## **German NGO Forum on Environment and Development**

## Questionnaire

1. Please share your experience in exercising, or seeking to exercise, your right to participate in public affairs in one or several of the following global governance groupings/spaces: G7, G20, G77/G24, NAM, BRICS, WEF and BG in terms of:

## a. Access;

Access to Germany's representatives in the G7/G20 does exist by semiannual meetings between civil society representatives with the Sherpa in the Chancellor's Office and also in various ministries, particularly the Ministry for Development Cooperation. There is however almost no dialogue with the Finance Ministry, which is a key ministry in the G20 process. When Germany held the presidency of the G7/G8/G20 there were high-level Civil7/20 conferences with the participation of the Chancellor.

b. Inclusivity; and

There is a fairly representative list of civil society representatives meeting with the Sherpa, so far nobody was excluded.

Influencing the decision-making process.

Government listens to us, but it would be difficult to find concrete examples where they would actually implement our advice. Usually they can always point out that there are some other governments who disagreed, so there is no way to find what the impact of our lobbying is.

2. What were the main structural and/or practical obstacles you or your colleagues encountered when participating, or seeking to participate, prior to, during and after decision-making (for instance in terms of shaping the agenda of decision-making processes, participation at an early stage when all options are still open, accreditation, physical and/or online access to forums, issuance of visas, availability of funds, access to information relevant to decision-making processes, etc.)?

The main obstacle is not structural, as we are in a regular dialogue (except for the Ministry of Finance). The main obstacle is that government and civil society disagree on policy.

3. Which improvements do you see as key to secure genuine and meaningful participation in decision-making processes of the aforementioned groupings/spaces, including by the underrepresented parts of society as mentioned above, victims of discrimination and marginalization because of their sexual orientation and gender identity, as well as social movements?

Those NGOs that want to enter a dialogue with the government on the G7/G20 process can do that, at least through their umbrella organisations and/or networks. Another question is how much social movements feel represented by these NGOs and whether they want such a dialogue at all.

4. What has been your experience exercising, or seeking to exercise, your rights to freedom of expression, peaceful assembly and association in the holding of meetings of one or several of the aforementioned groupings/spaces and in the margins thereof?

When there are G7/G20 summits, there is always a lot of security around these venues, and sometimes the right to peaceful assembly was infringed upon. In such cases, courts have sometimes corrected such decisions.

5. Have you or your colleagues been the subject of reprisal because of your participation, or attempt to participate, in a meeting or activity of one or several of the aforementioned groupings/spaces? If so, please provide information on the type of reprisal, the perpetrator(s), whether you reported the case to the organizers and the relevant authorities, and which action they took to address the situation and prevent reoccurrences (if any).

No.

6. In your view, what is the overall impact of the economic and financial policies of the aforementioned groupings/spaces on a democratic and equitable international order?

The impact of the G7 and G20 is probably overestimated. There are a lot of resolutions, but many of them are either not implemented or only reflect policies that are implemented anyway, irrespective of their endorsement by the G7/G20. The probably most important part of the G20 process, the "finance ministers track", is also the least transparent and the one that is most difficult to access.

7. More broadly, in what way(s) do you see a lack of genuine and meaningful participation and lack of influencing of decision-making process by the public in global governance grouping/spaces in general hampering the realization of a democratic and equitable international order?

There is a general tendency to restrict the democratic participation of civil society in the domestic policies in a lot of countries, including those that generally are called "democracies". This affects particularly the domestic policy space. An unrestricted domestic policy space is however the precondition for meaningful participation in international fora. We see a tendency for some governments to showcase international civil society dialogues when the eyes of the world are watching, for instance when that country is G20 presidency, but at the same time severely restricting civil society activity domestically.