

viewpoint

The role of INGOs in complex and politically charged contexts



Thomas Einberger · ©CBM/argum/Einberger

Food distribution in Meru, Kenya .

What is the role of INGOs in contexts where space for civil society is constrained, politics are volatile, there is social, political and economic instability, or where tensions within communities or between political and economic elites could erupt into violence or repression? The articles in this edition explore this question, providing examples of the work that INGOs are doing to support activists and local partners, as well as areas where improvements in practice could be made.

Defining ‘politically charged’

Last year we had a big debate at INTRAC about what term to use for describing places where international and local civil society organisations are active in supporting people and causes affected by violence, conflict or repression. But also contexts where civil society organisations (CSOs) are often struggling in the face of a hostile environment and competition for resources. These places may be national, but often they are local. Violent conflict is not always present, yet people are still exposed to low levels of violence, to political volatility and tensions in their communities.

Hence why we resorted to ‘politically charged’, adding to a muddy pool of terms used across international institutions and aid actors to describe these contexts, which includes: fragile and conflict-affected situations or states; settings of conflict and fragility; complex political environments; complex and sensitive contexts. Each of these terms is problematic, and even attempting to give a collective name to these contexts masks the unique forces at play in any given situation. Indeed, the five articles that follow touch on very different types of context and challenges.

It’s all about contextual understanding and partnership

In this edition we tackle a series of questions:

- How can INGOs best support civil society in politically charged contexts without undermining their legitimacy and sustainability?
- How can INGOs work with the state and civil society to build spaces for civil society?

Contents

The role of INGOs in complex and politically charged contexts. 1

Building capacity to influence and support change in complex contexts 2

Integrating a conflict sensitive approach in project implementation: International Alert in South Sudan 3

Frontline Defenders: protecting human rights defenders at risk 4

Supporting civil society development in a strict regulatory environment: CSSP in Ethiopia . . . 5

Disaster Risk Reduction: helping partners support disabled people in DRC, Haiti and Gaza. 7

In this issue:

This issue of ONTRAC looks at the different roles and initiatives INGOs have in ‘politically charged’ contexts, focusing on context and partnership.

Following an overview of the issues, INTRAC Associate Jenny Ross outlines the role of INGOs in influencing and supporting change in complex contexts, where advocacy can be risky and even illegal.

Summer Brown from International Alert stresses the importance of adopting a conflict sensitive approach when working in politically charged contexts through exploring their work in South Sudan.

Andrew Anderson looks at Front Line Defender’s approach to supporting human rights defenders at risk in politically charged contexts.

Getinet Assefa from CSSP Ethiopia addresses the challenges strict legal frameworks pose for supporting civil society.

Finally, Christiane Noe discusses CBM’s experiences of supporting disabled people’s organisations (DPOs) in politically charged contexts drawing on examples from their work in eastern Democratic Republic of Congo, Gaza and Haiti.

- Is there a role for challenging and putting pressure on the state from outside?
- How should INGOs tailor their partnership approaches to better support civil society in these contexts?

Gaining a deep understanding of the local context, and working with local activists and organisations to support their issues and actions are common themes running through all the articles.

Another is how external actors should nurture ways of engaging with the state at local and national level to challenge their policies, to address areas of weakness, and to build relationships founded on trust not antagonism.



Rod MacLeod. ©INTRAC 2015

Palestinian participant presents possible advocacy ideas at the British Council Women Participating in Public Life in Sharing and Learning event. Amman, Jordan.

The examples presented in this edition give a fairly positive picture of good things that INGOs can do. So, if it is primarily about understanding the context and working well with local partners then why do INGOs often have a bad name for stumbling into difficult environments and getting it wrong (as Andrew Anderson from Front Line Defenders argues)? Why are they often accused of shoring up the wrong people, stirring up tensions, or weakening existing movements by swamping them with resources or crowding the spaces for influence?

INGOs have clearly not got it right in many places, hamstrung by a combination of perverse incentives in the aid system, an absence of respect for local knowledge or

power dynamics, insufficient time given for tackling long-haul problems, and a lack of resources devoted to contextual knowledge, as budgets are squeezed and donors push for results.

Taking stock and remaining humble

As the articles demonstrate, there is a role for INGOs in these contexts: providing emergency assistance for civil rights activists; ensuring that marginalised groups get their voices heard; nurturing spaces for building trust between citizens, communities and the state. But INGOs (and their donors in turn) need to reach further and deeper in their understanding of the contexts. They have to take stock of the historical lessons of getting it wrong. They have to recognise that while they may think they are doing a good job, local actors may take a very different view. INGOs have to ensure that, when the situation is no longer considered to be 'complex' or 'fragile' or 'charged', local organisations are strong enough, legitimate enough, sustainable enough, and grounded enough to continue the fight alone.

Humility (as Jenny Ross concludes) may be the crucial ingredient. And I would add to humility the imperative of taking time for much deeper reflection.

Rachel Hayman
Head of Research, INTRAC

Building capacity to influence and support change in complex contexts

The process of influencing and supporting change in complex and politically charged contexts is challenging. Change is non-linear and dynamic. Governments and other duty bearers are routinely unwilling or unable to fulfill their basic responsibilities to citizens or uphold their rights. Advocacy is risky and may even be illegal.

INGOs need to be conscious of these factors when considering their role in supporting advocacy by local civil society organisations. INTRAC's new training course on Influencing and Supporting Change in Complex Contexts highlights three areas where INGOs can make an important contribution.

1. Invest in local capacity for critical analysis and strategy development

In the first instance, INGOs should support a locally relevant advocacy agenda. External funding can distort local CSO priorities and undermine the legitimacy and sustainability of advocacy initiatives.

Local ownership is key. Developing an effective advocacy strategy requires deep analysis of the context and socio-political dynamics. INGOs should support participatory strategy development that empowers and builds capacity for critical analysis. Local CSOs will then be able to adapt when their plans are inevitably superseded by events.

In these contexts there may be a climate of distrust and competition between local CSOs. INGOs should consider how they can provide support in a way that strengthens relationships between groups rather than choosing an 'implementing' organisation. Inclusive strategy development can help build trust and improve social cohesion as well as broaden the constituency for change.

One example is the DFID-led State Accountability and Voice Initiative in Nigeria which used in-depth participatory political economy analysis to identify advocacy issues. It then provides small facilitative support rather than grants to local CSOs for advocacy on those locally identified issues.

In a similar way Global Witness provide technical support to the Civil Society Natural Resource Monitoring Network in Afghanistan. Through investing in the collective capacity of more than 30 local civil society organisations, Global Witness is building a national watchdog on issues of resource extraction that will remain even if Global Witness stops working in Afghanistan.

“NGOs must avoid the temptation to tell others what to do”

2. Support an advocacy approach with a focus wider than policy change

Often donors and INGOs encourage a focus on changes in policy or legislation. This is partly because these changes can be objectively and independently verified, satisfying monitoring and evaluation requirements. Yet, in many countries policies remain unimplemented or the intended benefits do not trickle down to the poorest. The result is a stark gap between good policy and citizens’ everyday experiences. For example, Uganda is ranked top of a global assessment of anti-corruption laws yet Ugandans perceive their society to be very corrupt according to an alternative global ranking.

Ensuring that advocacy contributes to changes in people’s lives requires an understanding of power relations and socio-cultural norms not just policy processes. In complex and politically charged environments, analysing the interests and incentives of stakeholders is key to identifying advocacy opportunities and ways to leverage change. INGOs need to support political nous in local CSOs as well as technical capacity for advocacy.

Changing people’s lives through supporting advocacy by local CSOs requires a long-term commitment. There are no quick fixes or short-cuts. INGOs must respect local processes of negotiation and struggle. Often seen as outsiders, INGOs must avoid the temptation to tell others’ what they **should** do. Perceived external interference can undermine local advocacy and provoke a backlash from those whose power is challenged.

3. Promote dialogue and engagement to support inclusivity and accountability

Government authorities tend to see advocacy and campaigning as synonymous with opposition and confrontation in complex contexts. They see advocacy as threatening because they associate it with people marching on the streets rather than processes of dialogue on engagement.

INGOs need to promote understanding that effective advocacy often focuses on building a bridge between different actors. Claiming or creating new spaces for interaction can reduce mutual suspicion. In countries where there is a culture of impunity or intimidation, reducing the gap between different groups can be critical to developing governance that is more inclusive over the longer-term.

There are many examples when local groups have successfully taken a more collaborative approach to advocacy. In eastern Democratic Republic of Congo, a local advocacy officer has encouraged local citizens to engage directly with the provincial Ministry of Education by arranging and accompanying them to meetings where they raise their concerns. In Northern Uganda, community and school parliaments engage power holders and promote dialogue and engagement creating a space where issues can be raised and problems solved.

In conclusion, INGOs can play an important role in supporting advocacy by local civil society organisations but it requires humility, a respect for local context and capacity and long-term perspective.

Jenny Ross
INTRAC Associate

Integrating a conflict sensitive approach in aid interventions: International Alert in South Sudan

Integrating a conflict-sensitive approach into the operations and projects of institution and organisation – including governments, humanitarian and development organisations - often results in more sustainable and stable interventions.

A conflict-sensitive approach means understanding the two-way interaction between activities and the context. Whenever an activity is carried-out, it will affect the dynamics of that context and like-wise, the dynamics of the context will affect that activity. Conflicts which have not been taken into account can impede projects from achieving their goals. More importantly, projects which have not taken account of latent or active conflicts can unintentionally exacerbate them and do harm. Once this is understood, actors can take action to minimise negative and maximise positive impact.

In politically charged and conflict affected situations, which can be volatile from one day to the next, using a conflict-sensitive approach is vital.

Conflict-sensitivity is not an addition to the activities that are being implemented, but a way of thinking about how projects are implemented, taking into consideration on-the-ground factors including those that might have been viewed as outside the scope of the project, before deciding on the action that is needed.

A first step in integrating a conflict-sensitive approach is through conducting a conflict or context analysis which allows for a better understanding of the dynamics with which the project might interact. While it is important to keep an eye on conflict at national level, the local level factors where activities are going to be implemented are in most cases more important to understand because the project will directly interact with these.

International Alert is engaged in South Sudan in a partnership with the Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to support the Embassy and its development and humanitarian partners integrate conflict-sensitivity into their projects throughout the project cycle.

Two of these have borehole components, that is, drilling boreholes to improve access to drinking water. Drilling and maintaining boreholes might seem a relatively straightforward activity which would be influenced little by the local drivers of conflict. In unpacking this, we found that it is complex and tricky and takes buy-in and negotiation from many different layers. In understanding the dynamics on the ground and the project's potential interaction with these dynamics, it became clear that deciding where to put boreholes can cause tension.

“Using a conflict-sensitive approach requires flexibility from both implementers and donors”

First, there are the geological specifications of where a borehole can go (i.e. where there is water). At times, it can take three or four tries to find the water point, and a technical team is paid for each hole drilled regardless if water is found. Then there are the community members who might want a borehole in a certain location sometimes to serve the greater good and other times to serve the elite – and may or may not take account of differential gender needs and perspectives. If a borehole location is selected in one community over another, this could also negatively affect the relationships between communities. Finally, regardless of the planned purpose of the borehole, it will more than likely be overused.

For example, if its main purpose is potable water for human consumption, the reality is that there is a good chance that it will also be used for crops and livestock. The concern is then disease. If this overuse is seen as coming from a group outside of the community (such as pastoralists) this creates additional tensions between already conflicted groups. These are only a few of the factors at play in this scenario.

Once there is an understanding of these dynamics, an organisation must decide how to move forward, and how to continuously monitor the context in relationship to the project and the project in relationship to the dynamics. This is done through working with stakeholders, both direct beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, to ensure that potential problems are being mitigated, problems are being solved as they arise, and the project is being implemented in the most effective way possible.

In the example of the boreholes, involving the stakeholders (in this case different segments of the community including potential ‘outsiders’ who may use the water) is truly important for their understanding of and investment in the project. For instance, they should be involved in selecting the borehole locations and in discussions, on the potential benefits and downsides of the project.

More often than not, problems arise and are “solved” without the involvement of the stakeholders or even worse, the beneficiaries are blindsided because they were unaware of the potential negative consequences.

Using a conflict-sensitive approach requires flexibility from both implementers and donors. In South Sudan, the context is evolving and conflict can flare-up quickly. While a conflict-sensitive approach should give implementers more awareness of the interaction between their projects and the context, it also means that it is more than likely that some activities will need to be shifted to avoid fuelling tensions.

Donors must be open to hearing the case for these changes and make decisions in partnership with the implementing partners. While none of this is entirely new and in many ways echoes good aid practice, in politically charged contexts this mobility to change when and as needed is extremely important for long-term peace and stability.

Summer Brown
Peacebuilding Issues Programme Manager
International Alert

Front Line Defenders: protecting human rights defenders at risk

This is a crucial political moment. We are facing a global backlash against independent civil society. Authoritarian governments are investing huge efforts and resources to close down, silence, restrict and discredit independent civil society and human rights defenders.

We need a more consistent and credible response from governments and INGOs. We must give the same priority and resources to creating an enabling space for civil society that autocrats give to closing it down.

The people who will play the most effective role in countering this new authoritarianism will be human rights defenders (HRDs) and civil society working at the local and national level. There must be a new and reinvigorated political priority to protect them. This requires more high profile political leadership, a consistent strategy that prioritises the protection of HRDs across different policy areas, and sustained practical support to those under attack on the front line.

Duncan Green argues: *“that a radical redistribution of power, opportunities, and assets rather than traditional models of charitable or government aid is required to break the cycle of poverty and inequality. The forces driving this transformation are active citizens and effective states. Why active citizens? Because people living in poverty must have a voice in deciding their own destiny and holding the state and the private sector to account.”*

We have seen little evidence of this approach impacting the practical work of INGOs. Although the discourse around aid effectiveness has focused on the importance of accountability, partnership and participation, there seems to be a disconnect between this rhetoric and reality. INGOs are not taking the practical steps needed to encourage respect for freedom of expression and association, or space for civil society. Without space for critical voices, terms such as accountability, partnership and participation are meaningless and effective anti-corruption strategies impossible.

Why are many INGOs failing to take action? Caution about upsetting host governments by raising human rights violations or repressive measures may, in extreme cases, be justifiable for those providing humanitarian assistance. It is not justifiable for INGOs running development programmes as there are many ways to support independent civil society without engaging in megaphone diplomacy. This includes providing practical support for those targeted, asking searching questions of the authorities, and making the case for local activists by arguing that they are important partners with a legitimate role to play.

This is what we at Front Line Defenders aim to do: provide the support necessary so human rights defenders can continue to operate. As Front Line Defenders we provide security grants and security training. We also conduct urgent advocacy.

In 2014 the Front Line Defenders Security Grants Programme provided 411 grants totaling €987,897 to individuals and organisations at risk. This included reinforced doors for human rights defenders in Turkey, support for a refuge for women victims of sexual violence in DRC and emergency relocation for a human rights defender at immediate risk in Colombia. We engaged in urgent advocacy on behalf of 442 individuals at risk in 64 countries as well as organising security training and training in digital security.

There are examples of INGOs that have intervened in counterproductive ways. Western based INGOs launching public campaigns without local consultation has resulted in security issues for some LGBTI activists in Africa. However, there are also good examples of INGOs supporting local campaigns in ways that increase their impact, for example in Colombia. In general, if you have good local partners and take your lead from them, there is scope to provide important support.

Front Line Defenders chooses those we work with on the basis that they are HRDs working peacefully for the rights of others in accordance with relevant international declarations, as well as on the level of risk they face. We aim to prioritise support to those most at risk, and therefore often the most marginalised.

Due to the continuously evolving nature of civil society, especially when working in politically charged contexts, it is vital for an INGO to develop and maintain contacts with a range of local civil society groups from a variety of backgrounds. It is also important that any INGO working with local civil society aims to genuinely support those it works with and does not seek to merely impose their own agendas upon them.

Human rights defenders themselves are the real experts on their situations and what their needs are.

We only work on the security and protection of HRDs and take our lead from them on what will make a difference to their security.

Very occasionally we may decline to publish information they want to get out because we think it will bring added risk. However, we do not try to take ownership of the causes they are working on, or try to impose our views on what the most effective strategy would be for their work. This is because we believe that local HRDs are the ones who know best how to bring about real change in their context.

Andrew Anderson
Deputy Director, Front Line Defenders



Sergey Babinets holds the Front Line Defenders Award amidst the ruins of the office of the Joint Mobile Group in Gyrozny, Chechnya.

@Front Line Defenders. 2011

Supporting civil society development in a strict regulatory environment: CSSP in Ethiopia

In 2009, the Ethiopian Government introduced the Charities and Societies Proclamation, which provided a more regimented framework for both local and international NGOs and regulated civil society organisations (CSOs). It classified CSOs based on their mandate, funding, and nationality and specifying the proportion of administrative and programmatic costs that can be incurred in their operations.

The Civil Society Support Programme (CSSP) was established in 2011 and is specifically designed to support civil society development and operate within this context. CSSP saw that civil society needed to become more intelligent and constructive in the interpretation and application of elements of the new law.

Its strategies are based on the belief that, in a politically charged environment where the roles and operational space for civil society are defined against ideological backdrops; effectiveness can be better facilitated by focusing attention beyond ideology. This requires a deep understanding of power relations and use of key principles, governance approaches and tools to guide civil society work on multiple sectorial and thematic priorities .

A strict regulatory environment

The Charities and Societies Proclamation ideological framework reflects the Government's critical stance towards aided NGOs, which it sees as being driven by neo-liberal agendas and rent-seeking behaviours. CSOs have also been accused of playing a partisan role in the political sphere e.g. through voter education during past elections.

Institutional identity of national CSOs is determined by whether they mainly engage in service provision or rights promotion and advocacy. By law, an Ethiopian Resident Charity is restricted to service provision, and must spend at least 90% of its resources on services to poor people. An Ethiopian Society is a CSO whose activities concern mainly rights promotion, which must be funded predominantly by local sources. While an Ethiopian Resident Charity can

mobilise all its resources from foreign sources, only 10% of the funding to an Ethiopian Society can come from foreign sources. Foreign Charities can only engage in services delivery.

All CSOs are required to spend at least 70% of their resources on activities that directly benefit target people. Administrative costs should not surpass 30% of project or total annual expenditures. This includes personnel, equipment, M&E, research, workshops, publications and marketing. Heated debates continue to take place about what constitutes the 70% or 30% cost component.

There are ongoing efforts to make discussions between civil society and government bodies more structured in the hope to expand and achieve a more constructive interpretation of the cost components. In terms of funding sources, however, civil society is yet to develop the institutional capacity, systems and management practices needed to generate local resources, particularly in support of expanded rights promotion and advocacy.

CSSP key principles for Civil Society Development

Funded by Ireland, the UK, Norway, the Netherlands, Sweden, Canada and Denmark, and managed by a consortium made up of the British Council, INTRAC and *theIDLgroup*, CSSP uses a range of grants and capacity development instruments to support civil society development. Its overall objective is to strengthen poverty reduction efforts and advancement of national development, good governance and democratisation through more effective civil society contributions. A big task for CSSP was improving the image of civil society and building trust with private and public stakeholders.

It promotes seven key principles to guide civil society work:

1. Helping hard to reach CSOs and people.
 - CSSP invests most effort and resources in hard to reach CSOs, people and communities, and on development gaps.
2. Focusing on people and their capabilities and assets. CSSP aims to ensure that the assets and strengths of poor people and their cultures are recognised and not undermined by CSSP investment.

3. Building trust between stakeholders in Ethiopian society. This is the foundation stone for achieving positive change through constructive partnerships and coalition building, benefiting hard to reach people.
4. Incentivising innovation and creativity in civil society, especially at local levels, to add value to development efforts.
5. Pursuing social equality in all CSSP investments through creating an even playing field where those who are most marginalised receive most support.
6. Promoting decision-making at the most local level possible to ensure fair opportunity to access resources.
7. Achieving best value for resources for poor people. We recognise that CSSP's resources belong to the poorest and most marginalised people in Ethiopia and we strive to achieve best value for resources.



Over the last 3 years CSSP has provided grants, capacity development support and built the institutional capacity of more than 500 CSOs across Ethiopia. Some 5 million people have benefited. There are also indications that government perceptions of CSOs are improving. Where they were once thought of only as gap fillers, they are now seen as development partners.

Based on the lessons drawn so far, CSSP is placing more emphasis on supporting organisations from harder to reach people, and assisting them to become 'insiders' rather than 'outsiders'. We are also facilitating a deeper understanding among government authorities about what hard to reach means, and why Government and mainstream CSO responses must change.

CSSP has now moved from being an active observer, to being an observant actor in the political economy which shapes civil

society's future. It is promoting strategic partnerships around issues emerging from within its work, so that new attitudes, behaviours, values and practices can be sustained as legacies for civil society and government. It continues to catalyse understanding and management of the direction of change for the better of civil society in Ethiopia, its state and citizens, as the country grows.

Getinet Assefa
Executive Director, CSSP

Empowering disabled people through partnership in disaster risk reduction and emergency response

Partnership can be a complex business, even at the best of times. Relations between INGOs and their local partners can become even more complicated in politically charged contexts, which often transition between acute emergencies, sustained low intensity violence and peace.

Strong partnerships also become more critical in these circumstances. INGOs operating in politically charged contexts rely on working with strong local organisations to ensure international assistance meets the needs of local communities, and is effective and sustainable.

At CBM, an international disability and development organisation, we have developed an approach to partnership based on mutual commitment to shared values, vision and goals. We believe that continued engagement with those affected throughout all the transitions that can characterize politically charged environments is vital.

We work with all our partners to build their capacity to respond to these changing circumstances, so that the rights of persons with disabilities can be upheld and protected even under the most fluid and difficult situations.

One way we do this is capacity development for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR). This involves supporting our partners to develop an understanding of the complexities in their own community, region or country. Then we help them devise ways to address any risks they identify. This builds their organisational capacity, strengthens their ability to identify and support communities and people at risk, and ultimately their resilience.

Rapid assessment of response needs in Goma, eastern Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)

Local partner organisations are crucial to identifying appropriate responses as a situation escalates. After intense fighting between M23 rebel forces and government troops in November 2013, CBM supported

its long standing partner, HEAL Africa, to carry out a rapid assessment of response needs.

We supported HEAL Africa to systematically gather and analyse information from the displaced population including people with disabilities and the camp committees, as well as existing data from the Government, UN and INGOs. Staff also built on their own existing knowledge of previous similar displacements and existing contacts with people in the already displaced communities. Using multiple sources of information enabled HEAL Africa to accurately identify and respond to the felt needs of the affected population, and identify duplication with other planned or on-going efforts.

HEAL Africa also appointed an advocacy officer to highlight the concerns of persons with disabilities and proposed solutions that ensure response activities are more inclusive. The intervention provided an opportunity for persons with disabilities and people at risk of displacement to speak about their concerns and participate in designing solutions.

The engagement of HEAL Africa in the emergency response not only increased their technical know-how and practical experience on disability inclusion in humanitarian settings; it also made them more credible in promoting the disability inclusive development agenda in the eastern Democratic Republic of Congo.

Supporting recovery through relational capacity building in Gaza

Gaza has one of the largest populations living with deafness in the world yet those with hearing impairments are often excluded from society. In the aftermath of Operation Protective Edge in August 2014, CBM supported its long standing partner in Gaza strip, Atfaluna, to provide immediate basic needs, such as food and non-food items (NFI), as well as psychosocial care for children with hearing disabilities and their families.

As Atfaluna is not a basic needs emergency response actor, CBM facilitated links between Atfaluna and another partner of CBM, DanChurch Aid (DCA). DCA was supported by CBM to carry out a disability inclusive food and NFI response. Since targeting persons with disabilities in a tense

context like Gaza is very challenging, Atfaluna was instrumental in linking at risk persons with disabilities and DCA's intervention team.

The partnership approach served two purposes. It made the relief response disability inclusive by reaching out to most at risk people. It also forged a partnership between two agencies in Gaza that complement each other.

Rebuilding capacities and confidence in Haiti

In the aftermath of the earthquake in Haiti CBM worked with Disabled People's Organisations (DPOs) with the aim of building capacities and confidence to advocate effectively for the respect of the rights of people with disabilities and for their effective inclusion in the reconstruction process in Haiti. DPOs were accompanied to the meetings of key actors involved in the reconstruction process (e.g. cluster meetings) and provided with practical support in their advocacy activities (e.g. in the elaboration and presentation of their statements).

They received training to improve their organisational capacity, addressing the principles of leadership, transparency, governance and organisational structure. The goal of sustainability and ownership was at the forefront. Once the presence of INGOs and other emergency assistance actors in Haiti fades out, DPOs will be able to develop and manage projects that address the needs of persons with disabilities independently.

Supporting each other through the ups and the downs

Each politically charged environment is different. Individual contexts often change over time. Partnerships between INGOs and local civil society organisations need to be tailored according to the specific requirements that emerge in different times and places. From disaster risk reduction to recovery and (post-crisis) development, it is crucial to understand existing complexities and strengthen capacities to respond to changing needs. For this we need to listen to and learn from our partner organisations, and the people we work for.

Christiane Noe
Research Manager, CBM

Advanced Monitoring and Evaluation

27 April – 1 May 2015, 29 June – 3 July 2015

£1165, non-residential/ £1425, residential

Are you experienced in monitoring and evaluation and looking to work through some of the complex challenges in doing M&E with other experienced practitioners? This course has been designed to build on your understanding and skills of how to develop sustainable and cost-effective monitoring and evaluation processes and practices that contribute towards improving organisational learning and accountability.

Monitoring and Evaluation

8 - 22 May 2015

£1165, non-residential/ £1425, residential

Looking to build a more thorough understanding of M&E concepts? This course ensures that those who are new to M&E, or those who manage staff responsible for M&E, build up the practical skills and confidence needed to do M&E effectively in order to improve accountability, learning and effectiveness of projects and programmes within their organisation.

Influencing and Supporting Change in Complex Contexts

8 – 10 June 2015

£710, non-residential/ £860, residential

Recognising that there is no blueprint for change, this course combines practical tools, relevant tools and peer learning to build the knowledge, skills and confidence of participants who are engaged in advocacy, civil society capacity building, and transparency and accountability programmes at a national level in complex environments or fragile states.

Organisational Development

22-26 June 2015

£1165 non-residential/ £1425, residential

Are you an active agent of change, using organisational development techniques to improve organisational performance and strengthen learning? This course will provide a range of tools and models for 'reading' organisations as well as designing and facilitating processes of change within an organisation.

Use of Evidence (BLENDED LEARNING)

October – November

£680, delivered remotely using webinar technology

Do you lack confidence using evidence in your work? Do you face external or internal pressure to justify the evidence that you produce? In response to growing demand for support to practitioners, this course will help you to respond to evidence debates and challenges.

ONTRAC is the newsletter of INTRAC (International NGO Training and Research Centre). It is published three times a year.

INTRAC wishes to thank the NGO Research Programme members for funding ONTRAC: Broederlijk Delen, CBM, Cordaid, DanChurchAid, ICCO (Interchurch Organization for Development Cooperation), Norwegian Church Aid, and Save the Children International.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

Electronic copies of ONTRAC can be downloaded free in English, Arabic, and Russian at www.intrac.org/pages/en/ontrac.html.

Previous issues, including translated versions in a number of languages, are also available through the same page. To subscribe to ONTRAC via email, go to www.intrac.org and click 'Sign up for our e-news'.



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