Portfolio Review: Post-2015 On-the-Ground Shared Framework
January 13, 2016

Presented by: Pedro Abramovay, Shared Framework Implementing Lead and Regional Director for Latin America and the Caribbean
Prepared by: Pedro Abramovay; Leah Wissow, Strategy Specialist, Strategy Unit; Vonda Brown, Senior Program Manager, LAP
Moderator: Daniel Sershen, Strategy Unit
Discussants: Chris Stone, OSF President; Jim Goldston, Executive Director, OSJI
Rapporteurs: Elizabeth Kallop and Daniela Huber, Strategy Unit

Contents

I.   Our Ambitions

This portfolio covers the span of the Post-2015 On-the-Ground Shared Framework from its approval in March 2014 through its end in December 2015. The component activities are those funded directly by allocations from the shared framework reserve, those funded by contributions from the core budgets of programs and foundations, and associated work.[1] The following reflections are based on my own experience as implementing lead, the experience of the International Governance team that assisted in managing the shared framework, and that of the participating teams. This document focuses on the goals and structure of the shared framework as a whole, and does not go into the specifics of particular components or projects. Please refer to the attached team narratives for participants' own reflections on their strategies and the results of their work.

a.   Why this shared framework?

---

[1] Issues related to the process of implementing shared frameworks are not within the scope of this review, but have been addressed in a separate review conducted by Sanjay Patil of the Strategy Unit.

As stated in Chris Stone's original proposal, "the aim of the shared framework [was] to demonstrate that ambitious goals [on access to justice, good governance and public safety]…are measurable and achievable, making their inclusion in the final General Assembly resolution more likely and, regardless of the outcome of the debates at the UN, galvanizing domestic and international commitments to pursue them." The process of drafting the new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which would replace the expiring Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)[2], provided an unprecedented opportunity to change the relationship between the human rights and development sectors, and affect funding and program priorities for years to come. It also was an opportunity for a broad cross-section of the Open Society Foundations to engage in the advancement of access to justice, good governance, and public safety as necessary components of sustainable development at the global and national levels. Thus, the main objectives of the shared framework were: to demonstrate the value, viability, and measurability of access to justice, good governance, and public safety initiatives on the ground in a number of key countries; and to use that experience and evidence to advocate for the inclusion of access to justice, good governance, and public safety both with national governments and in the UN process. The shared framework was designed to add value to OSF's work and, regardless of the outcome of the UN process (which initially seemed unlikely to include a goal on these issues), the investment of the shared framework would result in change on the ground. Pursuant to this hypothesis, a three-pronged strategy was developed:

> (1) Engage in international and regional advocacy to press for the inclusion of justice, governance, and public safety in the Post-2015 agenda;
> (2) Engage in local and national advocacy to include justice, governance, and public safety goals in national implementation plans; and
> (3) Support on-the-ground initiatives to demonstrate the measurability of justice, governance, and public safety while advancing them as well.

In implementing the strategy, the shared framework was meant to take advantage of the existing expertise and ongoing work across the OSF network, calling on a number of different tools including advocacy, grant making, and technical support.

b. Our Approach

The countries, known as the "OSF 9" (Brazil, Indonesia, South Africa, Nepal, Nigeria, Serbia, Mexico, United Kingdom, and United States), were selected by a committee at the February 2014 charette. They

---

[2] The MDGs, established by the UN Millennium Declaration, were a set of eight goals addressing core issues of development such as poverty, education, and health. While parts of OSF had been engaging on them independently, the MDGs highlighted for others those aspects of development that were not being addressed on a global level, or even rightly considered within the purview of a development agenda: namely, access to justice, good governance, and public safety. To this end, George Soros in his personal capacity and programs like the Open Society Justice Initiative (OSJI) began engaging with members of the High Level Panel on Sustainable Development, appointed by the Secretary-General to produce an initial report on what a new set of goals might look like. This advocacy gained some traction and as a result OSF President Chris Stone proposed building on this as a network in the form of a shared framework so as not to miss the opportunity to institutionalize vital components of open society.

were selected based on a decision by OSF leadership and the participants of the charette that, as a global shared framework, it was important for us to strategically limit the scope to be able to have maximum impact within a two-year time frame. Participants in the charette reviewed criteria recommended by a working group and developed additional criteria to select the most promising geographies, including strategic importance at the UN level, geographic diversity, political opportunity in the country (such as a change in government), the ability of the country to influence regional debates, relevant OSF on-the-ground work, and preparedness of the relevant programs or national foundations to participate in the work.[3]

Shortly after the approval of the shared framework by the Global Board in March 2014, I worked with my team to reach out to all OSF programs working in these nine countries. I encouraged geographic programs and foundations that were not represented in the charette to take part in the shared framework and to provide leadership to coordinate OSF action with thematic programs working in those geographies. After a number of months, nine country teams and a Global Advocacy team were formed. The teams were led by the geographic program or foundation and structured to encourage collaboration across programs and foundations, with at least one member from the Justice Initiative on each team to provide a direct link to the Global Advocacy team.

I asked each team to create their own strategies related to the shared framework's goals, objectives and overall strategy. Country teams would focus primarily on prongs (2) and (3) of the shared framework strategy, identifying advocacy opportunities and grantees that could engage in substantive on-the-ground initiatives. The Global Advocacy team, led by the Open Society Justice Initiative with support from the Fiscal Governance Program, would focus on the UN process in New York and would try to bridge the gap between activities in New York and at the regional and national levels. Via support from myself and my team, these ten teams would then share information about their respective progress that could then strengthen efforts and collaborations and could be used as lessons learned in other geographies within the shared framework.

The selection of these countries and the approach I employed represented a number of assumptions. The first assumption was that OSF had existing coordinated efforts among programs and foundations on the ground that would provide an established base of local expertise and decrease the number of steps required for initial engagement in the SDG process. This would mean that as soon as the shared framework was approved by the Global Board, teams could come together and the strategy development process would proceed quickly. More substantively, it was assumed that the inclusion of countries from both the developed and developing world would demonstrate that the sustainable development goals are for everyone, thus distinguishing them from the MDGs, which focused only on the developing world. Certain assumptions were also made about the kind of work that could be accomplished in each country. Brazil, South Africa, and Indonesia were considered priority countries based on their regional leadership and the opportunities to pursue work in all three areas of access to justice, good governance, and public safety. Other countries provided key opportunities in one or two areas, such as access to justice through legal identity in Nepal and anti-corruption in Serbia. We also

---

[3] A full list of country selection criteria is available in the annexes to this document.

hoped that engagement in the shared framework would bolster programs' and foundations' existing work on these topics.

Concurrent with country-level activities, the Global Advocacy team would be in frequent contact with the country teams, and by bringing their experiences to the debates in New York, give greater weight to OSF's interventions and emphasize the on-the-ground impact of a global development agenda.

I.   Our Place

In accordance with the breadth of the shared framework's mandate, OSF occupied several places in the field of the Sustainable Development Agenda. Our role varied depending on a number of factors, including whether at a given time a team was working at the global, regional or national levels, as well as whether a team was engaged in government advocacy or on-the-ground initiatives. Moreover, as will be discussed in subsequent sections, our role evolved as it responded to a changing state of play throughout the course of the shared framework.

One of OSF's roles in engaging at the global level was to serve as an expert on access to justice, good governance, and public safety issues, with that expertise being grounded in the realities of what was going on in-country. This shaped the strategy of the Global Advocacy team and how it collaborated with and drew on the experience of the on-the-ground country teams to engage with the member states and UN institutions most involved in shaping the new SDGs. Influential member states—not all of them supportive of Goal 16—included leaders from the developing world, such as Brazil and South Africa, as well as prominent Western countries like the United States, United Kingdom, and the Netherlands. In addition to the High Level Political Forum and the United Nations Development Program, ad hoc UN bodies, such as the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals, served as both players and forums in the formation of the new SDGs. International civil society organizations (such as Transparency International and Save the Children) were also dominant voices at the global level. Unlike the other international actors, OSF was able to create opportunities for local voices in New York to influence the UN process.

At the national level of the OSF 9, willingness and capacity to engage on justice, governance, and public safety varied widely across different governments as well as among different civil society communities. In some countries, one or more of the three goals were seen as politically difficult for governments to publicly prioritize. For instance, the Mexican government resisted engaging on public safety due to ongoing crises, while in Indonesia and South Africa the election cycle and an incoming new government made political commitments uncertain. In other countries, capacity simply did not exist at times. The tragic earthquake in Nepal was an example of this, where many government and civil society resources had to be diverted to disaster recovery. However, for all of the OSF 9, the role of the shared framework teams was to engage with relevant ministries and agencies—which ranged from national development, to justice, to freedom of information—as well as with experts that could help shape sustainable development practices.

Working with civil society at the national level also allowed OSF to serve as a supporter and coordinator of collective civil society action. Shared framework participants tapped into networks of academics,

NGOs, and service providers working in access to justice, good governance, and public safety and helped connect them to each other and the global SDG process where necessary. Through this, grantees and consultants were able to frame their existing work within this global context and leverage it for greater impact.

II.   Our Work

a.   What have we accomplished?

Shared framework participants have undertaken a vast amount of work in the past 20 months, culminating in the adoption of Goal 16 as part of the 2030 Agenda and setting the stage for implementation. Overall, the shared framework positioned OSF as an interlocutor on Goal 16 at the global level and among civil society in the majority of the focus countries, while making concrete progress on demonstrating the measurability and importance of access to justice, good governance and public safety to development. OSF stood out as one of the only organizations focusing on the measurability of the goals, and I believe this approach helped to challenge the initial argument that goals on justice, governance, and safety would be unmeasurable. There is not enough evidence to demonstrate that the work of OSF through the shared framework was the principal reason why this argument disappeared during the negotiation process, but I feel strongly that we made an important contribution. I also believe that although there are a number of lessons learned and things I would have done differently, as mentioned below, overall the shared framework was successful in making significant progress on its goals. This success can be attributed to the way OSF was able to navigate political and social complexities at the national level to consolidate and connect on-the-ground work with advocacy efforts at the regional and international levels. What follows are a few specific examples of how this worked in practice. For a full report from all nine country teams and the Global Advocacy team, please refer to the narratives included in the annex to this document.

Global Advocacy: Prioritizing Goal 16

Given the overall number of goals and the relative uncertainty surrounding Goal 16 as measurable in particular, securing Goal 16's inclusion in the final agenda required making sure that it remained visible and a priority throughout the intergovernmental negotiation process. The Global Advocacy Team (GAT) focused on frequent individual bilateral contact with key stakeholders in governments, the UN system, and other relevant institutions, as well as the hosting of strategic events.

These events were designed to not only get Goal 16 on the agenda, but also to encourage UN actors to get out of the bubble of negotiations and understand counter arguments and different perspectives. Each event featured voices from the field, through films showcasing on-the-ground work in Brazil, South Africa and Nepal, the participation of presenters like the director of the national association of community advice offices in South Africa, and OSF Serbia colleagues engaged in rolling out new indicator frameworks for government accountability (see below for further details). In doing so, we created an expectation that OSF events were forums where diplomats and government officials would hear new and unusual voices and gain information otherwise unavailable to them in New York. Notably, private gatherings were especially effective. For example, the October 2014 meeting held at the Greentree

Foundation was attended by ambassadors, ministers and eminent activists from nearly 20 member states, including Brazil, South Africa, Indonesia, and South Korea, several of whom reported that the private setting and confidential format allowed them to have an honest discussion of the Post-2015 process and hear the perspectives of civil society. For some attendees, this was the first time they had truly considered the connections between development and justice, governance, and safety, and it helped frame their positions moving forward.

Brazil: Making Powerful Allies

The case of Brazil further illustrates the importance of OSF's connections and work on the ground to our credibility as an interlocutor in the Post-2015 process. Initially, the Brazilian Ambassador to the UN, Antonio Patriota, informed me that Goal 16 was a nonstarter for the Brazilian government because of concerns that these issues were not strictly related to development and that the Post-2015 process was a northern imposition on the Global South. This posed a significant obstacle to Goal 16 principles domestically, but also at the global level where Brazil had been playing a prominent role in discussions thus far. In my role as Regional Director for Latin America and the Caribbean, my team and I conducted meetings with key government officials and civil society partners, emphasizing the work the Brazilian government and civil society were already doing on access to justice and Brazil's potential for leadership on Goal 16. An OSF-sponsored event, organized with the UNDP, which brought together Supreme Court justices from Brazil, Kenya, and Mexico in New York, served to be pivotal for demonstrating the value of including Goal 16 in the SDGs and changing the position of Antonio Patriota and the Brazilian government. In addition, we were able to connect Brazilian civil society to the Post-2015 process, in which few organizations had been engaging previously. For example, Rede Nossa Sao Paulo (RNSP) adapted its own set of indicators—originally designed to monitor Sao Paulo's 96 districts under Brazil's Organic Act of the Municipality—to track Goal 16. This experience has been referenced by the media, civil society and government of Sao Paulo and is now being expanded to include 60 of Brazil's largest municipalities. As a result, RNSP demonstrated that Goal 16 could be measured and that actors in civil society and government could monitor this progress. As a result, the Brazilian government invited RNSP to the UN during the intergovernmental negotiations to present its work as an example of implementation and measurement of Goal 16 at the municipal level. I believe this example from Brazil demonstrates how OSF advocacy efforts were only possible because of the access and credibility that stemmed from our existing work and connections on the ground.

South Africa: Engaging a Reluctant Government

In South Africa, the primary obstacle was the South African government's relative disinterest in the process. While OSF-SA shaped its work around this, focusing on capacity-building and support for service delivery on the ground, it also realized that influencing the Post-2015 Agenda from a southern hemisphere perspective remained a central aim that would benefit greatly from leadership by South Africa. OSF-SA approached this in two main ways. The first was to make the concrete link between legal empowerment and development, demonstrating through its work with community advice offices, social audits, and community safety officials that justice is measurable and contributes to development. The second was to open up forums where South African officials could hear other southern hemisphere

perspectives, for instance through the south-south collaborative dialogue OSF-SA hosted in February 2015, which was attended by Igarape (an OSF grantee from Brazil) and supported by the Global Advocacy Team (GAT). In addition, the GAT and OSF-SA kept in frequent contact throughout the shared framework to discuss advocacy strategies and monitor the South African position both in-country and in New York.

The South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC) in particular was receptive to this engagement. The approach of the legal empowerment and development link through the shared framework provided OSF-SA with a strategic and specific basis for building a strong relationship. Hearing what other major actors from the Global South, such as Brazil, were doing to support and implement Goal 16 encouraged the SAHRC further. In the summer of 2015, the South African HRC announced its commitment to implementing Goal 16 through its national access to justice campaigns and activities. Additionally, Commissioner Mohamed Ameermia attended several events organized by the GAT, contributing further to OSF events' representation of leading voices from the Global South.

Serbia: Leveraging Ongoing Processes

At the outset of the shared framework OSF Serbia (OSFS) was already engaged in measuring effectiveness of institutions, good governance, and access to justice in service of Serbia's integration into the EU. Because EU integration is the predominant framework for political and development reform in Serbia, linking it to the SDGs was critical to ensure that the Post-2015 process was not overlooked. Along with significant efforts to educate both government and civil society about the Post-2015 process, OSFS expanded its existing work on EU integration to collaborate with civil society partners and six independent institutions in the Serbian government to create an indicator framework for measuring institutional effectiveness that the institutions would then pilot in their annual public reports.

The six institutions selected for collaboration were among those responsible for assuring transparency and rights enforcement for Serbian citizens, such as the Ombudsman, the Freedom of Information Commissioner, and the Equality Commissioner. In addition to educating them about the SDGs, the OSFS team also spent considerable time successfully convincing the institutions of the objective benefits of using the indicators as a monitoring framework, emphasizing that it would set a basis for improving their performance and increase public trust in their work. As of this writing, the Serbian Ombudsman has now used this indicator methodology to present its last two annual reports on public television. The Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government is now also interested in the methodology, and OSFS will work to support their adoption of it in 2016 after the shared framework has ended.

Mexico: Connecting Local Civil Society to a Global Agenda

In Mexico the OSF team reached out to organizations already involved in monitoring government progress on good governance and public safety and worked with them to incorporate Goal 16 as a framing tool to formulate appropriate indicators for the national and local levels. OSF again established itself as an important interlocutor, with the Mexican government inviting OSF to participate in a Post-2015 workshop it co-hosted with the government of the United Kingdom in Mexico City. The GAT was able to take advantage of these relationships as well, bringing Damaso Luna from the Mexican Ministry

of Foreign Affairs and Alejandro Gonzalez from LAP's civil society partner GESOC to New York for a side event in June 2015.

The global impact of the team's collaboration with both Mexican government and civil society was most felt in its successful efforts, along with the GAT, to link the Post-2015 process with the Open Government Partnership (OGP). In 2014, Mexico took over as chair of the OGP, while Alejandro Gonzalez became civil society co-chair. LAP seized on this leadership first regionally, at the OGP Regional Meeting for the Americas in Costa Rica in November 2014, which resulted in a declaration signed by governments and civil society calling for the inclusion of a goal for peaceful and inclusive societies. Over the span of the shared framework, and through continued engagement with the Mexican government and civil society, the commitment to OGP as a platform for implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals—and in particular Goal 16—grew. The most recent OGP Global Summit held in Mexico City in October 2015 focused on how the OGP's review and monitoring mechanism could contribute to the achievement of Goal 16.

Nepal: Building Civil Society-Government Collaboration

In Nepal, the Alliance for Social Dialogue (ASD) worked with the Legal Aid and Consultancy Center (LACC) to pilot a paralegal project that helped over 600 women in two districts of Nepal acquire citizenship certificates. This was used as an example of how the Nepalese government can make progress on justice targets and it was also the first partnership between local government and civil society to improve access to public services. Simultaneously ASD provided operational support to the National Planning Commission to develop an inter-ministerial steering committee on access to legal identity that includes representatives from civil society and academia as well. ASD serves on the commission and has been instrumental in providing relevant information and policy recommendations, drawing on the work of its grantees and partners to do so. In working with the GAT, ASD was also able to bring examples of its work to New York, co-hosting an event with the Nepal Mission during the April 2015 intergovernmental negotiation session that focused on reaffirming the link between access to justice and sustainable development.

United States: Demonstrating Universality

The work of US Programs (USP) on the shared framework was largely shaped by the United States' history of engaging in international development processes as a way to prescribe behavior for developing countries without adopting those models themselves. As mentioned previously, a major assumption in selecting the US as one of the OSF 9 was that this pattern could no longer continue: the US would need to engage in the Post-2015 process so that it could shed the legacy of the MDGs as an imposition on the developing world. US civil society was particularly disconnected from the global process, due to UN commitments having rarely been a strong advocacy tool for domestic change. Therefore, a large portion of USP's shared framework strategy revolved around making these connections and devising ways to leverage the process of Goal 16 implementation for greater progress in both access to justice and inclusive governance.

However, the outcome of at least one of those projects aimed at preparing civil society resulted in an unanticipated high-level advocacy victory. USP originally reached out to Risa Kaufman of the Columbia Human Rights Institute and David Udell of the National Center for Access to Justice to survey the access to justice field in the US and the potential relevance of the SDGs to its work and to then recommend activities. This survey showed the need for enthusiastic government leadership, and Kaufman and Udell used their own relationships in the field to plan and attend critical and high profile meetings where they could convey the importance of Goal 16 implementation in the US. The GAT, building on its initial engagement with the Department of Justice at Greentree, was also able to use the justice work in the US as an example of how the SDGs are universal in nature, helping to dispel concerns that the MDG process would simply repeat itself. Altogether, this work helped enrich the environment for the establishment of the White House Legal Aid Interagency Roundtable (LAIR), made up of 20 federal agencies tasked explicitly with increasing access to justice and implementing Goal 16. Moreover, OSF was able to host the announcement of the LAIR by the Deputy Assistant to the President for Urban Affairs, Justice and Opportunity and Ambassador to the UN at an event celebrating the adoption of Goal 16 in September 2015.

b. Lessons Learned

To reflect on the principal lessons learned over the course of this shared framework I examined the assumptions that we started with and thought about the aspects of the shared framework I think we could have addressed differently.

Reexamine Initial Assumptions

One assumption that did not hold true for the shared framework was that work would be able to begin quickly based on existing coordinated efforts on the ground after the charette and approval by the Global Board. In fact, even where existing portfolios focused heavily on the themes of the shared framework, connecting them to the Post-2015 process was more complicated than expected. Some of this was because we selected countries at the charette and the relevant programs and foundations had not done much prior to the meeting to formulate a strategy, and some key participants were not present at that meeting, such as OSF South Africa and US Programs.[4] Initial participation by some was also delayed by caution and a lack of information surrounding the new structure of shared frameworks. Wider participation earlier in the process would have provided important context about the Post-2015 process and also perhaps allowed for the demystification of the shared frameworks. Though I intended for country strategies to be collaborative, the need to move forward and lack of coordination immediately after the charette led to longer than expected delays in developing 2014 strategies. Given the opportunity, I would have liked to have established the coordination mechanism for the shared framework earlier in the hopes that this would have reassured skeptical participants and contributed to earlier participation in the process. I am encouraged that the changes in the Strategy Unit to support shared frameworks seem to have helped with some of these issues.

---

[4] A full list of charette participants is available in the annexes to this document.

The assumption that OSF had existing coordinated efforts among programs and foundations on the ground that would provide an established base of local expertise and decrease the number of steps required for initial engagement in the SDG process was also flawed. In general it was more difficult than I expected for thematic programs and regional foundations and programs to come together to develop and implement a collective strategy. As the shared framework progressed most thematic programs, except for OSJI, decreased their participation during the implementation phase, while geographic programs and foundations increased their involvement. It was also a novel experience for OSF geographic programs and foundations to look for opportunities to collaborate across countries and regions. I should have realized that regardless of great strides during the last couple of years there has been relatively little opportunity for OSF geographic programs and foundations to coordinate beyond specific regions. I think that the ability to meet face to face at key times also might have increased the collaboration between teams. While our shared framework calls were always well attended, they did not provide the best forum for exploring opportunities to collaborate. This was in part due to the format, as the phone is not always the most conducive tool for large group discussions. More importantly, due to time differences and technical capacity, participants from Nigeria, Nepal, and Indonesia were frequently unable to join the calls, leaving key perspectives out of the discussion. Following the retreat in Belgrade hosted by OSF Serbia in May 2015, participants told me the value of being in the same room to foster discussion and make personal connections with fellow participants. I understand that these kinds of meetings require a lot of resources and should be used very strategically, but I think their value cannot be underestimated for a large and culturally diverse organization such as ours.

From the global advocacy perspective, we learned that it was important not to prejudge the UN as a failed policy space. Even though we commenced the intergovernmental process with low expectations, we emerged with a standalone sustainable development goal incorporating all of our objectives. In a short span of time, we became known as one of the leading advocates for justice, good governance, and public safety in the Post-2015 agenda. This credibility emerged from our thematic expertise as well as our ability to bridge the gap between a global process and the everyday realities of poor peoples' lives. Regardless, I wish that we could have done even more to showcase the on-the-ground work in New York. In retrospect, this might have been improved further by more direct reporting of the country teams' activities to the GAT, beyond the updates shared at meetings or on KARL and ad hoc connections pointed out by the shared framework coordinator and GAT members working on other teams. However, the collaboration that did occur showed that a global advocacy agenda can have a mutually reinforcing role with national aspirations.

   Make Time for the Unexpected

For those teams that were first introduced to the SDG process via the shared framework, there was a learning curve for their partners and grantees. Though many teams had success with connecting partners to the process, as described above, it was incredibly labor intensive and affected how much could be accomplished in the time available. Several teams were surprised by the lack of familiarity with the process not just among civil society, but also their governments. They thus put significant resources into bringing the relevant stakeholders up to speed. Moreover, in the case of the Mexico team, some

organizations were simply not interested in engaging with the SDGs due to other priorities on the national agenda.

Intervening changes on the ground proved challenging for several of the teams as well. The Mexico team saw the development of a profound institutional crisis following the September 2014 disappearance of 43 students in Ayotzinapa, which contributed to an environment of mistrust between civil society and the government, especially regarding public safety. In the face of this crisis, the team was able to identify only one civil society partner willing to engage on public safety, and as such largely focused its efforts on right to information and the OGP. In Nigeria, in addition to a security situation that diverted government attention at critical times, change came at the end of the shared framework with a new government being sworn in during November 2015. OSIWA is engaging with the new government to secure support for Goal 16, but there is uncertainty about what will come of its implementation. Brazil, South Africa, and Indonesia also experienced elections during the span of the shared framework, which all presented challenges to the work of those teams. I think that in general we did well responding to these changes, even if at times we were a bit slow. The flexibility of the strategy approach to making allocations allowed teams to adjust as necessary without going through an additional project approval process. For instance, in response to changes both inside and outside OSF, the GAT changed the weight it gave to each country team's participation to get as much as possible out of the work being done on the ground.

Carefully Consider Capacity for New Areas of Engagement

Expectations about the kinds and amount of work that could be accomplished were also challenged as the shared framework continued. For all of the teams, engaging in new fields posed incredible difficulties. In the three priority countries (Brazil, South Africa, and Indonesia), while the assumption of their value as regional leaders bore out, the ability for OSF to work on all three areas of access to justice, good governance, and public safety did not turn out as planned based on limits in our capacity to build in new work. The Brazil team attempted to pursue all three areas, building on LAP's freedom of information and homicide reduction strategies and stimulating new work on access to justice. However, while the access to justice work was fruitful, its novelty for OSF (beyond the preexisting pre-trial detention work of HRI) as a thematic working area posed difficulties in identifying grantees, and the sustainability of those new relationships are uncertain as the shared framework comes to an end.

I am concerned that this approach of temporary engagement in new fields in Brazil and other countries may have given some organizations the false impression that there is a new and permanent donor interested in the field, despite explaining that our engagement was temporary. I think this should be considered carefully for future shared frameworks. In South Africa, OSF-SA ended up shaping its strategy around its existing areas of engagement, access to justice and public safety, as limited staff capacity would have made it even more difficult to engage effectively on good governance as well. The work in Indonesia was similar in that it focused on the expertise and pre-existing work of the Tifa Foundation in freedom of information and OSJI on access to justice. However, Tifa's internal transition led to a bifurcation of the work and a lack of clarity, which hampered the ability of the team to engage fully in

the shared framework and hampered the possibilities of other OSF programs like HRI and FGP with existing work on these topics to be fully involved.

Demonstrating Universality of the SDGs was Necessary but not Easy

As for what could be accomplished in developed countries and the value of their inclusion for the demonstration of universality, results were mixed. I think that the inclusion of the US was crucial for getting developing countries on board, with two ambassadors making a note of US participation at the Greentree retreat. The Global Advocacy Team found USP's engagement in the Post-2015 process very helpful to draw on as an example, and included a representative from the Department of Justice's Office of Access to Justice in several of its events to discuss how the US government was planning to implement Goal 16 domestically. Working with domestic-focused agencies like DOJ and other actors that were willing to more critically discuss the situation within the US allowed greater engagement than simply trying to work with the State Department. However, it was necessary to temper this universality approach somewhat so as to prevent the US perspective from taking over. For instance, early in the shared framework USP, LAP, and OSF-SA had hoped to collaborate on a homicide reduction project. However, it soon became clear that regional actors in Latin America and South Africa would be more receptive to a south-south dialogue, and feared an imposition of the US position.

The decision to include the United Kingdom in the OSF 9 did very little to demonstrate universality of the SDGs. The UK position became more problematic as the SDG negotiations progressed and it almost undermined the whole process. The UK's attitude reinforced some developing countries' fear that the SDGs would be used against the south for the benefit of a northern agenda. We could have addressed this if we had been more able to engage internal actors. However, the capacity of OSF and those staff who volunteered for the UK team to engage on the ground there limited what could be accomplished. None of the members of the UK team had work in-country as part of their normal portfolios, which made strategy formulation and coordination of the work difficult. This signaled to me that for future shared frameworks, it is better for participants to be working in either a region or field where they have existing work to be able to maximize the impact of the allocation.

Monitor the Shared Framework Approach and Timeline

In preparing this portfolio review, I found myself reflecting frequently on the decision to ask teams to submit strategies instead of specific projects for approval. Certain aspects of this approach worked well. It gave teams the opportunity to put together a vision for their work that could more flexibly respond to changes, rather than individual projects that would need to be approved one by one and revised and resubmitted if the situation on the ground shifted. I also believe that it helped some teams feel more comfortable with the shared framework process by giving them more freedom in planning their work and connecting it to their existing portfolios. However, there were some complications in implementation. As noted in the team narratives, some teams struggled with determining how work contributed to the shared framework objectives rather than just aligning with them. This was especially true for existing programmatic work, which teams were encouraged to classify as either a contribution or associated work. I think that as the culture at OSF shifts towards one of greater collaboration, this will

improve. I have already seen this shift taking place over the course of this shared framework. For example, both USP and OSF South Africa noted that their collaboration with JI helped them achieve much more than they anticipated would be possible, and they look forward to future collaborations. Looking back, I wish we could have done more to encourage this shift. Additionally, having ten separate strategies made monitoring progress by teams more difficult. While I think that the lighter touch I used in managing this shared framework was correct given how new the structure was and the anxiety around it, I do think that future implementing leads should work with the coordinator to develop a process to more closely monitor progress on the strategies while maintaining the teams' flexibility in carrying out their work.

The other decision I reflected on was that of when the shared framework should end. The 2015 General Assembly was a logical end point, given that that was when the goals would be adopted. However, once it became clear that Goal 16 would be included and need a global framework for implementation, we realized that the process of defining the indicators would extend until March 2016, beyond the shared framework's timeframe. It is possible that additional coordination and resources set aside for these last few months would have helped bolster our investments up to this point by further ensuring that Goal 16 would remain a priority prioritized in the implementation process. I am hopeful that participating programs and foundations will continue through their individual strategies to engage on these issues and collaborate in either an ad hoc form or through a community of practice. A couple of programs, like the Justice Initiative, have indicated that they plan to continue engaging on the indicators process, both domestically and globally, and several others, like USP, have said they are adopting new lenses and approaches for their work based on what they learned during the shared framework.

III.   Conclusion

Of the above lessons, there are a couple that I would like to highlight because of what they mean for OSF's future engagement in UN processes and for future shared frameworks. In the UN sustainable development process, we achieved far more than was expected and fully achieved our global advocacy goals. However, whether Goal 16 will be effectively implemented remains to be seen. The shared framework demonstrates that OSF is positioned to effectively participate in a UN process when we: are able to focus sustained efforts in New York; can interest and engage national level actors; can bridge the divide between domestic policymakers and New York diplomats; and are perceived as both substantive experts and constructive problem-solvers willing to work with states, multilateral agencies, and civil society actors alike. I believe that OSF's global network puts it in a unique position to bring on-the-ground experiences to New York, and that this should be prioritized even further in future similar efforts.