

# **Options Paper**

**Shaping our Movement to Meet our  
Collective Values and Vision**

**The Interim Core Group of the  
Global Movement Against Statelessness**

**Consultation Draft**

**July 2023**

## About the Global Movement Against statelessness

The Global Movement Against Statelessness is a community of stateless people, activists and civil society allies including NGOs and academics, dedicated to the eradication of statelessness, and the achievement of equal nationality rights as well as human rights of all stateless people. It aims to centre stateless people and be led by them, to build trust and solidarity in the field and challenge prevailing power imbalances. It ultimately aims to bring the statelessness field closer together, strengthen collaboration and contribute to efforts to combat statelessness, support stateless communities and achieve positive change. The idea for the establishment of a Global Movement first emerged out of the 2019 World Statelessness Conference in the Hague. Following an extensive consultation process carried out by the Institute on Statelessness and Inclusion (ISI) in 2020, an Interim Core Group (ICG) was established in November 2020 and tasked with driving the Movement forward. The ICG has since worked to develop a values statement i.e., *Manifesto* for the Movement, deliberate further on the objectives and purposes of the Movement, organise several community calls for members of the Movement, conduct surveys, mapping exercises and research into other movements in order to provide options for the structure and modalities the Movement could adopt (this paper is an outcome of this process), fundraise for the Movement and work on communications, its online presence and a launch event.

## About this Paper

This Options Paper reflects on how the Global Movement Against Statelessness can structure itself going forward, as it transitions from the nascent movement it currently is, into a larger, more sustainable global movement. It aims to facilitate discussions about how the movement should structure itself and what modalities of operation it should put in place, as it transitions from its current set-up into a more long-term, permanent set-up. The paper draws on extensive consultations with the statelessness field and wider movement<sup>1</sup>, research of other global social movements in terms of how they've structured themselves, and in-depth conversations within the Movement's ICG.

The paper is in two parts. **Part 1** sets out the main considerations that come into play when determining the structure and modalities of the movement. These include considerations such as the place the movement will have within the wider eco-system; the identity, objectives, values, and principles of the movement; and considerations of efficiency and effectiveness, governance, sustainability and safety. **Part 2** of the paper looks at the options before us, in the short-term (2024/25), as longer-term options, and as bridging measures between the two. It approaches these options by using various questions as prompts for discussion within the wider movement. The aim is, through a consultation process where these questions are addressed, to build a clearer picture of which option(s) best suit the movement. The ICG will on this basis, implement next steps to develop a more concrete proposal on the structure, and after consultation with the wider movement, implement it.

---

<sup>1</sup> The wider movement refers to stakeholders involved in the statelessness ecosystem. This includes affected people, activists, NGOs, academics, and policymakers who focus on statelessness, nationality rights and human rights more broadly in relation to statelessness.

## Contents

<i>About the Global Movement Against Statelessness</i> .....	2
<i>About this Paper</i> .....	2
Manifesto of the Global Movement Against Statelessness.....	4
Introduction.....	5
<b>PART 1: CONSIDERATIONS</b> .....	7
1.1. The Statelessness Eco-System: its Assets and Resources, the place Stateless People have within it and calls for a Global Movement .....	7
1.1.1. The Statelessness Ecosystem.....	7
1.1.2. The 2020 Consultations and the Call for Establishing a Global Statelessness Movement.....	8
1.1.3. Learnings from the 2022 Ecosystem Mapping .....	9
1.1.4. The Global Movement’s Impact on the Statelessness Ecosystem .....	10
1.2. The Identity, Values, Principles and Objectives of the Global Movement .....	11
1.2.1. Identity .....	11
1.2.2. Values .....	11
1.2.3. Principles .....	12
1.2.4. Objectives .....	13
1.3. Considerations of Efficiency, Effectiveness, Governance, Sustainability and Safety .....	15
1.3.1. Efficiency and Effectiveness.....	15
1.3.2. Governance .....	15
1.3.3. Financial Sustainability .....	16
1.3.4. Member Engagement: Participation and Contribution.....	17
1.3.5. Safety and Risk.....	17
<b>PART 2: OPTIONS FOR THE STRUCTURE AND MODALITIES</b> .....	18
2.1. The Current Structure and Short-term Prospects .....	18
2.2. Long Term Options .....	20
2.2.1. Questions for Consideration.....	21
2.3. Bridging Between the Short Term and Long Term .....	23
<b>ANNEX</b> .....	25

## Manifesto of the Global Movement Against Statelessness

*We are a global community of stateless people, activists, and allied organisations dedicated to the eradication of statelessness, the achievement of equal nationality rights, and the realisation of human rights of all stateless people.*

*We come together because millions of people are denied their right to nationality and endure statelessness, while the nationality rights of countless others are under threat.*

*We recognise and assert our shared humanity and the equal dignity and rights of all human beings. We centre those directly impacted by statelessness as leaders of our movement, recognising their expertise and lived experience as vital to our mission.*

*We are committed to equitable governance, transparency, collective self-reflection and accountability to each other.*

*We stand together in solidarity, choosing boldly inclusive and egalitarian collaboration, leading with kindness, patience, and mutual respect.*

*We seek to communicate in ways that are accessible to all.*

*We believe in the potential for social transformation to realise a world free from discrimination, which is the primary cause of statelessness. We recognise that this requires holding those in power to account and pursuing structural change.*

*We are determined to elevate and amplify the voices of stateless people at the international, regional and national levels, to influence policy makers, educate the community at large, and inspire global change.*

*We aim to create a new dynamic that empowers stateless people, inspires deeper understanding of our shared humanity, and galvanises action to uphold nationality rights for all.*

*We create and foster connections among people and communities impacted by statelessness and civil society allies, forging a safe and brave space for dialogue, storytelling, information and knowledge-sharing, and joint advocacy initiatives.*

*We recognise the deeply intersectional causes and impacts of statelessness and acknowledge that the success of our movement is intrinsically connected with other social justice movements. We are committed to work to connect, ally, and engage diverse social justice actors from the grassroots to the international levels.*

*We envision a world in which universal human rights - including the right to a nationality - are respected and upheld for all human beings.*

*We are confident that addressing the root causes of statelessness and realising our vision for the world will benefit all of humanity.*

## Introduction

This Options Paper reflects on how the Global Movement Against Statelessness can structure itself going forward, as it transitions from the nascent movement it currently is, into a larger, more sustainable truly global movement.

Ours is a values-driven Movement that ultimately aims to **centre and be led by people directly impacted by statelessness, nationality deprivation and discriminatory nationality laws**. Consequently, the question of agreeing a structure for the Movement and its modalities of operation, isn't solely based on questions of governance, efficiency and sustainability. More importantly, it is also based on our identity, values, principles and objectives. In other words, our decision on how we structure and organise ourselves, must give primary consideration to the identity we ascribe to, the values and principles we hold and our objectives in coming together this way. The structure and modalities must not only be in keeping with our identity, values, principles and objectives, they must enable them to flourish – so our Movement truly represents the change we seek.

Secondly, there is a particular context within which our Movement has emerged. A history of civil society action, collaboration and engagement on statelessness and the right to nationality, which comes with its own mistakes and challenges, but through which has emerged an ecosystem of actors who bring an array of assets and resources to the field. The Movement will take its place within this ecosystem, alongside existing actors, many of whom are active drivers of the Movement. This process will inevitably be disruptive, but it ultimately must be beneficial. It must complement and build on existing assets and resources, help grow our space and resourcing, and improve the ways in which we work together. Our Movement needs to be sensitive to the context out of which it has been born, and provide a net-gain to our field, both by expanding it and its resources and by accelerating efforts to meaningfully centre and be led by those directly impacted.

In this context, the question that this Options Paper reflects on is as follows:

***'Considering:***

- a. the statelessness eco-system: its assets and resources, the place stateless people have within it and calls for a Global Movement,***
  - b. the identity, values, principles and objectives of the Global Movement, and***
  - c. considerations of efficiency, effectiveness, governance, sustainability and safety,***
- what structures and modalities should the Global Movement consider to best organise ourselves, so we can grow into a Movement that truly represents the change it seeks?'***

Part 1 of the paper reflects on sections a, b and c of this question, before setting out in Part 2, a range of questions to be considered when thinking of potential shorter-term, longer-term and bridging options.

Our role in preparing this paper isn't to decide on behalf of the Movement, but rather to explore and study and present our reflections and guiding questions to facilitate further discussion within the wider movement on the different options before us, their pros and cons, and what types of structures are likely to be most complementary to the things we value most. It is for the Movement to weigh these pros and cons, debate, reflect and build a consensus in terms of the type of structure that would best fit. Once this decision is taken, the ICG will develop a concrete proposal for the Movement's structure and modalities, for further consultation and implementation.

It is important to note, that the reality of funding and resource availability will play a significant role in shaping what is possible. In other words, we need to be realistic in thinking through the options before us. This may require us to make compromises, both in terms of timing and sequencing, and in terms of scale. However, equally, it would be important to reflect on what we feel we cannot compromise on.

This paper draws on qualitative, descriptive, critical and good-practice analysis, utilising a range of data collection methods to examine a diversity of modalities and structures relevant to global movements, networks, coalitions and platforms. The paper draws on the following resources, which are made available in an **annex** online folder:

- **ISI's Global Movement Consultation Report (2020):** This documents the extensive process carried out by ISI in March 2020. It involved in-depth interviews with statelessness activists, affected people and civil society to determine if a Global Statelessness Movement is timely and needed.
- **ICG Questionnaires (2021):** These were surveys sent out to the wider movement in 2021, to identify capacity needs, existing expertise and resources and preferences of members around issues such as solidarity, consultation, and language inclusivity.
- **Case Studies (2021):** Ten case studies of movements and coalitions on their structures and approaches. Groups studied: #MeToo Movement, Asia Pacific Refugee Rights Network (APRRN), Association for Women In Development (AWID), Black Lives Matter, Global Network for the Right to Food and Nutrition, Indigenous People's Movements, International Detention Coalition (IDC) International Disability Alliance, International Lesbian Gay Bisexual Trans and Intersex Association (ILGA), and La Vía Campesina (LVC).
- **Options Paper draft 1 & Expert Responses:** A longer, earlier iteration of this Options Paper which in 2022 was presented to a group of movement building experts from other fields, and to those with experience running networks and campaigns within the statelessness field, and their detailed feedback on the paper.
- **Fundraising Field Needs Survey (2022):** A survey of the funding needs and barriers to accessing funding faced by actors in the statelessness ecosystem, and particularly focusing on impacted-person-led-groups.
- **Ecosystem Mapping (2022):** An in-depth mapping of the statelessness field to better understand who is operating in this space, how they operate, what their objectives are, their views on the Movement etc.
- **Global Movement Community Calls (2022):** Input from the wider movement through a range of community calls organised by the Interim Core Group in 2022.
- **Interim Core Group Retreat (2023):** Discussions and exercises carried out by the Interim Core Group

**The proposed next steps for this process are as follows:**

- From September-November 2023, there will be a series of online consultations with the wider movement on this Options Paper. The objective of these consultations is to walk people through the paper, answer any questions they may have and also take and key inputs of theirs on board. The consultations will be conducted in different languages, and a detailed schedule will be shared with movement members closer to the date.
- In January 2024, an updated paper (taking any feedback from the consultations on board), will be shared online. The paper will be made available in multiple languages. This will be accompanied with the publication of guiding questions for discussion and input from the wider movement.
- In February/March 2024, there will be a second series of online consultations with the wider movement. There will also be an in-person consultation at the World Statelessness Conference in Malaysia (February 2024). During these consultations there will be discussions on the guiding questions, to help build consensus on proposed structure and modalities.
- By end March 2024, members of the wider movement will be invited to share their written answers to the guiding questions, in order to identify the structure that best works for the Movement.
- In April – June 2024, the ICG will review all feedback received and put forward a more concrete proposal in terms of the structure and modalities for the Movement and next steps. The wider movement will have an opportunity to review and respond to this proposal.
- Next steps beyond this, will be captured in the proposal put forward by the ICG.

## PART 1: CONSIDERATIONS

### 1.1. The Statelessness Eco-System: its Assets and Resources, the place Stateless People have within it and calls for a Global Movement

Statelessness has different causes often rooted in discrimination. These include racial/ethnic discrimination, gender discrimination, state succession, settler colonialism, birth registration and inherited statelessness. Those who encounter statelessness face many challenges in life including access education, healthcare and the right to own property. Many are denied basic documents (birth, marriage, death certificates, passports etc.) and are vulnerable to arbitrary arrest and detention, as well as exploitation.

The issue of statelessness intersects with all of the biggest global challenges we face. It is simultaneously a human rights, development, migration and discrimination issue. It undermines democracy and the rule of law. It can be caused by conflict and disproportionately affects women and children. It violates civil liberties and creates a barrier to accessing justice. As more states instrumentalise nationality and treat it as a privilege, minority communities, refugees, migrants and displaced persons, human rights defenders, dissidents and journalists are all at risk of being deprived of their nationality – facing acute human rights deprivations as a result.

Addressing statelessness properly has been hindered by various barriers. These include closing civil society spaces, erosion of nationality rights, poor awareness and inadequate resourcing that contribute to serious difficulties for tackling the issue. Additionally, the field is affected by how it has evolved thus far. Historically, there has been a top-down approach of UN agencies, NGOs and academics taking the lead, often speaking on behalf of and side-lining people affected by statelessness and discrimination in nationality laws. There is a recognition that this needs to change with ongoing efforts to centre impacted communities and individuals and treat them as effective agents of change. NGOs must be accountable to them and create space for their meaningful engagement. It is in this context that the Global Movement Against Statelessness is both necessary, and emerging.

#### 1.1.1. The Statelessness Ecosystem

The global civil society constituting the statelessness ecosystem<sup>2</sup> is relatively small in comparison with the number of stakeholders involved and resources at the disposal of those working on refugee rights issues, for example. This is despite the similarities in the estimated global populations of refugees and of people affected by (the risks of) statelessness.

One of the advantages of being a small community, is the relative closeness within the field. Key actors tend to know each other and have histories of effective collaboration. However, the biggest disadvantage perhaps is acute under-resourcing, which means that needs always significantly outweigh capacity to address them.

The historical exclusion of affected communities, tokenistic opportunities offered to those with lived experience to 'tell their stories', the extractive nature of research, where communities have been used as sources of information, and significant power imbalances between more established organisations and emerging groups, with the latter often heavily dependent on the former for funding, have been familiar practices. **There is growing**

---

<sup>2</sup> The terms statelessness ecosystem refers to the NGOs, grassroots groups, advocates, activists and academics (both with and without lived experience of statelessness) working on the issue of statelessness, nationality and citizenship issues.

**acknowledgement that this must change, and emerging good practices to do so - at national, regional and global levels.** The emergence of the Global Movement is in itself a response to calls to change the status quo.

In terms of how the ecosystem is organized, at the global level, the Institute on Statelessness and Inclusion (ISI) is the only human rights organisation dedicated to the right to nationality and statelessness, globally. The Global Campaign for Equal Nationality Rights, a coalition of national and international organizations, independent activists, and allied UN agencies works on gender discriminatory nationality laws – a leading cause of statelessness. Other international organisations – Minority Rights Group International and the Norwegian Refugee Council for example, work at the intersection of statelessness and their main focus areas, such as minority rights and refugee rights respectively.

Regionally, several networks work exclusively on statelessness and the right to nationality. Americas Network on Nationality and Statelessness (Red ANA), Central Asia Network on Statelessness (CANS), European Network on Statelessness (ENS), Middle East and Northern Africa Network on Statelessness (Hawiati), Nationality For All – Asia Pacific (NFA) and Southern African Nationality Network (SANN) are all examples of such organisations, with an East African Network and an Asia-Pacific Regional Coalition currently being established. Some regional refugee or migrant rights networks, like the Asia Pacific Refugee Rights Network (APRRN) also have statelessness focal points.

A number of national organisations work on statelessness and nationality rights. The majority don't work primarily or exclusively on statelessness, but are human rights, legal service provision, research and advocacy organisations that work on statelessness among other issues. Some organisations are dedicated to statelessness and the right to nationality. There are several national coalitions and networks, such as in the Dominican Republic and India.

The Peter McMullin Centre on Statelessness in Melbourne is one of a few academic centres dedicated to statelessness, though there has been a growth in academic research and teaching on the subject.

Most importantly, there has been an upsurge in impacted-person-led-organisations and networks coming to prominence. Networks such as the Apatride Network and community spaces such as Statefree have emerged at regional and international levels. Nationally, groups like United Stateless (USA), Citizenship Affected Persons Network Nepal (CAPN), Nubian Rights Forum Kenya (NRF) and several others have gained more visibility and are playing greater leadership roles. Many groups rooted in communities disproportionately impacted by statelessness – the Rohingya, Dominicans of Haitian origin, the Roma etc. – are also prominent within the field.

### 1.1.2. The 2020 Consultations and the Call for Establishing a Global Statelessness Movement

In March 2020, the ISI team circulated a Concept Note entitled '**A Global Statelessness Movement: Time for Collective Action**' among several stateless individuals and NGOs dedicated to the issue. The concept was inspired by strong collaborations, generous partnership and a recognition that 'we are stronger together.' From April – July 2020, ISI consulted around 70 individuals with and without lived experience of statelessness. The consultations identified **a strong consensus that a Global Movement on Statelessness was a timely and much needed initiative.** The process further identified:

- The need to amplify the voices of stateless people directly, above those of intermediaries, thus challenging existing patterns of top-down actions on statelessness.
- That the top-down approach had created some mistrust among those impacted by statelessness. There were numerous suggestions on building trust and solidarity, emphasising inclusion, transparency, and open communication. The value of meeting each other and sharing experiences was reiterated.



- The potential for much stronger, unified action against statelessness, including through joint advocacy campaigns and collective engagement on international processes.
- That this was a space to stand strong together and engage in transformative, collective action.

There were also various challenges, dilemmas and possible options which were shared, including:

- Distinguishing between a movement and coalition in terms of process, structure and working methods whereby NGOs are more familiar with the latter, and affected communities more interested in the former.
- Understanding that hierarchy and power imbalances are not merely resolved by equal representation in the movement. This challenge is deeply rooted in the historical top-down approach in our field and existing structural inequalities in the world. Any serious effort to address this must confront the political, economic, capacity, language, mobility and other challenges which undermine true equality.
- That NGOs must ultimately become more accountable to affected communities and individuals.
- Practical challenges around building a sustainable movement such as fundraising. Relatedly: how do we collaboratively fundraise for the movement, by complementing funding for national and regional groups?

As an outcome of this process, there was agreement to move together in incrementally, through establishing an Interim Core Group, which would get the Movement off the ground.

### 1.1.3. Learnings from the 2022 Ecosystem Mapping

The 2022 Ecosystem Mapping by founder of Statefree Christiana Bukalo, while not a comprehensive study, provides a snapshot with several insights into the statelessness ecosystem. Bukalo interviewed and surveyed 66 respondents. While most respondents (over 65%) were connected to organisations, some were acting in their individual capacity (16%). While almost 60% of respondents worked nationally and locally, around 40% worked regionally and internationally. Of those surveyed, 57% had no lived experience of statelessness and only 13% were stateless at the time (over 20% had a personal connection to statelessness/unequal nationality rights). The respondents were generally well connected to regional and global initiatives on statelessness and the right to nationality: the nascent Global Movement being the entity with most connections in this regard.

According to the survey, most work in the sector focuses on awareness raising, policy advocacy, legal assistance, community work, paralegal support, activism and capacity building. Meanwhile, there's less focus on providing for the socio-economic and mental health needs of stateless communities. Thematically, most work focuses on legal identity, migration, documentation, civil and political rights, refugee rights, child rights, discrimination and socio-economic rights. Themes such as national security and counter-terrorism, state crime, citizenship stripping, immigration detention and climate change receive relatively less attention.

Respondents highlighted political, legal, economic and societal factors as the main external factors that impact their ability to work on the issue. Of the challenges identified, funding (almost 80%) was the biggest, with lack of awareness and engagement, capacity, challenges with networking and collaboration, strategic planning communications and reach, safety and wellbeing also being identified. Several respondents highlighted power imbalances within the field as a key challenge, calling for efforts to address discrimination and exclusion within the field, empower and centre stateless people and remunerate them for their time and expertise. 70% of respondents had encountered risk through their work – and 80% of those impacted said this shaped the way they worked going forward. They called for greater psychological, moral and emotional support, as well as emergency mechanisms for when people are under threat. While 77% received funding for their work, almost 20% did not. Only 11% of those who receive funding, felt that the level of funding received was sufficient.

Respondents identified several types of support that could be provided to help mitigate these challenges. They included funding, capacity building, better collaboration, more innovation, digital media and online communication, access to public events, knowledge sharing, and opportunities for strategic planning.

Of those interviewed, 94% expressed interest in joining the Global Movement, with the balance being neutral or not having an answer, due to lack of clarity at this stage, of the Movement's goals and objectives. 67% felt they could play an active role in the movement, with 10% feeling they had no capacity to do so, and the rest being neutral at this stage. The main ways in which respondents felt the Movement could support their work was through fundraising, capacity building, network and coalition building, awareness raising and communication. Several respondents also felt the Movement could play a strong advocacy role for the field. By the same token, respondents felt they could offer their skills to the Movement in these and other areas.

The mapping concluded with 7 take-aways for the Movement, to strengthen its offering to the field:

1. Stronger centring of stateless people within the field.
2. Implement systems to protect wellbeing.
3. Implement safety measures for actors at risk.
4. Improve global representation, prioritizing currently under-represented regions and countries, and addressing barriers to inclusion such as language.
5. Define clear goals and provide strategic clarity for the Movement.
6. Foster greater exchange and learning opportunities.
7. Strengthen funding for the field.

#### 1.1.4. The Global Movement's Impact on the Statelessness Ecosystem

As evident from the above, the need for the Global Movement has been articulated by the statelessness field, with guidance on why the Movement is needed, and what it should be. However, the Movement isn't emerging out of a vacuum, but rather, into a small but vibrant eco-system of civil society actors working through a range or means to address and combat statelessness. Inevitably, some difficulties within the current ecosystem have been highlighted, with the Movement being seen as a vehicle through which efforts to address them can be consolidated. However, there's plenty within the current ecosystem that's working well, which has immense potential, that the Movement can build on, contribute to and also benefit from.

The insertion of a Global Movement into an existing field will be disruptive. Some disruption is both necessary and representative of the most important reasons for the establishment of the Movement if it results in:

- more meaningful centring of stateless people and accountability to them;
- more serious and consistent efforts to build solidarity and trust within the field;
- identifying and countering extractive and exploitative practices that marginalise stateless people;
- openly addressing power imbalances and resourcing challenges that impact stateless groups;
- acknowledging and acting on the need to cede more space for stateless people to represent the field; and
- being more effective in jointly advocating on the issue at international and other forums.

But there also is a risk that the Movement will detract resources from existing groups, duplicate rather than build on efforts, and generate conflict. To mitigate this, there must be clear communication and coordination, and openness on all sides to share resources within our resource-strapped field, and joint efforts – that the Movement can contribute to – to grow resourcing for everyone, prioritising impacted-person led groups.

## 1.2. The Identity, Values, Principles and Objectives of the Global Movement

In order to determine the structure and modalities that best fit the Movement, it is crucial to reflect on our identity, values, principles and objectives. The structure and modalities we choose, must at a minimum, not contravene them, and ideally should facilitate the right environment for them to thrive. For example, if centring and being led by those impacted by statelessness is a main priority, the structure we choose should a) have built in leadership positions for those with lived experience, and b) support capacity development and leadership training, so people with lived experience can be supported and encouraged to thrive in leadership roles.

### 1.2.1. Identity

Some core elements to the Movement's identity must be reflected in its structure and modalities:

1. The Movement is a strictly civil society space. It is for those with lived experience of statelessness and discriminatory nationality laws and their allies. This includes academics, advocates, activists, artists and NGOs. By definition, government and UN actors cannot be part of the Movement.
2. The Movement centres those directly impacted by statelessness. It values the collaboration and shared responsibility of those with and without lived experience. It ultimately aims to be led by those with lived experience, recognising their expertise as vital to our mission and as the core of our identity.
3. The Movement's identity is intrinsically connected to its values, as articulated in its [Manifesto](#).
4. The Movement's identity is connected to its objectives, which relate both to how the Movement can positively impact the statelessness ecosystem, and the real-world impact it aims to have on the issue.

A significant step forward has been naming the Movement. There were many discussions within the ICG about the Movement's name. Considerations were driven by core values of inclusivity, clarity of purpose and a desire for the name to be representative of our shared values and identity. Over 80 names were discussed before narrowing down to three options that were shared with the wider movement, resulting in selection of the name **'Global Movement Against Statelessness'**.

One discussion within the ICG, was whether to include the word 'stateless' or 'statelessness' in the name. We were mindful that this word best captures the essence of the injustice we are collectively working to address. However, many individuals and communities who have been arbitrarily denied/deprived of their nationality, reject the term 'stateless', particularly because it has been used to undermine their belonging to and legal right to a nationality in their homeland(s). There were also questions about its interpretation as understanding varies from language to language. For example, the Arabic translation of 'lacking nationality (certificate)' is "عديم جنسية", whereas the term "stateless" can be interpreted literally as 'state-less' —i.e., lacking a state to belong to.

We therefore considered names which both used the term 'stateless'/'statelessness' and which used other terms ('nationality', 'citizenship', 'belonging' etc.). However, we realised without including 'stateless' or 'statelessness', the name wouldn't effectively convey the main issue we work on. So, we ultimately looked at options that use 'stateless' or 'statelessness', in a way that shows we are working to address this injustice. We hope this approach will enable those who reject being identified as 'stateless' to join our Movement.

### 1.2.2. Values

The structure and modalities must be consistent with the values captured in the Manifesto:

**Awareness and assertion** of the equal dignity and rights of all human beings. This means acknowledging those directly impacted by statelessness and positioning them as our leaders. . It also refers to the vitality of the experience and perspective of those directly impacted by statelessness to our mission and common objectives, which help guide the actions and priorities of the Movement towards addressing the root causes of statelessness and realising nationality rights for all, which the Movement believes will benefit all of humanity.

**Belonging** of the community of stateless people, activists, organisations and stakeholders that come together under the Movement. Belonging also refers to the creation of a space in which members feel safe, empowered, heard, and held up by a community that ignites a deeper understanding of human rights and working towards upholding nationality rights for all.

**Diversity and Collectiveness:** the recognition and acknowledgement of the diverse social, political, and cultural contexts that the Movement encompasses. Individuals and organisations bring different backgrounds, perspectives and experiences to the Movement, particularly with regard to statelessness, discrimination and human rights. Collectiveness involves acknowledging positionalities of those constituting the Movement, i.e., the ways in which social identities, such as race, gender, nationality, religion, or socio-economic status, may shape the Movement’s perspectives and experiences.

**Representation:** to effectively represent the movement, individuals must be aware of and sensitive to power dynamics, diverse perspectives and experiences that exist within it. This includes acknowledging that some may hold more power or influence than others, as well as different priorities or goals. As such, the Movement must prioritise being inclusive, promoting active listening and working collaboratively, to ensure that all voices are heard and included in decision-making processes. This may involve actively seeking out and amplifying the voices of marginalised or underrepresented groups within the movement.

**Universality of human rights:** We exist in a shared humanity where equal dignity and rights must be enjoyed by all human beings. This requires building solidarity with other social justice movements and also showing how statelessness intersects with other issues and ensuring that the Movement’s actions are always in step with human rights principles and norms.

### 1.2.3. Principles

The Principles of the Movement relate to key standards that would shape its day-to-day operations. Therefore, it is essential that the structure and modalities facilitate the furtherance of these principles.

**Accessibility and Inclusiveness:** the ways in which the Movement communicates, promotes inclusion and reaches its members and stakeholders. Accessibility ensures our capacity to be global and ensure equality and non-discrimination on the basis of - race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability, religion, language or other factors. While we strive for inclusivity and accessibility, we acknowledge that this is tied to capacity and resources to be able to engage the wider community in the process. We are committed to ensuring equitable engagement.

**Accountability and reflexivity:** the obligation to take responsibility for its actions and be responsible for the outcomes of its activities. Accountability and reflexivity help to ensure that the Movement and its members act in the best interests of stateless individuals and work towards achieving the movement's goals and objectives. It also helps to build trust among stakeholders and promotes good governance and ethical conduct. To ensure accountability, it is important to establish clear policies and procedures for decision-making, resource allocation, and performance monitoring, and to debrief, have honest conversations about mistakes made and find ways to grow and collectively move forward through continuous learning and improvement.

**Confidentiality:** the protection of sensitive information, and policies on what may be shared within the Movement or with external partners. Confidentiality helps protect the privacy and security of members. It also helps protect the integrity and effectiveness of the Movement by preventing disclosure of sensitive information that may compromise the safety and well-being of members. It is important to establish clear policies and procedures for the handling and sharing of sensitive information.

**Transparency:** The open and honest disclosure of information related to the Movement's activities, decision-making processes, and financial management. Ensuring that relevant information is readily available and easily accessible to stakeholders, including stateless individuals, civil society organisations, donors, and the general public. Transparency helps to build trust and credibility, while promoting greater engagement and participation. It is important to establish clear policies and procedures, that also take confidentiality requirements into account.

**Kindness, patience and respect:** The Movement is committed to treating all members with kindness, patience and respect, creating an environment that recognises dignity and equality and is welcoming and inclusive to all. The Movement commits to avoid language or behaviour that is discriminatory, derogatory, or offensive.

**Inclusion and consensus:** Inclusion involves ensuring that all stakeholders, particularly stateless individuals and their communities, are actively engaged and represented in decision-making processes. Consensus-building and collaboration involve working together to achieve shared goals and objectives through a process of negotiation and compromise. Inclusion and consensus help to build trust and legitimacy among stakeholders by ensuring that decisions are made through a transparent and inclusive process that considers diverse perspectives and interests. They also promote ownership and accountability, as stakeholders are more likely to support decisions that they have had a role in shaping.

**Best interests and benefit of the doubt:** In situations of conflict, it is important to give each other the benefit of the doubt, that we are all acting in the best interest of the movement. This requires members to make a clear commitment to act in the movement's best interests. Relatedly, it will be necessary to be transparent about conflict of interests and clear around representation roles.

#### 1.2.4. Objectives

The Movement's objectives should inform the type of structure that will be adopted. Ultimately, as set out in our Manifesto, our overall Mission is *"the eradication of statelessness, the achievement of equal nationality rights, and the realisation of human rights of all stateless people."*

Our objectives can be grouped into 'inward facing objectives' – which reflect the Movement's ambition to shape and influence the statelessness field, and 'outward facing objectives', which relate to the ultimate impact we aim to have on the issue of statelessness and the lives of stateless people. Several objectives can be extrapolated from the Manifesto text. Others have emerged through consultation, eco-system mapping and ICG discussions.

#### Inward facing objectives

Manifesto Text	Extrapolated Objective
<i>We centre those directly impacted by statelessness as leaders of our movement, recognising their expertise and lived experience as vital to our mission</i>	To change the way we individually and collectively work and organise, so that stateless people are at the centre and in leadership positions

<i>We stand together in solidarity, choosing boldly inclusive and egalitarian collaboration</i>	To prioritise strengthening collaboration and building trust and solidarity
<i>We create and foster connections among people and communities impacted by statelessness and civil society allies</i>	To strengthen connections, coordination and joint action in the field

Other inward facing objectives that emerged through consultations, mapping and ICG discussions are:

1. Strengthen wellbeing, provide safety measures and address risks.
2. Expand the Movement’s reach to improve global representation, prioritizing currently under-represented regions and countries, and address barriers to inclusion such as language.
3. Provide a global platform to connect statelessness stakeholders and foster greater information exchange, capacity development and learning opportunities.
4. Increase and facilitate flexible financial and other resources/resourcing for stateless-led organisations and other key actors in the statelessness field.

### Outward facing objectives

<b>Manifesto Text</b>	<b>Extrapolated Objective</b>
<i>We recognise that this requires holding those in power to account and pursuing structural change</i>	To pursue structural change by holding decision and policymakers accountable
<i>We are determined to elevate and amplify the voices of stateless people at the international, regional and national levels, to influence policy makers, educate the community at large, and inspire global change</i>	To strengthen voices, stories and communications on statelessness and equal nationality rights in order to achieve capacity to lead the way to positive change
<i>We are committed to work to connect, ally, and engage diverse social justice actors from the grassroots to the international levels</i>	To build alliances with other movements and social justice actors to increase our collective impact

Other outward facing objectives that emerged through consultations, mapping and ICG discussions are:

1. Advocate and facilitate representation of people affected by statelessness and discriminatory nationality laws in relevant global convenings.
2. Support national and thematic efforts to address statelessness through global engagement and from a global perspective.
3. Cooperate with good practice actors in the field of statelessness in advancing the Movement's mission.
4. Work to raise global awareness and persuade global public opinion on the issue.

It remains for the ICG – in consultation with the wider movement – to develop its strategy, prioritise objectives and work out plans to pursue them. Learning from other movements, it is important in strategic planning, to focus on collective involvement in terms of vision development, agenda setting, and goal and action prioritisation. The ICG began this process at a retreat in Nepal in April 2023, and has focused on important questions and considerations to be brought to the wider movement. For instance, there was emphasis on the need to address factors like colonialism, racism, the patriarchy and political motivators in conversations about statelessness.

Members also discussed the collective perspective and where the movement sits within the wider statelessness ecosystem. This includes how we must adopt a bottom-up approach, collaborate with regional and national groups, facilitate cross-regional exchanges, and not overshadow or encroach on the resources of national actors.

Other themes include the movement's potential to impact the day-to-day lives of stateless people. Suggestions included advocating for key changes, such as access to banking, freedom of movement, etc. Moreover, the movement can support local partners and activists to decide what brings most impact to them.

Finally, there was agreement that the movement must be mindful of its limitations. While it is critical to identify goals, objectives and activities, it is equally important to recognize what we cannot do and not commit to issues beyond our capacity at the time.

### 1.3. Considerations of Efficiency, Effectiveness, Governance, Sustainability and Safety

The final set of key considerations to bear in mind when determining the structure and modalities of our Movement, are more operational. How do we ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the Movement? What type of governance and oversight is necessary? How do we take decisions and address situations of conflict? How do we build a Movement that is financially sustainable and also sustains the engagement of its members? And how do we ensure that the safety of members is always a paramount consideration?

#### 1.3.1. Efficiency and Effectiveness

Finding the right balance between being democratic and inclusive on one hand, and effective and efficient on the other, is crucial. Given resource limitations, it is important to identify the most effective path to reach our objectives. Balancing the pursuit of the Movement's objectives, while adhering to our core values and principles requires careful consideration of the following two aspects:

**Structure and organization:** The movement needs a structure and organizational model that allows for efficient decision-making and action, while still upholding our values. Previous consultations yielded diverse opinions on this matter. Some advocated for a formalized structure with a secretariat for impact, strategic planning, and coordination, while others expressed concerns about power imbalances and conflicting agendas, favouring a non-hierarchical and flexible approach that emphasizes trust building, networking, and thematic organization. Suggestions have also been made for regional representation and the establishment of a council of stateless people. While preferences for structure vary, the importance of day-to-day engagement with, and participation of the wider movement was emphasized.

**Approach and objective:** There are two key considerations in this regard.

- The movement should focus on creating a values-driven space that prioritizes internal aspects such as inclusion, trust-building, addressing power imbalances, and fostering a global community.
- It should also function as a platform for those with lived experiences of statelessness, enabling them to advocate for real-world change in a strategic and coordinated manner.

While it may be desirable to pursue both objectives, it is necessary to consider prioritisation and sequencing. To make informed decisions, deeper conversations about objectives and values may be needed. Acknowledging that no single structure will be perfect due to varying perspectives and practical constraints such as funding, resources, and time availability, it is crucial to identify non-negotiable principles and areas where compromises can be made.

#### 1.3.2. Governance

Governance in this context relates to a system that provides oversight while supporting the setting of priorities, making strategic decisions, evaluating performance, ensuring accountability and transparency, and determining

defined roles and responsibilities. The governance model can include informal steering committees, working or coordination committees, formal boards with constitutional structures, councils, and advisory groups for strategic and technical inputs. There are various decisions to be taken on the nature and functions of these bodies and their connection to the secretariat, operations and wider movement. Based on previous consultations and the study of other movements, there are certain key factors to consider:

**Structure:** A highly structured movement would involve strong governance and oversight measures, with clear criteria for membership and structured ways in which members interact with secretariats. A loosely structured movement would have fewer structured governance and oversight measures, with greater collective accountability and trust serving as a basis for regular oversight. A hybrid movement would have a governance structure and oversight measures in place that would allow for coalescing around a set of values and objectives.

**Leadership/representation:** It is important to ensure representation in leadership to allow for diverse leadership roles, not filled solely by those with the most resources, visibility, or traditionally valued 'talent' based on the false idea of meritocracy. Those with lived experience should occupy central leadership and governance positions, while also ensuring equal representation across varied regions, including the expertise of trusted allies in areas required to build the movement.

**Decision-making:** Another key consideration may be to identify a suitable decision-making mechanism and space that informs the governance system. The mechanism can be consultative through member engagement in the development of operational plans and strategic plans. The space could be virtual Annual General Meetings, in-person International Conferences or hybrid sessions. Members should be engaged in major decisions. Leadership should be representative, transparent and democratic, and accountable to the members.

**Power balance:** past dialogues with members have highlighted the importance of avoiding NGO dominance and ensuring centring and leadership of affected persons. There are also concerns related to representation in terms of the type of stakeholders, region, gender, and thematic focus of work. As such, the dynamic to be struck between the core group and the wider Movement is a delicate one.

**Process of forming the governance body/system:** Democratic elections are viewed as the most common way of selecting members for boards. Depending on how structured the movement is, these processes would be clarified in pre-written agreements such as a constitution, by-laws, organizational manuals etc. However, there is the consideration that elections can be divisive and cause factions within the movement, and that initially at least, there may be other options to select leadership positions that are more suitable.

**Addressing Conflict:** There will inevitably be conflicts within the movement, and our approach to dealing with conflict will be important. Creating a sense of joint ownership, and in principle, giving each other the benefit of the doubt will go a long way. Working together and perceiving disagreement as an opportunity for compromise, learning and improvement were emphasized. Developing guidelines for discussion, active listening, and providing feedback were considered essential. Solidarity and trust were recognized as crucial in managing conflicts and disagreements. The Indigenous Movements' consensus-building approach was highlighted as a model to follow. Managing expectations and clearly stating limitations were seen as helpful in conflict resolution.

### 1.3.3. Financial Sustainability

The more structured and resource-intensive our Movement becomes; it will become more challenging to ensure financial sustainability. However, a more structured movement can also increase its capacity to sustain itself. The key question is how to develop a financially sustainable movement that strikes a balance between resource-



intensive operations and long-term viability, as has successfully been done by some loosely organized movements like #MeToo and #BlackLivesMatter.

Individuals behind movements invest significant time and effort, but their work may not receive adequate recognition. To enhance financial sustainability for members, two principles are crucial: compensating affected persons for their time and increasing viability for smaller, less financially stable groups to participate. An example can be drawn from the UN voluntary fund for Indigenous people and various regional NGOs that play a vital role in enabling engagement with Indigenous People's Movements.

The statelessness field, as a whole, is severely under resourced. The movement should avoid fundraising in a way that drains limited resources available to national and other partners. However, while financial sustainability presents challenges, it also provides opportunities to rethink funding for the field. There is a role for the Movement to expand resourcing for the field, rather than competing for the minimal funds that currently are allocated to work on statelessness. Movements like ILGA and AWID employ resourcing strategies that leverage influential activists and allies to access philanthropy, decision-makers, and funding opportunities. Diversifying funding sources and tailoring budgets to regional or thematic needs contribute to their sustainability. AWID's diverse membership strategy, including funding memberships, contributes to its sustainability.

#### 1.3.4. Member Engagement: Participation and Contribution

Members must feel a strong sense of ownership, solidarity, and responsibility towards the movement for it to be sustainable. Investing time and effort, even in uncertain circumstances, enhances the movement's sustainability. Facilitating spaces to build trust and a sense of community is therefore essential. Similarly, ensuring a dedicated space for affected individuals to collaborate and build relationships, leverage existing initiatives, and address concerns is crucial.

There may be concerns about inadvertently creating another institution that competes with existing groups for resources, undermines their sustainability, and develops its own agenda (as opposed to our collective vision). Likewise, there also exists concern around balancing participation amid the wider statelessness movement, competing priorities, limited time, language barriers, and logistical challenges. By considering these issues and drawing on successful examples from other movements, our movement can strengthen collective responsibility, sustainability, and impact.

#### 1.3.5. Safety and Risk

People with lived experience of statelessness and discriminatory nationality laws can face serious risks and vulnerabilities in their own advocacy. Barriers such as language, economics, security, and prejudices significantly impact their ability to continue their fight, while protecting their personal mental health, social life, and dignity. Ensuring safety and addressing the risks faced by members of the Movement and the Movement itself is of paramount importance. By fostering a culture of care, providing necessary resources, and establishing support mechanisms, the Movement should strive to create a secure environment for its members.

During its April 2023 retreat, the ICG reflected upon potential risks and proposed solutions for consideration by the wider movement. Among the myriad of risks, the ICG identified not only human rights aspects but also politico-legal factors such as discriminatory laws and hostile governments or political parties. Socio-political factors like xenophobia and border disputes, community perceptions and prejudices grounded in patriarchy and misogyny, further compound these risks. Further, impacted persons face financial exclusion and risk being criminalised due to their lack of legal status. Within a wider context of shrinking civil society space, those

impacted by statelessness are even less secure and more vulnerable to risk. As the Movement becomes more visible, individuals representing it may face increased scrutiny, including state violence and attacks on reputation.

Given the human rights violations and harsh conditions faced by affected individuals, those working in the field are at risk of vicarious and secondary trauma. Movement members may also experience mental health risks, privacy concerns, and various forms of mistreatment, including bullying, threats, and sexual harassment.

Other risks include possible growth of mistrust and misunderstanding within the Movement, which can compromise safety. Or risks that some members of the movement may face, due to being publicly associated with other members, in particularly divisive and challenging political contexts. Moreover, it is essential to be mindful of the risk of repeating past mistakes that have occurred in the statelessness field. The Movement can also face reputational risk, related to funding sources and other factors. Reputational risk as a result of members mis-speaking in the Movement's name – particularly in more decentralised structures, should be considered.

While the process of risk identification is ongoing and requires regular revisiting and input, discussion within the wider movement is necessary to ensure that, at the very least, the movement can effectively mitigate the major challenges and risks envisioned during its early stages. These are considerations that must be taken into account when thinking about the structure and modalities of the movement.

## PART 2: OPTIONS FOR THE STRUCTURE AND MODALITIES

In Part 2, we pose questions related to how the Movement can be structured. Part 2 first looks at the current structure, with the term of this current ICG up for renewal in April 2024. We ask whether in the short-term, the current structure should be extended, adapted/tweaked or replaced with something else. The paper then puts forward several questions to inform discussions on the longer-term structure and modalities. Finally, the paper looks at what bridging measures may be necessary between the short and long terms.

### 2.1. The Current Structure and Short-term Prospects

The ICG was established in November 2020 and tasked with driving the Movement forward, with support from the ISI Secretariat. It initially comprised 23 members (12 with lived experience of statelessness and 11 without), taking various factors including geographic representation, gender balance, type of work, lived experience and NGO representation into consideration. In March 2023, the ICG was further streamlined and restructured to comprise 14 members, half of whom have lived experience of statelessness. Two of those with lived experience were appointed Co-leads, a first step in the transition of the movement's leadership to those affected by statelessness. An Advisory Committee (AC) of 12 people (half with lived experience) was also constituted. As of June 2023, there were around 193<sup>3</sup> members of the wider movement on the Movement's mailing list. There are four ICG Working Groups:

1. **Solidarity and Action Working Group (SAWG):** Designing and implementing trust, solidarity and capacity-building activities for a more cohesive, resilient and sustainable Movement.
2. **Structure and Modalities Working Group (SMWG):** Facilitating consultation on structure and modalities, building consensus on values and objectives, and developing the proposed structure and modalities.
3. **Fundraising Working Group (FWG):** Developing a budget and fundraising plan and related policies and taking forward fundraising and donor relations.

---

<sup>3</sup> Updated on 01 September 2023

4. **PR Working Group (PRWG):** Branding, launching the Movement, developing and maintaining a website, social media, mailing list and communications with the wider movement and external stakeholders.

The ICG has focused on six priority areas. The below table shows progress made with regard to each:

Priority	Progress
Developing Manifesto	The Manifesto was developed through a consultative process.
Implementing inward facing activities	The ICG developed a strategy and started implementing inward facing activities, prioritising community building, trust-building, peer learning and capacity building sessions.
Developing structure and modalities	The ICG researched other movements, developed this Options Paper and consulted the wider movement. It is also developing various internal policies on safety and risk, a code of conduct, fundraising etc.
Developing outward facing activities and objectives	The ICG began this process at the 2023 Nepal retreat and will take it forward in consultation with the wider movement.
Fundraising	While ISI took responsibility for fundraising for the Movement's first 2-3 years, the ICG has developed and is now implementing its fundraising strategy.
Thinking about longer-term strategies and priorities	The ICG has begun this process, which relates closely to the process of building consensus on the structure and modalities of the Movement.

The wider movement will be providing input on the structure and modalities of the Movement, based on this paper, in February/March. When the ICG's current term is up for renewal in April 2024, the Movement will be at a pivotal phase of its development, with concerted action required in several areas:

1. Consultation and agreement of a strategic plan, including articulation of priority objectives and activities.
2. Outreach to grow the Movement, prioritising underrepresented regions and groups.
3. Consultation and agreement on key policies including on safety and risk, language and inclusion, representing the movement etc.
4. Pursuing outward facing objectives through implementing Movement activities.
5. Stepping up inward-facing activities and drawing in more meaningful participation of the wider movement.
6. Establishing the Movement's position as a key actor in the statelessness ecosystem and building relationships with other stakeholders.
7. Strengthening engagement and involvement of the wider movement and increasing opportunities for members of the wider movement to contribute to and benefit from the Movement.
8. On the basis of consultation results, developing more concrete option(s) for structure and modalities, consulting the wider movement on this and moving towards implementation.
9. Strengthening fundraising for the Movement and contextualising this within wider resourcing for the statelessness field.
10. Reaching out to and building closer ties with other social justice movements, UN allies and other stakeholders.

Questions of 'what is possible' will also be shaped by available funding and other forms of resourcing, including availability and ability of members to contribute time and expertise.

Bearing in mind this projected expansion and intensification of work for the Movement after it is launched, a number of **structural questions** emerge in the short term:

1. Should the ICG's term be extended by a further 1-2 year period?

2. Should the ICG be restructured an/or expanded to enable it to meet the growing demands of an expanded role as set out above?
3. Should there be a new recruitment drive for the ICG, to bring in new members, and how should this be conducted?
4. Should ISI continue as the secretariat for the ICG, and should there be any review of/changes to its role?
5. How can the ICG do better at engaging the wider movement and giving them a greater sense of ownership over the Movement, and involvement in decision making?
6. Are there any other structures that need to be set up in the short-term, e.g., an exclusive space for those with lived experience of statelessness, thematic steering committees or working groups?
7. How can this period be used to transition into the longer-term structure agreed by the Movement?

**These are the first set of questions for further discussion with the wider movement during the consultation phase.** Based on the outcomes of these discussions, it will be possible to develop a short-term plan for the 2024-2025 period.

## 2.2. Long Term Options

The March 2022 iteration of the Options Paper, which was shared with movement building experts and is available in the annexes, set out 6 options in terms of how the Movement can be structured. While that paper set these options out in greater detail, it is not necessary to do so again here. Instead, the below table summarises these 6 options and some of their main pros and cons:

	<b>Centralised</b>	<b>De-centralised</b>
<b>Highly Structured</b>	<p>Strong governance and oversight measures, with clear criteria for membership and established ways in which members interact with the secretariat.</p> <p><b>Pros:</b> a strong global operational coordination and governance structure and a dedicated team to implement strategic plans and oversee/support member-based initiatives. <b>Cons:</b> it may not function in practice as a movement, but more as a network with more ownership by the secretariat. It requires considerable resources for both the secretariat and movement members.</p>	<p>Rather than one centralised secretariat, would have a number of strong regional, country (or thematically organised) secretariats that (may) have greater autonomy to establish rules of membership etc.</p> <p><b>Pros:</b> allows for members to align and connect on areas of interest and priority and is a more bottom-up approach. <b>Cons:</b> there are risks of silos and a less coordinated global voice, as well as duplicating existing regional networks.</p>
<b>Loosely Structured</b>	<p>Fewer structured governance and oversight measures, with collective accountability and trust serving as a basis for oversight. Less structure in terms of organisation, representation and strategic direction, more based on common cause and trust.</p> <p><b>Pros:</b> allows for more collective action, organic and engaged membership, and more ability for members to represent and act. <b>Cons:</b> less coordinated and there is likely to be less capacity and a heavy reliance on volunteers and organisational member support.</p>	<p>With no regional/country/thematic secretariats, with, at the very most, different organisations that are part of the movement offering limited secretarial support. The movement would coalesce around a common set of values and objectives.</p> <p><b>Pros:</b> This would allow members to align and connect on areas of interest and priority. <b>Cons:</b> very little coordination and poses the risk of some regions being better organised than others.</p>

<b>Hybrid</b>	<p>Governance structures and oversight measures in place and would allow for coalescing around a set of values and objectives with criteria and a process for membership. It would allow for different ways for members to interact with the secretariat and present more scope for the structure to evolve and find its natural equilibrium.</p> <p><b>Pros:</b> Benefits of a small secretariat coordinating team with a focus on broader member engagement. More adaptive and flexible. <b>Cons:</b> Heavy reliance on volunteers and ‘building’ the movement might take precedence over ‘acting’ as a movement.</p>	<p>Regional/thematic/country secretariats which may or may not be hosted by organisations who are members of the movement and would give these secretariats more scope to develop their own structure which suits their contexts.</p> <p><b>Pros:</b> Allows for regional, thematic and country-level coordination and responsive action and also for members to align and connect on areas of interest and priority. <b>Cons:</b> Risk of siloing, less coordinated and visible global voice and structure and the duplication of existing regional networks.</p>
---------------	---	--

Instead of revisiting and fleshing out these six options, we pose a series of questions to consider. We feel that having discussions based on these questions, to test and build our thinking, will result in us having greater collective clarity about which option(s) would be best suited to the Movement.

Before getting to these questions, below is a reminder of the main considerations that should shape our decision on structure and modalities, which were elaborated on in Part One:

*‘Considering:*

- a. the statelessness eco-system: its assets and resources, the place stateless people have within it and calls for a Global Movement*
- b. the identity, values, principles and objectives of the Global Movement, and*
- c. considerations of efficiency, effectiveness, governance, sustainability and safety,*

*what structures and modalities should the Global Movement consider to best organise ourselves, so we can grow into a Movement that truly represents the change it seeks?’*

### 2.2.1. Questions for Consideration

Below, are the key questions for consideration, when thinking about the longer-term structure and modalities of the Movement. All members of the wider movement will be provided an opportunity to answer these questions. Based on answers received, the ICG will develop a more concrete plan for consultation and implementation. A realistic timeline for implementation would be after 2025, also factoring in challenges around funding, capacity and resources more generally, as well as the other short-term priorities of the Movement that must be taken forward.

#### **1. Should we register the Movement as an NGO?**

One of the key questions to consider, are the pros and cons of registering the Movement as an organisation. If we do register, the Movement will be an independent entity, not dependent on other organisations to ‘host’ it. However, the act of registration will immediately formalise the structure and bring it within a regulatory framework. There will be questions of where it is best to register the movement, with implications in terms of regulations, staffing and access to funding. If we follow the decentralised model, we can register in multiple countries. This will further complicate the structure, with added costs.

Equally, we should consider the alternatives to registration. What are the consequences of not registering? Will this result in the organisation(s) that host the Movement wielding too much power? Are there other risks related to staffing etc.? It also may be an option to view the Movement as a ‘collective’ and utilise an online platform or space – such as Open Collective - to organise and convene the Movement. Finally, there is the question of whether

registering the movement is a longer-term objective for us to consider at a later stage, while acknowledging that we are not quite at that place yet.

## **2. What governance structures should we have?**

It may be premature to ask this question until we take other decisions (around registration, structure etc.). However, it is worth looking at whether there are any minimal 'good practice' governance structures and requirements that the Movement will want to have in place, regardless of the structure we end up with. For example, should there be a Board that provides oversight? What characteristics are we looking for in Board members? Should there be an advisory function? What are the relationships and lines of reporting and accountability between Board, Movement leadership, secretariat, wider membership etc.?

## **3. What leadership structures should we have? How should we select people into leadership positions? How do we move towards leadership by lived-experience, and what is the role of those without lived experience?**

Simply put, where does the power sit within the Movement, and how is this shared among different stakeholders? There is a stated commitment to centring and being led by those with lived experience of statelessness, but what does this look like in practice? And what does this mean for the roles that can be played by those without lived experience? What is the relationship between those serving in the secretariat and those occupying positions of leadership and responsibility? How does the wider movement meaningfully engage to help shape the strategy and priorities of the Movement? Importantly, how do we select people into leadership roles, and how do we support them to develop the skills and capacities to enable them to thrive in these roles?

## **4. What should the secretariat function look like and what should its role be?**

Depending on the structure we settle on, what type of role should the secretariat(s) be playing? What does the secretariat need to do its job properly, and how do we ensure mutual accountability between the secretariat and those in leadership positions? What are the risks of the secretariat overstepping its role, or taking greater ownership of the Movement? Similarly, what are the risks of the Movement being ineffective due to the secretariat not driving it forward?

## **5. What kind of membership criteria/structure should be set?**

What is the criteria for membership of the Movement? Does the current criteria (persons aligned to the manifesto of the Movement, who do not represent UN agencies or governments) suffice or do we need to flesh this out more? Should members be expected to make a particular commitment to contributing towards the Movement's activities, that they will be held accountable towards? Should we categorize individual and institutional memberships? Should we make a distinction between members with lived experience of statelessness and those without?

## **6. What structures should be in place to ensure wider movement ownership and engagement in the delivery of Movement objectives?**

How can the wider movement be encouraged to actively participate in the Movement, and feel a sense of ownership in this regard? How can the Movement deliver for the wider membership, and how can the wider membership be brought in to support the Movement? What are the risks of alienation or conflict between those in positions of responsibility and the wider movement, and how can these be mitigated?

## **7. How is the Movement situated within the statelessness ecosystem and how centralised/decentralised should we be?**

What place does the Movement occupy within the wider statelessness ecosystem? Does this warrant a more centralised approach through a global secretariat? Is there a risk of duplication and/or competition with the regional networks if a decentralised approach is taken? Is there a role the regional networks can play to support

this decentralised approach? What are the risks associated with that? How do we foster strong communication, transparency and collaboration between the Movement and key global and regional actors?

**8. How do we ensure we embody our identity, values and principles as a Movement?**

Do we need to have further conversations around identity, values and principles, in light of the discussion on structure? What are values and principles that may be vulnerable to erosion, as the Movement becomes more structured? How do we protect against that?

**9. How do we achieve the right balance in terms of matters of efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, safety and risk management?**

How do we ensure that the structure of the Movement ultimately enables us to achieve both our inward facing and outward facing objectives? Where there may be a tension between these, how do we prioritise and sequence action going forward?

**10. Who speaks on behalf of the Movement?**

Should the Movement have identified spokespersons, who are authorised (and trained and supported) to speak on its behalf and to represent it externally? Or should there be a more *ad hoc* approach to this? How do we protect against any member claiming to speak on behalf of the Movement and related risks of contradictory or mixed messaging, or even damaging messaging?

**11. How do we take decisions? How do we set our priorities, strategies and objectives?**

We speak about decision making by consensus, but what does this actually look like? Is it practical for all decisions to be made by consensus, and what is to be done when no consensus can be reached? Which decisions can be delegated to the secretariat, to those in leadership positions or the Board? Which decisions should require input from the wider membership? Of particular importance, are decisions with regard to setting priorities, strategies and objectives.

**12. Who holds the budget?**

How do we set our annual budget, and who is responsible for this? How do we approach fundraising, and taking decisions on which expenditures to prioritise, in situations where we haven't raised our full budget?

**13. What are the things we need to protect against/prioritise?**

With regard to all of the above, and considering the discussion in Part 1, what are the main non-negotiables – in terms of core values and principles we will stick to, and which our structure and modalities must both comply with and also enable to thrive? What are the main concerns we have, and eventualities we should protect against? What are the main things we should prioritise?

**These are the second set of questions for further discussion with the wider movement during the consultation phase.** By discussing these questions and exploring them together, we will be able to better identify where we have common ground, what is really important to us, and where we may still have diverging opinions on what the best way forward is. These conversations will be invaluable to thinking through in more concrete terms, what the structure of the movement should be. Based on the outcomes of these discussions, it will be possible to develop more concrete option(s) for consideration and implementation.

In other words, the outcome of this consultation won't be a 'readymade structure', but rather, a clearer sense of what the wider movement wants, which the ICG can then shape and work with.

## 2.3. Bridging Between the Short Term and Long Term

Bearing in mind that through this process of consultation and consensus building, we will have a clearer sense of how the Movement should be structured in broad terms, but not at the level of detail necessary to actually action this, there will inevitably be a bridging period between the short term (2024-2025) and the longer-term (post 2025) in terms of fleshing out and implementing the structure and modalities that emerge through this process.

In addition to the expanded task list for the ICG (other bodies) in 2024/25, on the basis of the Movement having a public profile by then, there will also have to be specific measures taken in relation to the structure and modalities as follows:

1. Reviewing feedback received through the consultation process and developing a more concrete structure for consideration (this may require taking legal advice etc.).
2. Budgeting for the transition, and on the basis of the budgeted costings, facilitating a conversation on whether (and when) the transition can be made. If the option is not feasible due to budgetary or other reasons, the best possible alternatives should also be looked at.
3. Fundraising to make the transition possible.
4. Sharing information with the wider movement on the transition, consulting them on key questions and also encouraging the wider movement to be actively engaged in the process. This would include specifically engaging with global and regional actors, to find the best ways of collaboration, that are mutually beneficial to the Movement and to these other actors.
5. Implementing the transition. This could include, depending on what is actually decided as the structure for the Movement, the development of core documents setting out the structure and modalities of the Movement, facilitating the process of selection (or election) of leadership positions, negotiating with host organisations or registering the Movement, recruiting board members and staff etc.

Given that this will happen in tandem with the Movement also functioning as a Movement – setting its strategy, implementing activities etc., this process is likely to take time. This is something we should be realistic about when thinking about the measures that need to be implemented and related timeframes.

The ICG will think through these bridging measures when developing the concrete option at the end of the consultation process.

Finally, it is worth noting that the consensus of the wider movement may be to delay a decision on the structure, and to proceed in a more fluid way until (and unless) there is a need to look at structures in future. If this type of decision is taken, then the conversation around interim or bridging measures would entail a possibly longer period, than if there is a clear structure to be working towards.



## ANNEX

The Options Paper has drawn on several resources including:

- ISI's Global Movement Consultation Report (2020)
- Responses to ICG Questionnaires (2021)
- Case Studies of other Movements (2021)
- The March 2022 draft of the Options Paper & Expert Responses to it (2022)
- The Fundraising Field Needs Survey (2022)
- The Ecosystem Mapping (2022)
- Notes on Global Movement Community Calls (2022)
- Notes of the Interim Core Group Retreat (2023)

These documents can be found [here](#)