
Engaging Civil Society Organizations
on the Social Determinants of Health
through a Network: Food for Thought

REPORT

Submitted by JHG Consulting
v. December 2, 2008

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the civil society organization (CSO) representatives who provided information and participated in interviews.

The views expressed in the report are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Government of Canada.

Wanda Jamieson
JHG Consulting
Ottawa On
Canada

wjamieson@jhgconsulting.com

tel 613-730-2595

www.jhgconsulting.com

Table of Contents

Objective of this Study	1
What is a Network?.....	1
Selection Process	1
Selected Entities.....	2
Information Gathering Process	2
Limitations	2
Overview of Model Types	3
Traditional Structures	3
Innovative Partnerships or Networks: The Constellation Model	3
Innovative Partnerships or Networks: Contributions Model	5
Innovative Partnerships or Networks: Federation/Distributive Leadership Model.....	6
Innovative Partnerships or Networks: Examples of Other Models.....	7
Perspectives on CSO Engagement in SDOH and Advice from Key Informants	8
Key Suggested Readings	9
Appendix A: Engaging CSOs on the Social Determinants of Health: Food for Thought: Information from Website Scan"	A-1
Appendix B: Key Informant Interviews and Topics Addressed	B-1

Objective of this Study

The objective of this study was to identify and analyze a number of existing network models of engagement that could be feasibly considered for adaptation to enhance civil society engagement in addressing the social determinants of health.

What is a Network?

In essence, a network is an interconnected system of things or people. We did not adopt a strict definition of the term. Rather, we kept an open perspective about various types of models that could help achieve the function of mobilizing and strengthening CSO engagement in SDOH.

Selection Process

We conducted a cursory web-based scan to explore current thinking and resources about models of CSO engagement, with the view of identifying potential models or structures to explore. The review suggested that there are many ways in which civil society can come together to advance a common interest or purpose and exchange knowledge and ideas, including (among other things) through networks, coalitions, councils, partnerships, and alliances. Structures and processes vary by factors such as the overall vision, the degree of formalization and level of engagement, resources and other infrastructure. There are various models of governance and decision making, and various methods for engagement and participation.

A long list of 12 networks was identified and information was gathered from their respective websites.

The primary focus was on models in which CSOs play a prominent or leadership role, with the potential for involvement of other sectors as well, ideally including the following features:

Structure

- The network should not be a “monster with a big head” (e.g. heavy, centralized process/structure).
- The network should link vertically and horizontally.
- The network should be connected with local networks.
- It should capitalize on or leverage existing channels, networks, and structures, not duplicate them.¹

Process

The network should be nimble, that is, it should have the capacities and processes to address and respond to issues in strategic and timely ways.

¹ Note: This aspect was not within the scope of this study.

Selected Entities

The “long list” included 12 entities, from informal to formal structures. Ten were Canadian and two were international. Entities described themselves on their websites as follows:

- A council – Canadian Council of Chief Executives (CCCE); Canadian Council of Churches (CCC)
- A voluntary group – Sport Matters Group (SMG)
- A partnership – Canadian Partnership for Children's Health and the Environment (CPCHE)
- A network – Canadian Federation of Voluntary Sector Networks; Imagine Canada; Urban Public Health Network (UPHN)
- An initiative – Community Foundation Canada, Vital Signs Initiative; Assembly of First Nations Initiative on Poverty—Make Poverty History
- An alliance – Australian Chronic Disease Prevention Alliance (ACDPA); Campaign 2000; Global Equity Gauge Alliance (GEGA)

Information Gathering Process

We first scanned each entity's website to gather basic information about their respective mandates, legal status and scope of activity, governance structures, funding support and operations, and any particularly interesting features of their operations. This information is provided in Appendix B: Tables.

We then selected several entities to examine closer through key informant interviews. These entities were as follows:

- Canadian Partnership for Children's Health and the Environment, which is based on a “constellations model”
- Sport Matters Group, which is based on a “contributions model”
- Canadian Federation of Voluntary Sector Networks, which is based on a distributive model of leadership and encompasses elements related to constellations and contributions.

We also contacted the Assembly of First Nations—Make Poverty History to obtain more information than could be gleaned from the website.

A total of six interviews were conducted. A list of interviewees and the topics covered is provided in Appendix B: Key Informants. These interviews provided additional information about the entities and valuable insights into how they operate, and advice about developing network models. The information from these interviews is presented in the overview and discussion of these models.

Limitations

This study is simply a cursory scan of possible networks, not a thorough study of possible models. Much of the information provided was derived from the websites and in some cases the information

we sought was not available and may be out of date.

It does not address the overall vision of the network, its potential membership, feasibility, or issues of overlap or duplication.

Overview of Model Types

Traditional Structures

We explored two traditional structures that foster networking and engage a range of stakeholders on issues of common concern, namely the Canadian Council of Executives and the Canadian Council of Churches. The information in the website scan tables is exclusively based on what is available through their websites. Both councils have been in existence for decades and have fairly formalized governance structures and processes to advance their work on issues of concern. Both appear to have formalized infrastructures to support their work.

The Canadian Council of Executives focuses on public policy, advocacy and research to advance Canadian enterprise and has a national voice on these issues. It conducts research, consults with stakeholders and develops policy papers and position statements. Governance and the overall direction of the Council are provided by the Board of Directors, a 24-member body which meets three times a year. The process of developing policy, however, involves all (currently 150) members of the Council. It also makes use of task forces.

The Canadian Council of Churches engages 19 member churches, representing Anglican, Protestant, Eastern and Oriental Orthodox and Roman Catholic faiths, on a range of societal issues. Member churches participate in a forum where all voices hold equal weight and where understanding among members is promoted and positions are reached through consensus. It also has reference groups on certain issues. The interesting feature here is the Council's success in consensus building on complex issues, while respecting the diversity of Christian faiths that participate.

Innovative Partnerships or Networks: The Constellation Model

The constellation model originated in 2000 with the emergence of the Canadian Partnership for Children's Health and the Environment (CPCHE), which brought together a group of children's health and environmental organizations that were concerned about the impacts of toxins and other environmental hazards on children's health. The group was looking for a structure and a process of working together that could help them realize a vision of a healthier environment for children in Canada, without creating a new umbrella organization and all of the encumbrances of a traditional structure. It is an evolving model. Other groups and organizations are experimenting, adapting and applying the model, such as the Ontario Non-profit Network, Ontario Social Economy, Frontline Partners for Youth, Telecentre.org.²

The constellation model is a complexity-inspired governance model in which organizations work

² See the Centre for Social Innovations website for a description of how these partners are applying the model.

together toward a shared outcome. The aim is “not to create a new organization, but to get things done in a nimble, high impact manner.”³ The model draws its inspiration from the experience of the open source model used in the development and application of information technology. In the open source model, people are encouraged to openly license, share and refine products, enabling the best ideas and approaches to rise to the top. It aims to build on strengths and overcome common impediments to collaborative action such as distrust, competitiveness, power differentials and heavy structures and unwieldy processes, which often undermine, rather than empower participants and advance opportunities to build social change and innovation.

The constellation model is strategic and action-focused, with flexibility to flow energy toward opportunities and needs. Partners within a particular ecosystem come together, bringing their own interests, assets and energies to a particular action. It respects and preserves organization autonomy while harnessing and balancing organization self-interests with common or converging interests. The partnership is held together by an overall strategic vision—in the case of the CPCHE—the aim of working together to create a healthy environment for children in Canada. The “governance terms of reference” set out how the partners will work together and provide guidelines for decision making, money flow, secretariat services, conflict resolution, and adding new partners. Key principles include: as little process as possible; and day-to-day coordination of the partnership must reside outside the partnership (not within a participating organization). A coordinating committee makes the longer-term strategic and framework level decisions.

Partners cluster into “constellations” in response to a need or an opportunity, which is described as a “magnetic attractor.” A magnetic attractor can be projects, opportunistic initiatives or working groups. Once a cluster forms, a stewardship group is established to set the strategic direction, monitor the health/progress of the work and ensure that the work is aligned with the broader strategic vision and principles of the partnership. Authority and decision making resides within the constellation. Constellations are largely opportunistic—when there is low energy or a declining opportunity for action, the constellation may become inactive or disappear. In the case of CPCHE, over 15 constellations have been created in the past eight years. Constellations require energetic leadership and various forms of leadership are valued, providing they serve the overall strategic interest of the group. A third-party intermediary organization, skilled in planning, facilitation, balancing interests, mediating conflict and building capacity serves as a secretariat to the constellation. Because the constellation is not a legal entity, fiscal and legal responsibility moves around, typically to one of the partners leading a particular constellation.

According to key informants, the strengths of this model are its defining characteristics—lightweight governance, action-focused teams—and having the secretariat function reside outside the partnership and serve as a process catalyst and capacity builder. Some of the challenges include allowing enough time (several years) to truly create trusting relationships to enable the work and establishing a culture of trust, collaboration and partnership. Setting aside old ways of thinking and doing, and inventing and adopting new ways of thinking and doing, is an ongoing, evolving process.

³ Surman, Tonya and Mark Surman. “Open Sourcing Social Change: Inside the Constellation Model.” *Open Source Business Resource* September, 2008: *Social Innovation*. <http://www.osbr.ca/ojs/index.php/osbr/article/view/698/666>

Innovative Partnerships or Networks: Contributions Model

Another model that has emerged is the contributions model, adopted by the Sport Matters Group (SMG). SMG is a group of leaders in sports and physical activity who came together in 2000 in a relatively “organic” way to advance public policy and promote social innovation concerning sports and physical activity. In part, it emerged to address the limitations to collaborative work related to “built-in” competitiveness of sports groups and the strong government imprint on Canada’s sports infrastructure that was created in the 1990s (this had contributed to a sense of dependence and also to an orientation toward government priorities).

SMG operates on a contributions model, in which leaders in sports and physical activity spheres work together through voluntary contributions of time and resources. This model is informed by the open-source approach. A forerunner in the field had been Canadian Sport for Life, which had adopted a “creative commons” approach. Other organizations using the contributions approach include Podium Canada, which is pooling the Canadian Olympic Committee, the Canadian Paralympic Committee, Sport Canada and the 2010 Organizing Committee together to create capacity.

The fundamental principle of the contribution model is, “the contribution you want to make is the best one.” SMG is not a formal organization or an institution. It does not have a formal governance structure. Participants are bonded together through the shared value that sport matters. Contributions are strictly voluntary. There are no requirements for participation and no obligations. Organizations are free to make strategic choices about how they want to contribute. For example, one organization contributes space, another organization provides the web platform, and participants contribute their time. Some organizations contribute financially. SMG has well-established norms on how it convenes and how participants interact. There is a rotating chair; agendas are not heavily constructed; meetings are fluid, and all participants are considered equal peers and are reminded (in a friendly way) to focus on the collective/shared interests, not their organizational perspective or position. The merit of the ideas is what matters.

The primary strength of this model is that the contributions orientation creates conditions for things to happen that might not be possible otherwise. There is a great deal of interpersonal communication and personal commitment. This model has been successful in making changes to public policy and investments in sports, although the senior leader interviewed noted that there are no “straight lines” between SMG work and these results. Currently, it is promoting nationwide conversations among leaders and friends of sport and physical activity, in order to look at national ideas, priorities and policies beyond the 2010.⁴

SMG is also engaged in the Working Together Initiative to advance multiple policy outcomes that can be achieved through sport and physical activity. This initiative, like SMG, is based on the principles of shared leadership and contribution. It is led by a group of senior policy leaders from various government departments and NGOs. The Public Policy Forum is the third-party organization responsible for convening and coordinating activities.

⁴ Sport Matters: Beyond 2010: A New SMG Policy Framework for Sport – a brief in support of nation-wide conversations amongst leaders and friends of sport and physical activity. May 1, 2008.

In addition, because not all issues/opportunities/priorities are macro and appeal to all, SMG uses a mechanism called Policy Capacity Groups when leaders want to zero-in on the micro. For example, there is a very active group of leaders (about 30) who are working on a Social Development through Sport policy capacity group. This allows them to use the Sport Matters approach to work together. The results achieved in that context are quite different. For example, this particular group has co-developed a strategy/fund with a series of private foundations, has agreed on a conceptual framework for social development through sport, and is working on a policy process and communication strategy in relation to the Department of Canadian Heritage (International Sports).

Innovative Partnerships or Networks: Federation/Distributive Leadership Model

The Canadian Federation of Voluntary Sector Networks (the Federation) was established in 2003. It emerged in response to disaffection among some organizations with how established structures and processes were working in the Voluntary Sector Initiative at that time, which were perceived as being directive, top-down, closed and resistant to engaging new organizations and to working differently. The purpose of the Federation is to build connections, cohesion, and capacity in the non-profit and voluntary sector, in all regions of Canada, by strengthening cross-sector networks and by facilitating pan-Canadian public policy dialogue.

The Federation's model is one of a network of networks. The Federation is based on a shared set of values and operates on a distributive leadership model.⁵ This model focuses on creating collective responsibility for leadership action and activity. Under distributed leadership, it is assumed that roles of members will evolve and change. People are accountable for leadership within their respective areas of responsibility. The Federation acknowledges that good ideas can come from many sources, and people will need to cooperate and trust each other to create change. The operations have been refined over the past few years to accommodate some core functions. It has a core committee, executive committee and secretariat. It does not have any dedicated staff or formal funding for the Federation as a network—project funding enables them to work together. Sometimes the Federation seizes the opportunity to share information by “piggy backing” on other events. Currently Carleton University plays a secretariat role for the Federation (including project management, coordinating teleconferences and serving as a point of access to the Federation). The work of the Federation is largely provided by people based on their interest and capacity to contribute. Opportunities for information sharing/round tables are regarded as very valuable.

One of the strengths of the Federation is the wide diversity of organizations involved and the reach to the community level. Many of the organizations are all quite different and, as a result, there are increased opportunities to learn from other approaches and experiences. One of the disadvantages is that there are limits to what can be sustained through a virtual system. Face-to-face interaction is needed in order to build relationships, and develop a sense of trust, which in turn enables people to advance the work.

⁵ See draft terms of reference, included in accompanying binder to this report.

Innovative Partnerships or Networks: Examples of Other Models

Other examples of innovative models are included in Appendix A.

- *Imagine Canada* is a network of influence that advances knowledge and relationships to foster effective and sustainable charitable and non-profit organizations. It has a 14-member board of directors and an advisory council comprised of knowledge leaders. It engages over one thousand non-profit organizations in its work.
- The *Urban Public Health Network* is a network that addresses public health issues that are common to urban populations and works to develop strategies to address these issues. It is designed to share best practices, advocate for policy changes and to foster and facilitate research in public health. It currently engages 18 cities in its work (virtually and through semi-annual meetings).
- Another focused network with broad reach is the *Global Equity Gauge Alliance*, which is comprised of 11 country-level partners, called Equity Gauges. It has a vision that by the year 2015 every country should have an integrated system for monitoring health system inequities that informs, monitors and evaluates health and other socio-economic policies. It aims to reduce health inequities through three broad spheres of action, referred to as the “pillars” of the Equity Gauge Strategy: 1) Measurement; 2) Advocacy/action; and 3) Community participation.
- A health-oriented entity that does not have a heavy infrastructure is the *Australian Chronic Disease Prevention Alliance*. It is a deliberately small, five-member alliance that operates free of government funding to provide evidence-based advice; making recommendations for action; developing prevention initiatives; and bringing stakeholders together to plan prevention strategies, as agreed to in a shared work plan.
- *Campaign 2000* is an example of a focused, cross-Canada public education alliance that is building Canadian awareness of child poverty issues.⁶ It issues a public “report card” on child poverty. Similarly, the *Community Foundation Canada, Vital Signs Initiative* supports an annual community check-up conducted by community foundations across Canada to measure the vitality of Canadian cities, identify significant trends, and assign grades in at least 10 areas critical to quality of life. These activities promote dialogue, engage citizens and contribute to policy development at various levels.
- The *Assembly of First Nation—Make Poverty History Campaign* was launched in 2006 to create awareness of First Nations’ issues and call for action against poverty. It has also successfully engaged leaders from other sectors, including from unions, faith-based organizations and arts and culture.

Although web-based information was limited, it is hoped that these examples will also provide interesting food for thought.

⁶ Limited information was available from the website.

Perspectives on CSO Engagement in SDOH and Advice from Key Informants

In addition to gathering information about their various networks and alliances, we spent a few moments with key informants exploring the value and place of networking and collaboration in building linkages to further engage civil society in and advance SDOH work. Everyone sees the importance of networking and collaboration. It was also noted that there are many different ways to do this and that many things are already being done. In these discussions, key informants came back to these key points of advice:

- Civil society organizations should think through what they as civil society organizations need to do, what governments need to do and what is collectively needed to advance work on SDOH. Then find the best model that can lead to action. The model depends on the objective.
- Civil society organizations should be encouraged to step back and assess the current challenges for civil society organizations and what they can do to improve action on SDOH. For example, they should ask themselves questions, such as, what are the component parts of SDOH? What activities are currently underway? How can pockets of activity be best knitted together?
- They also noted that good personal interaction and strong working relationships among those involved makes social change possible. While virtual networks have a place, opportunities for people to get together, share thoughts and ideas is an important part of advancing social change and innovation.

We also explored the role of government and some of the challenges and limitations to government involvement in collaborative activity. For example, in an action-oriented model, it can be challenging for government officials to participate in action-oriented collaborations because it is difficult for them to quickly mobilize, respond and act.

At the same time, it was also noted that, strategically, civil society organizations need to build champions within governments on many health related issues. The question is really around how to invest in champions so that the work can advance from a place of strength and convergence.

Key Suggested Readings

Sport Matters Group

Sport Matters Group (SMG). "Beyond 2010: A New SMG Policy Framework for Sport: A brief in support of nation-wide conversations amongst leaders and friends of sport and physical activity." (May 1, 2008). This article provides some background information and is a good example of what the group undertakes.

Sport Matters Group (SMG). *The Working Together Initiative: The Contributions of Sport and Physical Activity to Multiple Policy Objectives: Overview of the Initiative* (June 23, 2008). This initiative involves and engages government.

Constellation Model

This model is used by the Canadian Partnerships for Children's Health and the Environment (CPCHE) and is being applied elsewhere, for example, the Ontario Non-profit Network and the Ontario Social Economy Initiatives have applied the constellation model. The Canadian Federation of Voluntary Service Networks also employs the concept of constellation members in its work.

Surman, Tonya. *Constellation Collaboration: A Model for Multi-organizational partnership: A CSI Think Piece*. Centre for Social Innovation (n.d.).
<http://www.socialinnovation.ca/sites/default/files/Constellation%20Governance%20Model.pdf>

Surman, Tonya. Open Sourcing Social Change: Inside the Constellation Model. Blog. Submitted by Tonya Surman September 25, 2008. <http://www.socialinnovation.ca/blog/open-sourcing-social-change-inside-constellation-model>

Surman, Tonya and Mark Surman. "Listening to the Stars: The Constellation Model of Collaborative Social Change." *Social Space*, 2008.
<http://ontariononprofitnetwork.ca/files/Tonya%20and%20Mark%27s%20Constellation%20Paper.pdf>

Surman, Tonya and Mark Surman. "Open Sourcing Social Change: Inside the Constellation Model. *Open Source Business Resource September, 2008: Social Innovation*.
<http://www.osbr.ca/ojs/index.php/osbr/article/view/698/666>

**Appendix A:
Engaging CSOs on the Social Determinants of Health:
Food for Thought: Information from Website Scan**

Background	Governance Structure	Funding / Support	"How it Works"	Interesting Features
Canadian Council of Churches				
<p>Background</p> <p>Year Founded: 1944</p> <p>Status: Ecumenical body (nondenominational religious).</p> <p>Mandate: The Canadian Council of Churches (CCC) was established in 1944 in the climax of World War II, stemming from hope and the desire for reunion and to work together. It has attempted to do so while being cognizant of the fundamental ecumenical dilemma: churches seeking the way to be together must at the same time find a way to preserve the integrity, the Witness to Truth (John 17:17-23), which each member church holds dear and essential.</p> <p>Scope: The Canadian Council of Churches is the largest ecumenical body in Canada, representing 19 churches of Anglican, Eastern and Oriental Orthodox, Protestant and Roman Catholic traditions. It is one of the few ecumenical bodies in the world that includes such a range of Christian churches.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Activities include, for example: founding and sponsoring Project Ploughshares, a Canadian peace organization; providing a safe place for immigrant churches to learn about Canada and to put down roots; promoting theological study and reflection; speaking out about and acting on current events such as the war on terror, the future of health care. It disseminates information and reflective materials to governments and individuals and is registered with the United Nations and participates in world conferences and commissions on such issues as funding for development, refugee settlement and human rights. 	<p>Governance</p> <p>The CCC has a Governing Board of Officers (representatives from various participating churches) and a core staff. The CCC operates various "Commissions" on relevant topics such as the Faith and Witness Commission and the Commission on Justice and Peace which addresses various issues, including peacemaking, economy of life, public health care, racism, HIV/AIDS and was also involved in a safe third country Charter challenge Reference groups are struck from time to time, such as the Biotechnology Reference Group.</p>	<p>Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The 19 member churches today represent Anglican, Protestant, Eastern and Oriental Orthodox and Roman Catholic traditions. o Staff is drawn from all traditions. o Information on funding/support is not available on Website. 	<p>How it Works</p> <p>Member churches participate in a Forum where all voices hold equal weight and where understanding among members is promoted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Forum acknowledges the validity of the theological principle of the Truthfulness of Deep Tradition. o Member churches—and their representatives on governing bodies—are expected to bring to the ecumenical table the fullest possible witness to the truth of the Gospel as their tradition understands it. As a working procedure, all participants in any ecumenical action speak and make commitments only with the authentic voice of their own church. Explicitly or implicitly, action-decisions of the CCC carry the full approval of the magisterial authoritative office within each member church. The "voice of the CCC" is heard in actions that receive 100% consensus. Actions that do not find 100% consensus might be facilitated as "joint actions of some member churches" if they do not violate fundamental doctrines of one of the member churches. o The thrust of the forum is that each member church has equal voice in discussing issues; the council acts as coordinator of churches wishing to work together, enabling them to act together or to delegate the Council to act on their behalf; member churches should take control of the agenda, with requests being referred to a committee, commission or board to which representatives are appointed by member churches; and any resulting action is thus endorsed by the participating member churches. Other member churches may opt in to such action or remain apart. 	<p>Interesting Features</p> <p>The Council has a fairly traditional structure and process, which has been sustained for over sixty years and has been able to engage a diversity of Christian faiths in dialogue, project-specific work, the development of position statements, on a range of critical societal issues.</p>

Background	Governance Structure	Funding / Support	"How it Works"	Interesting Features
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The results of this understanding and definition of ecumenism by the CCC have been absolutely historic, a major success in the 20th century search for an ecumenical reality and for a mode of operation in an ecumenical council. The definition of ecumenism is to be honest, true to present historic circumstances, faithful for every member church, and yet still workable and effective. In the ecumenical spirit, unity does not mean uniformity. It means learning from one another. 	

Background	Governance Structure	Funding / Support	"How it Works"	Interesting Features
Canadian Partnership for Children's Health and the Environment				
<p>Background</p> <p>Year Founded: 2001</p> <p>Status: Partnership. CPCHE represents a core group of organizations that agree to actively work together in good faith, through the "constellations" and the Coordinating Committee, to advance the Guiding Principles of the Canadian Partnership for Children's Health and the Environment (CPCHE).</p> <p>Mandate: Working across traditional boundaries, CPCHE provides common ground for organizations working to protect children's health from environmental contaminants. Overall, the shared goal is to improve the environmental health and safety of Canada's children. Organizations affiliated with CPCHE have overlapping missions to improve children's environmental health in Canada. CPCHE aims to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Move children's environmental health issues into the minds of decision makers both on the front lines and at the policy level; o Promote children's environmental health among caregivers and the public; o Coordinate activities and create efficiencies among the partners. <p>CPCHE aims to build the capacity of members to work more effectively on addressing specific children's environmental health issues and to facilitate change for the protection of children.</p> <p>Scope: National. CPCHE facilitates a closer collaboration between health, environment and child care professionals in order to coordinate activities, create efficiencies and build the capacity of the partners. The broader goal is to become more effective and coordinated promoters of children's environmental health in Canada.</p>	<p>Governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Partnership: CPCHE consists of a core group of organizations. The Partnership maintains ties with the broader community (Network) through its national email list and Website. This network is an informal affiliation of non-governmental organizations, government agencies, federations, health groups, citizens and others interested in children's environmental health and safety in Canada. Partners at the table tend to be executive directors, chief executive officers or organizational leads on specific issues. o The Coordinating Committee is the managing body that represents the members and advances a shared and coordinated voice around issues and strategies. o There is also a "flexible" form of affiliation that enables organizations to work together in "constellations" on children's environmental health issues. The constellation model⁷ is seen to support a partnership in which leadership is "balanced" and the work is "action-focused." It is also viewed as a good way to secure resources, build on core competencies and create efficiencies while still maintaining organizational autonomy. It fosters a flexible, self-governing approach that builds on collaborative strength and leverage. o The "host" organization is a virtual partnership (i.e., individual partners reached through their respective organizations), with a secretariat comprised of two individuals (director and web editor). The secretariat is "third party—not associated with any given organization. 	<p>Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Partnership may expand as needed; membership does not prevent organizations from pursuing projects and activities outside the Partnership. o CPCHE has received funding from a variety of sources, including the Laidlaw Foundation, which initially helped with initial coordination; the Ontario Trillium Foundation; Environment Canada, and through the Voluntary Sector Initiative's Children's Environmental Health National Policy Consultation Project: Building Capacity for Policy Development and Facilitating Policy Change. 	<p>How it Works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o CPCHE operates on a Constellation Model. o There are three committees: Policy Committee (policy platform to advance agenda), Communications Committee (Website, fact sheets), and Coordinating Committee. A third-party Secretariat (1.5 days/week) provides partnership/governance support to the Coordinating Committee and the overall Partnership. The Secretariat reports to the Coordinating Committee. o The Coordinating Committee is the incubator of the work of the constellations. o Groups of organizations choose to work together in a "constellation" on a particular issue relating to children's environmental health under the auspices of the CPCHE. The constellation maintains a reporting relationship with the Coordinating Committee, for the mutual benefit of all partners. It may also utilize the time and expertise of the third-party Secretariat (currently offered through the Centre for Social Innovation in Toronto). o There is light administrative footprint. 	<p>Interesting Features</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o CPCHE is based on the Constellation Model, an evolving 21st century model that is inspired by the Internet and open source ways of thinking and doing. o It brings together organizations where "self-interest" and a shared interest converge. It does not position itself as a representative body. o The model has a great deal of flexibility and potential to work nimbly. If a position statement is created, all partners have a vetting process in order to have sign-off on the position. There is more credibility with the statement as a result. o The CPCHE web portal operates as an information hub for researchers, policymakers, environmentalists, health professionals, child care professionals, caregivers and the public. o It has been able to successfully convene events and engage service providers and professionals and industry in dialogue and action to improve children's environmental health. o CPCHE links with national Canadian organizations and regional/municipal health bodies (Ontario) who emphasize the improvement of children's health and the environment.

⁷Add reference.

Background	Governance Structure	Funding / Support	"How it Works"	Interesting Features
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CPCHE builds capacity of the members to work more effectively on specific children's environmental health issues and supports its members in facilitating change for the protection of children through its: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Secretariat ○ Healthy Environment for Kids Website ○ Children's Environmental Health Literacy Initiative. ○ An example of the activities is a series of six regional workshops across Canada to develop a Children's Health and Environment Vision and Strategy for Canada. ○ CPCHE was influential in efforts leading to the Government of Canada's decision to ban Bisphenol-A (PBA), a chemical found in many plastics (including plastic baby bottles and water bottles), a dangerous substance in April 2008. 				

Background	Governance Structure	Funding / Support	"How it Works"	Interesting Features
Canadian Federation of Voluntary Sector Networks				
<p>Background</p> <p>Year Founded: 2003</p> <p>Status: The Federation of Voluntary Sector Networks is a pan-Canadian collective of local, regional, provincial and territorial cross-sector networks. The Federation reaches out to both existing and emerging initiatives that work to build connections, cohesion, and capacity in the non-profit and voluntary sector, as well as to informal networks of voluntary organizations that wish to explore the many models that the Federation has discovered.</p> <p>Mandate: The mission of the Federation is to build connections, cohesion, and capacity in the non-profit and voluntary sector, in all regions of Canada, by strengthening cross-sector networks and by facilitating pan-Canadian public policy dialogue. Its goals are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Increase linkages and collaboration among and build capacity of cross sector non-profit and voluntary sector networks in communities, regions, provinces, and territories across Canada; o Bring grass roots, locally based, provincial, territorial voices to pan-Canadian public policy dialogue; o Provide leadership on common issues and engage in collective responses; o Convene and facilitate community, regional, provincial and territorial mobilization and engagement. <p>Scope: National/pan-Canadian, active in most province and territories.</p>	<p>Governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Centre for Voluntary Sector Research and Development, of the University of Ottawa and Carleton University serves as the secretariat for the Federation of Voluntary Sector Networks. The Federation has a diversity of members representing community groups and organizations from across the country. o It is a "network of networks," which is loosely structured and does not have a central organization driving the process. o Leadership is seen as distributive and collaborative. o Applies philosophy of "distributed leadership," which is a model of leadership focused on creating collective responsibility for leadership action and activity rather than on formal positions of authority. o Loose structure is seen as a benefit, as members of the Federation are able to focus attention on action, rather than on structure and management. It originally contained a Steering Committee and Secretariat, which helped define the structure, decision making process, and criteria for inclusion. 	<p>Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Federation is largely enabled through project funding. It does not have dedicated paid staff. o It typically "piggy-backs" its meetings onto other events. o Types of members: Constellation member, Core Committee member, Executive Core Committee member, Secretariat. 	<p>How it Works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Membership is based on the shared interests of players in the non-profit and voluntary sector. While designed as a "network of networks," some members are not full networks. Criteria are "cross-sectoral networks." o The Federation has a "bottom up" process, with many organizations working on capacity development at the local level to strengthen their impact in their respective communities, regions, provinces, and territories. o This involves exchanging information and resources, facilitating and promoting collaboration, raising the profile of the voluntary sector, building the capacity of the voluntary sector, impacting public policy development, and engaging in dialogue with other sectors. o Roundtables are used for information sharing. All members are considered equal, and opportunities for learning from others are valued. o Work is completed through shared responsibilities of individuals. Participation ranges from senior individuals, to board members, or to operational-level staff. 	<p>Interesting Features</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There are differences in the manner in which organizations operate and work together. The federation does not position itself as a representative body. o There are vertical connections with local, regional and national groups. Through affiliate sites, it has the capacity to host a variety of forums, workshop and training options to aid in building the capacity of the voluntary and non-profit sectors. o The federation has helped to increase member opportunities to learn from different organizations approaches and experiences.

Background	Governance Structure	Funding / Support	"How it Works"	Interesting Features
Sport Matters Group				
<p>Background</p> <p>Year Founded: 2001</p> <p>Status: Sport Matters Group (SMG) is a voluntary group of individuals (sport leaders and organizations) who have come together to talk about the important contribution that sport makes to society and to collaborate on various sport policy issues on an ad hoc basis. SMG is not an organization—there are no official members or investors and it does not have any legal status (e.g. incorporated, not-for-profit).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mandate: SMG initially focused on helping members learn more about the public policy process and get directly involved in that process. Developing the ability to work together on issues of common interest evolved from the initial focus. It works to implement the Canadian Sport Policy and to look for new approaches to the governance and leadership of sport. SMG tracks and intervenes in issues of charitable status, regulatory conditions, and tax policy that affect sport organizations <p>Scope: National. SMG has worked together to contribute to Canadian Sport Policy, the <i>Sport and Physical Activity Act</i>, and to campaign/support an increase in resources for sport in Canada. It has been actively involved in tracking, reviewing and responding to sport policy issues as they arise.</p>	<p>Governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The SMG is comprised of over 90 sport leaders and organizations. All participation and contributions are voluntary and are generally based on level of interest, specific issues of common interest and the nature of resources need to have impact. ○ Support is offered from senior management of sport organizations. ○ Some groups contribute to the costs of office space, travel, printing, data collection, communications, meetings, fiduciary functions, and the operations and administration of the Sport Matters Group. ○ SMG draws on the embedded policy capacity of partner organizations, which the sector taps into all of the time through. SMG is as much "out there" with leaders embedded in organizations as it is within the paid staff capacity. This occurs by design and is one of the key components of the group's success to date—<i>very low overheads with very high levels of distributed capacity throughout the sector</i>. It means that contributions to policy papers, the on-line community, media releases, government relations, endorsements and the like are taken up by the sector as a whole. 	<p>Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Funding/support is based on a "contributions" model, which views the contribution the organization <i>wants</i> to make as the best one for it to make. ○ 2006 revenue: \$340,046; 2006 expenditures \$394,047 (of this amount \$145,030 was spent on salaries and benefits). ○ Received grant from 2007-2011 for the amount of \$459,000 from the J.W. McConnell Family Foundation. ○ Pooling of financial resources from various sector leaders in order to collectively undertake effective campaigns for sport and physical activity. ○ Sport Research Intelligence contributes the physical space; other organizations provide support with administrative/ contract work; web platform. 	<p>How it Works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Contributions are made by organizations and go toward shared objectives, activities or goals. ○ Members meet regularly to contribute ideas and views, share their concerns, and discuss activities of common interest. ○ The group is described as "informal" in nature. There are functioning "policy capacity groups," which allow sector leaders to connect when they have an interest and a willingness to engage around a specific policy issue, to bring or to develop their policy expertise, or to work to advance a policy goal or to help build policy capacity within the sport and physical activity sector. The SMG has also spawned the Friends of Canadian Sport, which is made up of people from Canadian towns and cities and counties who are working to connect the dots between sports at all levels, particularly within their local communities. ○ More information on members exact contributions can be found in the document footnoted here.⁸ ○ The contributions in CEO time and support staff are very valuable, and come from people and skills from different organizations. ○ With CEO-level involvement, SMG has an oral culture, where CEOs focus on how to work collectively 	<p>Interesting Features</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SMG has a unique culture and operating norms, which respects and encourages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - peer-level relationships - contributions - openness - meritocracy (the merit of an idea, not where it came from) - the messenger - active engagement ○ SMG pays regular attention to its norms and values of operation. ○ SMG does not position itself as a representative body. ○ SMG builds on work to connect Canadian Sport, using on-line technologies that allow members to easily connect with each other, policy capacity groups, and services that make it easier for members of the group to work together. ○ SMG has well established norms on how to convene and interact in a truly informal environment (high degree of networking capabilities, less task-oriented). Peer-level operation and merit-of-the-idea approach.

⁸ SMG (2008) *How does Sport Matters make the most of all of the Contributions from different sport organizations and leaders?* Retrieved September 9, 2008. Available on-line at: <http://www.sportmatters.ca/Images/2%20Support%20Documents/2007/About%20us/Making%20it%20happen%20together.pdf>

Background	Governance Structure	Funding / Support	"How it Works"	Interesting Features
Imagine Canada				
<p>Background</p> <p>Year Founded: 2005</p> <p>Status: non-profit, charitable status. A network of influence.</p> <p>Mandate: The mission of Imagine Canada is about advancing knowledge and relationships to foster effective and sustainable charitable and non-profit organizations. The vision states that, "We believe in a Canada where strong and vital charitable and non-profit organizations, the private sector and governments individually and collectively contribute to social progress and vibrant communities."</p> <p>Scope: National, umbrella organization. Imagine Canada is a national charity that looks into and out for Canada's charitable and non-profit sector. Its research and public policy are designed to increase philanthropy and public engagement and its tools and resources aim to strengthen the sector. Imagine Canada serves the sector broadly through direct engagement with leading non-profits and charities—of all sizes—from small to medium to large. It delivers products and services geared to improving charity's ability to secure and sustain community support</p> <p>Imagine Canada's insights are designed to lend influence that shapes public policy and builds support and engagement from businesses, government, media and individual Canadians. Its programs and services provide the sector with timely information and tools and ensure the community resources are there to do its work.</p>	<p>Governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There is a 14-member Board of Directors. 	<p>Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There are 1,200 non-profit organizations who are members of Imagine Canada. o More than 1,000 non-profits are as members and thousands more are engaged through Imagine Canada's research, on-line library, events and workshops. Canadian businesses are also engaged as members of the Caring Company 	<p>How it Works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It has an Advisory Council. The Website includes the following information on the proposed "role of the Advisory Council": The Advisory Council advises the Board of Directors of Imagine Canada on areas where Imagine Canada should be taking a lead, facilitating or convening; providing a forum to identify and discuss major issues having an impact on the sector; and, giving structured input to Imagine Canada's strategic planning at a formative stage. o The Advisory Council will be asked to identify and prioritize policy issues and initiatives. These could include public policy issues, capacity building projects, research, self-regulation, etc. Members of the Advisory Council will be asked to attend a maximum of two face-to-face meetings in any year with additional teleconference calls as required. o Imagine Canada considers Advisory Council members as knowledge leaders who deliver insights that put the sector on the map. o It conducts research that describes the sector and how Canadians engage with it. It identifies trends, issues and opportunities of concern and serves to raise the sector's profile in the minds of Canadians. o It has a library that provides information for and about non-profit organizations and charities and is described as the largest collection of on-line non-profit resources in Canada. o program. 	<p>Interesting Features</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Imagine Canada has a web/audio conferencing series <i>SectorCast</i> for the membership. This provides first-hand updates on public policy developments, new research findings, or trends in fundraising and grant making—directly to supporters' offices.

Background	Governance Structure	Funding / Support	"How it Works"	Interesting Features
Urban Public Health Network				
<p>Background</p> <p>Year Founded: 2004</p> <p>Status: Network.</p> <p>Mandate: The Urban Public Health Network (UPHN) is designed to share best practices, advocate for policy changes and to foster and facilitate research in public health. Objectives of the Network are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Share experiences and best practices in delivery and evaluation of public health programs and initiatives in urban centres; o Create more awareness/profile for urban public health issues; o Advance policy change by developing a collective voice for urban public health issues; o Foster collaborative action on issues of mutual interest; o Provide a forum for other groups/organizations that wish to consult on urban public health issues; o Foster and facilitate research in public health. <p>Scope: Urban-local/national. The network addresses public health issues that are common to urban populations and works to develop strategies to address these issues. Examples of topics that are being addressed include emergency preparedness, common standardized indicators for public health activity, the provision of tertiary public health services, immunization capacity, poverty and health.</p> <p>Activities: UPHN is collaborating with the Canadian Population Health Initiative (CPHI) to produce a series of 19 reports that look at health indicators and socio-economic status within each of the network's cities.</p>	<p>Governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Hosts meetings on a semi-annual basis, with the next meeting occurring in Quebec City from September 24-26, 2008. o UPHN has a secretariat. 	<p>Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Information not available on Website. 	<p>How it Works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Through the UPHN, the Public and Population Health Observatory for the Victoria Island Health Authority is involved in a pilot project to produce health indicators at the neighbourhood level (i.e. James Bay, Fairfield, etc.).⁹ o A total of 18 cities participate in the network. Through the UPHN, Medical Officers of Health from some of Canada's largest cities collaborate to share information on research, policy development, and best practices. 	<p>Interesting Features</p>

⁹ Scan of the UPHN Website included scanning member homepages (listed on the bottom right menu bar). The following search terms were input into the search function of each member site: "urban public health network," "UPHN." Information pertaining to local or urban-level projects were included as part of the activities, where possible.

Background	Governance Structure	Funding / Support	"How it Works"	Interesting Features
Australian Chronic Disease Prevention Alliance				
<p>Background</p> <p>Year Founded: 2001/02</p> <p>Status: Alliance. Members participate via a Memorandum of Understanding. Incorporation was considered but it was determined that an informal alliance was appropriate.</p> <p>Mandate: The Australian Chronic Disease Prevention Alliance (ACDPA) works to prevent chronic disease by focusing on the risk factors, initially addressing the shared risk factors of nutrition and physical activity. It focuses on developing evidence-based recommendations and initiatives and providing leadership and a strong unified advocacy voice for the prevention of chronic disease.</p> <p>Scope: National. Works with national and regional health agencies, government and government organizations. It has resisted diversifying the membership (to avoid competing agendas). It does engage other organizations in events, discussions, forums.</p>	<p>Governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Steering Committee of the five member organizations, with up to two representatives, at the CEO level, from each member organization. There is only one vote per member organization. The Chair rotates among member organizations every two years (initially Cancer Council, currently Heart Foundation). o Decision making is by consensus. o Steering Committee representatives participate on a volunteer basis. 	<p>Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There are five member organizations: Australian Kidney Foundation, Diabetes Australia, National Heart Foundation of Australia, the Cancer Council Australia and the National Stroke Foundation. The organization has been deliberate about being small, national in scope, and about having CEOs at the table (for commitment and building trust). o Initially, the Alliance had government funding and is now funded by the alliances (amounts vary by organization) themselves. o Secretariat is provided by the organization of the Alliance member occupying the position of ACDPA Chair. A part-time Executive Director will start soon. The Cancer Society is working on a strategic plan for the next three years, including budget. o Has an Executive Officer. 	<p>How it Works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Preparing evidence-based advice; making recommendations for action; developing prevention initiatives; and bringing stakeholders together to plan prevention strategies, as agreed to in the ACDPA Work plan. 	<p>Interesting Features</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The strengths of this model are in its simplicity and independence from government funding; however, it may not meet certain expectations for collaborative work on systems change.

Background	Governance Structure	Funding / Support	"How it Works"	Interesting Features
Campaign 2000				
Background	Governance	Members	How it Works	Interesting Features
<p>Year Founded: 1991</p> <p>Status: Alliance, with registered charity status.</p> <p>Mandate: Campaign 2000 is a cross-Canada public education movement to build Canadian awareness and support for the 1989 all-party House of Commons resolution to end child poverty in Canada by the year 2000. It seeks to increase public awareness of the levels and consequences of child/family poverty by publishing research on the indicators of child poverty and developing public education resources.</p> <p>Scope: National. Campaign 2000 activity areas include: public and government consultations on child and family poverty issues and government policy; advocacy for improved social policies relating to the national child benefit, social housing, child care, labour market supports, community services; and other relevant policy areas (e.g. advocacy, research).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Information is not available on the Campaign 2000 Website nor other sites related to Campaign 2000. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o National and P/T representatives. Includes a network of national, regional and local partner organizations that actively work on child/family issues from diverse perspectives. o There are 155 national (51), community and provincial partners (104). o Supported through donations, United Way of Greater Toronto. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Campaign 2000 produces an annual national Report Card on Child Poverty in Canada measuring the progress, or lack of progress, of the unanimous all-party resolution "to seek to achieve the goal of eliminating poverty among Canadian children by the year 2000." Partner organizations also produce local report cards. o Involved with a number of national and regional projects that focus on children and poverty. 	

Background	Governance Structure	Funding / Support	"How it Works"	Interesting Features
Global Equity Gauge Alliance				
<p>Background</p> <p>Year Founded: 1999</p> <p>Status: The Global Equity Gauge Alliance (GEGA) consists of 11 country-level partners, called Equity Gauges that share a common action-based vision and framework called the Equity Gauge Strategy.</p> <p>Mandate: The vision of GEGA is that by the year 2015 every country should have an integrated system for monitoring health system inequities that informs, monitors and evaluates health and other socio-economic policies. GEGA places health equity squarely within a larger framework of social justice, linking findings on socio-economic and health inequalities with differentials in power, wealth, and prestige in society. It aims to reduce health inequities through three broad spheres of action, referred to as the "pillars" of the Equity Gauge Strategy: 1) Measurement; 2) Advocacy/action; and 3) Community participation.</p> <p>Scope: Cross-national. An "equity gauge" is described as action-oriented project aimed at bridging research to policy, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Monitoring the current dimensions of health inequity as well as changes over time, especially in response to policies and programs, using rigorous methodologies; o Advocating for health equity through evidence-based policy recommendations and through raising public awareness; and o Actively supporting public and community participation in developing projects, advocacy campaigns, and interventions. <p>GEGA is involved in the creation of a Global Gauge, a Global Network, and the development of a Capacity Development Tool.</p>	<p>Governance</p> <p>There are three interdependent organizational components: the Coordinating Committee, the Secretariat and the Equity Gauges. GEGA is considering including an Advisory Board and Network Partners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Coordinating Committee includes representatives from the country Gauges as well as technical specialists, who provide strategic leadership skills and advise GEGA, as well as Gauge members. Collectively, the Coordinating Committee is responsible for guiding the direction of the organization, supporting the Gauges, liaising with global partners with whom GEGA works, and ensuring the long-term financial stability, integrity, and effectiveness of GEGA. The GEGA Coordinating Committee's primary function is to guide the development of the Alliance. o The Secretariat, located in Health Systems Trust, Durban, South Africa, includes GEGA's Deputy Coordinator, a coordinator, an admin assistant, and part-time staff. The coordinator facilitates the work of the country Gauges and the effectiveness of GEGA's work as an alliance, and directs GEGA's global activities for capacity development and advocacy. The Secretariat's primary functions include the promotion of the 2015 goal, technical assistance to support each of the three pillars, cross-fertilization of lessons learned, resource mobilization, global networking to encourage monitoring and generally promote health equity endeavours. o Both the GEGA Secretariat and Coordinating Committee support the development of democratic organizational structures by proposing, for member approval, internal policies such as mission statement; the 	<p>Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Supported by funding through the Rockefeller Foundation and the Swedish International Development Agency. 	<p>How it Works</p> <p>All Equity Gauges share a common strategic vision of the action-based Equity Gauge Strategy. GEGA supports and promotes the activities and goals of the 12 Gauges, and supports the Global Equity Agenda by creating a voice for the global advocacy arm of the alliance.</p> <p>An Equity Gauge represents the coordinated and dynamic <i>interplay</i> of activities that may be undertaken by various organizations or groups. Although one organization may play a lead role, diverse skills and actions are needed. Thus, Equity Gauges are encouraged to form from several groups or institutions, and adopt fluid and flexible structures to effectively pursue the goals and needs of the work.</p>	<p>Interesting Features</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o What is novel about the Equity Gauge Strategy is the explicit link between research/monitoring activities and action. The Strategy initially combined information collection (research, assessment, and ongoing monitoring) and advocacy to influence action. The vision evolved to incorporate a third element of community empowerment and mobilization, reflecting a recognition that, if advocacy efforts targeting decision makers are to be effective in a sustained fashion, pressure from below—that is from civil society, including grassroots groups—will often be required to push leaders to make decisions that may not please powerful segments of the population. o Three elements—information (referred to as Assessment and Monitoring), Advocacy and Community Empowerment—form the foundation on which Equity Gauges orient their activities and work, and are referred to as the "pillars" of the Equity Gauge Strategy.

Background	Governance Structure	Funding / Support	"How it Works"	Interesting Features
	responsibilities of the Coordinating Committee, Chair, and Coordinator; performance of evaluations; representation within the Coordinating Committee; managing financial support to Gauges, and prioritizing requests; prioritizing and providing technical and financial support for Gauges; and adoption of new Gauges and GEGA activities; and preventing conflicts of interest.			

Background	Governance Structure	Funding / Support	"How it Works"	Interesting Features
Community Foundation Canada, Vital Signs Initiative				
<p>Background</p> <p>Year Founded: 2001</p> <p>Status: Initiative, under the Community Foundation of Canada</p> <p>Mandate: Community Foundation Canada (CFC), Vital Signs Initiative supports an annual community check-up conducted by community foundations across Canada to measure the vitality of Canadian cities, identify significant trends, and assign grades in at least 10 areas critical to quality of life. Measuring the vitality of Canadian communities in critical areas will help community foundations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Increase the effectiveness of grant making; o Better inform donors about issues and opportunities in the community; o Assist in making connections between individuals and groups to address those issues. <p>Scope: National/Community. Vital Signs builds on existing initiatives by collating a broad range of data; engaging community, and creating a national snapshot of the issues that are critical to the vitality of Canada and its communities. CFC hopes to engage Canadians in a deeper discussion about national trends and to explore issues that are key to Canada's shared success in the future. It provides information in a way that appeals to a wide range of readers.</p>	<p>Governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It is based on a project of the Toronto Community Foundation and is coordinated nationally by Community Foundations of Canada. 	<p>Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The J.W. McConnell Family Foundation provided critical support for the national expansion of the Vital Signs Initiative 	<p>How it Works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Information not available on Website. Community foundations in Victoria, Vancouver, Calgary, Medicine Hat, Red Deer, Sudbury, Waterloo region, Guelph-Wellington, London, Oakville, Ottawa, Montréal, Toronto, Fredericton and Saint John are issuing <i>Vital Signs</i> reports in 2008. 	<p>Interesting Features</p> <p>Has provided a shared mechanism to address critical issues in Canadian cities which can be used for a variety of purposes (e.g. local engagement, policy development, planning) at local levels and beyond.</p>

Background	Governance Structure	Funding / Support	"How it Works"	Interesting Features
Assembly of First Nations—Make Poverty History				
<p>Background</p> <p>Year Founded: 2006</p> <p>Status: The campaign was launched in 2006 to create awareness of First Nations' issues and call for action against poverty.</p> <p>Mandate: The Assembly of First Nations (AFN) Initiative on Poverty focuses on creating opportunities and building on successes so that First Nations citizens can contribute fully to Canada's economic competitiveness on achieving sustainability by ensuring that First Nations have adequate and equitable funding capacity to enable their citizens to reach their full potential; 3) and on implementing structural changes that facilitate First Nations control over the content, design, delivery and management of all the Assembly's programs and services.</p> <p>Scope: National. The AFN campaign is linked to Make Poverty History, a worldwide effort to eliminate poverty that began in 2005 and involves over 80 countries.</p>	<p>Governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The campaign is led by the Assembly of First Nations. 	<p>Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o International and national partners have supported or partnered with AFN in promoting the campaign. Examples include the Canadian Auto Workers Union, which has donated funds to the campaign and spoken out on the issue; and KAIROS (Canadian Ecumenical Justice Initiatives), which has also spoken out on the issue. A recent fundraiser was held at the 4th Annual ONEXONE Gala (Toronto Film Festival) where a "Medicine Man in the Tree" Totem Pole carved by Dewey Smith of Victoria was auctioned, with Pepsi-QTG being the winning bidder. 	<p>How it Works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o AFN and its partners worked together to raise awareness of the extent of poverty and poor living conditions within First Nations communities. Prominent celebrities from the arts and sports communities, including Actor Adam Beach, New York Islanders coach Ted Nolan, NHL hockey players Bryan Trottier and Gino Odjick, have also lent their voice and support to the campaign. 	<p>Interesting Features</p>

Appendix B Key Informant Interviews and Topics Addressed

Key Informants

Erica Phipps
Partnership Director
Canadian Partnerships for Children's Health and the Environment (CPCHE)

Tonya Surman
Centre for Social Innovations

Katherine van Kooy
Co-Chair, Canadian Federation of Voluntary Sector Networks
Calgary Chamber of Voluntary Organizations

Penelope M. Rowe
Co-Chair, Canadian Federation of Voluntary Sector Networks
Community Services Council Newfoundland and Labrador

Ian Bird
Senior Leader
Sport Matters Group

Bryan Hendry¹⁰
Senior Policy Advisor
Economic Partnerships
Assembly of First Nations

General Interview Topics

- Background information on the entity – why and how it came about and where possible
- How the entity works in practice, including underlying philosophy; structure and processes strengths and challenges; relationships with stakeholders
- Perspective and ideas about the value and place of networking and collaboration to build linkages that could further engage civil society in, and advance SDOH work.
- Other models, reference materials
- Advice about key considerations in selecting a model
- Additional comments.

¹⁰ This interview focused primarily on gathering basic information about the Making Poverty History campaign, as Mr. Hendry had limited time as he was on travel status.