be posed in the initial conversations between collaborators? So they agree at the beginning of the collaboration how they would like to resolve disputes should they arise?
- Would it be useful to establish a dedicated structure to address disputes?

14.B. Collaboration facilitation

Before moving to the next section, do you have any other comments, questions, or observations on anything in this section?

CQOs (Categorized)		
Category	**Total responses (/12)**	**Summary**
Funding	2	Concerns about funding.
Collaboration	5	Comments about collaboration, including: focus on conducting participant due diligence rather than collaboration; collaboration and commitment between independent actors; collaborators should be consultants.
Procedures/ complaints	1	Suggestion for CRE operating procedures to provide for complaint mechanisms.
Requesters/ communities	4	Other comments about requesters, including: must consider language barriers.

15. Governance

How do we avoid building a separate organization and ensure that the CRE is owned and fueled by the participants?

Responses (Categorized)			
Category	**Sub-Category**	**Total responses (/107)**	**Summary**
Governance	Structure/ roles/ rules	22	Support for a governance structure for roles, rules and decision-making.
	Leadership rotation	11	Support for rotational leadership of CRE, including for Secretariat and IFP/ RFPs.
	Secretariat, including	3	Support for Secretariat to have coordination role; should have diverse representation.

	diverse representation		
	Learn from other CSOs	4	Support for learning from existing networks.
Principles	Transparency	7	Support for transparency in communications between participants; information-sharing between participants.
	Equality between participants	2	Support for ensuring equal participation between participants.
	Participation/ collaboration, including physical/ online meetings	23	Support for a collaborative / participative approach; regular (in-person/ offline) discussions and consultations between participants.
	Accountability/ feedback	12	Support for ensuring accountability through M&E of participants; feedback sessions.
Participants	Collaborators	6	Suggestions for collaborators committing time and resources to CRE; collaborators should be vetted.
	Requester/ community focus	5	Support for CRE having a community focus / ownership, including through capacity-building.
	Capacity-building	3	Support for capacity-building and collaborative learning so participants and collaborators can understand CRE.
Other	Funding	3	Suggestions regarding funding, including: even distribution of financial resources; Regional FPs should not be dependent on CRE funding.
	Other	6	Several suggestions/ questions, including: CRE should be less formal to be more participative; concerns about time/ language; complementary role of CRE; prioritization of participants.

Reasons for setting-up new organization (Categorized)		
Category	**Total responses (/6)**	**Summary**
CRE's large scope	2	New organization may be required due to CRE scope.
Time/ resources required	3	New organization may be required because of amount of time/ resources required for CRE.
Ensuring accountability	1	New organization to ensure accountability.

In-person/Virtual Consultations:

The Uganda consultation stressed the active and regular engagement of all participants, while the Philippines and International consultation highlighted transparency and accountability to communities, ensuring their role in decision-making at every level. The Guatemala consultation laid out a process whereby CRE efforts would start from internal

dialogue among peoples, nations, communities and then facilitate a space of co-creation and continuous learning.

Changes to Final Design:

- Added that the CRE Coordinator and RFPs (now Regional Facilitators) will be hosted by existing networks and organizations. As such, it will fall under existing governance structures.
- Added language to require an annual reporting of requests received, collaborations facilitated, and budget spent.

Questions for the Pilot:

- Is the Advisory Committee sufficient to provide accountability to collaborators and the broader civil society community?
- How will collaborators contribute to the evaluations of the CRE? And what will be reported back to them?
- What other materials can be produced to be transparent about the CRE's operations and budget?

16.A. Capacity building and learning

What other steps could the system take to build capacity and expertise?

Responses (Categorized)			
Category	**Sub-Category**	**Total responses (/80)**	**Summary**
Knowledge exchange between all participants	Knowledge exchange generally	10	Knowledge exchange between and support for participants.
	Online/ in-person training/ workshops	13	Host in-person/ online trainings for participants, in all sectors and at all levels; developing online tools.
	Collaborations with CSOs/ others	11	CRE should collaborate/ engage with other groups, including international bodies, CSOs, media and local organizations.
	Exchange/ learning platform	3	Enable learning exchanges/ opportunities for all participants.
Internal CRE processes	Fact-finding missions	3	Undertake fact-finding missions/ outreach to build community capacity.
	Assessment/ measurement/ evaluation	11	Learn from experiences through M&E and feedback; identify capacity gaps.
	Database on capacity/ collaborations	5	Develop an accessible database of CRE knowledge, capacities and collaborations.
	Written materials/ publications	7	Publish written materials on CRE's cases, including via blogs, briefing notes and newsletters.
	Broader focus	1	Highlight patterns in CRE cases, to influence policy and implement change more broadly.
	Scholarships/ internships	1	Offer scholarships and internships.

Other	Implement, then modify later	2	Suggestion to implement CRE as proposed and make changes later as needed.
	General recommendations	11	Several suggestions, including: important role of regional groups in deciding steps; capacity-building; importance of experts with local language knowledge; clarifying role of nodes and CSOs; encouraging participation of women.
	Other concerns	2	Other concerns, including duplication of existing networks.

16.B. Capacity building and learning

Before moving to the next section, do you have any other comments, questions, or observations on anything in this section?

CQOs (Categorized)		
Category	**Total responses (/10)**	**Summary**
Resources/ time/ administration/ funds	3	Concerns about: CRE being time-consuming to implement and coordinate; opportunity costs; limited resources; requirement for administrative oversight; funding.
Capacity building	3	Comments about capacity building, including clarity on whose capacity is being developed.
Collaborations/ matchmaking	1	Suggestion for collaborations to be based on a common perpetrator.
Case tracking system	1	Suggestion for there to be a regular survey for collaborators to update the CRE.
Awareness of CRE	1	Suggestion to promote local awareness of CRE.
Broader impact	1	Comment on potential broader impact of CRE for advocacy.

In-person/Virtual Consultations:

There was agreement that capacity building is a key goal in order to have a sustainable outcome where communities have the tools they seek to lead their struggles. Suggestions for capacity building included to create national resource centers, community grievance reporting committees or community monitors, and to utilize constant engagement, exchanges, educational materials. Other suggestions included undertaking a capacity needs assessment and engaging CRE stakeholders on capacity development, instilling leadership and ensuring thoughtful leadership succession, maintaining a community of practice, peer to peer mentoring, in-person trainings and web-based education.

Changes to Final Design:

● Eliminated text on decentralizing the task of financial/corporate mapping. It is not clear that is feasible.

Questions for the Pilot

● There is a wealth of ideas here. Some of them are dependent on additional funding. How will capacity building be monitored, evaluated and reported on?

- Whose responsibility will it be to propose ways to enhance capacity building throughout the CRE's operations? Collaborators? CRE Coordinator? CRE Advisory Committee? CRE Regional Facilitators? Who else? All of them?

17. Phase 1 priority

Which of the following do you think should be a priority for the first phase of the CRE or a way to grow incrementally?

Category	Summary
Responses (multiple answers could be selected)	27% of respondents selected 'Piloting collaboration in one or more strategy areas e.g. security support'; 27% selected 'Piloting collaboration in one or more geographies'; 22% selected 'Developing a usable database for managing collaborations'; 15% selected 'Connecting requesters with collaborators but without offering any financial support to implement strategies'; 6% provided other responses; 3% provided no response or were unsure.

Other responses (Categorized)		
Category	**Total responses (/10)**	**Summary**
Collaboration	2	Suggestions regarding collaboration, including: first identify a collaboration platform then pilot that in one region; CRE should learn from collaborations.
Trust-building	2	Suggestions regarding trust building, including: importance of building mutual trust among participants.
Vulnerable groups/ indigenous	2	Suggestions regarding vulnerable groups, including: need to focus on these groups, particularly indigenous people.
Other	4	Other suggestions, including: develop a database of CRE participants' capacities; work on a regional and case-by-case basis; bring existing complaints together for systematic change.

Our pilot is more extensive than what we contemplated in preparing the survey. Regardless, it is interesting to see that survey respondents appear to prefer depth of connections including a database and small grants (either by region or strategy area), over just a database or connections without any financial support.

18. Likes

What do you like about the proposed CRE?

Likes (Categorized) [Please note that if a respondent indicated a 'Like' for more than 1 issue, this response was split and may fall under more than 1 category below]		
Category	**Total responses (/107)**	**Summary**
Idea/ CRE Mission & Principles	27	Positive comments about CRE generally, including its Mission and Principles.

Collaborative/ networking	32	Positive comments about CRE being collaborative, including benefits of networking and knowledge exchange for increasing impact.
Value for/ focus on affected communities	20	Positive comments about CRE's added value for local communities, and CRE's focus on these communities.
Fills a gap/ real need	13	Positive comments about CRE filling a gap by connecting communities and expertise; CRE being of real need for communities.
Inter-related structure	2	Positive comments about CRE (including CRE strategy areas) being interrelated.
Participatory/ flexible project proposal	4	Positive comments about the participatory, collaborative and flexible approach taken to develop CRE.
Broader impact	4	Positive comments about the potential, broader impact of CRE, including: information gathering for corporate accountability movement; advocacy.
Diversity (geographic/ sectors/ collaborators)	5	Positive comments about CRE's diversity, including geographic and issue diversity, and gender balance.

Dislikes in answers to this question (Categorized)		
Category	**Total responses (/5)**	**Summary**
Duplication / added value	2	Concerns about CRE duplicating existing networks/ NGOs.
Clarity of participant roles	2	Comments that CRE needs to be clear on participant roles.
Structure	1	Concern about CRE's decentralized structure.

19. Outstanding questions

How many respondents had further questions about the CRE's operations?	
Category	**Summary**
How many respondents had further questions about the CRE's operations?	50% of respondents asked further questions; 50% had no further questions.

What questions remain about how the CRE would work?

Responses (Categorized)			
Category	**Sub-Category**	**Total responses (/67)**	**Summary**
Implementing the CRE	Funds/ resources	13	Questions about funds and resources, including: who is funding CRE and for how long?; security of funds?; opportunity costs.
	Start date	2	Questions about when the CRE will start.

	Situating the CRE in its context	5	Questions about CRE structure, including: is CRE a new organization?; role of other organizations in CRE?
	Scope	7	Questions about CRE scope, including: in which sector will CRE start?; what are CRE's priorities?
	Founding documents/ laws	2	Questions about CRE's founding instruments/ laws, including: which instruments will be used to operationalize CRE?; what laws will be used?
	Outreach to/ access by local communities/ collaborators	8	Questions about communicating with local collaborators, including: how CRE will reach out to local communities?
CRE structure	Need for local focus	3	Suggestions about the importance of focusing on local contexts, including: necessary for people who speak local languages to be FPs; summarizing CRE for local communities.
	Relationship between participants	6	Questions about the relationship between CRE participants, including: how will decisions be made?; how will participants communicate?; how will knowledge exchange occur?
	Secretariat's role	5	Questions about Secretariat's role, including: how Secretariat will be managed and staffed?; where will Secretariat be located?
	Collaborators	5	Questions about collaborators, including: how will participants communicate with collaborators?; how matches between collaborators and requesters will occur?; how to become a collaborator?
Other	Broader impact/ advocacy	5	Questions about CRE's broader impact, including: will CRE have long-term/ broader advocacy goals?
	Operation/ accessibility of CRE in reality	6	Questions about the operation and accessibility of CRE, including: how practical is CRE?; how CRE will respond to excessive demand?; how to ensure safety of participants?

20. Dislikes

What do you dislike about the proposed CRE?

What do you dislike about the proposed CRE?	
Category	**Summary**
Summary	70% of respondents stated no dislikes; 30% commented on this question.

Responses (Categorized)

Category	Sub-Category	Total responses (/34)	Summary
Idea	Opportunity costs	1	Concern about opportunity costs in the absence of significant new funding.
	Potential duplication	3	Concerns about potential duplication of CRE and existing networks.
Structure	Complex/ bureaucratic	5	Concerns that CRE is too complex and bureaucratic.
	Governance structure	7	Concerns about CRE's governance structure, including: it is too top-down; unsure of capacity to reach local communities; Global North-orientated.
	Unclear relationships between participants	3	Concerns that there is an unclear relationship between CRE participants.
	Groups/ topics not included	3	Concerns that CRE does not identify certain groups (indigenous peoples, women) and topics (role of government in project's that violate human rights).
	Clarifications needed	3	Concerns that some aspects of CRE are vague and need to be clarified, including: definitions; rules; procedures.
Other	Effectiveness	5	Concerns about CRE's effectiveness, including: database may reduce accessibility for remote communities; risk that substantial time is invested without results.
	About the CRE proposal/ surveys	3	Criticism of CRE survey itself, including: lack of outreach; too long.
	Other	1	Other comments.

21. Informed

Would you like to be kept informed about this project?

Category	Summary
Summary	99% of respondents said yes; 1% said no.

Annex 1: Community Resource Exchange Design
With modifications for three-year pilot
February 2021

CRE Mission and Principles

CRE Mission:

To better support communities, grassroots groups, and indigenous people in promoting and defending their rights in the context of international investment and development activities by facilitating access to collaborations across diverse areas of experience, and co-creating effective strategies that build community power and further community-led development.

More specifically, the CRE strives to:

- Facilitate a multidimensional exchange and collaboration that responds to the self-identified needs, challenges and priorities of those who will or have been harmed by international investment and development activities.
- Reach more communities and facilitate their access to more comprehensive support in the following strategy areas: corporate and financial research; access to remedy; community organizing; advocacy and campaigns; scientific and technical expertise; and security support.
- Build capacity among CRE collaborators to support communities by:
  - Expanding the number of people who can undertake the strategies used by CRE collaborators; and
  - Mobilizing resources to be able to better meet existing need for support.
- Generate information to:
  - Provide better strategy advice for the next request for support by learning from collaborations about what works;
  - Provide collaborators with input for policy debates and systemic reforms; and
  - Provide collaborators with material for strategic communications campaigns.

CRE Principles:

- The system supports efforts that help build collective power at the community level, defend human rights, advance social and environmental justice, and hold international investors and development actors accountable for violations.

- The system is co-created with and led by the people who would use, representing the vibrant diversity of communities and civil society as a whole -- from different cultures, with different lived experiences, and who engage with different strategies.

- The system values all skills, experiences and expertise, facilitating collaborations that are directed by and accountable to affected communities.

- The system is accessible, transparent, practical, flexible, and responsive while maintaining a shared commitment to security and effectiveness.

- The system prioritizes resource allocation and capacity building closest to the community.

- The system complements, rather than replaces or duplicates, existing networks (formal and

informal), strengthening the collaboration that already exists and facilitating better coordination across organizations and strategies.

- The system seeks to expand the pool of existing funding and will avoid competing with or diverting resources from collaborators.

CRE Structure

Everyone is welcome to participate in the CRE. The system will have the following roles: CRE coordinator, CRE Regional Facilitators, collaborators, nodes, grant working groups.

Secretariat: The CRE will be supported by a Secretariat staff consisting of a CRE coordinator and regional facilitators (RFs). The RFs will be hosted in existing organizations in the regions that they serve. The CRE coordinator will also be hosted in an existing organization or network.

- Regional facilitators will:
    - Identify and recruit collaborators in their regions;
    - Serve as the intake point for requests;
    - Facilitate the collaborations. To do so, they will liaise with local and national stakeholders, including national nodes, to develop an understanding of regional and national contexts and players.
- CRE coordinator will coordinate the regional facilitators and the system as a whole, and assist with outreach, fundraising, governance, data management and communications systems, and learning etc.

Collaborators: People who participate in the system. Collaborators do not need to be formal members of any organization or network, and may be: communities, organizations, associations, social movements, academics, practitioners, socially responsible investors, and activist funders etc. Collaborators can provide support or request support. They will have agreed to be generally available to entertain requests from the CRE, to keep their contact information up to date, and to follow the CRE principles (e.g. community-centered, accountable collaboration and capacity building).

The CRE coordinator and RFs will maintain a database of collaborators organized by strategy, country, and other relevant information. In general, the collaborators in a given strategy area will not be expected to coordinate amongst themselves. Rather, there will be a roster of contacts and existing networks whom the RFs can access individually or as a subgroup, depending on the specific needs of the request. The security support strategy area, however, may benefit from being more organized internally so that resources can be identified more quickly and comprehensively. The database will not be publicly accessible but can be accessed through the RFs and nodes.

Nodes: Collaborators who are an entry point either to a country (national nodes) or to networks within a particular strategy (strategy nodes), or some intersection (regional strategy node). There can be multiple nodes within each country or strategy. The nodes may help review and vet requests and identify possible collaborators. The organization hosting a RF could serve as a national node.

Grant working groups: At a minimum, each regional will have a grant working group that will help review and approve requests for financial support. The working group will be made up of communities and organizations from that region.

CRE Pilot structure

· The Coalition for Human Rights in Development will host the CRE pilot for an initial period of three years.

· The CRE coordinator will be hosted by the Coalition Secretariat.

· There will be three RFs, one each in Asia, Latin America, and Africa. The exact locations of the RFs are still to be determined. The RFs will be hosted by existing organizations (either members of the Coalition or not).

· The RFs will be assisted by the Coalition's regional coordinators and secretariat staff.

· There will be an advisory committee to inform and guide the implementation of the pilot. The advisory committee will be chosen from those who have provided a formal expression of interest and represent a diversity of geographic distribution; gender; race and indigeneity; abilities; other kinds of diversity; skills, expertise, connections; sector of work; type of group; etc.

· The Coalition's existing Community Engagement Partnership Working Group will serve as the grant working group initially. It will be expanded and restructured to create three regional working groups.

Requests for collaboration

Who can submit a request for collaboration?

The CRE is designed to respond to community-led efforts. The CRE will accept requests from anyone – from community members, local, national, or international groups. However, if requests for tier 2 or 3 collaborations (see below) are not submitted by those directly affected by an international investment or development activity, the individual or group presenting the request should show that they are presenting the request with the knowledge and consent of those directly affected. For requests involving financial support, priority will be given to requests supported by a group or collective, unless it is a request for security support for defenders.

About what?

The CRE will respond to requests involving communities and grassroots groups defending their human rights, including the right to a healthy environment, in the context of international investment or development activities. That includes activities financed by national, regional or international development banks, international commercial banks, or multinational corporations. The CRE will accept requests for assistance addressing adverse impacts that have already occurred, as well as requests seeking to avoid or prevent adverse impacts. This can involve efforts to ensure meaningful community participation in a project, or to fight against a project that doesn't align with local development priorities and visions for the future.

Tier 1 requests for information do not have to be specific to an international investment or development activity.

How?

A simple request form will be available in multiple languages (e.g. who is making the request, relationship to affected community; what organization(s) they work with; what they know about the project/investment; what collaborations/strategies they seek, if they know; what outcome they seek, a reference or referral; and any security concerns regarding communications).

It is not realistic to expect most communities or even local organizations will know about the CRE and access it directly. Therefore, while requests will certainly be accepted from community members and grassroots groups, outreach will target national groups and larger social movements who are already working with and trusted by local groups and communities to serve as a link to the CRE.

When?

Requests for collaboration can be submitted at any time and will be processed by the RFs on an ongoing basis. Funding decisions, for collaborations that are not self-funded, will occur through regular calls for proposals (as well as the ability to entertain urgent requests between scheduled calls).

Making the Connection

Types of Collaboration

The following are the types of collaborations that the CRE offers. Engagement with the CRE may end after one tier of support, or the requester may return to request the next tier.

- Tier 1: Information Requests. If the request is relatively specific and simple, the RF will answer the request directly, providing information, quick connections, or simple advice regarding advocacy options. The requests do not have to relate to a specific international investment or development activity. The CRE hosts an online resource library and can recommend relevant manuals and toolkits.

- Tier 2: Facilitated Collaborations. The regional facilitator will identify potential collaborators relevant for the objectives of the collaborator(s) who submitted the request. If requested, RFs can assist--either with or without research support from other collaborators--with mapping the actors (investors, corporations, etc.) involved in the activities affecting requesters. After potential collaborator(s) are identified, the RFs may facilitate a discussion among all of the parties in order to ensure clarity about the activities to be undertaken, the roles for each collaborator, and the budget, if any. The result of the discussion can be reflected in a formal memorandum of understanding (MoU), letter, audio recording, or any format useful for the parties. The regional facilitator will monitor the implementation of the plan. These collaborations can be self-funded (e.g. the collaborator may have a budget or offer support pro bono), or can include a funding request of up to 5000 USD.

- Tier 3: Facilitated Collaborations requiring substantial financing. Collaborations that have exhausted self-funding, pro bono and Tier 2 level of support and require more substantial financing (5000-30,000 USD), may seek additional funding through a Tier 3 collaboration.

CRE Pilot Types of Collaboration

· Tier 3 will not be available for the three-year pilot, unless additional funds are secured.

Request Intake

The RF will process requests for collaboration on an ongoing basis. Additional consultation with the collaborator(s) presenting the request may be needed to understand which type of collaboration best meets their needs. RFs, with the assistance of the national nodes if needed, will conduct additional due diligence on requests for tiers 2 and 3.

Building the Collaboration

After receiving a request, the regional facilitator will identify potential collaborators within the relevant strategies and as close to the requesters as possible. Where local capacity or availability is not adequate or available, the secretariat will seek to find a regional or international collaborator that could either alone or preferably in partnership with a local organization, entertain the request. The RF may contact specific potential collaborators in the database, consult the national and

thematic nodes to assist in identifying collaborators, or send an open call to a portion of the collaborators in the database.

The regional facilitator will arrange initial discussions between the requester and potential collaborators until a good fit is found. The ultimate decision about who is involved in the collaboration rests with the requester with mutual agreement of the other collaborator(s).

The RF will facilitate further discussions, as needed, among the collaborators to enable them to co-create a plan of action. The RF will ensure that the result of those conversations is documented to provide clarity and a shared understanding of: the activities to be undertaken; the timeline; the roles of collaborators; budget, if any; and how the knowledge, experiences, and outputs can be used following the collaboration. Collaborators should also agree on how to resolve any disputes that arise. The documentation could take the form of a memorandum of understanding or any other format appropriate and useful for the collaborators.

Funding Decisions

Requests for financial support to implement collaborations will be considered by the regional grant working groups. Application requirements and deadlines will be published. Regional grant working groups will prioritize requests according to national and regional needs. Procedures for emergency funding will also be published.

CRE Pilot Grants

- The pilot will not have the capacity to accept urgent requests for funding between scheduled calls. The RFs can provide information about other organizations that offer emergency funding for HRDs.

Collaboration Implementation

The work of implementing the activities (advocacy, research, etc.) will be done by the collaborators. The RFs will not take part in the actual collaboration.

The RFs will follow up with the collaborators periodically to help ensure that the collaboration is proceeding satisfactorily, and to see if additional support is needed. The collaborator who made the request may also ask for additional support as needed. The RFs will facilitate an evaluation meeting following the completion of the plan to draw lessons learned for future collaborations.

Governance and Learning

Governance

The CRE would be governed in a collaborative manner. The success of the CRE is dependent on a feeling of collective ownership in which there is a shared interest in keeping the system funded and functioning effectively. Communities and local groups will be represented in the governance structures.

The CRE will report annually on the number of requests received, collaborations facilitated, and budget spent.

CRE Pilot Governance

· The Coalition for Human Rights in Development will host the CRE pilot. The Coalition is coordinated by a Steering Committee whose members serve for two-year renewable terms. The majority of the members of the Steering Committee are from the Global South.

· In addition, an Advisory Committee will be established to provide input on the implementation of the pilot and participate in its review at the end of the three-year period.

Capacity building and Learning

Regional facilitators will use a case tracking system to record the collaborations made, strategies employed, outcomes, and lessons learned for this collective work, drawing from a short evaluation from collaborators.

Matchmaking will prioritize local collaborators. Collaborators are encouraged to build capacity by partnering with others on activities. Funding decisions for Tier 2 and 3 collaborations will prioritize collaborations that can demonstrate that it will contribute to capacity building.

CRE will facilitate opportunities for collaborators to share lessons learned with each other. Community-to-community exchanges will be offered as one type of collaboration. Funding permitting, exchanges could be held among collaborators at the national or regional levels to swap skills and experiences.