

Board of Trustees
25-26 November 2024

Refers to
agenda item 02

Agenda Item: IPPF FOOTPRINT UPDATE AND WAY FORWARD

Summary:

This paper follows up on the Footprint discussion held at the June Board meeting. It presents a draft affiliation model option which explores the desire to expand the partnership and invite individuals and movements to the “IPPF Family.”

Action Required:

- The Board to discuss and provide further guidance on next steps as required

The term *Footprint* describes IPPFs formal presence in the world. The term covers both IPPFs members and collaborative partnerships.¹ At the June 2024 Board meeting, trustees discussed the strategic imperative of expanding the footprint in terms of organisational type, geography and risk. The board suggested *loosening* the partnership model in order to attract a larger “family” of movements and activists. The Board also suggested *tightening* the membership, to safeguard standards and development sector compliance (e.g. with the charity commission). Within these parameters, the Secretariat has drafted a proposed tier-based affiliation model (see Annex 2) that differentiates levels of engagement (and responsibilities). The model has drawn inspiration from existing MA practice and models. It presents three distinct rings of IPPF affiliation, which have earned it the moniker: *the IPPF onion*.

The core ring of ‘the onion’ relates to IPPF Membership. This remains the most profound form of affiliation. The membership is defined by *Policy 1.13 IPPF Affiliation Categories*. No changes to the membership are proposed in this paper. The middle ring describes partnerships. The only form of partnership covered by Policy 1.13. is Collaborative Partnerships (CP). It is an open-ended form of affiliation that does not have constitutional, governance or membership-standard requirements (see Annex 1). The CPs enjoy many privileges of the MAs, including core funding on a temporary basis. The new model proposes a tier-based approach to partnerships. It proposes that collaborative partnerships should be timebound and applicable to organisations that aspire to membership within a two-year horizon. It also proposes an additional two tiers: strategic and implementing partnerships. These do not appear in Policy 1.13. Both are existing forms of partnership that are covered in the 2024 IPPF Partnership paper (attached).²

The third ring represents the greatest departure from Policy 1.13. It proposes a new category of *Movers* and *Mobilisers*, which consists of movements, activists, enablers and individual givers. It is based on the Board’s guidance to loosen the partnerships model with a view to inviting more people to the “IPPF family”. Volunteering is of course not new to the federation; it is the DNA. IPPF’s *Policy 1.2*. defines volunteers as people

¹ IPPF’s footprint is not a constant. It has always been in flux. In 1952, eight family planning organisations formed the federation. Since then, the membership has ebbed and flowed in accordance with resources, needs, and strategic priorities. Today there are 119 Member Associations and 39 collaborative partners

² An external review of the IPPF partnerships was conducted in 2023 and a paper was drafted on the basis of its recommendations. It is currently the federation’s most comprehensive paper devoted to partnerships. It is attached with this paper as context.

who undertake “a service or activity without pay” and cites examples related to governance, peer-education, clinical care as well as advocacy, with a distinct focus on national-level contributions (i.e. volunteering for/with member associations). The policy further commits IPPF “to expanding and developing its volunteer base through engaging volunteers in a meaningful way ... [this] includes effective youth participation and promotion of a youth centered approach at all levels.” (IPPF Policy 1.2)

The third ring of ‘the onion’ gives recognition to existing voluntary donations of time and resources, and it widens the scope for movements and individuals to contribute. It presents these as constituent parts of the federation rather than silent enablers. By doing so, it actively seeks to invite engagement with a larger section of the population, who, rather than being a target audience, can become direct participants in the mission. The ring would apply to all geographic levels.

The *Movers and Mobilisers* ring is inspired by existing MA practice. Most MAs have a ‘Get Involved’ button on their website. It is most commonly used to invite passive contributions in the form of monetary donations and some MAs recruit volunteers or register new paying members. But some MAs go further. In the USA, PPFA maintains a large cadre of volunteers who backstop and staff its SRHR clinics across the country. Whereas SRHR care is in itself a political act, direct political lobbying is not allowed for 501(c)(3) registered charities under US laws. PPFA has created a sister-organization called PP Action Fund (PPAF) that actively advocates for policy and legal reform in favour of abortion and other health rights. They recruit activists and volunteers to join through the [Action Fund website](#), which is linked to PPFA’s main website. Utilizing synergies and infrastructure with PPFA, the Action Fund has grown to be a large impactful advocacy movement that works in tandem with the clinical care outlets across the nation. The model illustrates the benefits of galvanising activists into a national advocacy movement through local clinics and associated networks.

Perhaps the most advanced MA offer to individuals is made by RFSU in Sweden. It is a member organisation, which currently boasts more than 7,500 individual paying members in 16 branches as well as a separate roster of individual givers.³ The RFSU website presents a bouquet of options for individuals and movements that want to get involved. This ranges from local activism to seminars and debates about topical international development issues. Engaging at international level is a primary motivating factor for many local members.

A recent RFSU survey found that a very large percentage of the members and allies describe themselves as SRHR ambassadors. They advocate in their families, friendship circles and workplaces using RFSU talking points. According to their Executive Director, Ingela Holmertz, the activation of Swedish society is a core ingredient in their effectiveness and continued relevance. Sweden, like many countries in the region, are seeing devastating opposition recruitment campaigns politicise SRHR. Instead of ceding this ground, RFSU are seeking out perceived opposition demographics. “Instead of seeing them as opposition, we see every lonely man sitting at home as a potential ally and champion”, she said.

The introduction of the Movers and Mobilisers ring will undoubtedly introduce new opportunities for the federation, and it could bring the energy and movement that especially strategic pillars 2 and 3 demand. There is also a clear fit with the effort to

³ The branches are connected by the shared RFSU strategy, and they are supported by a single national office and its Board of Trustees.

expand individual giving to IPPF. At national level, MAs could be supported to broaden the movement and to better utilise and monetize a refreshed brand.

In presenting the 'onion', the main question is whether this is a viable model to pursue. If it is, what depth of engagement should the third ring have? Should it: 1) limit its ambitions to individual giving and loose affiliation with social movements; 2) recruit and build a (global) advocacy movement in the form of PPAF; 3) or, enable a deeper engagement with people and movements with an articulated offer and responsibilities for those who join, in the manner of RFSU?

While there are obvious advantages, it will also be important to consider the challenges and constraints. Building and maintaining a global cadre of members, givers, and enablers at global and regional levels will require management and resourcing. How will this be done without removing resources and attention away from grant-receiving members? How will a strained secretariat, mandated to keeping within its 30% core remit, cope with an added scope? How do we avoid the Secretariat's role in recruitment and co-ordination of Movements and Mobilizers overlapping with the MA/CPs role in a national context, not to mention the risk of duplication of existing global, regional and national networks?

Annex 1: Policy 1.13. IPPF Affiliation Categories

THE FEDERATION

Policy 1.13

9. Table summarizing the different types of affiliation with IPPF

	MEMBERS			PARTNERS	
PRINCIPLES	FULL MEMBER	ASSOCIATE MEMBER		NATIONAL/REGIONAL COLLABORATIVE PARTNERS	INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATIVE PARTNERS
		AM1	AM2		
Subscribes to IPPF Vision, Mission, Values	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Comply with IPPF Membership Standards	Yes	No	No	No	No
Comply with Governance and Constitutional Checklist	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Time Limit	No	4 years	No	As per MOU terms with Region	As per Partnership Agreement with the IPPF Board of Trustees
Periodic Accreditation Review	Yes	Yes, but not before 2 years	No	No	No
Renewal of Status	After approval of re-accreditation	Yearly	Yearly	As identified by MOU with the Regional Office	As per Partnership Agreement terms and conditions
Governance: Attendance at General Assembly (GA) Meetings	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Voting Rights at GA*	Yes	No	No	No	No
Core Funds Eligibility	As determined by the new Resource Allocation mechanism	As determined by the new Resource allocation mechanism	As determined by the new Resource Allocation mechanism	As determined by the new Resource Allocation mechanism	As determined by the new Resource Allocation mechanism
Restricted Funds Eligibility	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Membership Fee	As deemed necessary by the Board of Trustees	As deemed necessary by the Board of Trustees	As deemed necessary by the Board of Trustees	No	No

As adopted by Governing Council, May 2011

As amended by IPPF Board of Trustees, September 2022

* As per IPPF Regulations
IPPF Policy Handbook

Annex 2: Proposed Affiliation Model

AFFILIATION MODEL

Tightening and loosening



Global Level

Regional Level

National Level

