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# Executive Summary

The AusAID NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP) 2011 Annual Thematic Review (the Review) was conceptualised and designed as a collaborative learning exercise through a dynamic partnership between AusAID, the Australian Council for International Development (ACFID) and participating Australian NGOs (ANGOs).

The ANCP is a unique funding modality, providing a high degree of flexibility to accredited ANGOs. In 2010-2011, ANCP provided around $70 million to ANGOs to subsidise their own activities which directly and tangibly alleviate poverty in developing countries.

Thematic Reviews will focus on one aspect of development practice which contributes to the ANCP Goal of poverty reduction. The theme for this Review is:

*How are ANCP activities engaging with the poorest and most marginalised people?*

ANGOs are supporting partners in many of the poorest countries in the world, and most ANCP projects specifically target the most disadvantaged members of poor communities. By documenting the experience of ANGOs in working with the poorest and most marginalised, this Review seeks to identify and share learning in order to improve practice and impact.

Through a literature review, in depth interaction with the ANGO Reference Group, their selected ANCP activity case studies, and sector-wide learning events attended by over 40 ANGOs, ACFID and AusAID, the Review sought to identify key factors that have enabled ANGOs to work effectively with the poorest and most marginalised and to reflect on limitations and challenges experienced.

ANGOs understand and describe poverty in multi-dimensional terms, recognising that a range of social indicators enable a deeper level of poverty analysis than economic indicators alone. This analysis allows ANGOs to develop integrated programs that directly tackle the fundamental barriers and disadvantages experienced by the poorest and most marginalised. The depth of the community reach of ANGOs and their civil society partners is critical in enabling direct relationships and engagement with the poorest and most marginalised.

Working with the poorest and marginalised presents particular challenges for the development community as it is time consuming and labour intensive to get the poorest over the poverty line. This presents difficult choices to results-driven donors and national programmers as it is often easier to assist the poor who are just below the poverty line compared to the significant level of resources (time, HR and sometimes funds) required to work with the poorest in communities and facilitate their emergence from such entrenched poverty. This means that programs aimed at reducing poverty have been predominantly concentrated among the ‘better –off’ poor whilst the poorest and most marginalised have found it difficult to participate in development activities and national progress.

ANGOs play an important role within the Australian aid program in their focus on reaching the poorest of the world’s poor. The findings of this Review were strongly endorsed by the broader ANGO group and ACFID during the sector-wide learning events held in Sydney and Melbourne in August 2011.

# Summary of Key Findings

The following key findings are discussed in greater detail in the body of this report:

1. ANGOs demonstrated that they take a multi-dimensional approach to understanding and defining poverty which extends beyond economic indicators incorporating health, education, access to social services, social exclusion and self-esteem;
2. Local knowledge and local partners are critical in the identification of the poorest and most marginalised;
3. Identifying the poorest people is challenging due to transience and ‘invisibility’ of the poorest due to disability, social marginalisation, ethnicity and other socio-cultural bias, nepotism and power imbalances;
4. Given the exacerbated experience of poverty among women, most ANGO projects either deliberately or incidentally work with women;
5. Explicit strategies designed to include people with disabilities were weak in the case studies reviewed but recognised as critical by the ANGO sector;
6. There are multiple barriers to working with the poorest and most marginalised including: remoteness; local power structures; seasonal absences due to work; social exclusion and stigma; low motivation and self-esteem; lack of literacy; and a lack of capacity to visualise or understand the possibilities of change;
7. The immediate needs of the poorest such as food, health and income, are often supported in order to facilitate longer term participation in development;
8. Access to credit to help participants attend to immediate needs and/or initiate economic activity is frequently used as an important starting point;
9. Improved confidence and empowerment are recurring factors in improved and sustained development outcomes for the poor. Regular, personal contact through case management, counselling, or training/mentoring is seen as key to building confidence among participants and maintaining their participation;
10. Processes that tangibly demonstrate or role model success encourages the initial participation of the poor in new development activities. This assists them to visualise the changes to their lives that are possible;
11. Likelihood of success increases when activities are tailored to the living reality of the poor e.g. childcare at training sessions;
12. Regular personal contact often through community based staff, is important for maintaining long term participation of the poor;
13. Many ANGOs refer to qualitative measures of empowerment, confidence and self-esteem as measures of success although information about this is rarely collected systematically;
14. Historically, ANCP reporting structures have not facilitated meaningful flows of information particularly in regards to reporting less tangible outcomes;
15. ANGOs agree that the flexibility of the ANCP model provides good scope for working with the poorest and marginalised as it allows for flexible and responsive design processes.

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Background and Context

The AusAID NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP) is the largest single support mechanism within AusAID for Australian Non-Government Organisations (ANGOs). The goal of the ANCP is to subsidise ANGOs’ own community development activities which directly and tangibly alleviate poverty in developing countries[[1]](#footnote-1).

The ANCP is a unique funding modality, providing a high degree of flexibility to accredited[[2]](#footnote-2) ANGOs. In 2010-2011 the ANCP provided an estimated $70 million to 42 accredited ANGOs to support an estimated 400 community development activities in over 50 countries, predominantly in Asia, Pacific and Africa but also including Latin America, Caribbean and Middle East. In 2011-12 this budget increased to $98.1million. The core focus of the ANCP is poverty reduction and the majority of ANCP activities are concentrated in countries with a low Human Development Index rating (see Annex 4 – ANCP Geographic Spread). While ANGOs pursue a broad range of sectoral and geographic interests within the ANCP, it is clear from ANCP reporting that ANGOs generally aspire to improve the development outcomes for the poorest or most marginalised people in pursuit of poverty reduction.

In 2010-11 ANCP activities delivered improvements for the poor across a range of areas including; health, water supply and sanitation, education and literacy, civil society strengthening and food security. Many ANGOs made a particular effort to work with the poorest and the most marginalised or vulnerable in communities - people with a disability, people living with HIV/AIDs, refugees, ethnic minorities, sex workers, street children, and women and children living in poverty.

The 2011 ANCP Thematic Review (the Review) was designed as a collaborative learning exercise undertaken with ANGOs, AusAID and the Australian Council for International Development (ACFID). It is AusAID’s intention that periodically a thematic issue of contemporary mutual interest to the ANGO sector and AusAID will be chosen for an ANCP Thematic Review. This exercise will contribute to development sector learning and practice and to AusAID’s expanded approach towards understanding the performance and achievements of ANGO partners in reducing poverty. The Review forms part of a broader suite of ANCP learning, evaluation and reporting undertaken by ANGOs and AusAID which is reflected in the recently developed ANCP Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework (MELF).

## 1.2 Scope of the Review

The 2011 ANCP Thematic Review has focused on one aspect of development practice which contributes to the ANCP Goal of poverty reduction. The thematic issue of contemporary mutual interest identified was: ***How are ANCP activities engaging with the poorest and most marginalised people?***

This theme was chosen because there is often an assumption that NGOs, more so than other development actors, specifically target the poorest and most vulnerable people who are otherwise often unable to access the benefits of development processes. It was considered that there would be useful lessons to be learnt vis-à-vis understanding the barriers to reaching the poorest and how ANGOs approach the multiple deprivations that face the poorest and most marginalised. It is also generally considered an important albeit particularly challenging application of NGO values and practice.

The topic is particularly relevant in the context of the Australian Government’s aid policy, *An Effective Aid Program for Australia*, which has as its statement of purpose that Australian aid ‘must address the fundamental constraints that prevent people from breaking out of poverty’ (p.17). It also accords with the recognition that like development, poverty is multidimensional and includes multiple deprivations of which income poverty is only one factor.[[3]](#footnote-3) Working with the poorest and most marginalised people is also an issue of interest to the broader development community in terms of understanding development effectiveness and successfully achieving the MDGs.

The purpose of this Review is therefore to elicit lessons about the critical elements of ANGO’s development practice through their ANCP activities that have led to sustainable changes in the lives of the poorest and most marginalised or which have been identified as barriers to achieving this outcome.

The Review methodology established an ANGO Reference Group consisting of six ANGOs and their selected ANCP activities which were used as case studies to enable in-depth investigation. ANGOs volunteered to join this reference group. ANCP case study activities were chosen using a purposive sampling method to ensure “experience rich” case studies. To broaden the Review’s enquiries and to test assumptions of emerging themes, two sector-wide learning events were held in Sydney and Melbourne to consult with the broader ANCP funded ANGO community.

As a review designed for collaborative learning and sharing amongst partners, the methodology was not designed nor intended to evaluate the specific outcomes or impacts of individual ANCP activities. Rather it was designed to reflect on ANGO approaches in regards to this specific aspect of practice in light of other international experiences and research and to identify common themes or shared areas of learning. The Review has not made judgments about whether working with the poorest and most marginalised is more effective or meaningful than other development practice.

## 1.3 The ANCP Case Studies

As mentioned in the previous section, six ANGOs were chosen to participate in the Review’s NGO Reference Group. Each of these ANGOs then recommended a number of their ANCP activities as possible case studies. Following discussion with AusAID, six ANCP activities were chosen as case studies and formed the basis for the Review’s investigations. The following table provides a summary of the participating ANGO’s ANCP case studies. Detailed outlines of each ANCP case study, including key results are provided at Annexure 1 and are also discussed throughout this report.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ANGO** | **Project Name** | **Project Duration** |
| **Union Aid Abroad -APHEDA** | Literacy and Vocational Skills Training, East Timor | 2006 -2011 (ongoing) |
| **Brief Description:**  Provides literacy training and income generating training and activities to poor rural women. | | |
| **Key Results**   * 97 women trained in literacy, ranging from basic through to advanced classes * 97 women trained in income generating activities * 7 groups established to conduct income generation activities * The literacy and income generation training for rural women provided educational outcomes, as well as poverty alleviation in the rural districts of East Timor * Improvements in literacy and numeracy amongst rural women and ability to more fully participate in community life * As a result of literacy training, women report that they read local Timorese newspapers and articles relevant to their lives such as articles about women’s rights, organic agriculture, leadership etc. * Women from the ‘advanced’ groups are actively using their language skills to compose songs etc. that tell their story of the independence struggle. | | |
| **ANGO** | **Project Name** | **Project Duration** |
| **Assisi Aid Projects Australia (Assisi)** | Self Help Groups for Women, Tamil Nadu, India | 2004 - present |
| **Brief Description**  Works with rural poor to establish and strengthen skills and saving groups, working predominantly with women | | |
| **Key Results**   * A holistic approach to group formation that is based on a long process of consultation * Groups that continue to function for long periods (many years), with successful savings schemes, livelihood training * Women and children empowered to speak up about social issues * Women actively engaged in decision making roles, including standing for election * Providing access to training and education | | |
| **ANGO** | **Project Name** | **Project Duration** |
| **Caritas Australia (Caritas)** | Bridges of Hope Program, Phnom Penh, Cambodia | Caritas funded from 2006 (ongoing) |
| **Brief Description**  Assists People Living with HIV/AIDS to socially and economically reintegrate into society after regaining their health on Anti Retro viral Therapy (ART). | | |
| **Key Results**   * Approximately 500 clients have graduated from the program which began in 2004 * The discrimination and stigmatisation of family members has decreased as a result of numerous HIV/AIDS education and mobilisation activities by different groups including Maryknoll * Instead of rejection by family members, families are more ready to show compassion as they have better understanding of HIV/AIDS, its prevention and means of transmission, and how to care for PLHA. The majority of Maryknoll PLHA clients can now live happily with their family. * Networking between PLHAs has provided the opportunity to connect, share experiences and resources. This connection has proven significant in areas of drug adherence, abating loneliness, isolation and depression. | | |
| **ANGO** | **Project Name** | **Project Duration** |
| **Credit Union Foundation of Australia (CUFA)** | Building Institutional Capacity (BIC) Project, 14 provinces in Cambodia | CUFA funded from 2006 |
| **Brief Description**  Provides technical assistance and training to individual community finance organisations in basic areas of bookkeeping, financial reporting and management skills. | | |
| **Key Results**   * An evaluation of Phase 1 of the project found that the BIC Program achieved good reach but not sustained depth in terms of participants who deliver on-training in a cascade model. * In response to this in Phase 2, 54 Savings Banks received Field Implementation Support in 2010. * Field Implementation Support has proven to be a satisfactory and valuable addition to cascade training as it brings a localised application to generalized training topics. | | |
| **ANGO** | **Project Name** | **Project Duration** |
| **Plan International Australia (Plan)** | Empowering Families project, Siem Reap Province, Cambodia | July 2008 –present |
| **Brief Description**  A project deliberately targeting the poorest people to address their exclusion and poverty in order to improve their living conditions, social inclusion and access to social services. | | |
| **Key Results**   * Providing alternative sources of income for the poorest people * Supporting improved access to health and education for excluded people * Addressing the needs of whole families, resulting in reduced domestic violence and improved sanitation * Good evidence and lessons on how to deliberately work with the most excluded and poorest people | | |
| **ANGO** | **Project Name** | **Project Duration** |
| **Quaker Service Australia (QSA)** | Permaculture Skills Training with Rural Poor and Disabled people, Kampong Thom and Pursat Provinces, Cambodia | P1: 2002-2005  P2: 2005 - present |
| **Brief Description**  Provides training and support to poor rural people in permaculture and to disabled people in skills development in order to improve nutrition, income and quality of life. | | |
| **Key Results**   * Adaption of training to context * Addressing immediate food security needs through quick results of food production * Addressing multiple needs of people with disabilities and their families through combined training * Using training to address broader issues such as domestic violence * Using training to develop confidence as well as skills, and encourage women into decision making positions * Supporting government partner to understand and address causes as well as consequences of poverty and exclusion | | |

# 

# 2. Methodology

The methodology developed for this first ANCP Thematic Review is based upon principles of shared learning and collaboration between AusAID, ANGOs and ACFID. This active collaboration has been an important contribution to the analysis of evidence throughout the Review, to optimise shared learning and to the overall review approach.

The Review has used a qualitative methodology based on a strengths-based and grounded approach to investigate and learn from ANGO practice, experience and achievements through their ANCP projects. The findings have been considered within a broader framework of good development practice and will contribute more generally towards improved knowledge and understanding about engaging with the poorest and most marginalised in development.

## 2.1 Analytical Framework

A number of critical questions were asked about the development approach used by ANGOs in the ANCP activities they support and the management approach used to manage the funding and associated AusAID reporting requirements.

**Development Approach:**

1. Who are the poorest and most marginalised people and who defines them?
2. How are ANGO projects, funded through ANCP, reaching and assisting the poorest and most marginalised?
3. What are the enablers to reaching and assisting the poorest and most marginalised?
4. What are the barriers or constraints to reaching and assisting the poorest and vulnerable communities?
5. What ANGO development strategies have been effective in reaching, assisting and promoting the voice of the poorest and most marginalised?
6. Are there secondary development benefits arising from a focus on the poorest and most marginalised?

**Management Approach:**

1. Do ANGO management approaches facilitate a focus on the poorest and most marginalised?
2. Does the ANCP modality facilitate a focus on the poorest and most vulnerable people (given that ANCP promotes NGOs’ own programs)?
3. Is the Annual Development Plan (ADPlan) and reporting format facilitating the collection of good information on poverty reduction of the poorest and most marginalised?
4. While these questions formed the basis of the inquiry in the Review, the report has been structured around the key findings which emerged from the ANCP case studies and broader ANGO consultations.

## 2.2 Conduct of the Review

The Review was conducted over a number of stages:

**Initial Consultations**: Consultations took place between AusAID, ACFID and the DPC about the chosen theme; review timing and agreement on the final methodology.

**Literature Review:** A literature review broadly scanned current literature and related practice from other international donors, Australian and International NGOs and development agencies in order to contextualise the Review.

**ANGO Reference Group and Selection of Case Studies:** ANGOs were invited to participate in the Review as part of a Reference Group and to recommend ANCP activities as case studies for in-depth review. Six ANGOs were selected from the 21 who nominated ensuring representation of full and base accredited; large, medium and small agencies; and faith and non-faith based NGOs.

**In-Depth Review of ANCP Projects:** A range of ANCP related reports and documents for each of the identified case studies were reviewed. In-depth, semi-structured interviews were conducted with the ANGO program managers (and other staff if appropriate) responsible for the ANCP activities being reviewed. These interviews used an appreciative inquiry approach to explore success and challenges, how these activities reflected broader organisational values, policies and strategies, and address the questions and issues identified within the analytical framework.

**Shared Learning Events:** A draft report was distributed to all ANGOs, who were invited to attend one of two learning events, held in Sydney and Melbourne in early August 2011. The purpose of these events was to provide an opportunity for the broader ANGO community to discuss, reflect, contest and validate preliminary findings. 65 representatives from 42 ANGOs and AusAID representatives attended these workshops to discuss and test the preliminary findings based on the six case studies. In particular, the groups were invited to assess whether these findings were consistent with their own agency’s experience and practice, and whether there were key issues related to working with the poorest and most marginalised that had not been addressed through these case studies.

## 2.3 Rigour and Validity

Ensuring rigour and validity is important in any qualitative study, and particularly so when attempting to make general statements based on the in-depth analysis of a small number of case studies. The rigour and validity for this review has been provided in a number of ways:

* The Review, while a collaboration between AusAID and ANGOs, was led and conducted by independent consultants;
* Triangulation and cross-checking by accessing multiple sources of data – project documents, thematic reports, AusAID information on ANCP, ANGO information, interviews, literature and practice of other development organisations;
* In-depth analysis exploring development, organisational and management issues;
* Invitation to implementing partners to share their perspectives;
* Progressive analysis and cross-checking involving key stakeholders;
* Feedback to a larger group of stakeholders via shared learning events to validate preliminary findings and collect further data.

# 3. Findings

## 3.1 Identifying and Understanding the Poorest and Most Marginalised

ANGOs each have their own way of defining and identifying ‘the poor’. In two ANCP case study activities (Caritas and Plan), working with the poorest and most marginalised**[[4]](#footnote-4)** was an explicit focus of their projects. In the other four ANCP case study activities, the target groups were both poor and marginalised people, although not explicitly identified as ‘the poorest’.

There are a number of ways to identify the poor commonly used in poverty reduction approaches. The literature review undertaken within this Review found that the $1/day measure of economic poverty widely used by the World Bank and others is still one of the most common measures of poverty. However many, including World Bank representatives themselves, acknowledge that poverty is not just about economic measures but needs to address more complex issues such as equity, social inclusion and well-being. A range of new tools have been developed to enable more holistic and integrated poverty assessment[[5]](#footnote-5), including a new poverty measure called the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) used for the UNDP’s Human Development Report in 2010.

Many authors describe holistic and varied measures of poverty and wellbeing, including Amartya Sen[[6]](#footnote-6) who describes well-being (and poverty) in the broadest terms as *the capability of people to function effectively in society*. This type of measure is very important in identifying the poorest and most marginalised.

### 3.1.1 Defining Poverty

The common factor within the ANCP case study activities that most clearly differentiated the poorest from the poor is that the poorest are both poor and excluded. The focus on **‘**exclusion**’** recognises that ’the poorest and most marginalised’ are not able to participate in the practices, traditions, activities and services within their own communities. To overcome this element of ‘exclusion’, programs are designed to specifically target those who are both poor *and* marginalised.

Some of the Reference Group ANGOs’ implementing partners clearly define what they mean by ‘poverty’ or ‘vulnerability’ and use specific measures or tools such as a wealth ranking to identify them, whereas others tend have an implicit understanding of the meaning of ‘poverty’ in their local context and rely on less structured or formal mechanisms for identifying those who are poor. For example, QSA’s partner, in consultation with village leaders, identifies poor people as those with large families, children who do not go to school, those with the smallest or least secure housing, or people with disabilities.

Most of the ANCP case study activities did not rely on one method or measure alone, but rather used a combination of approaches to identify the poor, poorest and most marginalised. This finding was consistent with broader ANGO sector practice as discussed at the learning events. A multi-dimensional approach was seen as providing scope for ANGOs and their partners to explore complex community dynamics and intra-household issues, including identifying who in the community and the household is excluded. Commonly these were women, children, the aged and infirm, and those living with a disability.

### 3.1.2 Identifying the Poor

A range of strategies were used by the Reference Group ANGOs in their ANCP case study activities and the broader ANGO group to identify the poor within communities. In some ANCP case study activities, ANGO partners utilised a number of assessment processes that attempted to understand poverty as a complex and integrated issue in order to ensure they are genuinely working with the poorest members of the target population. Plan Australia indicated that this process of identification is labour intensive, time consuming and expensive as it is supported by extensive background research and assessments. However they also indicated that there is strong evidence that it does enable them to genuinely work with the poorest individuals and families in a comprehensive way.

Approaches used include home visits and interviews, wealth criteria, relying on local knowledge, and working through local hierarchies or project committees. Assisi, APHEDA and QSA rely on internal assessments involving village leaders, local government staff and/or local partner representatives. All participating ANGOs acknowledge that this approach has advantages in that local people have the best knowledge of their communities. However, they also acknowledge that these processes have limitations and that there is no guarantee that the poorest people in these communities will necessarily be identified or selected for participation. This may be in part due to local selection practices and processes which unintentionally but systematically exclude the poorest.

ANGOs acknowledged that there are limitations with most strategies of selection and identification. For example, relying on the local knowledge of communities may overlook women due to ingrained cultural perspectives about the role of women; local hierarchies may prioritise those whom they are related to; wealth criteria may miss issues within households and non-material dimensions of wealth; and the poorest may not be registered in the village or contactable at the time that project assessments are taking place.

Typically it takes time to identify the poorest and local contextual and cultural understandings are imperative. To reach the very poorest depended greatly on the Reference Group ANGO’s local partners and their knowledge of, and trust and credibility within the communities. This means there is strong reliance on local partners and knowledge to identify the poor and the poorest. However, there is also recognition that the objectivity provided by an external body, such as an ANGO, can promote a stronger focus on selecting the poorest and identifying and overcoming barriers to working with the poorest.

Caritas found that it needed to provide training to its partner organisation to assist them to identify the key barriers facing the poorest of the poor, and to develop specific strategies to overcome these barriers. QSA stated that assisting their partner develop a strategic plan that was more grounded in their work, made it easier for the staff to understand their roles but importantly why they were working with particular people such as poor and marginalised women.

### 3.1.3 Focusing on Women

One of the complexities within defining the poor is that global poverty measures rely on data about households, which assumes all members experience the same level of deprivation within a household– i.e. that men, women and children experience poverty in the same way. These measures overlook the fact that there are intra-household differences and a range of disadvantages that women and girls face which are significant sources of inequality and exacerbate their experience of poverty. Focusing on women specifically within poverty reduction approaches is therefore especially significant to tackling ingrained poverty, given women’s exacerbated experience of poverty as well as the positive impacts on families and communities when the lives of women are improved.

|  |
| --- |
| *In the APHEDA project in Timor Leste, trainers travel to rural communities and stay with the community for up to a week to conduct literacy training in women’s own environments, taking into account their need to attend to domestic and childcare duties. The women are able to keep their children with them while they attend training.* |

A recent research report conducted for ACFID[[7]](#footnote-7) concluded that “there is still a predominant focus on livelihoods, including microfinance, with women as the major beneficiaries, and the belief that this may lead to empowerment outcomes...” and that “agencies generally did not have strategies to work in the private space of the household, which is the primary space for gender discrimination and reproduction of patriarchal norms that can have violent outcomes”. The ANCP case study activities and the sector-wide learning events confirmed that while many activities did focus on working with women on livelihood and empowerment issues, ANGOs and their partners generally did not adequately analyse the cultural complexities of gender power relations, particularly at the intra-household level.

|  |
| --- |
| *The Department of Women’s Affairs previous strategic plan was too high level and did not guide or give reason to the staff as to how or why they worked in particular place or with particular people. The new strategic plan has been useful in helping staff understand their roles better and has been important in assisting staff understand the needs of the poorest people in villages, the need to be more tolerant of them and to adapt their training approaches accordingly.*  *- QSA Cambodia* |

These findings are relevant to any activities which have an explicit focus on women and those which target poor communities more generally. The gender dimension of poverty was explicit in only half of the case studies researched for this Review. Within all ANCP case study activities, the ANGOs acknowledged that there are still multiple barriers that preclude women from participating or realising the full benefits of participation. Discussion with the broader ANGO group at the Review learning events particularly highlighted the complexities in gender based power relationships that exist in different cultural settings although as one participant noted, ‘*we need to be realistic about mainstreaming gender in 3-5 year projects in communities when we haven’t achieved this in Australia*’.

The ANCP case study activities which included an explicit focus on women included the QSA activity in Cambodia which worked with the Department of Women’s Affairs (DOWA) to provide permaculture training for poor women in order to improve their food security and quality of life; the Assisi activity which has worked with a partner in Tamil Nadu for 25 years who support and strengthen self-help groups for poor rural women to establish savings schemes and skills development in order to improve their economic condition as well as improve their social status; and the APHEDA activity which has a focus on providing literacy training to illiterate rural women.

In the ANCP case study activities where women were not an explicit focus of the activity, there were not necessarily specific strategies used to target and include women. In the ANCP case study activities where the focus was with the poorest (i.e. Caritas and Plan), there was an assumption that women who were both poor and excluded would naturally be included in the activity by virtue of their poverty and exclusion. CUFA acknowledged that more gender specific strategies would need to be employed to better reach and include poor women in their ANCP activity.

APHEDA identified that for their ANCP case study activity, literacy was a major impediment to women’s capacity to participate within their communities and the public domain. APHEDA have found that in gaining basic literacy skills and confidence, the women now have the tools to participate in a broader range of family, economic and community roles. APHEDA reports that through literacy training, women are now able to better participate in economic activity, assist their children to do their homework, and participate in important social governance activities such as voting, reading the newspaper, and reading and writing letters.

|  |
| --- |
| *“This project has really benefited our community because it improves literacy (reading, writing, counting). We can now read on information from Lafaek, Babadok, Care, Hasatil and other social training information on gender, human rights, and domestic violence. We could even help teach our children who are in school.” a mother in Dauboru Baha literacy/income generation, Viqueque, Timor Leste.*  *- APHEDA* |

## 3.2 Engaging with the Poorest and Most Marginalised

### 3.2.1 Barriers to Reaching and Assisting the Poorest

There are multiple barriers that prohibit and limit the participation of the poorest and most marginalised in the development aid process. ANGOs assert that specific and dedicated strategies are required to reach and sustain working with this cohort of people. While most ANGO activities have criteria by which to identify and select participants, there are often systemic issues that preclude the poorest of the poor from then engaging in regular development projects, particularly on an ongoing basis. The key barriers identified by the ANGOs and their overseas partners in the ANCP case study activities included:

* The poorest often suffer systemic social exclusion based on their caste, family connections, ethnicity, religion, health status or political influence;
* The poorest often live in remote areas and frequently move, and are therefore difficult to meet/work with;
* The poorest may not speak the official national language and also lack literacy skills;
* The poorest often have heavy burdens and no spare time - all their time is used to seek out an existence;
* The poorest often have low self-esteem and lack of confidence or fear of participation;
* The poorest often have a limited knowledge of their rights to basic services;
* Development work with the poorest is a slow process because it requires positive changes in both mindsets and materials of the poorest.

As a consequence, ANGOs recognise that they may not always reach the poorest for various reasons. In the ANCP case study activities, QSA accepted that it was not always possible to work with the poorest due to their transient lifestyle of seeking work; Assisi recognised that the poorest may not voluntarily participate; and APHEDA recognised that illiterate rural women sometimes may not be able to attend literacy classes due to other work or household pressures.

There were also a number of specific examples within the ANCP case study activities of overcoming barriers and obstacles to working with the poorest. Some ANCP case study activities (Assisi, Caritas and Plan) have used a holistic approach that include comprehensive packages of psycho-social, economic, health, counselling and education to encourage participation of the poorest and meet the wide range of needs with which they present. Others, such as QSA, APHEDA and CUFA have tailored their project activities to be conducted at a time and place that best suits the lives and needs of participants.

|  |
| --- |
| *“We, community members of this aldeia, are very happy about the adult literacy project because our sisters, mothers, and grandmothers now know how to read and write. We want more women and men to get lessons” community member of Dauboru Baha, Viqueque APHEDA* |

The learning events confirmed that ANGOs identify the importance of working with other members of a community in order to sustainably address poverty for communities as a whole. The ANGOs are aware that targeting those who are otherwise excluded may result in further exclusion by providing benefits to some, but not all in the community. Some of the ANCP case study activities used (explicitly or implicitly) the basic premise of a ‘do no harm’ approach where interventions targeting the poorest are framed within broader interventions which seek to include a development benefit that everyone in a community can share in and benefit from. In the Assisi and Plan ANCP case study activities, the involvement of youth and children’s groups has been very successful at breaking down barriers and engaging the whole community. The ANCP case study activities demonstrated that involving the broader community is important in preventing jealousy about perceptions of a ‘special group of people’ getting extra attention or support.

### 3.2.2 The Importance of Meeting Basic Needs

ANGOs provided a range of incentives or strategies to assist or support the ongoing participation of the poorest either by meeting basic needs or building trust. Often this included the provision of basic needs such as shelter, food, clothing and medical support in order to enable participation in ongoing development processes.

|  |
| --- |
| *Staff visit clients at home during the entire length of their participation in the program. These visits are a critical element in building trust and also allow staff to see how each client lives which is necessary for case evaluation.*  *- Caritas* |

For example the Caritas activity, where chickens were provided so that individuals or families could immediately have eggs; the QSA activity included permaculture training which started with quick growing vegetables that built confidence as well as providing rapid results and food; and the Assisi activity which offered seed money once a savings group was established, which then became part of a revolving loan. The QSA activity has employed deliberate strategies to maintain the motivation and participation of their training participants by providing meals so that the people who are not able to go to the field during training get fed and child minding to allow parents to fully engage in training. They also allowed multiple members of one family to attend permaculture training which provided the family with access to food thereby reducing the need for participants to seek employment instead of training. Assistance was not always material; the Plan activity supported the accompaniment of poor families to the local health centre to facilitate assistance with health issues and also reduce their sense of stigma and exclusion.

In short, working with the poorest and most marginalised often included the provision of some form of ‘welfare’ in order to enable the poorest to participate. The inclusion of ‘welfare’ within ANCP activities has always been a contentious issue, with ANCP guidelines and accreditation requirements explicitly precluding welfare activities. There was strong evidence however that the material assistance provided in these ANCP case study activities was clearly part of broader development interventions that sought to enable the immediate participation and strengthen the capacity of the poorest to remain engaged.

### 3.2.3 Access to Savings and Credit

|  |
| --- |
| *Small grants of up to $200 are provided by the project. Clients who don’t own property or have other assets may be limited in accessing either loans or grants from other sources such as microcredit agencies. While loans rather than grants have been considered as an option, Bridges of Hope believes that grants are a better, less stressful option for clients and are easier to administer.*  *- Caritas.* |

Almost all of the ANCP case study activities identified that access to savings and credit was a critical factor for sustainability and four of the six ANCP case study activities (Assisi, APHEDA, Caritas and QSA) provide start up grants or access to credit to help participants initiate economic activity. While banking services have increased and become visible in most countries, this service often remains inaccessible for the most economically disadvantaged individuals. The poorest and most marginalised usually have no property or other assets to use as collateral, so accessing credit through formal means is extremely difficult. Furthermore, discrimination still persists within formal banking services.

The CUFA ANCP case study activity specifically sought to strengthen community savings mechanisms. Its aim was to work at the community savings bank level to improve governance and management systems, thereby increasing the availability of community finance to those who are unable to otherwise access credit. This differs somewhat from micro-credit schemes, as the focus is on developing and sustaining formal membership based savings banks at the community level.

While most of the ANCP case study activities focused on providing training in micro-enterprise activities and management, an evaluation of the Caritas activity which works with PLHA suggested focusing on vocational training for wage employment for clients living in urban and semi-urban settings as a more stable source of income than micro-enterprise. Most, if not all, of the Caritas activity participants are involved in the informal economy. It found that most people opted for small grants for small business in order to rebuild what they had lost before they became ill with HIV/AIDS. The Caritas activity provides participants with the choice to receive a grant for micro-enterprise activity or to meet the cost of vocational training expenses such as transportation and materials.

### 3.2.4 Confidence Building and Empowerment

Improved confidence and empowerment are recurring factors in improved and sustained development outcomes for the poor. This is consistent with other research undertaken by Oxfam that found that *internal empowerment is a fundamental building block for achieving sustainable changes in ... all ... dimensions of empowerment and equality.[[8]](#footnote-8)*

|  |
| --- |
| *“Department of Women’s Affairs are a group of very strong women and the trainers are all women who are excellent role models of strong, decisive women who assist in community decision making which encourages the women themselves to participate in village decision making.”*  *-QSA* |

At the core of most of the ANCP case study activities is the challenge of overcoming a sense of hopelessness of people who have suffered health issues, poverty issues, and social exclusion for a long time. The ANGO staff talked about people being jaded, being stuck in the routine of living hand-to-mouth and a lack of ability to visualise the possibilities being offered to them. The task of building and sustaining self-esteem and confidence among the poorest of the poor was endorsed as critical at the ANGO learning events to sustaining any material achievements. Regular, personal contact (for example through case management, counselling, or training and mentoring) is seen as key to building confidence among participants as well as maintaining their participation and being able to more effectively respond to issues as they arise.

In their ANCP activities, QSA and Assisi use the ongoing process of training, mentoring and support, as well as trainers or facilitators who are strong role models, to gradually build up confidence and esteem. This concurs with the findings of Oxfam Australia’s report *Breaking the Shackles*, which used four indicators to assess changes in internal empowerment of women. The report concluded that there was strong evidence for three strategies essential to promote women’s empowerment – group discussions, support and solidarity; CBO training, particularly on gender and rights; and one-to-one discussions and support provided by field staff – strategies that are consistent with many of those used by the ANCP case study activities in this Review.

|  |
| --- |
| *In the last couple of years Bridges of Hope [the Caritas activity] has actively recruited PLHA graduates from the project as volunteer counsellors. In this way, the project is gaining the benefit of PLHA lived experience and the PLHA develop skills which may enable them to be recruited into the project on a more permanent basis or to find work with other agencies.*  *- Caritas* |

The Caritas and Plan ANCP case study activities which explicitly focus on the poorest of the poor, both adopted an integrated approach to working with the poorest, whereby the projects sought to address both the psychological and physical/material needs of people. In the example of the Caritas activity, the main objective of the first stage is to strengthen the clients’ sense of self-worth and value as a human being, to overcome fears and to regain self-confidence. This is seen as an essential precursor to being able to make sustained changes in the lives of PLHA. The basic premise to this approach is that enabling the poorest peoples to gain confidence in themselves through counselling (i.e. achieving positive psychological change) will not be sustained unless their economic livelihood is also improved (i.e. positive physical change) because their deep material poverty will ultimately result in their loss of confidence again.It is recognised however that this is a difficult outcome to measure and is therefore not widely articulated as a development impact.

### 3.2.5 Tailoring Capacity Building and Training

All the ANCP case study activities attributed their long-term commitment to capacity building as a critical success factor. This was typically implemented through a combination of training, mentoring and accompaniment. There was a common premise among the case study activities that one-off training sessions diminish success, and that effective capacity building requires an ongoing process to enhance confidence and skills over time. Some ANGOs indicated that repeat activities provide additional opportunities to encourage ongoing participation by people who may be preoccupied with the daily task of meeting basic needs and whose attendance is therefore compromised. All ANGOs agreed that motivation, the transient nature of poor people and social exclusion continue to be key challenges to the success of capacity building.

The ANGOs and their ANCP case study activities addressed social issues and life skills strengthening in different ways. Some indicated that while training sessions will notionally be about a specific technical skill such as gardening, they are also deliberately designed to be an opportunity to develop self-esteem and general life skills in parallel. In some case study activities, training provided a forum for poor people (often women) to discuss sensitive social issues such as domestic violence. In the APHEDA case study activity, literacy is integrated in a real and functional way into the everyday lives of the women in their communities through book-keeping for income generation groups, making signs for kiosks, reading fliers from government and other NGO initiatives, etc. Life skills messages are also integrated into other vocational skills training such as sewing training where the facilitator will use the session to introduce discussion on topics such as HIV, health, or nutrition.

QSA relaxed the criteria for participation in their skills training programs to allow the participation of multiple family members in permaculture training where food was provided so that a family’s basic nutrition needs could be met. QSA and Assisi also use the opportunity of training sessions to develop a support network for participants, and to address social issues such as domestic violence and alcoholism. CUFA does not try to integrate general life skill messages into their financial independence and literacy trainings but instead refer participants to other relevant trainings or activities delivered by other agencies.

|  |
| --- |
| *QSA’s approach of paying older community members to care for the children of participants during training sessions not only facilitated participation, but provided real opportunities for otherwise excluded members of the community to indirectly engage with the project.* |

Training that is tailored to a target group’s needs, using local materials and contexts, tends to lead to greater application of the training. For example, training that is delivered in participants’ own environments and at suitable times, with practical support such as childcare arranged (e.g. QSA) enhances access and ongoing participation, particularly for women. The more recognition that is placed on the living reality of the poor – such as the need for childcare in order to attend, the need to work in fields or gardens in the morning, the fact that women will bring their young children and that people will wander in and out – the more likely training or counselling sessions will be delivered in an accessible way and be held at a place and time that facilitates participation. Training that is delivered by local people rather than expatriates is more easily able to be contextualised to the needs of trainees, delivered at a more appropriate pace, and can respond to context as it arises.

In their ANCP case study activity APHEDA place significant effort in contextualising training materials in order to make any learning relevant to the lives of poor participants. For example, they conduct literacy groups in a number of villages and the materials used are specifically created for each group. This will include a book with photos and names of group members, doing their usual daily tasks, or lessons will involve activities directly relevant to their local environment, such as learning to read local road signs. Numeracy materials focus on the actual items women would typically buy at their local market. APHEDA states that while it takes time and effort to build these resources, it is a good investment because they are used for a long time.

This was clearly demonstrated in the CUFA ANCP case study activity, which transitioned from a centralised training model to a more adaptive field based model where trainers provided training at times most convenient to the participants – weekends, night times, avoiding harvest and planting times etc. This meant that a range of community members were able to participate in training, including women.

|  |
| --- |
| *“Two years after the first batch, generally clients approach Bridges with a sense of hope and excitement because they can see that their peers, who have graduated, are doing just fine. We feel this was our initial success- changing the ways of thinking and attitudes of clients, from dependency to taking responsibility.”*  *Caritas* |

### 3.2.6 Motivating Participation

The ANGO ANCP case study activities have adopted a range of strategies to promote the motivation and participation of poor people. One key strategy employed is providing real examples of poor people who are participating in or have graduated from a poverty reduction program and are in improved situations. Seeing concrete examples and the success of others is important and sometimes deliberately facilitated through ANGO activities. This approach has been found to be a very powerful tool to demonstrate the possibilities of change to other people and encourage their participation in a development program.

In the QSA case study activity, exposure visits are a fundamental aspect to allow people to have the opportunity to see tangible examples of what others have achieved, such as being inspired by seeing first-hand the productive gardens of previous permaculture participants. This is particularly important as the poorest in communities also often have very low literacy and are often limited by their own experience. Exposure to the success of others can be illuminating for those who have not had the opportunity in their life to visualise possibilities for change.

|  |
| --- |
| *“The new group is inspired by the old group and their progress, and they also want to do income generating activities. The members of the old group help members of the new group to learn, through helping with reading, writing and spelling.”*  *APHEDA staff member* |

Other ANCP case study activities used leadership or champions in order to motivate and encourage others. Formal and informal group support mechanisms such as self-help groups, village management groups and savings groups, as well as training groups themselves also play an important role for many activities aimed at the poorest. These engender a sense of shared responsibility and opportunities to share information and provide support.

The Caritas case study activity was developed with the involvement of PLHA to practice the GIPA principle (Greater Involvement of People Living with HIV/AIDS) and because their participation ensured a credible strategy of influencing behaviour change among peers. The case study activity now has a number of graduate peer volunteers who are meaningfully involved in the process of social and community reintegration. Furthermore, the volunteers are leading in the education campaign on positive prevention in their respective communities.

Similarly the APHEDA case study activity demonstrates the value of leading by example, where some literacy classes have been established for longer than others. ANGOs at the learning event concurred, having observed informal or unprompted action-learning processes by community members. In many cases, the curiosity in the village when trainings or sessions are taking place is an important catalyst for poorer members of the community to participate in training. When the poor see others involved in training, and after time, see the benefits that participants are enjoying, they are subsequently encouraged to become involved. APHEDA described a separate example where a group of local women saw a literacy training group being facilitated in their community. The women were so interested in literacy training, that they formed their own group and began to meet regularly, despite not having a literacy trainer. After some time, APHEDA was able to support this group by providing a literacy trainer.

## 3.3 Time, Scale and Relationships

Time, scale and relationships were found to be critical factors in all of the ANCP case study activities reviewed. It is the time taken to build trust, to maintain grassroots level engagement, to build genuine relationships with local partners and with the poor, and the efforts taken at the beginning to foster local ownership which enables ANGO effectiveness.

### 3.3.1 Time and Scale

All six Reference Group ANGOs believe that a long term engagement with communities is critical in order to effectively target the poor. For example, Plan takes approximately 12 months to gain the confidence of participants, provide support and encourage them to participate in development activities. Typically, this requires project partners to provide some form of direct financial or material support initially, invest heavily in case management, make long term commitments and provide phased programs that build on earlier skills development.

ANGOs at the learning events noted that there are improved chances for success when time is spent at the beginning of a project to establish trust and ownership of the activities with community leaders and villagers. Establishing genuine and respectful relationships with the poor as participants is important and this often involves establishing a relationship with their families. ANGOs observed that the connection with the poor is deeper when program staff live in, or spend significant time in the places where poor people live (e.g. through home visitation, providing training at the place of work, basing project offices in slums, etc.), in order to understand the living reality of the poor.

The Assisi ANCP case study activity approach of working with self-help groups contrasts with other approaches often used in India where groups are started up with quick injections of large amounts of cash, but with little ongoing support or follow-up. Assisi deliberately takes a slow process to establish trust and ownership, conducting good education with the community and has often worked in communities for up to 15 years. They have also learnt that leaving a community before a group is ready can result in failure of the group. Conversely if a group is appropriately supported, over time they can evolve into a well-organised CBO addressing community needs[[9]](#footnote-9).

The Reference Group ANGOs reported differing experiences regarding appropriate activity scale. A number of the ANGOs consider that the small scale approach is a critical success factor in reaching the poorest and have deliberately worked at a small, and grassroots scale, stating that this approach best enabled the slow, intensive and relationship-focused nature of their work addressing context specific constraints to poverty reduction.

### 3.3.2 Local Partners – Relationships and Roles

There was consensus among all Reference Group ANGOs and at the learning events that it is vital to work with local organisations in order to reach the poorest and most marginalised. The role of trust between communities and partners is especially important when working with the poorest. This requires partners to be present, to accompany, to participate and to visit frequently in order for individuals and families to have confidence in the partner and the activity. Caritas has found that employing people from within the community enhances understanding of the experience of the poor and reduces obstacles to their participation.

The relationships between the six Reference Group ANGOs and their partners were slightly different but important in all of the ANCP case study activities. In the case of Assisi, PLAN, Caritas and APHEDA, the partners were grassroots organisations. This was considered key to their ability to reach and work with the poor in their own environment.

ANGOs at the learning events reflected that local partners and staff do not always understand the structural reasons behind poverty and disadvantage, which may affect how effectively they are engaging with the poorest. The role of an ANGO can be to make these issues more visible to their local partners.

In its ANCP case study activity, CUFA works at an institutional level rather than directly with the poor themselves, with the intention of strengthening local institutions so that they may in turn better serve the poor. In the case of APHEDA activity, it provided training in participatory adult education and training methodology to the trainers used by its partner organisations. It also provided training and support to its local partner in the area of strategic planning and management development.

### 3.3.3 The need for political change

The question of why ANGOs (Reference Group and learning event ANGOs) specifically sought to work with the poorest and most marginalised was commonly grounded in a rights based approach (either implicitly or explicitly) where agencies seek to provide support to those whose rights are not being met. Often, the poorest of the poor are not able to access other aid and development programs because they experience a level of additional exclusion that prohibits their participation in most community activities. ANGOs recognise that they are often filling a gap where government services and programs have failed to reach the poorest.

The ACFID Practice Note on the Rights Based Approach[[10]](#footnote-10) states that human rights and human development share a common vision to secure freedom, well-being and dignity and that the recognition of human rights is recognised by ANGOs as being crucial to sustainable human development and the eradication of poverty. Consistent with the findings of this Review, the report states that while the overall majority of ANGOs recognise human rights as important to their development activities, not all had specific strategies or policies to achieve this.

The capacity of ANGOs to make larger scale improvements to the lives of the poorest of the poor is, however, to a large extent limited by community practice and systemic issues such as government policies, systems and practices. To sustain long term improvement in the lives of the poor, development interventions would need to address both the basic needs of the poorest of the poor and promote the responsibilities of duty bearers - government and civil societies. In the ANCP case study activities, the ANGOs took the view that support is aimed at making it possible for the poorest of the poor to restore/gain their self-confidence and thereby enable them to better claim their rights, and even interact with their government representatives to advocate for themselves.

Among the broader ANGO group however, it is acknowledged that advocating governments to improve the enabling environment for the poorest and most marginalised is critical to longer term improvements in the lives of the poorest and most marginalised. The learning event discussions noted that engaging in the work around establishing the preconditions for enabling environments inevitably leads NGOs into an advocacy and policy role.

For example, one implementing partner of an ANCP case study activity notes:

*In general, our current strategy focuses more on the direct interventions with the poorest families, and less on strengthening the supporting institutions of the governments, civil societies at both local and national levels to support the poorest. For the long term sustainability of the project and support services for the poorest, further involvement and strengthening of government and civil society institutions (e.g. health centres, commune council members) is required so that they adopt more inclusive development approaches*. [Plan Cambodia]

Caritas attributes the introduction of the antiretroviral therapy policy of the Government of Cambodia in 2002, accompanied by legislation to create a favourable legal environment for prevention and care, to significantly changing the face of the HIV/AIDS trajectory in Cambodia. It has meant that Cambodia now has a growing population of PLHA who rather than being economically inactive and preparing for death are now slowly regaining their health and economic potential. The legislation has assisted with the challenges of societal reintegration by seeking to reduce stigma and discrimination. This new Cambodian Government policy enabled Caritas to shift its focus from assisting PLHA to ‘die with dignity’ to being able to assist them ‘to live with hope’. This example demonstrates the relevance of national policy environments and how they directly affect the lives of the poor and marginalised.

While the ANCP case study activities did not have an explicit focus on promoting the role of duty bearers, it is an important factor that deserves further discussion and reflection, particularly in the context of recent work undertaken by ACFID on development effectiveness which contends that ‘if we are to improve development effectiveness then, amongst other things, changing accountability mechanisms, engaging in domestic political change and constituency-building all need to be part of that strategy’.[[11]](#footnote-11) This is an area that demands further investigation in terms of its impact on the lives of the poorest.

## 3.4 NGO and ANCP Management

### 3.4.1 Monitoring and Learning

All of the Reference Group ANGOs had invested to some degree, and some significantly, in research, evaluations and learning processes in their ANCP activities. Plan has conducted extensive research into community cohesion and others, such as CUFA, are investing more in developing baseline information to track change. Most have conducted independent evaluations of their ANCP activities. The evaluation of the Caritas ANCP case study activity found that the project has helped over 500 people living with HIV to achieve self-sufficiency over a five year period. It concluded that ‘the project is cost effective since the number of people who have graduated from the program is high and as clients achieve self-sufficiency they no longer require the services of the project or other NGOs and are able to contribute to the communities they live in and in the national economy. ‘Bridged’ clients are largely self-sufficient and therefore require no, or at least very little, welfare support from partner agencies. This is a positive and cost effective outcome.’

Assessing outcomes in regards to building self-esteem and confidence is difficult and resource intensive, although very important given this is a critical indicator of people moving out of poverty, particularly for the poorest and most marginalised. Most outcome information available in this regard appears to be anecdotal, although there have been some efforts at developing systems to capture outcomes based information. For example in the Caritas ANCP case study activity, the local partner conducts regular quality of life surveys with current clients.

The information documented in ANGO ANCP activity monitoring reports (and in many evaluations) varied greatly in quality and level of analysis. Most ANGOs could report on the numbers of people participating but reporting/analysis on the usefulness and application of the training and capacity development in people’s lives, particularly over a longer time period, was inconsistent. However, in discussion, ANGOs could offer clear examples of longer-term changes based on their experience, visits, and personal knowledge and demonstrated sound analysis of the progress of project participants and change over time.

This highlights the challenge of identifying the best way to capture and share the rich and meaningful experiences of ANCP activities in reporting documentation. Beyond the formal reporting processes, case studies and narratives are used by most ANGOs and AusAID is interested in these being included in ANCP reporting. Case studies are a useful way of capturing the change as experienced by the communities and how the poor perceive themselves.

Historically, ANCP reporting and program management requirements have not facilitated meaningful flows of information about development achievements and effectiveness between AusAID and ANGOs. Where ANGOs use ANCP funding for multiple activities, these are joined together within one ADPlan Report. Grouping activities together for funding and reporting purposes is an efficient approach administratively, but it can mean that the richness of information and learning from multiple activities can get lost when reporting is provided at such a consolidated level.

ANGOs and AusAID acknowledged that there is greater scope for increased learning and sharing between the ANGO sector and AusAID. This is being addressed in the new ANCP Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework (MELF) developed by AusAID in consultation with ANGOs and ACFID.

### 3.4.2 Design Processes

Many ANGOs noted that flexibility in design is an important factor when working with the poorest and most marginalised. The flexibility of the ANCP funding modality provides good scope in this regard and this was highly valued by ANGOs. Caritas states that “*if you really want to reach the poorest you have to be ready to change the design, and the timeline.”* QSA, CUFA and Assisi also provide examples where their approach has changed or evolved over time as a result of learning lessons and applying them progressively as projects are implemented.

Plan is placing more emphasis on the underlying theory of change in order to identify the critical elements of the social change process rather than following a rigid or detailed project design. This has shifted their focus away from a set plan to looking at “*understanding ‘what are we trying to achieve here?’ and reflect on the best ways to achieve that”.* Suchan approach requires testing assumptions along the way, being flexible and open to adjusting approaches in response to issues as they emerge. ANCP reforms undertaken in 2009 allow a long-term (multiple year) project commitment, and enable a percentage of AusAID funds to be used for program design, monitoring and evaluation and for program quality, which provides more space for ANGO reflection and adaptation.

A strong example of a changed approach can be found within the CUFA ANCP case study activity. CUFA shifted from a cascade model of training (training delivered centrally to trainers who were then required to on-train at the local savings bank level) to a field-based training and support model where training was provided directly to the local savings bank. While the first model had much greater reach, an evaluation found that its depth was limited. The new model of training and support has been found to be more effective in terms of changed practices at the savings bank level and reinforced the notion that support that is contextualised to the local experience is likely to be far more successful.

### 3.4.3 Value for Money

The Aid Effectiveness Review of the Australian Aid Program was released during the conduct of this Review, and provides an additional lens through which to consider findings. The emphasis in the Aid Review is on improved demonstration of effectiveness through Result-Based Management and Value-for-Money analysis.

In the context of this focus, working with the poorest requires thorough analysis. On the one hand, work with the poorest and the most marginalised is often time and resource intensive, typically targets smaller numbers of beneficiaries and can be slow to realise results. In other words, the cost of such projects can be significant, even when run through the typically lower cost base of NGOs. On the other hand, however, this Review has found that the integrated, localised and intensive approach taken by ANGOs is necessary to achieve sustained changes among the poorest and most marginalised. Where projects are able to assist truly poor people achieve self-sufficiency, they no longer require the services of the project or other NGOs and are able to contribute to the communities they live in and in their national economies. Many would argue that the economic benefit that accrues from improving the social and economic status of the poorest and most marginalised is significant, particularly where the poorest are enabled to establish financial independence.

In a broader sense, however, the more important value-for-money measure is the extent to which ANGOs programs targeting the poor are able to demonstrate results. While ANGOs have demonstrated an active commitment to development effectiveness, the sector is still working towards developing reliable methods for measuring results, particularly for intangible but relevant areas such as improved self-esteem and confidence among the poor. The findings of this Review indicate that more work needs to be done to better articulate and document the results of working with the poorest and most marginalised.

# 4. Recommendations

The following recommendations are made following final reflection on the findings of the Review:

1. Improved analysis of intra-household gender power disparities and barriers is required to both identify poor women and men, boys and girls and provide an improved enabling environment for their participation;
2. AusAID and ANGO reporting mechanisms that better capture the non-tangible development achievements of ANCP activities.
3. AusAID to consider a variety of communications mediums such as documented, photographic or video stories of change for presenting the rich social empowerment related performance information in regards to ANCP activities;
4. Enhanced attention by ANGOs on influencing the structural barriers to development wherever possible, particularly in partnership with other development actors through advocacy and policy engagement.
5. Further research and analysis into the actual cost of engaging over long periods of time with the poorest and marginalised to demonstrate value for money;
6. Development of tools which collect baseline data on the multidimensional aspects of poverty, as a precursor to measuring change. (Refer to Literature Review at annexure 3)
7. Further attention to developing explicit strategies to identify and facilitate the participation of those living with a disability, recognising their exacerbated experience of poverty.
8. ANGOs to develop clearer theory of change analysis which explicitly links improved confidence, esteem and skills to sustainable poverty reduction outcomes;
9. ANGOs and AusAID to increase efforts towards developing performance indicators for outcomes such as increased confidence and self-esteem;
10. Provide training for local partners on identifying the barriers to reach the poorest, particularly where barriers are ingrained in cultural norms;
11. Improved recognition of the gender dimensions of poverty and explicit strategies to address these within programming.
12. Expanded definition of welfare in the ANCP guidelines which recognizes that some individuals in communities may require some immediate assistance, especially in the early stages of engagement with a community. Such assistance should be provided only on a temporary basis and as an entry point for a broader process of engagement for sustainable change.

# Annexures

## Annexure 1 ANCP Case Studies

### 

### Assisi Aid Projects Australia

Name of Project: Strengthening Self Help Groups

Partner: Assisi Farm & Training Centre (AF&TC)

Location: Tamil Nadu, India

Duration: 2004 to present

**Project Summary:**

Assisi Aid Projects (Assisi) has worked with the same partner in Tamil Nadu in Southern India for over 25 years. During that time, Assisi and Stella Maris/**AF&TC** have together used their experience to develop a holistic model for strengthening self-help groups, particularly focusing on the groups as a mechanism for women’s empowerment. One of Assisi’s key lessons they have learnt in 25 years is that it takes at least ten years to achieve established results and for Assisi, these projects are a long term commitment where they have learnt that it is important not to leave communities too early.

Self Help Groups (SHGs) are a much utilised model for development in Southern India, most commonly used for micro-credit or savings schemes. Many of these groups fail because they are established too quickly with a focus on injections of money and quick results, but little focus on activities and changes that can be sustained. Assisi’s projects are aimed at strengthening groups to provide more long-term and sustained benefits to improvements in well-being and empowerment as well as improved income opportunities.

Assisi works in areas identified by AF&TC who work with rural villages in close to one of their five rural operating centres. AF&TC identify villages themselves or the Government identifies villages where they want to introduce a SHG and approaches AF&TC as a registered NGO to establish it. Once villages are identified, a full needs assessment is conducted – which is a questionnaire that is conducted with the support of the village leader and his committee and volunteer animators (facilitators, usually women) are trained in economic development and holistic life-skills by AF&TC over 3 months. After this training, they spend 3-6 months conducting personal house visits to every home in the village to identify participants and form the SHG. They use this labour and time intensive approach to establish the group rather than via a public meeting (as commonly used in other projects) to ensure that the poorest and most marginalised are given the opportunity to participate. During this period of intensive work the animators are paid a stipend to compensate their time away from other family duties or paid work. This stipend is put aside for them during their training period. It is important that the prospective animators are volunteers and as such are not paid directly for undertaking the training.

About 90% of group members are women who were identified by the needs assessment and then volunteered to participate. One of the first activities of the group is to conduct a second needs analysis of the group by the group themselves in order to identify needs and social issues that the group wants to address. They will also typically start a savings scheme/group early on and use the first 3-6 months to build up savings. The issues identified vary from group to group – some set up water sanitation committees, others will want to focus on domestic violence, and others will focus on health for example. In some cases, Assisi also works with children through tuition/learning centres and supporting the formation of and participation in Children’s Parliaments. These groups are focused on assisting the academic achievements of the children as well as education about savings, and often are a way for children to talk about community issues that affect them. Assisi reports that these children’s groups have sometimes opened the door to addressing social issues in communities which are otherwise difficult or sensitive.

Spending time with families on the house-to-house visits is an important component of this activity to identify what the real issues are at a family level. Because participation is voluntary, not all participants are those identified as the poorest; however some SHGs will establish a community fund to support the most vulnerable such as the elderly. At the end of 6 months, the group decides if they want to undertake a small income generating project and at this point Assisi will match the savings as seed capital. If more funding is required, Assisi will facilitate a bank loan by accompanying group representatives to the bank. This seed capital becomes a revolving fund, and the recipient of the loan repays the loan plus a small amount of interest back to the group.

**The critical success factors:**

* Time supporting and training animators who are from the village themselves.
* Paying animators a small stipend after they have completed their training so they are not a financial burden on the village.
* House-to-house recruitment and understanding of issues affecting each family.
* Including holistic (counselling) activities as well as economic activities.
* The slow process of establishing trust and ownership of the SHG by the villagers and group participants – as opposed to some NGOs that don’t take time to do this but quickly establish SHGs with large amounts of seed capital.

**Inhibiting factors:**

* Competition in villages with other NGOs who adopt different approaches (quick fix) and don’t take time to establish ownership and a more holistic approach by the villagers. These groups tend to attract participation with immediate and initial investment of money which often fails. Villages often require a longer process of engagement, relationship building and education to encourage villagers to participate in the SHG as per Assisi model (i.e. when there is no immediate offer of cash).
* The payment of a stipend to the facilitators (animators) has caused some perception and trust problems with some people believing that the facilitator has a vested interest in starting the SHG in order for them to get paid, rather than starting it in the interest of the community members themselves.

**What has worked well?**

* A more holistic approach, taking time understanding families, not starting groups with quick injections of money straight away without first establishing ownership.
* The confidence of the volunteer animators and group members is developed and enhanced through this process and they often go on to take positions of responsibility, leadership and advocacy in the community.
* Working with children through the tuition centres and Children’s Parliaments has supported the academic and social development of children as well as making them more active members of their communities and provided a platform to address social issues not easily addressed in other ways.
* Because SHGs have been established for a long period in India, they are now a vehicle for the government to implement programs – e.g. subsidised rice bags are provided through SHG rather than village leaders – so SHG have become a civil society role in themselves.
* SHGs have linked to form the Women’s Development Corporation which as a group is in a strong position to promote empowerment by women and advocate for change in the community.
* Government banks now subsidise loans to SHGs in acknowledgement of their important role in community development.
* In some cases, SHGs become community based organisations (CBO) in response to community needs, reflecting improved community organisation. This is typically a long term outcome over a 20 year period.

The two examples below are representative of the sorts of change observed and reported by Assisi over a number of years:

**Example 1**: Mrs Chithra, from Mettukalam Village, has been a member of the Thamari SHG for the past two years and is currently the Group Secretary. Before joining the group, Mrs Chithra was not familiar with the public activities in the village and had not participated in any training or meetings. Now, she organizes programs and takes the initiative to conduct campaigns on social issues in her community. She also learned financial literacy and how to operate a bank account after joining the SHG and has attended the organic farming training as well. Mrs Chithra has developed her leadership skills through our training and motivation and has the support of her husband. This was helpful for her to stand in the election and her work was acknowledged by the people, as demonstrated by her election as a ward member.

**Example 2:** Mathakoil village consists of 40 families with agriculture as the main occupation. Children go to Velampatti and Mukanammalai patti for primary and higher secondary studies. Due to lack of motivation, children’s school performance in recent years has not been good. In 2009, Assisi SHG started tuition centres in the villages where children could receive additional tuition in the evenings. The academic performance of these children improved, with nine students regularly getting 1st and 2nd place in their classes. The participation in these tuition centres provided a way to start children’s parliaments, where they became aware of children’s rights, and where they began to discuss village problems as well as start a savings group. Before 2009 children’s academic performance was low and children’s initiative in savings and community participation was nil. One student from the evening study centre was elected as State Level Joint Communication Minister for the State Level Children’s Parliament forum. Children from these groups also regularly send poems and drawings for the publication in daily newspaper. A better change observed was that the children spontaneously come to the tuition centers and start to do regular activities even in the absence of teacher.

### Union Aid Abroad-APHEDA

Name of Project: Vocational Skills Training

Partner: GFFTL, a local women’s organization

Location: Rural East Timor

Duration: 2006 – 2011 (ongoing)

**Project Summary:**

APHEDA partners with a local grassroots women’s organisation, GFFTL, to provide literacy and income generation training for groups of women in rural villages in East Timor. The project explicitly targets women, as it is often women that have been denied the opportunity to attend school to learn to read and write. Participants are not explicitly targeted as being the poorest or most marginalised, but those who become members of a literacy group are accepted as being poor by virtue of their illiteracy and their remoteness.

Significant to this project is that one of its primary objectives is to expand women’s capacity within their communities and in the public sphere. The project’s literacy and training activities have therefore been geared towards being directly relevant to the lives of rural East Timorese women. The training materials are tailored to suit the local context – e.g. being able to read local road signs. In addition, at the end of each month, GFFTL facilitates a discussion program between women to discuss the challenges they experience in their life and community, to share ideas and experiences between participants, and to share the obstacles they face through involvement in the program. Following on from basic literacy training, women receive training and support to begin income generation activities. Those in established groups are supported to continue their income generation training and activities.

Groups are established at the request of villages and women are self-identified at the village level for participation in a group. Each group of women meets on a regular basis to participate in literacy training, and the time and meeting place is determined by the group of women themselves, according to their availability and whole-of-life responsibilities. The training is conducted by a trainer who travels by public transport from the partner organisation in Dili to meet with the women, and who is accommodated in the village.

**The critical success factors:**

* New groups are initiated by request from villages that have been exposed to the literacy groups in other villages.
* Facilitators/trainers are local people who spend time in a village to conduct training – they travel by local public transport and are accommodated within the community – this approach builds rapport and contextual understanding.
* The participants in literacy groups meet together at a time and place that suits them – this means that they can accommodate training within the scope of their other duties and that children are able to be among them.
* The project is not only focused on improving literacy, but using literacy as a vehicle to expand women’s capacity within their communities and in the public sphere.

**Inhibiting factors:**

* Some women have reported that some of the women had to do other work and therefore could not participate in the group.
* The income generating activities can be affected by rising prices of goods, making it sometimes difficult to maintain business.

**What has worked well?**

* APHEDA has provided support to strengthen the capacity of the trainers used by its partners through training in participatory adult education and training methodology. Training materials and approaches have now been completely contextualised to the local context. An example is photos of local signs used as a basis for learning to read. Other examples of application of numeracy and literacy are book-keeping for income generation groups, making signs for kiosks, reading fliers from government and other NGO initiatives, reading the newspaper, and writing songs.
* The acquirement of literacy skills by women has enabled them to more fully participate in community life. The project encourages women to meet regularly and discuss issues of relevance and importance to them in a supported environment.
* “We can now read on information from Lafaek, Babadok, Care, Hasatil and other social training information on gender, human rights, and domestic violence. We could even help teach our children who are in school.” – quote from project evaluation.
* Evaluation reports document changed attitudes among women towards the value of education for their children; improved community dynamics, improved group management, and improved gender roles; and empowerment among some women due to their contribution to family income.
* Newer groups have been encouraged by the progress of more established groups, giving them an incentive to continue their training.

### Caritas Australia

Name of Project: Bridges of Hope Program, Cambodia

Partner: Maryknoll

Location: Cambodia

Duration: Caritas Australia funded from 2006 (ongoing)

**Project Summary:**

The overall goal of the project is for socio-economic rehabilitation and reintegration of people living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA). It assists people living with HIV/AIDS, who have been marginalised due to illness, to socially and economically reintegrate them into society after regaining their health on Anti Retro viral Therapy (ART). The program assists each client to build an individualized “bridge” to the future by addressing health, social, economic and psychosocial aspects of living a productive life with HIV/ AIDS.

The program uses a holistic approach that includes comprehensive packages of psycho-social, economic, health, counselling and education. It uses a case management approach that focuses on the client, yet involves the whole family in the process. The end result of the program is for the client to go back to his or her normal life, become economically active and be independent. It has three stages:

1. to help PLWHAs regain self-esteem and self-reliance through counselling and training;
2. to improve the lives of PLHIVs through the provision of job skills training to help them re-enter the labour force; and
3. to sustain the lives of PLHIVs by providing follow up meetings and counselling sessions.

In addition, Maryknoll works with communities for greater acceptance of PLWHAs.

As HIV/AIDS is recognised as a major contributor and consequence of poverty, this program specifically targets the poorest and most vulnerable to improve the quality of life of PLWHAs. In doing this, PLWHA’s are provided access to education, training, psycho-social support and economic opportunities in mainstream society reflecting the principle of working toward the common good.

**The critical success factors:**

* Bridges of Hope (BoH) staff visit their clients at home during the entire length of their participation in the program. These visits are a critical element in building trust and also allow staff to see how each client lives which is necessary for case evaluation.
* The holistic approach is critical - psychological healing, regaining hope and confidence need to happen before a PLWHA can start thinking of earning a living again.
* Savings and access to credit has been identified by the program as one important factor for sustainability. Program experience shows that most clients’ economic activities were successful and most were earning more than the amount of social support that had been provided to them before they graduated from the program.

**Inhibiting factors:**

* Poverty and its consequences remains the biggest challenge for the Bridges of Hope clients. As the target group of BoH is the poorest, they are already disadvantaged by being poor prior to HIV infection. This means that most of them had no formal education, earning their livelihood dependent on manual labour which requires good physical health. The majority of the clients would be non-skilled workers which present a challenge in finding employment.

**What has worked well?**

* Of significant evolution, the program was developed with the involvement of PLWHA. The program realised that their participation is critical, not only because it wanted to practice the GIPA principle (Greater Involvement of People Living with HIV/AIDS), but because they present a very credible example of influencing behaviour change among peers.

### Credit Union Foundation (CUFA) Australia

Name of ANGO: CUFA (Credit Union Foundation Australia)

Name of Project: Building Institutional Capacity

Partner: CUFA Field Office

Location: Cambodia

Duration: CUFA funded from 2006

**Project Summary:**

The overall goal of this project is to strengthen the capacity of individual community finance organisations which provide savings and credit facilities to poor rural people. This project partners with five Cambodian Credit Union Federations, each of whom represent a number of local savings banks.

The provision of training and support to community savings banks is intended to build and promote sustainable community finance organisations which are able to sustainably make finance available to their members – typically poor, rural and remote individuals and families who are unable to access commercial financial institutions and products.

In the first phase of the project, representatives from savings banks were selected by the Cambodian Credit Union Foundations to attend a series of eight 3-day training modules delivered in Phnom Penh. Participants then were responsible for delivering the same training to Savings Bank members in the field. An evaluation of Phase 1 in 2008, however, found that information learnt through the ‘cascade’ training approach was not being implemented at the savings bank level.

The program was redesigned under Phase 2, whereby trainers now travel to the field and spend two days each with a Savings Bank committee, delivering and reviewing progress of implementing each module’s training objectives. From early 2010, Field Implementation Support was also introduced to review Savings Banks’ integration of material learnt from the modules delivered; determine support needs relating to these modules; and deliver on-site implementation assistance to the savings bank from a suite of support tools relating to each of the modules.

**The critical success factors:**

* Under Phase 2, CUFA’s Trainer travels to the field and spends two days each with the Savings Bank committee, reviewing progress of implementing each module’s training objectives.
* Field Implementation Support is a follow-up initiative to field based training. It is a valuable opportunity to observe and affirm changes made and progress in the Savings Bank; exposes new staff to what other committees have learnt; sustains momentum and motivation to implement and improve capacity.

**Inhibiting factors:**

* The 2008 evaluation found that there were some weaknesses inherent in the cascade training model. On-training is a particularly weak link of the cascade model and in the context of rural Cambodia especially when general knowledge about the Savings Banks is limited, learning and education requires repetition, revision and constant reviewing to build knowledge in stages.
* On-training effectiveness is also weakened through low literacy and comprehension skills of trainees, baseline of experience and knowledge of participants; participants’ lack of confidence in applying training strategies; few or no resources to support on-training and on-training provided to discontinuous groups of trainees.
* The 2008 evaluation found that module materials were negatively characterized by their lack of ‘technical definitions’ and ‘localized examples.’ It recommended simplified module materials which also included minimising technical terms.

**What has worked well?**

* In the first phase of the project, group learning and role plays consistently emerged as the most effective and valued training technique for the Savings Banks participants, making it easier for them to learn and also enabling participants to better prepare for the field.
* This brings a localised application to generalised training topics and serves as an accountability mechanism to ensure implementation of training. It reinforces knowledge learned and helps ‘fill in the gaps’. It is also a valuable opportunity to observe and affirm changes made and progress in the Savings Bank, and all committee members receive the same level of information.
* The shift to field based training has also provided greater opportunities for women to access training while also fulfilling their domestic responsibilities.

### Plan International, Australia

Name of Project: Empowering Families Project

Partner: Plan Cambodia and Krousar Youeng (KrY)

Location: Angkor Thom District, Siem Reap, Cambodia

Duration: July 2008 - present

**Project Summary:**

This project aims to reach and include the poorest people in the process of development, recognizing that the poorest people are typically excluded by poverty, illiteracy and the existing social structures of power and influence. It adopts a rights-based approach to work with rights bearers (the poorest), duty bearers (through government workers), and civil society (the communities in which they live). While its community development programs were broadly targeting the poor, Plan Cambodia was concerned that these programs were not reaching the poorest families, so this project was developed to specifically target the poorest families. The intended change of this project was that poorest families would have increased empowerment, self-confidence and motivation, improved health, improved access to education and development opportunities, and improved diversity of livelihoods.

The project deliberately and specifically addresses the poorest in the nine villages where it is working. The majority of Plan’s projects are not actually working with the hardest to reach and most marginalised people. This project responds to these evaluations and is a conscious shift in Plan to focus on the poorest and improve the way that Plan identifies and works with/includes the poorest (not just the poor). It also provides Plan with the opportunity to test assumptions that we make about poverty and what is effective change, to better understand who the poorest are, how to better work with them and how to address chronic poverty more holistically.

The poor and the poorest are identified in a number of ways. One of the aims of the project was to research and test approaches to identifying the poorest. Plan works with a local NGO with long experience and knowledge of the context and who are well linked in with communities. In order to identify the poorest, poverty assessments identify people along a spectrum of poverty from poor to ultra-poor. Assessment starts with the partner’s assessment of families based on criteria including house condition, income generation situation, transportation means, equipment in the house, food security and nutrition and breadwinners as well as the official poverty line measures. This is followed up with a validation process with leaders and members in the village. The “ultra-poor” is deliberately a specific target group within the broader identification of poor because Plan did not want to work only with the ultra-poor to not further isolate them.

The project represents Plan's increasing focus on exploring exclusion and how to address it effectively in their programming. This notion of exclusion is growing in the Plan discourse and will be a central emphasis in next 5-year strategy. This project alludes to a number of dimensions about exclusion such as social, religious, health, exclusion from community meetings (because they are out in the field working), and children not going to school.

After the identification of the poorest families, the project works with them and their community in a number of ways. They work with the families themselves, providing counselling to work on family dynamics, build motivation and esteem; working on livelihoods and the consequences of their poverty that affect their access to basic services; and accompany them to make the first and subsequent steps in accessing these services such as health care; e.g. accompanying them to health centres to mitigate stigma and negative attitudes of government staff. The project also works with the community as a whole to address social inclusion of these families, validating or checking perceptions of who are the poorest and working on ways to encourage traditional safety nets for the poorest to be used.

The project also describes working with duty bearers at the same time as rights holders and what that means for working with the ultra-poor. While this is being implemented in some degree through the accompaniment of people to access government services, criticisms in the appraisals and review are that the project doesn’t work with government sufficiently enough (especially education) to help address the reasons that the poorest don’t/can’t attend schools. The project is still trying to find those points for levers for change.

The project reflects a change in both Plan’s program strategy and the opportunities provided through their ANCP Partnership. In 2010, Plan developed a program strategy that has thematic foci and this project has been drawn in from being an isolated ANCP project to sit as part of an integrated approach within the livelihood and security portfolio (although it can also be considered a child rights program). The ANCP Partnership has been instrumental in strengthening this integrated approach and building up Plan’s effectiveness capability and by supporting community impact programs as well as enhancing Plan’s capacity and resources for reflection and research. This has provided much of the impetus for the research and reflection that has happened for this project.

**There have been a number of tangible outcomes from this project:**

* Through step by step counselling, after the first year or two, 70 - 80% of the target poorest families have developed positive behavioural changes/mindsets (such as feeling confident enough to establish relationships with other people, reduce domestic violence, reduce alcohol consumption, and agree to start new ideas on income generation);
* Through continuous diversified livelihood support, 70% of the target poorest families have better diversified sources of incomes (e.g. generating income through both farming and off-farm activities), and have improved family income after 2 – 3 years of interventions;
* Through parenting training, step-by-step counselling, and health and sanitation campaigns, the houses and surroundings of the poorest of the poor are observably more sanitary/cleaner; and
* All pregnant women regularly go to health centres for pre- and post-natal consultations.

Beyond these specific outcomes, the project has provided a good experience and learning in using a multi-dimensional approach to understanding poverty, including asking the poor themselves. Through this, it has identified key success strategies for working with the poorest, most marginalised and excluded people, and currently Plan is using this information to scale up this activity into other provinces.

**The critical success factors:**

* Investment and funding from Plan Australia, and having an internal champion to support this project that is more resource intensive compared to other projects.
* Not just working with a particular target population but within the broader village context and engaging that broader community through activities such as adult literacy classes.
* Working with a local NGO that is well connected with the community and linking with other NGOs to learn from what has already worked as well as accessing the existing support they provide.
* Seeking perceptions of poverty by the poorest themselves and not just relying on external assessments. The validation process on who is defining who is poor is really important, as is working with people within the context. For example, some of the people identified were not always a direct part of the community but were brought into the community through this process.
* Understanding the notion of dealing with trauma (post-conflict in this case) as a deliberate entry point in dealing with empowerment. This features strongly in working with a household in overcoming that experience as well as the more structural factors of poverty.
* Implementing through a phased process including learning, refection and adaption as we go.

**Inhibiting factors:**

* Understanding of context and traditions to sufficient depth.
* There is expectation of Plan to demonstrate the impact of programs through scale (the numbers of people reached) and an emphasis to seek defined results rather than allow time for the development of relationships. This project is resource intensive and requires time, which does not fulfill this emphasis and puts pressure on funding for the project.
* There is a shift in Plan International’s strategy to focus more on exclusion and the most marginalised, and some Plan offices will need to change their approaches and systems quite significantly to enhance their effectiveness in achieving change for the ultra-poor, rather than a tendency to demonstrate impact by working at scale and increased cost efficiency.

**What has worked well and lessons learnt?**

* 98% of participants had increased and diverse income sources but their income is still low and not necessarily above the poverty level.
* There is evidence of more children attending education past primary school, although there are knowledge gaps about whether it is the poorest who are benefitting and older children are still not getting access.
* There are signals of significant changes in the participation of women, but these are early indicators and are yet to see whether this is long term. A number of the project’s livelihoods activities were home based so women who were previously out in the fields were able to participate more with village activities, which also meant they did not have to leave their children or carry them with them as they worked. A report by Meas Nees assessing gender impacts asks whether there are unintended consequences of empowerment and what impact this will have on community structures, traditions and decision making.
* In general, the current strategy focuses more on the direct interventions with the poorest families, and less on strengthening the supporting institutions of the governments, and civil societies at both local and national levels to support the poorest. For the long term sustainability of the project and support services for the poorest, further involvement and strengthening of government and civil society institutions (e.g. health centres, commune councilors) is required so that they adopt more inclusive development approaches.
* An unintended benefit of the project has been the strengthening of the local NGO, who have expanded their reach by replicating the model with another project and donor and are now working in a new way in other communities.
* There is a question of whether this is an appropriate approach in post-traumatic contexts and Plan is interested to assess how much of the counselling focuses on the war trauma versus the trauma of structural poverty.
* Plan has focused on learning a lot from the model of empowering families, particularly as it is an intensive approach that does not have the numbers to easily justify expenditure. Part of the reflection is whether working more intensively with a smaller number of families is effective. There is also an assumption that by focusing on households there will be flow-on benefits to kids which is the ultimate focus for Plan but this needs further testing.

### Quaker Service Australia (QSA)

Name of Projects: P1 - Training for Poverty reduction of Disabled   
 People and their families (Pursat)

P2 - Permaculture training for rural poor (Kampong Thom)

Partner: Department of Women’s (& Veteran’s) Affairs,   
Royal Government of Cambodia

Location: Pursat and Kampong Thom provinces, Cambodia

Duration: P1. 2002-2005; P2. 2005 – present

**Project Summary:**

This case study is an amalgamation of two projects supported by QSA over almost ten years with the Department of Women’s Affairs (DOWA) in Cambodia using similar approaches to address food and water security issues for poor people (mostly women, but not exclusively so) in rural areas of Pursat and Kampong Thom provinces. QSA’s approach is aligned with a rights-based approach without being labeled as such but one where empowerment and capacity building are integral which reflects general Quaker philosophy. For five years of the project, the partner was the Department of Women’s and Veteran’s Affairs and during this period, the project also specifically targeted veterans who were disabled.

The projects worked with people in the lowest percentile of poor people in communities, although QSA acknowledges that they were not necessarily working with the poorest people of this group, particularly for the permaculture training because participants required ownership of or access to land. DOWA staff identified the poorest in consultation with commune and village leaders through a consultative process. After a community meeting, selections are made with community input using criteria to identify people who are interested in participating, and assessing their level of poverty (including number of children, condition of house, widows, disability, etc.) as well as those who have not received any previous NGO input.

The permaculture training was established as a way to assist people directly to improve their immediate food security needs (a base line survey identified food security as an urgent priority). The project found that because participants couldn’t necessarily visualise what the benefits might be, they needed something positive quite quickly in order to maintain their participation. The training addressed this by starting the training with quick growing vegetables to get quick results (include food on the table) and taking participants on exposure visits to other nearby projects to see what is possible. The Project Coordinator reflected that “*When they see something grow quickly they are often ‘converts for life”.*

Motorcycle/bicycle repair and food processing training were offered for those without access to land or with disabilities. The motor/bicycle repair training for disabled people was an apprenticeship model which was considered a suitable skill for disabled people who had lost lower limbs only. However, it was difficult to keep them motivated to maintain their participation due to the long time for them to see any tangible results and in difficult times some participants would resort to selling the tools they were provided. The food processing also didn’t work as anticipated because if people had extra food they would sell it or eat it rather than process it for storage later in the season. Some people who completed the training process things and make sweets such as rice crackers but to sell them immediately rather than to store for themselves. The concept of saving food was difficult for participants, particularly for people who are more used to a hand-to-mouth existence. Also, storage of preserved food is an issue and people will sell food or eat it themselves so as not to have to store it. New training in developing marketable products that can be made at home, such as brooms and weaving are being trialed in Pursat for people unable to participate in permaculture training.

The project quickly learnt that the only way to keep participants in the training was to keep food on their table. A complementary training model was devised where a disabled person doing the motor/bicycle training could have family members do the permaculture training to ensure that more immediate needs such as food supply were met. In subsequent years, the criterion for participation were relaxed to include family members as eligible to participate in training and this approach to include partners of persons receiving training has been adopted in Kampong Thom. Only a few businesses were established as a result of this training as most people lived on the margins of remote communities away from main roads and as such had little passing trade to provide them an income and thus did not typically lead to them establishing a viable small business.

Project trainers conduct the trainings over a period of time and once the training is completed, make return visits every month to monitor the application of skills and provide any ongoing mentoring or support to anyone who is there. After a period of time, the project (Kampong Thom) began to incorporate training in empowerment issues such as reduction of domestic violence, health, nutrition and hygiene awareness in order to address poverty issues being faced by the community more holistically. A critical lesson is that skills development and growing food takes time and people who are on a bus route with access to factory work for example will take opportunities for employment instead of training as it provides more immediate income. When people did continue with training, they become their own support group which generates the community cohesion, sharing of resources and ideas and forges new friendships and helps address issues of marginalisation and exclusion.

**Significant Outcomes**

The significant outcomes of these projects have been the learning approach adopted by QSA and their primary partner, the Department of Women’s Affairs, in working with the poorest and most marginalised. One particular example of success is one family where the father was participating in training for disabled people to learn motor mechanical skills and his wife was allowed to join the permaculture training at the same time. This meant that he was more able to maintain his participation in the longer-term skills training because the immediate needs of providing food for his family were being assisted through the permaculture training, which typically had very quick results. He was able to complete the training and eventually open a small workshop.

The other significant outcome was the way that the training sessions became an important support network for the participants and a forum where they could discuss other issues affecting them at home such as domestic violence. The staff from the Department of Women’s Affairs were good role models for the women in the trainings by modeling confidence. QSA reported that over time, they noted an increase in the number of women from these trainings stepping in to fill roles such as village leader or deputy leader positions, and examples where they would more readily speak up at community meetings.

**The critical success factors:**

* Participants’ support of each other within the training group – generates the community cohesion, sharing of resources and ideas, forging new friendships.
* The training and growing (for permaculture) requires time and ongoing contact.
* DOWA staff who conduct the training and visit become role models for other women in villages.
* The relationship between QSA and DOWA is crucial to ensure openness to discuss successes as well as problems and QSA has to work hard at this but does well.
* QSA deliberately works at a small scale and grass-roots level and they are conscious of the tipping point with the level of funding their partner is able to effectively implement in communities. Smaller activities are easier for QSA to maintain regular contact with and support of the partner.
* The deliberate strategy by QSA is to work with DOWA on institutional strengthening, their strategic plan and supporting them to understand their role in working with the poor and how to understand the factors which cause their poverty.

**Inhibiting Factors**

* Approaches to training poor and disabled people to earn their own income was a challenging concept, particularly for disabled people who were more accustomed to receiving a pension. It was also challenging for a Government department whose form of assistance to these people was limited to handing out pensions.
* When working within the lowest percentile of the poor, the knowledge that the poorest of this group are unlikely to participate (or benefit) due to lack of literacy, access to land and social exclusion.
* Most of the target group tended to be on the outskirts of communities so are not accessing information about what is going on, and were despondent as a result of their life circumstances, cultural isolation and poor nutrition. It was difficult to maintain their participation in many cases.
* If they are on a bus route with access to factory work for example this would take precedence for more immediate income.

**What worked well and lessons learnt**

* Trainings were more successful (i.e. with ongoing participation) for more isolated people without access to bus routes and thus transport to factory or other employment.
* People who did well with permaculture are still using it and their land is still productive – staff are still visiting communities, food gardens continue to be productive.
* However, for those who are successful in permaculture, many still only grow enough for themselves if they do not have access to a market. Motorbike and bicycle repairs needed to be closer to town for the market. The project has achieved its objective of three nutritious meals a day but not the objective of improved income.
* Improved confidence and esteem of women. The projects provide a lot of opportunities for women to stand up for themselves and there are more women in village leader or deputy leader positions now.
* Hard to know whether people are accessing Government services better or whether there are just more services, particularly more health services.
* A study tour of the projects was really helpful and the community were thrilled to be selected to show off their projects – their garden, weaving, brooms and seeing outside interest was a great boost to them.
* As a result of observations on the study tour, QSA are now funding child-minding so parents can participate in training without worrying about children near wells or in danger and at the same time providing employment to the child-carer.

## Annexure 2 TOR and Methodology

**Annual ANCP Thematic Review 2010-11 - Methodology**

As a collaborative learning exercise with the NGO sector, AusAID will undertake an Annual Thematic Review of the AusAID NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP). It is proposed that each year a thematic issue of contemporary mutual interest to the sector and to AusAID will be identified for exploration through this Review process. This annual exercise will contribute to development sector learning and practice and to AusAID’s new approach to understanding the performance and achievements of the ANCP.

The Annual Thematic Review forms part of a broader suite of ANCP learning and reporting methods undertaken by NGOs and AusAID. These include: ADPlan Reports; NGOs’ own evaluations; shared learning events with the NGO sector; Accreditation; ODE Evaluations; desk and field based performance reviews and audits and AusAID Quality at Implementation Reports. The linkages between these methods and the various elements of ANCP learning, performance and risk management are currently being mapped in an ANCP Learning and Performance Framework[[12]](#footnote-12) which we hope to discuss with the Sector over coming months.

The ANCP is a unique funding modality, providing a high degree of flexibility to accredited ANGOs. In 2010/2011 the ANCP will provide an estimated $70 million to ANGOs to subsidise their own community development activities.

The methodology for the conduct of the 2010 Review is outlined below. Also included is general information on the Annual ANCP Thematic Review process more broadly.

**Scope**

The 2010 Review will focus on one aspect of development practice which contributes to the ANCP Goal of poverty reduction. The theme identified for the 2010 Review is:

How are ANCP activities engaging with the poorest and most marginalised people?

The core focus of the ANCP is poverty reduction. It is clear from ANCP reporting that NGOs generally aspire to engage with the poorest or most marginalised people in this pursuit, but it is also recognised that this is a particularly challenging aspect of practice. Working with the poorest and most marginalised people is an issue of interest to the broader development community in terms of understanding development effectiveness and achieving the MDGs. It is also generally considered an important part of NGO values and practice. The implications for gender equity in this context will be explored within the review.

One of the challenges of this review will be to identify who are the poorest and most marginalised. OECD, World Bank, UN and other references offer no consistent definition and most definitions or descriptions adopt a predominantly economic approach. Beyond economic poverty, the concept of the poorest and most marginalised becomes more complex. Jan Vandermoortele (2009)[[13]](#footnote-13) argues that addressing equity is essential to achieving the MDGs. It will therefore be an important aspect of the review to identify who are the poorest and most marginalised in a given context or a range of contexts.

The approach to this review recognises that there is no requirement in the ANCP guidelines explicitly requiring ANGOs to target the poorest and most marginalised. As such, this review will not make judgments about the overall performance of the ANCP or individual ANCP activities based on the extent to which the poorest are being assisted or not. The nature of this Thematic Review as a learning exercise (as distinct from a performance evaluation) is consistent with this principle.

The ***Goal*** of the Annual ANCP Thematic Review process is to inform and improve development practice based on the experiences of ANGOs and their ANCP activities and of AusAID’s experiences in managing ANCP.

The ***Objectives*** of the 2010-11 Review are to:

1. Explore who ANGOs, their partners and communities identify as the poorest and most marginalised, and how they are identified;
2. Provide insights into the successes and challenges of working with the poorest and most marginalised, drawn from the experiences of ANGOs and their ANCP activities;
3. Identify common trends and/or critical elements that lead to sustained changes in the lives of the poorest and most marginalised;
4. Promote learning on successful approaches across AusAID, the Australian NGO community and other development actors and stakeholders more broadly;
5. Contribute to the body of knowledge around AusAID's engagement with civil society organisations;
6. Contribute to ANCP performance information at the highest modality level i.e. ***not*** at the individual NGO or ANCP activity level. This review is not a performance evaluation, but it will contribute to performance information and reporting;
7. Consider ANCP management mechanisms and how these support or limit ANGOs to reduce poverty and reach the poorest and most marginalised in their ANCP activities.

**Principles and Approach**

The purpose of the review is to elicit lessons from practice about the critical elements of development practice that lead to sustained changes in the lives of the poorest and most marginalised. The review will not make judgments about whether working with the poorest and most marginalised is more effective than other development practice. The approach that will be adopted for the review is consistent with this principle.

The review will inform AusAID’s understanding of the general performance of the ANCP in regards to the review theme, but it will not rate the performance or quality of individual NGOs or their ANCP activities. It is not a performance evaluation.

The methodology is based upon principles of shared learning and collaboration between AusAID and ANGOs (including ACFID and its Development Practice Committee (DPC)). It is anticipated that a dynamic partnership between AusAID, ACFID/DPC and participating ANGOs will be established, with active participation and engagement throughout the process by all partners. This active collaboration will be an important contribution to the analysis of evidence throughout the review, to optimise shared learning and to the overall review approach.

This formative review will use a qualitative, strengths-based and grounded approach to investigate and learn from ANGO practice, experience and achievements through their ANCP projects. This will be considered within a broader framework of good development practice and will contribute more generally towards improved knowledge and understanding about engaging with the poorest and most marginalised. The Review will also explore descriptions and definitions of the poorest and most marginalised people as identified through the practice and experience of ANGOs.

The active participation of a Reference Group of ANGOs (and a DPC representative) and the joint identification of ANCP case studies and other documentation to be examined reflect the collaborative approach. The formation of an ANGO Reference Group is a critical element of the approach for this review. It is proposed that the participating ANGOs, DPC and AusAID will have an active role in the shared learning events which will disseminate findings of the review with a broader peer group. It is intended that ANGOs ensure meaningful engagement of their local NGO/CBO partners throughout the review process.

The Annual Thematic Reviews will offer useful management guidance to AusAID and ANGOs. With its focus on ANCP- funded activities the reviews will provide information to AusAID and ANGOs regarding the overall management of the ANCP, including the usefulness of current funding and reporting mechanisms. As an annual review, it will also provide the opportunity to test and reflect on the effectiveness of these mechanisms for AusAID and ANGOs over time.

**Theme and Analytical Framework**

Each year it is proposed that a theme of mutual development interest to AusAID and the NGO sector be chosen in consultation with ACFID/DPC for the Annual ANCP Thematic Review.

ACFID Council in 2010 will focus on themes of Accountability and Equity. With DPC and ACFID already pursuing research in regards to accountability, the topic of ‘equity’ has informed the choice of theme for the 2010 Annual ANCP Thematic Review. This resonates with the international agenda to achieve the MDGs requiring a greater focus on equity.

The ***broad theme*** is: How are ANCP activities engaging with the poorest and most marginalised people?

Within this theme, there are a number of critical questions under two key domains of ANGO work. ***Development approach*** refers to the various principles and strategies used by ANGOs in planning, designing, implementing and monitoring the activities they fund under the ANCP program. The ***management approach*** refers to the organisational (both AusAID and ANGO) mechanisms and systems used to manage the funding and associated reporting requirements to the ANCP.

A range of critical questions for the examination of these two domains are proposed.

*Development Approach:*

1. Who are the poorest and most marginalised people and who defines them?
2. How are ANGO projects funded through ANCP reaching and assisting the poorest and most marginalised?
3. What are the enablers to reaching and assisting with the poorest and most marginalised?
4. What are the barriers or constraints to reaching and assisting the poorest and vulnerable communities?
5. What ANGO development strategies have been effective in reaching, assisting and promoting the voice of the poorest and most marginalised?
6. Are there secondary development benefits arising from a focus on the poorest and most marginalised? (e.g. Gender equity, empowering communities/influencing development/broader equity/civil society strengthening etc.)

*Management Approach:*

1. Do ANGO management approaches facilitate a focus on the poorest and most marginalised?
2. Does the ANCP modality facilitate a focus on the poorest and most vulnerable people (given that ANCP promotes NGOs’ own programs)?
3. Is the ADPlan and reporting format facilitating good information on poverty reduction of the poorest and most marginalised?

**Selection Process**

A purposive selection process will be employed. The first step in the selection process will be the identification of a Reference Group of participating ANGOs. It is anticipated that the Reference Group of participating ANGOs will become active partners in conducting the review and sharing the findings and learning. Accredited ANGOs will be invited to nominate as active participants in the review enhancing its collaborative nature and allowing for more in-depth inquiry. In consultation with these ANGOs, a selection of ANCP projects for in-depth investigation will then be chosen using a strength-based approach.

To the extent possible and as appropriate, it is proposed that each year new ANGOs are invited to participate in the ANCP Thematic Review, with the aim that over a five-year period, all accredited ANGOs are provided an opportunity to participate and the diversity of the sector is reflected (large, small, volunteer, faith based, etc.). Some degree of purposive selection will also be required to also ensure there are not repeated demands placed on particular NGOs.

The subsequent selection of ANCP projects will be made in consultation with AusAID and the ANGO Reference Group and based on recommendations by the consultants. The selection will ensure that an appropriate mix of project type (including length of implementation, sector, scale); geographic spread (including fragile states) and cross-cutting issues (such as gender, disability, environment) are represented.

It is anticipated that between 4-6 ANGOs will be involved, offering 1-3 ANCP projects each (depending on scale and other factors), while the final number of actual projects will be determined in consultation with AusAID and ACFID/DPC.

**Methods of Inquiry**

The 2010 -11 Annual Thematic Review of the ANCP will be conducted over a number of stages which aim to affirm the collaborative approach described above. Not all of the steps will occur sequentially and the precise timing for the review will be agreed during the discussions on the methodology during stage 1.

*Stage 1: Initial Consultations*

Consultations take place between AusAID, ACFID and the DPC about the annual theme; the review timing and the methodology.

*Stage 2: Literature Review*

The literature review will broadly scan current literature and related practice from other international donors, Australian and international NGOs and development agencies in order to contextualise the review. Further literature reviews may be undertaken to specifically seek more detailed or additional information from other sources to test, verify or counter the review findings.

*Stage 3: Selection of participating ANGOs and ANCP projects*

As outlined above, accredited ANGOs will be invited to participate in the review as part of a Reference Group and to recommend ANCP projects for in-depth review. Once the final selection of the projects is made, AusAID and the participating ANGOs will be asked to provide documentation for the subsequent stages of the review. The participating ANGOs will remain engaged with the review at various stages as outlined below.

*Stage 4: In-Depth Review of ANCP Projects*

This stage of the review will involve a desk assessment, interviews and a field-based component.

*ANCP Desk Assessment*

This will involve a review of a range of ANCP related reports and documents relating to each ANCP project. This information will be provided by both the ANGOs and AusAID and could include:

* Current and previous project documentation
* Current and previous evaluation reports
* ADPlan reports

Any internal reports or other information that ANGOs wish to offer (not necessarily restricted to project documentation).

Consultation with ANGO and AusAID staff if required to clarify documents.

*Semi-Structured Interviews*

In-depth, semi-structured interviews will be conducted with the ANGO program managers (and other staff if appropriate) responsible for the projects being reviewed. These interviews will use an appreciative inquiry approach to explore success and challenges, links with broader organisational values, policies and strategies, addressing issues within the analytical framework identified above. Interviews may also be conducted with AusAID staff. This process may be further complimented by a joint workshop of the Reference Group to discuss and test preliminary findings and learning.

*Field based inquiry*

Subject to approval and at an agreed time[[14]](#footnote-14), it is proposed that field visits also take place. The key purpose of field visits will be to ensure that the views of partners and communities are included in the overall analysis and that they will also benefit from shared learning opportunities. This will typically involve in-country workshops and/or discussion groups with partner NGOs, CBOs and communities, visits to partner offices and participating communities. Semi structured interviews and focus groups may also be conducted with ANGO partner staff, CBOs, community members and other stakeholders.

The details of the approach to field based enquiry have not yet been developed or approved. It is expected however that fieldwork would likely include a mix of Australian and locally engaged consultants, an AusAID representative and could extend to peers from ANGOs/local NGOs and CBOs.

Participating ANGOs will be closely consulted and involved in shaping this stage of the review.

*Stage 5: Shared Learning Event/s*

The details of this stage will be determined in consultation with AusAID and the ANGOs as the review progresses. The primary objective of the shared learning event/s is to present and discuss findings of the review including discussion of the in-depth case studies to ANGOs, their partner where possible, AusAID staff, other stakeholders and development actors as appropriate. It is hope that the shared learning event will provide an opportunity to discuss, reflect, contest and validate within the broader context of the ANGO sector.

It is expected that the 4-6 ANGOs in the Reference Group, who contributed to the case studies, would take an active role in this event.

**Rigour and Validity**

Ensuring rigour and validity is important in any qualitative study, and particularly so when attempting to make general statements based on the in-depth analysis of a small number of case studies. The rigour and validity for this review will be provided in a number of ways:

The review, while a collaboration between AusAID and ANGOs, will be led and conducted by independent consultants.

Triangulation and-cross-checking by accessing multiple sources of data – project documents, thematic reports, AusAID information on ANCP, ANGO information, interviews, literature and practice of other development organisations.

In-depth case studies exploring development, organisational and management issues (and the links between them).

Progressive analysis and cross-checking involving key stakeholders.

Feedback to key stakeholders via a shared learning event to validate preliminary findings and collect further data.

**Analysis and Reporting**

The analysis of key findings will be conducted progressively throughout the review and where practicable, preliminary findings will also be made available to the broader NGO community for comment and reflection.

The specific details of the analysis and reporting will be determined as the review progresses. There are however two key events occurring throughout the review where it is proposed that preliminary findings will be shared. These are:

1. A proposed dialogue with the Reference Group and the broader NGO sector at the ACFID Annual Council in October 2010 (TBC). Depending on progress at the time, the Review Team will introduce the theme, the methodology, the Reference Group and a discussion of the literature review.
2. A shared learning event is scheduled for 2011 (tentatively for March). This event will be a key event in terms of validating, checking and countering the preliminary findings as well as an opportunity to explore what the findings mean and to share learning.

A final report will be prepared after the shared learning event and presented to AusAID and to ACFID/DPC at a date to be agreed. It is also proposed that case studies developed during the Review be more broadly disseminated and utilised for reporting, learning and communications purposes.

*Prepared by Anna Clancy, Rhonda Chapman and Jo Thomson in consultation with DPC, August 2010.*

# Annexure 3 Literature Review

**AusAID ANCP Thematic Review 2010-11**

**Literature Review, December 2010**

Introduction and background

As a collaborative learning exercise with the Australian NGO sector, AusAID is undertaking an Annual Thematic Review of the AusAID NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP). It is proposed that each year a thematic issue of contemporary mutual interest to the Australian NGO sector and to AusAID will be identified for exploration through this review process. This annual exercise will contribute to development sector learning and practice and to AusAID’s understanding of the performance and achievements of Australian NGOs funded under ANCP. The theme identified for the 2010-11 Annual Thematic Review is “How are ANCP activities engaging with the poorest and most marginalised people?”

This Literature Review is a ‘work-in-progress’ and will grow and evolve as the review unfolds. At this stage, the purpose of the literature review is to provide an initial platform from which to generate debate and discussion of the salient issues and to provide a reference point for the experiences of the NGOs involved in this year’s review.

The dominant theme emerging from the review of relevant literature at this initial stage is that defining and measuring poverty and defining who are the ‘poor’ is a highly complex issue which has not yet been satisfactorily resolved despite decades of work on poverty reduction. A second theme of particular interest is the reality that many poverty alleviation activities in fact struggle to engage with or benefit the ‘poorest and most marginalised’. Against these reference points, the ANCP Thematic Review will explore how various NGOs define poverty and identify the ‘poorest and most marginalised’ in their ANCP activities and how they approach this challenging tension.

What is Poverty? How and why do we measure it?

While poverty reduction has been an important aspect of aid and development policies and initiatives for many years, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) have focused international attention on poverty. The target of MDG 1 - to reduce by half by 2015 the proportion of people living in extreme poverty - and the use of the $1/day benchmark for that goal has been widely adopted (OECD 2001). But what this target means is obscured by the ambiguous way in which the term ‘poverty’ is used by the different indicators to monitor poverty (Maxwell 1999).

According to the World Bank (2000) “poverty is a pronounced deprivation in well-being.” This definition of poverty begs the question of what is meant by well-being and what the reference point is against which to measure deprivation (Haughton and Khandker 2009).

The conventional view links well-being primarily to command over commodities. Thus, the poorest are those who do not have enough income or consumption to put them above some adequate minimum threshold. This view sees poverty largely in monetary terms and is typically the starting point for most analyses of poverty (Haughton and Khandker 2009). Since its World Development Report in 1990, the World Bank has aimed to apply a common standard to measuring extreme poverty, anchored to what poverty means in the world's poorest countries. The World Bank's “$1 a day” poverty line is an attempt to measure the welfare of people living in different countries on a common scale by adjusting for differences in the purchasing power of currencies. Described as $1 a day, the $1.08 poverty line (based on 1993 prices) was widely accepted as the international standard for extreme poverty. In 2008, the international poverty line was recalibrated at $1.25 a day, measured in 2005 prices. The new poverty line maintains the same standard for extreme poverty – the poverty line typical of the poorest countries in the world – but uses the latest information on the cost of living in developing countries (World Bank 2008).

By focusing on the standards of the poorest countries the international poverty line establishes a realistic lower bound for the minimum – but not acceptable – level of consumption to meet basic human needs (World Bank 2008). However, as Ravallion (2010) states, “everyone agrees that poverty is not just about low consumption of market commodities by a household. It is agreed that consumption or income poverty measures need to be supplemented by other measures to get a complete picture”.

The different approaches to understanding and measuring poverty and well-being, as well as the interconnected issues of inequality and vulnerability, have long been debated. It is well accepted that there is no one perfect measurement of poverty despite the fact that the World Bank's $1 a day measurement has been broadly adopted and has been included as the basis for Millennium Development Goal 1. While most agree that money income (or consumption) on its own is an imperfect measure of welfare, and that the idea of relative deprivation is widely accepted, there are different views about the relative importance of non-monetary variables like self-esteem and about the weight that should be given to the views expressed by poor people themselves (Maxwell 1999). Despite the OECD’s broad adoption of the $1/day measure for poverty, their Poverty Reduction Guidelines state that “*poverty encompasses different dimensions of deprivation that relate to human capabilities including consumption and food security, health, education, rights, voice, security, dignity and decent work*” and that developing a shared understanding – among all development partners – of poverty and its many dimensions is crucial for working together (OECD 2001).

Poverty is related to, but distinct from, inequality and vulnerability. *Inequality* focuses on the distribution of attributes, such as income or consumption, across the whole population. In the context of poverty analysis, inequality requires examination if one believes that the welfare of individuals depends on their economic position relative to others in society. *Vulnerability* is defined as the risk of falling into poverty in the future, even if the person is not necessarily poor now; it is often associated with the effects of shocks such as a drought, a drop in farm prices, or a financial crisis. Vulnerability is a key dimension of well-being since it affects individuals’ behaviour in terms of investment production patterns and coping strategies and in terms of the perceptions of their own situations (Haughton and Khandker 2009).

Poverty (and well-being) may also be understood by asking whether people are able to obtain a *specific* type of consumption good: do they have enough food? Or shelter? Or health care? This analysis goes beyond the more traditional monetary measures of poverty. For example nutritional poverty might be measured by examining whether children are stunted or wasted; and educational poverty might be measured by asking whether people are illiterate or how much formal schooling they have received (Haughton and Khandker 2009).

The broadest approach to well-being (and poverty), as described by Amartya Sen (1987), focuses on the capability of the individual to function in society. Poor people often lack key capabilities; they may have inadequate income or education, or be in poor health, or feel powerless, or lack political freedoms. This means understanding poverty as a multidimensional phenomenon that is less amenable to simple solutions. One emerging consensus seems to be that extreme poverty is best represented by some combination of low purchasing power, limited capabilities, a high degree of vulnerability and a sense of powerlessness (Islam 2001). The Chronic Poverty Research Centre (CPRC) argues that the duration of periods spent in poverty is as important as poverty depth in multidimensionality for identifying the poorest and understanding their experience of poverty (Moore, Grant et al. 2008).

Ravallion 1998, quoted in (Haughton and Khandker 2009) states that a credible measure of poverty can be a powerful instrument for focusing the attention of policymakers on the living conditions of the poor. Measuring poverty is critical to be able to identify poor people and thus target appropriate interventions; to monitor and evaluate interventions geared to poor people; and to evaluate the effectiveness of institutions whose goal is to help poor people (Haughton and Khandker 2009). The measurement of poverty is necessary if it is to appear on the political and economic agenda. However measuring the non-income dimensions of poverty in a way that allows policy makers to weigh priorities and allocate resources is a challenge. As Duncan Green from Oxfam UK states on his blog, in policy terms, *if it can't be measured it gets ignored* and while many acknowledge the multi-dimensional nature of poverty, most decision makers and policy documents ultimately revert to the $1 a day measure (Green 2010 (a)).

The current focus on whether the MDGs will be achieved by their deadline in five years’ time highlights the complexity of this issue. Some argue that the MDGs can technically be achieved without addressing disparities or improving the lives of the very poorest people. In theory, halving the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar a day can be done by bringing those just below the poverty line to a level just above it (Vandemoortle 2010). While the MDG’s use of the $1/day measure to define extreme property has undoubtedly provided an important rallying call in the battle line against poverty, analysts increasingly recognise that inherent methodological problems undermine the usefulness of the $1/day line as a way of determining the global distribution of poverty much less as a means of identifying poor households and individuals and the causes of their poverty (Moore, Grant et al. 2008).

In June 2010 the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI) of Oxford University and the Human Development Report Office of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) launched a new poverty measure. It gives a multidimensional picture of people living in poverty which is aimed to help target development resources more effectively (Alkire and Santos 2010). The new Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) is featured in the 2010 edition of the Human Development Report (HDR), and replaces the Human Development Index (HDI), used in HDR reports since 1997 (Alkire 2010; UNDP 2010).

The MPI is a measure that attempts to capture the severe deprivations that people face at the same time. It reflects both the incidence of multidimensional deprivation and its intensity, capturing how many people experience overlapping deprivations (incidence) and how many deprivations they face on average (intensity). It measures these across the same three dimensions used for the HDI (living standards, health and education) but does not measure income or empowerment (UNDP 2010). There is a current and lively debate discussing the merits of the MPI on various blogs and websites and while these often focus on the technical aspects of aggregating indicators into a single index and how such an index is weighted. There is also useful discussion on the nature of multidimensional poverty and how it might be measured (Demombynes 2010; Green 2010 (a)).

Another recent attempt at measuring the multidimensional nature of poverty is the Multidimensional Poverty Assessment Tool (MPAT). This is a survey based thematic indicator primarily designed to assist monitoring and evaluation, design, targeting, and prioritisation efforts at the local, and usually, rural level. MPAT measures people's capacity *to do* by focusing on key aspects of indicators of the domains essential to an enabling environment within which people are sufficiently free from immediate needs, and therefore in a position to more successfully pursue their high-end needs, and ultimately, their wants. The MPAT framework assesses the core dimensions of rural poverty by addressing universal human needs and other essential domains. These include the six basic needs of food and nutrition security, domestic water supply, health and health care, sanitation and hygiene, housing clothing and energy, and education, as well as four additional components of farm assets, non-farm assets, exposure and resilience to shocks, and gender and social equality. The MPA project is a collaborative international initiative currently being tested in Asia, specifically rural China and India (Cohen 2010).

The complexity associated with defining poverty has led to the development of a small industry devoted to the task of its measurement, particularly in response to the need to define targets and measure progress against them. The debates about poverty have involved politicians, academics and practitioners over many years, involving shifts in concepts, definitions and language. Simon Maxwell (1999) provides an overview of the meaning and measurement of poverty, arguing that the conceptual complexity can be understood as a series of fault lines. Some of these include questions such as do we measure individual or household poverty, monetary only or monetary plus non-monetary components of poverty, snapshot or timeline, actual or potential poverty? In outlining the challenges for development agencies in understanding and measuring poverty, Maxwell (1999) concludes by reminding us that “*measuring poverty is not the same as understanding why it occurs. Interventions need to tackle causes not symptoms*.”

Who are the poorest and most marginalised?

*“I am poor because my father was poor, so I got married to a poor man, and now I'm*

*divorced I am poorer than poor* ...” Saleha from Patgram, (Purvez, Khan et al. 2003)

In 1990 it was estimated that 93% of the world's poor people lived in low-income countries. In 2007-08, it is estimated that 75% of the world’s approximately 1.3 billion poor people now live in middle-income countries and only about 25% of the world's poor - about 370 million people - live in the remaining 39 low income countries, which are largely in sub-Saharan Africa. This change implies that there is a new ‘bottom billion’ that do not live in fragile and conflict affected states but largely in stable, middle-income countries. Such global patterns are evident across monetary, nutritional, and multidimensional poverty measures (Sumner 2010).

By definition, all poor people fall below the poverty line whether it is defined by income, consumption or a broader bundle of monetary, non-monetary and subjectively determined assets. Ask poor people what poverty is like and they typically talk about fear, humiliation and ill health at least as much as money (Green 2010 (a)). But not all poor people are poor in the same dimensions (breadth); nor do they fall the same distance below the poverty line (depth); nor do they all stay below the poverty line over the same length of time (duration). The poorest are those who are on the bottom rung (or rungs) in all (or some) of these systems of characterising the poor (Moore, Grant et al. 2008). The poorest are also defined according to a range of different criteria; the income or non-income dimensions of poverty; poverty as a state; poverty as dynamic process; and poverty as an outcome of an interplay of all of the above (Purvez, Khan et al. 2003). Intuitively the chronically poor are those who remain poor for much of their lives; pass on poverty to subsequent generations or die of preventable poverty related death (Hulme and Shepherd 2003).

Understanding who the poorest and most marginalised people are is integrally linked to the debate described above about how poverty is measured and what factors are included. An important consideration in understanding who the poorest are is which reference group to use. The poorest members of one community, region or country – regardless of the measurement – will not necessarily be the poorest in a different community, region or country. This is obviously the case when using relative poverty measures. There are many different reasons why individuals and groups are very poor and why they stay poor and the poverty dynamics of the poorest may follow many different trajectories. At one extreme is someone born into multidimensional poverty and at the other extreme is someone recently driven into severe income poverty by a sudden shock, with many trajectories in between (Moore, Grant et al. 2008). Analyses of the poor as a single sociological group ignore the regular and sometimes rapid movements in and out of poverty by poor people. Significant differences in identities and material interests exist across these distinct subgroups of poor people and policies to assist poor people must consider these differences in order to be effective (Krishna 2009).

When we ask the poor themselves how to define who the poorest are, this issue becomes even more complicated. A recent study conducted in Bangladesh (Purvez, Khan et al. 2003) showed that in some places people used similar terms to describe the extreme poor in their villages while others used very different words. And where similar terms were used they meant different things in different places. The authors found that the way extreme poverty was defined varied from place to place and also in each village because the poor are a heterogeneous group and that the perceptions of poverty depends on the value judgment of the people categorising a person or group. The research found that the perceptions of poverty *within* a village vary between those who are not considered poor and those who are the poorest.

This same study in Bangladesh describes the following types of households as amongst the poorest:

* child managed households
* female burdened households (i.e. those with daughters to arrange dowry and marriage)
* elderly living alone
* the chronically ill
* ethnic minorities

The poorest people from these households are often excluded from programs supported by NGOs or other institutions that are specifically aimed to address the causes and consequences of their poverty. They also stated that NGO programs, such as micro-finance or groups savings schemes, cannot provide support for them because the terms and conditions are unfavourable (Purvez, Khan et al. 2003). This is of particular interest in the context of the 2011 ANCP Thematic Review.

Girls’ vulnerabilities in relation to poverty dynamics are different to those of boys and to those of adult women. This is in part because of their relative powerlessness and the particularities of their life stage. Addressing gender inequalities is a critical aspect of the struggle against chronic poverty. Teenage girls and young women are a key group whose experience and progress, or lack of it, at this point in their lives not only shapes their own adult hood but also the life chances of their children. What happens at this critical time in their lives can reinforce their poverty status and that of the offspring or influence their movement into or out of poverty (Jones, Harper et al. 2010).

Disabled people are estimated to make up approximately 10% of any population and a higher proportion of those living in chronic poverty. Disabled people are disproportionately amongst the poorest of the poor in all parts of the world and international development targets are unlikely to be met without including disabled people. Disabled people are so severely excluded from all areas of society that there is not even comparative or reliable data on incidents, distribution and trends of disability, let alone the extent of disabled people’s poverty. The relationship between disability and chronic poverty varies within and between cultures. While not all disabled people are poor in economic terms, all disabled people experience discrimination and they are disproportionately amongst those living in chronic poverty, particularly when poverty is measured not only in terms of rates of income but also social exclusion and powerlessness (Yeo 2001).

The Politics of Poverty

Poverty Reduction Strategies

Poverty reduction has become the central goal of development policies over the last decade but there is a growing realisation that the poorest people rarely benefit from poverty reduction programs (Carr 2008; Lawson, Hulme et al. 2010). Engaging with and assisting marginalised communities remains a major challenge for the governments of developing countries. Development aid strategies, including poverty reduction initiatives, have focused primarily on economic development and as a result have contributed to the erosion of the asset base of these communities, and in particular their access to natural resources. Research conducted in sub-Saharan Africa, suggests that the potential impact of development investments on reducing poverty remains unrealised, owing to the exclusion of the poorest people in the process, coupled with questionable political commitment by national governments and international aid agencies (Kinsella and Brehony 2009).

Carr (2008) argues that the practice of poverty alleviation is greatly limited by a vision of poverty that fails to capture the locally specific causes of, and solutions to, the challenges that threaten human well-being. He states that contemporary efforts to alleviate poverty share a conception of poverty as a singular, universal problem and defining poverty like this shapes approaches to poverty reduction in three practical ways. First, poverty alleviation begins from preconceived notions of what are and are not problems to be dealt with in a particular place. Second, because the causes of poverty are often seen as being the same everywhere, approaches to poverty alleviation generally overlooked the local processes by which phenomena become classified as problems and also overlook the local means by which people have already attempted to address these problems. Finally, because poverty is conceived as a singular problem with universal causes, contemporary poverty alleviation efforts have difficulty in identifying the trade-offs and synergies – the compromises and the mutual benefits – that accompany any poverty reduction intervention and must be managed to ensure the efficacy of that intervention.

The government of Tanzania endorsed a Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRSP) in December 2000, followed in 2005 by the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty which places poverty reduction as the core element of the National development agenda, aiming to deepen citizen ownership and inclusion in policy-making processes. While bilateral and multilateral donors generally regard the Poverty Reduction Strategy in Tanzania as successful, a 2003 assessment of the PRSP by Evans and Ngalewa (quoted in (Kinsella and Brehony 2009) found that the rural poor were becoming increasingly disengaged and that political decision-making tended to be dominated by the private sector and government. The research conducted three case studies in Tanzania and found that national development strategies tended to favour the richer and more powerful sectors of society and have further alienated the already marginalised through their lack of participation in the planning and decision-making processes (Kinsella and Brehony 2009).

**Poor people or poor countries?**

In the past poverty has been predominantly viewed as a low-income country issue, with the ‘bottom billion’ described as living in Africa and all fragile states. Recent research is challenging this description, arguing that the global poverty problem has changed because most of the world's poor no longer live in poor countries. Using a range of poverty analysis approaches including the World Bank $1.25 a day poverty line and the UNDP Human Development Report 2010 Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI), current estimates suggest that around 1 billion people now live in middle-income countries because a number of the large low-income countries have graduated into this category. Since the recent graduations of many low-income countries (LICs) to middle-income country (MIC), status the remaining 39 LICs account for 25% of the world's poor, and fragile low income countries for just 12%, while 61% of the world's poor live in stable MICs (Sumner 2010). While Sumner acknowledges that much of this change can be attributed to the classification of countries as lower or middle income and indeed provides a critique of the classification system, it does raise questions about the approaches for poverty reduction in heterogeneous contexts, about the role of inequality and structural social change, and about aid and development policy. As he states, if development is about poverty reduction, where the poor lives is a crucial question.

**Political Participation of the Poor**

It is widely believed that political participation rates are lower among the poor compared to others, giving rise to the notion of a distinct culture of poverty. For example, in democracies where the poor constitute a majority or near majority of the population, why don't they vote themselves to power? Why are large populations of poor people unwilling or unable to act collectively? This analysis regards the poor as a stable, consistent or homogenous category. Krishna (2009) argues that when the poor are disaggregated and subgroups considered, political participation can vary significantly, as do the motivations behind that participation. The different experiences, identities and material interests of the subgroups tend to make collective action uncertain and questions related to what needs to be done by the State for poverty reduction become more complicated and nuanced when it is recognised that poverty is simultaneously both growing and ebbing (Krishna 2009).

**The Role of NGOs in poverty alleviation**

Understanding poverty is a multifaceted phenomenon through which people may travel many different trajectories and one in which large scale economically focused national policies often further marginalises the already chronically poor suggests that a more integrated and multifaceted solution is required. NGOs have an important role to play in facilitating greater social inclusion and voice for those whom large-scale efforts or national policies overlook. There is also an important role for NGOs to play in enhancing our understanding the specific nature of poverty at a local or village scale. Carr (2008) argues for refocusing development policy on a critical grassroots approach to ‘poverties’ in order to allow for more productive forecasting of the impacts of agricultural interventions on human well-being as well as enhance understanding on the relationship between power relations, local knowledge and development. This will allow us to build poverty alleviation programs on existing local management efforts thereby promoting the voices and strengths of the poor.
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# Annexure 4 ANCP 2010-11 Projects and the Human Development Index Rank

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **No. Projects** | **UN Human Development Index rank** | **Country** | **No. Projects** | **UN Human Development Index rank** |
| Cambodia | 39 | 124 | Pakistan | 5 | 125 |
| India | 26 | 119 | Mongolia | 5 | 100 |
| Timor Leste | 22 | 120 | Sri Lanka | 5 | 91 |
| Indonesia | 22 | 108 | Peru | 5 | 63 |
| Bangladesh | 20 | 129 | Afghanistan | 4 | 155 |
| Vietnam | 20 | 113 | Lebanon | 3 | no rank |
| Philippines | 20 | 97 | Nigeria | 3 | 142 |
| Vanuatu | 15 | no rank | Ghana | 3 | 130 |
| Solomon Islands | 15 | 123 | Bolivia | 3 | 95 |
| PNG | 14 | 137 | Palestinian Territories | 2 | no rank |
| Laos | 14 | 122 | Burundi | 2 | 166 |
| Sudan | 11 | 154 | Haiti | 2 | 145 |
| Burma (incl. Thai-Burma border) | 11 | 132 | Cameroon | 2 | 131 |
| China | 11 | 89 | Swaziland | 2 | 121 |
| Uganda | 10 | 143 | Honduras | 2 | 106 |
| Malawi | 9 | 153 | Eritrea | 1 | no rank |
| Nepal | 9 | 138 | Samoa | 1 | no rank |
| Fiji | 9 | 86 | Democratic Republic of the Congo | 1 | 168 |
| Zimbabwe | 8 | 169 | Guinea | 1 | 156 |
| Mozambique | 8 | 165 | Rwanda | 1 | 152 |
| Ethiopia | 8 | 157 | Senegal | 1 | 144 |
| Kenya | 8 | 128 | Lesotho | 1 | 141 |
| Zambia | 7 | 150 | Togo | 1 | 139 |
| Tanzania | 6 | 148 | Paraguay | 1 | 96 |
| South Africa | 6 | 110 | Ecuador | 1 | 77 |

1. *AusAID and NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP) Guidelines,* [*http://www.ausaid.gov.au/ngos/ancp.cfm*](http://www.ausaid.gov.au/ngos/ancp.cfm) *accessed 26 June 2011*  [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Accredited ANGOs - Accreditation is a risk management and continuous improvement assessment conducted every five years by which all ANGOs must satisfy a rigourous process of assessment against sector standards in order to receive ANCP funding. There are two levels of accreditation: base and full with commensurate levels of criteria and funding.* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *The 2010 Human Development Report introduced a new tool known as the* [*Multidimensional Poverty Index*](http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/mpi/) *(MPI). This tool complements money-based measures by considering multiple deprivations and their overlap.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. *While this study specifically focused on the experience of Australian NGOs working with the poorest and most marginalised people in poor communities, for ease and flow of language, the terms poor, the poorest and most marginalised are used interchangeably, depending on the specific context and reference.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. *For more information on these approaches, refer to the Literature Review accompanying this report (Annex 1).* [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Sen, Amartya. 1987. *Commodities and Capabilities*. Amsterdam: North-Holland [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. *Patrick Kilby and Joanne Crawford “Closing the Gender Gap – Gender and Australian NGOs”, ACFID Research in Development Series Report No 2, Australian Council for International Development, October 2011.* [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. *Breaking the Shackles – Women’s empowerment in Oxfam Australia’s Sri Lanka program*, Occasional Paper Number 3, September 2009 <http://www.oxfam.org.au/resources/filestore/originals/OAus-BreakingTheShackles-0909.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. *Assisi states that when this occurs, it typically happens over a twenty year time frame.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. ACFID Practice Note - *Human rights-based approaches to development*, July 2010. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. *Promoting Voice and Choice: Exploring Innovations in Australian NGO Accountability for Development Effectiveness, ACFID 2010* [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Draft working title for this document, which later became the Monitoring Evaluation and Learning Framework (MELF). [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Dr Jan Vandermoortele, (2009) *Meeting Millennium Development Goals* conference (30 November – 1 December, La Trobe University, Melbourne) stated that ‘if we address equity we can achieve the MDGs”. He argues that the preconditions for meeting the MDGs are not faster economic growth or more aid – this has been happening and there is still not good progress so these are not sufficient. Rather what is needed to progress the MDGs is less inequity and more equal partnerships between donors and recipients. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. The In-country component of the review process requires further consideration with AusAID and may be undertaken at a later stage utilising in-country expertise. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)