MSI Integrity Global Consultation and Comment Period

Comment Form

Written submissions to MSI Integrity

Submissions to MSI Integrity must be received by 31 August 2013.

Email submissions can be sent to: info@msi-institute.org

Postal submissions can be sent to: Amelia Evans, MSI Integrity, [postal address redacted following comment period closing]

Written submissions to regional host institutions

Submissions can also be made regionally via the process established by regional host institutions. These host institutions will also hold in-person meetings to allow the public and interested stakeholders and discuss the issues raised by the consultation and/or orally provide comments on the evaluation standards or methodology. Each host institution will establish its own process for submission. See regional consultations for more details.

Name:

Organization (if relevant):

Email address:

Postal Address:

Please select a stakeholder group that best describes you/your organization:

Academic

Business

Civil Society Organization

Government

Community

Other (Please Specify):

Are you a currently involved in an MSI? If yes, which MSI(s):

Have you previously been involved in an MSI? If yes, which MSI(s):

Areas of Consultation

None of the questions below are mandatory. Please answer those questions that allow you to provide the most useful feedback.

Comments are most helpful if they include a rationale for the comments and, in the case of Standards Comments, make specific suggestions for any proposed changes to wording.

Comments relating to the criteria for evaluation (Standards Comments)

1. Are the seven high-level categories identified in the <u>Table of Minimum Standards</u> *and* <u>Scope and Mandate Evaluation Criteria</u>, *appropriate and sufficient for evaluating the effectiveness of MSIs to protect and promote human rights?*

> The seven categories identified are an MSI's (1) internal governance, (2) standards, (3) implementation, (4) formation/capacity to evolve, (5) transparency and (6) level of affected community involvement. In addition, (7) the scope and mandate of an MSI is separately evaluated.

2. Are the minimum standards identified in the <u>MSI Evaluation Tool</u> *(and summarized in the* <u>Table of Minimum Standards</u>*) appropriate and sufficient for evaluating the effectiveness of MSIs to protect and promote human rights?*

> Comments may relate to:
>
>> A) The sufficiency of the general issues classified as minimum standards, including whether additional indicators are needed or some should not be seen as minimum standards; and/or
>>
>> B) Precise comments on the wording of indicators of minimum standards.
>
> If providing comments on the wording of indicators, please note that the Table of Minimum Standards is only a summary of the indicators of minimum standards. The actual minimum standards are the indicators highlighted in red in the MSI Evaluation Tool.
>
> <u>All comments on specific indicators of minimum standards should cite the category and number of the indicator </u>contained in the MSI Evaluation Tool (e.g., "Standards 7A or Internal Governance 2").

3. Are the criteria contained in the [Scope and Mandate Evaluation Criteria](#) *appropriate and sufficient for evaluating the effectiveness of MSIs to protect and promote human rights?*

4. Do you have any other comments on the standards for evaluating the effectiveness of MSIs to protect and promote human rights?

Comments might include whether qualitative evaluations of an MSI should be triggered when an MSI meets a high proportion of minimum standards. For example, where an MSI meets 80% of the minimum standards, this could trigger a qualitative inquiry with MSI members on specific questions.

Comments relating to the methodology for evaluating MSIs (Methodology Comments)

1. Do you have any comments on the process of selecting and evaluating MSIs, as proposed by MSI Integrity?

Areas to focus comments on may include:

A) The process and approach for selecting MSIs to be evaluated, given that only a limited number of MSIs can be evaluated each year.

B) Whether the methodology strikes an appropriate balance between context-specificity in individual evaluations while retaining comparability across evaluations.

C) Whether relying on an MSI's publicly available material, input from MSI staff and expert review is sufficient to ensure accurate evaluations.

D) The suitability and sufficiency of engaging with MSI staff to review draft reports.

2. Do you have any comments on how the results of evaluations should be scored and reported?

Areas to focus comments on may include:

A) Whether and how to provide numeric scores for evaluated MSIs based on the number of minimum standards met. This includes comments on the specific weightings for categories or indicators; whether to provide grades or pass/fail classifications.

B) The specific content to be included in summary reports and/or long-form reports.

C) The suitability of the proposed long-form and short-form summary reports.

3. Do you have any other general comments on the methodology for evaluating MSIs?