The newsletter of INTRAC
International NGO Training and Research Centre
No. 56 January 2014
ontrac

viewpoint

Funding civil society in emerging economies


© Josh Hough / delayedgratification

UNICEF community event in South Africa.

Funding for civil society in emerging economies is changing at an unprecedented rate. In many countries, the transition from low to middle-income status has triggered the withdrawal of large sums of foreign aid. As a result, civil society organisations have rapidly found themselves in a very different funding landscape. This edition of ONTRAC brings together perspectives from the north and the south on this new funding environment, and the challenges and opportunities it poses for civil society in emerging economies.[1]

Our discussions with international NGOs and other donors have revealed surprise at the rate of change. When INTRAC engaged in the 'Civil Society @ Crossroads' project, a collective reflection process about the future of civil society worldwide, it became obvious that many groups around the world had not sufficiently thought through their future roles or resourcing.

This has had significant implications for civil society in emerging economies. In many instances, upwards donors – including international NGOs – have not phased out as well as they would have liked to. Despite all the talk of sustainability, in reality many donors have done too little to prepare civil society organisations for a future without aid. For many local and national

[1] There is considerable discussion and some unease about the term "middle-income country", which originally came from World Bank classifications according to Gross National Income per capita. This classification obscures inequalities and often major poverty within these countries. Moreover, those living within MICs do not necessarily relate to these labels.

Contents

In this issue:

Funding for civil society in emerging economies is changing rapidly. This ONTRAC presents perspectives on this new funding environment, and the challenges and opportunities it poses for civil society. Some initiatives have sought a transitional approach to the end of external aid. Suzy Serneels describes Broederlijk Delen's efforts to assist the transition process in South Africa, through various forms of support to local groups. The results were mixed: some local groups managed the transition reasonably well, others found it difficult to change track. Nomvula Dlamini describes some issues confronting South African organisations adjusting to procuring resources from domestic instead of foreign donors.

Ana Toni and Alice Amorim discuss the decline of aid and rise of a nascent national philanthropy sector in Brazil. While more funding opportunities have become available domestically, CSOs can find them difficult to access. Overall, it seems that CSOs that were never dependent on external funding have adapted better. To stay relevant, CSOs may have to re-evaluate their focus, form, and function. Supriya Roychouhury and Emma Mawdsley look at how large NGOs in India are doing this.

civil society organisations, the shift from being an aided to unaided organisation has happened much faster, and with much less support, than they expected or needed.

How are organisations dealing with the challenges of transition?

A few initiatives exist that have sought a transitional approach to the end of external aid. One such example is the Dutch-based Wilde Ganzen. Through its Action for Children Programme, it is encouraging a form of co-funding with local intermediary NGOs and their community based partners. Wilde Ganzen provides 50% of the required funds, only releasing them once the intermediaries and communities have raised the remaining resources locally.

Other organisations have phased out completely over a number of years. Later in this issue, Suzy Serneels describes Broederlijk Delen's efforts to assist the transition process in South Africa, over three years prior to the organisation's exit from the country. They combined various forms of support to local groups.

However, the results were mixed. While some local groups managed the transition reasonably well, others found it difficult to change track. Nomvula Dlamini of CDRA, a former recipient of funding from Broederlijk Delen in South Africa provides a good counterpoint in her article. She describes the issues confronting many South African organisations adjusting to procuring resources from domestic instead of foreign donors.

Endogenous initiatives to found local trusts also exist, which raise money from corporates and the newly emerging middle class. Endowment funds from private foreign foundations sometimes boost these domestic resources. Here, the lesson is to create local trusts well before the aid circus leaves town. It takes time to foster a culture of giving and raise awareness of the need to develop local resources.

Ana Toni and Alice Amorim use their article to discuss the decline of aid and subsequent rise of a nascent national philanthropy sector in Brazil. While over time, more funding opportunities have become available domestically, civil society organisations can find it difficult to access them. However, the authors are hopeful that, with support, Brazilian civil society will be more successful in leveraging these resources.

Overall, it appears that civil society organisations that were never dependent on external funding have adapted much better. For those that were heavily dependent on foreign aid, the move from being an aided organisation in a developing country, to being an unaided organisation in a middle-income country has been tough. Many have not, or will not, survive the transition. I believe that for many organisations, simply looking for new funds to replace old ones will not be enough. In order to stay relevant, civil society organisations may have to re-evaluate their focus, form, and even function.

Supriya Roychouhury and Emma Mawdsley's contribution to this ONTRAC looks at how large NGOs in India are doing just this. These organisations are not just looking for alternative funding sources to replace old ones; they are fundamentally reorienting themselves to respond to the challenges posed by the new context. They are refocusing on more nationally appropriate issues such as inequalities resulting from caste, religious or ethnic-based discrimination; issues that foreign donors have typically overlooked.

Reconsider the roles of civil society organisations

I am not convinced that the sector should just fill the gap between foreign and local funding without reconsidering the roles of civil society organisations in developing, transitional and emerging economies. As governments take over large-scale service delivery, the civil society organisations that once provided these services should instead focus on holding the state to account, subjecting its service delivery record to independent scrutiny. As the Civil Society @ Crossroads project demonstrated, some groups have already done this.

I believe that the changing funding environment arguably presents an opportunity for civil society to play a more dynamic and political role. National civil society organisations should focus on taking up specific issues with their government relating to public policy, governance and human rights. They should also support marginal and niche voices to come to the fore, highlighting the interests and needs of groups that the government and wider public would otherwise ignore. Where possible, they should also support the development of a rich and vibrant local voluntary sector via context specific self-help membership groups.

There is, however, a long way to go before this vision becomes a reality. For many organisations, filling the funding gap remains their immediate priority. In many countries the departure of foreign funders is happening faster than the new forms of resource mobilisation emerge, posing huge challenges to civil society in emerging economies. Yet if they are to survive, civil society organisations must also address the crucial questions of focus, form and function.

Brian Pratt
INTRAC Associate
bpratt@intrac.org

Emerging challenges and opportunities in funding: a perspective from India

The funding landscape for development NGOs is changing. This article explores how large NGOs in India are responding strategically to these funding challenges.

Most traditional bilateral donors are cutting their budgets. In many cases a higher share of their foreign aid funding is being directed towards the private sector, infrastructure, and growth, which tend not to be the preserve of NGOs.

Foreign funding continues to support knowledge sharing, rights-based work, and advocacy, but there may be some decline in funding for social programmes (although this varies widely). Major international NGOs, which help fund partners across the world, are also experiencing tighter budgets.

However, new sources of funding are opening up – individuals who make up the growing affluent classes of the 'South', wealthier governments, growing numbers of charities and philanthropic organisations, and increasing technology-enabled giving from individuals (including diasporas) across the world. The implications, choices and possibilities for NGOs depend in large part on their funding and country context, on their core purpose and mission, and on their institutional flexibility and resilience.

India has a well-established, vibrant and diverse NGO sector. It is also a good example of the growing phenomenon of 'rising powers' from which traditional western donors are retreating. This is occurring while considerable absolute and relative numbers of people continue to live in poverty. This is a paradox that development actors are confronting in the context of changing geographies of global poverty and wealth within and between countries. There are a number of points to make here.

The first is that there is a recognition of the significant changes taking place within the international development system, including financing options.

NGOs are highly aware of the issue, and are reacting to it at several different levels. However, responses to the changing financial landscape are not separate from recognition of wider shifts in global political and ideological power.

Community health worker gives a vaccination in Odisha state, India.

Larger NGOs, with the institutional capacity to respond strategically, are not just aiming to find alternative funding sources, but to more fundamentally reorient themselves within a rapidly changing domestic and international context. They are not just looking for new sources of financing to replace dwindling older sources so that they can continue to work in old ways. The need to adapt and shift their resource profiles is one part of a wider set of shifting contexts, challenges and opportunities.

Partly as a response to this, large transnational NGOs (such as Oxfam and ActionAid) are 'Southernising' further. For some years, many of these organisations have, to some extent, been devolving and decentralising their offices, personnel, decision-making, and agenda-setting. Funding, however, often continued to flow primarily from Northern to Southern partners.

The beginnings of decentralisation are under way, and a number of national affiliates of these transnational NGOs, which have been established fairly recently, are actively exploring how to build a sustainable domestic resource base and move away from the traditional grant-based model. This requires strong, grassroots-led campaigns, which foster recognition of the NGO 'brand' as a national organisation.

Branding, however, can be challenging in a situation where such NGOs may continue to be labelled as "international" or outsider organisations. In some cases this casts doubt on their legitimacy. As mentioned by Obino in ONTRAC 54[1], such affiliates can be regarded as competitors by Indian civil society actors already engaged in national campaigns and advocacy.

Obino also observes that a marker of INGO decentralised governance is the ability of national affiliates to participate and contribute substantively to global policy-making and agenda setting. Indeed, this kind of engagement at the national/country level is a prerequisite for successful global advocacy (noted by Hobbs in ONTRAC 54[2]).

In this context, Southern affiliates such as Oxfam India were able to successfully link grassroots-generated content that informed national campaigns to global policy processes, such as setting the agenda for the post-2015 development

1 INTRAC. 2013. "ONTRAC 54 The rise of INGO families: perspectives, issues, and experiences." Oxford: INTRAC. www.intrac.org/resources.php?action=resource&id=769

2 INTRAC 2013.

architecture. Thus, there appears to be a strong interest within the global donor community to continue to support and fund projects where civil society in Southern-based NGOs can influence global policy conversations on issues that are also nationally relevant.

Turning to potential domestic sources of funding requires NGOs to demonstrate or persuade new actors and audiences of their legitimacy and credibility. These are long-standing challenges for NGOs, but they require specific strategies for domestic constituencies. The Indian middle class, for example, is likely to respond to somewhat different messages, issues and images, conveyed through various channels (such as social media) if they are to become contributors.

Finally, growing the share of funding from domestic (and diasporic) sources, may affect the issues and approaches taken by Indian NGOs. The Indian general public, and corporate and philanthropic funders, for example, may have strong preferences for 'tangible' outcomes, such as health clinics, over rights-based advocacy. They may also help drive more national concerns and issues, such as inequalities perpetuated through social discrimination on caste, and ethnic lines.

These are issues that Northern donors have tended to neglect compared to, say, gender. It is important to note, however, that the conversation around reducing inequality is quite a recent phenomenon within Indian civil society.

Securing financial resources to support NGO activities is core to their survival and impact. The changing development landscape appears to be reducing some streams, but opening up others. Many NGOs will find this a tough transition, but some will certainly flourish. Financing options and choices will be central to shaping other aspects of NGO identity, functioning and role.

Supriya Roychouhury, Oxfam India, and
Emma Mawdsley, University of Cambridge
supriya.roychoudhury@gmail.com /
eem10@cam.ac.uk.

From "business as usual" to innovation: par funding in South Africa

When Broederlijk Delen announced its withdrawal from South Africa in 2008, our partners instinctively began looking for funding sources amongst the international donor community and were mostly unaware of potential alternatives for funding civil society initiatives. When we finally withdrew at the end of 2011, their approaches were very different. Many had successfully diversified their funding sources, including local funding.

During that period, we were not the only NGO to withdraw from South Africa. The country was working hard to profile itself as an emerging economy, becoming a member of the BRIC group (now BRICS) and strengthening its position as regional leader. As a result, many donors changed the focus of their support to the many other African countries still dangling at the bottom of all development charts.

When we announced the withdrawal to our partners we followed three main principles: we developed a tailor-made, multi-year withdrawal plan for each partner; we introduced flexible funding oriented towards financial sustainability; and we undertook targeted capacity building for institutional strengthening and fundraising. Exit strategies were developed over two-to-three years. The timeframe adopted depended on the funding cycle of the organisation and the importance of our financial contribution to its overall budget.

With each partner, we had a thorough discussion on their donor portfolio and how they saw future developments. Most partners had very little, or no, funding that originated in South Africa, despite the many opportunities present there. Government funding was considered cumbersome to apply for, unreliable, and short-term only. With a few exceptions, NGOs had no links with the private sector, be it for funding purposes, or as partners in development.

Our partners were grouped in clusters according to their main area of expertise and met on a regular basis (two to three times each year) to exchange experiences. During these meetings, a lot of attention was paid to exploring novel ways of funding and collaborating with non-traditional partners (the private sector, local government, mentoring of emerging farmers or businesses by more experienced entrepreneurs, etc.).

The Broederlijk Delen local representative played a key role in the identification of opportunities and bringing potential interested parties together. Partners were stimulated to share their experiences, both successes and failures, of local (national) fundraising and collaboration with the private sector.

As part of our exit strategy, all partners could renegotiate the use of their budgets in case they managed to secure new funding before the end of the Broederlijk Delen funding. Broederlijk Delen actively tried to link partners to new donors (within our own networks), but with limited success. This was because many of these donors were also withdrawing from South Africa, or the funding interests of donors and our partners' policies did not match.

Because of the length of our exit plan, we found that it was difficult for organisations to look beyond that timeframe, given the volatility of the donor environment that they were dealing with. Most partners thus opted for a "business as usual" planning, with only a few proposing specific initiatives that would help to improve their long-term financial sustainability. For example, one organisation opted to speed up the process of paying off the loan for its infrastructure, another to increase its fund to pre-pay its members for the craft products they produce.

Another project was already in the process of developing into a separate organisation when we announced our exit. They were granted very flexible

artners' attitudes towards

© USAID Southern Africa

Children at Maptela Day Care Centre, a USAID/PEPFAR-supported day care centre for orphans and vulnerable children in Soweto.

core funding, to be used when needed over a period of three years. This enabled them to leverage other funding, make investments, use it as bridge funding for staff salaries between different projects, and so on. That partner testified that this funding, though modest in quantity, had made a huge difference to their organisation because of its unrestricted nature.

When partners submitted their last annual report in 2012, all had managed to secure at least one source of local funding. Many had signed contracts with local (or national) government agencies. Others had obtained funding from South African philanthropic foundations or had entered into collaborations with private companies.

However, private sector collaboration can be difficult. Though most of our partners were striving to improve the economic situation of their target group, many NGOs in South Africa are, or were, struggling to achieve the right balance between the social and economic development of the target group. Income generating projects were often subsidised and the long-term profitability of the businesses was poorly investigated, or overestimated.

We found that the NGOs that were most successful in fostering ties with local businesses were those training out-of-school youth. The youth get internships with local businesses and sometimes a paid job afterwards. The local business gets well-trained young people who are skilled and have developed a positive attitude towards work. Neither of these are a given in the local context.

Overall, we found that NGOs seemed reluctant to look for funding outside their natural environment. Often, getting funding from international NGOs is seen as the easiest route, because they speak the same language and share the same vision and values regarding development. It is only when these funding sources dry up that organisations are pushed out of their comfort zone and will venture into new types of relationships.

One important factor for success is the presence of innovators (or early adopters) in the partner network who are willing to share their experiences. Also important is the sustained facilitation of contacts between different parties. We noticed that it is only when relationships are built and when both parties have sufficient time to appreciate each other's challenges and approaches, that sustainable partnerships can be developed.

Suzy Serneels
Broederlijk Delen
suzy.serneels@broederlijkdelen.be

Transforming opportunities into reality: challenges and obstacles in funding civil society in Brazil

Civil society organisations' (CSOs) funding in Brazil is complex and blurred. Despite there being more funding possibilities in the country now than a decade ago, enjoying these opportunities seems to be more difficult than expected. Particular barriers include a lack of support for social justice and advocacy activities, and a lack of trust in NGOs.

This article explores three main issues, which we think explain the current landscape of financial sustainability of civil society in Brazil. These are: (1) the redirection of international funding to other countries; (2) the rise of a nascent national philanthropy and lack of knowledge and experience of civil society; and (3) an inadequate legal framework.

Brazil is no longer a priority for traditional international funders

On the return of democracy in Brazil in mid-80s, the country was impoverished, highly unequal and still very authoritarian. In this context, Brazilian CSOs assumed an important protagonist role in pushing forward an agenda of social justice and rights like the protection of indigenous lands, human rights, hunger eradication and environment protection.

Brazil became a great social and political 'experiment lab', with its highly politicised civil society and democratic participatory processes advancing these pressing demands to the point that many were even incorporated in the Brazilian Federal Constitution. Brazilian civil society flourished with the emergence of organisations including Fase, Ibase, Inesc, Themis, and Abong, among many others. These organisations actively contributed to the consolidation of Brazilian democracy and were mostly funded by traditional international cooperation, for example Oxfam Novib, the Rockefeller Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation, and the Ford Foundation.

The funding context has changed substantially in the last decade. Economic growth, along with the positive results of progressive social programmes, transformed Brazil into an important global player. International donors substantially reduced, and sometimes even suspended, their operations in the country, redirecting resources to other countries with more pressing needs, mostly in Africa. The overall assumption of these funders was that Brazil had the necessary resources within the country to deal with its social and economic problems.

The funders' assumption was not only confirmed, as we show in the next section, but also shed some light on the reflection that looking for funds within the country is not only a matter of sustainability, but actually of legitimacy of CSOs. Thankfully, many CSOs are progressively understanding the potential and importance of raising funds nationally and adapting their structures to engage with these new stakeholders.

The rise of a nascent national philanthropy

In the last 20 years many new national private and public foundations or institutes have been created in Brazil. Around 90% of these are corporate or business institutions, with only 10% family or independent foundations. While this must be celebrated, most Brazilian philanthropic organisations implement their own social and environmental projects, rather than fund independent CSOs to do their own projects.

Recently, a few national public and private enterprises have started to provide funds for the social and environmental projects of civil society groups through yearly and rolling calls for proposals, for example Petrobras, Itaú, Vale, and Banco do Brasil. These are exceptions and it is especially important to note that very few of these support social justice and advocacy activities.

Accordingly, GIFE[1], a private social investment network, has been doing an impressive job in promoting the culture of "donation for civil society" among Brazilian philanthropic organisations. However, the marketing drive of corporate foundations and the lack of trust in NGOs have been major obstacles to this.

The deficient Brazilian legal framework for civil society organisations

An important institutional obstacle for CSOs in Brazil is the lack of a clear and progressive legal framework to regulate them. Whereas freedom of association is taken for granted, in Brazil there is a broad definition of entities that fall under the general umbrella of 'third sector'. These include associations, private foundations, political parties, sports clubs, hospitals, private universities, etc. The lack of clear criteria in distinguishing the nature of these not-for-profit entities hinders an accurate understanding of their roles and often results in the misleading application of public and private subsidies and endowments.

A key aspect of the absence of specific legislation for civil society is that CSOs have to compete with other groups to benefit from a very complicated tax system. Tax benefits are directed to specific areas: child rights, education, sports, social care, and culture. CSOs and NGOs end up competing with companies or private foundations for these benefits. In addition, this complicated legal framework makes it less attractive for individuals and companies to donate for CSOs, as a donor in Brazil pays around 4% of tax to donate to NGOs.

1 Acronym for 'The Institutes, Foundations and Enterprises Group'

Brazilian civil society has been very active in pushing forward the political debates around a new regulatory framework for civil society groups, but for almost a decade the federal government has been promising to engage on this topic without any significant movement until now.

In a country where transparency and corruption concerns are highly important, the lack of a specific legislation for civil society seriously harms the reputation of civil society in general, and NGOs in particular. Thus, many organisations have been investing in improving their communication strategies and transparency procedures to increase their public credibility.

While there are now more funding opportunities available, most organisations are still not fully able to take advantage of them. Transforming funding opportunities into reality has been a painful process for Brazilian civil society.

Despite the odds, we see a tremendous potential for CSOs in mobilising funds in Brazil. International CSOs acting in Brazil have been very successful, and at the forefront, in mobilising resources with Brazilian individuals and entities. Let us hope CSOs will be resilient to overcome these challenges and obstacles and keep its vibrant footprint.

Ana Toni and Alice Amorim
GIP - Public Interest Management Research and Consultancy
a.toni@gip.net.br / alice@gip.net.br

"Building a more enterprising CDRA": transcending blurred boundaries between organisations and sectors

The Community Development Resource Association (CDRA), a civil society organisation based in South Africa, is finding that the traditional organisational forms that previously justified funding in South Africa are disappearing. Civil society space is evolving quickly, ushering in many opportunities, threats and challenges, not least a contracting resource base. This is reshaping the contributions, roles, relationships and value of civil society.

The challenges are not universal, however. Civil society in South Africa comprises a vibrant, wide-ranging group of organised, formal groups as well as unorganised, informal formations. A focus on the funding of civil society must appreciate this diversity. The NGO community, where organisations such as CDRA are located, is a small part of civil society. However, it is the segment that is more dependent on external aid.

The impact of the contracting resource base has been particularly severe on the organised part of civil society that has become part of the funded development industry. Diminished funding flows to civil society led to the closure of many NGOs, and also introduced staff rationalisation and retrenchment into NGOs. The informal segments of civil society have been less impacted, as the voluntary means through which they are sustained has been relatively unscathed.

Similar to many other South African NGOs, CDRA is actively exploring new means and revenue streams to resource its work. Inevitably, this brings us to reposition ourselves in relation to those who control resources – government, corporations, major foundations, small private foundations, and individual philanthropists. CDRA is actively questioning whether the new means and resourcing strategies will compromise our sovereignty, identity, creativity and legitimacy.

The options for resourcing our work and sustaining our contributions have their pros and cons. Working with government on national development programmes will open access to resources that we have not benefited from before. But we fear that we may become merely implementers of government programmes and our social change agendas will be undermined. We are afraid that we would compromise sovereignty, legitimacy and creativity and be subject to demands for measurable, verifiable outcomes. So is this a viable resourcing option for CSOs?

On the other hand are the business corporations and the social enterprise models they promote. Exploring this as a resource also has problems. In South Africa, corporate social investment provides funding tailored to the thematic focus areas and social projects of business. While we can access programme funding from businesses, this has to be connected to their focus areas. Essentially, corporate funding remains restricted funding. However, in the bigger picture, corporate social investment funding is substantial and contributes to the development of our society.

We are experiencing that donors are no longer interested in simply providing financial support to a sector or group; being part of civil society and the NGO community is no longer a good enough basis for being funded. Also, we can no longer assume that being a social purpose organisation is all it is about; these days many businesses have clearly articulated social purposes. Increasingly, we need to explain our unique contribution and value to societal development.

As our traditional funding relationships with allies in Europe and the United States come to an end, we find that as intermediary organisations whose work is not directly with communities, exploring different means of resourcing our work is challenging. For CDRA, providing organisational accompaniment support services remains an important revenue source. However, in the depressed economic environment, there are limitations on this income. We are complementing our self-generated income with programme funding from mainly local and foreign private foundations. These foundations, not previously a source of funding for us, are much more amenable to support social change and social justice work.

In exploring new means of resourcing, while continuing to embrace essential civil society values, we recognise the need to build an organisation that is premised on a different financial logic. We talk about "building a more enterprising CDRA"; a shift away from the NGO 'recipient' mentality, orientation and way of engagement. We have to accept that the traditional 'donor / recipient' relationships are part of our past. Building a more enterprising CDRA is not about becoming business-like; it is about restoring creativity and imagination to our work.

We have moved beyond working via relationships with individual CSOs; we are increasingly working with complex organisational systems. As new organisational forms are blurring the boundaries between organisations and sectors, we are increasingly drawn to work in multi-actor processes and spaces. The traditional organisational forms that justified our funding are disappearing. Today we are facilitators, accompaniers, supporters, innovators and mentors; and this is increasingly appreciated by new funders.

To ensure longer-term sustainability, we have to transcend the traditional organisation and sector boundaries that have, for a long time, limited who we work with and how we work; we have to challenge ourselves to engage with the multi-actor world and work in spaces where multiple connections and complex webs of relationships are common. The ability to work in a more integrated way across a shared space is proving vital.

Nomvula Dlamini, Director, CDRA
nomvula@cdra.org.za

INTRAC training

For more information on these courses, to apply online, and to read details of all our training courses, visit **www.intrac.org/pages/en/training.html**

NEW Monitoring and Evaluation Blended Learning

February - April 2014
Course fee: £850
Location: Worldwide

Do you need to build effective monitoring and evaluation into project and programme work for both accountability and learning? This programme will strengthen your skills in supporting the monitoring and evaluation of projects and programmes, from programme design through to evaluation.

Organisational Development

17-21 February 2014
Course fee: £1,045 (non-residential)/£1,295 (residential)
Location: Oxford, UK

How to develop the capacity of their organisations is high on the agenda for most managers and senior practitioners in CSOs. This course is designed for those with some experience of organisational capacity building who wish to use organisational development techniques to improve organisational performance and strengthen organisational learning. The course will provide a range of tools and models for 'reading' organisations as well as designing and facilitating processes of organisational change and development.

Theory of Change Approaches to Planning and Impact Assessment

17-19 February 2014
Course fee: £595 (non-residential)/£745 (residential)
Location: Oxford, UK

There has been an increased interest in Theories of Change (ToCs) in the development sector. Some donors now require organisations to provide ToCs to accompany their proposals. Organisations who have already developed a ToC for their programmes have found that the process and the product can provide greater clarity for communication, planning and M&E; enhance partner relationships and support organisational development. This course gives participants an understanding of what ToCs are; how they complement other planning, evaluation and impact assessment processes; and how they can be applied in different organisational contexts and situations. Knowledge and skills from this course can be applied to the development of Theory of Change approaches to planning, evaluation and assessing impact within programmes and organisations.

Advanced Monitoring and Evaluation

3-7 March 2014
Course fee: £1,045 (non-residential)/£1,295 (residential)
Location: Oxford, UK

This course builds on participants' understanding and skills of how to develop sustainable and cost effective monitoring and evaluation processes and practices within their own projects and organisations. It is also relevant for those trying to improve and enhance current M&E processes, or supporting partners to develop and implement effective M&E. The focus is on ensuring M&E contributes towards improving organisational learning and accountability.

Advanced Partner Capacity Building

17-21 March 2014
Course fee: £1,045 (non-residential)/£1,295 (residential)
Location: Oxford, UK

International development and civil society organisations have been working to support the capacity development of their partners in a variety of ways. Some have chosen to develop specific partner capacity building programmes, whilst others are integrating this support into their ongoing sector or thematic programmes. Whichever approach is taken, there is a need to ensure appropriate support provision by tailoring initiatives towards the specific characteristics and needs of the partners. This course will provide an opportunity for experienced practitioners to strengthen their expertise in the design and implementation of partner capacity building programmes.

Monitoring and Evaluation (Foundation)

24-28 March 2014
Course fee: £1,045 (non-residential)/£1,295 (residential)
Location: Oxford, UK

M&E is an essential component of international NGOs, NGOs and CSOs striving to continually improve their work and have greater accountability. This foundation course is designed to develop individuals' understanding of what M&E entails, why it is so vital, and how to do it well and in a participatory way. This course ensures that those who are new to M&E have a thorough understanding of M&E concepts and have built up the practical skills and the confidence needed to do M&E effectively. Participants will learn to use a range of M&E tools and activities that will help them improve accountability, learning and effectiveness of projects and programmes.

ontrac ISSN 1476-1327

ONTRAC is the newsletter of INTRAC (the International NGO Training and Research Centre). It is published three times a year. The contents of the newsletter may be freely reproduced and translated, providing the source is acknowledged. INTRAC wishes to thank the NGO Research Programme members for funding ONTRAC: Broederlijk Delen, Cordaid, DanChurchAid, Norwegian Church Aid, Save the Children Denmark, and ICCO.

To receive a printed copy of ONTRAC, please contact info@intrac.org indicating whether you wish to receive a copy in English or Russian. ONTRAC can also be downloaded at www.intrac.org/pages/en/ontrac.html, where translated versions in Russian, and previous issues, are also available.

INTRAC
Oxbridge Court, Osney Mead, Oxford OX2 0ES
T: +44 (0)1865 201851
F: +44 (0)1865 201852
E: info@intrac.org • www.intrac.org