



10 Principles of Good Practice for

THE INTELLIGENT FUNDER





Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	3
INTELLIGENT FUNDING – 10 PRINCIPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE.....	4
CASE STUDIES – THE 10 PRINCIPLES IN PRACTICE.....	6
LESSONS FROM THE CASE STUDIES.....	25
SUMMARY: THE INTELLIGENT FUNDER TRACK AND GOOD PRACTICE.....	25
ACRONYMS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	26
LIST OF RESOURCES.....	28
INDEX.....	30

Introduction

Donors today recognise civil society as a crucial partner and resource in progressing human development goals. For civil society, the relationship with its donors is a key issue, and much remains to be done on both sides to advance understanding and collaboration. The CIVICUS network, through the CIVICUS World Assemblies (WA), has provided a forum for donors and civil society stakeholders to discuss their relationship and how together they can face today's major crises effectively and intelligently.

Since 2006, the Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations (SCVO) and CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation (CIVICUS), with the support of the Big Lottery Fund UK (BIG), have consolidated these discussions under the umbrella of the "Intelligent Funder Track" (IFT). The IFT has enabled donors to analyse, discuss and propose initiatives for a more collaborative approach with civil society through a multi-year thematic "track" of events and activities focused on funding issues and practices attached to the WA. BIG solicited this work to assist funders domestically and internationally to think through their relationship with grant seekers, applicants, grantees and policy makers. The ultimate aim of the track is to introduce different, innovative models of funding relationships.

The following report outlines ten principles of good practice for the intelligent funder's relationship with civil society. These principles have emerged during three years of discussions between donors and representatives of civil society organisations (CSOs) at the WA in Glasgow. They are therefore closely tied to the initial solicitation paper by BIG, the findings in the synopsis of the IFT 2006-2008¹ as well as Julia Unwin's initial discussion paper "The Intelligent Funder"², in which she laid the foundation of the three years of discussions in Glasgow by defining "intelligent funding" and posing the following lead questions:

1. Legitimacy of the funder and the nature of their mandate
2. Long-term funding of strong organisations vs complacency and contestability, as well as question of self-assessment of impact
3. Funders as actors or enablers

These three questions continue to be the underlying *raison d'être* for the ten principles. They set out to help the funder identify its legitimacy and mandate, impact and approaches, and ultimately to help both donors and civil society define "intelligent" funding, and translate concepts into action.

Assisted by case studies and practice examples, this report provides details on mechanisms and tools that have been identified as innovative and replicable. At the same time, the report allows readers to draw lessons for their own activities. The principles are based equally on existing practices as well as aspirations for a model of more intelligent, sustainable funding partnerships.

Ultimately, the report will introduce how the IFT can progress and promote these principles of good practice. The report will also explore how the principles of good practice can be supported by the Intelligent Funder Forum, consisting of funders and civil society partners, created at the World Assembly. This will be rounded up with a matrix of the tools and approaches discussed in this paper. The examples and cases cited are drawn equally from a wide list of resource literature as well as interviews with key members of the IFF, conducted during January and April 2009.

Intelligent Funding – 10 principles of good practice

The following principles of good practice should be seen as interdependent – no single principle can be implemented independently from the others; each principle is complementary to the other. There is no hierarchy between the principles; the enumeration below is arbitrary – each principle builds on the other, as a value as much as an approach to intelligent funding. Taken together, these ten principles define how the intelligent funder approaches funding relationships.



Principle 1:

UNDERSTAND CIVIL SOCIETY

Through innovative tools and mapping exercises, understand civil society and the context in which it operates; identify the “agents and drivers of change” in civil society, and understand their motivations and restrictions.

Principle 2:

RESPECT CIVIL SOCIETY’S NATURE

Respect the diversity and variety of civil society. Do not impose your own agenda, but symbolically acknowledge civil society’s diversity through statements of intent that mirror your ethos and determine the rules of your engagement.

Principle 3:

ENGAGE AS PARTNERS

Listen to the stakeholders and beneficiaries, and find frameworks for dialogue and applied learning. Act on what you have been told – engage your stakeholders and ultimately aim to build a real partnership with the recipients of your funding. Find forums to channel the engagement, such as multi-stakeholder groups. Build ways of engagement with other donors from your sector, and other sectors.

Principle Number 4:

HAVE A LONG-TERM VIEW

Balance the short-term goals with long-term, strategic approaches. Be in it for the long haul – become an effective partner for your beneficiaries, and help them build their capacity through long-term and core support. Find ways to make your funding approaches clear and consistent.

Principle 5:

MAXIMISE COMBINED RESOURCES

Be responsive to the local context in your programming. Tap into the ideas, resources and enthusiasm of your civil society partner and maximise those combined resources.

Principle 6:

FOCUS ON ACCOUNTABLE RESULTS

Adhere to self-regulation, good practice guidance and standards set with your peers. Agree on expected and realistic outcomes with the grantee through results-based management and consequently ensure a shared strategic approach. Inform your beneficiaries about any changes in your approach.

Principle 7:

BE TRANSPARENT

Be open about your opinion and evaluation processes and results and your aims and motivation in entering a funding relationship. Be clear in your purpose and intentions, about the source of your funding and the process of your decision-making.

Principle 8:

INVEST WITH PURPOSE

Funding civil society is an investment of more than money. You invest time, intellectual and financial capital. Define why you are investing in a specific partnership, what your purpose in this relationship is, and what you wish to receive in turn from your partner.

Principle 9:

LEARN

Innovate, test and implement methods of evaluation and assessment to continually improve your understanding, effectiveness and responsiveness, in a manner that is neither too arduous nor just ticking boxes. Work with your civil society partner on learning lessons from your partnership.

Principle 10:

SHARE WITH YOUR PEERS

Share your learning and knowledge with other donors, through formal and informal engagement. Become a more effective donor through harmonisation with other donors.



Case Studies – The 10 principles in practice

Each of the above principles has been translated into practice in multiple ways already. Below we give a number of case studies and practical examples of innovative and tested tools for the intelligent funder, as well as analysing their potential for replication. The case studies do not claim to be exhaustive, and only cover certain aspects of the larger principle to illustrate the high-level principle.

I. UNDERSTAND CIVIL SOCIETY

Mapping civil society and defining the agents of change

Definitions of civil society and its role vary slightly for every donor, from very global to very specific, local characterisations. When selecting a civil society partner, it is crucial for the intelligent funder to have a clear understanding of this partner, its legitimacy in society, as well as the values and internal structures of this society.³

Donors who look to map civil society use a variety of interesting approaches, ranging from field visits to literature reviews to consultation and research tools:

- Sida, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, uses the **CIVICUS Civil Society Index (CSI)**, an assessment tool that helps CSOs to analyse the state of civil society at country level via a set of indicators. The CSI is initiated and implemented by CSOs at the national level under the auspice of CIVICUS, and its findings are shared with a broad range of stakeholders. The CSI is currently rolled out in 56 countries.⁴ The CSI uses 74 indicators for its civil society assessment, each of them measuring an important aspect of the state of civil society. These indicators are grouped together into 25 sub-dimensions, which are grouped into four dimensions: Structure, Environment, Values and Impact. The indicators are scored by a National Advisory Group in deliberation on a scoring system from 0 to 3. The CSI is a readily available source of information for donors to understand civil society in its local context without necessarily having to allocate funds to carry out their own research.
- The **United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)** developed a **framework for CSO mapping** and the selection of possible civil society grantees. The framework was formulated as part of an initiative to strengthen CSO capacity in post-conflict countries, and was piloted in Colombia, Liberia and Sri Lanka. The indicators used in this assessment tool range from questions on the legal status and history of the organisation to its financial capacity, and include wide-ranging and flexible questions which make it possible to be easily adjusted to various country contexts and different funding relationships, and as such replicable for other donors.⁵ In the pilot studies, UNDP set out to identify local CSOs which would best fit the objectives of the project with the help of the indicators and national civil society advisory committees, that were created for this purpose. UNDP found that, while in the past cooperation had been limited to well-known and established non-governmental organisations (NGOs) overlooking the potential of other civil society actors,⁶ through the mapping process, new potential partners were identified with whom lasting relationships could be built.

- The **World Bank** has developed a number of tools to assist in determining the relevant “agents of change” those CSOs that should be engaged on a given issue, project or strategy. One of those World Bank piloted methods is the **Civil Society Assessment Tool (CSAT)**, as part of the ARVIN framework (Association, Resources, Voice, Information, Negotiation).⁷ ARVIN is a set of questions for indicators that analyse the legal and regulatory, political and governmental, socio-cultural and economic factors affecting civic engagement. Tested in Senegal, Albania, Mongolia, Ecuador, Sierra Leone and Ghana, the tool identifies ways to draw on the resources that CSOs have to offer, and provides guidance on how to engage with CSOs. The ARVIN methodology is a multi-stakeholder and participatory process, in that it includes all affected groups (from governments to media to civil society); based on both qualitative and quantitative research. In Ghana and Sierra Leone, the World Bank has complemented the ARVIN framework with the CSI⁸; thus using civil society’s own existing resources to broaden the understanding and ultimately effectiveness of how the World Bank approaches CSOs.

Hand in hand with improving their understanding about civil society and its local context, donors have begun to identify how to effect change through partnerships with CSOs. This analysis of the “**drivers of change (DOC)**” is at the “cutting edge”⁹ of development funding, helping donors understand the political and institutional factors that shape development outcomes. The example we want to feature here is the DOC approach as implemented by the UK Department for International Development (DFID).

Case Study I

For DFID, DOC is a way of understanding the political economy of change in developing countries. DOC studies direct attention to the structural and institutional factors likely to “drive” change. Understanding the underlying interests and incentives that affect the environment for reform, as well as the nature of state-society engagement, is the first step to successful development for DFID.¹⁰ The DOC analyses the agents of change, from civil society to the political elite to the judiciary, the institutions and rules governing the agents both formally and informally, as well as structural features such as the history and demographic of the country in question.

DOC has become an integral part of a number of country analyses. The advantages of using DOC according to DFID’s own evaluation have been obvious and “how-to tools” continue to be developed to train in-country staff.¹¹ Among other benefits, DOC has made clear the role that non-traditional partners, including civil society, can play in collaboration with DFID; it has affected country teams to revise and extend programme timetables, and equally to stop programmes if the DOC has showed them to be ineffective.

Overall, the DOC has been proven to be an efficient tool for donors to understand the local context better, and has helped to identify more effective partners in civil society. Challenges remain, such as the harmonisation of findings with other funders who undertake similar studies¹² (this will be addressed again in principle 10), or its narrow focus which excludes the examination of civil society issues and assessments of civil society’s strength.¹³ Taken in conjunction with the CSI, those knowledge gaps could be closed and the DOC framework could greatly advance the understanding of donors about intelligent civil society development on the country level.

Summary: Donors looking to map civil society in the country context have a variety of existing programmes to choose from. The tools outlined above have been chosen for their potential for replication and their well-documented use. The CSI is thereby a set of indicators that has been created and established by CSOs itself, and its use would open the door for donors to engage with local civil society while learning about them, as the example of Sida shows. Both the CSAT and the UNDP framework are giving indicators that can be helpful in finding objective information on the state of any given CSOs, and help donors ascertain whether the CSOs can deliver projects to their satisfaction. Finally, the DOC studies are of a more technical level, and require a more in-depth analysis; they are therefore well suited for donor harmonisation exercises and donor partnerships – and taken together with a CSI-like approach could produce the most comprehensive understanding of civil society.

2. RESPECT CIVIL SOCIETY'S NATURE

Acknowledging civil society's diversity through statements of intent

CSOs should be seen as effective agents of change, which can make important contributions to the funder's knowledge about the local context, as well as providing access to the beneficiaries of funding. Partnership with a CSO should be based on equality, trust and **a realistic understanding about the capacity** on both sides to fulfil the obligations of the partnership.¹⁴ The expectations that legitimately exist on the side of the donor have to be "finetuned"¹⁵ to the local realities in order to ensure a trusting relationship and a successful investment of the funds. The intelligent funder is aware of the contributions a CSO can realistically make towards the achievement of its mandate through the tools of understanding, and respects these contributions. To show this understanding and respect for the nature of civil society, many donors have manifested the underlying principles of their cooperation with civil society in **statements of intent**.

These principles of engagement set forth accepted ideas of cooperation that each party to the agreement pledges to achieve. To formulate such principles will help both the donor and the grantee to maintain an open and trusting partnership. Much like **a memorandum of understanding**, those statements of intent are the foundation of all cooperation in a partnership and help both sides to position themselves, as well as defining the nature and scope of the engagement.¹⁶

Principles of engagement also show that the funder is aware of any preconceptions that may exist from their side, and that it is important to the funder not to impose their own agenda on the organisations they choose to fund.¹⁷ The purpose of such principles is thereby not to provide the legal and administrative background of the partnership so much as formulating aspirations and showing respect for the multiple accountabilities any CSO is faced with.

Case Study 2a

With its "**principles and commitments of CSO-UNDP engagement**"¹⁸, UNDP gives an example of how such an approach can be formulated. Commitment number four ("Disaggregation, selection and intellectual differentiation") recognises the diversity of the nature of CSOs, and classifies it as a "valuable development asset" which has to be respected. UNDP pledges not to attempt to "homogenise" civil society or liken Southern CSOs to an image of what is perceived a CSO is and does; an image often modelled on a typical Northern CSO.¹⁹



Consequently, UNDP has given a commitment in writing to work on increasing its own understanding and capability to make differentiations between CSOs, and adopt practices that respect those differences. While commitments like these could easily be dismissed as rhetoric, statements of intent are a sign of genuine respect that can underpin a successful partnership, not least because it develops the trust of the CSO partner. The intelligent funder shows that they are not imposing their own agenda and world view through their money, but instead that they accept and respect the realities on the ground.

At the same time, not imposing your own agenda means recognising the principle of **local ownership**, and acknowledging that involving civil society partners should and can lead to real change in setting priorities and meeting joint targets.

Case Study 2b

The **Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation** has established 15 Guiding Principles²⁰ which define the underlying philosophy and commitment of the Foundation. This statement of intent defines both the mission and operational approach of the Gates Foundation, and provides a very different formulation to the above example of UNDP's own principles.

Especially the principles number 9 and 10 show that the Gates Foundation acts as an aware funder which is committed to creating trusting relationships: "We must be humble and mindful in our actions and words. We seek and heed the counsel of outside voices" and "We treat our grantees as valued partners, and we treat the ultimate beneficiaries of our work with respect." The intelligent funder is an unassuming and respectful partner.

Summary: Statements of intent and principles of engagement are easy-to-replicate means for a donor to show respect for civil society and its nature, and at the same time define expectations and approaches. The examples showcased above are two amongst many existing statements, and have been chosen for their difference in approach. While the UNDP statement is phrased in a highly formal tone, reflecting the official nature of the expressed sentiment for all future UNDP-CSO cooperation, the Guiding Principles by the Gates Foundation are deliberately plain-spoken. Principles of engagement are a useful way of reaching your target audience and explaining your vision and approach.

3. ENGAGE AS PARTNERS

Creating forums for dialogue between civil society and donors

How funders and their grantees and, on a different level, their beneficiaries, engage with each other determines the success of their partnership. The intelligent funder takes steps to enhance their dialogue with CSOs to improve their own understanding and capacity to effectively respond to the needs on the ground. The intelligent funder listens, but also develops tools to channel the learning (see below principle 9). There is a benefit in learning from CSOs about innovative approaches, and allowing "cross-fertilisation" of ideas and approaches with the donor's own.



Dialogue with CSOs is a way to gain access to the ultimate beneficiaries of funding and determine whether they are experiencing an impact of the funding.²¹

Engagement through forums of dialogue also means empowering the grantee to voice their opinions, and inherently, challenge the power relationship with the donor – towards an understanding of equality. A number of advisory and engagement forums have been created on the multi-lateral level, which can be examples for similar approaches on a bilateral and local level.

Case Study 3a

UNDP has a long history of engagement with CSOs, and has worked to move towards more strategic, mainstreamed partnerships instead of “episodic, project-driven engagement”, a process which it admits remains a challenge.²² Since 2000, the **UNDP-CSO Advisory Committee to the Administrator** has the remit of helping UNDP become more open and sensitive towards civil society’s agendas. The Committee assembles senior UNDP staff and leading civil society figures with an expertise in the areas UNDP engages in (such as human rights, governance or gender).²³ The Advisory Committee provides creative mechanisms for mutual agenda-setting, frank policy debate, and also ensures that civil society leaders and senior UNDP figures have access to each other.²⁴ Its primary function for UNDP is to advise and guide the UNDP Administrator and pilot strategic UNDP/CSO initiatives.

In practice, the advisory committee meets once a year for three days and the resource persons are available for dialogue with UNDP in between the meetings on an ongoing basis, as well as participating in workshops, consultations and UNDP Executive meetings on the global and local level.

For UNDP, the Committee “demonstrates the important synergies that are created when a multi-disciplinary committee is established to provide strategic guidance on a range of issues with which UNDP is grappling.”²⁵ The intelligent funder maximises the benefits of engagement and thus maximises the impact of their investments.

Case Study 3b

Another advisory committee which should be mentioned for its innovative nature and impact is the World Bank’s **Joint Facilitation Committee (JFC)**, a transitional consultative body, which was maintained between 2003 and 2005 to define a new platform of civil society engagement for the World Bank. The JFC was initially composed of 14 regional and international civil society networks and staff and senior managers of the World Bank, and was co-chaired by CIVICUS.

The JFC examined issues of civil society access to the World Bank, methods of engagement, accountability and responsiveness.²⁶ Initially met with scepticism by civil society representatives, who in the past felt that their contributions to consultations with the World Bank had not been taken seriously and were weary of

being “co-opted” into a tokenistic process with little impact, the JFC however managed to create some genuine dialogue and involvement of both sides; not least because of the perceived seriousness in the World Bank approach.²⁷

These case studies are high-level, formalised forums for engagement, which tend to assemble infrequently. Frameworks for dialogue on a more frequent level could take many other forms. **Funder-grantee “away-days”**, where members of staff from both sides interact, get the opportunity to exchange about their work, and discuss common concerns, possibly enhanced by project visits to beneficiaries, are already implemented by intelligent funders.

Many larger foundations have adopted an organisational structure that focuses on regionalisation, with **country or regional offices** delivering the majority of the programmes. Similarly, the structure of the UNDP-CSO advisory committee has been successfully replicated on the local level, for example in Botswana and Brazil (see also principle 5). The advantage of relative autonomy on the country level is that formal and informal dialogue with CSOs can be established on an ongoing basis, through individuals and committees.

Case Study 3c

The **Ford Foundation** has since 1950 maintained regional offices, staffed both by local experts and foreign nationals. Today, the Foundation has a total of 12 offices in Africa, Asia, Russia, Latin America and headquarters in the United States. This means that nearly half of the staff of over 500 is based in-country, working close to and with the beneficiaries of the funding. The programme officers in each country are tasked to forge co-operations with local NGOs, community leaders and governments.²⁸ The regional offices are directly responsible for the grantmaking and the support of existing grantees. The regional offices are established with a long-term view and work according to regional implementation plans. Each office thereby focuses on four to six of the eight strategic issues the Foundation has identified, and which are decided on by the office and its partners on the ground, guaranteeing maximum local engagement.

On a global scale, conferences like the CIVICUS WA give donors and civil society an opportunity to reflect on their engagement more widely through the IFT, from a multi-stakeholder and multi-sector perspective, and perhaps more “philosophically”, than when dealing with day-to-day business.

Summary: Engagement and dialogue do not need to take place just through face-to-face meetings. Creating a **user-friendly and interactive website** to share views and case studies can be just as effective if all sides agree to continuously update it and use it as a resource tool. Whatever the approach, it is crucial to any stakeholder engagement to identify the activities and the level (operational, strategic, policy), at which the funder expects the CSO partner to be engaged.²⁹ It is just as crucial for the donor to act on the learning obtained from such engagement. The above examples show the range of engagement that is possible – from high-level meeting to day-to-day business, the intelligent funder engages with its grantees.

4. HAVE A LONG-TERM VIEW

Building civil society capacity through long-term core support

Increasingly, a major proportion of civil society funding is earmarked for service delivery projects, in sectors such as education or health. The adverse effect of this is that CSOs working in advocacy, policy and capacity building of the sector are often underfunded and their ability to engage effectively in public policy processes is seriously impaired.³⁰

On the other hand, balancing their short-term goals such as health service delivery with long-term, strategic approaches towards funding is an ongoing dilemma for funders. To decide to fund a civil society organisation over a few years (five or more years) instead of focusing on supporting a number of single projects requires above all understanding of the organisation and its internal processes, and a huge amount of trust in its efficiency. Measurable success seems more guaranteed for short-term projects with a clearly defined set of objectives than for broad core support of organisational capacities over several years.

The intelligent funder however realises that multi-year core support for strategic “agents of change” can have a much more sustainable impact on the beneficiaries than any short-term project funding. Predictable funding gives CSOs the security to develop their capacity and become a stable force that can be innovative and responsive when needed, without the added burden of having to continually search for funding. Long-term support aims to ultimately ensure financial stability and institutional sustainability planning.

Increasingly, too, funders are getting dissatisfied with project-based approaches, their lack of sustainability and their limited scale.³¹ Project-based approaches incur high transaction costs for both sides compared to their potential impact, especially when managing large numbers of small-scale projects. More and more therefore, donors are moving to long-term, large-scale, programmatic approaches with their civil society partners.

Case Study 4a

One funder who has successfully implemented long-term core funding is the UK Department for International Development (DFID) through their **Partnership Programme Arrangements (PPAs)**. The PPAs offer long-term, strategic funding to major international civil society organisations, thus helping both sides to move from a donor-recipient agreement to a true partnership. Currently, DFID has 27 PPAs with UK-based NGOs. The total PPA funding amounts to £90 million per year.

The PPAs are unrestricted funds, which allow the NGO partner to set their own parameters in the allocation of the funding against agreed high level outcomes. They free the grantee from a project-based focus to an organisational focus. Where too often there is the danger that a single funded project can become more important than the organisation, PPAs strengthen the capacity of the NGO to deliver a variety of projects with equal attention and impact.

To qualify for a PPA, the NGO partners must meet a number of criteria, including certain standards of corporate governance, an extensive reach to beneficiaries in Southern countries as well as a capacity to raise public awareness in the UK, and a sufficient consistency between its own and DFID's priorities.³²



One of the most successful PPAs is the partnership with Oxfam, established in 2001 and building on 30 years of prior co-operation between the two partners.³³ DFID has contributed more than £26m to the partnership, allowing Oxfam to carry out operations in areas where DFID's own work is limited, such as francophone Africa, Latin America and the Middle East.

Another exemplary strategy devised to move towards more effective funding relationships with civil society is **Irish Aid's Civil Society Policy** which was launched in March 2008. Irish Aid emphasises the strategic priority of multi-annual and programmatic funding to NGOs where certain pre-determined standards of accountability, appropriate management systems and a level of programme quality have been developed.³⁴ Other bilateral funders who have similarly recognised the value of long-term, multi-year funding are New Zealand Aid and the Canadian Government.³⁵

Case Study 4b

Since 1967, the **Aga Khan Foundation** has supported social development in Asia and East Africa, focusing its activities on a small number of projects with grassroots partners on a long-term basis, rather than a larger geographical focus with many different grantees. One of the stated goals of the Foundation is to “put institutional, management and financial structures in place to ensure that programme activities are sustainable without Foundation assistance within a reasonable time-frame”.³⁶ The Aga Khan Foundation thus puts emphasis on organisational capacity building instead of short-term projects, which marks it out from other similar-sized international development foundations.

This long-term support also means that Foundation staff and funds remain when there is political or social instability in a country, precisely to allow for sustainable development, and to avoid “quick fixes” that are rarely successful.³⁷ This approach also sees the Foundation seeking long-term relationships with other donor agencies and peer organisations to mobilise funds and expertise.

In 2006, for which the latest annual report is available, the Foundation funded projects in 18 countries with a budget of USD \$153 million.³⁸

Summary: The advantages of long-term support vis-à-vis short-term, project financing have been recognised by many donors, but its translation into reality is often a difficult question. The importance of trust in a long-term relationship is outlined above. It seems that with the emergence of a new economic world order, where donors often have to make priorities and cut project funding, a new perspective on long-term support to known and trusted CSO partners could result. Whether this takes the form of PPA-like agreements alongside project funding, or an organisation-wide change in prioritisation towards fewer, longer-term programme partners like at the Aga Khan Foundation, a more sustainable, more effective partnership will most certainly be the outcome, as has been shown by the examples outlined.



5. MAXIMISE COMBINED RESOURCES

Programme responsively

Responsive programming means tapping into the ideas, energy and resources of the CSO partners and their constituencies, especially when developing new and innovative projects. The intelligent funder works towards maximising access to the local beneficiaries of the funding. Three years of IFT discussions in Glasgow have shown that there is a desire from both the CSO side and some intelligent funders to involve the beneficiaries of the funding more in all aspects of the process, and maximise the resources which all three sides (donor-grantee-beneficiaries) can bring to the table.

Case Study 5

In 2005, CARE, in response to the realisation that they were not meeting the demands of the beneficiaries through their traditional means of disbursement created the model of “**Local Funds**”. Designed as “quick-disbursing” and “driven by a demand-led approach in which the public voice informs project design, implementation and monitoring”³⁹, these funds are able to channel smaller resources to the local civil society level. Local Funds have become increasingly popular with donors as they have been proven to strengthen local ownership, fostering greater sustainability, and reducing transaction costs for the donor – under at least initial management of NGO intermediary organisations in the country, the costs of running the funds move away from the donors to the Funds, which are run as discrete, separate entities.

Donors like DFID have joined CARE in Local Funds in Zambia and Tanzania.⁴⁰ The donors contributing to the funds – including CARE International itself – often found it difficult to “let go” of the control over the funds and accept that the management tools are tailored to the local context.⁴¹ Their established standards and expectations were no longer applicable to the Local Funds. With their emphasis on poverty reduction, governance and civil society, the funds shift the focus from government-oriented budgetary aid to the demand side of pro-poor governance reform, and so facilitate those voices which can hold the governments accountable.

Challenges remain, not least in the coordination of the various donors involved, but also in the lack of strategic approaches in the Funds, being demand-driven as they are. How to support and reward innovation in the Funds to move away from traditional service delivery and welfare projects remains to be solved.⁴² On top of this, Local Funds tend to show certain weaknesses that have not yet been completely tackled – on the whole they are in danger of funding the “usual suspects”, simply because the involved agencies do not have the knowledge of the true “agents of change”. Secondly, donors have not managed to date to involve private sector partners, limiting the impact the funds could have immensely. To resolve these challenges and roll out the Funds on a larger scale remains the task, and more funders need to join the existing donor conglomerates to make this happen.

Summary: Maximising combined resources means working close with the local CSO partners. Understanding and respecting them, and engaging with them on a long-term basis are all prerequisites to this. Over the last 20 years in development policy, many approaches have been tried and tested, and the involvement of local beneficiaries is as important as ever to donors. In practice however, this still proves to be difficult, and requires further willingness on behalf of the funders to involve larger parts of the local civil society and the private sector. The example given

above is not without its challenges, but has had some positive impact, and enough case studies exist to make it in principle replicable for other donors in other countries.

6. FOCUS ON ACCOUNTABLE RESULTS

Becoming more accountable through results-based management

The concept of what accountability means encompasses a wide variety of standards and good practice. In the context of intelligent funding, it can mean anything from self-regulation, to transparent communication with CSO partners and adherence to good practice.

The intelligent funder can optimise their accountability by undertaking steps to establish clear and more consistent funding practices, increase their efficiency by reducing response time to proposals and consider overall strategic approaches such as **results-based management (RBM)**. RBM is essentially an approach that incorporates every stage of the life-cycle of a project into its design from the earliest stage. This means defining realistic, expected outcomes, clearly identifying the beneficiaries of the programme, identifying the risks to a programme and how to manage them, as well as tools to monitor progress, report on outcomes and draw lessons from the findings.

Case Study 6

In 1996, the **Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)** issued a policy statement that effectively integrated RBM into all CIDA policies. This statement was based on previous RBM experiments within the agency, and was the basis for the development of a variety of tools and processes. In 1998, this was complemented by the **Agency Accountability Framework**.⁴³ RBM helps CIDA to be an accountable funder by clearly defining the roles and responsibilities, expected results and parameters for reporting.⁴⁴ RBM obligates CIDA to better reporting and transparency. For its partners, the existence of a standard project cycle makes the work with CIDA predictable.

At the core of CIDA's RBM is the "results-chain", describing the steps of a project from inputs to activities to development results – broken down into three categories: outputs (immediate, visible consequences), outcomes (short or medium-term effects) and impacts (broader, longer-term effects).

While RBM makes CIDA more accountable in its funding relationships, it tends to favour quantifiable results over qualitative evidence in the way the evaluation is set out. This limits RBM for reporting on multi-lateral development activities, where it can be difficult to measure outcomes in the short-term and on a regular basis.⁴⁵ In response to this problem, **AusAID**, the Australian Agency for International Development, developed a "**Multi-lateral Assessment Framework**" (**MAF**). MAF is a comparatively simple framework, designed to assess the performance both of AusAID and of the regional and global CSOs it supports. MAF focuses on three performance indicators only – **relevance, efficiency and effectiveness**. The MAF reports are based on "explicit acceptance of fundamental problems related to measuring results"⁴⁶, intended to be short and pragmatic, and focused on what the donor can measure and take responsibility for – the rationality of its overall strategy.

The data used in the reports is mostly based on already existing secondary sources. MAF allows the agency to explain what its multi-lateral strategy is, the reasons behind it and which activities are being undertaken

for its implementation.⁴⁷ To the extent possible, MAF also provides information on the impact of the strategy, clearly pointing out the limitations to this knowledge in the process. MAF is an important tool for the intelligent funder to become more accountable. It is easily replicable for other donors who work in the multilateral context because of its simplistic framework.

While government donor agencies are by law directly accountable to their parliaments and therefore the tax payer, private foundations are to a large degree self-responsible for ensuring their own accountability. Many examples of self-imposed accountability codes and standards exist for foundations, which are of a voluntary and aspirational nature, but acknowledge the multitude of procedures and practices, influenced by their local regulatory authorities, their donors and stakeholders, including the public. Examples include the Council on Foundations “Principles for Accountability for International Philanthropy”, and “Stewardship Principles for Corporate/Family Foundations”.⁴⁸

Summary: Accountability is a term that comprises many concepts. We have tried above to give an example of a tool that can help funders manage for results and thus become more accountable for every step of the project cycle, including the higher level outcomes. RBM and MAF are two ways of concretely implementing accountable management procedures, moving away simply from self-imposed pledges of accountability. While codes of ethics are commendable, especially in light of principle 2 (respect), they do not reach the degree of regulation and outcome focus that can be achieved with a relatively simple measure like RBM. There is much information already available from many sources on RBM and related processes, and we have shown how it can be improved through replication. Results-oriented accountability is most important for government donor agencies, but is also easily replicable for private donors and foundations who would like to move beyond rhetoric to concrete measures, both in terms of upward accountability and accountability towards their peers.

7. BE TRANSPARENT

Ensuring your availability for your grantees

Transparency is often seen as sub-principle of what is commonly understood as accountability, but here it is seen as of equal importance. A trusting relationship has to be based on openness about opinions, evaluation results, aims and intentions. Only when these are given and the CSO partner does not feel cut off from information can they make the best contribution towards the project. A transparent funder is open about what they are looking for in a CSO partner; holds orientation meetings before any agreement is entered into; and publicly discloses all documents relating to the relationship, with a narrowly defined set of conditions for non-disclosure.⁴⁹ The intelligent funder is realistic from the outset about what support they can and want to provide in the relationship.⁵⁰

The need for more awareness about transparency is apparent even in the smallest aspects. In its annual report on global accountability, the One World Trust states that several of the funders analysed do not have any **contact information on their website**, and are thus either deliberately or unconsciously making themselves unavailable for their stakeholders in a world where web-based communication has become the norm.⁵¹ Transparency means availability, especially in the age of the internet. **The Carnegie Foundation**, part of the Carnegie Corporation, recognises this when defining itself as “the transparent organisation”, which has “re-imagined transparency’s possibilities in the ways unimaginable prior to the current Internet era”.⁵² The intelligent funder understands and responds to the increased expectations from the public to find exhaustive information on its website.



In the spirit of RBM, transparency also means **disclosing the outcomes of evaluations** and funding relationships so that they can be lessons for other donors and CSO partners, where possible and the information is not sensitive.⁵³ Consultation responses for example should be made available, and where these recommendations have not been taken on board, the intelligent funder should provide an explanation why the input was not considered.⁵⁴

Funders should equally be transparent about **where their own funds come from**, how decisions on funding applications are made and why they have decided to enter a funding relationship with the CSO in question. Being open in these areas will help grantees to avoid wasting time and duplicating work, and will help donors to avoid entering into direct competition with each other.

Case Study 7

In their Global Accountability report 2007, One World Trust rated **UNDP** as leading in the donor transparency ratings, with 98% transparency and adherence to current good practice principles and a “robust” transparency system.⁵⁵ In 1997, UNDP created the **Information Disclosure Policy (IDP)**, designed to make information on programme and operational activities easily available. UNDP considers public access to information a key component of facilitating involvement of its stakeholders. UNDP, as an intelligent funder, has recognised a correlation between a high level of transparency and public participation in its activities.⁵⁶

UNDP has developed a large **library of documentation** on its website (www.undp.org.uk) which includes information on the operations of UNDP in each country and as an organisation, including information on evaluation outcomes, financial information, staff contact details and procurement details. As part of the new policy, UNDP also introduced an independent **Public Information and Documentation Oversight Panel**, which is tasked with reviewing how well UNDP implements the IDP, as well as reviewing appeals where requests for information are denied on the grounds of confidentiality. Confidentiality is determined on a case-by-case basis according to legal, operational and practical considerations, for example where disclosure could endanger individuals, organisations or member states. The IDP entitles UNDP stakeholders to a response to an information request within 30 calendar days. If a response is not given within this period, the stakeholder can turn to the Oversight Panel to appeal the decision. The panel consists of three UNDP staff members, two external civil society representatives, and an observer from the UNDP Executive Office.

In practice, the Oversight Panel has been engaged less frequently than was anticipated at its inception, with cases in the single digits in ten years of existence. Widely seen as a model for others on how to become a transparent funder, the Panel’s decision-making has been protested by CSOs for its justifications when denying the disclosure of information. This action, it has been argued, directly undermines the commitments made in the IDP.⁵⁷ The discussion around the UNDP Oversight Panel shows that even with exemplary disclosure models in place, donors have to become more aware of the way they communicate their decisions and policies. Transparency means defining the parameters of how the intelligent funder communicates with the grantee.

Summary: Transparency, much like accountability, is a concept that is often evoked, but not often translated into real action. We have shown above that in today’s online world, it does not only and not exclusively require formal oversight panels which have shown to be a model on paper but lacking access in reality. Instead, the intelligent funder gives access to information and to staff via rich online libraries, feedback functions and disclosure policies. There are a multitude of excellent donor websites out there already from which others can learn how to become



more accessible. Being more accessible on the other hand also means making yourself more open to feedback and criticism. While some have made the commitment to disclose, even if this can have negative impact on the organisation itself, a total disclosure has to be decided by each funder on a case-by-case basis.

8. INVEST WITH PURPOSE

Becoming a mentor and advocate

The intelligent funder knows that when entering a funding relationship with a CSO, they commit more than financial capital. To fund intelligently means to provide your organisation's full capacity, to invest your staff's time and intellectual capital. The intelligent CSO grantee will be open to interacting on a regular basis and accepting the funder's offer to convene forums, link existing grantees, and assist in publishing information. In such a relationship, the intelligent funder is both a **mentor and advocate**. Both sides recognise the value they have in each other. Ultimately, this invested relationship will have a bigger impact than mere financial support ever could.⁵⁸

This sort of investment presupposes that the intelligent funder has a purpose and is clear about why they are funding a certain area and haven't chosen a certain civil society partner. The donor is clear about their intentions and what they wish to achieve – either through a strategic directive, their mission or the direction given by the trustees.

Some private sector donors in particular, when compared to traditional government funders, have understood funding investments in such a wide-ranging manner. With their relative independence and freedom to determine their own agenda, some private funders have shown to be more "intelligent" in how they invest their resources, and have developed some interesting innovative funding models, though too often still the funding priorities are set depending on current interests and as small project grants. Moving away from traditional grants, they have challenged the existing culture of funding by introducing differentiated pots of funding, such as seed capital for start-ups.⁵⁹ Donors should consider what they can add to the partnership apart from the funding, and in the case of business philanthropy, this includes introducing business capabilities and networks.

Case Study 8

Unilever, the global conglomerate of consumer products, in 2007 lent its financial support and, crucially, its marketing skills, to a **UNICEF** (United Nations Children's Educational Fund) campaign to promote hygiene in primary schools in Nigeria through hand washing.⁶⁰ The campaign was part of a three-year Memorandum of Understanding the two parties signed in 2005, and saw UNICEF declare a Global Handwashing Day on 15 October 2008.

Both sides have been transparent in their reasons for investing in this partnership, which has created a model for development programmes that aim to change individual behaviour. For UNICEF, Unilever's sophisticated marketing tools and experience in understanding and shaping consumer behaviour have replaced previously unsuccessful approaches in public health education. For Unilever, meanwhile, the campaign opens up a market, doubles up as an advertising campaign of its products, and taps into an infrastructure of community mobilisation and the public sector.⁶¹

Both donor and grantee are thus aware of the motivations and expected outcomes on the other side. Unilever has invested more than funds into the relationship by effectively becoming a **mentor** for marketing strategies for UNICEF, as well as an **advocate** for the cause and UNICEF.

Summary: The innovations that private sector grantmakers have made by moving away from “mere” financial investment to a more mentor and advocate role can be a lesson to all donors. An increased peer-to-peer exchange as part of the IFT between private sector foundations and traditional donors could assist in rolling out some of the more innovative “business” models of funding and help funders become more intelligent in expanding the way they invest into funding relationships (see principle 10 below).

9. LEARN

Improving your evaluation methods

The intelligent funder who operates with a results-based approach has to continually innovate, test and implement methods of evaluation and assessment to improve their understanding, effectiveness and responsiveness. Where a solid RBM approach has been implemented, it is easy to establish good indicators for a conclusive evaluative process. The intelligent funder is a conscious funder, who is able to look inward and flexible to translate learning into action.

Performance should be evaluated in relation to all aspects of the project cycle, from the strategic plan to internal administrative and management policies, to specific operations. External stakeholders should be engaged on various levels in the evaluation of activities that impact on them; this can be achieved for example by building indicators of evaluation into the discussion from the outset to ensure the evaluation is as participatory as possible. Participatory evaluation could also be achieved in networking and knowledge-sharing activities, such as donor-organised stakeholder forums or workshops at the WA.

Case Study 9

The **Tata Index for Sustainable Human Development** is a pioneering effort at directing, measuring and improving the results of the Tata Group’s corporate social responsibility (CSR).⁶² The Tata Group is one of India’s largest business conglomerates and operates on six continents. The Index provides evaluation guidelines for each Tata company, and under the auspice of the Tata Council for Community Initiatives (TCCI), each year a large number of assessors examine how the company meets its own social development standards. The Index helps Tata to improve its own learning about the impact of its funding activities and helps establish a CSR mentality throughout the organisation.

The aim of the Index is to measure impact, develop indicators for less tangible and measurable areas of development, and examine how the private sector in India can contribute towards improving India’s ranking in the UN Human Development Index. The evaluation looks at the three dimensions of Tata’s CSR: **systems, people, and programmes**. On the systems level, the assessment concentrates on how responsive Tata’s

organisations and processes are towards social responsibility. It involves a series of interviews, as well as site visits. On the people level, the assessors look at how competent employees translate social development objectives into their work; it evaluates training and volunteering opportunities, and ties CSR into the performance management of each individual. The programme level finally deals with the impact of the CSR on the ground, by looking at factors such as knowledge transfer, sustenance and good governance.

The evaluation is conducted along a point scoring system. Each of the three dimensions is scored on **process and outcomes**. A company can reach a maximum score of 1000 points. "Process" refers to how the three indicators above are addressed; it looks for example at how effective employed methodologies are, how replicable, and how wide-ranging. The "outcome" evaluation on the other hand looks at comparative data on performance levels, and concretely measurable impacts and evidence. An outcome score of 50 to 60 percent shows a clear improvement trend.

Tata encourages its companies to achieve a high score through an awards scheme; in a very business-like approach, competitiveness encourages positive outcomes for the development of the beneficiary communities. The Tata Index is an example of how an innovative donor, here coming from the corporate field, measures their own activities on an ongoing basis, along a very structured, quantifiable framework. At the same time, Tata is aware that the Index is a work in progress, and input from the beneficiary communities will lead to changes in the Index on an ongoing basis.

UNDP has praised the Index as a trendsetter, and other organisations have looked at replicating a similar approach. TCCI representatives have presented the scheme at conferences around the world. There have been visible outcomes in India⁶³: an increased awareness of corporate social responsibility, an increased understanding about Tata's role in communities in India, and concrete benefits for those communities through the learnings from the Index assessment.

Summary: The Tata example is interesting for its replicability on several levels. Here a private sector donor has pioneered its own Index to measure its own CSR, based on already existing tried and tested standards, but adapted to its own needs. The learning impacts on all levels of the company and each individual employee is involved in the programme delivery and outcome evaluation, not least encouraged through competitive measures. Implementing a similar index would require a concerted effort from the whole company, and would most likely change the nature of the underlying philosophy behind the donor's CSR. The undeniable success of Tata's approach towards learning should be encouragement for others to follow.

10. SHARE WITH YOUR PEERS

Integrating peer-to-peer exchanges into your approaches

Peer-to-peer exchanges help harmonise each donor's approach and foster cooperation in-country and on a global scale. Donor exchanges furthermore help to develop a sense of mutual accountability. Sharing information with fellow donors is therefore an important part of being an intelligent funder.

Since the **Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005)**, bilateral donor agencies have committed to more harmonised and co-ordinated approaches and common arrangements in all stages of the funding process, from the



planning to the evaluation.⁶⁴ The implementation of the harmonisation principle is led by the individual signatory countries of the Declaration under the auspice of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Existing engagements are both of a formal and informal nature, and range from global websites to formalised in-country cooperation.

Case Study 10a

In 2006, the European Commission and the World Bank launched a donor harmonisation programme called **DECIM – Donor Exchange, Coordination and Information Mechanism**, a voluntary donor coordination process which is open to all types of donors from government to private foundations who work in the area of civil society development.

DECIM is based on the idea of information sharing and transparency, and is a “proactive effort (...) to seek effective synergies”⁶⁵ among the participating donors. DECIM is a practical instrument to work towards the principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.

The two signing parties see DECIM as a process, not an institutional structure which could incur organisational overhead costs. In practice, much of the DECIM collaboration is centred on a website portal which is hosted in collaboration with CIDA,⁶⁶ and which offers registered users the opportunity to share information on their operations, identify synergies and joint initiatives at country and sub-regional level, and engage in policy discussions. DECIM is focused on five themes: (i) CSO legal frameworks, (ii) public advocacy, policy dialogue and governance, (iii) delivery of social services and creation of social capital, (iv) CSO financial sustainability, and (v) CSO capacity building, knowledge sharing and networking. DECIM is furthermore focused geographically on Eastern and Central Europe, the former Soviet Union states, the Western Balkans, Turkey and countries of the Mediterranean and Middle East.

Apart from the electronic exchange of information, DECIM also incorporates a series of roundtable peer-to-peer events and seminars, on regional and country levels, which include local CSOs in the discussions.

DECIM with its flexibility and voluntary nature is attractive to a wide variety of donors. It has the potential to be rolled out further geographically and include more partners who are interested in integrating peer-to-peer exchanges into their operations.

Case Study 10b

On a much smaller scale, the “**Learning Bridges Initiative**” of three European foundations brings home the importance of co-operation for each participating funder and their beneficiaries. Here, three emerging women’s funds from Central Eastern European countries came together to share their experiences and harmonise their approaches – the **Women’s Fund in Georgia**, the **Slovak Czech Women’s Fund** and the **Rekonstrukcija Zenski Fond in Serbia**. The initiative is furthermore supported by three sister foundations in the US, Germany and the Netherlands (Global Fund for Women, Filia, and Mama Cash).⁶⁷



The initiative consists of regular site visits between the foundations, focused on pre-determined topical areas, rather than an exchange about all aspects of all partners. Part of the reasoning behind the initiative was the feeling that, as donors, the participants could not evaluate their achievements properly without comparing what peers in similar situations, regions and topical areas are doing and have achieved.

What makes this case study particularly interesting is that emerging funds based in areas relatively new to home-grown funders first chose to turn to each other, before connecting with more established Western donors, to share their experiences – thus integrating the concept of peer exchanges and solidarity among like-minded foundations of similar experience levels into the organisational learning.

Summary: For participating donors, information exchange and harmonisation approaches have the potential to reduce costs and at the same time increase the impact of the funding. As we have shown, they also have capacity building qualities for emerging donors. Outside large-scale agreements like the Paris Declaration and its follow-up action plans, events like the WA and projects like the IFT provide funders with forums for exchange and can contribute to the sharing of information and creation of synergies. The advantage of a process like DECIM is that it is relatively cost effective to set up and is maintained by the participating parties. A focus on themes and geographical areas helps to share concrete information. DECIM could easily be rolled out to further donors, regions and topics, or replicated by other donor conglomerates.

Lessons from the Case Studies

For further reading

Please note: many of the website addresses are too long to be published in full within this table. The Tinyurl web service provides a facility for abbreviating long web addresses, and many of the relevant links to the resources listed below can be accessed by simply entering the Tinyurl address link below as with a normal web address.

Principle	Practice	Tools	Further Information
Understand civil society	Mapping civil society	CIVICUS Civil Society Index	www.civicus.org/csi
		UNDP Framework for CSO Mapping	http://tinyurl.com/28bwjg
		World Bank Civil Society Assessment Tool (CSAT)	http://tinyurl.com/ltcoul
		DFID Drivers of Change	http://tinyurl.com/m8yf6y
Respect civil society's nature	Principles of Engagement	UNDP and Civil Society Organisations	www.undp.org/partners/cso/
		Council on Foundations Principles and Practices for Effective Grantmaking	http://tinyurl.com/mbulz3
		Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation – 15 Guiding Principles	http://tinyurl.com/c7vson
Engage as partners	Creating forums for dialogue between CSOs and donors	UNDP – CSO Advisory Committee	www.undp.org/partners/cso/
		World Bank Joint Facilitation Committee	http://tinyurl.com/n5vl2n
		Ford Foundation regional offices	www.fordfound.org/regions
		CIVICUS World Assembly	www.civicusassembly.org
Have a long-term view	Building capacity through long-term support	DFID Partnership Programme Arrangements	http://tinyurl.com/mvzdp8
		Irish Aid Civil Society Policy	http://tinyurl.com/no5hco
		Aga Khan Foundation	www.akdn.org/akf

Cont overleaf

Principle	Practice	Tools	Further Information
Maximise combined resources	Programme responsibly	CARE Local Funds	http://tinyurl.com/kpfdww
Focus on accountable results	Becoming more accountable through results-based management	Results-based Management CIDA	http://tinyurl.com/m86soh
		Results-based Management PARC	http://tinyurl.com/m3gsem
		AusAid Multi-lateral Assessment Framework	http://tinyurl.com/m39znu
		Council on Foundations Principles for Accountability for International Philanthropy	http://tinyurl.com/ne5hkq
Be transparent	Ensuring your availability	UNDP Disclosure Policy and Oversight Panel	www.undp.org/idp/
		Carnegie Corporation Transparency	http://tinyurl.com/nw5472
Invest	Being an advocate and mentor	UNICEF Unilever partnership	http://tinyurl.com/l8vpnt
Learn	Improving evaluation methods	Tata Index for Sustainable Human Development	http://tinyurl.com/n63od4
Share with your peers	Peer-to-peer exchanges	DECIM	http://tinyurl.com/m22tqo



Summary:

The Intelligent Funder Track and Good Practice

The above good principles of intelligent funding are based on existing practices, discussions and aspirations in the funding community. It is an achievement of the IFT that they have been compiled for the first time in one document. The IFF, as a forum for leading thinkers on funding, has the potential to promote these principles amongst donors, and elevate them to standards. The IFT principles focus specifically on donors' engagement with civil society, and therefore complement and build on existing principles by the Council on Foundations and the European Foundation Centre.

In concrete terms, the IFF and the IFT project can progress the intelligent funding principles on three levels:

Dissemination

The IFT through the IFF will disseminate the principles throughout the international funding community, and to CSO networks. The collection of principles will be communicated as the current definition of what intelligent funding entails, via our website and as a publication. The IFT principles will underpin any further IFT activity.

Inclusion into existing policies

The IFT can provide a resource to help donors include the principles into existing policies. The case studies featured in this guide can only be a snapshot of current practice, and the IFT will continue collecting practical examples of intelligent funding. It is hoped that at a future stage there will be intelligent funding pilot projects in the field, based on the principles and the identified cases of good practice.

Evaluation and learning

Finally, the IFT could continue to convene donors and civil society to discuss their understanding of intelligent funding, contemplate and evaluate the principles, and enrich the discussions with practice examples. The IFT could follow-up on how the principles have been adapted and how they have stood the practice tests.



Acronyms

ARVIN	Association, Resources, Voice, Information, Negotiation
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
AWID	Association for Women's Rights in Development
BIG	Big Lottery Fund
BNF	Belgium Network of Foundations
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CSAT	Civil Society Assessment Tool
CSI	Civil Society Index
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DECIM	Donor Exchange, Coordination and Information Mechanism
DFID	UK Department for International Development
DOC	Drivers of Change
IDP	Information Disclosure Policy
IFF	Intelligent Funder Forum
IFT	Intelligent Funder Track
JFC	Joint Facilitation Committee
MAF	Multilateral Assessment Framework
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NZAid	New Zealand Aid
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PPA	Partnership Programme Arrangements
RBM	Results-based Management
SCVO	Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
TCCI	Tata Council for Community Initiatives
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Educational Fund
WA	CIVICUS World Assembly

Acknowledgments

For their help on this guidance, thank you to Fiona Talcott, Henri Valot, Liz Robson and the International Funders' Forum and the Big Lottery Fund UK for their support.

List of Resources

Aga Khan Foundation, Annual Report 2006.

Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID), *The "JFC": A new strategic opportunity for gender equality advocates to engage with the World Bank?*

CARE, *Building Governance and Civil Society: Learning and Innovation from Local Funds. From a CARE International project on aid architecture and its impact on civil society*, 2006.

Canadian International Development Agency, *Results-based Management in CIDA: An introductory guide to the concepts and principles*.

Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), *The Agency Accountability Framework*, 1998.

Carnegie Corporation, *The Transparent Organization: Carnegie Corporation Values Documents, Grant Information and Financial Documents*.

CIVICUS and Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations, *The Intelligent Funder Track 2006-2008, Synopsis*, 2008.

Council on Foundations, *Principles and Practices for Effective Grantmaking*, 2002.

Council on Foundations, *Principles for Accountability for International Philanthropy*, 2007.

Council on Foundations, *Stewardship Principles for Corporate Grantmakers*, 2004.

Council on Foundations, *Stewardship Principles for Family Foundations*, 2004.

de las Casas, Lucy, *Report on Wilton Park Conference 882, Partnerships for Development Forum*, 2008.

Department for International Development, *Civil Society and Development*, 2006.

Department for International Development, *Drivers of Change*, Public Information Note, 2004.

Department for International Development, *Lessons learned – planning and undertaking a Drivers of Change study*, 2005.

Department for International Development, *Using Drivers of Change to improve aid effectiveness*, 2005.

Gijssels, Caroline, Develtere, Patrick, *Foundations in motion: Trends and evolutions in the foundation sector in Belgium between the years 2000 and 2005*, Commission of the King Baudouin Foundation in cooperation with the Belgium Network of Foundations, 2006.

Institute on Governance, *Results-based Management and Multilateral Programming at CIDA: A Discussion Paper*, 1999.

Irish Aid, Department of Foreign Affairs, *Civil Society Policy*, 2008.

Jobson, Barney, *Unilever looks to clean up in Africa*, Financial Times, 15 November 2007.

Joint Accord Table of the Voluntary Sector Initiative, *A Code of Good Practice on Funding, Building on an Accord between the Government of Canada and the Voluntary Sector*, 2002.

Keaveney, Triona, Richardson, Wendy, *Finding the best way to good practice*, Effect, Foundations in Europe together, EFC Publication, 2009, p. 6-7.

Klementova, Vieira, Slovak-Czech Women's Fund, *Learning Bridges Initiative*, 2009.

Lavergne, Réal, Wood, Jacqueline, CIDA Expert Group on Civil Society, *CIDA, Civil Society and Development. A discussion paper*, 2008.

National Audit Office, Department for International Development – Working with Non-Governmental and other Civil Society Organisations to promote development, 2006.

New Zealand Aid (NZAid), *Strategic Policy Framework for Relations between NZAid and New Zealand NGOs*, 2008.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC) Network on Governance (GOVNET), *Lessons learned on the use of Power and Drivers of Change Analyses in development cooperation*, 2005.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness*, 2005.

One World Trust, *2007 Global Accountability Report*, 2007.

Roberts, Alasdair, *UNDP panel makes first decision, and guts disclosure policy*, 25 October 2006, <http://www.freedominfo.org/ifti/20061025.htm>.

Sida, *Sida's Support to Civil Society in Development Cooperation*, 2007.

Southern Africa Trust, *How can we make aid to civil society organisations more effective in overcoming poverty?*, Policy Brief, 2007.

Tata, *Tata Index for Human Sustainable Development. Guidelines 2003-2004*, 2003.

Thindwa, Jeff, *Promoting Social Accountability and Good Governance through Analytical Studies*.

United Nations Children's Education Fund (UNICEF), *Unilever and UNICEF support hygiene promotion in primary schools: hand washing campaign launched in Federal Capital Territory*, Media release.

United Nations Development Programme, *A Toolkit for Strengthening Partnerships: UNDP and Civil Society Organisations*, 2006.

United Nations Development Programme, *Information Disclosure Policy*, <http://www.undp.org/idp/>



United Nations Development Programme, *Sourcebook on Building Partnerships with Civil Society Organisations*, 2002.

United Nations Development Programme, *UNDP and Civil Society Organisations: A Policy of Engagement*, 2001.

Unwin, Julia, *The Intelligent Funder. A discussion paper*, 2006.

World Bank, *Issues and Options for Improving Engagement between the World Bank and Civil Society Organizations*, 2005.

World Bank, *The European Commission and the World Bank launch joint initiative to support civil society development*, Press Release, 12 December 2006.

Index

- 1 **CIVICUS and Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations**, "The Intelligent Funder Track 2006-2008, Synopsis", 2008.
- 2 **Julia Unwin**, *The Intelligent Funder. A discussion paper*, 2006.
- 3 **Sida**, *Sida's Support to Civil Society in Development Cooperation*, 2007, p. 11.
- 4 **For more information, please see www.civicus.org**
- 5 **United Nations Development Programme**, *A Toolkit for Strengthening Partnerships: UNDP and Civil Society Organisations*, 2006.
- 6 *Ibid*, p. 8.
- 7 **World Bank**, *Issues and Options for Improving Engagement between the World Bank and Civil Society Organisations*, 2005.
- 8 **Jeff Thindwa**, *Promoting Social Accountability and Good Governance through Analytical Studies*.
- 9 **Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC) Network on Governance (GOVNET)**, *Lessons learned on the use of Power and Drivers of Change Analyses in development cooperation*, 2005, p. 1.
- 10 **Department for International Development, Drivers of Change, Public Information Note, 2004; Department for International Development, Civil Society and Development, 2006; Department for International Development, Lessons learned – planning and undertaking a Drivers of Change study, 2005; Department for International Development, Using Drivers of Change to improve aid effectiveness, 2005.**
- 11 **DFID**, *Drivers of Change*, p. 3.
- 12 **For a comparative study of different donors' approaches, please see OECD**, *Lessons learned*, p. 3ff.
- 13 **National Audit Office**, *Department for International Development – Working with Non-Governmental and other Civil Society Organisations to promote development*, 2006, p. 12.
- 14 **United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**, *UNDP and Civil Society Organisations: A Policy of Engagement*, p. 6.
- 15 **Council on Foundations**, *Principles for Accountability for International Philanthropy*, 2007, p. 16.
- 16 **See also Council on Foundations**, *Principles and Practices for Effective Grantmaking*, 2002.
- 17 *Ibid*, p. 14.
- 18 **UNDP**, *UNDP and Civil Society Organisations*, p. 6.

Cont overleaf



- 19 **United Nations Development Programme**, *Sourcebook on Building Partnerships with Civil Society Organisations*, 2002, p.4.
- 20 See <http://www.gatesfoundation.org/about/Pages/guiding-principles.aspx>
- 21 **Réal Lavergne and Jacqueline Wood**, **CIDA Expert Group on Civil Society**, *CIDA, Civil Society and Development. A discussion paper*, 2008, p.18.
- 22 **UNDP**, *UNDP and Civil Society Organisations*, p. 4.
- 23 For a list of current members (including CIVICUS), see http://www.undp.org/partners/cso/publications/Civil_Society_Advisory_Committee_BIOS_20090210.pdf
- 24 For case studies on civil society engagement in high-level decision making in the African Union, the Council of Europe, and UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme), see also **One World Trust**, *2007 Global Accountability Report*, 2007, p.34.
- 25 **UNDP**, *UNDP and Civil Society Organisations*, p. 7.
- 26 **World Bank**, *Issues and Options*, p.30.
- 27 **Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID)**, *The JFC: A new strategic opportunity for gender equality advocates to engage with the World Bank?*
- 28 See www.fordfound.org for more information.
- 29 **One World Trust**, *Global Accountability*, p.33.
- 30 **Southern Africa Trust**, *How can we make aid to civil society organisations more effective in overcoming poverty?* , Policy Brief, 2007.
- 31 **CARE**, *Building Governance and Civil Society: Learning and Innovation from Local Funds. From a CARE International project on aid architecture and its impact on civil society*, 2006, p.10.
- 32 For a list of current PPA recipients, see <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/aboutdfid/DFIDwork/ppas/partnerprogarrangements.asp>
- 33 **DFID**, *Civil Society*, p.17.
- 34 **Irish Aid, Department of Foreign Affairs**, *Civil Society Policy*, 2008, p. 17.
- 35 See **New Zealand Aid (NZAid)**, *Strategic Policy Framework for Relations between NZAid and New Zealand NGOs*, 2008; Joint Accord Table of the Voluntary Sector Initiative, *A Code of Good Practice on Funding, Building on an Accord between the Government of Canada and the Voluntary Sector*, 2002.
- 36 See also <http://www.akdn.org/akf.asp>
- 37 **Aga Khan Foundation**, *Annual Report 2006*, p. 7.
- 38 **Aga Khan Foundation**, *Annual Report 2006* .
- 39 **CARE**, *Building Governance*, p. 9.
- 40 See *ibid* pp. 11-19 for case studies.
- 41 *Ibid*, p. 13.
- 42 *Ibid*, p.21.
- 43 **Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)**, *The Agency Accountability Framework*, 1998.
- 44 **Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)**, *Results-based Management in CIDA: An introductory guide to the concepts and principles*, Annex 1. <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/CIDAWEB/acdicida.nsf/En/EMA-218132656-PPK#31>.
- 45 **Institute on Governance**, *Results-based Management and Multilateral Programming at CIDA: A Discussion Paper*, 1999.

- 46 For more information on the MAF, *ibid*, p.v., p.17-21.
- 47 *Ibid*, p. 24.
- 48 **Council on Foundations**, *Principles for Accountability for International Philanthropy, Stewardship Principles for Corporate Grantmakers*, 2004, *Stewardship Principles for Family Foundations*, 2004.
- 49 **UNDP**, *Sourcebook*, p.18-20.
- 50 **Council on Foundations**, *Principles*, p. 16.
- 51 **One World Trust**, *Global Accountability*, p.25.
- 52 **Carnegie Corporation**, *The Transparent Organization: Carnegie Corporation Values Documents, Grant Information and Financial Documents*.
- 53 **Even though some, like the US-based Human Rights Foundation, are transparent without discrimination: We disclose fully all relevant case information, regardless of whether that information strengthens or weakens our position. Nothing that we do is immune to public scrutiny**, <http://humanrightsfoundation.org/transparency.html>
- 54 **One World Trust**, *Global Accountability*, p.33.
- 55 *Ibid*, p.24.
- 56 **UNDP**, *Information Disclosure Policy*, <http://www.undp.org/idp/>
- 57 **Alasdair Roberts**, *UNDP panel makes first decision, and guts disclosure policy*, 25 October 2006, <http://www.freedominfo.org/ifti/20061025.htm>
- 58 **Council on Foundations**, *Principles*, p.17.
- 59 **Lucy de las Casas**, *Report on Wilton Park Conference 882, Partnerships for Development Forum*, 2008, p.13.
- 60 **UNICEF media release** *Unilever and UNICEF support hygiene promotion in primary schools: hand washing campaign launched in Federal Capital Territory* http://www.unicef.org/nigeria/media_2217.html; <http://www.globalhandwashingday.org/>
- 61 **Barney Jobson**, *Unilever looks to clean up in Africa*, *Financial Times*, 15 November 2007, http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/47b3586c-931f-11dc-ad39-0000779fd2ac.html?nclick_check=1
- 62 **Tata**, *Tata Index for Human Sustainable Development. Guidelines 2003-2004*, Foreword by Brenda Gael McSweeney, UNDP Resident Coordinator India, 2003.
- 63 **One World Trust**, *Global Accountability*, p. 46.
- 64 **Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)**, *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness*, 2005, Indicator 9.
- 65 **World Bank**, *The European Commission and the World Bank launch joint initiative to support civil society development*, Press Release, 12 December 2006.
- 66 <http://web.acdi-cida.gc.ca/decim>
- 67 **Klementova, Viera, Slovak-Czech Women's Fund**, *Learning Bridges Initiative*, 2009.



This guidance was written and produced by
Eva Rehse (SCVO) and Henri Valot (CIVICUS)
For further information on the CIVICUS Intelligent Funding Track, please visit
www.civicus.org/world-assembly/intelligent-funding-track-



CIVICUS is an international
alliance dedicated to strengthening
citizen action and civil society
throughout the world.
www.civicus.org



**The Scottish Council for
Voluntary Organisations**
is a membership and representative
body working with and for charities
and voluntary organisations in Scotland.
www.scvo.org.uk