

**The Baring and John Ellerman Foundations
International
Development Programme
Review 2006/7 – Review report**

Trish Silkin

February 2007

Summary conclusions

This report is a review of the Baring and John Ellerman Foundations International Development Programme since 2001 and in the light of the collaboration between the two Foundations since 2004. The objectives for the review were to consider whether, and if so how, the Foundations should adopt a more strategic focus for their grant-making, particularly whether the geographic focus or the focus on forced migration and displacement should be narrowed. The review was also asked to consider the clarity of the current aim and theme and to see whether changes need to be made in programme management, including application and selection procedures, grant management, and monitoring and evaluation. The review was not in any sense an evaluation of the work being funded. The main sources of information for the review were grants files and documentation relating to grant management, and the views of applicants, grant-holders, Trustees, Advisers and Directors.

The major general finding from the review provide confirmation that the programme is working well and that no major changes are needed.

Grant-holders feel extremely positively about the relevance of the programme's aim and theme to international development work and about the open, flexible and supportive way that the programme manages its relationship with applicants and grant-holders. Grant-holders are also appreciative of the confidence that Trustees place in them when they agree to fund challenging work in unstable political environments. Particularly valuable features of the programme for grant-holders are the core costs element and the fact that Trustees are willing to fund work that other donors consider to be too risky in terms of: organisations that are less well-established; types of work and target groups that other donors consider are challenging or low priorities; and countries and regions that are unstable. The single area of criticism by grant-holders was that the programme does not sufficiently exploit opportunities for learning from the programme.

Trustees are equally positive about the programme. They believe that the collaboration is working well and that it was the right decision for the two Foundations to join forces. All of the Trustees also support the theme of working with migrants and displaced people, but there are differences between them in how they see the capacity building aim. These differences arise from whether they see the main purpose of the programme as being to build local capacity to address problems arising from displacement or whether they see its purpose as being to provide immediate practical responses to these problems. These differences are quite nuanced but Trustees may wish to consider whether it would be helpful for them to devote a little time to taking stock of their differences and seeing whether there is scope or a need to reach a greater consensus.

In the light of the review findings, the following recommendations are made:

- i. The aim and theme of the programme should be re-formulated as a single statement as follows:
The purpose of the International Grants Programme is to improve the effectiveness of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and community-based organisations (CBOs) in Sub-Saharan Africa to address problems arising from the long-term forced migration and displacement of people.
- ii. Given that the aim of the programme includes capacity building for grant-holders, the Trustees should revisit their decision to fund NGOs with a turn-over above £15 million. Major NGOs have

much greater access to alternative sources of income for developing the skills of their staff, including enjoying a quasi-monopoly on public fund-raising.

iii. The programme needs to be more systematic about monitoring, evaluation and learning. The programme's aim and theme present particular challenges to monitoring and evaluation. (i) the line from capacity building for NGOs/CBOs to improved welfare outcomes is a long one, and the links are not always clear or quantifiable. (ii) there is a general lack of recorded experience of development work with displaced people (as distinct from humanitarian responses), where the programme can situate itself and from which the programme can learn. However, these challenges can also be seen as opportunities for the programme to invest more in monitoring and reviewing the work and learning from joint reflection on achievements and challenges. This learning should also be used to inform future grant-making decisions. The main recommendations coming out of this section of the report are to:

- support grant-holders in setting out clear monitoring plans that establish robust links between capacity building and improved welfare outcomes
- create annual opportunities for joint reflection on progress
- maintain the current number and level of grants awarded annually
- embed overseas field visits within on-going monitoring and evaluation processes

iv. If the programme invests more in monitoring, evaluation and learning, there are good reasons to adopt a narrower geographic and/or thematic focus as this will provide a common, more coherent set of issues around which monitoring, evaluation and learning can be organised. The arguments for adopting either a geographic or thematic focus are set out in the relevant section of the report. However, the review does not come down decisively in favour of either one or the other because no single geographic region or sector has an obvious and over-riding claim to support. The first choice of geographic or thematic focus is therefore likely to be a fairly arbitrary one. If the Trustees decide to go down this path, it is suggested that the narrower focus be maintained for three funding rounds and then changed or at least reviewed.

1. Introduction and background

1. In 2006 the Trustees of the Baring and John Ellerman International Development Programme commissioned a strategic review of the programme after three years of collaboration between the two Foundations. The period under review was 2001-2006, and so included three grants rounds before the collaboration between the two Foundations and three grants rounds conducted by the Foundations jointly. The study was carried out between November 2006 and January 2007, the presentation of review findings being timed to inform the 2007 grants round.
2. The *overall aim* of the International Development Programme is:
to improve the capacity and effectiveness of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and community-based organisations (CBOs) in Sub-Saharan Africa

and the *theme* of the International Development Programme is:
problems arising from the long-term migration and displacement of people, particularly when caused by political, economic and environmental circumstances.
3. The review has three main areas of concern. These are:
 - to consider the *partnership* between the two Foundations;
 - to review the International Development Programme's *strategic focus* in terms of its aim, theme and geographic spread; and
 - to comment on *operational aspects*
4. The approach adopted for the study period was straightforward. It consisted of desk-based research (grants files; minutes of International Development Programme Committee meetings; guidelines and other documentation relating to grant management) and interviews with grant-holders, Trustees, Advisers and Directors. Interviews were conducted with one or more representatives of all but two grantee organisations between 2001 and 2006¹. Some grant-holders have been unsuccessful applicants in other funding rounds, and they added comments on the application and selection process from the perspective of unsuccessful applicants. In addition, I received useful supplementary comments on this aspect from two organisations that have applied several times and have never been awarded a grant². Some context was provided by a study carried out by New Philanthropy Capital (NPC) on the funding of international development by UK trusts and foundations.³ The study was informed by my own experience of development work in Sub-Saharan Africa, particularly in conflict-affected countries, and by informal discussions with colleagues who have a similar background and experience.
5. The review report is structured as follows. Section 2 provides a brief sketch of the collaboration between the two Foundations. In Section 3 grant-holders' and Trustees' perceptions on the International Development Programme are reported. The final section of the report sets out the recommendations for change that are summarised above. The report also has the following

¹ The two grant-holders who were not interviewed were the Reason Partnership (which has gone into liquidation) and South Sudan Women Concern (whose representative in London was in Southern Sudan throughout the review period).

² These were ChildHope UK and Marie Stopes International.

³ I was able to discuss the research with Sarah Lock of the Nuffield Commonwealth Programme and to read a first draft of the NPC report.

appendices. A full list of people interviewed is at Appendix 1, with the check-list and report format used for interviews with grant-holders at Appendix 2. Appendix 3 contains an inventory of grant-holders' perceptions of the programme. For reference, the 2006 Guidelines for Applicants are included in Appendix 4. Appendix 5 shows the share of grants allocated to different regions in Sub-Saharan Africa between 2001 and 2006.

6. *A note on terminology:* As noted, the review period covers the three years when the Baring Foundation was awarding grants alone and three years of the joint Baring and John Ellerman Foundations International Development Programme. As it turned out, there were no significant differences between the 2001-2003 grant-holders and those of 2004-2006 in their perceptions of the programme. Most of the time therefore I have found it more convenient to use the term 'the BJEF' as a convenient, if rather unattractive, shorthand when referring to the International Development Programme. I refer to the two Foundations in their own names only where their individual contributions to the collaboration are being discussed.

2. The joint programme

7. Discussions on potential collaboration between the Baring and John Ellerman Foundations were initiated by Nicholas Baring with a view to increasing the level of resources available for the International Grants Programme. The John Ellerman Foundation was an ideal potential collaborator because both Foundations have strong commitments to international development work, born partly out of the historic overseas commercial interests of each of the parent companies. In addition, existing relationships between the Foundations' Trustees made it quite easy to bring the John Ellerman Trustees onto the International Development Grants Committee. Both Directors actively supported the proposal. The additional funds available from the John Ellerman Foundation raised the total level of annual funding from £500,000 to £750,000. The first round of joint awards was made in 2004.
8. Governance of the BJEF lies with an International Development Grants Committee that is now composed of Trustees from both Foundations. Because the BJEF awards only a small number of grants each year, it has been possible for the Baring Foundation to continue to manage the programme with no increase in staffing or advisory resources. Similarly, the Baring Foundation's application and reporting procedures have continued to be used for the joint programme. The most obvious consequence of the collaboration for applicants and grant-holders therefore is that the International Grants Programme now has additional resources but with no increase in transaction costs.
9. The different roles of the Baring and John Ellerman Foundations in the BJEF mean that the Ellerman contribution to the programme is much less visible to applicants and grant-holders than that of the Baring Foundation. This division of labour within the partnership emerged naturally, mainly because the John Ellerman Foundation joined an already established and highly successful programme. This might have been different had the two Foundations created a joint programme from scratch. None of this was reported to be a problem by the Trustees (see Section 3).
10. There are several ways that the John Ellerman Foundation has added value to the programme over and above the additional funding that it has brought. Most obviously the collaboration has brought the experience and skills of two new trustees and the expertise of another Director. The collaboration also brings fresh ideas. For example, it was the John Ellerman Foundation that proposed that £1000 should be offered to short-listed applicants who are not awarded grants. This

was cited to me by grant-holders as an example of trust and foundation ‘best practice’. The two Directors worked closely together on a significant revision of the guidelines for 2006. The Directors’ visit to Sierra Leone in the same year was a chance to jointly assess work on the ground, which in turn helps to develop a common understanding about the type of work and organisation that the BJEF should be supporting.

3. Perceptions of the International Grants Programme

11. This account of grant-holders’ and Trustees’ perceptions is the largest section of the report. This is because it seemed important to record at some length perceptions of the current programme – particularly those of grant-holders – in order to frame the consideration of whether and how changes to the programme need to be made. In this section, the grant-holders’ perceptions are first described and they are then distilled to tease out what this group of informants sees as the distinctive characteristics of the BJEF, particularly when the Foundations are compared with other funders. Grant-holders’ perceptions also provide a backdrop against which to view the Trustees’ perceptions of the programme; differences of perception among the Trustees on the aim of the programme are highlighted so that there can be some reflection on these differences as a precursor to considering possible changes.

How do grant-holders see the BJEF?

12. Before reporting how grant-holders see the BJEF, it is worth commenting briefly on the character of the group of grant-holders that I interviewed. What was most striking to me was the passion that these grant-holders brought to the issues, causes and social groups for whom and with whom they work. This seems to me to be a distinctive characteristic of small and medium-sized organisations, which have often stayed small because they have maintained a focus on and developed an expertise in a quite specific issue or set of issues. It was notable that the large NGOs lacked this passion, although they shared with the smaller ones a deep commitment to their work. While great passion does not always translate into great effectiveness, it seemed to me that passion is a quality that is needed in international development work and that it is something that the BJEF might wish to nurture through its funding.
13. A remarkably consistent and positive view of the BJEF emerged from the interviews with grant-holders. I am confident that what grant-holders told me reflected their real views and was not triggered by bias on my part or by a wish on their part simply to flatter. My confidence is based on the fact that their observations were largely spontaneous and unprompted, and it is unprecedented in my experience to be given such a consistent and such a positive picture in an exercise of this type.⁴ The picture that these perceptions provide was essentially a confirmatory one: grant-holders said that they find the programme’s aim and theme very relevant to international development work⁵ and also that they rate the BJEF very highly, in terms of how it manages its relationship with applicants and grant-holders. While grant-holders are not averse to possible changes in the BJEF, they are certainly not demanding this. If there was a more general

⁴ In any event, NGOs are quite capable of biting the hands that feed them and they are frequently and vociferously critical of the funding approaches and practices of their bilateral and multilateral donors in particular.

⁵ Self-evidently these perceptions are not representative of all NGOs but only of those that work in areas that are eligible for BJEF funds. However, it is likely that most NGOs would find a fit between their work and the aim of capacity building; issues of displacement will be relevant to fewer NGOs but still to a large number working in Africa.

criticism, it related to weaknesses in how the BJEF exploits opportunities for learning from the programme.

Procedures⁶

14. Almost all grant-holders felt that the aim and theme of the BJEF were generally quite clear. Some grant-holders had had doubts as to whether their project would fit into the theme, but they were easily able to clarify this through a telephone call to the Baring Foundation. Several grant-holders commented that they would have liked the guidelines to be more explicit about what information they needed to provide on their plans for capacity building and on what could be included under the theme of forced migration and displacement. This point was also stressed by one NGO that had made several unsuccessful applications to the BJEF; this NGO would also have liked more feedback on why their application had not succeeded.
15. Grant-holders had few comments on the application and selection process, except to say that it is logical and straightforward and that the guidelines are refreshingly unbureaucratic compared with those of many other funders. A two-stage process has now become more of a standard donor practice, and it is mostly welcomed by applicants who appreciate being able to submit just an outline proposal at the first stage. However, one grant-holder and one failed applicant commented that preparing an outline proposal in the first instance does not reduce the workload significantly, since it is still necessary to do detailed planning to produce a realistic outline, even if this detail is not reflected in the outline itself. No-one suggested that the two-stage process was inappropriate but some would have liked the first outline proposal to be even more schematic than is currently the case.
16. Several grant-holders commented that the selection meeting was intimidating at first but that the questioning by the Trustees was pertinent, relevant; for many applicants the selection meeting was also in the end an enjoyable experience. They felt that it gave them the opportunity to present themselves in the way that they wanted and that in the process they also learned something about the Trustees' concerns and interests in relation to their organisation and its work with the displaced.
17. Because the role of the John Ellerman Foundation is less visible to applicants and grant-holders, they are relatively unaware of the collaboration between the two Foundations. For the organisations working in Sierra Leone the field visit by the two Directors has been perceptible and helpful evidence that it is a joint programme. For others, the main – barely noticeable – effect is that the funds are transferred through cheques from both Foundations, rather than through a single cheque. This initially disconcerted one or two grant-holders, but they were reassured when they understood that there was nevertheless a single reporting line.

Distinctive characteristics

18. From the interviews with grant-holders the BJEF emerged as having four distinct characteristics. The first two characteristics relate to the programme's aim and theme and the second two to the management of the programme. The four characteristics are that the BJEF:

⁶ Few and relatively minor criticisms were made about the application procedure. They are included here for the record.

- i. *gives priority to capacity building*, in other words to building the potential for NGOs and CBOs to respond to the needs of the communities that they serve
- ii. *is willing to fund work that other donors see as risky*. In particular:
 - organisations that are less well-established
 - areas of work and target groups that are seen as challenging by mainstream donors or that are low priorities for other donors
 - countries and regions that are seen as unstable
- iii. *provides high quality support to grant-holders*
- iv. *has a commitment to lesson-learning*

19. Each of these characteristics is described in the following paragraphs. An inventory of grant-holders' comments – sometimes paraphrased and sometimes verbatim – is contained in Appendix 2.

Building the potential of NGOs and CBOs

20. The relevance of the aim to grant-holders needs to be seen in the context of current trends in international development work. For at least the last decade, working in partnership has been the main approach adopted in this work. 'Partnerships' include those that link northern (mainly European) NGOs with NGOs and CBOs in the south (Asia, Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa), as well as those between bilateral and multilateral donor agencies and aid-recipient governments or between these donors and NGOs. The word 'partnership' is often used rather loosely in the context of international development to describe quite different types of relationship and different understandings of the term. However, it almost always includes the principle – if not always the practice – that southern actors take the lead in designing and implementing development programmes, and that the role of their northern partners is to support and facilitate this process. For international NGOs, this typically takes the form of initiatives that aim to develop their partners' capabilities in formulating policies and strategies, and developing and managing programmes, as well as in lobbying for policy and legal reforms.
21. Together with this emphasis on partnership, there is also now a much more explicit international consensus that the goal of social and economic development is to reduce poverty; this goal is usually expressed in terms of achieving the quantitative targets of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). A strengthened international consensus around poverty reduction is obviously welcome, but grant-holders say that they are finding it more difficult to fund work that is mainly about developing the skills of their partners, since the impact of this on poverty is indirect, long-term, difficult to measure, and particularly difficult to quantify. Grant-holders commented, for example, that many donors would prefer to put money into services and physical outputs (e.g. numbers of teachers trained, numbers of water points constructed) rather than into building the management and technical skills needed to keep services going and infrastructure in working order: "[Most] donors just want you to report on how many water points you have built; they are much less interested in whether people have learned how to run and maintain the systems so that they supply water on a continuous basis."
22. Given that this is how grant-holders experience the general funding climate, it is not surprising that almost every grant-holder highlighted the BJEF's emphasis on capacity building as being

enormously helpful to them. The term ‘capacity building’ encompasses a very wide range of activities: grant-holders have used grants to provide training in IT and in budgeting and financial reporting, to develop technical skills, to provide consultancy support, and to assist partners to build national or regional coalitions of like-minded organisations to lobby for legal and policy reform. Grant-holders cited many examples of the difference that funding from the BJEF had made (for examples see Appendix 2). In general terms, grant-holders described partners that were more effective, had grown in confidence, and had come to be seen as effective development agents by other agencies: “Our partners are tiny” but “they are now organisations that are on the national map.”

23. The core costs element of the grant has been used to develop both UK and overseas offices. Several NGOs opted to use all of the core costs to develop their offices in Africa and to train their local staff, who are “key to the success of our work”. A diaspora NGO reported that the office that was funded through the BJEF has become one of their strongest, and that it now requires little support from the head office. Where NGOs used some of the core costs element to fund UK staff, this freed up staff time for other tasks including publicity and fund-raising: “to do the sort of added value work that we could never have done before – to tell the story”. One NGO has used some of the core costs to employ an intern at its UK head office, one of whose responsibilities is to build a network of law firms in the local area that are providing technical and financial support to paralegal work in West Africa. Another NGO has used the core costs element to part-fund the programme officer for the project which has enabled the organisation to maintain a focus on its own priorities rather than having to tailor its programme to what donors are willing to fund. By creating time for organisations to publicise their work, build relationships with other donors and supporters, and focus on their core priorities, the core costs element is reported to have moved organisations on and put them “on the ladder” to expand and consolidate their development work⁷.

Willingness to fund work that is risky

24. Through its aim and theme the BJEF has emphatically – though not necessarily explicitly – embraced risk: i.e. the programme provides funding mainly to small and medium-sized organisations addressing deep-rooted problems caused by devastating events in regions of Africa that are very unstable. These last two aspects were highlighted by large grant-holders, as well as smaller ones, as being an important characteristic of BJEF funding.
25. Since most grant-holders are small and medium-sized organisations, it is not surprising that the general practice among trusts and foundations of awarding grants to smaller NGOs is something that they noted as being very important⁸. With some justification, also, these NGOs feel that the bulk of the funding more generally available in the UK for international work is increasingly being absorbed by a few very large international NGOs and that small and medium-sized NGOs are being squeezed out. Small NGOs in particular are hesitant about applying to major donors, either because they feel that they lack visibility and status or because they lack the time and the experience to handle these donors’ bureaucratic demands. In this regard, the BJEF’s simple guidelines and relatively light reporting requirements are very helpful, especially to southern

⁷ This positive assessment by grant-holders of how they have used the core costs differs somewhat from that of the Foundations which have an impression that optimum use is not always made of this element of the grant.

⁸ The larger number of small and medium-sized organisations in the portfolio of trusts and foundations is also a reflection of their larger number in the market-place.

partners and to diaspora organisations who may not have English as a first language and who have greater difficulties dealing with the jargon that donors often use. In addition, diaspora organisations' more limited knowledge of and links into British society can be a barrier to their efforts to secure funds from British sources.

26. Many grant-holders commented that institutional donors can be quite prescriptive and narrow in what they are willing to fund, and that they appear to have become more so in recent years. One example given of this was that institutional donors have little interest in funding informal education, and especially education programmes for adults, even though informal education is often the best or the only way to provide education to refugees and internally displaced people, among whom non-literate adult women are usually disproportionately represented. Other activities were less attractive to donors because the topic was an uncomfortable one for governments or elites (e.g. former child soldiers; children in domestic service) or because the target group was not considered to have distinct needs (e.g. street children being subsumed within broader programmes for orphaned and vulnerable children). What this means for organisations working on these issues is that funds are either not available from institutional donors or that an NGO may have to tailor its work to donor preferences rather than sticking to the priorities that it has defined for itself. For example, donors are said to be keen to fund work on trafficking but are much more ill at ease funding work that addresses the resulting exploitation of children: if the NGO concerned in this instance had approached other donors for funding they “would have needed to push trafficking much harder and to down-play the issue of exploitation”.
27. Related to this, grant-holders reported a particular difficulty in raising funds to support lobbying by their southern partners for the legal and policy reforms needed to address the difficult circumstances of groups such as trafficked children, street children and indigenous peoples who, as one grant-holder put it, “have no political clout”. Forming alliances, networks and coalitions of organisations that represent the interests of such groups is one way of overcoming this lack of political influence and forcing political elites to take note. Such alliances – particularly ones that span more than one country – also offer a measure of protection to members working on what are sometimes politically sensitive issues. Grant-holders appreciate the fact that – again unlike other donors – the BJEF does not make arbitrary distinctions between service delivery and advocacy activities, but understands that both approaches are necessary if improvements in people’s lives are to be made and to be sustained.
28. The final area where the BJEF is willing to take risks is in the geographic focus of its grants. Trustees have been willing to fund work in countries and regions where many other donors consider that only humanitarian work is possible. Among the current group of grant-holders, such regions include Somalia, the eastern parts of the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Southern Sudan. Grant-holders appreciated the fact that the Trustees asked hard questions about whether development work was possible in these environments but that they were willing to accept the NGOs’ judgements on this, if a convincing enough case was made. The difficulties that NGOs face in funding work in some other countries relates either to the fact that the areas concerned receive little media coverage (e.g. eastern Sudan) or to the fact that these countries were previously Belgian or Portuguese colonies and so historically have aroused limited interest among British donors (e.g. the DRC, Angola)⁹. Funding for Latin America (from where the BJEF

⁹ Recent events in the DRC have significantly changed things. DFID was the largest bilateral donor to the elections in 2006 and its development assistance has risen from £5.6 million in 2001-2 to a planned £70 million in 2007-8.

withdrew in 2006) is also difficult because most of the countries in Latin America are now categorised as middle income, although they also contain very poor and vulnerable populations.

Support to grant-holders

29. Among NGOs, the BJEF is known as an example of best practice. The £1000 offered to short-listed but unsuccessful applicants was cited as a case in point. The BJEF is described as going beyond the normal relationship between donors and grant-holders, the words most often used to describe it being: open, flexible, accessible and honest; (a genuine) partner. One of the most telling comments from a grant-holder about the quality of the BJEF's support compared with other donors was: "Other donors want to catch you out. Baring and Ellerman want to help you." Another grant-holder explained the relationship by saying that dealing with other donors sometimes felt like playing a complicated game of chess where "what is important is protocols and procedures and properness... like jumping into shark-infested custard". By contrast, conversations with representatives of the BJEF were open, serious and about substantive issues. The qualities of the BJEF, which are well-known in the NGO world, were invoked by one grant-holder as an explanation for the large number of applications that the programme receives.
30. A tangible indication of the quality of the relationship with applicants and grant-holders is that the BJEF is experienced as a very accessible funder where applicants and grant-holders are not "just a file number". The way that this accessibility was described was in terms both of the number of times that grant-holders had met with the Director, the Adviser or Trustees – in their own offices and not just in London Wall – and also in terms of the speed and seriousness with which the BJEF responds to problems: "not many Chief Executives would come down to our offices to talk to us about our problems". This accessibility is valued in its own right by grant-holders and it also "hugely adds value" to the relationship because the level of contact encourages grant-holders to be much more open and honest in what they have to say. This creates a more genuine sense of partnership than exists with many other donors.
31. This partnership was described in various ways but with the emphasis always on the quality of communication with the BJEF, which "was not about whether you were complying with the grant but was much more about giving advice and guidance". Grant-holders get a sense that the BJEF wants them to succeed and they find this very motivating. It encourages applicants as well as grant-holders to be less inclined to hide difficulties than they would be with other donors. Grant-holders also noted that the Adviser read their reports carefully and provided feedback that was substantive and helpful rather than being the bureaucratic response of a "paymaster". The BJEF is also seen as being fair and flexible about the inevitable delays that occur in projects and the effect of these on planning and budgets. More than this, the BJEF does not merely accept that NGOs experience problems but the Director and Adviser also spend time with grant-holders working through possible solutions to those problems.
32. Most grant-holders commented that this support was not at the cost of rigour in respecting work plans, budgets and deadlines and in following up things that had not gone well. These comments may have been self-serving; a minority voice felt that, while the questions asked about reports were relevant, they could be tougher.

Lesson-learning

33. Almost all grant-holders described the BJEF as a funder that has a commitment to learning, and they appreciated the many ways that funding had enabled them to promote learning within their own and their partners' organisations. However, they were more equivocal about whether this commitment had been translated into systematic learning from the programme as a whole or into cross-fertilisation between projects. One grant-holder was quite forthright in expressing his opinion that the BJEF was not yet getting the most out of what was being learned from the organisations and projects being funded. "I get the sense that learning is important to the Baring Foundation but I don't get the sense that they are leading the learning... There seems to be no direction of travel... There is a need to be more rigorous, to define the direction of learning, not just to accept everything as part of life's rich pattern."
34. Grant-holders who attended the internal part of the seminar held in January 2005 saw it as a good opportunity for sharing experience and making useful contacts. Grant-holders also appreciated the fact that programme learning was disseminated to a wider audience through the publication 'Filling Gaps and Making Spaces', which they have found useful in publicising their work more widely¹⁰. However, some NGO representatives felt that the organisations that attended the seminar were too diverse a group to provide much in the way of common issues and shared concerns, and rather few grant-holders were able to point to contacts or other follow-up that they have maintained systematically since the event. Grant-holders also recognised that such events are too costly in time and money to be organised on more than an occasional basis.
35. As an organisation that funds both domestic and international work, the Baring Foundation is seen as being well-placed to encourage cross-fertilisation between the British and international programmes. International grant-holders appreciated being invited to the Foundation's 'Core Costs Club' and the potential opportunities for learning that being part of this group presented. However, they felt that in practice most of the issues discussed there were more relevant to the domestic NGOs than to themselves. Sometimes, as international grant-holders, they felt a bit "like fish out of water" and, given their limited staffing, several of the smaller NGOs said that they had not made it a priority to attend. There were different views on whether the BJEF should convene similar meetings just for international grant-holders. Most grant-holders could identify topics that in principle it would be useful and interesting to discuss with their peers¹¹ but they wanted these to be meaningful opportunities for learning and not simply getting together for the sake of it.

How do Trustees see the BJEF?

36. The Trustees are enthusiastic about the collaboration between the Baring and John Ellerman Foundations; and all the Trustees believe that joining forces in order to increase the funds that they are able to distribute annually was the right thing to do. The John Ellerman Trustees are appreciative of the Baring Foundation's management of the programme and the expertise that they bring to this. The fact that the two Foundations are comparable in size is also seen as helping to produce an effective working relationship, and good personal relationships between the

¹⁰ The seminar in January 2005 was divided into different components with different objectives. Part of the intention was to give grant-holders the opportunity to have private discussions on their work. There was also a public part, which was an opportunity for grant-holders to present their work more widely and to make a public contribution to the field. This public contribution was disseminated through ed. Twigg, J. 2005. *Filling Gaps and Making Spaces: Strengthening Civil Society in Unstable Situations*. The Baring Foundation.

¹¹ See for example suggestions in Appendix 3.

Trustees create a working atmosphere of mutual respect and easy informality. Trustees feel that they all have an equal stake in the BJEF. Trustees were also appreciative of the fact that recent streamlining has reduced the amount of paperwork that they are required to read for meetings.

37. All the Trustees support the theme of addressing the needs of migrants and displaced people. However, Trustees differ in how they see the aim of capacity building for NGOs and CBOs. These differences may be quite nuanced but in their essence they relate to whether Trustees see the priority for the BJEF as being to fund work that builds local capacity to address problems arising from migration and displacement or whether they see the priority as being to fund work that provides an immediate practical response to these problems.
38. These differences in perception about the BJEF's aim are associated with other concerns. Some Trustees thought it would be helpful to have clearer examples in the guidelines of how activities that build organisational capacity also lead to outcomes in terms of tangible improvements in people's lives¹². Some Trustees also wanted more guidance on how to assess and prioritise applications against the criteria provided in the guidelines for applicants. (The guidelines are included in Appendix 4 for reference). Different positions on the aim of the BJEF are also associated with differences in how far Trustees are willing to take risks in funding less well-established organisations: Trustees who see the main purpose of the BJEF as being to fund work that directly alleviates suffering also feel that the focus on capacity building discriminates against larger NGOs, which have a proven track record in doing good international development work.
39. It is important not to over-state these differences, which for all Trustees are secondary to their commitment to maintaining the collaboration between the two Foundations. It is also healthy for differences of view to exist within the International Grants Programme Committee and for there to be robust debate on the merits of the applications on which decisions need to be made. However, the Trustees may wish to consider whether it is an opportune moment for them to take stock and reflect together on their different perceptions, and to see whether it would be beneficial to try and achieve a greater consensus around the overall purpose of the BJEF.
40. The Trustees were uncertain about the merits of narrowing the geographic or thematic focus of the programme. Some felt that it would limit creativity and the interest of the programme, and that it would also curtail possibilities for cross-fertilisation of ideas between different regions. Similarly, there was some concern that it might prevent Trustees from responding to interesting new initiatives outside the agreed focus area(s). However, Trustees were undecided on this and were interested to hear arguments for and against these options.

4. Where next?

41. Discussions with everyone involved with the BJEF point to a programme that is highly thought of in the international NGO community, that is performing well, and where major changes are not required. The proposals that are set out in this final section of the report are, therefore, modest; their intention is for the BJEF to make more of what it is already doing rather than to offer radical alternatives. This is in line with the Terms of Reference for the review, which asked for ways in

¹² Proposals in the next section for ways to improve programme monitoring are also intended to address the need to see a more robust link between capacity building and tangible improvements in people's lives.

which the programme might have a more strategic focus within its existing approach. The Terms of Reference also offered a fairly broad menu of strategic and operational issues on which the review was invited to comment. In this final section, I consider (i) the wording of the aim and theme, (ii) the eligibility of larger NGOs, (iii) monitoring, evaluation and learning, and (iv) options for adopting a narrower geographic and/or thematic focus.

(i) The BJEF aim and theme

42. The Terms of Reference make clear that in the context of this review no major changes to the aim and theme of the BJEF are envisaged. It may however be worth considering whether amendments to the wording of the aim and theme would be clarifying. As noted, the existing formulation is problematic for some of the Trustees. Although almost all grant-holders said they felt that the aim and theme were clear, one or two also suggested that the way that they were currently formulated suggested that there was a hierarchy between capacity building as the primary objective and addressing the needs of refugees and other displaced people as the secondary objective. As a stylistic point, a grant-holder suggested that it was unnecessary to include both “capacity” and “effectiveness” in the aim since improved effectiveness means improved capacity. Similarly, the clause “particularly when caused by political, economic and environmental circumstances” appears to be redundant since there are no other factors that cause forced migration and displacement. I am inclined to accept these editorial comments.
43. A simple way of dealing with these considerations while maintaining the focus of the BJEF would be to reformulate the separate aim and theme statements as a single statement of purpose. This statement of purpose would then read:

The purpose of the International Grants Programme is to improve the effectiveness of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and community-based organisations (CBOs) in Sub-Saharan Africa to address problems arising from the long-term forced migration and displacement of people.

This statement would stand as the permanent and over-arching purpose of the Baring and John Ellerman Foundations International Grants Programme, regardless of whether the Trustees decide to opt for a narrower geographic or thematic focus.

(ii) Eligibility of larger NGOs

44. In 2006, the Directors proposed that the BJEF should only fund organisations with a turnover above £150,000 and below £15 million. It was hoped that one outcome of this proposal would be a reduction in the number of applications to the BJEF. The Trustees accepted the recommendation to impose a lower threshold. However, they decided against imposing the higher threshold on the grounds that large NGOs have become large because they have shown themselves to be effective development agents doing work that has a significant impact. I believe that the decision to exclude the smallest NGOs is justified but that the Trustees should revisit the issue of whether to fund organisations with a turnover above £15 million.
45. My reasons for this are not to do with reducing the number of applications but concern the capacity building aim (or purpose) of the BJEF. From my interviews with the small and medium-sized NGOs it is apparent that the BJEF grants have made a positive difference to their ability to develop the skills of their own staff as well as build the capacity of their partners. This is an

important need for small and medium-sized NGOs and they have few other sources of funds to meet this need other than from donors. Few donors are willing to finance these costs, however. Staff development is equally important for the large NGOs but they enjoy a quasi-monopoly on public fund-raising, which provides a flow of unrestricted income to fund costs such as these. While it is the case that funding from trust and foundations fills a useful niche for larger NGOs, in my view this is out-weighed by their far greater fund-raising capacity, in general, and their ability to raise unrestricted income from the public, in particular.

(iii) Monitoring, evaluation, learning

46. This section of the report suggests how the BJEF can help to strengthen grant-holders' monitoring and evaluation (M & E) systems. These suggestions are intended to augment, and not to replace, the initiatives that the BJEF is already taking to improve project evaluation. They should largely be manageable within the BJEF's existing resources, though some short-term additional expertise for monitoring may from time to time be required as it is now with evaluation. For simplicity's sake, these proposals for M & E are presented separately from the options for a geographic or thematic focus. However, as I explain below in the discussion of the latter, a sharper programme focus would provide a more coherent framework around which monitoring and evaluation could be organised.
47. First, a brief summary of why M & E are important and why they present particular challenges for this programme. Monitoring is a management tool for routine assessment of progress; it helps to keep work on track and it indicates if things are going wrong so that timely corrective action can be taken. Good monitoring is important in its own right and because it establishes a chain of evidence that can make the difference between a useful final evaluation and a weak one. Final evaluations help to assess how well projects achieved their objectives, why things happened as they did, whether projects had unanticipated results, and how external factors influenced project outcomes. Good M & E systems are obviously of most importance to grant-holders in managing programmes and learning lessons from their work, but the information that they generate also provides lessons for the BJEF in how to make the best possible use of its annual grant-making of £750,000.
48. The programme's aim and theme present particular challenges for any M & E system. The first challenge (which relates to the aim) is the difficulty of establishing a causal connection between capacity building and improvements in people's lives. As we have already noted – and as grant-holders acknowledged – the line from capacity building to improved welfare outcomes is an extended one, the links can be hard to see, and the results can be difficult to measure. The NGO community has begun to think about how to measure changes in capacity and the impact of capacity building on welfare, but this is still a rather under-developed area of work¹³. The second challenge (which relates to the theme) is that responses to displacement more often take the form of humanitarian rather than development assistance, even when the people concerned have been displaced for many years. For this reason, there is a general lack of well-documented experience of doing development work with long-term displaced communities. The positive aspect of both of

¹³For example, James, R. 2001. *Practical Guidelines for the Monitoring and Evaluation of Capacity building: Experiences From Africa*. OPS No. 36. INTRAC. www.intrac.org/docs/Ops36.pdf Also, resources available at www.impactalliance.org Similar work has been done on tracking the links between advocacy and development outcomes. Examples include : Chapman, J. and Wameyo, A. 2001. *Monitoring and Evaluating Advocacy: A Scoping Study*. Action Aid. www.actionaid.org/wps/content/documents/Scoping%20advocacy%20paper%202001.pdf ; BOND. 2005. *The How and Why of Advocacy*. www.bond.org.uk/pubs/guidance/2.1howwhyadvocacy.pdf

these challenges is that there is potentially a lot for the BJEF and grant-holders to gain and to learn from developing more systematic ways of monitoring and from joint reflection on the work that is being done. A more systematic focus on M & E would also address international grant-holders' concerns to have opportunities for discussing the specific features of their work, while avoiding the risk that such meetings were just 'talking shops'.

49. There is considerable potential for the BJEF to assist grant-holders to define objectives more carefully and to monitor progress more systematically. The current standard of M & E among grant-holders is inevitably quite variable. Some proposals have well-defined objectives and realistic milestones for monitoring progress, while others set out their plans for M & E in much more imprecise terms. Similarly, there are some excellent annual reports that demonstrate convincingly how the activities completed during the year are contributing towards project objectives while other reports are limited to providing an account of work done.
50. The BJEF is seeking to improve the quality of evaluations. The Baring Foundation Director and professional Adviser met recently with the latest group of grant-holders to start them thinking about how they plan to evaluate their work at the end of the three year period. It would be a simple and natural extension of this initiative to also encourage grant-holders to think harder about how they plan to monitor their work. This would involve helping new grant-holders to define realistic and achievable objectives for their work and to draw up careful plans for how they will measure progress; a particular issue will be for them to think about how they will know (and be able to show) that investments in capacity building are leading to tangible results for migrants and the displaced. An initial meeting on M & E should be followed by annual meetings throughout the life of the grant to look at annual reports, to collectively reflect on progress and to see what lessons have been learned. The content of such reflections might relate broadly to what is in annual reports and/or could pinpoint specific topics (e.g. reflections on the impact of socio-political contexts on progress; challenges in different sectors; the strengths and weaknesses of different models of working; the gender or generational dimensions of the work; and so on).
51. It will be important that these annual meetings are internal (rather than public) and that they take place in a non-competitive and non-judgemental atmosphere, where grant-holders feel that it is safe to admit to what has gone wrong as well as about what has worked well. Since the BJEF is known to be a funder with whom it is possible to be open about problems, it is particularly well-suited to creating the right environment for such constructive and self-critical discussion.
52. If this idea were taken up it would need further fleshing out. For example, a decision would need to be made on whether to convene a single annual monitoring meeting involving all grant-holders or whether three annual meetings, one for each year's cohort, would be preferable. I would suggest that, if these proposals are accepted, they should apply only to new grant-holders, in which case the decision on whether to have joint or separate meetings of different year' grant-holders would not need to be taken until the second year. The BJEF might also want to consider whether there would be a value and a possibility to invite African partners to the discussion once in the lifetime of the grant. (See further below in the discussion of the arguments for a geographic focus.)
53. Trustees may also wish to consider what involvement they would like to have in these M & E processes. Currently, members of the Baring Foundation Council have a written report each year from the professional Adviser on each funded project with a recommendation as to whether the next annual tranche should be paid. The John Ellerman Foundation Director also provides a

regular update on progress to his Trustees. If Trustees want more than this, they could participate in annual review meetings and/or receive the associated reports and other documentation. The decision may be an individual one and may rest on how much time and interest individual Trustees have for following up on the projects that they have funded.

54. A more systematic approach to M & E has other implications for programme management. First, it suggests that the BJEF should continue its current practice of awarding a small number of relatively large grants each year. This would keep the total portfolio at around a dozen grants and grant-holders, which is probably the most that can be managed if more investment of time is to be made in M & E. A greater investment in M & E would also be a disincentive to making partial awards, because a larger number of smaller grants might dilute the potential for programme learning. In any event, it would be unreasonable to demand the same standard of M & E from NGOs receiving partial awards as is made of NGOs receiving full three year grants.
55. Another important implication for programme management is that it would mean that field visits to projects by BJEF representatives would be more firmly embedded in M & E processes; it would be easier to define monitoring objectives for visits (in consultation with grant-holders) and to use the findings from these visits to inform and add value to other monitoring processes. Care must be taken to ensure that field visits do not lead to the BJEF taking over the proper role of grant-holders in supporting and monitoring their partners' work. Field visits by the BJEF should not become a substitute for grant-holders' support to partners but should be used as a means of adding to and "ground-truthing" the information on progress that is coming from grant-holders' reports and from monitoring meetings¹⁴.

(iv) Theme and geographic spread

56. The Terms of Reference for the review raise the question of whether programme funding is too widespread and whether funds would be more effectively used if either the geographic or thematic focus were narrowed¹⁵. This question arises in the context of a current trend among larger donors to be more selective, and sometimes prescriptive, in how they allocate grants. By contrast, the draft NPC report suggests that grant-making trusts have maintained a more inclusive approach to funding: about half have a broad focus overall and a further quarter have a broad geographic focus and a narrow thematic one.
57. The Terms of Reference do not explicitly raise the issue of focus in the context of M & E and programme learning. In my view, however, the most substantial argument in favour of a narrower geographic or thematic focus is that it is consistent with the proposals for M & E made above. With a narrower programme focus it will be easier for grant-holders to identify realistic and achievable milestones of progress for projects and it should mean that the information coming out of projects is more consistent and coherent. In terms of the management of the BJEF, this should make it more feasible to assess progress programmatically, rather than just organisation by organisation or project by project. It should also help to clarify grant-making decisions. For reasons that are explained below, I am proposing that any decision to narrow the geographic or

¹⁴ In disciplines (such as meteorology), which make use of satellite imagery, "ground truthing" is the process by which information is gathered on the ground to verify and assist in the analysis of the information obtained from remote sensing.

¹⁵ As noted above, a further reason for narrowing the focus is that this might reduce the number of applications to a more manageable level. While it is difficult to predict what the effect of focus might be on the level of applications, I personally believe that it is likely to be negligible, in terms of both their number and their quality.

thematic focus should be done for a limited period in the first instance and that the focus should be rotated.

58. Option 1: Fund work in a single country or region (within Sub-Saharan Africa)

If the decision is taken to limit the geographic focus it would be sensible for this to be done on a regional rather than a single country basis, and for the region to change, or at least to be reviewed, every three years. The reasons for this are that (i) displacement is typically a regional rather than a national issue, in its effects and often as well in its causes and its solutions; and (ii) displacement is a phenomenon that shifts from region to region over time, with no single region having a permanent monopoly on claims to support.

59. There appear to be two principal arguments in favour of concentrated geographic funding. The first is that the relative physical proximity of projects will make it easier for grant-holders to be in contact with one another. This should encourage them to learn more about one another's work and should promote a greater sharing of experience; this should also help to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort. In terms of grant-management, it will make it easier to monitor the effectiveness of the programme as a whole, and not just of individual projects, including through field visits by the Directors or other representatives of the BJEF. It might also be possible to organise meetings of grant-holders and partners in the region, rather than just in the UK.

60. The second argument is that when projects are located in the same region they will also be operating within similar socio-political systems, with similar patterns of laws, policies, customs and practices. Patterns of conflict and their consequences also tend to be very context specific. It is these institutional factors – which often give rise to inequitable and discriminatory practices – that often present the most difficult development challenges. If projects are operating in the same or similar socio-political contexts, there is great potential for grant-holders to learn from one another about ways to tackle the challenges that these present; and there is also a lot for them to gain from collaborating in addressing them.

61. If the Trustees follow this path, there is no obvious candidate to be the first region for funding. A seemingly objective way of deciding this would be to look at the numbers of displaced in each region in the context of the total population, of overall levels of welfare/poverty (e.g. as measured by the HDI¹⁶) and of overall levels of development assistance. This seems to be too mechanical an approach, quite apart from the fact that it is not easy to reach an estimate of the total number of displaced¹⁷. A more pragmatic approach is just to look at the share of funding that different regions have received to date from the International Development Programme. This shows that, since 2001, the Greater Horn has received more than 50 percent of the funding, with the Great Lakes, Southern Africa and West Africa sharing the remainder almost equally. Southern Africa has much fewer numbers of displaced than the other regions, which suggests that the Great Lakes and West Africa have stronger claims to be the first candidate or candidates for regionally focussed funding. (See Appendix 5, where UNHCR figures for refugees and IDPs also provide a rather rough basis of comparison.)

¹⁶ HDI – the UN's Human Development Index, a composite measure of welfare.

¹⁷ UNHCR has reasonably accurate figures for people who have been displaced for a Convention reason (i.e. people having a "well-founded fear of persecution") but the BJEF uses a wider definition than this.

62. Option 2: Focus funding more narrowly within the programme theme

There appear to be two principal ways that the programme theme could be narrowed: either by placing limits on the types of displaced person to be funded or by placing limits on the activities or sectors to be funded. It seems to be inconsistent with the theme – of addressing problems arising from displacement caused by any circumstances – to place limits on who among the displaced is eligible for funding. In practice therefore a narrower thematic focus is most likely to mean funding work in a single or in a limited number of sectors (e.g. education, employment/livelihoods or health). A strong argument can be made for doing this. As with a geographic focus, a sector focus will provide a clear and specific peg around which programme experience and monitoring and learning can be organised. Similarly, in terms of programme management, it will make it easier to monitor the effectiveness of the programme as a whole, and not just of individual projects and organisations.

63. Joint reflection on challenges, on what has been achieved (and what has gone wrong) are likely to be particularly fruitful where the group of grant-holders brings similar sectoral expertise and experience to the exercise. In addition, these reflections can be enriched by the mass of accumulated sectoral knowledge and experience which is now available in research and practitioner organisations, in publications and on web-sites¹⁸. The focus on a single sector might also provide an agenda around which grant-holders could organise to advocate in the UK and Europe to raise awareness on shared issues of concern; for example, there may be scope for lobbying donors about their reported preference for funding formal schooling for children rather than informal education programmes for adults and young people.

64. A possible argument against single sector funding is the fact that displacement always gives rise to multiple problems¹⁹ and so a more holistic, multi-sectoral approach might be more relevant. This may explain the fact that relatively few of the NGOs and projects that have been funded since 2001 are defined in terms of a sector focus: four projects have an explicit education focus, two have a focus on psycho-social health and some have a general focus on livelihoods. Most of the funded projects, however, are defined in relation to the needs of particular target groups (e.g. women, indigenous people, street children, trafficked children, child soldiers), and are about equipping partners with the organisational, implementation and management skills to respond to the diverse needs that these groups present.

65. If a single sector focus is adopted, the first choice of sector may need to be fairly arbitrary since no obvious choice is provided by the BJEF's funding history. A persuasive argument can be made in favour of focusing on livelihoods since people who have an adequate income are also more likely to be healthy and to be able to educate their children. However, there are formidable obstacles to achieving sustainable livelihoods in unstable political and economic environments, particularly for displaced people who may have imposed on them restrictions on freedom of movement or the right to look for work. A strong case can also be made for education both because education is a portable asset and because Africa's alarmingly low education levels are a major impediment to the continent achieving stability and prosperity²⁰. Because no single sector

¹⁸ Although there is similarly a great deal of information on different geographic regions, much of it has a less immediately practical application to the type of work that grant-holders are doing.

¹⁹ For example: "lack of skills, natural resources or economic opportunities, inadequate education or healthcare facilities, and denial of fundamental human rights". *Filling Gaps and Making Space*. p. 99

²⁰ Another obvious approach to selecting a sector would have been if either or both of the Foundations had a historic interest in health, education or another sector in Sub-Saharan Africa. This does not appear to be the case.

is the complete response to the problems of displacement, any decision to limit the thematic focus should, as with the geographic focus, be for three funding rounds in the first instance, and should then be reviewed.

Additional comments

66. A caveat to be noted is that, if the geographic and/or sector focus of the BJEF is narrowed while at the same time no limits are placed on the size of NGO that is able to apply, the major NGOs, which operate in a much larger number of countries and across most sectors, might benefit disproportionately from the changes.
67. If the Trustees opt to narrow the geographic and/or sector focus of grant-making, the guidelines will need to contain a qualifying statement below the purpose statement for the International Development Programme saying something along the lines of “For the year(s) 200X-200X, the Baring and John Ellerman Foundations International Development Programme will be soliciting applications for work in (region(s) and/or sector(s))”.

Conclusion

68. This review has shown that the portfolio of the BJEF includes NGOs that are unusually passionate about the work that they do. It has also shown that these NGOs see the BJEF as a somewhat exceptional funder, both in terms of what it has chosen to fund and in terms of its qualities as a grant-manager. It is my opinion that by and large the BJEF should continue to work in the way that it has done in the six years since it chose its current theme and in the three years since the two Foundations formed their partnership. If anything the BJEF needs to make a more explicit commitment to funding work that may look risky to others. If it is to do this, however, it needs to make a greater investment in monitoring project and grant-holders, to learn from programme experience, to ensure that this experience is more widely shared, and to use this to make more informed decisions about future grant-making.

Appendix 1:

People met

GRANTEE ORGANISATIONS

Organisation	Name(s) and title(s)
AFRICA EDUCATIONAL TRUST	Michael Brophy, Director
ANTI-SLAVERY INTERNATIONAL	Romana Cacchioli, Africa Programme Officer Rod Leith, Fund-Raising Officer
CHILD SOLDIERS COALITION EDUCATIONAL AND RESEARCH TRUST	Enrique Restoy, Programme Office West Africa
CHILDREN IN CRISIS	Belinda Greenwell, Trusts Manager Sarah Rowse, Overseas Programme Manager
CONSORTIUM FOR STREET CHILDREN	Alexander Dressler, Executive Director
DISABILITY AND DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS	Kamala Achu, Executive Director Maggie Owen, Finance and Fund-raising
EDUCATION ACTION INTERNATIONAL	Sally Pritchard, Head of International Programmes (by telephone)
GORILLA ORGANIZATION	Gillian Miller, Director Dan Bucknell, Regional Programme Manager
ICA UK	Jonathon Dudding, Director of Programmes
OXFAM GB	Louisa Daubney, Trust Fundraiser Graham Mackay, Humanitarian Co-ordinator for Africa Jane Cocking, Deputy Director, Humanitarian Department
PENHA	Dr Ali Mohammed, Director Kees Maxey, Project Officer Uganda, fund-raising and UK liaison
PRACTICAL ACTION	Alison Gordon, Head of Programme Funding Unit Farai Mutsambiwa, International Programme – Trusts and Foundations Theo Schilderman, International Programme Team Leader - Access to Services
RAINFOREST FOUNDATION	Simon Counsell, Director
SKILLS FOR SOUTHERN SUDAN	Florence Natana, UK Programme Manager
TIGRAY DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION UK	Dr Fesseha Alemayu, Managing Director (UK)
TRANSFORM AFRICA	Charles Kazibwe, Director
UNICEF UK	Nancy Giles, Fund-raising: Trusts and Foundations

GRANTEE ORGANISATIONS

Organisation	Name(s) and title(s)
VILLAGE AID	George Ferguson, Africa Programme Manager
Y CARE INTERNATIONAL	Gemma Hayes, Programme Coordinator Helen Kirkland, Senior Programme Coordinator/Team Leader

THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Foundation	Name and title
THE BARING FOUNDATION	Myles Wickstead Trustee, Chair of the International Development Programme Committee
	Tessa Baring, Chair of the Baring Foundation, Member of the International Development Programme Committee,
	Geoffrey Barnett, Trustee, Member of the International Development Programme Committee
	Nicholas Baring, previous Chair of the International Development Programme Committee
	David Cutler, Director
	John Twigg, Adviser
	Tina Wallace, Adviser
THE JOHN ELLERMAN FOUNDATION	Sarah Riddell, Trustee, Member of the International Development Programme Committee
	John Hemming, Trustee, Member of the International Development Programme Committee
	Tim Glass, Director

OTHER

THE NUFFIELD FOUNDATION	Sarah Lock, Commonwealth Programme Coordinator
-------------------------	--

Appendix 2:

Grantee interview check-list and report format

Note: The top shaded section of the report format completed before the interview

Organisation			
Summary project description:			
Interviewee:		Job title:	
Grant awarded: (yr)		Grant amount:	
Funding from (mth/yr) to (mth/yr):			
Other applications: (yrs)			
Evaluation (y/n):		Attended 01/05 seminar (y/n):	
Interview date/time:			
<p>Background: Role of interviewee(s) with regard to application(s). (If not clear from the type of organisation) general information on number and type of funders, and relative difficulty of fund-raising. Do they have dedicated fund-raisers?</p>			
<p>Knowledge of the collaboration between BF and JEF:</p>			
<p>Clarity and relevance of International Development Programme aim and theme: Are the aim and theme clear and helpful in indicating what type of application is likely to be successful? Reasons that they applied to the International Development Programme (rather than to another donor). Did they try to get funding from other foundations/donors?</p>			
<p>Added value: Ways that the International Development Programme adds value to their work. Comparison with other donors. Specific examples. Other ways that the International Development Programme could add value.</p>			
<p>Application and selection process: Clarity and helpfulness of guidelines for applications. Experience of selection meeting. Transparency of decision-making. Comparison with other foundations/donors. Ways that application/selection could be strengthened.</p>			
<p>Unsuccessful applications: Reasons that they continued to apply when other applications were unsuccessful. Transparency of decision-making. Comparison with other foundations/donors.</p>			
<p>Grant management, reporting and evaluation: Clarity and straightforwardness of reporting and evaluations requirements. Comparison with the requirements of other foundations/donors. Ways that reporting could be strengthened. Quality of day to day communication/ correspondence. Ways that communication could be strengthened.</p>			
<p>International Development Programme future strategy: Comments on ways to strengthen the International Development Programme's strategic focus, and for strengthening relevance, impact and added value. Specific questions about narrowing geographic and/or thematic focus.</p>			
<p>Dissemination/learning: Focus of the International Development Programme on dissemination/learning. Additional ways that the International Development Programme could support dissemination/learning.</p>			

Appendix 3:

Grant holders' perceptions of the distinctive characteristics of the Baring and Ellerman Foundations International Development Programme

The Baring and John Ellerman Foundations International Development Programme gives priority to building the potential for NGOs and CBOs to respond to the needs of the communities that they serve (capacity building)

The [BJEF] is one of the very few donors that has capacity building as an aim – other donors are much more focused on poverty reduction and the MDGs, with capacity building as a component of this. We feel that we are in step with the [BJEF]– our aim is to build partners, while the partners' aims are to reduce poverty.

The [BJEF] is distinctive in its focus on capacity building. Other donors just want to know how many water systems you have constructed; they are much less interested in whether you have built people's capacities for operating and maintaining the systems so that they continue to supply water.

Most funders don't understand capacity building; they don't understand how long it takes to change practice. Most donors would rather fund physical infrastructure.

The emphasis on capacity building is absolutely critical. Our partners are tiny and very under-resourced. The grant built their capacity and changed other donors' perceptions of them so that they have now been able to access grants from other donors. They are now organisations that are on the national map.

VSO returned to Sierra Leone a few years ago and two out of the five organisations where they placed volunteers were our partners. This was a reflection of the capacity building that had been done with the [BJEF] grant. Our partners are now also competent to get grants from the local offices of some of the major donors.

The nature of our work makes it difficult to get other organisations on board. We need to build critical mass around the issues. It is very good that [BJEF] is willing to fund networks. Other donors are cautious about this. Information sharing is important to the network members; being a member of a network, especially a sub-regional one, also offers protection.

As a consortium our job is to build the capacity of our members, especially in advocacy. NGOs working with street children have no political clout.

It's difficult to fund capacity building and advocacy; larger foundations and donors are looking for quantitative indicators of impact but it's hard to come up with quantitative measures of success in this area of work.

It's difficult to get funding for capacity-building because it's long-term. The core costs element was used to train regional staff in IT, budgeting and accounting, monitoring and evaluation. We were delighted to be able to use it for this because these staff are key to programme success.

Because of the core costs element our Somaliland office is now one of our strongest. Other organisations are now asking to partner with them in new areas of work and the office is now able to make applications for large grants from institutional donors.

Core costs support funded one-third of a UK Programme Officer's salary. This "moved us on" and "put us on the ladder for" extending our work and securing larger funds from institutional donors.

The core costs element covered the costs of UK support. Without this, the work would have been done at a much lower level. The grant enabled us to work to our agreed priorities.

[BJEF] recognises the importance of core costs for UK based organisations. The grant freed up the Director's time to develop relations with other donors and to work with Trustees and Patrons – “to do the sort of added value work that we could never have done before – to tell the story”. This enabled us to secure more resources for our work from other donors. The grant had a snowball effect.

The [BJEF] has been fantastic. It is willing to invest in organisations' own capacity building; other donors won't do this. We were able to fund an intern from this who has been an enormous help (e.g. in getting local law firms to support paralegal work in West Africa).

The Baring and John Ellerman Foundations International Development Programme is willing to fund work that other donors see as too risky. In particular:

- **organisations that are less well-established**
- **areas of work and target groups that are seen as challenging by mainstream donors or that are low priorities for other donors**
- **countries and regions that are seen as unstable**

The Foundations are willing to fund non-mainstream organisations; “organisations that are not household names”; organisations that would be much less confident in approaching much bigger donors.

It is very good that the [BJEF] is willing to fund small organisations and take risks with them.

Large international NGOs are highly professionalized with specialised fund-raisers. We don't have those specialists. I do the fund-raising. Do I know the right language for proposal writing? I looked at the language I had used for the application and thought that other donors wouldn't have funded it. You also need to have personal contacts, which we lack; you need to be able to ask around to find out what it is that donors are looking for.

The links that diaspora organisations have into British society are less strong than for UK organisations, and so fund-raising is more difficult for us.

At the 2005 seminar I was really impressed that these were real grass-roots organisations working on very difficult issues. The presentations from Peru and from South Sudan were inspiring.

For almost the first time we felt part of the mainstream when we met other grant-holders at the 2005 seminar.

The Trustees were willing to take a risk and accept our assessment that we are able to work in eastern DRC. Other donors see it as too remote and too risky.

The Greater Horn is a very difficult Region to get funding for.

Fund-raising is very difficult for Port Sudan and Red Sea province of Sudan.

Outside humanitarian work, Southern Sudan is not well funded because it's such a risky environment. The [BJEF] is one of the few funders willing to take a risk and to fund work in a very fluid situation.

It has been difficult to fund work in a Francophone area (although things have changed in the last 3-4 years and DFID is now the largest donor in the DRC).

Latin America is a very difficult area to fund because most Latin American countries are middle income; but they all contain very poor and vulnerable populations.

Bigger donors and governments are mainly interested in funding formal education for children; they are not particularly interested in funding informal education or work with adults and young adults.

Everyone wants to fund trafficking but it is difficult to fund the end result (e.g. the exploitation of children in

domestic service) because this brings the issue right home to African elites. For other donors we would have needed to push trafficking much harder and to down-play the issue of exploitation.

Forced labour is not seen as an issue in its own right. There is a simple assumption that working on poverty will in itself benefit people forced into labour, but this does not happen with highly socially marginalised groups.

We are working with marginal organisations working on unpopular causes – large organisations won't work with them because it jeopardises their relationship with the wider constituency.

Children in armed conflict has been a fundable area of work but we have to move on and focus more on root causes and consequences which are much more complicated and difficult to convey to funders. It's especially difficult if your donors include governments because looking at causes involves looking at arms transfers, asylum issues and so on where governments are more sensitive.

Funding is particularly difficult for work with former child soldiers and combatants; they appear to be a very risky group that is very vulnerable to political developments.

The grant provided an opportunity not available elsewhere to fund work with street children. This work is difficult to fund because street children are usually subsumed within 'orphaned and vulnerable children' whereas street children face very specific problems and needs.

It is difficult to find funders willing to fund non-humanitarian work in conflict situations. It is particularly difficult when projects respond to partners' demands because they may not fit with donor priorities.

One of the beauties of grant is that we didn't have to sacrifice any of our strategy. With most donors, everyone has to sacrifice a bit of their strategy.

Our work is often not attractive to donors because it is technical, difficult to understand and relatively low profile. One of the biggest benefits of attending the 2005 seminar was that we achieved greater visibility.

The Baring and John Ellerman Foundations International Development Programme provides a high quality of support to grant-holders

"Baring and Ellerman want to help you out. Other donors want to catch you."

The [BJEF] is an unusual trust in providing funds to the level of £250,000. In that respect and in being very thorough [BJEF] is like Comic Relief or the Lottery Fund. In other respects it operates like a small trust with a very personal level of communication.

In the [BOND] Trust Networking Group the Baring Foundation was singled out as an example of best practice; for example, the £1000 given to second round applicants who fail to get a grant.

The level of accessibility and contact throughout the grant management process is something unique to the Baring Foundation.

You can be very open with the Baring Foundation. It is possible to say in the application that it would be difficult to find funds elsewhere, which you would not say to e.g. DFID or the EC.

The Baring Foundation is very fair and open; very flexible and responsive to changing circumstances and the effects of this on budgets (unlike DFID and the EC).

They are flexible in how to deal with the money. There were delays in the start-up of the programme and our local office was happy because there was no problem about carrying over funds.

You can actually talk about things e.g. the way that we were able to explain why we needed more time and needed to carry out the evaluation later.

“A dream of a donor”, especially for our partners. These are very tiny organisations. They can’t write complicated narrative and financial reports. Because the format is so simple, we need to do very little re-working before presenting the reports to the Baring Foundation.

I really enjoyed preparing the report; it had a very relevant focus compared with other donors. John Twigg’s follow-up queries were relevant rather than bureaucratic. It was good to know that someone had actually read the report and responded to it. This is unusual with Foundations.

Questioning on reports could be tougher. It’s relevant but some of the questioning lacks rigour. I’m happy to report problems to donors as long as this is done on the basis of partnership.

The Baring Foundation is engaged, working with you. You get a sense that they want you to do well, to achieve what you want to do. A very motivating relationship, not just a one-way process, an honesty of approach. But without loss of rigour – there is still a respect for work plans and deadlines – it’s not too informal.

The Baring Foundation is more of a partner. We were very touched that David Cutler came down to our offices to discuss with us. The Baring Foundation has an interest in us as an organisation: not many Chief Executives would come down to our offices to talk to us about our problems. Even if we never get any more money from them in the future, we will still see the Baring Foundation as one of our partners.

We had rather more contact with the Baring Foundation than with other donors. I had the sense that they were genuinely interested in what we were doing. All of this makes the whole thing much more pleasant – you don’t feel that you are accounting to a paymaster.

One thing very unique about the Baring Foundation is that I met David Cutler six times in the course of a year. This hugely adds value because you can discuss problems in relation to the grant, especially because the Baring Foundation is a very open organisation.

The Baring Foundation goes beyond the normal relationship between donors and grant-holders. For example, David Cutler and John Twigg visited our offices when the International Coordinator died unexpectedly. They helped to keep us on track because they thought about how we could cope with this.

The good thing about the Baring Foundation is that you can discuss with them. You have immediate access to David Cutler and you get down to business immediately. We have visited their offices and they have had meetings in ours. There’s an immediate response to problems.

David Cutler is always very accessible and understanding. The Baring Foundation is also rigorous, though. They always come back and query things if they are not clear. The relationship with John Twigg is also very constructive.

John Twigg is very supportive and helpful: If you start a communication with him, he’s on it. With more bureaucratic funders you feel you are involved in “a complicated game of chess and that what is important is protocols and procedures and properness.” It’s good to know that you can just talk to someone – “it’s not like jumping into shark-infested custard.”

To John Twigg we were not just a file number. It’s clear that he read and understood our report and he provided very useful feedback. Communication was not about whether you were complying with the grant but was much more about giving advice and guidance; especially reflections from other programmes. This breaks down the conventional barriers between donors and recipients – it’s much more of a partnership.

We found the visit from the Trustee very interesting, particularly because their it was clear that they were as interested in how we work as an organisation as they were in the project.

We had less contact with John Twigg than we would have liked. He has the capacity and expertise to deal with some difficult strategic issues, but he doesn't have enough time.

The Baring and John Ellerman Foundations International Development Programme is committed to lesson-learning but could make more of learning from the programme

The Baring Foundation is very good at bringing NGOs together for lesson-learning; you get a lot out of looking at different models in different contexts.

The 2005 seminar was a very good opportunity for learning because everyone was working in Africa and the main theme was relevant to everyone. Working groups were useful in terms of problem-sharing and problem-solving; the discussion provided food for thought. The event was also useful for networking and for identifying other organisations as a resource for us and recognising ourselves as a resource to others.

It was very good that the Baring Foundation created this opportunity to bring partners together. The publication was also a very good initiative – it was good for our partners to be able to show that they feature in a publication.

I had the impression that the 2005 meeting was for the [BJEF] to find out more about the grant-holders, rather than being a learning opportunity for the grant-holders. However, through it we were able to establish relations with other advocacy based organisations and learned useful things about EU lobbying and advocacy.

At the 2005 seminar we could only find things in common with one or two of the other organisations. I had hoped for more synergies from this cross-fertilisation. Not much has come out of it since the seminar.

The [BJEF] grant enabled us to invest in cross-learning from the Angola work to Mozambique and to encourage networking in the Lusophone countries.

Our South Africa office liked the fact that the [BJEF] has a clear theme because it encourages learning between organisations.

It is a strength of the Baring Foundation that they work nationally and internationally; this provides opportunities for cross-cultural learning.

We have been regularly invited to the Core Costs Club but – given our limited staffing – it is not a high priority because it tends to be dominated by the interests of domestic NGOs. It's good for the Baring Foundation to bring people together but it doesn't seem to have a clear objective, or at least the objectives don't seem to relate to us.

It would be good to have a Core Costs Club just for international grant holders – the current set up is not particularly relevant.

The Baring Foundation needs to make a greater investment in capturing learning. The Core Costs Club doesn't really work for international grants-holders who are rather fish out of water. It would be better to have a Core Costs Club/Learning Forum just for the International Grants Programme.

I get the sense that learning is important to the Baring Foundation but I don't get the sense that they are leading the learning. There seems to be "no direction of travel." There is a need to be more rigorous, define the direction of learning "don't just accept everything as part of life's rich pattern."

Appendix 4:

The Baring Foundation International Grants Programme in collaboration with The John Ellerman Foundation

Guidelines for applicants

These guidelines describe in order:

- The aims of the Programme
- Who can apply for a grant and who cannot
- The size and types of grant, and duration of funding
- The types of activity that are eligible for funding, and those that are not
- Assessment criteria that will be used when applications are being considered.

They are accompanied by instructions on ‘How and When to Apply’ and an application form (NB application form not included in this Appendix).

1. Aim of the Programme

The International Grants Programme’s **overall aim** is:

- to improve the capacity and effectiveness of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and community-based organisations (CBOs) in Sub-Saharan Africa.

The programme’s current **theme** is:

- problems arising from the long-term migration and displacement of people, particularly when caused by political, economic and environmental circumstances.

2. Who can apply for a grant and who cannot?

The Foundation will accept applications from registered charities, voluntary and constituted not-for-profit organisations in the UK which have had an income of over £150,000 for each of the last two years. Such UK charities will need to have close working partnerships with non-governmental and community-based organisations in Sub-Saharan Africa and to seek to benefit people disadvantaged or marginalised by long-term migration and displacement. Organisations (including those in consortia) may make only one application in each annual funding round.

Partner CBOs can be in a single country or more than one country.

If you are in any doubt about your organisation’s eligibility, you should contact the Foundation’s staff for advice before preparing your application.

The International Grants Programme will not support:

- organisations currently funded under this programme or which have been funded within the last two years
- organisations with an income below £150,000 for the last two years.

3. Size and types of grant

3.1 Amount and duration of grant

Applicants can apply for grants of up to five years. Only one application may be made in each funding round. The maximum size of a grant is £250,000. The amount of funding in each year can vary according to the needs of the project.

In practice the Foundation expects many applications to be for less than the maximum amounts and it may award less than the amount requested.

3.2 Types of work

The Foundation recognises that capacity-building initiatives take many different forms and so it does not specify particular types of activity for support within this programme, but examples would include:

- developing networks and other partnerships
- training programmes, and the design and preparation of training courses and materials
- research and dialogue with policy and decision makers about issues affecting NGOs and communities
- workshops, meetings and exchange visits to develop or share skills and experiences
- piloting new approaches
- improving information resources and upgrading capacity in information and communications technologies
- improving financial and administrative systems.

3.3 Exclusions

The international programme will not support the following activity:

- expeditions
- bursaries or scholarships
- medical research or equipment
- animal welfare or wildlife conservation
- vehicles
- the purchase, conversion or refurbishment of buildings
- religious activity
- emergency relief
- general fundraising appeals
- work that has already been completed or will have started while the application is being considered
- the continued funding of activity that is already taking place or will be repeated.

3.4 Use of funds

Part of the grant may be used to strengthen the applicant's own capacity. Priority will be given to applications proposing to use a grant for strategic, long-term capacity building. It may also be used to cover the costs of technical support provided by the applicant organisation to its partners in Sub-Saharan Africa for the work being funded through the grant.

It is expected that a significant element of the grant will be re-granted to partner NGOs and CBOs to build their capacity to assist migrants and displaced people.

An end-of-project evaluation is compulsory. The grant can be used to cover this cost.

4. Assessment Criteria

Proposals must aim to improve the capacity and effectiveness of NGOs and CBOs in Sub-Saharan Africa in meeting the practical needs of migrants and people displaced by political, economic or environmental circumstances.

All applications must be factual and written in plain English, avoiding jargon and rhetoric.

Applications will be assessed against the following four criteria, in order of importance:

- (1) **Need** – a compelling explanation of the nature and extent of need - both for the displaced peoples/refugees **and** the development of NGOs/CBOs seeking to help them.
- (2) **Plan** - a realistic and practical plan, including clear objectives, which:
 - takes account of the broader context (e.g. security situation and relevant work by other organisations)
 - responds to problems and opportunities identified by the refugees/displaced people themselves
 - develops or extends genuine partnerships with local organisations and communities
 - sets sensible timetables and outcomes
 - offers the prospect of enduring improvement
- (3) **Trackrecord** –a brief account of the applicant's previous achievements and experience.
- (4) **Other Factors** - a successful application will also cover the following issues;
 - gender issues and the needs of particularly vulnerable groups –e.g. children and older people

- means whereby intended beneficiaries take or share control of decision-making and initiatives
- a workable system for evaluating progress and outcomes
- ways of allocating or distributing funds and responsibility downwards

The applicant organisation will need to demonstrate that it has the management structures and systems to plan and manage the work and the Foundation's grant as well as the skills and experience of working effectively with other agencies and local organisations and people. It should have a commitment to equal opportunities and a track record of considering potential environmental effects of its work and avoiding harmful ones. The Foundation will assess the organisation's ability to evaluate and replicate the success of the work.

In its assessment, the Foundation will take account of organisations' ability to secure unrestricted funding from other sources and may give priority to those that find it more difficult to do so.

December 2005

HOW AND WHEN TO APPLY

1. How to apply

The selection procedure has two stages:

- outline proposal
- full proposal and presentation to the International Grants Committee by 5 or 6 shortlisted applicants

Applicants should note that there will be very strong competition for funding. It is probable that only three or four grants will be awarded each year. In 2005, 61 applications were received and six projects were funded. Often we have chosen to fund fewer than six applications. Details of projects funded since 2001 can be found on our website, www.baringfoundation.org.uk.

1.1 Outline proposal

Outline proposals must be no more than 1,750 words (excluding budget). They should be presented under the following headings and contain the following information, covering both the core and project elements of the proposed work:

- *Applicant organisation:* brief description of the applicant organisation, its aims and principles, current work and experience.
- *Goals:* the overall objectives and aims of the proposed work, indicating how these relate to the Foundation's interests.
- *Needs:* the needs (of partner organisations and beneficiaries) that will be tackled, and how they were assessed.
- *Beneficiaries:* who will benefit from the work, where, in what ways and for how long?
- *Approach:* the principal activities that will be carried out and by whom; and the reasons for taking the approach chosen.
- *Timetable:* a schedule of the main activities (the start and finish dates of the work must be given).

- *Assessment:* how the proposed work will be monitored and evaluated, and in particular the criteria that will be used to judge its achievements.

Budget: The proposal should also contain an estimated budget setting out the amount requested from the Foundation and outlining the main items of expenditure for each year over the period of the grant. If funds from other sources are also being used or requested for the work, details should be given.

Supporting information: the following additional information about the applicant organisation should be enclosed with the proposal:

- the most recent audited accounts or financial report required by the Charities Act *
- the organisation's income/expenditure projection for the current financial year
- the organisation's current strategic plan or equivalent (if no such plan exists, this should be stated clearly)
- the organisation's most recent annual report, if one is published
- details of staffing, organisational structure and use of volunteers

*if the year covered by these accounts ended more than 12 months previously, an income/expenditure report for the most recent complete financial year must also be included.

Applications will only be considered if all the supporting information listed above is sent to the Foundation with a completed application form.

1.2 Full proposal and presentation

Shortlisted applicants will be asked to submit a fuller proposal of no more than 5,000 words (excluding budget) to explain and justify the work in more detail. This should follow the same format as the outline proposal. A detailed budget should also be included, with expenditure broken down by years.

Shortlisted applicants will also be asked to make a short presentation of their proposal to the International Grants Committee and to answer questions. £1,000 will be paid to shortlisted organisations which are unsuccessful in acknowledgement of the work undertaken to get to this stage. The participation of field workers in the presentations is encouraged.

1.3 Timetable

There will be one funding round in each year (the Foundation's financial year runs from January to December). The timetable for 2006 is:

- End December 2005 guidelines issued
- 31 March 2006 deadline for submission of outline proposals
- June 2006 selection of applicants for second stage
- 15th September 2006 deadline for submission of full proposals
- 1st November 2006 presentations made to a joint committee and decisions made.

A timetable for subsequent funding rounds will be included in the call for proposals on the Foundation's website towards the end of 2006.

1.4 Address for applications

Applications should be sent to:

The Baring Foundation
60 London Wall
London EC2M 5TQ

1.5 Response

All applications will be acknowledged. The Foundation's staff or advisers may need to telephone or visit the applicant organisation in order to obtain further information. Applicants will be notified of the outcome of the first and second stages by letter.

Once you have read these guidelines and you wish to apply, please complete the application form and ensure you provide all the necessary supporting documentation with your application. If you have any questions about the application process or would like further clarification and advice you can either email: baring.foundation@uk.ing.com or telephone us on 020 7767 1348

December 2005

Appendix 5:

Distribution of International Development Programme funding for Sub-Saharan Africa by region: 2001-2006

Overview: Share of International Development Programme funding for Sub-Saharan Africa 2001-2006 and share of displaced by country of asylum and country of origin in 2005

Region	Level of funding 2001-2006	Share of funding 2001-2006	No. displaced by region of asylum 2005	% displaced by region of asylum 2005	No. displaced by region of origin 2005	% displaced by region of origin
Greater Horn²¹	-5	53.39	48.39	44.35	141.13	51
Great Lakes	-5	16.63	11.63	28.23	51.49	23.54
Southern Africa	-10	16.02	6.02	6	18.04	5.45
West Africa	-20	13.96	-6.04	21.40	9.32	19.99
Total	-40	100	60	99.98	219.98	99.98 To

International Development Programme grants for Sub-Saharan Africa by region and by year 2001-2006

Greater Horn

Organisation Name	Project summary	Grant amount £	Year awarded
Education Action International	This three-year project aims to improve the effectiveness of Education Action International and its local partners in Africa and Peru to deliver educational services to adults and children who have been uprooted by conflict.	198,636	2001
Pastoral and Environmental Network in the Horn of Africa (PENHA)	This three-year project aims to provide capacity building and institutional support to organisations of nomadic pastoralists in Somaliland.	238,948	2001
South Sudan Women Concern	This three-year project will provide grants, training resources and materials to enable 20 groups of displaced women in Southern Sudan to build their organisational capacity. It will also improve the capacity of South Sudan Women Concern and other local partners to support this process.	239,850	2001
Tigray Development Association UK	To promote conflict resolution as an essential strand running through development initiatives with displaced people in the region through the establishment of a Conflict Resolution Unit within TDA International.	221,000	2002
UNICEF UK	A comprehensive support programme for the reintegration into the community of child soldiers in Sudan.	173,050	2004
Oxfam GB	Towards providing livelihood and educational opportunities to displaced women in shanty towns around Port Sudan.	46,407	2005
South Sudan Women Concern	Towards capacity building of 30 groups of displaced women in South Sudan and provision of support to former child soldiers.	107,138	2005
Africa Educational Trust	To reduce illiteracy and poverty amongst displaced women, children and young people living in camps for internally displaced people in Somalia by building their communities' capacity to identify and address their education and training needs.	256,230	2006
Skills for Southern Sudan	The project will train local consultants who will go on to train CBOs in a range of skills needed to establish themselves as organisations	176,192	2006
Total Greater Horn		1,657,451	

Source: <http://www.baringfoundation.org.uk/>

Great Lakes

Organisation Name	Project summary	Grant amount £	Year awarded
Rainforest Foundation	To increase the capacity of Central African organisations to address the problems of displaced forest people through policy and advocacy work.	185,000	2003
The Gorilla Organization	Capacity-building of indigenous peoples' organisations in the African Great Lake region, to enhance their socio-economic conditions and assert their rights.	85,715	2004
Children in Crisis	The project will train 300 primary school teachers and support local NGOs and community groups in delivering educational services in an isolated part of the Democratic Republic of Congo.	245,597	2006
Total Great Lakes		516,312	

Source: <http://www.baringfoundation.org.uk/>

Southern Africa

Organisation Name	Project summary	Grant amount £	Year awarded
ICA UK	Towards building the capacity of ICA Tanzania to expand its involvement with displaced people and migrant communities. It will also develop the capacity of 20 local groups from amongst the (predominantly) Maasai and Waarusha peoples in Kisongo and Manyara Divisions, Monduli District, Tanzania.	138,565	2002
Disability and Development Partners	To strengthen the capacity of a local partner in Angola and enhance its capacity to respond to the needs of internally displaced people with disabilities, and their families.	156,000	2003
Practical Action	Building the capacity of NGOs and CBOs to implement decentralised infrastructure interventions to improve the lives of flood-displaced communities in Mozambique. (The John Ellerman Foundation awarded an additional 50% to the amount shown here).	202,780	2004
Total Southern Africa		497,345	

Source: <http://www.baringfoundation.org.uk/>

West Africa

Organisation Name	Project summary	Grant amount £	Year awarded
Anti-Slavery International	To establish a permanent network of NGOs in West Africa working on the issue of child trafficking.	164,358	2003
Child Soldiers Coalition Educational and Research Trust	To establish and support a network of West African organisations seeking to stop the use of child soldiers and support regeneration of former child soldiers into society.	222,192	2005
Transform Africa	Towards assistance to build the capacities of NGOs and CBOs in Sierra Leone to support the long-term integration of former refugees and displaced people.	46,407	2005
Village AiD	To support partner organisations in Ghana and Sierra Leone working with displaced and excluded young people.	138, 215	2005
Total West Africa		433,310	

Source: <http://www.baringfoundation.org.uk/>