

Dear colleagues,

We note receipt of your collective letter of July 31st and individual letters that have followed and, with dismay and regret, acknowledge their contents.

Membership of the Federation is voluntary, of course. It is certainly within your power to withdraw from membership if you believe your participation will no longer add value. However, such a grave decision should be taken on the basis of accurate information. Regretfully, it appears from your letters that you do not have the correct information and that the process has been rushed to prevent you from receiving it.

The facts are that as a global Federation, IPPF is just as committed as you are to “leaving no one behind”. And allegations to the contrary are simply not true. The issue of funding for high income countries (HIC) was raised and discussed at the General Assembly meeting in Delhi. The Assembly report (endorsed unanimously by the Global Council included by its three members from the WHR) sets out a model that allows IPPF to continue providing funds to HIC in both a legal and a sustainable way.

However, there is no legal, sustainable way for IPPF to continue to allocate core funds received from all donors to HIC (i.e. it is not possible through stream 1). To try to do so would be a violation both of IPPF policy and of donors’ policies. So, please be clear: IPPF cannot choose to ignore restrictions set out in donor contracts. Nor can IPPF/WHR either – not now or in the future.

So IPPF’s proposed new funding model seeks instead to bundle together in stream two the funds from those donors who do allow their core contributions to go to HIC. That solves the legal problem. And this new approach is sustainable too. For, while the majority of funds IPPF receives must go through stream one, it is also true that the (stream two) volume of current core grants to MAs in high income countries is \$1.2M a year. Under the new model, the total volume permitted for stream two will be between \$6-9M. That means there is ample space to continue finding donors who will allow funds to flow to HICs. We have seen that work well in recent years and believe this can continue to work well provided that – in keeping the Delhi spirit and by implementing the governance decisions taken there – we also retain and build donor trust and confidence. Why undermine that now? We have explained this in letters to WHR/IPPF and asked they be convey to you. We understand that this never happened.

As for your stated concerns regarding fraud and safeguarding, IPPF’s commitment to zero tolerance, to creating a robust culture of prevention, investigation, and repair is as strong as anyone’s in the Federation. The proof is that we are uncovering and addressing even issues that have existed for years. Donors know of, are impressed by and are supportive of these diligent efforts. Cases exist in each and every region. What matters most is the culture that we create together - in partnership - to respond quickly, authoritatively and accountably. Two cases that were presented to you as showing that the reforms we approved in Delhi are not making a difference show the exact opposite. I can confirm to you that in both cases I, as chair of the Board and safeguarding focal point, the Treasurer and Chair of the Finance Audit and Risk Committee were kept well informed in real time and donors and the Charity Commission have been informed where appropriate.



Finally, we hear you have been told that we were unwilling to agree to a framework agreement that did not even go beyond the status quo. Again this is simply not true. The proposed draft included clauses like WHR becoming the only acceptable channel for all contacts and funding from the US and Canadian government and Foundations to IPPF members across the world, prohibiting all direct communication between IPPF members and Secretariat and MAs from Western Hemisphere Region other than through the RO; requiring all communication between Secretariat and RO staff to go through the RD. All things IPPF could never agree to – or enforce if it ever did. We are happy to share that draft with you as we understand WHR never did.

Friends, the changes introduced in Delhi are barely six months old. Our new Board has only just finished its first full meeting ever! Yet, all steps for reform are underway and are moving IPPF in the right direction. So it is very difficult to comprehend how, you could have arrived at such a harsh judgement - with such grave consequences and public risks - about our leadership commitment, let alone about our success. Frankly, to do so at such an early stage is not just unreasonable and non-collegial. It is deeply unfair.

You state your concerns about reputational risk: please think about the consequences of your decision for MAs in other regions too. Please think again about the burden you are now placing on the remainder of the Federation by acting as you suggest you will.

IPPF remains committed to being global, to tackling the mounting challenges and to leaving no one behind. Proof of that is in our short and long term plans to continue investing similar amounts in Latin America and the Caribbean. And donors have so far been so supportive of the changes they are seeing that in spite of Covid and everything else going on. We already (in July!) have firm commitments for 2021 to maintain the same levels of funding as in 2020. Thanks to the changes MAs also demanded that we make to the Secretariat's cost structures, more funding will flow to MAs. But of course, we have to be and must behave as credible partners and members.

Separate from ensuring that you have the full facts of the situation, I must also convey just how sorry I am that neither Alvaro, our director general, nor me as IPPF's very new Chair, were provided an opportunity to discuss these concerns directly with you before you took this weighty decision. I am deeply troubled to learn further that communication between us was actively discouraged through the signing of non-disclosure agreements which also ensured you had no opportunity to verify whether or not the information you had was accurate or comprehensive. Nor did it provide us our right of reply.

That said, we continue to be fully open to dialogue with you. We stand ready to convene a webinar at your convenience, either individually or collectively. And if you would be willing to reconsider membership with IPPF - given further clarification - then we would be delighted to welcome you back to continue our global solidarity for sexual and reproductive health and rights, extend our powerful work together locally and ensure that we do all we can towards meeting our shared goal of ensuring no one is left behind in any region.

With respect and in solidarity,

Kate and Alvaro